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Introduction

A review of literature showed that studies relevant to the Chinese in Australia were mostly concerned with immigration laws and early Chinese settlements, and that little had been done on post-World War II Chinese communities in Australia. The present study utilizes Australian censuses, immigration and marriage statistics, etc. to trace the main outline of Chinese migration and settlement in Australia since 1861, and then examines the present pattern of settlement in Melbourne in the form of a survey in 1968. Australian censuses were particularly useful as a basic source material. This thesis can be readily divided into two parts: The first part deals with the history of Chinese migration and settlement in Australia and the second part deals with the Melbourne survey.

Chapter I

The Canton Delta, from which most of the Chinese in the United States, Canada and Australasia have originated, is a densely populated area. During the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, numerous riots and rebellions added extra burdens onto the general population. Moreover, the unequal distribution of land adversely affected many peasant-tenants. Evidence from various sources showed that socio-economic conditions were conducive to emigration.
The importance of the Chinese family-lineage system was next considered in relation to emigration. Lineages owning much land competed with each other in gaining control of particular areas and villages, so forcing defeated lineages either to accept permanent subordination or to leave the village entirely. The main motive for emigration during the early periods was often to promote the welfare of one's family-lineage. By working hard and saving thriftily, the migrant often returned home to advance the prestige and power of his family-lineage at home. This desire, together with the government policy of the Ching Dynasty to discourage Chinese emigration, resulted in a Chinese commuting system of migration.

Chapter II

Strong colonial restriction laws characterized early Chinese migration to Australia. The gold rush brought a large number of Chinese miners to the goldfields and aroused fear among the Australian miners. Early colonial restrictions were mainly in the form of entry poll tax and 'tonnage restrictions' - i.e. restricting the number of Chinese a vessel could carry according to the tonnage of the vessel. After the gold rush, many Chinese returned to China. But some who stayed settled in country areas as station-hands and market gardeners, while others were beginning to move towards metropolitan centres and were engaged in urban occupations such as furniture making and laundry. Market-gardening was, at this time, the most important occupation.
Chapter III

The 1901-47 period saw a major decline of Chinese population in Australia, partly through death and partly through large scale re-migration, especially of those in higher age groups. The strong attachment to their family-lineage together with the severe restriction on the entry of wives and dependants and the exclusion of Chinese from naturalization, were major reasons for the large number who returned to China. But more important than the effect on the decline of numbers was the influence on the pattern of Chinese settlement. By permitting only certain categories of Chinese to enter, the 1901 Immigration Restriction Act excluded the immigration of independant Chinese while at the same time encouraged the continuation of some of the traditional Chinese occupations.

Chapter IV

The post-World War II picture of the Chinese in Australia is very different from that of the pre-war period. The number of Chinese increased first during the war with the repatriation of war-time refugees, then in the 1950's when the large number of sponsored assistants, chefs and 'substitutes' arrived, and finally in the 1960's when the influx of non-sponsored students began.

In terms of residence, the suburbanization of the Chinese in Sydney and Melbourne has begun to disperse the heretofore concentrations in city centres. In terms of occupations, there is the continuation of vegetable and fruit distributing business, the Chinese merchants and
the emergence of the Chinese cafes as a major development. In general, the Chinese population after World War II is more settled; it has grown younger. Both the conditions in China and the conditions in Australia are now favourable for the Chinese to stay permanently.

Chapter V

This chapter describes the methods of sampling. Melbourne was chosen as the research site because the Chinese in Melbourne are known to be more 'homogeneous' than those in Sydney, and are therefore more suited for small sample surveys, and secondly because less work has been done on the Chinese in Melbourne. The sampling frame was constructed from the Sands and MacDougall Directory for Victoria (1968), Electoral Rolls (1967) and the Telephone Directory (1968). Chinese addresses on these three lists were found to correspond well in terms of suburb distribution, and they were combined to make the sampling frame.

A sample of 200 addresses was drawn randomly by stratifying the frame into three groups of suburbs. The suburbs were grouped according to socio-economic rankings. Uniform sampling fraction was applied to each group. A supplementary frame was constructed for obscure Chinese names, and appropriate number of cases was drawn from this supplementary frame.

The administration of the survey was smooth and non-responses due to refusals were few.
Chapter VI

The restrictive sponsorship system and the family-lineage commuting system causes the formation of a unique Chinese settlement in Melbourne. The sponsorship system limits the occupational choice on arrival and influences mobility away from Chinese occupations, while the commuting system forces upon the migrants a continued link between them and their home villages, and facilitates the formation of regional settlements. This migration process produces a situation not conducive to rapid integration into Australian society. The accommodation of the Chinese who migrated through the traditional sponsorship system is attained by the formation of a complementary occupational structure within the Australian society.

For the Australian-born and the non-sponsored students, the movement away from Chinese occupation is oriented towards the professionals and not towards other sectors of the Australian occupational structure.

The residential pattern shows that suburbanization of the Chinese is accompanied by the spread of Chinese cafes in the suburbs. However, the high proportion of home ownership in outer suburbs seems to indicate that the trend of suburbanization will probably continue.

Chapter VII

The marriage pattern among Chinese in Melbourne shows the importance of village and district of origin in influencing the choice of marriage partners. Among foreign-
born Chinese who married other foreign-born Chinese, in-district marriages dominate. Out-district marriages are rare, and appear to be largely the absorption of non-Four-District males into the Australian population and the females into Australian-born Chinese population. The traditional sponsored migrants, being members of a well established group in Melbourne, out-marry less than the Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysian non-sponsored students and war-time refugees. The large proportion of intermarriages among the Australian-born, especially among part-Chinese, indicates that rapid assimilation occurred with the second generation much more rapidly than with the first generation.

The analysis of age at marriage shows major postponement among foreign-born females, a fact which is commonly found in migrant communities where the sex ratio is highly favourable to the males.

Chapter VIII

Most traditional sponsored Chinese have few Australian friends, and then mostly of shallow relations; they participated little into Australian organizations. For many, in addition to distinct physical features and a deficiency in the use of English, there is also a feeling of being marginal to Australian society - a feeling which arouses embarrassment and consciousness of their ethnic and migrant status. Significant differences in social participation and friendship pattern were found for the Australian-born, especially among part-Chinese. Integration into Australian society occurs rapidly among
Australian-born Chinese, not only in occupations, residence and intermarriage, but also in their social activities.

Chapter IX

In summary, the pattern of Chinese migration and settlement in Australia was discussed in relation to Park's race relations cycle and other theories of assimilation. While the history of the Chinese in Australia indicates no major deviation from Park's cycle of contact, conflict, accommodation and assimilation, several findings concerning group size, continuous inflow of new arrivals and uneven assimilation, etc., show the weakness of Park's theory.

The pattern of Chinese migration and settlement in Australia with its unique background, history and restrictive laws etc., seems to indicate that a synthesis of assimilation theories is difficult.
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INTRODUCTION

Review of Literature and Aim of Study

This thesis is a study of the history of Chinese migration and settlement in Australia; it includes a detailed sociological survey of the Chinese population of Melbourne (1968).

Much has been written on the Chinese abroad, especially those in South-east Asia, and several works on the Chinese in the United States of America have been published. However, studies relevant to the Chinese in Australia are mostly concerned with restrictive immigration laws.


and regulations rather than directly with Chinese settlement. Among the few which deal specifically with Chinese migrants, almost all are historical studies concerning the early settlements. Works of Carrington, Oddie, Serle, Rendall, and Yong, for example, are related to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

1 Numerous articles and pamphlets describing and expressing opinions on the origin and mechanism of the "White Australia' policy can be found in various Australian journals, notably in Australian Quarterly, The Bulletin, and the Current Affairs Bulletin. For a full list of these articles and pamphlets, see C.A. Price (ed.), Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest (Canberra, 1966), Part P, pp. 47-63. The most important works are chronologically, M. Willard, The History of the White Australia Policy (1923; Melbourne, reprinted, 1967); A.T. Yarwood, Asian Migration to Australia: The Background to Exclusion, 1896-1923 (1964; Melbourne, reprinted 1967); A.C. Palfreeman, The Administration of the White Australia Policy (Melbourne, 1967).


There are only three studies of post-World War II Chinese settlement in Australia: Lee Siew Eng's ecological study of the Chinese in Sydney, 1 Christine Inglis' study of the Darwin Chinese; 2 Arthur Huck's general treatise of the Chinese in Australia and a sample study of the voting behaviour among Chinese in two suburbs of Melbourne. 3 While Inglis' work on the Darwin Chinese deals with assimilation in general, Lee's study is more specific, describing the characteristics of the Chinese in each zone in Metropolitan Sydney; Huck's book has brief discussions on the number and social origins of Chinese migrants but includes also sections on political opinions of Chinese voters and non-permanent resident students. None of these studies, however, describe the process of Chinese migration and the effects of the restrictive immigration laws on Chinese settlement in Australia.

There are two books on the Chinese in Australia written by Chinese scholars in Chinese. 4 Both of these


draw heavily from Australian sources, and most of the information there can be found elsewhere from Australian works.

Besides these few, there are some studies on the Asian students in Australia; for example, Mary C. Hodgkin's study of the Asian students in Western Australia, Armstrong and others' monograph on the Asian students in Melbourne, and Keats' study of the Asian students in Australia in general. These, however, deal with private non-permanent resident students, and have little relevance to the settler group.

The aim of this study is partly demographic, to draw on all information available in Australian censuses from 1861 onwards, on immigration and marriage statistics and on other documentary materials, in order to trace the main outline of Chinese settlement in Australia, with special reference to the growth and decline of population, the age and sex structure of that population, marriage patterns, place of settlement and occupational changes. Detailed aspects of these general trends are then studied in the Melbourne Chinese community by means of a more

1 Mary C. Hodgkin, Australian Training and Asian Living (Nedlands, Western Australia, 1966).


3 D.M.Keats, Back in Asia (Department of Economics, The Australian National University, 1969).
sociological survey in 1968. This is designed to concentrate on occupational changes, residential movements and marriage patterns, so revealing the effects of the Chinese background, of Australian immigration policy and of the Australian environment on the migration, settlement and integration of the Chinese in at least one part of Australia.

This study emphasizes general population trends and characteristics, migration and marriage, but has much less on two other important topics of demography - i.e. fertility and mortality. These topics cannot adequately be dealt with here, first because statistics showing the origin of persons who died or were born are not available by 'race'. Although statistics on death by place of birth and births by place of birth of parents are available from 1907 to date, they are, as we shall presently see, poor estimates of Chinese race figures. Moreover, even if these figures are analysed, they give only crude death and birth rates and these are not refined enough to be of much significance in showing fertility and mortality trends. Secondly, in the decades before World War II, the Chinese in Australia were a very incomplete population; many Chinese males reaching old age retired to China, so affecting mortality, while the great majority of wives and children remained in China without emigrating, so affecting fertility. Under these conditions, and with inadequate material, careful analysis of fertility and mortality trends cannot be made.¹

¹ Attempts were made to construct simple indices of mortality and fertility levels among the Chinese; but these were so unsatisfactory that they were not included in the thesis.
Although, as a demographic history, the thesis is incomplete (and is therefore not called a demographic history), the other topics covered - places of residence, occupational patterns, etc. - compensate to some extent. In fact, they turn it into a more general social history, from which the Melbourne survey quite naturally derives though it does not claim to be in any sense a complete social history. In a sense, it is a social history of the Chinese in Australia concentrating on demographic trends, geographic distribution, occupations and other matters associated with these strands of social history.

A Note on Sources

Australian censuses, immigration statistics and the Melbourne survey, are the main sources of this study.

The censuses are particularly useful because colonial censuses before 1911 treated Chinese as a special category, often tabulating them separately from the general population. The Chinese were enumerated with extreme care during the late colonial period when the Chinese question received wide attention. For instance, Victorian census reports after 1845 mentioned the use of Chinese speaking interpreters (usually 'Chinese protectors' on the goldfields or English speaking Chinese) to accompany census collectors.¹ New South Wales presumably followed

¹ Victoria Censuses Statistician's Report for 1854, p.iii; for 1857, p.5; for 1861, p.vi; for 1871, p.6; for 1881, p.6.
the same system, but the first mention of Chinese-speaking interpreters was in the 1881 Statistician's Report where the system was said to be extremely satisfactory.¹

Particulars relating to the Chinese are available for Victoria (1854) and Queensland (1861) in their first censuses,² for South Australia in 1861 and for New South Wales in 1856. For the other colonies - Western Australia and Tasmania - they are available after 1881. At first, persons born in China were treated as ethnic Chinese and there was no distinction made between 'nationality' and 'race'.³ There was also a great difference in the amount of information tabulated about the Chinese between the colonies, the colonies least affected by Chinese migration (Tasmania, South Australia and Western Australia) having

¹ New South Wales Census, Statistician's Report for 1881, p. II.
² Previously, Victoria and Queensland were parts of New South Wales.
³ New South Wales, until and including 1881, had no separate categories of 'race' or 'ethnic' Chinese. In Victoria until and including 1871, Tasmania and Queensland 1881, Western Australia and South Australia 1891, persons born in China or Chinese nationals were categorized as ethnic Chinese persons. In these early days, it was probably that figures based on 'birthplace' or 'nationality' were close estimates of race figures, since Chinese came mainly from China and not from other overseas Chinese communities.
the least information. But in 1901, most of the basic information such as age, sex, marital status and occupation were available for all colonies. Although the 1905 Census Act did not specify 'race' as an item of inquiry,\(^1\) Commonwealth censuses from 1911 have always included an item of 'race' in addition to birthplace and 'nationality'. This practice continued until the present and it is, therefore, possible to analyse basic demographic trends of the Chinese population by race from 1901. However, detailed cross-tabulations of various socio-economic characteristics by race and by birthplace simultaneously are not available; and direct comparison between foreign-born and Australian-born Chinese is not possible.

Migration statistics are more limited than censuses. Before 1948, Australian migration statistics used 'nationality' for Europeans and 'race' for non-Europeans as major variables in their tabulation. In 1948, the term 'race' was dropped, and 'nationality' became, until 1959 when 'birthplace' was added, the only description of the origin of the migrants. 'Nationality', however, is a very decept-ive term. First, the one general category of 'British' includes not only persons from the British Isles but Maltese, Malaysians, Australians, etc., who are British subjects by birth.\(^2\) Because Chinese born in Hong Kong, Malaysia, and other British Commonwealth countries, are

---


2 This problem has been discussed in relation to movements of Australians who were classified as British. C.A. Price, "Some Problems of International Migration Statistics: An Australian Case Study", *Population Studies* XIX (July, 1965), p. 18.
included in the 'British' category, figures of Chinese nationals necessarily under-count the actual number of ethnic Chinese. In 1947, 558 (10 per cent) full-Chinese born outside Australia had non-Chinese nationalities. In 1954, there were 2,170 (27 per cent); in 1961, 8,143 (55 per cent); and in 1966, some 11,000 (64 per cent).

Secondly, nationality is seriously affected by naturalization, although in the case of the Chinese this is not of major concern because the right to become naturalized was withheld between 1904 (1888 in New South Wales) and 1956. Naturalization means that immigration figures of arrival and departure are not directly comparable.²

Another characteristic, i.e. birthplace, however, was not included in the annual statistics until 1959; but by this time, birthplace figures for the Chinese were seriously affected by the large arrival of Russians who were born in China and by increasing numbers of Chinese not born in China.²

---

1 Because government policy in Australia encourages naturalization, nationality changes very quickly. Price (op. cit., p.27) estimated that about half of the net alien arrivals of 900,000 since 1945 have become naturalized by 1954.

2 The exact number of Russians is not available, but an approximate for 1961-5 can be estimated from the number of Chinese-born Eastern (Communistic) Europeans who arrived as settlers. They represent a large proportion of settlers arrivals of persons born in China.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Settler Arrivals of Eastern Europeans born in China</th>
<th>Settler Arrivals of all persons born in China²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Special Tabulation made available to the Department of Demography, The Australian National University, by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics.

Note: a) by financial years 1961-2, 1962-3 etc. The two sets of figures are, therefore, not directly comparable. They are given here for reference only.
The seriousness of these defects can be illustrated from census figures comparing Chinese (race) with persons born in China. In 1947, 11 per cent (599) of the total foreign-born full-Chinese in Australia were not born in China. This percentage increased to 26 per cent (2,209) in 1954, 50 per cent (7,457) in 1961, and 53 per cent (9,029) in 1966. Similarly, the percentage of ethnic full-Chinese among Chinese-born persons decreased. In 1947, 75 per cent of those born in China were actually ethnic Chinese. This dropped rapidly to 57 per cent in 1954, to 51 per cent in 1961, and to 46 per cent in 1966. 'Birthplace' figures, therefore, necessarily over-count ethnic Chinese who are not born in China.

Marriage statistics are also limited by the inconsistency between figures based on 'ethnicity' and 'birthplace'. Not only is it erroneous to equate marriages between Chinese-born persons to in-marriages of Chinese, it is also a mistake to assume Australian-born persons are non-Chinese. A marriage between an Australian-born Chinese and a foreign-born Chinese is not distinguishable in marriage statistics from an intermarriage between a European-Australian and a foreign-born Chinese.\(^1\)

Another important source of information on migrants—the naturalization records—is, unfortunately, less

---

valuable for the Chinese than for other migrant groups because naturalization was not granted to the Chinese between 1904 and 1956.

Besides official statistics, the reports of the Royal Commission on the Goldfields (Victoria), of Select Committees on Asiatic Labour (New South Wales) and on Chinese Immigration (Victoria) and other historical documents are also used. Chinese sources, such as local gazetteers of Kwangtung and the Four Districts area, Joss House records, association records and Chinese newspapers, are also valuable. All these, together with relevant information from secondary sources, are the materials used in tracing the history of Chinese migration and settlement in Australia.

The Organization of the Thesis

This thesis can be readily divided into two parts. The first part, from Chapter I to Chapter IV, deals with the history of Chinese migration and settlement, and the second part, from Chapter V to Chapter VIII, deals with the Melbourne Survey.

The history of Chinese migration to Australia is long, some 120 years since the first gold rush in the 1850's to the present, covering periods of significant social change in Australian history. It is difficult to discuss each aspect of Chinese migration and settlement through such a long span of time, not only because Australian society has changed much since the gold rush days, but
also because important factors in the Chinese background have also changed. This thesis, therefore, divides the history of Chinese in Australia into three periods: 1) the gold rush (1850's) to Federation (1901), 2) Federation to World War II, and 3) World War II to the present. These three periods coincide with important social change both in Australia and in China. The early period of frontier development in Australia ended with the Federation of the colonies in 1901, while in China the Republican movement was gaining much strength so that in 1911, the Ching government collapsed under the revolution. The period from 1901 to World War II saw strict immigration restriction in Australia against the Chinese; in China, Chinese society underwent a period of gradual modernization and westernization. The period after World War II is very different from the pre-war periods. Australian immigration laws have become more liberal and the communist victory in China has largely transformed the nature of Chinese emigration from the temporary movements of the early periods into a more permanent settlement.

The thesis, therefore, begins with a description of the Chinese background during the early twentieth century (Chapter I) and proceeds to analyse the migration and settlement of Chinese in these three periods (Chapter II to Chapter IV).
Chapter V describes the methods of the Melbourne Survey; and Chapters VI to VIII present the results of the Survey under the headings of processes of migration and settlement, marriages, and education and social participation. The last Chapter (Conclusion) discusses the finding of the study of Chinese of this thesis in the broader context of assimilation 'theories', comparing the Chinese in Australia with other migrant groups.
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CHAPTER I
THE CHINESE RURAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

Chinese emigration overseas has been restricted to certain provinces close to the Pacific Ocean and exposed to Western impact during the nineteenth century. Those who went to Australasia, the United States and Canada were nearly all from Kwangtung, the southern-most province of China. A majority of them came from the Canton Delta, an area of nearly 7,000 square miles of fertile land around the estuary of the Pearl River (Chu-Kiang). This area has also sent many migrants to South-east Asia.

Not all Chinese emigrants came from this area. The majority of those in Thailand, for example, came from Swatao in north Kwangtung and the surrounding Han Delta region. Many in Vietnam came from the island of Hoinam (Hainan) in south Kwangtung. The Hokkien (Fukien) Chinese from Fukien province, north along the coast from Kwangtung, migrated generally to all countries in South-east Asia; many are still in Malaysia, Philippines, Indonesia and Borneo. The Hakka Chinese, who originally came from central China in the thirteenth century and settled in various parts of China, migrated to most countries in South-east Asia, but mainly to Malaysia. In addition to emigration from South China, coolies were recruited from Chefu, Shantung province in North China, to go to France during the labour shortage of the First World War. Seamen from Shanghai also settled in Europe, some in England. Migration from the Northern province to Manchuria was also extensive after the fall of the Ching dynasty in 1911.
For my purpose which concerns Chinese migration to Australia, it is necessary to explore the social and economic conditions of Kwangtung only and more specifically of the Canton Delta region where most of the Chinese in Australia have originated.

Geography, Production, Population and Law and Order

The province of Kwangtung is hilly but is penetrated by the valleys of three large rivers which converge to a common delta, usually called the Canton Delta. These three rivers are the Si-Kiang, the Pei-kiang and Tung-kiang - i.e. the West, North and East Rivers. All three converge near the city of Canton and the combined flow is then called Chu-kiang or the Pearl River.

The whole province of Kwangtung can be seen as a vast valley drained by these three rivers and bounded on three sides by mountain ranges stretching from the east through the north to the west. The south side opens into the South China sea.

To the east are the South-eastern Uplands which comprise the eastern third of Kwangtung, the whole of Fukien and a portion of Chekiang province north of Fukien. The Uplands are rather high in altitude, in general around 2,000 feet with regions higher than 6,000 feet. The rocks of the Uplands have been repeatedly compressed into a series of parallel scarps of upfolds and downfolds. The few passes over the scarps are high and difficult, and they constitute a formidable barrier between the Southern Yangtse Basin and the densely populated coastal areas of Fukien.
and eastern Kwangtung. Communications between coastal towns and interior villages is difficult, and railways and motor roads are not well developed.

The mountain ranges in the north, known as the Nanling ranges, are an important divider between Kwangtung province and Central China. These ranges are not as prohibitive to traffic as the South-eastern Uplands and there are several major and minor passes through which trade and communication are maintained. In terms of climate and vegetation, however, the Nanling ranges separate the sub-tropical lowlands of Kwangtung and the Southern Yangtse basin with its cold winters. The Nanling ranges were used conveniently to mark off two distinctly separate agricultural areas.\(^1\) Although both have similar topographical conditions, they differ in vegetation, temperature and rainfall. In broad terms, the forests to the south are definitely sub-tropical and the forests of the Yangtse basin to the north are primarily warm temperate.

To the west of Kwangtung province is the plateau of Kwangsi, covering the province of the same name. Essentially the basin of the upper Si-kiang, it reaches heights of more than 3,000 feet with only sparse population concentrated along the many tributaries. Much of the plateau is composed of limestone layers, a part of which being badly eroded and carried off downstream Si-kiang to form the Canton Delta.

The South-eastern Uplands, the Nanling ranges and the

---

\(^1\) To the north is the 'Rice-Tea' area, and to the south the 'Double-Cropping' area. See J.L. Buck, *Land Utilization in China* (Shanghai 1937), pp.27-30.
Kwangsi plateau form a protective shield for Kwangtung, so isolating it from any extensive influence from central China. Fukien, too, is effectively isolated by the South-eastern Uplands. Politically, Kwangtung and Fukien have often been places of refuge for rebellious armies and defeated emperors, and therefore, areas of potential trouble and danger to established governments. In fact, Chinese migration from the north to the south was often propelled by political changes of dynasties, the defeated emperors withdrawing to Kwangtung together with their loyal troops and people. Although the Canton Delta, a 7,000 square mile area of fertile farm land\(^1\) produces two rice crops and one dry crop a year, economically the pressure of population on land is great. In addition, natural disasters such as floods and droughts, and destructive warfares such as the Taiping Rebellion, have often occurred. These, together with the corrupt opium-smoking widespread in Kwangtung in the latter half of the nineteenth century, shattered the economic foundation of the Kwangtung society.

---

\(^1\) The whole area of some 7,000 square miles consists of thirteen districts and includes the 'Four Districts' of Toishan, Sunwui, Hoiping and Yanping. See Chang Chi-Yun, An Introduction to the Regional Geography of China (Taipei, 1967), Vol. Bl, p.28; J.L. Buck (op.cit., p.83), gave approximately the same figure of 7,000 square miles. A much smaller estimate of 3,000 square miles was, however, given by The Royal Navy Intelligence Division, China Proper: Volume I, Physical Geography, History and People (London, 1944), p. 119. Their figure, as far as can be judged from the maps included (p.121) is for a smaller area not including the Four Districts. See also Theodore Shabad, China's Changing Map (New York, 1956), p. 164. Shabad also gave a figure of 3,000 square miles.
The isolation of Kwangtung and Fukien is well shown in their distinctive languages. In Hunan, Kiangsi and Chekiang provinces north of Kwangtung, the Mandarin dialect is generally spoken as elsewhere in China. On the South-eastern Uplands in Fukien province and in the Swatao area of Kwangtung, the Hokkien-Teochiu dialect prevails, while on Hainan Island, off the south coast of Kwangtung, inhabitants use the Hoinam dialect. In central and western Kwangtung the inhabitants use an ancient form of spoken Chinese, often referred to as Cantonese after Canton City. Various versions of Cantonese exist; those from Toishan, Sunwui, Hoiping and Yangping speak the Sze-Yap (Four Districts) dialect and those from Namhoi (Nanhai), Punyu and Shunte speak the Sam-Yap (Three Districts) dialect. Canton City and the districts of Chung-Shan and Kao-Yao, being near the Three Districts, are also places where the Sam-Yap dialect is spoken.

There are also the Hakkas who have retained their own village system and distinctive Mandarin style language. Chinese in the United States, Canada and Australia are mostly Cantonese whereas Hokkiens, Teochius and Hakkas have migrated more frequently to various countries in Southeast Asia. Dialect groups, with the exception of the Hakkas, correspond to places of origin and provide one of the basic classificatory criteria of Chinese migrants. According to the figure published by the Communist Chinese government after the first systematic census of China in 1953, the

---

province of Kwangtung has an area of about 231 thousand square kilometres (or a little less than 86 thousand square miles),\(^1\) about two-thirds of which are hills and mountains and the other one-third level plains. In addition to the cultivation of the plains and the valleys, some of the slopes of low hills and mountains are also terraced for farming. In total, cultivated land consists of about one-twelve to one-tenth of the total land area of the whole province,\(^2\) making it one of the most intensely cultivated provinces in China.

The climate is also favourable for agriculture. The Kwangtung coastal low lands and the Hainan Island are the warmest regions of China. Frost and snow are rarely seen, except on high ranges, and rainfall is abundant. This sub-tropical climate, together with the rich sediments of the Canton Delta, makes it possible to grow crops continuously throughout the year. Two crops of rice is general throughout the province and three crops can be produced in some parts of the Delta and on Hainan Island. So intensive is cultivation in this area that when a crop of rice is soon to be harvested, young rice shoots are raised in nursery beds to be transplanted to the fields when the first crop is harvested.

Irrigated rice is the leading food crop, having a


\(^2\) Wang Chin-Fu, Chung-Kuo Fen Sheng Ti Chih (Provincial Geography of China) (Shanghai, 1926), Vol. 2, p. 70.
production of about 8,500,000 tons per year. Sweet potatoes, peanuts and various types of vegetables and fruits are also grown. Mulberry trees flourish, especially around the Shunte area directly south of Canton City, supporting a large silk industry second in scale only to the Hankow-Shanghai silks. Kwangtung is also one of China's major sugar-cane provinces, having sugar-cane fields in the Han River Delta and on Hainan Island as well as in the Canton Delta. Among other crops are tea and tobacco, both suited to the north and north-western hilly countries. In the coastal regions fishing, both from ocean catches and from fish ponds, plays a major role in the economy.

In short, the province of Kwangtung is relatively fertile and the variety and quantity of produce are abundant enough to support a relatively large population, making the province one of the most populated areas in China. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the population of Kwangtung had reached 14 million, and by the 1860's had approached the 30 million mark.

---

1 Shabad, op. cit., p.164.

2 For the amount of silk production in Kwangtung, see Wang Chin-Fu, op. cit., pp.79-81.
### TABLE 1.1

POPULATION DENSITY OF KWANGTUNG 1776-1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population ('ooos)</th>
<th>Density per sq.mile</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>14,821</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>J.Durand, p.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>16,014</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>E.K.Lo, p.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>16,337</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>C.P.Yen, p.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>19,174</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>J.Durand, p.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>21,558</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>C.P.Yen, p.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>22,662</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Ditto p.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>25,744</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Ditto p.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>28,182</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Ditto p.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>29,204</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Ditto p.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>29,489</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>Ditto p.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>29,672</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Ditto p.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>Ditto p.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>34,876</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Y.C.Liu, p.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>37,168</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>China Year Book, p.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>34,770</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>People's Handbook 1959, pp. 209, 217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

**Notes:** Figures for 1776-1902 are extracted from Hu-bu Ching Ts'e (Population Registers) of the Ching Dynasty which give population estimates each year according to provinces. These population registers are not censuses in terms of the method of enumeration. They give simple estimates basing on local reports which are open to serious doubts. For a discussion of this, see Ho Ping-ti, Studies
on the Population of China, 1368-1953 (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), especially Chapter 3. Estimates beyond 1902 under the Nationalist government are even more erroneous. The Pao-Chia system of population registration was discontinued and no real census was taken. Estimates were sometimes made by the Post Office and sometimes by the Ministry of Interior. The exact area of Kwangtung is also uncertain. Some estimates gave a figure of 100,000 square miles (China Yearbook, 1925, p. 3). Others gave much lower figures, for example of 83,340 square miles (J. Durand, op. cit.). The first systematic census, which was conducted in 1953 under the Communist government gave a figure of 231,400 square kilometres, or approximately 86,000 square miles. This figure is used in the above table for calculating population density.

Inaccurate as China's population figures are, the above table shows an increase of approximately 0.8 per cent per year for 1776-1812, 1.1 per cent for 1812-1860, 0.07 per cent for 1860-1890, and 0.3 per cent for 1890-1953. The relatively little increase between 1860 and 1890 was probably due to the Taiping Rebellion which caused a great loss of human lives in Kwangtung as well as in other provinces in south-eastern China. The increase during the whole period was maintained by a high birth rate compensating a high death rate. Buck's survey of land use in China 1929-1933 reported a crude birth rate of 39.0 per 1,000 population and a crude death rate of 30.0 per 1,000 population for rural South China.\(^1\) Kulp's study of the Swatao area showed that both crude birth and death rates were high at 34 per thousand.\(^2\) Elsewhere in China, birth

\(^{1}\) J.L. Buck, *op. cit.*, pp. 382, 387. Both the birth and death rates were suspected to be underestimated.

rates fluctuated between 50 and 25, and death rates between 40 and 20 per thousand population.\textsuperscript{1} Although the figures quoted refer to later periods, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the rates for earlier periods were also high.

The population density for the province as a whole is not totally indicative of the pressure of excessive population, for the bulk of the population is concentrated on the fertile Canton Delta while the mountain areas are not as crowded. Figures of 2,000 per square mile,\textsuperscript{2} and 3,000 per square mile\textsuperscript{3} have been reported for the Canton Delta area; and it is known that large numbers of Tankas (some 200,000) live permanently on boats.\textsuperscript{4} Some rough estimates of population densities and proportion of cultivated land are given below for the various districts (Hsien) around Canton Delta; most of these are districts of large scale emigration to Australia.

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] Chen Ta, "Jen-kou Pien-Ch'ien ti Yuan-su" (Determinants of Population Change) in Ya-Tung Hsieh-she (ed.), \textit{op.cit.}, p.31.
\item[2] Royal Navy Intelligence Division, \textit{op.cit.}, p.122.
\item[3] Buck, \textit{op. cit.}, p.86.
\item[4] Ibid., p.122.
\end{itemize}
### Table 1.2

**Land Use and Population of Fourteen Districts in the Canton Delta**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canton Delta</th>
<th>Total Area (sq.mls.)</th>
<th>Cultivated Area (Mows)</th>
<th>Per cent of total Cultivated Area</th>
<th>Population (1923)</th>
<th>Population per sq.mil. of land</th>
<th>Cultivated land (Mows) per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toishan</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>2,254,700</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>940,680</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunwui</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,245,100</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1,230,770</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoiping</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>346,800</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>671,410</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanping</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>299,900</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>325,300</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanhai</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43,600</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punya</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>1,516,300</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1,367,680</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunte</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,087,100</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>1,039,740</td>
<td>3,141</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Kuan</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,848,800</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoyao</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,063,600</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>726,825</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungshan</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>602,200</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>1,145,220</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsui</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>182,500</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>186,860</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoming</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>322,300</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>142,670</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pao-an</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>133,460</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokshan</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>308,900</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>150,420</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b) *Ibid.* 1 Mow = 0.0614 hectare.

c) Post Office estimates of 1923, China Year Book 1925, pp.4-20.

d) The figure given for Nanhai is unreasonably large. It is, therefore, omitted.

e) Excluding British Hong Kong.

f) Excluding Portuguese Macao.
The figures of Table 1.2 have to read with a great deal of qualification as they are based on estimates of the district post offices and no details exist as to how the areas were surveyed. Even so, it is apparent that these districts, except for a few hilly ones, were subjected to intensive farming with more than 30 per cent. of their total land area cultivates; and in Nanhai and Shunte districts directly south of Canton City, the proportions of cultivated land were even higher, at 72 per cent. and 84 per cent. respectively. These proportions contrast with 12 per cent. calculated for the total area of Kwangtung.

The need to produce and extract more from the land is apparent if the population in each district is considered in relation to land area (Table 1.2). Densities of over 3,000 per sq. mile are observed for Shunte and Chungshan, the two most fertile districts. Five other districts - Samsui, Punyu, Toishan, Sunwui and Hoiping - have densities over 1,000 per sq. mile. Only three districts had densities lower than the provincial average of about 400 per sq. mile.

Since there was large variation in the proportion of cultivated land between the districts, the situation of population pressure is better described by the ratio of cultivated land to the population. For the period during the 1920's and 1930's in South China, it was estimated that a minimum of 3 mows of cultivated land per person was necessary to provide enough to satisfy the minimum requirements of ordinary livelihood. In 1812, for example, Kwangtung had

approximately 32 million mows of cultivated land and about 19 million population, thereby giving an average of 1.67 mows to each person. This was considerably lower than the national average of 2.19 and much lower than the 3 mows of minimum requirement. According to the 1812 figures, the province of Kwangtung had less cultivated land per person than all but Kweichow, Kwangsi, Kansu, Fukien and Anhwei. Coming back to the 1920's and 1930's, for the districts around Canton Delta, only five - Tungkuan, Pao-an, Toishan, Kaoming, Hokshan - had a ratio larger than two. If the figure of 3 mows per person is accepted as the minimum for ordinary livelihood, all of these districts were below the minimum standard of living. Some relief came from growing high yield crops rather than rice, for example, tobacco and opium poppies which had a high sale price, and from cultivating sandy soil for peanuts, potatoes and corn. Chinese emigrants from these districts have also helped by sending remittance from overseas to their families.

But the shortage of land and food was keenly felt and remained a basic problem of rural South China. In the early 1910's, the imports of rice increased from about 10,000 tans per year (1 tan = 133.33 lbs.) during the late Ching period to over 10 million tans, sometimes exceeding 20 million tans as in 1923, 1927 and 1933. Kwangtung and Fukien received

1 Ibid., p.42.

2 Tobacco growing, however, had an adverse effect on decreasing the land area for rice. See E.K.Lo, op.cit., pp.55-56.

3 Wu Chuan-Chun, Chung-kuo Liang-shih Dili (Food and Geography of China) (Shangai, 1943), pp.81-83.
the majority of these imports.¹ Inpoeverished farmers, leaving their small plots of land, have for a long time migrated during the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century to Kwangsi and Szechuan provinces;² some with connections in South-east Asia or the United States migrated abroad. Others joined bandits or became beggars and gathered in gangs or formed secret societies. They roamed the country and attacked towns, looting rich families and government rice storages, and occasionally occupying villages and towns. In both Toishan and Hoiping, bandit robbery and riots occurred almost every year in some part of the districts.³ All these finally merged into the White Lotus Riot (1796-7) and the Taiping Rebellion (1850-64) which devastated large areas. Others joined pirate gangs and became a great menace to local governments around the coast. Still others enlisted in the local militia units which were established for self-defence. Wealthy clans and families had their own mercenary braves.⁴

---

1 Ibid., pp.73-74.

2 E.K.Lo, op.cit., p.57. See also Kwangtung Tung-chih (Gazetteer of Kwangtung), Canton, 1864, pp.67-8. Emperor Yung Ching (1723-17), in an edict to the Viceroy of Hunan and Kwangtung asked the officials to discourage Kwangtung emigration to Szechuan.

3 Sun-ning Hsien Chih (Gazetteer of Toishan), 1893, chapter 16. Hoiping Hsien Chih (Gazetteer of Hoiping), 1932, loc.cit.

4 For a description of the local militia and the mercenary braves of Kwangtung, see Frederic Wakeman, Strangers at the Gate (Berkeley, 1966), pp.22-28. While emigration has often been considered a major outlet of excessive population, much less is known about the great number of persons enlisted in the central and local military units. Yet probably more men left to enlist in the army than to emigrate. See Chan Han-Seng, Landlords and Peasants in China (New York, 1937), pp.110-111.
Rural villages of South China during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were far from being peaceful and quiet. Central troops, bandits, beggar gangs, as well as militia and clan mercenaries were operating, each trying to consolidate their positions. The "Farmers' Movement" of the 1920's for the protection of villages against bandits and for the equalisation of land ownership was short-lived and ineffective. In addition, heavy taxation was levied on the farmers to pay indemnity to Western powers, and the collapse of the Republic's economy added extra burdens to the peasants. From whatever little the peasants gained from the land, the usuries, the landlords, the government and so on extracted a portion. The socio-economic conditions of the late Ching and early Republican period were conducive to emigration not only to overseas countries but also internally within China. It was partly because communications with overseas countries was more efficient, owing to Western shipping, than communications within China, and partly because conditions in

1 The Farmers' Movement was nation wide but started originally from Kwangtung. Supported by the Coalition government of the Nationalists and the Communists, the Movement took on a policy of uniting all farmers against landlords, usuries and oppressive local governments. The Movement was branded "Communist" by the Nationalist Party; and after 1927 when the Communist Party lost power in the government, the Movement collapsed under government pressure. Later, in areas where Communist influence was strong, the Farmers' Movement emerged as Chinese Soviets. See T.C. Chang, The Farmers Movement in Kwangtung, (translated by the Committee on Christianizing National Christian Council of China, Shanghai, 1928), p.4-15.

2 Rent of land can be as high as 50 per cent of the entire harvest. This, together with taxation and natural calamity, sent the peasants to the usuries. In Kwangtung during the 1920-30's, over 60 per cent of the peasants were in debt. Chan Han-Seng, op.cit., p.ix, Introduction.
other parts of China were almost as bad that resulted in the large numbers of overseas migration. Given these conditions, it is not surprising to find Chinese peasants susceptible to the attraction of foreign countries. In the later half of the nineteenth century, numerous Chinese were emigrating, some to South-east Asia to join their relatives, others through coolie contracts to Hawaii and South America, still others through the 'credit-ticket' system to North America and Australasia. The 'push' factors for emigration were abundant; it is necessary now to consider how the process of emigration was regulated and how the 'pull' factors functioned to influence the volume as well as the nature of Chinese emigration.

The Scene of Rural South China in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century: The Family-Lineage System and the Effect on Emigration

The importance of the family and the kinship system in China, at least prior to the establishment of the Communist government, has long been recognised as vital to

1 For a detailed study of the 'contract' and 'credit-ticket' system of Chinese emigration, see Percia Campbell, Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries Within the British Empire (London: 1923). Early Chinese migration to Australia was mainly organised through the 'credit-ticket' system; see Wang Sing-Wu, "The Organisation of Chinese Migration", (unpublished M.A. thesis, The Australian National University, 1969).
the integration and functioning of the society. ¹ Many of
the society's economic, educational, religious and political
functions were intimately related to the family institution,
and the process of emigration much affected by it. From
birth to death, an individual constantly made reference to
the need of the family or the larger agnatic groups in making
decisions concerning himself - education, marriage, migration,
residence, the choice of occupation and so on. The individual
was constantly under the influence of the head of the family,
who in turn deferred to advice from senior members of his
lineage. Ideally, patriarchal authority prevailed, sons
deferring to their fathers, wives to husbands, brothers to
their elder brothers, while decisions of importance - for
example, the sale of 'clan' land or the migration of a young
son - were made in consultation with senior families of the
lineage.

The organisation of these agnatic units is complex.
Freedman, in his analysis of Chinese lineage and society
in Kwangtung and Fukien made the following hierarchy of
categories: Elementary Families² (Parents and Children);
Stem-Families³ (Parents and Children and Grandparents);

¹ Olga Lang, writing in 1946, was of the opinion that the
family was one of the "most representative" institutions
of China. Chinese Family and Society (New Haven, 1946),
Preface, p. xi. C.K. Yang considered the traditional
family system as dominating all social institutions,
especially in South China rural area. Chinese Communist
Society: The Family and the Village (Cambridge, 1959),
pp. 5-6.

² Maurice Freedman, Chinese Lineage and Society: Fukien

³ Ibid., p. 44.
Joint-families\(^1\) (Married brothers, with or without parents sharing same household); Local Lineage\(^2\) (Corporate groups of male agnatics, minus their married sisters and plus their wives, living in one settlement or a tight cluster of settlements); Higher-order Lineage\(^3\) (Local Lineages resident in distant settlements but connected through common ancestor and possession of common lineage property); Clan\(^4\) (Those sharing the same surname, reported to be descendant from a common ancestor).

The importance of the family, or rather the Local Lineage, can be understood if the rural scene of the nineteenth and early twentieth century China is reconstructed. First, villages in Kwangtung and Fukien consisted of a few surnames (lineages or clans), some of one.\(^5\) Outsiders

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., p. 20.
3 Ibid., p. 21.
4 Ibid. Freedman appeared to be of the opinion that clans were rather loosely organised entities and remarked that "the ties of clanship may be almost devoid of significance...But if several local or higher-order lineages in fact combine and establish a common ancestral hall or estate, then, clanship has once more been condensed into lineage bonds" (p. 21).
5 Single lineage villages were found more often in South China than in North China. Hu Hsieh-Chin, in her The Common Descent Group in China and Its Functions (New York, 1948, p. 14) found that of 1,291 villages in Kao-an district in Kwangsi, 87 per cent. were villages of a single surname. In Kwangtung it was also reported that villages with a single or only two or three surnames constituted a majority of the villages. See Ch'u Ta-Chun, Kwangtung Hsin-yu (Canton, 1700), Chapter 17, pp. 5-6; K.C. Hsiao, Rural China: Imperial Control in the Nineteenth Century (Seattle, 1960), pp. 328-329. Freedman went as far as to assume that the desire to form single lineage villages was a motive given in the kinship system, op. cit., p. 8.
were sometimes admitted as tenants or occupational specialists, but were usually subjected to the unchallenged authority of the residing lineage. The presence of more than one strong lineage in a village might give rise to inter-lineage rivalry or to open conflict.\(^1\) Secondly, a large proportion of village land was owned corporately—in contrast to individual ownership—by lineages and clans.\(^2\) The proportions were specially high in Kwangtung, estimated to average about 23 per cent. of all agricultural area in the South-east, 25 per cent. in the North, 35 per cent. in the East and 40 per cent. in the Middle South.\(^3\) In the Four Districts around the Canton Delta, for example, Toishan had 50 per cent. of her agricultural land "clan-owned"; Sunwui, 60 per cent.; Yangping and Hoiping, each 40 per cent.\(^4\) In Chungshan, Nanhoi, and Shunte, the proportions were estimated to be 50 per cent., 40 per cent. and 60 per cent. respectively.\(^5\) These lands, rented to individual families in the lineage or outside the lineage, provided an income which was used as education funds for lineage schools and scholarships, for purchase of more lineage lands, for relief and charity, for loans to needy families, or for construction and repairs of ancestral halls.

---

1 Hsiao, K.C. *op.cit.*, p. 327.

2 These lands are usually called "Clan Lands" in the literature; but here, we follow Freedman's terminology and use the term clan to mean a loose and much bigger unit.

3 Chan, Han-Seng, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-5. T.C. Chang also reported that about one-third of all agricultural land was owned by clans, *op.cit.*, pp. 39-41; see also R.H. Tawney, *Land and Labour in China* (London, 1932), p. 32.

4 Chan Han-Seng, *op.cit.*, pp. 33-34.

Theoretically, though lineage land was privately owned by head families of lineages, it could not be privately sold as this was a disgraceful breach of the Confucian tradition of filial piety; on the contrary, to be prestigious and honoured, one was supposed to contribute to the accumulation of lineage properties. In practice, however, though wealthy farmers, officials and titled scholars often willingly gave money or land to their own lineage, (and thereby gained a decisive voice in the management of lineage affairs), much land was bought and sold, ownership being transferred from poorer lineages to wealthier ones. The ownership of large areas of land meant much more than just economic advantages. In Kwangtung, at least, the landlord-tenant relationship involved the deference of tenants to landlords, resembling sometimes a relationship of father and son or benefactor and beneficiary. Since land was scarce and concentrated in a few lineages, the dominating position of the landlord over the tenant was well established.

1 Ibid., pp.27-28.

2 For some examples on the efforts of individuals to provide for their lineage and thereby gaining prestige and honour, see Hsiao, op.cit., pp.335-6.

3 Some features of the landlord-tenant relationship are described in Chung-Kuo Ching-chi Nien-Chien (China Economic Year Book), 1923, pp.G235-237. See also Chen Cheng-mo, Chung-Kuo Ko Sheng ti Ti-tsu (Tenant Systems in China) (Shanghai, 1936). Chan Han-Seng used the term 'slave-clan' to describe subordinate tenant lineages, op.cit., P.57.
Where landlords and tenants were from different lineages, the landlord lineage dominated over that of the tenant; but if two lineages were of similar strength, and were competing for more land, conflicts easily arose. Cases of corrupted officials co-operating with wealthy lineages to secure land from weakened lineages were often reported.\(^1\) Sometimes, conflicts were so severe that lineage wars, (popularly called clan wars), developed. Each lineage assembled in its ancestral hall. The members were promised that those wounded would be rewarded, those dead would be honoured in the ancestral hall and their families taken care of.\(^2\) Lineage wars were often openly backed and organised by the lineage leaders because this was one important way to unify members of the lineage, and thereby increase their own power. By the nineteenth century, lineage warfare was widespread in Kwangtung; mercenaries were hired and lineages extended their network of alliances by calling on other unrelated lineages of the same surname.\(^3\) Some villages erected high walls, embankments and other defences for protection.\(^4\)

---

1 Chan Han-seng, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

2 Hu, Hsien-chin, op. cit., pp. 186-187, Appendix 60. In this appendix, the cause and the mechanism of a Kwangtung clan war were described. The competition of land ownership and the oppression of rich clans against poor clans were given as the cause of such disputes which lead to open conflicts. See also Freedman, op. cit., pp. 109-110.

3 Hsiao, op. cit., p. 364; Freedman, op. cit., p. 107; Hu, op. cit., p. 94.

4 Freedman, op. cit., p. 114. There is also a photograph of a walled-village in the New Territories, Hong Kong. Plate 2b.
The emphasis on lineage solidarity was not limited to land ownership. Politically, lineages struggled for power and influence; hence the practice of a lineage educating at least one son for an official position, or if competition in official examinations was too keen, of purchasing an office to enhance the power of the lineage. The lineage organisation, moreover, was recognised by the imperial government as a legitimate and supplementary organ of the 'Pao-Chia' system. Where the Pao Chia system did not function, lineages enforced laws, collected imperial taxes, and organised the local militia to protect villages against bandits. In religious matters, ancestral worship dominated religious ceremonies. Ancestral halls were built for the descendants to honour the ancestors. In terms of commerce and trade, the lineage as a unit of organisation was equally dominant. When a boy reached working age, he worked in the family business, or would be apprenticed to a firm owned by his relatives. Should he want to work in the city, he would be given some work in

1 Hsiao, op.cit., pp.348-352. The Pao-Chia system was essentially a local police system to watch and check the number, movement and activities of the people. It provided an organ for census-taking, revenue collection and police supervision. The system started well before the Ching Dynasty during the Sung Dynasty, being set up by Wang An-Shih in 1070, and was employed by various Dynasties for more or less the same purposes.


3 The joss-house, found frequently in Chinese communities abroad, can be considered as extensions of the ancestral halls, covering, in this case, persons of the same district or even all Chinese instead of persons of the same lineage or clan.
a relative's firm in the city.¹

In this kind of rural society where the collective interests of the family and the lineage were paramount, movements and activities of individuals were restricted and controlled. Hence, in marriages, it was extremely important for the wives to be able to bear children and as many as the family could support. Failure to bear children, especially male ones, was a major ground for divorce or for the husband to take a second wife.² Wealthy lineages, whose men were able to support several wives and numerous children, were in a stronger position to survive lineage struggles, disease, poverty and war, and thereby gain a position in the ancestral cult and accumulating lineage property and wealth. When a family was relatively barren but wealthy, sons were adopted as a means to boost the numbers at home; if the family was a migrant family, the adoption of sons was a way to provide help in their father's business abroad.³ Multiple marriages were, therefore, not uncommon and had legal sanction under the Ching Code of laws. For the traditional Chinese family, marriage was not so much an undertaking of the matured children as a decision of the parents; and its chief purpose was not so much the romantic happiness of the

1 Yang, op.cit., p. 138.

2 Marion Levy (Jr.), The Family Revolution in Modern China (Cambridge (Mass.,) 1949), p. 98. Lang, op.cit., p. 40. Lang gave seven reasons for divorce: (1) if she disobeyed her husband's parents, (2) failed to bear children, (3) committed adultery, (4) exhibited jealousy, (5) had some repulsive disease, (6) was garrulous, (7) stole.

3 Chen Ta, Nanyang Hua-ch'iao Yu Ming-yueh She-hui (Emigrant Communities in South China) (Shanghai, 1939), p. 141.
marrying couple but fulfilling the sacred duty of producing male heirs for the perpetuation of the ancestor's lineage, the acquiring of an extra woman to help in domestic work, and the begetting of sons for the security of the parents old age.

Whatever the reasons behind marriage and child-bearing, one thing is clear. The lineage had to be sustained and strengthened, even though this might entail some hardship for individuals. But in a community where competing lineages were often in conflict, it was important to belong to strong and prosperous lineages which could protect members and provide economic and legal-political benefits.¹

This elevation of lineage loyalty over individual comfort can be detected in the process of Chinese emigration. While there was comparatively little objection to males emigrating to foreign countries especially when migration was only temporary, there was strong objection regarding females, for fear that the whole family would be lost.² Hence, the small number of Chinese females migrating with the men in early periods. Emigrants, either from weak or from strong lineages, were expected to make money abroad and to remit a portion back to the villages in China to promote the interest of their lineage. If they become wealthy, they might also assist to establish schools, or construct new ancestral halls. Some invested in commerce and industries in China while others invested in

¹ Freedman used a metaphor to describe this situation and said, "It was better to be a little fish in a big pond than a little fish in a small pond". Op.cit., p. 130.

² Skinner, op.cit., p. 126.
purchasing land. The ideal migrant was one who regarded himself as a member of his own village but separated by distance. If he was married when he migrated, he would be encouraged to go without his wife but return to the home village once in a few years, thereby maintaining his overseas earning and keeping in touch with his family. When his economic conditions permitted, he might take a native girl as second wife and maintain two households, as was frequently the case among wealthy Chinese in South-east Asia. If he was single when he migrated, he would return home, after saving enough money, to marry, stay for a few months and return to the place of migration

1 Chen Ta in his study of the migration areas around Amoy and Swatow reported that numerous industries - railways, motor roads, electricity and other public utilities - were established by migrants, op.cit., chapter 6. In the district of Hoiping, a secondary school was established in 1922 by Chinese migrants in the United States. Hoiping Hsien Chih, 1932 edition, Chapter 1, p.20. Great concern was also raised about the immense investment in the purchase of land by overseas Chinese which inflated land prices making it more difficult for those who did not receive remittance from abroad. (p.21). The amount of remittance from Chinese migrants was so large that it counter-balanced a major proportion of the trade deficit of China during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. See C.F. Remer, The Foreign Trade of China (Shanghai, 1926), pp.220-23, for some statistics for the period 1871-1921. Even at present, remittance is still an important item in the consideration of policies towards Overseas Chinese, both for the Nationalist and the Communist governments.

2 Chen Ta, op. cit., p.141.

3 Ibid., p.139.
without his wife.¹ Thereafter, he would visit his home village as often as he could afford, adopting essentially the same commuting system as those who migrated married. This commuting system thus developed certainly helps to explain the frequent re-migration movements of Chinese.² Here, too, can be found some of the reasons for the objection that Chinese migrants in North America and Australia were "clannish" and non-assimilable, and that they remitted their earnings instead of spending them in their place of residence.³

The influence of lineage solidarity on Chinese migration did not stop at regulating numbers of female and male migrants. It penetrated the organisations which facilitated migration - the money-lenders, commercial firms, agents and so on - and affected the method of migration. Chinese labourers often recruited from one local area worked in gangs under headmen who were sometimes appointed from important lineages of the same area. Persons of the same clan (surname), or even of the same village or district, grouped together to form associations abroad to protect themselves and provide conveniences for

¹ A major consequence of this system on migrant marriage in China was that the bride's family usually demanded an extremely high bride money to compensate for the future absence of the husband and for the fear that remittance might not continue if the husband married again abroad. See Chen Ta, op.cit., pp.149-155.

² This aspect of Chinese migration with reference to Australia will be discussed in a later chapter.

³ There are, of course, other factors involved; prejudice and discrimination against Chinese, in turn, made it undesirable for the Chinese to stay.
newcomers. Gold-diggers, migrating under the credit-ticket system, borrowed passage fares from friends and relatives both at home and overseas. Commercial firms and import-export traders sent for their sons and relatives to help in their business, or to work as junior clerks, shop assistants, or to open branches elsewhere. In Australia, and probably also in other places, Chinese merchants played an important part in advancing passage money to their own kin;¹ and in countries where Chinese entries were restricted, the merchants were often the only ones who could sponsor new arrivals.

Another major effect of this kin-oriented migration was on the attitude towards work and settlement in the new land. Since the migrant's goal was not only individual achievement but also lineage survival and advancement,² there were enough reasons for him to be frugal, thrifty and industrious. While poverty and recurring disturbances in the villages of South China reminded the peasant-migrant that thrift and industry were essential to his survival, he also realised that through hard work and saving, he would be able to raise the prestige of his family-lineage, thereby fulfilling an important ambition of his life. Additionally, he was probably in debt for his passage and exploited by his creditor. Hence, it is not difficult to comprehend why early Chinese migrants were willing to labour

¹ Wang Sing-wu, op.cit., p. 102.
² Skinner, op.cit., p. 93.
long hours, to sacrifice personal consumption and enjoyment, and to live at a low standard of living. They entered into business from which quick profits could be expected - they washed alluvial gold instead of working on the more time consuming quartz deposits. If they were poor they were willing to work for very low wages, or in jobs such as cooking and domestic service which were not desirable for men; if they were wealthy, they favoured import-export trade and other commercial enterprises rather than investments in long-term capital-intensive projects. All in all, this disciplined sobriety, thrift and industriousness presented a sharp, yet often unpopular, contrast to the local population.

The Policy of the Ching Government of Chinese Emigration

The official policy towards Chinese emigration during the Ching Dynasty was fundamentally the prohibition of migration, although in the later stages Western pressures succeeded in obtaining the Ching Court's recognition of the freedom of movement. The Emperors took the attitude that emigration was a disgrace to the mother country and therefore to be prohibited. But the policy was largely

1 Whatever long-term investments were made, for example railways, roads, hospitals, etc., they were made in China, in the migrant's own districts, and not in the country of settlement. The intention of the early Chinese migrants to return ultimately to China and retire is undeniable and operated at least until the establishment of the Communist Government in 1949.
dictated by the political consideration that emigrants from South China would almost certainly be anti-Manchu. Being mixed with loyal elements of the late Ming Emperors, and once out of reach of the government, they would undoubtedly be plotting for the overthrow of the government. The Koxinga's resistance in Formosa (1661-83) and the Revolt of the San-Fan (1673-81) were such examples. The policy was severe, even to the extent of prohibiting the settlement within 50 li\(^1\) of the sea coast of Kwangtung and Fukien.\(^2\)

It was difficult, however, to enforce the policy, partly because the government did not have adequate control and partly because the large gains in overseas trade made emigration risks worthwhile. Even during this time Chinese had privately migrated to South-east Asia in large numbers, and coolies were already transported to Peru, the West Indies and other places. But the policy remained central to the non-protective attitude of the Ching Government towards Chinese abroad.\(^3\)

\(^1\) 1 li = \(\frac{2}{5}\) miles.


\(^3\) Examples of this attitude of the Ching Government were numerous. The massacres of Chinese in the Philippines in 1603 and 1639, and in Java in 1740, caused very little concern. The Emperor, in reply to apologies sent from the Spanish and the Dutch authorities, maintained that Chinese emigrants were greedy materialists who were unduly dissatisfied with conditions at home and therefore not worth the Government's concern. See Hua Ch'iao Chih, op.cit., p.637; Purcell, Victor, The Chinese in South-east Asia, Oxford University Press, Second Edition, 1965, p.27.
Official recognition of the right to emigrate was finally proclaimed when Western demands for Chinese labour was heightened by the rapid development of colonies. In 1859, the first public announcement of a change in policy was made by the Governor of Kwangtung to allow voluntary emigration. The 1860 Peking Convention contained statements making it legal for the recruitment of labourers in treaty ports.¹ France in the same year, and Spain in 1864 secured similar rights; and the United States concluded the Burlingham Treaty in 1868. The permission given to emigration was, after all, forced upon the Ching Government by foreign powers. Recognising the fact that, in Overseas Chinese communities, secret societies, whose members came often from the lower classes of the Chinese society, were infiltrated by revolutionary anti-Manchu elements, the Ching Government was far from encouraging emigration. Consular posts were set up only upon repeated requests both from Chinese communities and from foreign countries. The first permanent legation was established in London in 1877, seventeen years after the signing of the 1860 Peking Convention. The Washington and Tokyo legations were established in the next year in 1878. This indifference towards Chinese abroad continued and there was no concrete policy towards Chinese migration for the whole period after the opening of treaty ports and the downfall of the Ching Dynasty.

¹ For the affairs leading to the 1859 proclamation and the 1860 Peking Convention, see Wang Sing-Wu, "The Attitude of Ch'ing Court Towards Chinese Emigration", Chinese Culture, IX (September, 1968), pp.62-69.
Summary

This chapter discussed the background of Chinese emigration, the scene of the rural villages of Kwangtung and the policy of the Chinese government. Evidence from various sources indicated that socio-economic conditions of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Kwangtung were conducive to emigration. In addition to the tremendous pressure of excessive population, the unequal distribution of land adversely affected many peasant-tenants while numerous political disturbances and local banditry and violence made life at home frequently unpleasant.

The importance of the Chinese family-lineage system was next considered in relation to emigration. Lineages owning much land competed with each other in gaining control of particular areas and villages, so forcing defeated lineages either to accept permanent subordination or to leave the village entirely. Frequent lineage (clan) wars also influenced emigration.

The course of Chinese emigration was also affected by the loyalty of the individual towards his family and lineage, his motive for emigration often being to promote the welfare of his family and relatives. He worked hard, saved, and if fortunate, accumulated enough to advance the prestige and honour of his family at home. Consequently he did not intend to stay permanently abroad, but to return home once in a few years to see his wife, children and kin. Abroad, he was a long-term visitor.
All these, together with the policy of the Ching government opposing the settlement of Chinese abroad, presented a unique background to Chinese emigration.
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EARLY CHINESE MIGRATION TO AUSTRALIA 1861-1901

Introduction

Early in the sixteenth century after Vasco De Gama sailed around Cape Town to India (1498), the Portuguese and the Spaniards were the first to establish trading posts in Malacca and in the Philippines. The Dutch subsequently arrived in the late sixteenth century and occupied Java and Formosa Island until Koxinga, having been defeated by the Manchus, succeeded in driving the Dutch out in 1661. By this time, Macao had become an important trading port. The British joined in at a later date and became a strong competitor for other Western powers. British interests and influence in China were further expanded in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries; the acquisition of Singapore in 1819 and the signing of the Anglo-Dutch Treaty in 1824 provided an advantageous position for Britain in trade with China.1

Disagreement and conflict over trading terms and over the sale of opium finally brought China and Britain into the First China War (the First Opium War) of 1840-42. The Treaty of Nanking was signed in 1842 whereby the five ports of Canton, Amoy, Fuchou, Ningpo and Shanghai were opened to foreign trade. Hong Kong island was annexed and the monopoly trading system of the Co-Hong was abolished. Two years later, in 1844, the United States, Germany, France and Italy obtained similar treaty agreements on trade with China. The Second Opium War broke out in 1856. The Taiping Rebellion was well under way at that time. The Ching Government was near collapse.

At this time of confusion when China was suffering from immense trade deficits, frequent local disturbances and high taxation, Australia and other newly developed Anglo-Saxon countries (California, British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand) were at a stage of frontier development. Land was abundant but labour was in sharp demand. Much of this demand was first met by convict transportation in Australia and by Negro slaves in the United States. With the abolition of slavery (in 1833 within the British Empire and in 1865 in the United States) and convict transportation in the 1840's, these countries began to seek Chinese labourers to meet their demand. At this time, Chinese coolies were already being transported to Malaya, Hawaii, Peru, Cuba, and the West Indies for plantation and the clearing of jungles. First, Amoy, then Macao and Hong Kong became centres of Cantonese coolie trade. The Peking Convention of 1860 also made it legal for foreign agents to recruit Chinese labourers in treaty ports.

It was during this active recruitment of labour that Chinese coolies were first introduced to Australia.

**Early Chinese Migration and Colonial Restriction Policies**

In Australia, suggestions for the introduction of Chinese coolies were heard as early as 1783 when James Matra thought that they might be used to develop Australia as they did in the Dutch Indies.¹ Wakefield, in his often quoted

¹ "Immigration Restriction", *Australia Encyclopedia* (1925), I, p. 646.
'A Letter from Sydney', also advocated in 1829 the employment of Chinese and other Asiatic indentured labourers. But the actual shipment of Chinese coolies was much later. The first shipload was reported in 1848 when a consignment of 100 adults and 20 boys embarked at Amoy for New South Wales through the agency of J. Tait, a coolie merchant. Another 270 embarked in 1849. In 1852, the British Consul at Amoy reported that 2,666 Chinese, of whom 1,438 left in 1851, had been taken to Australia. In 1854, a Select Committee on Asiatic Labour (N.S.W.) estimated that a total of about 2,400 Chinese had been introduced into New South Wales. This number may be incorrect, but, in fact, relatively few coolies came to Australia this way - probably less than 3,000 by the time gold was discovered. The small influx of Chinese indentured labourers aroused some suspicion among Australian Workers. These workers who had recently succeeded in the campaign to abolish convict transportation naturally did not wish to see their efforts undermined by cheap Chinese labour. But the number of arrivals was not large enough to cause large scale alarm. The 1845 Select Committee on Asiatic Labour recognized

1 Ibid., p. 647.
3 Ibid.
the undesirability of these labourers but felt that "there (was) no necessity for any immediate legislation in the matter."¹

But the experiment of introducing Asian labour was shortlived. Willard thought that the coolies, being recruited from the lower classes of Chinese peasantry, were physically unfit and of bad character.² But an important reason for the failure was the attraction of gold. Gold discoveries in New South Wales and Victoria in 1851 were made known through shipping companies and merchants in South China early in 1852 and Chinese migrants, now coming from the Canton Delta region under the credit-ticket system, were destined to the gold fields. Attempts to keep Chinese indentured labourers on their jobs faced difficulties because these too deserted their employers to the goldfields.³ During the goldrush period when labour was in sharp demand, it was difficult to enforce the Masters and Servants Act in general to prevent contract labourers from deserting to distant places. This is particularly true of Chinese indentured labourers because Chinese contracts were not clearly part of the contracts covered by the Masters and Servants Act, and this made the enforcement of the Act on Chinese labourers a complicated matter. Moreover, Chinese labour contracts, being organized by Australian companies or their agents in China, lacked the sanctions of clan authority and clan reprisals, which kept the later, Chinese-directed

¹ New South Wales, Legislative Council, Votes and Proceedings (1854), II, p. 923.
² Willard, op. cit., p. 11.
³ The extent of this desertion was such that in 1852 in New South Wales, W.C. Wentworth, then Member of Legislative Council for Sydney, introduced a bill to amend the Gold Field Management Act to withhold license from the Chinese who were not properly discharged from their employers. This bill, however, was defeated.
emigrants of the credit-ticket era under control.

In fact, the first colony to put restriction on Chinese was not New South Wales but Victoria which received the first massive influx of Chinese diggers in 1854.

The first census of Victoria in 1854 counted only 2,341 Chinese, but after that arrivals increased. Early in 1855, the number of Chinese passed 10,000 and by mid-1855, the number had reached 17,000, almost all of them male adults. Early in 1854, there was already agitation against Chinese gold miners. Near violence at Bendigo in July, though tactfully averted by officials of the district, aroused the attention of the government to the problem of Chinese immigration. The Goldfield Commission, appointed in December 1854, to enquire into miners' grievances generally and the Eureka Uprising at Ballarat, decided to ask diggers and officials in the mining areas about Chinese immigration to the goldfields. The Commission reported in March of 1855 and recommended legislation to check the inflow of Chinese. The objection at this time to Chinese immigration was probably economic and the differences between the Australian and the Chinese ways of life, and not so much the feeling of 'racial superiority' as was manifested later.

---

1 Victoria became a colony separated from New South Wales in 1851. The Census of 1854 was taken on April 16.


in the 1860's.\(^1\) The Commission Report argued, for example, that, "even if the Chinese were considered desirable colonists, they are unaccompanied by their wives and families under which circumstances no immigration can prove of real advantage to any society", and "nor is the economic

---

1 There are several articles in the *Australian Quarterly* debating about the origin of the 'White Australia' policy. Carlotta Kellaway, "White Australia - How Political Reality Became National Myth", XXV (June 1953) asserted that the concept of White Australia was much more complicated than just racial discrimination; national and international politics as well as economic pressure groups all had decisive roles in the final formulation. Bruce Mansfield, "The Origin of 'White Australia'", XXVI (December 1954) disputed Kellaway's assertion and claimed that the policy was based on predominately nationalistic and racial grounds, and that "racialism was not the cloak for ulterior political objectives but the crux of the matter." (p. 65). In the next year, R.M. Dallas wrote another paper of the same title, XXVII (March 1955), refuting Mansfield and maintaining that racialism was not the major cause of the policy. By far the most exhaustive survey was done by N.B. Nairn, "A Survey of the History of the White Australia Policy in the Nineteenth Century" XXVIII (September 1956), in which he largely supported Kellaway's initial understanding and said that, "racialism or feelings of white superiority were not a part of Australian patriotism." (p. 19). He claimed, instead, that non-assimilability of the Chinese was the main reason for exclusion.

New evidence, however, has shown that economic interests, humanitarian and religious objections to slavery, fears of being swamped by vast numbers of Chinese, the struggles of young countries to find some identification, antipathy to strangers, worries about law and order, racial superiority and other factors, interacting with each other under different situations, together produced the political atmosphere for the exclusion of the Chinese. C.A. Price, "Coloured Immigration in the White Pacific: 1856-1970" (Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Demography, The Australian National University, 1970), quoted with permission from author.
argument of their utility as servants available as they all seem to proceed to the mines.¹ There was no mention of Chinese as an inferior race at this time.

In June 1855, therefore, the Victorian legislature acted on the advice of the Goldfield Commission and passed "An Act to Make Provisions for Certain Immigrants".² The number of Chinese that could be brought in any vessel was limited to one in every ten tons of shipping and a poll tax of £10 was imposed on every arrival. This tax was collected to provide 'protectors' for the Chinese. The importance of this Act lay more in setting the first example for the other Australian colonies than in its effectiveness in curbing the arrival of Chinese. Shipmasters and owners who had no desire to lose their lucrative business, simply evaded the Victorian Act and landed their Chinese passengers in South New South Wales, or more often, in Guichen Bay in South Australia. These Chinese, then, walked in several weeks to the Victorian diggings. By March 1857 when the second census of Victoria was taken, there were 25,424 Chinese.³

---

2 Victoria Act No. 39, 1855.
3 It was estimated that over 15,000 arrived in Guichen Bay in the first six months of 1857 such that by mid-1857, there were between 30,000 to 40,000 Chinese in Victoria. Victoria, Legislative Council, Votes and Proceedings, 1856-7, III p. 1003. The 1891 Victoria Census Report estimated that there had been at least 42,000 Chinese in the Colony in 1859. (p.23).
In the same year in May and July, the Canton Lead and Buckland riots against the Chinese occurred, and the Victoria Government, anxious to restore law and order, saw the necessity of negotiating with South Australia and New South Wales for restricting the overland movement and of proposing a residence fee. A fee of £1 monthly on every adult (over 12 years of age), subsequently reduced to £4 a year, was levied on the ground that the system of protectors needed additional funds. The Act was largely ineffective owing to an omission of a penalty clause, and only a few hundred Chinese purchased licences in the first months of operation. The negotiation with South Australia and New South Wales to restrict Chinese migration was, however, more successful than the residence fee.

South Australia in 1857 introduced and passed an Act almost identical to the Victorian Act 1855. However, the Chinese were now diverted to New South Wales where the 1858 restrictive bill was rejected by the Legislative Council after lengthy debates on moral issues as well as practical and immediate economic and social problems involved. The delay in New South Wales was also partly due to the smaller numbers of Chinese in the colony at this time. In March,

---

1 Victoria Act No. 41, 1857.
2 Victoria Act No. 80, 1859.
3 Serle, op.cit., pp. 330-1. In 1859, however, the collection was strictly enforced by the O'Shannassy government, and many thousands of Chinese were imprisoned or fined for non-payment.
4 South Australia Act No. 3, 1857.
5 For a discussion of the arguments during the debates, see Willard, op.cit., pp. 29-30.
1856, the census of New South Wales counted only 1,806 Chinese, but by April 1861 when the next census was taken, the number of Chinese had increased to 12,986. Some of the increase was overland from Victoria, now attracted by New South Wales gold discoveries. New South Wales finally passed an act similar to the Victorian act in 1861.

The restrictive measure of these three colonies effectively checked the inflow of Chinese. Census figures for 1871 for New South Wales and Victoria showed a considerable decline of the number of Chinese. For New South Wales, the decline was about 5,800 for the period 1861-71; and for Victoria, it was more drastic, about 7,000.

TABLE 2.1
CHINESE IN AUSTRALIA, BY COLONIES, 1861-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>12,986</td>
<td>7,208</td>
<td>10,141</td>
<td>13,048</td>
<td>10,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,988</td>
<td>7,220</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>13,157</td>
<td>10,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC.</td>
<td>24,724</td>
<td>17,795</td>
<td>11,795</td>
<td>8,355</td>
<td>6,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,732</td>
<td>17,826</td>
<td>11,959</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>6,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD.</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>11,206</td>
<td>8,497</td>
<td>7,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>538</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>11,229</td>
<td>8,524</td>
<td>7,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 There seems to be a major under count of Chinese in colonial censuses. In New South Wales in 1861, for example, it was estimated that there were 21,000 in the colony (New South Wales Legislative Council, Votes and Proceedings, 1861, IV p. 121. Quoted in Serle, op.cit., p. 31), while the census showed the above low figure.
(Table 2.1 con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>2,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>3,613</td>
<td>3,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUST.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>38,247</td>
<td>28,307</td>
<td>38,274</td>
<td>35,523</td>
<td>29,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>38,258</td>
<td>28,351</td>
<td>38,533</td>
<td>35,821</td>
<td>29,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) not available
b) N.S.W., Victoria, and Queensland only for 1861 and 1871.


Notes: 1) There are great discrepancies between Census figures and official estimates. These are partly due to constant movements of Chinese between goldfields and partly due to the different dates of the censuses and estimates. Since 1861, however, the Chinese population were more settled and the 1925 Commonwealth Yearbook was able to maintain that the census figures did not greatly undercount the real number (p. 955).

2) Figures including Australian-born Chinese. But their number was small. Even in 1901, only very few full-Chinese were born in Australia - Victoria 128 (70 males and 58 females) and New South Wales 195 (114 males and 81 females).
In view of the decrease of Chinese in both these colonies, it was felt safe at this time to repeal the restrictive acts - Victoria in 1865 and New South Wales in 1867. South Australia had already repealed hers in 1861. From this time on until new measures were taken in 1881, there was no restrictive regulation against Chinese immigration. The general decrease of the Chinese population continued for a short while after the repeal. In Victoria, census figures showed that, by 1901, the Chinese population in this colony was only about one-fourth of that in 1861. New South Wales, however, presented a different picture, census figures showing an increase of about 3,000 each for the period 1871-81 and 1881-91.

Migration figures of Chinese arrivals and departures for this period reveal the same pattern and suggest that the great part of the increase in New South Wales and the decrease in Victoria was due to overseas movements rather than to overland across borders of the colonies.
### TABLE 2.2

**ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES OF CHINESE (BY SEA).**

**NEW SOUTH WALES AND VICTORIA, 1862-1901**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Gain(+)</th>
<th>Loss(-)</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Gain(+)</th>
<th>Loss(-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arr</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arr</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-1866</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>-2,905</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td>8,411</td>
<td>-5,119a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-1871</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>-1,957</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>6,511</td>
<td>-3,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-1876</td>
<td>2,819</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>-1,260</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>-706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-1881</td>
<td>12,755</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>+8,343</td>
<td>3,938</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-1885</td>
<td>11,155</td>
<td>6,933</td>
<td>+4,222</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>+130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-1888</td>
<td>6,284</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>+1,949</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>+937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1891</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>-2,120</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>-1,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1896</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>-2,479</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>+813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1901</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>-1,769</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>+1,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Statistical Registers of NSW and Victoria

**Note:**
- a) Departure figures for 1865 and 1866 were given at 1,043½ and 1,190½ respectively, but there was no explanation for the half-persons included. These half-persons were excluded from the computation.
- b) Departure figures for 1878 and 1879 were not recorded.

According to Table 2.2, revival of Chinese immigration occurred in the late 1870's and early 1880's for both New South Wales and Victoria, and continued, in spite of new restrictive measures of 1881, until 1888 when the Second Intercolonial Conference adopted even stricter controls. Sudden drops of arrivals can be observed for both colonies after 1888, and this continued for New South Wales until
1901, while Victoria saw a slight gain after 1892.¹

Almost all the Chinese migrants at this time were males. The high rates of arrival and departure show a highly unsettled population, the members of which stayed only temporarily for short periods of time.

The events leading to the 1880-1 and 1888 Intercolonial Conference were important in showing the desire of all colonies (not limited to New South Wales and Victoria alone) to restrict Chinese immigration. They also helped the colonies to recognize the fact that British foreign policies did not necessarily mean the protection of Australian interests and therefore served to strengthen the feeling for a federation of all colonies. These events started with the Queensland gold rush of 1875.

Before 1875, Queensland planters and capitalists had been trying to develop the central and northern areas by low-wage contract coloured labour. Efforts to obtain Indian coolies had failed, attempts to entice Aborigines into regular employment had failed, schemes for attracting Pacific Islanders had been partly successful but were not always adequate to provide all the labour required. In 1874, therefore, some planter interests persuaded the government to explore the possibility of obtaining Chinese coolies from

¹ Mortality must have contributed, to a great extent, to the decline of the Victoria Chinese population after 1881. In 1881, 55 per cent. of the Chinese were 45 years of age or over; in 1891, this percentage increased to 63. The Chinese population in New South Wales was considerably younger – only 33 per cent. were 45 years and over in 1891.
Amoy. The government did so, but was rather dashed to find that both the British and Chinese governments expected the colonial government to exercise strict control and supervision. Some planters might have acted independently but early in 1876, there occurred a great rush of Cantonese gold-diggers to the Palmer gold-fields of Northern Queensland. This aroused the fears of Chinese domination and the hostility to Chinese gold-diggers that had been revealed in Victoria and New South Wales in the 1850's and the 1860's. The Queensland government and planters, therefore, quickly dropped all suggestions for Chinese coolies. Instead, the government hurriedly introduced the Gold Field Act Amendment Bill of 1876 imposing a heavier license fee for 'Asiatic and African Aliens'.

This bill, though passed through both Houses was referred to Westminster but did not receive Royal Assent.

This action of the British government produced loud outcries that the principle of self-government was violated, since, it was argued, the restriction of Chinese in the goldfields was as much an internal as an external foreign policy. Queensland quickly sought support from other Australian colonies, and in addition, in 1877, passed a


2 £3 mining license fee instead of 10/-, and £10 business fee instead of £4.

3 Another Amendment Act of the Gold Field Act in 1877 was passed with slight changes in wording and received Royal Assent. This Act excluded Chinese for three years from any new goldfields not discovered by an Asian or African person in addition to a heavier fee.
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act. This act was almost identical to the New South Wales 1861 Act with the exception that the entrance tax of £10 was refundable if the Chinese left within three years without being convicted of crime.¹

The Queensland attempt to win intercolonial support for restricting Chinese immigration was not the only reason for moves for an intercolonial conference on the Chinese. First, there were troubles concerning Chinese seamen on Australian vessels when the Australasian Steam Navigation Company began to introduce Chinese seamen in 1878 at a lower wage than that paid to European seamen. This aroused tremendous opposition from white employees of the Company and finally led to a general strike by unions in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and even New Zealand. The Queensland government intervened in January 1879 by threatening to withdraw mail subsidy to the Company. Under great pressure, the Company finally ceded to the demands and promised to withdraw the Chinese seamen.

Second, was intercolonial disquiet at events in the Northern Territory; at this time the Territory, under South Australian control, had a few hundred Chinese in the goldfields and it was feared that these would ultimately migrate to Queensland. Third, it was known that California and British Columbia were attempting to restrict a large scale entry of Chinese though their power was limited by

¹ Queensland Act No. 8, 1877.
the central governments of Canada and the U.S.A.\textsuperscript{1} Fourth, the working class in several capitals was becoming agitated at competition from Chinese as furniture makers, laundrymen and the like. Finally, early criticisms again became prominent: the absence of women, separatism and clannishness, opium-smoking, gambling and disease. Stories about leprosy and small pox among Chinese became particularly prevalent.

The 1880-1 Intercolonial Conference discussed several common problems and moved to enact uniform legislation. There was little objection to the principle of exclusion; but in practice, Western Australia and South Australia deviated from the general consensus of the Conference, both being anxious to develop their territories and in great demand of labour. Western Australia, in fact, continued its 1878 hopes of introducing Chinese coolies from Singapore. Although in fact only a few were introduced,\textsuperscript{2} Western Australia did not enact any law against Chinese until 1886 after gold was discovered in the Kimberley District of the Colony. South Australia, while conforming to the decisions of the Conference, gave special consideration to Northern

\textsuperscript{1} For a concise review of the events in California and British Columbia, see Charles Price, "'White' Restriction on 'Coloured' Immigration", \textit{Race}, VII (January, 1966) pp. 217-34. See also Willard, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 41-2 for the influence of events in the U.S.A. on the Australian colonies.

\textsuperscript{2} Fifty in 1878 and another 50 in 1880. Willard, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 64.
Territory and exempted her from the 1881 Chinese Restriction Act.

The situation in 1881 was as follows: New South Wales and Victoria both re-introduced restrictive acts with entrance taxes of £10 but raised their tonnage limits to 100 tons per Chinese.\(^1\) Queensland with the 1877 Act still in force did not need to introduce new laws; the tonnage restriction was however raised to 50 tons in 1884. South Australia's 1881 law imposed a tonnage restriction of only ten tons and an entry tax of £10 was levied, while Tasmania and the Northern Territory imposed no restriction.

These restrictions clearly expressed the general feelings against Chinese. Such feelings mounted steadily during the 1880's fed by the continuous influx of Chinese into the Northern Territory, the visit in 1887 of Chinese Commissioners seeking better treatment of Chinese settlers, the constant evasion of restrictive laws, and the 'Afghan' and 'Tsinan' events.\(^2\) In 1887, Tasmania adopted restrictions similar to Victoria while New South Wales amended her 1881 Act in 1887 and imposed a £100 poll tax and provided for a passenger limit of one Chinese in every 300 tons. In 1888, after the Second Intercolonial Conference, Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland abolished the poll tax but raised the tonnage

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 65. Willard reported that the tonnage restriction was ten tons; in fact, they should be 100 tons.

\(^2\) For a description of these events, see ibid., pp. 84-6.
restriction to one in every 500 tons. South Australia followed suit and extended the restriction to Northern Territory. Tasmania alone was satisfied with her 1887 Act and did not raise the tonnage limit.

These laws for the restriction of Chinese were not achieved without difficulties. Not only were there disagreements among colonies concerning exemptions for specified categories of Chinese labourers - Western Australia, Queensland and Southern Australia wanted cheap labour to develop tropical parts of their colonies - there was also conflict between the colonies' desire for heavy restriction and Britain's foreign policy of not offending friendly nations. This conflict between Britain and the Australian Colonies continued into the late 1890's as a debate on whether restriction should be overt or by means of an education or language test.

The last ten years of the nineteenth century saw extension of anti-Chinese legislation to all Asiatic and coloured persons. In the 1896 Intercolonial Conference, bills were drafted to exclude all coloured persons without exemption for British subjects, this last being directed against Indians and other coloured British subjects. This move meant the distinction between categories of British subjects purely on the grounds of race and was immediately disapproved by the British government. The bills, passed in New South Wales, South Australia and Tasmania, were therefore reserved, and Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary, suggested to colonial representatives at the London Premiers' Conference of 1897 that restriction could be achieved by the Natal Immigration Restriction Act 1897 (The Dictation Test) which required a modest standard
of literacy in any European language. By putting restriction on educational and not on racial grounds, these laws would not be so plainly objectionable to Indians and Japanese. This suggestion was accepted by most of the colonies; Western Australia (1897), New South Wales (1898) and Tasmania (1899) took the lead in enacting restriction laws on the Natal Model, while retaining their old tonnage limits against the Chinese. Queensland followed a different path, kept its anti-Chinese laws, negotiated in 1897 with Japan to restrict voluntarily the number of Japanese immigrants, but imposed no restriction on Indians and other coloured persons.

The restrictive policies of the colonies were effective in checking Chinese arrivals. From around 1881, Chinese arrivals declined but departures were consistent at a high level (approximately 2,500-3,000 per year for New South Wales and Victoria) such that the total number of Chinese in Australia in 1901 was only 29,627 while it is believed to have been at one time between 45,000 to 50,000.

While Australian restriction laws functioned to discourage Chinese immigration, the high rates of departure cannot be explained by these laws which were affecting newcomers rather than those domiciled. The pressure from their family-lineage to return and the temporary nature of the early Chinese settlement were important causes of the rapid decline of the Chinese population during this period.
Early Chinese Settlement in Australia

In the early days, most of the Chinese population was found in the goldfields. In Victoria in 1861, the goldfield areas of Ararat, Ballarat, Beechworth, Castlemaine, Maryborough and Sandhurst had some 24,000 among a total Chinese population of 24,700.¹ In New South Wales in the same year, of a total 13,000 Chinese, about 12,200 of them were in the mining areas - Mount Braidwood, Bathurst, Bombala, Turon and Wellington.² In Queensland later in the 1870's, it was the Cook and Palmer fields which attracted most of the Chinese, these two districts alone totalled 8,000 Chinese in a total of 10,000 Chinese in Queensland in 1876.³

Not all the Chinese in goldfield areas were gold miners; some were scattered around mining towns managing small stores and groceries, or working in market gardens, or keeping cafes and boarding houses. The Chinese population in the capital cities was not large. The following tables show the distribution for 1861-1901.

1 Census of Victoria, 1861, p. 22. The number of Chinese was large enough in these areas to enable the operation of Chinese coach lines running between Guildford town and the camps at Bendigo (Sandhurst), Castlemaine, Ballarat and Maryborough. Charles Daly, "Chinese in Victoria", in The Victorian Historical Magazine XIV (February, 1931), pp. 23-35. Also Serle, op.cit., p. 332.

2 Census of New South Wales, 1861.

3 Census of Queensland, 1876.
### TABLE 2.3

CHINESE POPULATION IN METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1861-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>3,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of N.S.W.</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>33.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>2,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of VIC.</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>38.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of QLD.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of S.A.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>32.85</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>45.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of W.A.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of TAS.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Excluding Northern Territory  
b) Not available

Even by 1881, the proportion of Chinese in metropolitan areas was still relatively small, none except Adelaide having more than 15 per cent of the total Chinese population in the colony. After 1881, however, Sydney and Melbourne had large increases and became the two most important Chinese concentration areas - Sydney having about 3,500 Chinese or 34 per cent of New South Wales, and Melbourne 2,400 or about 38 per cent. The number of Chinese in the other capital cities remained very small, none having more than 500 Chinese.
Although a considerable proportion of the Chinese stayed in the rural areas, many of them were beginning to switch from mining to agricultural and pastoral pursuits, notably as station hands, general labourers or as market gardeners. A small number drifted to country towns and set up small grocers stores or became hawkers of vegetables, fruits and other items. In Victoria, the number of Chinese goldminers declined from over 20,000 (or 89 per cent of the total Chinese working males) in 1861 to a little over 6,500 (58 per cent) in 1881. Similarly in Queensland, the number of miners in 1881 was only 5,525 (52.8 per cent) although gold was discovered later in the early 1870's. The situation in New South Wales in 1881 is not certain because the main census volumes of 1881, including figures for the Chinese, were destroyed; but it is not unreasonable to expect similar trends. Table 2.4 shows Chinese occupations for New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland for 1891 and 1901.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourteen Occupations</th>
<th>NSW 1891</th>
<th>VIC 1891</th>
<th>QLD 1891</th>
<th>NSW 1901</th>
<th>VIC 1901</th>
<th>QLD 1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Miners</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Market-Gardeners</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pastoral Workers</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Agriculture</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General Labourers</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Domestic Servants</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hotel, Boarding-house Workers</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Merchants</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Greengrocers</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Storekeepers</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hawkers</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Commercial Clerks</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cabinet Makers</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Laundry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 14 occupations</td>
<td>11,722</td>
<td>7,244</td>
<td>7,564</td>
<td>9,210</td>
<td>5,863</td>
<td>7,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total breadwinners</td>
<td>13,127</td>
<td>7,937</td>
<td>8,399</td>
<td>9,968</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>8,468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 2.4 con't).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourteen Occupations</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1901</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>QLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Market-Gardeners</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>35.76</td>
<td>33.02</td>
<td>28.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pastoral Workers</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Agriculture</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>21.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General Labourers</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Domestic Servants</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hotel, Boarding-house Workers</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Merchants</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Storekeepers</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hawkers</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Commercial Clerks</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cabinet Makers</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Laundry</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 14 occupations</td>
<td>89.30</td>
<td>91.27</td>
<td>90.06</td>
<td>92.39</td>
<td>95.75</td>
<td>89.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Breadwiners</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1891 and 1901 Censuses for New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland.
After 1881, when most of the alluvial gold deposits had become exhausted and goldmining a deep and expensive enterprise, the number of Chinese miners fell more rapidly. By 1901, the number of Chinese miners in New South Wales was 1,019 (10 per cent of the total working Chinese males), in Victoria, 1,296 (21 per cent), and in Queensland 657 (7.7 per cent). Although it was reported that some Chinese had actually invested in quartz mining, many simply left goldmining and turned to other occupations. Market gardening gradually assumed the most important position, increasing to over 30 per cent of the total working Chinese males for New South Wales and Victoria, and 29 per cent for Queensland, in 1901. Many of the Chinese market gardens were in country towns although areas around Sydney and Melbourne had quite a number of them in the late 1880's.

Supplementing the gardens were the fruit vendors, vegetable hawkers and small grocers and shops which catered mainly to Australians. Much of the flourishing fruit


2 Charles Daly, op.cit., p.28; Western Bate, The History of Brighton (Melbourne, 1962), pp.358-60.

3 The large number of grocers and small retail dealers was evident in New South Wales towns. In fact, competition with Australian retailers was so keen that there was agitation against them by storekeepers in these towns. See A.T.Yarwood, Asian Migration to Australia (Melbourne, 1967), p.118.
and vegetable distributing business was due to their close connection with the market gardens which supplied them with vegetables. Indeed, market gardens were often operated in partnership, with four or five sharing the whole range of work from planting, weeding and watering to harvest and hawking.¹

There were also those employed in other agricultural and pastoral pursuits; many worked as general farm labourers, shepherds, bush-clearers and the like. In Queensland, a large number of Chinese were fruit growers, 377 in 1891 and increasing to 1,019 in 1901.

Although the apparent massive entry into market-gardening and other agricultural pursuits can be readily understood from the peasant background of the Chinese migrants, the growing importance of the cabinet-making and the laundry business - the focus of much agitation in the 1900's in New South Wales and Victoria - needs some explanation. It seems that there were a number of artisans, including furniture makers and carpenters among the numerous Chinese gold diggers, some of them were engaged in making boxes for the despatch of gold bullion to China;² some, then, stayed on after the goldrush as cabinet-makers. But the number remained very small until 1881. In Victoria, the 1881 census returned only 56 Chinese furniture-makers, but the 1891 census counted 246, and the 1901 census 620, accounting for ten per cent of the total Chinese working males in 1901. In New South Wales, there were 347 Chinese

² Ibid., p.68,
cabinet-makers in 1891 and 662 in 1901 accounting for seven per cent of the total.

This increase of cabinet-makers was related to the general prosperity of Sydney and Melbourne during this time. Metropolitan Melbourne, for example, experienced an important period of growth, the population increasing from a little over 280,000 to 490,000 from 1881 to 1891. This, together with the economic boom of the eighties (sometimes called the 'Land Boom' or the 'Marvellous Eighties'), stimulated the building industry which received its funds partly from substantial foreign capital then flowing into Victoria. In this great building boom, the small Chinese furniture shops prospered greatly although they were initially making only cheap articles. So well, indeed, did they establish themselves that when depression came (1892-3), they were successful in competing against Australian makers; the number of Chinese furniture shops increased rapidly employing large numbers of workers in the 1900's.

The situation in New South Wales was similar although Sydney did not experience a building boom of the magnitude of the Melbourne one; the number of Chinese cabinet makers increased substantially during this period. In


3 The Metropolitan Sydney population did increase substantially during this period (139,179 in 1871, 227,166 in 1881, 387,434 in 1891, and 487,930 in 1901), about 100,000 every ten years.
Queensland, however, cabinet making was much less important.

The rise of Chinese laundries was perhaps less dependent on economic conditions of the 1880's than on the shortage of women in general. The large number of Chinese domestic servants, working either in private households or in lodging-boarding houses, was the result of the great demand for household and personal service.¹ Laundry work was part of domestic service, and it appeared that many domestic servants, who had learned to launder as part of their job, opened small laundry shops when their service was no longer needed during the 1892-3 depression.²

By 1901, then, although market gardening was still the most important occupation, urban occupations such as cabinet making, laundry, vegetables and fruit distributing, general dealers and hawkers, grocers and cafes, were becoming more important, especially in Sydney and Melbourne. The opportunity of employment in these urban occupations, together with the security and fellowship made possible through the formation of benevolent associations and

¹ This has been shown to be true with the Chinese in the United States. See Paul Siu, "The Isolation of the Chinese Laundryman" in Ernest Burgess and Donald Byrne (eds.), Contributions to Urban Sociology (Chicago, 1964), p. 430. Also Rose Hum Lee, The Chinese in the United States of America (Hong Kong, 1960), p. 257.

² Yong (op. cit., p.108) was of the opinion that laundries started when Chinese were forced out of the furniture business during the depression of the 1890's; but the number of persons engaged in cabinet making did not decline during this period but reached a maximum in the early 1890's.
social clubs, certainly helps to explain why the Chinese population in Sydney and Melbourne increased rapidly after 1881, although the general decrease of the Chinese had been continuous after 1861 for Victoria and after 1881 for New South Wales.

Chinese were found in most of the suburbs in Sydney and Melbourne even during this time (1901) but the principal concentrations, both of residence and shops, were in the city centres: in Sydney, around Hay Market-Dixon Street area, and in Melbourne, along the east end of Little Bourke Street. There was, however, no concentration in Brisbane, the majority of the Chinese in Queensland was scattered in the country towns.

The Chinese communities in Sydney and Melbourne were taking shape during this time. Stratified into the 'working class' Chinese (market gardeners, hawkers, cabinet makers etc.) and the merchant 'elite', they had grown to such numbers that Chinese associations could afford to build club-houses for their members. The joss-house in South Melbourne of the Sze-Yap Association, built in 1856, had an important extension erected in 1902. 

---

1 For careful examination of the formation and functions of some of the Chinese associations in the period 1901-1921, see Yong, op.cit., pp.323-35.


3 Chinese Times (Melbourne), 10 August 1902.
Society in Melbourne of the Sunwui migrants bought several houses in Little Bourke Street during this time. The Chinese Times, an important organ of the Chinese anti-Manchu revolutionaries began publishing in 1901 in Melbourne and continued, with intermediate pauses, until 1921. In Sydney, similar events occurred. Numerous Chinese regional associations and business organizations were formed, including the important Chinese Chamber of Commerce in 1913.

In both Sydney and Melbourne, Chinese merchants, now occupying important positions in the fruit and vegetable markets as well as in the import trade, were gaining respect. Indeed, they were wealthy enough to co-operate with other businessmen in Hong Kong to operate the short-lived Australia-China Mail Steamship Line (1917-24) which once owned three steamers sailing between Shanghai, Canton, Hong Kong and Australia. Their value as import-export merchants, their capacity in commerce, and their more tidy-looking European dress, probably convinced some of the Australian public that there were many types of Chinese migrants, some more assimilable than others.

1 Yong. *op.cit.*, pp. 183-203.

Summary

At the time of federation (1901), the settlement of Chinese in Australia was somewhat different to that of the gold rush days. The Amoy indentured labourers were long gone - dead or departed. The majority of those in Australia in 1901 were from the Canton Delta region. The 'Four District' people were concentrated in Melbourne and in small country towns in Victoria; but in Sydney, most of them came from Kaoyao, Chungshan, and Tungkuan, while some from the districts of Nanhai, Punyu and Shunte. Goldfields were more or less empty and though some stayed behind in the country areas as farm hands and station men, many of those remaining in Australia began to move towards the metropolitan centres and settled around their fringes, forming Chinese communities. Here we arrived at the next period of Chinese migration to Australia, the pattern of which was partly influenced by the strong ties of the Chinese migrants with their family-lineage but more decidedly by the 1901 Commonwealth Immigration Restriction Act.

1 Ibid., p. 324. C.A. Price, Unpublished data made available to author.
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Changes in the Chinese Scene

In 1911, the Republican Revolution in China forced the last Ching Emperor to relinquish his throne, thus ending the legal support of the confucian-oriented kinship ethics. Encouraged by the success of the revolution, young intellectuals attempted, as part of the May Fourth Movement (1919), to initiate fundamental changes in the family system. The impact of the West, through missionaries, trade, education and political intervention, to a degree, upset the ethical and ideological foundations on which the 'classical' family-lineage system was built. But the spearhead of this movement was directed mainly in the cities to the inteligible and the educated, and the degree of penetration to the rural area is doubtful. Some claimed that the countryside was not much affected by modern movements.

1 The term 'family revolution' is sometimes used as a slogan for this movement, see C.K. Yang, Chinese Communist Society: The Family and the Village (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp.12-13. For a legal description of the changes in marriage laws, see Vermier Y. Chiu, Marriage Laws and Customs of China (Hong Kong, 1966), Chapter III.

2 Yang, op.cit., p.16.
On the one hand, it is known that Chinese females, especially married ones, began to emigrate to South-east Asia during the 1920's, indicating that the family-lineage rules against female emigration was relaxed to allow some women to go abroad, although this did not affect Chinese migration to Australia because restriction on Chinese females had tightened by then. On the other hand, the existence of large clan ownership of land continued throughout the Republican period, 1911-49, showing that the power of the family lineage, though under the increasing impact of modernization, was entrenched in the rural areas. Moreover, the Chinese Women's Movement, aiming to attain for women equal status with men and freedom from family and lineage control gained little success, and concubinage continued even among educated families in the cities, although concubines no longer had a legal status after 1930.

All this and more points to one significant aspect of the 1911 Revolution. The Revolution certainly caused the disintegration of the traditional system of government control by deposing the Emperor in favour of a Republican system. But social changes were slow. The importance

---


2 Chan Hen-sang, Landlords and Peasants in China (New York, 1937), pp. 34-5.

of the family-lineage in the rural area of China continued, and Chinese emigration after 1911 still carried with it the earlier characteristic of being a temporary movement to promote the well-being of one's family and lineage at home.

The difference between the period under the Ching Government and the period under the Nationalist Government lies in the official attitude and policy towards Chinese emigration. The policy of the Nationalist Government largely arose from the strong tie of overseas Chinese with the 1911 revolution. Dr. Sun Yat-Sen, himself, joined the Chi Kung Tong in America and organized the Tung Men Hui which later became the Nationalist Party of China. Soon after establishing itself, the Republican Government allocated several seats in the Chinese legislature to overseas Chinese in recognition of their contribution to the revolution, and in 1923 established the first office of Overseas Chinese Affairs in Canton. The first policy,

1 The Chi Kung Tong was the overseas branch of the Hung League (sometimes called the Heaven and Earth Society) of South China. The League was essentially an anti-Manchu organization formed by elements of the late Ming Emperors. The League gained support during the Tai Ping Rebellion; and after the defeat, the supporters were widely scattered in South-east Asia, North America and in Australia, and were instrumental in the overthrow of the Ching Dynasty.

2 Six seats were allocated in the Temporary Parliament in 1911. In 1925, when the Constitution was rectified, 65 seats were allocated to the Overseas Chinese in the National Assembly, 19 in the Legislative Yuan, and 8 in the Supervision Yuan. See Lian Tze-hen, Hua-Ch'i ao Cheng Chi Sheng-hao (Political Life of Overseas Chinese) (Taipei, 1962), p.14. The Chinese in Australia once sent two delegates, Mr. William Ah Ket and Mr. M. Ah Mouy, to the Chinese National Assembly in the 1920's. Private conversation with Mr. H. Ah Mouy, 20 June 1968, and Mr. William Liu, 6 April, 1970.
announced in 1925 in The Second Nationalist Party Conference, aimed at (1) protesting against discriminatory laws and gaining equal treatment for Chinese in foreign-countries, (2) providing facilities for young Chinese who desired an education in China, and (3) encouraging overseas Chinese investment in China.¹

In 1936, the policy was further spelled out, a major emphasis this time was the spread of Chinese education and associations in overseas Chinese communities. Chinese schools, at this time, were already widespread in South-east Asia, creating much conflict with local policies of education and arousing criticism from local governments.² Similarly Chinese associations, in the past largely religious, economic and district-oriented, became more political after the 1911 revolution. The strengthening and consolidating of these associations ran counter to the desire of local governments to assimilate the Chinese. In regard to Chinese nationality, the Chinese Nationalist government kept the doctrine of *jus sanguinis* - that all Chinese, wherever born, are Chinese nationals - and was opposed to Chinese becoming naturalized.

The rallying of overseas Chinese to the support of China was central to the policy of the Nationalist Government, especially the maintenance of investment and remittance from


overseas. It became even more important after the growth of communism which forced the government to consolidate every support it could.

In addition to the traditional loyalty towards their family-lineages, the tie between Chinese migrants and China was further manifested in the rise of Chinese nationalism in Australia, not only in response to the efforts of the Chinese Nationalist Government, but also as a reaction against the 1901 Commonwealth Immigration Restriction Act.


In 1901, when the Commonwealth of the Australian colonies decided to exclude practically all Chinese and other non-Europeans, there were already 30,000 Chinese in Australia; with other Asian, Pacific Islanders, and other non-Europeans, they totalled about 47,000 coloured persons. It was not practical or possible to close the door completely. Some Chinese were already naturalized under laws of the colonies; some had domicile rights; others sought entry for special reasons (merchants, students, ministers of religion). The 1901 Act was forced to allow such exemptions to boost overseas trade, to uphold humanitarian principles, and to ease international diplomacy. Under these conditions, the policy aimed at restriction rather than exclusion. The principle, then, was simple: non-Europeans were to be discouraged from permanent residence in Australia. But the practical administration of the policy was problematic and complex. In fact, the revisions, and modifications of exemptions, plus the attempts to
rectify loopholes in the 1901 Act, constituted a major part of the administration of the policy.

The original 1901 Immigration Restriction Act provided, under clause 3a, authority to deem a person a prohibited immigrant if that person, when asked to do so by an officer, failed to write out at dictation a passage of fifty words in a European language. The choice of language as well as the choice of whether or not to administer the test lay in the hands of the immigration officer. Clause 9 stipulated that the master, owners and charters of any vessel from which any prohibited immigrant entered the Commonwealth were liable to a maximum penalty of £100 for each such prohibited immigrant. The effectiveness of this act was due to its double-check. The shipping lines shouldered a large share of the responsibility by restricting the issue of tickets to potentially prohibited passengers and by co-operating with the Australian government in the control of stowaways and desertion of crew members. The dictation test provided a further check on those who succeeded in obtaining passage and on those who somehow entered through illegal means, as the test could be administered to anyone in the first year of arrival (clause 5.2). The one year period was later amended to two years in 1910, three years in 1920 and five years in 1932. The 1903 Nationality Act which prohibited the naturalization of non-Europeans, formed the final barricade against non-Europeans in Australia.

1 In 1902, upon severe protest from Japan, the test was changed from "fifty words in a European language" to "not less than fifty words in any prescribed language". The original 1901 Act was reproduced in A.T. Yarwood's Asian Migration to Australia (Melbourne, 1967), Appendix I, pp. 157-162.
The original 1901 Act expressly permitted the entry of wives and children of migrants who were not prohibited (clause 3m), and also any person who satisfied an officer that he had formerly been domiciled in Australia (clause 3n). The clause concerning wives and dependants was suspended by proclamation in March 1903, and both clauses were repealed in December 1905. Clause 3n was, from 1905, substituted by the amended new Section 4B which allowed the issue of the "certificate of exemption from the Dictation Test" to those who were of good character and of five years of residence in Australia.  

On the surface, the suspension and repeal of clause 3m affecting wives and dependants was explained by the government as due to the Chinese taking too full an advantage of the concession. In fact, relatively few Chinese entered in this way. Yarwood was of the opinion that it was the intention of the Commonwealth government to maintain the scarcity of females amongst the resident Asian population as a permanent obstacle to the increasing of their numbers. Without their families, the Asian migrants would also tend

1 Section 8 of the 1905 Amendment Act.


3 During 1902-1903, when the Chinese could have brought in their families, 2,080 Chinese who went back to China and returned, brought with them only 88 persons as members of their families. (See Yarwood, op.cit., p.78). Yarwood, therefore, argued that "it is impossible to accept Prime Minister Deakin's claim that the Chinese had forced the government to extreme measures by taking advantage of the exemption in large numbers." (p.79).
to return to their countries more quickly.¹

As far as the Chinese were concerned, even when there was no restriction on Chinese female migration, Chinese wives had not often migrated with their husbands. A petition for the repeal of the "Act to Make Provisions for Certain Migrants" in 1856, explained that Chinese wished to leave their wives and children to look after their aged parents, and that Chinese women were too weak physically to travel over long distances.² It was pointed out earlier that the objection against female migration was imbedded in the Chinese family-lineage system. Even during the early 1900's, there was little indication that this sentiment had changed. The already functioning commuting system of husbands visiting their families every few years now received new impetus from the repeal of clause 3n of the 1901 act, witness the large total movements of males to and from Australia since 1901 (to be discussed in the next section).

The restriction of female entry was strictly carried out. After 1905, only wives of well-established merchants were admitted and for short periods only, usually six months. The severity of the government's attitude was shown by the famous Poon Gooey case where the government did not yield to the popular demand to let a wife of Poon


Gooey, a merchant in Australia, stayed. Subsequent petition for the re-incorporation of clause 3m from the Chinese in 1918, who presumably took advantage of popular support at that time, was met with a firm rejection from the government, although the privilege was granted to the less numerous Indians and Japanese, whose governments actively intervened on their behalf. It was apparent that the Chinese, being the most numerous among all non-Europeans and having only weak support from their government, were in a disadvantageous position.

Several categories of Chinese migrants were exempted from the Dictation Test. Students and merchants were the first two categories, apparently to enter from 1901 on temporary certificates of exemption and after 1912 on passports. Merchants were allowed to have assistants and special clerks to assist them. In 1934, assistants and 'substitutes' for local traders and market-gardeners, and chefs and cafe workers, were exempted: i.e. allowed in on temporary permits but with no rights of having wives with them or nominating other Chinese as immigrants.

The system of exemptions was complicated, and the conditions affecting each category differed. Even if conditions were stated - for example, turn-over requirement for businesses to introduce assistants, period of stay, etc. - the granting of exemption was administratively

1 Yarwood, Asian Migration to Australia, op. cit., pp.80-1.

2 For the conditions affecting each of the exempted category, see Appendix I.
at the discretion of the Departments concerned. Over time, changes were often made, significantly in 1934 after Sir John Latham's visit to China, when the exemption categories of assistants, substitutes and cafe workers were officially recognized, and in 1947 after World War II when the conditions of each exemption category were clarified.

Whatever the changes, the basic principle is clear: the reasoning of the policy was that competitive labour was to be excluded. While no exemption was made either for unskilled labour or for professionals, skilled workers and other trained persons, non-competitive labour was admissible; this included chefs, assistants, special clerks and substitutes. It follows that, once admitted, these Chinese would either have to stay with those who sponsored them, or move to another job if the new employer was also an 'eligible' employer. That is, the change of employment must not result in the assumption of a position to which Chinese under exemption did not have a free choice of employment. This philosophy continued at least until after World War II when substantial changes were made; and from then on, we enter into the post-War period.

1 Immigration was administered by the Department of External Affairs between 1902-16, by the Department of Home and Territories between 1917-32, and by the Department of the Interior between 1933-45 when the Department of Immigration was formed.

2 For a summary of the 1947 regulations, see Letter from Mr. Calwell to the Charge d'Affaires of China reproduced in Palfreeman, op.cit., pp. 153-6, Appendix II.

3 Ibid., p. 28.
From 1901 to 1947, then, Chinese migration was heavily restricted by exemption categories. This, together with a continuous re-migration of Chinese back to China, produced a significant period in the history of the Chinese in Australia, a period of continuous population decline and a period which decidedly influenced the present settlement of the Chinese in Australia.

Numbers, Arrivals and Departures

The 1901 census counted almost 30,000 full-Chinese in Australia; this was considerably less than the 45,000 - 50,000 estimated for the gold rush periods. But by 1947, the number had decreased even further by more than two-thirds to only about 9,000. The table below shows the census figures for 1901-1947.

**TABLE 3.1**

**Number of Full-Chinese by Sex**

**Various Censuses, 1901 - 1947**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>% of Australian Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>29,153</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>29,627</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>21,856</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>22,753</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>16,011</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>17,157</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>9,311</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>10,846</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6,594</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>9,144</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This decline was even more drastic if we consider that in 1947 some 3,700 of them were Australian-born, leaving only 5,416 full-Chinese born outside Australia. Among the foreign-born, 1,921, or nearly 35 per cent had been in Australia for 40 years or more, probably having arrived in Australia before 1901. The actual number of Chinese who managed to land in Australia after 1901 and stayed until 1947 can, then, be estimated to be not more than 3,500. Of these 3,500, 1,228 were recent arrivals, having been in Australia for less than four years. Some of these were temporary residents such as students and assistants, and others were seamen and travellers without resident status.

During this period, from 1901 to 1947, Chinese departures generally exceeded arrivals, except for the war years when some Chinese were repatriated from war areas. The following table shows total arrivals and departures during 1911-1948.

---

1 There were 776 full-Chinese counted as migratory persons in the 1947 census. Most of these must have been travellers and seamen on ships in Australian waters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male Arrival</th>
<th>Male Dept.</th>
<th>Male Gain (+)</th>
<th>Male Loss (-)</th>
<th>Female Arrival</th>
<th>Female Dept.</th>
<th>Female Gain (+)</th>
<th>Female Loss (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>3465</td>
<td>3869</td>
<td>-404</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>3362</td>
<td>4233</td>
<td>-871</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>+73</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2836</td>
<td>2602</td>
<td>+234</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>2265</td>
<td>+102</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>-223</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>3323</td>
<td>4045</td>
<td>-722</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>3426</td>
<td>4634</td>
<td>-1208</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>3417</td>
<td>3522</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>3699</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>+190</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td>3291</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2471</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>-297</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>3162</td>
<td>3521</td>
<td>-359</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>3259</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td>-627</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>3065</td>
<td>3257</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>2693</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>-297</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>2977</td>
<td>-516</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>-478</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>-332</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>-409</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>-84</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>-86</td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>+80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>+191</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>+112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td></td>
<td>524</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>+113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>-225</td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>+63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male Arrival</th>
<th>Male Dept.</th>
<th>Male Gain (+)</th>
<th>Male Loss (-)</th>
<th>Female Arrival</th>
<th>Female Dept.</th>
<th>Female Gain (+)</th>
<th>Female Loss (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941-43b</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>-389</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>+75</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>-354</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>-589</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male Arrival</th>
<th>Male Dept.</th>
<th>Male Gain (+)</th>
<th>Male Loss (-)</th>
<th>Female Arrival</th>
<th>Female Dept.</th>
<th>Female Gain (+)</th>
<th>Female Loss (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914-40</td>
<td>65938</td>
<td>72747</td>
<td>-6809</td>
<td></td>
<td>5231</td>
<td>4962</td>
<td>+269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-47</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>-1257</td>
<td></td>
<td>368</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>+52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Demography Bulletins, figures by "nationality or race".

Note: a) Total movements include long term and short term movements as well as transients. A. T. Yarwood (op. cit., p.165), gave another, set of figures for "Chinese admitted without test" and presumably long term departures only which excluded transients. (Commonwealth Year Book 1925 p.946). Consequently, the above table does not coincide with Yarwood's figures.

b) Figures for periods 1911-13 and 1941-43 are not available by sex, but the total arrivals and departures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Departures</th>
<th>Gain(+)</th>
<th>Loss(-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td>-214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>3464</td>
<td>3937</td>
<td>-473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>3349</td>
<td>3354</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jan-Sept)</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+1019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1911-13; 1941 Monthly (later Quarterly) Summary of Australian Statistics. 1942-43 Commonwealth Yearbooks

Yearly figures do not necessarily show permanent loss or gain because Australian migration statistics do not show the precise number of persons entering or leaving Australia. Moreover, departures in a certain year may eventually return at a later date and arrivals may depart without settling permanently. Indeed, this seems to be the usual case among Chinese. With a population always less than 30,000 during the years 1901-1947, total yearly movements (male and female arrivals and departures together) of about 6,000 during 1914-27 decreasing to 2000

in later years, were great. This can be expected because first, arriving Chinese were usually persons exempted from the dictation test under some regulations which demanded their future departure. Students, assistants and substitutes were temporary residents who had to depart after a certain prescribed length of time. Settler arrivals could have been very few. Secondly, the form of Chinese settlement was gradually changing from a mining, market-gardening type of economy (which demanded few movements) into a trade and commerce oriented economy, where movements in and out of the country could be expected to be frequent.

In spite of these defects in the raw data, a consistent loss of Chinese through excess of departure over arrival throughout the whole period can be observed. A major exception to this was in the years 1942 and 1943 when the evacuation of New Guinea and some Pacific islands brought with them some Chinese. For the males, this loss was consistent until the outbreak of the Pacific War; for the females, a slight gain started around 1937. The depression of the 1930's did not cause a sudden return of Chinese to China, but the total movements dropped and did not regain its predepression level. The Pacific War started in 1942 and total movements dropped even further, probably due to a stricken decline of Sino-Australian trade and lack of shipping.

If the crude gain and loss for the years are added together it can be seen that there was a total loss of 692 persons for 1911-1933, a loss of 1811 males and 46
females for the period 1914-20, a loss of 4275 males and 67 females for 1921-32, and a loss of 723 males but a gain of 382 females for 1933-40 — giving a total loss of 6809 males and a gain of 269 females for the whole period 1914-1940. The 1941-43 War years cannot be analysed by sex, but there was a total gain of 1138 persons for the three years. Some of this gain during the War years departed subsequently after the war and probably contributed to the male loss of 1257 for the year 1944-47. The total loss irrespective of male or female for the whole period 1911-1947 was 7299, contributing to about 53.7 per cent of the decline of the full-Chinese population census dates 1911-1947 (see Table 3.1).

Although the interpretation of migration statistics is limited to crude numbers, it adequately shows that there was a large number of departures for the males and no appreciable immigration of females.

The lack of Chinese women in Australia was explained partly as a phenomenon arising from the traditional kinship system of Southern Chinese villages, but during the late 1920's and early 1930's, when Chinese females were beginning to emigrate to Thailand, Malaya and other South-East Asia countries, the restrictive policy of Australia limited the entries of wives and dependants, except those of merchants and well-established families. Because the number of these families were few, there was little increase in female arrivals until after the Second
World War.¹ The number of foreign-born full-Chinese females remained very small - 265 in 1911, 237 in 1921, 219 in 1933, and 746 in 1947.

Since migration figures do not show other characteristics of Chinese arrivals and departures, an estimate of the age distribution of the loss or gain through migration was made alternatively by utilizing the "survival method" to compare the expected survivors

¹ This phenomenon was repeated in countries where restrictive policies were operating. The United States Chinese population had a similar, but not as intensive, imbalance of sex ratio until after the Second World War. Rose H. Lee, The Chinese in The United States of America (Hong Kong, 1960), pp. 23-4.
of a previous census with the next census. The female numbers were too small for meaningful estimation and they were, therefore, excluded from the calculation.

1 This is done by adopting Australian survival ratios for the appropriate periods to the Chinese census population. For inter-censal periods which are multiples of five, the census five-year age-groups were survived by five-year survival ratios to the next census. For intercensal periods which are not multiples of five (1921-33, 1933-47), single-year age distribution was obtained from the census five-year age-group by first drawing a free-hand curve for the cumulative figures of the five-year age-groups and then subtracting the cumulative totals for one age from the age immediately above. For example, to obtain the number of age 12, the cumulative number read from the curve for all those age 11 and under is subtracted from the cumulative number for age 12 and under; and so on. This single year distribution is then survived by single year survival ratios to the next census. This free hand curve method is preferred to other methods based on mathematical models which assume the shapes of the curve.

Another method, suggested by the United Nations (Manual IV: Methods for population projections by Sex and Age, 1956, pp.10-11) to survive five-year age-groups beyond the next census year and to interpolate linearly for the census year survivals, is also rejected because it assumes an even distribution of the ages within each five-year age group.

Australian survival ratios were obtained by linearly interpolating Australian Official Life Tables (Lx) values. The Australian 1966 Life Table was constructed by M. Sivamurthy of the Department of Demography and I am grateful to him for allowing me to use his figures. His work will be submitted to the Australian National University as a Ph.D thesis in 1970.
The results are as follows:

TABLE 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age-Groups</th>
<th>1911-21 Males</th>
<th>1921-33 Males</th>
<th>1933-47 Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>+47</td>
<td>+60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>+180</td>
<td>+157</td>
<td>+273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>+274</td>
<td>+162</td>
<td>+319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>-139</td>
<td>-109</td>
<td>+185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>-197</td>
<td>-160</td>
<td>+102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>-467</td>
<td>-135</td>
<td>+72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>-489</td>
<td>-308</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>-436</td>
<td>-452</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>-705</td>
<td>-616</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>-491</td>
<td>-820</td>
<td>-319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>-553</td>
<td>-660</td>
<td>-458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>-166</td>
<td>-338</td>
<td>-382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>-128</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td>-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>-3274</td>
<td>-3312</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (+) denotes gain (-) denotes loss

The great loss of males indicated in the previous analysis of migration statistics was reflected again in the above table. For the period 1911-21, there was a heavy net loss of males for those aged 35 and over, totalling 3,834. The 1921-33 period showed a similar trend and the net loss was 3,678 males aged 35 and above.
Net loss for the later 1933-47 period was not as heavy and occurred with those aged 60 and above.

The important aspect of the above Table 3.3 is not only the relatively large number but also the ages of the Chinese returning. For both periods 1911-21 and 1921-33, it can be observed that heavy emigration occurred for ages 60 and above. This lends strong support to the often impressionistic contention that Chinese of the earlier periods tended to return to China for retirement. Even during 1933-47, this return movement was still distinctly observable, although it had slowed down considerably.

Age-sex, Nativity and Conjugal Conditions

It was shown that early Chinese migration was predominantly male. The 1901 census counted 474 females as against 29,153 males. Previous censuses of the colonies showed even lower proportions of females. After 1901, however, the ratio dropped from 2,436 males to 100 females in 1911, to 1,397 in 1921, 606 in 1933, and to 258 in 1947. ¹ Put in terms of percentages, males constituted 96.0 per cent of the total population in 1911, 93.3 per cent in 1921, 85.8 per cent in 1933 and 72.1 per cent in 1947.

¹ Sex ratios are calculated from Table 3.1 for all full-Chinese irrespective of birthplace. The sex ratios for foreign-born full-Chinese show similar pattern of decline. The part-Chinese population will be discussed later in connection with conjugal conditions.
For the whole period, 1901-1947, there was no appreciable migration of Chinese females to Australia; at least the gradual balance of sex-ratio was mainly caused by a decline of male population and the small increase of Australian-born females, rather than by a marked increase of female migrants. This lack of females resulted first in a very slow growth of the Australian-born full-Chinese population and secondly on the prolonged predominance of aged males. Let us consider the Australian-born Chinese population first.

**TABLE 3.4**

**NUMBER OF AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHINESE**

**a BY SEX, 1911-47 (FULL CHINESE ONLY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>% of all Full Chinese Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>% of all full Chinese Females</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>% of all native-born Chinese</th>
<th>% of Chin-Chinese in the U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>21(1910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>30(1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>52(1940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>54(1950)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Excluding those born in New Guinea, Papua, Nauru Island and other Australian administered external territories.

In 1911, there were only 1,456 Australian-born Chinese, or approximately 6 per cent of the total full-Chinese population; in 1947, the Australian-born Chinese were about 41 per cent of the total. This rapid percentage increase was the result of the departure and death of the foreign-born Chinese rather than the growth of the Australian-born population itself. The increase in the number presents a better picture; although showing a continuous increase after 1911, the amount of approximately 95 persons a year is very slow.¹

For comparison, the United States percentages are shown in the table. The Chinese in the United States experienced a similar growth pattern, that is, a sudden influx during the gold rush and railway construction years and a decline after restrictive immigration laws were imposed. For the Chinese in the United States, the percentage of native-born had been consistently higher than that of the Australian counterpart, in 1950, the native-born Chinese in the United States exceeded the foreign-born.

Partly because of the slow increase of Australian-born and partly because of lack of immigration of young Chinese, the Chinese population in Australia grew older during the first three decades of this century. By

¹ The number of Australian-born female has always exceeded the foreign-born females in this period; the males, however, have been vastly outnumbered by foreign-borns.
1933, the group of young adults who came before or about the turn of the century were now, in 1933, mostly over 50 years of age. The age structure of the Chinese for this period is shown below.

**TABLE 3.5**

**AGE-STRUCTURE OF FULL-CHINESE, 1911-1947**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Median age&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under 20</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>m 21156</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f 840</td>
<td>62.75</td>
<td>17.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p 21996</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>m 15708</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f 1138</td>
<td>60.10</td>
<td>14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p 16846</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>m 9213</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f 1528</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p 10741</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>m 6507</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f 2533</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p 9040</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>16.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Figures excluding these ages unstated.

b) Median ages calculated from census five-year age-groups.

The median age for males rose from an already high figure of 44.21 in 1911 to the still higher figure of 50.58 in 1921 and 56.46 in 1933, then dropping to 40.29 in 1947. This rapid ageing of the Chinese was attained in spite of the large numbers of re-migrants of higher age-groups (see Table 3.3). The proportion of males aged 50 and over remained high for this period: 34.08 per cent in 1911, 52.00 per cent in 1921, and 68.59 in 1933. The big drop in proportions was in the younger age-groups - those between
20-39 for 1911-33, and 40-49 for the period 1921-33.
The increase of the proportion under 20 years of age was
very slight, in fact due more to the decline of the general
population than to the increase of the number of these persons.

The majority of the full-Chinese female population until
1947 was Australian-born (see Table 3.4). In the
absence of any appreciable immigration of adult females,
the proportion in the reproductive ages 20-49 remained
very low, although an increase was observed for every
census period. This is reflected in the median age of the
females - 12.75 in 1911, 16.03 in 1921, 20.27 in 1933, and

The high masculinity, and the big difference between
the age structure of male and female, had important
effects on their marriage pattern. Pre-1911 colonial
census figures on conjugal condition are inaccurate.
The colonies decided that Chinese should be reported
as 'never married' unless they had or had had wives in
Australia.¹ This practice was followed by all colonies
for 1871, 1881, 1891, and 1901. Under this rule, the
percentage of never-married Chinese males of age 15 and
over was abnormally high: 99 per cent in 1871, 95 per cent
in 1881, and 94 per cent in 1891 and 1901.²

¹ New South Wales Census 1881, Statistician's Report p.90
1891 census, Statistician's Report p.168; Western
Australia, 1901 census, Statistician's Report p.201.

² Figures for 1871 and 1881, Victoria only; 1891 figure
excludes South and Western Australia; and 1901 figure
excludes South Australia.
From 1911 onwards, the practice was officially discontinued and figures were from then on theoretically comparable. But the never-married figure for 1911 was still high. The following table shows the conjugal conditions of the Chinese for 1911 and 1933.

### TABLE 3.6

**CONJUGAL CONDITIONS OF FULL-CHINESE 1911 AND 1933**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugal Conditions</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1933</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A) Males 15 years of Age and over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>12860(60)c</td>
<td>8032(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2608(30)</td>
<td>5352(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B) Females 15 years of age and over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>66(17)</td>
<td>314(79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>410(42)</td>
<td>463(48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Not available for 1921 and 1947.

b) Including divorced, separated and all others.

c) Figures in brackets are percentages.
There is a great disparity between the numbers of married males and married females for both these censuses. In 1911, there was only one married female to every 25.6 married males. Though this figure dropped to 11.6 in 1933, the extreme discrepancy indicates that an overwhelming majority of Chinese men had their wives and families in China.

Not only were married females scarce among Chinese, females who were never-married were also few compared with males, for example, in 1933, there were 2,608 males and 410 females or a ratio of 6.36 males to one female. The traditional commuting system, plus the restrictive legislation, virtually forced single Chinese wishing to marry to return to their places of origin to marry.

Lack of marriageable Chinese females also affected inter-racial marriage with European-Australians. Since Australian marriage statistics are based on 'birth-place', reliable analyses can only be made to about 1940, as the percentage of ethnic Chinese among Chinese-born persons dropped rapidly after that - for the males to 84 per cent and for the females to 41 per cent in 1947. The table below presents the pattern of marriages involving persons born in China.
TABLE 3.7

MARRIAGES OF PERSONS BORN IN CHINA, 1907-1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Percent both Bride and Groom born in China</th>
<th>Percent Bride born in China</th>
<th>Percent Groom born in China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907-1910</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-1920</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1930</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-1940</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Demography Bulletins

Two interesting facts emerge from the above table. First is that, in the total number of marriages which occurred in Australia, the proportion involving both partners born in China remained very low, while the proportion of Chinese-born grooms marrying non-Chinese-born brides was high for the whole period. Second is the increasing proportion of Chinese-born brides marrying non-Chinese-born grooms. It is, however, erroneous to consider non-Chinese-born persons as non-Chinese in ethnic terms. Both non-Chinese-born males and females include a portion of ethnic Chinese who are not born in China. The increasing proportion of non-Chinese-born grooms marrying Chinese-born brides may, in fact, be reflecting growth in the Australian-born Chinese population, some of the males have chosen Chinese-born brides as marriage partners.

The low proportion of marriages involving both partners born in China appears to be a result of keen competition for the small number of marriageable Chinese females. In general, it seems that while inter-racial marriages occurred, they were very largely the result of the small number of single Chinese
females available. The small total number of marriages contracted during the whole period lends support to the above argument.

Partly because of the small number of inter-racial marriages, and partly because of a possible inaccuracy in enumerating part-Chinese, the censuses recorded an extremely slow growth of the part-Chinese population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Total number of Chinese</th>
<th>Per cent of part-Chinese in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1000a</td>
<td>1018a</td>
<td>2018a</td>
<td>37839</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>32717</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1518b</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>3019</td>
<td>25772</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1891b</td>
<td>1778b</td>
<td>3669b</td>
<td>20826</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>14349</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>12094</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Australian Censuses.

Note: a) Number estimated by Commonwealth Year Book (1925), pp. 951-956. Western Australia excluded.

b) The 1925 Commonwealth Year Book gives a slightly lower figure for part-Chinese (p. 956), presumably taken from the table on Race by Birthplace in Census 1921 Volume II pp. 295-6 which excluded Chinese whose birthplaces were unstated.

Figures prior to 1891 are incomplete, but it is likely that there were already some part-Chinese before that time.

1 The term 'Half-Caste' is used in Australian censuses until 1966. Since it carries some negative connotation, 'part-Chinese' is used here as an alternative.
If the accuracy of the numeration of part-Chinese can be assumed (which is doubtful), Table 3.8 shows practically no increase for the 50 some years. A number of the part-Chinese might have reached advanced age in the 1920's and were consequently eliminated through death. From 1921 until 1947, there was a continuous decline in numbers signifying either an excess of deaths over births, or emigration over immigration, or both. There is no good reason for part-Chinese emigrating in any great numbers during the period, and it is unlikely that mortality among them was so high as to exceed the number of births.

Instead, it seems likely that part-Chinese were under-enumerated. Since Australian censuses have always been completed by heads of the households and not by census collectors and because the popular concept of 'mixed-bloods' (as amplified by the objectionable term 'half-caste' in the census schedule) carries undesirable connotation, it is very likely that some part-Chinese simply wrote "European" or "Chinese" in spite of specific instruction to state (H.C.) if part-Chinese.

It is clear from the above discussion that marriage statistics and census data cannot be easily interpreted. Not only were marriage data based on birth-places of bride and groom unsatisfactory because they could not take account of the Australian-born Chinese intermarrying, census figures of part-Chinese were subject to under-enumeration. Any attempt to explain the pattern can, therefore, only be tentative.
Geographical and Occupational Distributions

The geographical distribution of the Chinese followed closely the general Australian pattern. For Australia as a whole, from 1901 to 1947, the total population more than trebled; but the eastern states continued to be the main settlement areas. New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland together consistently attracted more than 80 per cent of the total Australian population. The Chinese were also concentrated in these most populous states. New South Wales alone had 34.5 per cent of the total Chinese population in 1901 and this proportion increased (though not in absolute number until 1933-47) to slightly over half in 1947. The number of Chinese in Victoria was not as numerous as those in Queensland for the period 1901-1947, but the proportion in Queensland dropped continuously from a high of 25.90 per cent in 1901 to 19.00 per cent in 1947. The three states together, however, accounted always for more than 80 per cent (85 per cent in 1947) of the total Chinese population. (See Appendix III).

We have seen that in the 1890's and the early 1900's, furniture factories, laundries and fruit and vegetable distributing businesses as well as market gardening around them began to replace primary industry - such as station hands or farm labourers - as the main occupations. Sydney and Melbourne provided the most suitable areas for these employments. Many older Chinese, previously having worked in rural areas, also, retired to the Chinese quarters of these cities to await transportation back to
China or to be cared for by the Chinese benevolent associations. By 1911, the occupation structure already showed the growing importance of urban employment. Commercial and industrial pursuits accounted for 39.6 per cent (6,300 persons) of the total workforce, and although agricultural pursuits (mainly market gardening) still claimed 9,126 persons (or 43.1 per cent),¹ many of the market gardeners were located near the metropolitan centres.² The mining population had almost completely declined by this time. The drift to the urban centres was evident. The number of Chinese declined rapidly in general between 1901-1947, but was less marked in New South Wales and Victoria, especially in Sydney and Melbourne. Queensland experienced the greatest decrease from a high of 7,672 (25.90 per cent) in 1901 to only 1,737 (19.00 per cent) in 1947, probably losing some Chinese to New South Wales especially Sydney where the chances of finding jobs were better. Brisbane, being less important to Queensland than Sydney or Melbourne to their states, never had a high proportion of Chinese population — by 1947, only 24.37 per cent of the Chinese in Queensland were in Brisbane.

¹ Census 1911. Figures of occupation by Chinese (race).

² Weston Bate, History of Brighton (Melbourne, 1962, p. 358-60), described some of these in the Brighton and Moorabbin areas of Melbourne. Some gardens were located on the banks of the River Yarra in Kew and Heidelberg. Hwu-yung, A Chinaman's Opinion of us and his Own Country (trans. J.A. Makepeace; London, 1927), p. 17.
The tendency toward urbanisation was experienced by the Australian population as a whole; it was, however, more rapid for the Chinese. In 1911, only 32 per cent of the Chinese resided in metropolitan areas. This proportion increased rapidly to 37.5 per cent in 1921, to 41.4 per cent in 1933 and to 58.9 per cent in 1947 when this proportion exceeded that for the Australian population (see Appendix III).

The urbanisation of the Chinese was not a phenomenon limited only to those in Australia. Chinese in the United States have also experienced a similar trend. In 1880, only 23 per cent of the Chinese in the United States lived in cities of over 25,000 population. In 1890, the percentage had risen to 43 per cent; in 1920, 66 per cent and in 1950, 94 per cent.¹

This rapid urbanisation of the Chinese in America was similarly accompanied by a switch of occupation from mining, farming and railroad construction to restaurant and laundry work which are primarily orientated towards the services.

In essence, then, the pattern of urbanisation among the Chinese in the United States was similar to that in Australia, although in the United States, they tend to spread to many more metropolises.

¹ United States Census figures reported by Rose H. Lee, op.cit., pp. 35-8.
In Australia, it is Sydney and Melbourne which absorbed most of them.

During this period, 1901-1947, the occupational structure of the Chinese was undergoing change, partly because of the loss through emigration and through death. Chinese furniture-makers and laundry-keepers, being keen competitors and therefore unpopular among Australian counterparts, were not permitted to sponsor Chinese migrants to help in their businesses. The recruitment of help in Australia was limited in view of the consistent decline and ageing of the Chinese population; and this made it difficult for the cabinet-makers and laundry-keepers to find enough workers. In addition, the discriminatory Factories and Shops Act (N.S.W., 1896, Victoria, 1896) further put the Chinese in a disadvantageous position. The Act defined any workshop employing one or more Chinese as a factory, and thereby, made industrial regulations concerning wages, conditions of work and limited hours applicable to small Chinese workshops. Lyng,¹ writing in 1927, noted the beginning of the decline of the Chinese cabinet and laundry business. By the end of the Second World War, the decline was complete and Chinese furniture or laundry shops were almost non-existent.

Market gardening declined more slowly. Unlike cabinet-making and laundries, there was little objection to Chinese market gardeners, and their value as a major

producer of vegetables was appreciated. Indeed, immigration regulations allowed assistant and 'substitutes' to enter and work in the gardens. They declined only after the Second World War with the expansion of the metropolitan areas into surrounding market gardens.\(^1\) Many of the market gardeners were by now rather old, reaching retirement age. Having been separated from their families for years, some sold their gardens and returned to China, while others retired to China-towns and spent their last days under the care of Chinese benevolent associations. A few younger gardeners and their assistants, who were still able to work, were beginning to be absorbed by the flourishing cafes and restaurants.

While the market gardens were becoming less numerous, their supporting occupations as distributing agents were flourishing. Large wholesale fruit and vegetable distributing firms were established in both New South Wales and Victoria during 1910-1920\(^2\) and almost monopolised the business at that time. Small-scale vegetable and fruit retail stalls were also numerous, claiming a major part of the distributing agents. They usually bought their vegetables from Chinese wholesalers or market-gardeners, and sold them at the retail market.

\(^1\) This has been the case with market gardens around Melbourne. Brighton, a suburb, used to have many Chinese gardens along the present Nepean Highway; this area is now part of the metropolitan built-up area. See Weston Bate, *op.cit.*, pp.358-60.

Unfortunately, detailed occupation data on the Chinese are not available for censuses after 1911.\(^1\) It is, therefore, not possible to trace the exact timing of the rise and fall of some of these occupations from census data.

\(^1\) The last census to tabulate occupation by race is 1911. The 1921 and 1933 censuses give 'occupational grade' by race as well as by birthplace. Grades of occupation are divided into 'employer', 'persons on own account', 'persons assisting with wage', 'waged or salaried persons', and 'unemployed or persons not in workforce'. The 1947 census gives even less information. Data on occupational status (which is equivalent to occupational grade in previous censuses) and broad 'occupational order' categories by birthplace are available.
Summary

This chapter described the changes in the Chinese background and the Australian immigration restrictions which influenced the pattern of migration and settlement of the Chinese in Australia in the period 1901-1947. It appears that changes in the Chinese background had less influence than the Australian immigration laws. Although social change in China during the 1920's permitted the emigration of married females to South-east Asia, the number of Chinese females in Australia remained very small. This was mainly because clause (3m) in the 1901 Immigration Restriction Act which permitted residents to introduce their wives and dependents was suspended. Forbidden to become naturalized after 1903, they were not able to exercise the right as Australian citizens to effect their families' entries. The separation of Chinese families and the difficulties in living a de facto bachelor life probably provided strong reasons for the large numbers who returned to China.

The 1901-1947 period, then, saw a major decline of the Chinese population. The 1947 census counted the lowest number of Chinese - less than 10,000, of whom only 5,400 were foreign-born. But, more important than the effect on declining numbers was the influence on the pattern of Chinese settlement. By permitting only certain categories of sponsored Chinese to enter, the 1901 Immigration Act excluded the immigration of independent Chinese while at the same time encouraged the continuation of some of the traditional occupations.
By 1947, more than half the Chinese were concentrated in the metropolitan centres. The Chinese furniture shops and the laundries had mostly disappeared, but the market-gardeners and vegetable distributing business continued into the post-war period.
CHAPTER IV

POST-WORLD WAR II CHINESE IN AUSTRALIA

Influence of Communist Chinese Policies on Chinese migration

Post-World War II Changes in Australian Immigration Restrictions

Chinese in Australia, 1947 - 1966

The Suburbanization of the Chinese, 1947 - 1966

Summary
Influence of Communist Chinese Policies on Chinese Migration

Events after the establishment of the Communist government in China had far greater influence on Chinese migration than those of the Republic period 1911-49. Among these events, the Land Reform of 1950-3 probably had the most far reaching effect, not only by eliminating large land ownership, especially clan land, and thereby weakening the binding strength of the family lineage, but also by confiscating land owned by Overseas Chinese families.¹ As the lineages began to disintegrate, loyalty among Chinese migrants towards their families and lineages started to lose its basic foundation. In addition, the accusation that wealthy families with relatives abroad were landlords and exploiters put these families into disadvantageous positions; their above average livelihood was regarded as 'bourgeois' and non-productive, and they themselves were suspected and watched. Their ties with foreign countries, especially Western countries, became for the first time a political liability rather than an asset.

¹ In the beginning of the Land Reform, there were special considerations given to Overseas Chinese families. These concessions were, however, withdrawn in 1952 when the programme was accelerated. Lu Yu-sen, Programs of Communist China for Overseas Chinese (Hong Kong, 1956), p. 16. Ho Wei, Overseas Chinese Policies of Communist China (Hong Kong, 1956), p. 3.
The relationship between emigration and traditional ties with the family-lineage and China had been very different after the Land Reform. First, many Chinese migrants abroad seriously doubted the advisability of returning to China, especially when their investments in China might be nationalized, and private ownership of land was virtually abolished in favour of agricultural communes. Against such unfavourable conditions at home, Chinese migrants began to settle permanently abroad, and tried to bring their wives and families out from China. Return movements, either for visits or settlement, which were so characteristic of early Chinese migration, became difficult, partly because of strict immigration-emigration control of the Communist Chinese government and partly because of the fear of being persecuted as landlords. Some of these fears received confirmation when it was known that rich Chinese migrants were forced to remit large sums of money to pay 'fines' on behalf of their landlord-relatives.1

Second, the strong hostility towards Communist China on the part of many countries affected China's capacity of improving the status of Chinese settled there. This was specially true, for example, in Malaya after the 'emergency' 1948-60, in Thailand and Indo-China as a whole, in India after the Sino-Indian War, 1962, and in Western countries such as the United States and Australia where communist sympathizers were suspected.

1 This campaign of extracting remittance from Overseas Chinese seems to be world wide. For some accounts of this, see Robert S. Elegant, The Dragon's Teeth (New York, 1959), pp. 22-6. Also Lu Yu-sen, op.cit., pp. 15-8.
Third, and perhaps most important, the Chinese Communist Government did not have a policy of protection of the Overseas Chinese, and this cast serious doubts on the real interest of the Peking Government. The general trend, at least until the 'Cultural Revolution' in the early 1960's, had been the encouragement of the assimilation of Overseas Chinese to local populations. Liao Shao-chi and Chou En-lai were reported to have asked overseas compatriots to obey local laws, to respect the customs and habits, to learn local languages and to intermarry.\(^1\) In the same vein, the Communist Government abandoned the doctrine of *jus sanguinis*, as instance the 1956 treaty between Peking and Jakarta to resolve the question of Chinese dual nationality in Indonesia. This policy seemed to indicate a desire of Communist China to disassociate herself from local politics involving Overseas Chinese instead of actively participating to protect them.\(^2\)

---


2. This desire is also indicated in the attempt to repatriate those who were discriminated and wished to return to China. Beginning in 1959 when Indonesia banned alien retail traders and accelerated by the 1962 Sino-Indian War and the 1965 Indonesia coup-d'état, the programme of repatriation has brought thousands of Overseas Chinese back to Kwangtung and Fukien. The settlement of these repatriats became a major item in the administration of Overseas Chinese affairs.
The policy of carrying the Chinese revolution to her neighbouring countries too was not welcome by the local government nor by the Chinese communities.

All these contributed to a definite alienation of Overseas Chinese from China. While the Nationalist Government in Taiwan gradually lost the support from Chinese communities, the Communist Government was not able to resolve the conflict arising from their policy of internal reconstruction, especially the Land Reform and the nationalization of private enterprises, and from their policies of aiding communist activities abroad. The Overseas Chinese now faced an enormous problem if they wished to stay being 'Chinese' not assimilated to the local society. Mainland China had greatly changed since they left. The rural villages were no longer the same as before. If they returned, they would be facing a problem of adjusting to this new environment which might be even more difficult than adjusting to the countries in which they resided. The hope that the Nationalist Government would return to mainland China seemed remote and unrealistic as time passed; and even if this did happen, the old familiar China was only a part of history that would never return. In the meantime, their children were being brought up and educated abroad. There was every reason to stay permanently in their place of residence and be assimilated into local conditions.
Post-World War II Changes in Australian Immigration Restriction

Encouragement for the Chinese to remain permanently in Australia came not only from post-war changes in China but also from a relaxation of the Australian immigration restriction policy towards the Chinese.

Policy changes after World War II and especially in 1956 involved not only the curtailment of the entry of assistants and substitutes but also the improved treatment of the war-time refugees and those on exemption who did not want to return to Communist China. Partly because of the practical difficulties of deporting Chinese to China and partly because of current demands for a more humanitarian approach to stranded migrants, the Australian Government decided on the one hand to liberalize the treatment of those who were already in Australia, but on the other hand to tighten the fresh entry of non-Europeans.

The first group to be affected by these changes was the war-time refugees - some 800 of them, mostly Chinese who did not wish to return. The Labor Government, with Arthur Calwell as Minister for Immigration, strenuously attempted to deport them. Having encountered difficulties in the O'Keefe case,¹ Calwell immediately introduced the controversial War-time Refugee Removal Act in June 1949 to enable deportation. The general election was near.

¹ For a description of the case, see A.C.Palfreeman, The Administration of the White Australian Policy (Melbourne, 1967), pp.87-8,102.
The deportation of war-time refugees became a political issue with the government under constant attack by both Opposition and the general public. In December, 1949, the Liberal Party won the election and at the same time China fell under the complete control of the Chinese Communist Party, making it more difficult to deport Chinese migrants who did not wish to return. The incoming government decided to cancel the outstanding deportation orders and not to proceed with further deportation. For practical reasons, then, these refugees were allowed to stay permanently with the status of 'War-time Refugees' but with no right to nominate families and assistants.

Similar difficulties occurred with some assistants who violated their conditions of entry. In view of this, and the expected reduction of numbers eligible for entry in the future by tightening the admission of assistants and substitutes, a general review of the policy in 1956 resulted in a more liberal attitude being adopted towards persons already in Australia. They received 'Liberal Attitude' status which permitted them to stay and change their employment freely but denied them any privileges such as that of employing persons under exemption, introducing assistants, or bringing in families.

At the same time, the policy of refusing naturalization to non-Europeans was abandoned. Non-Europeans were allowed to become permanent residents and be naturalized after 15 years of residence. Such persons were then able to introduce wives and children.
In 1958, the new Migration Act repealed the old Immigration Restriction Act and abolished the 'Dictation Test', while the Minister for Immigration introduced the category of 'Distinguished and Highly Qualified' persons. In 1962, provisions to admit Eurasians were relaxed, and in 1966, there was another review of policy. Non-Europeans could now be naturalized after five years of residence, and the 1958 category of 'Distinguished and Highly Qualified' persons was extended to include a wide range of professionals and semi-professionals.

Many factors were responsible for the liberalization of the restrictive policy. Within Australia, notwithstanding determined opposition to reform, pressure groups such as the Australian Council of Churches, the Catholic Bishops, and Immigration Reform Associations, had been actively campaigning for immigration reform.

In the Australian political arena, the Democratic Labor Party and the Australian Communist Party had consistently denounced the racial content of the policy, although their influence in the government had been small. Some individual members of the Liberal-Country Parties and the Australian Labor Party had also deviated from the traditional line and supported immigration reform. Immigration reformers within the Labor Party were successful,

1 Some associations such as the Australian Natives' Association and the Returned Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen's League (R.S.L.) had been consistently opposed to any reform.

2 For a summary of the activities of these groups, see H.I. London, Non-White Immigration and the 'White Australia' Policy (Sydney, 1970), pp. 107-42.
in 1965, in asking the Party to delete the words 'White Australia' from its platform.\(^1\) Within the Liberal and Country Parties, the more conservative view that Australia should retain its homogeneous population was rapidly losing governmental adherents,\(^2\) although as a government the Liberal-Country Coalition was not likely to effectuate major policy shifts.\(^3\)

Outside Australia in the international scene, the racial content of the 'White Australia' policy was an obstacle to smooth diplomatic relations with the emerging and racially conscious Asian and African countries. Indeed, Australian politicians realized the difficulties in defending racial notions in a world which was increasingly sensitive to such issues.\(^4\) Moreover, in view of the importance of future co-operation with Asian countries in trade and defence, there was a growing necessity to eliminate the objectionable image of the 'White Australia' policy abroad and to avoid embarrassment which might arise from a discriminatory immigration policy.\(^5\)

It is not possible to pinpoint accurately which of these factors was most responsible for policy reform. They complemented each other to produce a favourable climate for liberalization.\(^6\)

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 105.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 260.
\(^6\) London, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 262.
Chinese in Australia 1947 - 1966

The post-war period saw two important changes in the Chinese population in Australia: first, the large scale re-migration (return movement) ended after 1947 partly because the Chinese were now more settled in Australia and partly because the number had decreased to such a low point in 1947 that the volume of migration could not have been large; second, there was a continuous increase in the number of Chinese in Australia since 1947.

Unfortunately, migration figures for the post-war period are not available by 'race', and both 'nationality' and 'birthplace' figures are inadequate approximates to ethnic Chinese figures. The post-war period cannot be analysed by straightforward figures such as those in the previous periods. In the absence of more accurate data, we have to be content with 'nationality' figures, which, though undercounting large numbers of ethnic Chinese who have non-Chinese nationality, are probably slightly better than 'birthplace' figures which have a high proportion of non-Chinese. First, naturalization of Chinese was granted only after 1956 and then after 15 years of residence until 1966. Second, ethnic Chinese from Malaysia, Singapore or Hong Kong who hold British (Commonwealth) passports were mostly non-sponsored students who return to their countries after they finish their studies. With the above consideration, we proceed to examine Chinese migration after World War II.
**TABLE 4.1**

TOTAL MOVEMENTS OF CHINESE NATIONALS

BY SEX, AUSTRALIA 1948-1965

(THREE YEARS MOVING AVERAGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Dep't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-51</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-52</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-53</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-54</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-55</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-56</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-57</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-58</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-59</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-60</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-61</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-62</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-63</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-64</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-65</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 15,090 10,554 +4,536 6,991 4,739 +2,252

Source: Demography Bulletins

a) Three year moving averages are calculated to correct the uneven-ness of the crude figures by averaging three year arrivals and departures from 1949 to 1951, 1950-52 and so on for both males and females.

From the above table, it can be seen that, as far as Chinese nationals are concerned, arrivals exceeded departures generally for both males and females. For the males, the relatively heavy gains during 1949-52 were probably due to political change which occurred in China in 1949.
Large numbers of Chinese fled the war stricken Chinese mainland to other countries; some of these entered Australia in this period. Since then, arrivals decreased for a short time between 1952 to 1956 and picked up again until the present.

For the females, the pattern was similar. But the years 1957-9 marked the beginning of large number of female arrivals. The excess of arrival over departure was large, about 250 a year. This was related to the Australian Government's decision to grant naturalization rights to the Chinese.

Survival estimates of net gain or loss through intercensal migration show a general agreement with the trend indicated by the migration figures. The intercensal periods of 1947-54 and 1954-61 show significant gains of both males and females, especially for the ages 15 to 30.

---

1 For a description of the method, see Chapter III, page 97, footnote 1.
TABLE 4.2
ESTIMATES OF NET GAIN OR LOSS OF CHINESE
FOR INTERCENSAL PERIODS 1947-1966, THROUGH
MIGRATION BY AGE GROUPS BY SEX (FULL CHINESE
ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>1947-54</th>
<th>1954-61</th>
<th>1961-66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>+152</td>
<td>+101</td>
<td>+383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>+646</td>
<td>+165</td>
<td>+1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>+981</td>
<td>+197</td>
<td>+2,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>+502</td>
<td>+68</td>
<td>+571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>+229</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>+162</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td>+141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>+82</td>
<td>+56</td>
<td>+36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>+52</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>+173</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>+2,972</td>
<td>+700</td>
<td>+5,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these gains were probably due to the increase of migratory Chinese during the years, but this accounted

1 The total full-Chinese migratory population (those on ships, aircrafts, etc.,) was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only for a slight proportion. The majority represented the arrival of assistants, substitutes, cooks and dependants who could enter more easily between 1947 and 1956.

Those of higher ages were virtually not emigrating at all and the general pattern presented itself as a marked contrast to the pre-war trend. The next inter-censal period 1961-66 showed a relatively large loss of males for the age groups 25-29 and 30-34. Part of the explanation was the large number of non-sponsored private students who, having entered Australia at a younger age (possibly mainly at 15-19 and 20-24), were enumerated in 1961, but had left the country by 1966. This is because the majority of these students did not settle permanently. The loss of 500 or so of those aged 30-34 can be partly attributed to a small number of temporary assistants and substitutes leaving Australia without replacement, and the decrease of about 470 migratory persons in 1966 compared with 1961.¹

The post-war period, then, showed a large increase of both males and females. In 1947, there were 5,416 foreign-born full-Chinese, of whom 4,670 were males and 746 females. In 1966 this number increased to 17,065 (12,166 males and 4,899 females). The total increase was more than three-fold; for the males alone, the increase was more than two-fold and for the females alone, it was more than six-fold.

¹ See previous footnote.
This seemingly spectacular increase of Chinese population since 1947 would look less impressive if migratory persons and non-sponsored students were excluded. In March 1966, the Chinese student population holding temporary permits was given at 8,502. Unfortunately, the sex composition was not available. But if 67 per cent of them were assumed to be males, there would be 5,696 male and 2,806 female non-sponsored students. The census counted 779 (777 males and two females) and 1,125 (1,118 males and seven females) migratory full-Chinese for 1947 and 1966 respectively. If these non-resident students and migratory persons were excluded from the total foreign-born full-Chinese population, the 1947 figure would drop to 4,637 (3,893 males and 744 females), and the 1966 figure

1 Department of Immigration, Planning Division, Mimeographed Statistics (Canberra, 1966).

2 During the years 1964-67, 'arrivals for educational purposes' were classified by sex and published by the Bureau of Census and Statistics in Australian Demographic Review. The proportion of males for these arrivals was 68 per cent for 1964 and dropped gradually to 66 per cent in 1967. Although these proportions refer to all arrivals in the year, and not to all Chinese students residing in Australia in that year, the proportions are here assumed to be approximately applicable to the Chinese students. This assumption is made because the Chinese students form the overwhelming majority of the foreign student population in Australia. In 1966, 8,502 from a total of 10,865, or about 80 per cent, were Chinese. Department of Immigration, Planning Division, Mimeographed Statistics for 1966.

3 Private non-sponsored student figures for 1947 are not available, but are assumed to be very small and negligible.
would drop to 7,438 (5,352 males and 2,086 females). There is, then, an increase of a mere 2,801 (1,459 males and 1,342 females) from 1947 to 1966, or about 150 per year, nearly half of them being females.

The above analysis of migration and census figures shows that the loss of Chinese for the period 1901-47 through death and emigration was compensated more by the massive arrival of non-sponsored private students than from non-student arrivals. Being non-settlers and engaged in short-term academic pursuits, these students cannot be classified as Chinese immigrants unless they decide to stay permanently after their studies. The importance of students (so long as they stay as students) in a study of Chinese immigration and settlement in Australia should only be assessed in terms of their influence on the settler group and not in terms of the students per se.

1 Note must be taken that when the entry of dependants was restricted, i.e. before the naturalization change in 1956, one of the ways for young Chinese dependants to enter Australia was to enter as students. Since the 1960's, however, this type of student entry was less frequent because they can be introduced as dependants. Arthur Huck reported about 19 and 17 per cent ex-students in the Chinese populations of New South Wales and Victoria respectively. The Chinese in Australia (Melbourne, 1967), p.21-22. Some of these presumably were children sponsored as students.
With this increase through migration, the Chinese population grew younger. The median age for males fell from over 40 in pre-war years to 31.9 in 1954, and then rapidly to 24.8 in 1961, then rising slightly to 26.0 in 1966. Among males, the proportion in the higher age groups (50+) fell continuously from 24.4 per cent in 1954 to 12.9 per cent in 1966, while the 20-29 age group became more important, the proportion increasing from 23.2 per cent in 1954 to 38.1 per cent in 1966. For the females, the age structure remained more or less the same for this period, except that when compared with the pre-war situation, the proportion in ages under 20 became slightly smaller. Also because of the influx of new arrivals the proportion of Australian-born among the total Chinese population decreased - from 40.8 per cent in 1947, to 37.0 per cent in 1954, to 27.2 per cent in 1961, and to 25.7 per cent in 1966.

**TABLE 4.3**

| Total Persons | Percentages | Median Age*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>9150</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>3728</td>
<td>39.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>12878</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>14237</td>
<td>25.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>6145</td>
<td>37.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>20382</td>
<td>29.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>15406</td>
<td>24.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>7874</td>
<td>34.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Median ages are calculated from census five-year age-groups.
The actual number of Australian-born full-Chinese, in fact, increased from 3,728 in 1947 to 5,976 in 1966.

The sex-ratio, too, became more balanced, but not through a decrease of males as was true of the pre-war periods, but through an increase of the females. For the total full-Chinese population, the sex-ratio declined from 245 males to 100 females in 1954 to 232 in 1961 and to 196 in 1966.

The trend of changing age structure and sex-ratio showed a 'normalization' of the population composition. Had it not been the great influx of non-sponsored male students, the sex ratio would have been more balanced and the proportion of Australian-born would have been considerably higher.

Summing up the discussion, we can come to the following conclusion: Although the increase in the total number of Chinese since 1947 has been mainly through immigration and not internally generated through natural increase, it is nevertheless reasonable to expect a faster rate of growth by natural increase in the near future. Australian-born Chinese with a more balanced sex-ratio are replacing the older foreign-born immigrants; and the youthfulness of the Chinese population as a whole compared to earlier periods ensures a decline of deaths. The revision of the naturalization laws in 1956 and 1966 will also contribute to greater opportunity for the Chinese to stay and to introduce their immediate families after naturalization.
It was noted earlier that urbanization of the Chinese occurred rapidly in New South Wales and Victoria, and that most of this was caused by the opportunities and other attractions offered by the Chinese communities in Sydney and Melbourne. Before World War II, most of the Chinese in Metropolitan Sydney and Melbourne concentrated in the city centres. In 1921, the city centre of Sydney and the surrounding areas (since 1954 included into the Local Government Area of the City of Sydney) had 63.2 per cent of the total Chinese population in Metropolitan Sydney. In 1933, this proportion dropped to 51.9 per cent; and since 1947, it has declined below 50 per cent. The situation in Melbourne was similar; the City of Melbourne accounted for 63.3 per cent of the total Chinese population in Metropolitan Melbourne in 1921, 52.9 per cent in 1933, and declined below 50 per cent since 1947. In 1966, the percentage of Metropolitan Chinese in the City of Sydney and the City of Melbourne were 16.3 per cent and 20.2 per cent respectively. Though still somewhat higher than the proportion in the general population, they show, however, significant changes in the residential pattern of the Chinese in these Metropolitan areas.

In Melbourne, as a whole, the growth of residential suburbs has been towards the South-eastern areas, while the Western and the North-western side remains to be
important industrial areas. Since the Second World War, even distant suburbs such as Doncaster and Templestowe, Ringwood, Waverley (Mulgrave), Springvale and Frankston, etc. are beginning to develop and now contain sizeable populations. The distribution of Chinese in Melbourne follows closely this general pattern. In the twenty some years after World War II most Southern and Eastern suburbs had considerable increases of Chinese population. The following table shows increases in broad sectors of Metropolitan Melbourne for intercensal periods 1947-1966.

---

1 The preference for Southern and Eastern suburbs, according to the Melbourne Board of Works, is on the relative attractiveness of the coast line in the south and the gentle slopes in the east. Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme 1954: Survey and Analysis, p.49.

For a social area analysis of the Melbourne area, see F.L. Jones, Dimensions of Urban Social Structure: The Social Areas of Melbourne, Australia (Canberra, 1969).
## TABLE 4.4

INTERCENSAL INCREASE OF CHINESE IN METROPOLITAN MELBOURNE,\(^a\) 1947-1966 (FULL-CHINESE ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Year 1947 = 100</th>
<th>1947 Index</th>
<th>1954 Index</th>
<th>1961 Index</th>
<th>1966 Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Sector:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>554 (100)</td>
<td>770 (139)</td>
<td>942 (170)</td>
<td>995 (180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Suburbs(^b)</td>
<td>236 (100)</td>
<td>236 (100)</td>
<td>284 (120)</td>
<td>212 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Central</td>
<td>790 (100)</td>
<td>1006 (127)</td>
<td>1226 (155)</td>
<td>1207 (153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Sector:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Suburbs(^c)</td>
<td>182 (100)</td>
<td>357 (196)</td>
<td>949 (521)</td>
<td>1166 (641)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburbs(^d)</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
<td>76 (267)</td>
<td>247 (1123)</td>
<td>479 (2395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Southern</td>
<td>204 (100)</td>
<td>433 (214)</td>
<td>1196 (586)</td>
<td>1645 (814)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Sector:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Suburbs(^e)</td>
<td>107 (100)</td>
<td>376 (351)</td>
<td>907 (847)</td>
<td>967 (904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburbs(^f)</td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
<td>83 (415)</td>
<td>268 (1340)</td>
<td>403 (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eastern</td>
<td>127 (100)</td>
<td>459 (361)</td>
<td>1175 (925)</td>
<td>1370 (1079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Sector:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Suburbs(^g)</td>
<td>129 (100)</td>
<td>259 (201)</td>
<td>421 (326)</td>
<td>469 (364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburbs(^h)</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
<td>64 (291)</td>
<td>86 (391)</td>
<td>128 (582)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total northern</td>
<td>151 (100)</td>
<td>323 (214)</td>
<td>507 (336)</td>
<td>597 (395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Sector:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Suburbs(^i)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburbs(^j)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Western</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Melbourne</strong></td>
<td>1285 (100)</td>
<td>2245 (175)</td>
<td>4187 (326)</td>
<td>4916 (383)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Unpublished Census Figures (Race by Local Government Areas) made available by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra.

**Notes:**

a) Sectors are Statistical Districts (within a Statistical Division) as used by the Melbourne Board of Works in their 1954 Planning Scheme: Survey and Analysis, p.16. For the exact suburbs (L.G.A.s) contained in each Sector, see footnotes b-j below. The sectors are further divided into Inner and Outer suburbs (except the Central Sector) to show the large increases to outer suburbs.
b) Suburbs of Collingwood, Fitzroy, Port Melbourne, Richmond, and South Melbourne.
c) Suburbs of Brighton, Caulfield, Malvern, Prahran, and St. Kilda.
d) Suburbs of Berwick (shire), Chelsea, Cranbourne (shire), Dandenong, Springvale, Frankston, Knox (shire) or Fern Tree Gully, Moorabbin, Mordialloc, Mornington(shire), Mulgrave (Waverley), Oakleigh, Sandringham and Sherbrooke(shire).
e) Suburbs of Camberwell, Hawthorn and Kew.
f) Suburbs of Boxhill, Croydon, Lilydale(shire), Doncaster and Templestowe, Eltham(shire), Heidelberg and Diamond Valley,Nunawading, and Ringwood.
g) Suburbs of Brunswick, Coburg, Essendon, and Northcote.
h) Suburbs of Broadmeadow, Bulla(shire), Keilor, Preston and Whittlesea(shire).
i) Suburbs of Footscray and Williamstown.
j) Suburbs of Altona, Melton(shire), Sunshine, and Werribee(shire).

In terms of totals, there was a general increase of Chinese in Metropolitan Melbourne - from 1,261 persons in 1947 (full-Chinese) to 4,916 in 1966, about a four-fold increase representing a rise from 74 per cent of the total Victoria Chinese population to 84 per cent. Not much of this was due to the increase to the Central Sector. The City of Melbourne, for example, had an increase of 540 (mostly in North Melbourne around the Victoria Market) but the Chinese population in the city suburbs (Collingwood, Fitzroy, Port Melbourne, Richmond and South Melbourne) actually decreased after 1961. These are also areas where the general Australian population declined since 1947.  

1 The population in the City of Melbourne declined from 99,861 in 1947 to 75,997 in 1966; in the City Suburbs, the decline was from 159,185 in 1947 to 125,032 in 1966.
The increase of Chinese was most rapid in outer suburbs of the Southern and Eastern Sectors, especially suburbs such as Moorabbin, Oakleigh, Doncaster and Templestowe, and Heidelberg. Inner suburbs such as Caulfield, Malvern, Prahran, and St. Kilda in the Southern Sector and Camberwell, Kew and Hawthorn in the Eastern Sector also had substantial increases, making them the major areas of Chinese settlement in Metropolitan Melbourne.

In 1966, the ten suburbs having the most Chinese were, in ranking order: Camberwell, Hawthorn, St. Kilda, Prahran, Caulfield, Malvern, Kew, Essendon, Coburg, Oakleigh. According to a recent ranking of Melbourne suburbs, Camberwell, Caulfield and Kew were listed in Groups I and II; St. Kilda, Hawthorn, Prahran, Malvern, Essendon, and Oakleigh were listed in Groups III and IV; only Coburg was listed in Group V and below. There are altogether eight groups of suburbs ranked according to socio-economic status scores from high to low. Group I has the highest scores and Group VIII has the lowest. It can be seen, though only roughly, that a large number of Chinese are integrated residentially into the wealthier suburbs of Melbourne.²

---


2 See following dot map for distribution in each L.G.A.
Map 1: Distribution of Chinese (Full-Chinese) in Metropolitan Melbourne, 1966
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MAP 2: DISTRIBUTION OF CHINESE (FULL-CHINESE) IN METROPOLITAN SYDNEY, 1966
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Because the general Melbourne population itself shows similar pattern of dispersion towards the Eastern and Southern suburbs, Gini Indices\(^1\) based on LGAs were calculated, first to show the pattern of Chinese concentration relative to the general population, and secondly to compare with other ethnic groups. The following values were obtained: \(.812 \text{ for } 1947; \ .627 \text{ for } 1954; \ .487 \text{ for } 1961 \text{ and } \ .474 \text{ for } 1966\). Although LGAs, being large areal units, are unable to detect detailed patterns of concentration in small areas, the Gini values show a rapid dispersion of the Chinese into the general Melbourne population. This contrasts with the Greeks and Italians who showed an increase in concentration from 1954 to 1961.\(^2\) In 1961, Gini values obtained for the Greeks, Italians, Maltese and the Dutch were considerably higher than the Chinese.\(^3\)

In Sydney the pattern is similar. Much of the outer suburbs were developed after World War II. Northern suburbs such as Warringah, Ku-ring-gai, Baulkan Hills, and Blacktown and Southern suburbs such as Fairfield,


\(^3\) Ibid.
Liverpool, etc., had large increases of population. The increase of Chinese, however, was not limited to the outer suburbs; the middle-distance suburbs also had considerable increase. The following table shows the pattern of urbanization in Sydney.

**TABLE 4.5**  
INTERCENSAL INCREASE OF CHINESE IN METROPOLITAN SYDNEY*, 1947-1966 (FULL-CHINESE ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>1947 Index</th>
<th>1954 Index</th>
<th>1961 Index</th>
<th>1966 Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Sector:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney City*</td>
<td>1717 (100)</td>
<td>1936 (113)</td>
<td>1900 (111)</td>
<td>1622 (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Suburbsc</td>
<td>165 (100)</td>
<td>340 (206)</td>
<td>749 (454)</td>
<td>685 (415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Central</td>
<td>1882 (100)</td>
<td>2276 (121)</td>
<td>2649 (141)</td>
<td>2307 (123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older Residential Inner Suburbs:</strong></td>
<td>283 (100)</td>
<td>531 (188)</td>
<td>1022 (361)</td>
<td>1046 (370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle-Distance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Suburbs</td>
<td>166 (100)</td>
<td>484 (292)</td>
<td>964 (581)</td>
<td>1089 (656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Suburbs</td>
<td>821 (100)</td>
<td>1477 (179)</td>
<td>3018 (365)</td>
<td>4152 (502)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Middle</td>
<td>987 (100)</td>
<td>2961 (300)</td>
<td>3982 (403)</td>
<td>5241 (531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outer Suburbs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Suburbs</td>
<td>96 (100)</td>
<td>319 (332)</td>
<td>453 (472)</td>
<td>678 (706)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Suburbs</td>
<td>52 (100)</td>
<td>266 (511)</td>
<td>417 (802)</td>
<td>671 (1290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Outer</td>
<td>148 (100)</td>
<td>585 (395)</td>
<td>870 (588)</td>
<td>1349 (911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sydney</strong></td>
<td>3300 (100)</td>
<td>5353 (162)</td>
<td>8523 (258)</td>
<td>9943 (301)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: as Table 4.4.

Notes:  
a) The division into Central Sector, Older Residential Suburbs, Middle-distance, and Outer Suburbs, is based on I.H. Burnley in "Immigration", a commentary to Atlas of Australian Resources (1970 forthcoming). The Middle-distance and Outer Suburbs are further divided into North and South.
b) City of Sydney contains the 1947 L.G.A. of Sydney, Paddington, Glebe, Darlington, Newtown, Redfern, Erskineville, Alexandra and Waterloo.


d) Suburbs of Ashfield, Drummoyne, Botany and Woolahra.

e) Suburbs of North Sydney, Mosman, Manly, Lane Cove, Hunters Hill, Ryde and Willoughby.

f) Suburbs of Concord, Strathfield, Burwood, Auburn, Parramatta, Canterbury, Rockdale, Randwick, Waverley and Bankstown.

g) Suburbs of Warringah, Ku-ring-gai, Hornsby, Baulkan Hills, Blacktown, Penrith (part), and Holroyd.

h) Fairfield (part), Liverpool (part), Campbelltown (part), Hurstville, Kogarah, and Sutherland (part).

Like Melbourne, the Chinese in Sydney had a large increase after 1947 - a three-fold increase from 3,300 in 1947 to 9,943 in 1966. Again, this was mainly due to increases in middle-distance suburbs and outer suburbs, and not to the City of Sydney, although Sydney's City suburbs (especially Marrickville) had considerable increase. The increase was most rapid in the Southern middle-distance suburbs (from a total of 821 in 1947 to 4,152 in 1966), especially Randwick, Canterbury and Rockdale, making them important areas of Chinese settlement besides the City of Sydney. Among outer suburbs, the increase was most marked in Ku-ring-gai.

In 1966, the ten suburbs having most Chinese were, in ranking order: Randwick, Canterbury, Marrickville, Ashfield, Rockdale, Waverley, Willoughby, Ku-ring-gai, Burwood and Ryde. According to a survey of the ecology of the Chinese in Sydney, there were two important movements, one among the
post-War 'upper class' Chinese who moved from Burwood-Canterbury area (Southern Middle-distance) to Ku-ring-gai, and another among the pre-war Chinese to the Southern Middle-distance suburbs.¹

Gini Indices for the Chinese in Sydney show a continuous dispersion. Their values fell from .616 in 1947, to .614 in 1954, to .424 in 1961, and to .422 in 1966. It appears then, the Sydney Chinese have experienced a similar pattern of dispersion as the Melbourne Chinese and are no longer concentrated only in the city centre.²

The suburbanization of Chinese has obvious effects on the social integration of the Chinese into Australian society. Their children now attend schools where students are primarily Australian. Chinese housewives, for the sake of convenience, shop at suburban shopping centres, and therefore are in contact with Australian shop-keepers. With Australian neighbours, they learn to speak English faster as they want to communicate more efficiently. Chinese who are Christians may prefer to attend local churches rather than commuting to the city centres to


² According to a 1961 status ranking of Sydney suburbs, none of the Chinese concentration areas were classified as an 'A' (highest status) suburb. Only Randwick, Willoughby and Burwood were classified as 'B' suburbs, while the rest were all 'C' suburbs. See Athol A. Congalton, Status Ranking of Sydney Suburbs (Kensington: School of Sociology, The University of New South Wales, 1961).
attend Chinese churches. In short, when they live away from other Chinese, they will be exposed more thoroughly to the influence of Australian society than if they lived in segregated areas.

Both the Little Bourke Street area in Melbourne and the Hay-Market-Dixon Street area in Sydney where once thriving China-towns were located, have been under rapid urban renewal during the post-war years to make way for commercial developments. The old China-towns are certainly undergoing rapid change.
Summary

The post-World War II picture of the Chinese in Australia is, clearly, very different from that of the pre-war period. After almost 80 years of decline (from 1860's to the early 1940's), the number of the Chinese increased again, first during the war with the repatriation of war-time refugees, then in the 1950's when large number of sponsored assistants, chefs and 'substitutes' arrived, and finally in the 1960's when the influx of non-sponsored students began.

In terms of residence, the suburbanization of Chinese in Sydney and Melbourne has begun to disperse the heretofore concentrations in city centres. In terms of occupations, though less data on them are available from the censuses, we see the continuation of vegetable and fruit distributing business, the Chinese merchants and the emergence of the Chinese cafes as major developments.

In general, the Chinese population after the Second World War is more settled; it has grown younger, and wives and young dependants have been gradually coming to join their husbands and fathers. Both the conditions in China and the conditions in Australia are now favourable for the Chinese to stay permanently. The period of the struggle for survival is over; the problem now is to settle, with their families, in Australia.
CHAPTER V

SAMPLING AND THE MELBOURNE STUDY GROUP

The Rationale of the Melbourne Survey
The Choice of the Melbourne Site
The Construction of the Sampling Frame
The Administration of the Survey
A description of the Sample
The Rationale of the Melbourne Survey

The above analyses of published census and migration statistics reveal broad trends of population change and the general pattern of settlement among the Chinese in Australia. Yet patterns of migration and settlement must not only be identified; they must also be explained. It is the purpose of the Melbourne Survey to supplement these official materials to describe in more detail the important factors which affected the process of migration and settlement. The historical survey based on official data opens up the issues, even if lightly; the survey examines the issues in greater depth and reveals the complex processes of integration and assimilation.

The survey is, therefore, designed to concentrate on examining occupational changes, residential movements, marriage patterns, and social participation among Chinese in one metropolitan area. Upon consideration of the time and finance available, it was decided that only one community could be studied. Generalization to other Chinese communities in Australia will be possible only to the extent that the community studied represents other communities - in the sense that the characteristics, demographic, economic, or social, are shared by other Chinese communities.
The Choice of the Melbourne Site.

The choice of Melbourne rather than other metropolitan centres lies in the following considerations. At census date 1966, Metropolitan Sydney had about 11,000 Chinese, 41.4 per cent of the total Chinese population in Australia at that time. Melbourne had about 5,500 or a little over 20 per cent. Other Metropolitan areas having more than a thousand Chinese were Brisbane (1,497) and Perth (1,045). The choice of the study site was between Melbourne and Sydney, other populations being too small. Two practical reasons made the choice of Melbourne more suitable than Sydney.

First, with only one interviewer, the author, and with a severely limited amount of time available for field work, the Melbourne population, being about half the size of Sydney's, seemed more appropriate for this survey. On the one hand, it is easier and quicker to understand the general structure of small communities; and on the other hand, it is known from historical studies of the Chinese in Australia that the Chinese in Sydney are less homogeneous, in the sense that Sydney Chinese are more diverse in their places of origin and their occupations than the Melbourne Chinese.¹

A small sample will, therefore, reflect a more homogeneous population better than a less homogeneous one. The use of interviewers to increase the sample size is rejected because of expense and because it is difficult to find trained interviewers who can speak both the Cantonese dialect and the Mandarin dialect of the Chinese language, and a large proportion of the Chinese speak no or very little English.

Secondly, both the Chinese in Victoria and New South Wales have been studied in the past\(^1\), mainly from the viewpoint of immigration policies or the history of early settlements. There is, however, a recent study of the ecology of the Sydney Chinese in 1963 by Lee Siew Eng.\(^2\) Another study, now in progress by C.A.Price on the Non-European population in Australia, will have a detailed section on the Chinese in Sydney.\(^3\) In contrast to Sydney, the Melbourne Chinese have not been recently studied, and there has not been any systematic survey of the Melbourne Chinese at all in the past. Melbourne has been one of the important areas of Chinese settlement since the gold-rush days; her importance, at present, can also be observed in the increase of the number of Chinese since World War II, both in absolute numbers and in proportion to the total Chinese population in Australia.

It is hoped that this first systematic survey of the Melbourne Chinese can be used as a basis for comparative purposes in future research into Chinese communities, and,

\(^1\) See Introduction for a review of the literature.


in fact, other ethnic communities in urban areas.

The Construction of the Sampling Frame

Few surveys attempt to enumerate total populations. Not only are total enumerations usually more expensive than sample surveys, but they are sometimes less efficient and less accurate, especially if the information required can only be obtained by highly trained personnel. Sociological surveys, collecting extensive and detailed information from individuals, many of whom may not have the experience or education to answer the questions independently without help, are often of this type. Detailed information from a small number of individuals can also be handled more easily and with more speed and accuracy, both in data processing and in the analysis of results.

There are, of course, certain disadvantages in sample survey methods. Omissions of coverage cannot be easily checked and discovered. Generalization to the population can only be legitimately made if the sample is representative of the population. Sometimes, a simple complete enumeration is necessary to provide the basis from which a sample can be drawn. Detailed information can, then, be obtained from a survey of the sample.

As is meant in this study, Chinese persons will include all those of Chinese origin wherever born and of whatever nationality. This will include all those who may not be born in China and may not have been to China, such as those
who have come from countries in Southeast Asia and others who have lived all their lives in Australia.

Excluded, however, are those non-sponsored private students who have no permanent resident status in Australia. These students do not form part of the Chinese settlers in Australia.

It is known that there have been intermarriages between Chinese and Australians in the past, and that there are a large number of part-Chinese in Australia, some very remote from any resemblance to Chinese. It was decided to include all these who are quarter-Chinese, i.e. those where either one of the parents is half-Chinese.

The sampling frame consists of Chinese addresses. Sampling addresses and interviewing the heads of households in the addresses have several advantages over sampling individuals. First, one avoids including in the sample more than one person of the same address and therefore will not be obtaining the same information on the members of one address (often one household) from more than one person. Secondly, sampling addresses will decrease the amount of non-response arising from changes of address; while individuals move, Chinese addresses do not do so as frequently - that is, a Chinese address evacuated may again be occupied by other Chinese because many of these addresses are restaurants, business shops, or boarding types of Chinese accommodation. This last consideration is important since the sample frame has to be constructed from directories about a year old.¹

¹ See below for description of directories used. Although the directories used were 1968 editions, they were, however, compiled in 1967.
For the above reasons, it was decided to construct a frame of Chinese addresses as a basis for drawing the sample.

Several lists were utilized to make the frame, the first being the 1968 Sands & McDougall Directory of Victoria. Sands & McDougall Proprietary Limited has compiled a directory for the Melbourne area since 1857, adding the country areas of Victoria in 1901. The directory lists names and addresses of government offices both Commonwealth and States, churches, professional and trade associations, and householders. The householder list, printed by postal districts subdivided into streets, is arranged alphabetically according to the surnames of the householders. It is the alphabetical list of householders which is used to construct the frame. The list gives the surname and initials of the householder, the full address and sometimes the occupation. While the publisher does not claim complete accuracy and coverage, the Directory Manager, Mr. D.R. Holbrook, said that the directory was "collated from teams of compilers calling door to door and working to post office boundaries", and that "the householder is the actual occupier of premises at the date of compilation". 1

Upon further enquiry, it was found that only one call to each premise or address was made, but if the occupants

---

1 Private correspondence to author, 17th April 1968, from Mr. D.R. Holbrook, Directory Manager.
were out or unavailable, their next door neighbour was asked about the occupants of that premise. A self-addressed post card was also left at each of these unknown premises, to be filled in and returned to the Directory office. For addresses where no information was available, the former (or in this case, the 1967) occupant was assumed to be still residing there, and the 1967 listing was repeated in the 1968 Directory.

Although some error and omissions from non-response to the compilers are inevitable, it is apparent that the Sands & McDougall Directory is a good working list of all households in Victoria. The important question to be asked at this point is how much error, in terms of inaccuracy and omissions, are there in this 1968 Directory.

This question cannot be answered until a completely accurate and exhaustive list is available for comparison. But if such a list is available, there is little need for the Sands & McDougall Directory. A better question can be asked: How much of the omission has been included and errors detected in other lists covering the same area of Victoria? Or in other words, how much correspondence is there between the Sands & McDougall Directory and other lists? To answer this question, two other lists of Chinese households were prepared, one from the Victoria electoral roll and the other from the telephone directory.

Enrolment and voting are compulsory for Australian citizens. Any Australian citizen, whether by birth or by naturalization and registration, of twenty-one years of
age and over, is required by law to register as a voter.

The electoral rolls list all registered voters, giving names in full, addresses, sex and occupations. The latest principal rolls for the Melbourne Metropolitan area were printed variously from 17th January 1967 to 24th August 1967 with Supplementary rolls up to 13th October 1967. A list of Chinese addresses was made by extracting from these rolls addresses of Chinese-sounding names. It was found later that for reasons of changing address and double registration, some names in the Principal rolls were repeated in the Supplementary rolls; here, the Supplementary rolls were considered more up to date and therefore correct.

A final list was obtained from the 1968 telephone directory. This is, of the three available lists, the least adequate because the cost of a private telephone is often outside the reach of poor homes.

From these three sources, Chinese names together with their addresses were extracted. There are only a limited number of surnames among Chinese, and even with many varieties of pronunciation according to Chinese dialects and romanization, it is not a very difficult task to recognize them. For the electoral rolls, particularly, where the full name and not merely the initials are given, it is even easier to distinguish Chinese names from others.

This, however, does not mean that errors and omissions can be totally avoided. Names having Chinese pronunciation of 'Li' and 'Yong', for example, are sometimes Anglicized to 'Lee' and 'Young'. Together with the adoption of Christian names instead of Chinese given names, these people cannot be distinguished as Chinese from the list above.
The second category of errors involves Chinese women who are married to non-Chinese men. Having adopted the surnames of their husbands, they too are no longer recognizable as Chinese. Some of these women are ultimately accounted for if their fathers are included in the sample and are interviewed. But the proportion thus accounted for cannot be easily ascertained.

The second error is more serious than the first. The first can be eradicated by constructing a list of Lees and Youngs of Chinese ancestry during the course of field work and then drawing a supplementary sample from this extra list. In reality, the number of Lees and Youngs is very small, and the problem was overcome in this way. But the second error cannot be easily tackled and the omission of women married to non-Chinese husbands automatically lowers the proportion of inter-marriages among Chinese women. Analysis of Chinese female inter-marriage pattern, then, is not possible from the sample survey data without some major adjustment. This will be further discussed in a later chapter on marriages.

The following number of Chinese-sounding names together with their addresses is extracted from the three lists.
Each of the lists was first checked separately to eliminate duplicate addresses within the list (column 2 in Table 5.1). The internally non-duplicating address lists were then compared with each other to eliminate duplicate addresses between the lists. After all duplicated addresses were eliminated, the left over ones were combined to form the sampling frame.

Since the Sands & McDougall Directory is essentially a list of addresses with the names of the occupants, there are only seven (or less than one per cent) duplication within the
The electoral roll, however, is a list of electors; the husband, the wife and the children all having the same address are included. The duplication of address is, therefore, relatively large (572/1225 or 47 per cent). There is no duplication in the telephone directory.

After the first stage of elimination, the Sands & McDougall list has 944 addresses, the electoral roll list 653 addresses, and the telephone directory list only 368 addresses. The second stage of elimination shows the degree of correspondence between the lists. Taking the Sands & McDougall list as base (because of its wider coverage) 479 common addresses found in the electoral list are eliminated. This is 73.35 per cent of the addresses in the electoral roll list. The Sands & McDougall list and the remaining 174 addresses of the electoral list are combined to form a new list. The telephone list is, then checked with the new list. Almost 93 per cent (341/368) of the telephone list addresses can be found in the new list. The remaining twenty-seven addresses of the telephone list are added on to the new list. The sampling frame, therefore, contains 944 addresses from the Sands & McDougall Directory, 174 from the electoral rolls, and 27 from the 1968 telephone directory, making a total of 1,145 addresses.

There is no information available concerning these addresses. Although the electoral rolls give the occupation and sex of the persons living in the addresses, no such information is available for those addresses from the Sands & McDougall Directory and the telephone directory. The only useful information by which the sampling frame of 1,145 addresses can be compared with each list is the geographic distribution of the addresses among the suburbs. This
comparison makes possible an assessment of whether or not addresses are concentrated in certain suburbs for one list and certain other suburbs for other lists.

### TABLE 5.2

**SUBURB DISTRIBUTION OF CHINESE ADDRESSES: THE FRAME, SANDS & McDougall DIRECTORY, ELECTORAL ROLL, AND TELEPHONE DIRECTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Areas (Suburbs)</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Sands &amp; McDougall</th>
<th>Electoral Roll</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxhill</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmeadow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulfield</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandenong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morialloop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunawading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Melbourne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahran</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Areas (Suburbs)</th>
<th>Frame No</th>
<th>Frame %</th>
<th>Sands &amp; McDougall No</th>
<th>Sands &amp; McDougall %</th>
<th>Electoral Roll No</th>
<th>Electoral Roll %</th>
<th>Telephone No</th>
<th>Telephone %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sth Melbourne</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kilda</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamstown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shires:
- Altona: 3 (.3) - - 3 (.5) - -
- Croydon: 7 (.6) 7 (.7) 2 (.3) - -
- Doncaster & Templestowe: 20 (1.7) 20 (2.1) 12 (1.8) 9 (2.5)
- Eltham: 2 (.2) 1 (.1) - - 1 (.3)
- Ferntree Gully: 4 (.3) 4 (.4) 2 (.3) 1 (.3)
- Frankston: 11 (1.0) 10 (1.1) 8 (1.2) - -

**Total** 1145 (99.9) 944 (99.8) 653 (100.0) 368 (100.0)

Apart from a slight concentration of Chinese addresses in the city of Melbourne, there is no special concentration area where a disproportionately large number of Chinese addresses are found. Even in such outer suburbs as Frankston, Croydon, Springvale, etc., there are many Chinese addresses. The Sands & McDougall list and the electoral list correspond almost perfectly in the proportion of addresses in each LGA. The telephone directory however, is biased in having more addresses in wealthier suburbs, e.g. Camberwell and Caulfield, and having less in Melbourne City. However, these differences are small; and on the whole, there is no significant bias in any
The combination of these lists to make the frame increases the extent of coverage. This increase is even among all suburbs. In other words, if the frame is incomplete, it seems very likely that the incompleteness is evenly distributed among all suburbs and is not concentrated in a few.

If the above can be assumed, it follows that this incompleteness does not create a bias in the frame, and a sample drawn from such a frame would assume a lower sampling fraction than would be the case if the frame had been perfect.

Unfortunately, no other information is available about the addresses; and it is impossible to compare these

---

1 A test of significance is made comparing the three lists by grouping the suburbs into four broad categories according to socio-economic status (City of Melbourne, Suburb Groups I-II, Groups III-IV, and Groups V and over). See footnote 1 on page 164 for explanation of procedure of grouping suburbs. The distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburbs Groups</th>
<th>Sands &amp; McDougall</th>
<th>Electoral Roll</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups I-II</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups III-IV</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups V &amp; over</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>944</strong></td>
<td><strong>663</strong></td>
<td><strong>368</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 11.910, \text{df}=6, p > .05 \]
lists again on some other characteristics. In a later section, however, the results of the sample survey will be compared to the 1966 census.

The Sampling Method

The sample size was fixed at 200 addresses, giving a sampling fraction of 1 to 5.7. For such practical reasons as the difficulty of finding appropriate interviewers, the relatively large area to be covered, and the likelihood that most interviews had to be done in the evenings, 200 seems the optimum size for a field work of approximately six months, especially as it was necessary to leave some time for participation in the activities of the community. However, 200 addresses seem large enough a sample size to enable cross-tabulations involving two variables, and even three, if the number of categories in each variable is not large (for example, two or three). This ensures some flexibility in the manipulation of the survey data.

The sample of 200 addresses was drawn randomly from the 1,145 address-frame stratified by socio-economic ranks into four categories: The City of Melbourne,
Suburbs Groups I-II, Groups III-IV and Groups V and over.

1 The ranking is derived from the original social ranking of Melbourne's Postal districts by F.L.Jones ("A Social Ranking of Melbourne Suburbs" The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 3 (October 1967), pp.93-110), by collapsing Postal districts together to form Local Government Areas (LGAs). Not all LGA boundaries coincide with Postal district boundaries, and a single LGA may contain two or more Postal districts which may be of different rankings. The first difficulty was solved by ignoring small portions of a Postal district which fall into another LGA, and by dividing the population between the two LGAs if the Postal district affected, is almost equally divided. This admittedly is rather arbitrary; but the number of Postal districts so affected is small, totalling only 14. The second difficulty of having different-ranking Postal districts in a single LGA was partly avoided by combining adjacent LGAs into categories. The original ranking of the suburbs divided them into eight groups. If groups I and II, groups III and IV, and groups V and over, are collapsed respectively and treated as three categories, much of the fine differences in the ranking of Postal districts are avoided. Thus only eight LGAs contain Postal districts which can be classified into two or more categories. For these eight LGAs, the socio-economic scores are weighed according to the proportion of population in each LGA and a new score is computed. For example, Essendon LGA has the Postal districts of Ascot Vale, Moonee Ponds and Essendon, having populations of 16,500, 18,500, and 23,500 (nearest hundreds), and socio-economic scores of -115, -024, and +186 respectively. Thus, the new score is computed by multiplying the population of each Postal district to its score, summing up the products and dividing the sum by the total population of these three Postal districts. The new score for Essendon LGA is now 34 which can be classified as group IV. In a similar way, new scores for the other seven LGAs are calculated. The results are as follows: Groups I-II contain Boxhill, Brighton, Camberwell, Caulfield, Kew and Sandringham; Groups III-IV contain Altona, Chelsea, Croydon, Doncaster, Eltham, Essendon, Frankston, Hawthorn, Heidelberg, Malvern, Moorabbin, Mordialloc, Nunawading, Oakleigh, Prahran, Ringwood, St Kilda, and Waverley; Groups V and Over contain Broadmeadow, Brunswick, Coburg, Collingwood, Dandenong, Fitzroy, Footscray, Keilor, Northcote, Port Melbourne, Springvale, Williamstown, Sunshine and Ferntree Gully.
Uniform sampling fraction was applied to each of the four categories of suburbs, and random numbers were used to obtain the sample addresses. The sample thus drawn contained 33 addresses from the City of Melbourne, 61 from suburb groups I-II, 77 from suburb groups III-IV, and 29 from suburb groups V & Over. Stratification ensured that appropriate numbers were drawn from both the wealthier and the poorer suburbs.

During the course of field work, 27 cases of non-response were met and 25 of these were substituted by a replacement sample. The replacement sample was drawn in the same way as the original sample by stratification and the application of uniform sampling fraction. No matching with the non-response cases was attempted.

A supplementary list of seventeen obscure Chinese addresses was also constructed; and this included the names of Lee, Young, Hiah and Jann. From this, a supplement sample of three cases was drawn, using random numbers but without stratification.

A non-response rate of 27/200 (or 13.5 per cent) for the original sample seems somewhat high, especially when non-respondents and respondents can be expected to differ in important aspects. But if the causes of non-response were examined, it can be readily seen that most of them were due to an imperfect frame.

Five of them were in Brunswick, two each in Boxhill and Doncaster, and one each in Melbourne, Hawthorn, Malvern, Mordialloc, Prahran, Northcote, Preston and Sunshine.
TABLE 5.3
NON-RESPONSE BY CAUSES AND SUBURBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb (LGA)</th>
<th>Not Chinese</th>
<th>Non-sponsored Student</th>
<th>Moved</th>
<th>Refusal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III-IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altona</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunawading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V &amp; Over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sth Melbourne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten addresses having Chinese-sounding names were, in fact, of European race. Thirteen others have moved away and non-Chinese families have since moved in. One was a non-sponsored student. Only three of all non-responses were refusals. One claimed Australian identity and denied emphatically his Chinese origin, although his physical features and family name gave enough evidence that he was in fact Chinese.
Another refusal was on the grounds that the interview might bring political difficulties to the respondent. The third one refused mid-way during the interview complaining that the questions were too many and too personal.

Examples of ten per cent non-response due to old addresses can be found for lists ten months old, and a total non-response rate of 10-20 per cent has been reported as within the margins of an average survey. 1

The Administration of the Survey

The survey was conducted between 20 May 1968 and 3 October 1968, extending over a period of four months and two weeks. The months of May to October are the Australian winter months; and it was fortunate that the survey could be made during these months when the respondents were most likely to be home. These were also the months in which most of the functions of Chinese associations were performed.

During the field work, the author stayed with a Chinese couple in Burwood (Boxhill) who had extensive connections with the Chinese community. This helped the author very much, not only in obtaining information which was otherwise unavailable, but also in creating a friendly atmosphere

during interviews when it was understood that the author actually stayed with one of their friends.

On 16 May 1968, only four days before the commencement of the survey, a letter was sent to every address in the sample list explaining the purpose of the survey. (See Appendix IV for a copy of the letter). The addresses were, then, grouped by adjacent suburbs into areas, and each area was visited continuously for several weeks until all, or most, interviews were done. At first, it was thought that the evenings were the only time when interviews could be done. This was true for those who worked during day time but retired in the evenings. Most office workers were of this type. However, it was later found that the restaurant workers were most conveniently interviewed in the morning or in the afternoon, before or after lunch hours. The evenings were not convenient for them.

On arrival at an address whose head of household was out, it was decided, then, to enquire if the head worked in a restaurant. Where no one answered the door, the next-door neighbours were asked. This facilitated very much the effective use of interview time and made possible the use of both the day time and the evenings.

No preliminary contacts, apart from the letter sent before the survey, were attempted; and appointments were made only when necessary. Most interviews were made on the first contact, but for a few, (mostly professionals), an appointment was necessary.
The support of Chinese associations was sought, and a meeting with the "leaders" of these associations was held. It was later found that the support from these associations was not a necessity. Although a letter of introduction from the Department of Demography was brought along, it was used only twice in the first week of the survey. The letter sent before the commencement of the survey, however, was rather useful. In all cases, the respondents remembered the letter, and with little introduction understood the purpose of the visit if not the purpose of the survey. After about a month, news of the survey had spread and any suspicion about the author disappeared. The fact that the author-interviewer was Chinese probably helped to ease the suspicion that it was an investigation from the Immigration Department.

The Questionnaire was administered systematically to the respondents. After explaining that the names would not be recorded, the respondents were asked to give the demographic particulars of all persons living in the household; there were few objections to having the details written down in front of the interviewees. After the demographic details were completed, the questionnaire was put aside and the interview continued informally. Notes were not taken and the questionnaire was filled in afterwards, usually in the car before driving home or going to another interview.

Whenever possible, the interviews were conducted in English. This was a way to test whether the respondents could understand and communicate in English, and to avoid mistakes in English-Chinese translation.
In general, the actual interviewing process was rather smooth. Some time was spent in tracing persons who had moved; but the difficulties encountered were not insurmountable. The participation into Chinese community activities not only provided a chance for a first hand knowledge of the social life of the Chinese community, it also provided an opportunity for the author to mix with the group and thereby gain confidence among them. This confidence was essential if a stranger-interviewer was to be accepted.

The hospitality and generosity shown by the Chinese was, nevertheless, the major single factor which enabled the smooth administration of the survey. There were a few difficult cases; but they were the exceptions rather than the rule.

A Description of the Sample

In total, 201 addresses were visited and 215 households interviewed, of which 130 of these interviews were made in Chinese. There were four addresses where there were two households in each, two addresses where there were three households in each, and two addresses where there were four households in each. Most of these multi-household addresses were single men sharing a house or flat. Because they usually did not eat together and often worked at different hours of the day, they were treated here as separate households. Information was gathered for a total
of 804 individuals: 367 foreign-born full Chinese (206 males and 161 females), 285 Australian-born full Chinese (149 males and 136 females), and 152 Australian-born part-Chinese (76 males and 76 females). This is approximately 3.74 persons to each household.

In terms of residential distribution, the sample resembles the 1966 census, having approximately 20 per cent in the City of Melbourne, a slight concentration in Camberwell and Hawthorn, and a general dispersion in the other suburbs, although Camberwell and Essendon appear to be slightly over-represented in the sample, and Prahran slightly under-represented.

**TABLE 5.4**

PERCENTAGE RESIDENTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF CHINESE IN THE CITY OF MELBOURNE AND IN TEN SUBURBS OF MELBOURNE, FOR THE SAMPLE (1968) AND FOR THE CENSUS (1966):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>+4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>+1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kilda</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahran</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulfield</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>+1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>+3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td>652</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Multiplying 804 into the reciprocal of the sampling fraction (5.7), we obtain an estimate of 4,583 for the total Chinese population in Melbourne. In 1966, the census counted 5,506 Chinese (both full and part) in Metropolitan Melbourne. The discrepancy is probably due to the exclusion of large numbers of non-sponsored students.
But the pattern is a general agreement with the census residential distribution, showing no obvious bias in the sample.¹

In terms of age structure, however, the sample differs to a considerable extent from the census. The following table shows the percentage distribution.

| TABLE 5.5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>MALE Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Female Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>+2.56</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>+ .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>+6.64</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>+4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>+3.45</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>+3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>-6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>-19.26</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>-15.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>-13.92</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>-3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>+7.09</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>+3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>+6.67</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>+3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>+6.44</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>+4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>+3.56</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>+2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>+1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ A 'Goodness of Fit' test comparing the two distributions is made using broad categories of suburbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1966 Census</th>
<th>1968 Survey</th>
<th>1968 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups I-II</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups III-IV</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V &amp; Over</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,895*</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = \frac{(E-O)^2}{E} \]
\[ df = 3, \ p > .05 \]

* 21 cases in new suburbs which do not fall into the four categories are excluded.
The discrepancy occurs most significantly at ages 20-24 and 25-29 for the males and ages 20-24 for the females, where differences are more than 10 per cent; for males 20-24, the difference is 19 per cent. These differences are due to the more limited coverage of the sample which excluded large numbers of non-sponsored students who mainly fall within the 20-29 age-groups. The census, however, included these students, therefore, showing a much higher percentage in these age-groups. As a description of the age-structure of Chinese settlers in Melbourne, the sample is perhaps more appropriate than the census.

There is a major difference in the age structure between Australian-born and foreign-born Chinese, the Australian-born (both full and part-Chinese) being much younger (see Diagram: Age Pyramid). For the foreign-born males, only 5.3 per cent are under 15 years of age, and for the females only 6.8 per cent. The corresponding figures for the Australian-born are 48.0 per cent (males) and 56.6 per cent (females) under 15 years of age. While in the total sample, the Australian-born outnumber the foreign-born, occupying 52.2 per cent of the total males and 56.8 per cent of the total female, the predominance of Australian-born is limited to ages under 15; for higher ages, especially over 30, the number of foreign-born is much bigger than the Australian born.

1 A test of significance (Goodness of Fit) using ten-year age-groups shows $\chi^2$ values of 204.72 for the males (df=7, $p < .001$) and 67.24 for the females (df=7, $p < .001$).
Very few pre-war Chinese arrivals are included in the sample, for males 20 out of 206, and for females only nine out of 161.

TABLE 5.6
PERIOD OF ARRIVAL BY AGE ON ARRIVAL, FOR FOREIGN-BORN CHINESE MALES AND FEMALES, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968

A) MALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age on Arrival</th>
<th>1957-68</th>
<th>1947-56</th>
<th>1940-46</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) FEMALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age on Arrival</th>
<th>1957-68</th>
<th>1947-56</th>
<th>1940-46</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the arrivals during the war-years, 1940-6, were refugees; but the number included in the sample is also small. However, slightly more than half of the foreign-born males arrived within ten years after the war, 1947-56, making this the most important period for Chinese male arrivals. Most of these were assistants, chefs and student-dependants, etc., sponsored by their relatives and friends already in Australia. The next period 1957-68 saw fewer male arrivals, only about half of the 1947-56 numbers. For the females, however, the majority came after 1957, i.e. after their
husbands or fathers became eligible for naturalization, and to introduce their families. Female arrivals during this period included also a number of elderly dependant mothers.

Ages on arrival showed only slight changes through these periods: for the males, they have arrived younger since World War II; for the females, because of the arrivals of wives and dependant mothers, they have arrived at higher ages than before. In total, 36.9 per cent (75/206) of the males arrived at ages 10–19, and 31.6 per cent (64/206) arrived at ages 20–29. Female arrivals were 26.7 per cent (43/161) at ages 10–19, 21.7 per cent (35/161) at ages 20–29, and 23.0 per cent (37/161) at ages 40 and over.
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CHAPTER VI

CHINESE SETTLEMENT IN MELBOURNE I:
PROCESSES OF MIGRATION

Places of Origin and Migration Chains -
Traditional Process of Migration

It was noted in the first chapter that one of the most distinctive aspects of Chinese migration is the dominance of certain 'speech-groups' in certain countries of settlement. In Australia, the overwhelming majority of the Chinese are Cantonese, as are those in Canada, New Zealand and the United States.

In Victoria, William Young reported to the Select Committee on Chinese Immigration that the majority of Chinese migrants at that time were from an area about one hundred miles south-west of Canton city including the Sze-Yap (Four Districts: Toishan, Sunwui, Hoiping, and Yanping) and the Sam-Yap (Three Districts: Nanhoi, Punyu, Shunte). There were also others from adjacent districts of Chungshan and Kaoyao. The precise proportion of these early Chinese from each of these districts was, however, not certain, but it seems likely that the Sze-Yap Chinese, particularly those from Toishan, were the majority. Certainly, by the turn of the century, the Sze-Yap had already formed a community resembling what C.A.Price has called a 'regional concentration' in Melbourne with the

2 Southern Europeans in Australia (Melbourne, 1963), pp.230-1
Toishan and Sunwui groups dominating. Chinese from other districts and regions have also come to Australia but were mainly found in States other than Victoria. Though less evidence can be found concerning the Sydney and Brisbane communities, it is believed that even during this time, the majority of the Chinese were from Chungshan. At present, in New South Wales, especially Sydney, the majority are from Chungshan, Kaoyao and Tung-kuan which are adjacent to the Sze-Yap.

During the Melbourne survey, it was possible to obtain from the South Melbourne Chinese Joss House, operated by the Sze-Yap Society, records of the names and native villages of those Chinese who registered with the Sze-Yap Society 1893-1913 and then died in Australia. Although this is not an adequate record of all the Chinese in


2 Ibid., p.324.

3 Unpublished information made available by C.A. Price, Department of Demography, the Australian National University.

4 For each of these deceased persons, the Sze-Yap Society established an ancestral tablet and placed it in the South Melbourne Joss House for worship. These names were recorded from 1893 to 1913 systematically by surname and village of origin in books, and were made available to the author.
Victoria at that time, including only the Sze-Yap Chinese and omitting those who re-emigrated, it nevertheless helps in estimating the proportion of Chinese from each of the four districts in these early years, so providing a comparison with results of the Melbourne survey.

TABLE 6.1
PLACE OF ORIGIN OF CHINESE MIGRANTS IN VICTORIA AS REGISTERED IN THE SOUTH MELBOURNE CHINESE JOSS HOUSE, 1892-1913, BY PRINCIPAL SURNAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Toishan Hoiping</th>
<th>Sunwui</th>
<th>Yanping</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wong (Wang)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louey (Luey)</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau (Liu)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam (Lin)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng (Wu)</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin (Chen)</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leong (Leung)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheung (Chang)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung (Chung)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>927</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) 39 of these were from Hokshan.

While it is generally believed that most Chinese in Victoria came from the Four Districts, the above table shows that the Chinese have not come in equal numbers from all

---

1 The Sze-Yap Society actually accepted registration of those from other districts, but there were very few of them, mainly from Hokshan which is immediately north to Sunwui and Hoiping. The Sam-Yap Chinese having their own Association would have registered their dead in their own temple. Their registration records are unfortunately unavailable.
these districts. The number from Yanping was very small and insignificant, while those from Hoiping were much less numerous than those from Toishan (5433/9567) and Sunwui (3081/9567); these two districts, with 50 per cent and 30 per cent of the total Sze-Yap migrants, were the most important immigration areas for the Chinese in Victoria.

The selectivity in regional concentration can be further shown by the tabulation of places or origin by family names. The nine most populous family-groups accounted for about half of the total Chinese migrants in the records. All of the Loueys and a major proportion of the Laus and Ngs had come from Toishan; while the Lams, Leongs, Cheungs and Chungs were mainly from Sunwui. The Wongs and Chins, however, were almost equally divided between Toishans and Sunwuis. Close examination of the original records, from which Table 6.1 was constructed, further showed that each surname group had come from a few selected villages (see Map III). Almost one out of every two Loueys (358/777) came from T'ang Mien P'ao, a village in the furthest north of Toishan almost adjacent to Sunwui. About one to two miles south of T'ang Mien P'ao was another village called Heng Shui from where many of the Laus have come. The Ngs came mainly from the same area but slightly to the South, from two villages called Shang P'ing and Hsia P'ing. Across the Toishan-Sunwui boundary were villages from where the Lams, Leongs, Cheungs and Chungs came. The Wongs of Sunwui too, were from villages near by, all within easy travelling distance from each other.

All these villages were located in the general area containing the Toishan-Sunwui border which was definitely a
MAP 3: PLACE OF ORIGIN OF SZE-YAP CHINESE MIGRANTS, 1893-1913

Source: Kwangtung Yu Ti Chuan Tu
(Map of Kwangtung), Canton 1897.
major emigration area for the Chinese in Victoria.¹

Other, though less important emigration areas can be found in the south of Toishan. In Hoiping, the pattern is similar: the Chus and Kwans came from Yang Lu village south-west of Hoiping and the Tams came from another village nearby.

In May-November 1968 when the Melbourne survey was conducted, fifty odd years after the registration in the Joss House, the basic characteristic in terms of regional concentration was almost the same as during the turn of the century. Sydney remained dominated by those from Chungshan and Kaoyao,² and Melbourne remained very much Sze-Yap. In Melbourne, apart from the Second World War refugees, private students who stayed permanently, and those who were sponsored recently and were still dependants, the foreign-born Chinese were mainly from Toishan and Sunwui (Table 6.2), and more or less from the same general area.³

¹ Unfortunately comparable information on the Chinese in Canada, New Zealand and the United States is not available. It is, therefore, not known whether or not the Sze-Yap Chinese in these countries are also from villages in the same area.

² Unpublished information made available by C.A.Price.

³ The Laus, for example, are mainly from Heng Shui, Toishan, and the Loueys, still the biggest surname group in Melbourne in 1968, are mostly from Tang Mien P'ao, Toishan.
TABLE 6.2
PLACE OF BIRTH OF FOREIGN-BORN CHINESE
BY MIGRANT TYPES, MALES ONLY, MELBOURNE
SURVEY 1968 (N=206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Sponsored Employed Dependants (incl. students)</th>
<th>War-time Refugees</th>
<th>Non-sponsored students</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toishan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunwui</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoiping</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Kwangtung*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Guinea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islandsb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore/Malaysia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other S.E.Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Other Kwangtung: Of 5 students, 4 were born in Canton City and 1 in Shunte ; of 7 War-time Refugees, 1 each from Nanhoh, Kaoyao, Chingyuen. Punyu, Shaohing, and 2 from Shunte ; and of 11 sponsored 3 were born in Chungshan, 2 each in Shunte, Tungkuan and Canton City and 1 each from Punyu and Hoinan Island.

b) Pacific Islands: Tahiti
The above tables show that the Four Districts sent large numbers of Chinese to Australia. These districts at least, if not the villages, were also the major emigration area for the Chinese in North America and New Zealand. Initially, as during the gold rush, migrant groups from one or several near-by villages were formed under 'headmen' and emigrated through Macao and Hong Kong.¹ Successful stories were quickly transmitted back to the villages through re-migrants, letters, and not less important, shipping agents. All these encouraged their fellow villagers to try their luck in Australia. Villages nearby, hearing the news, then sent migrants, thereby creating a migration stream from a large area. Since many of these villages contained a few 'clans' and therefore only a few surnames, we find migrants of certain family names coming from specific villages.

A great number of the immigrants during the early period came under the credit-ticket system.² After 1901, however, the Commonwealth Immigration Act, while

1 Headmen during the early migration period (1850-1870's) were major organizers of migrant groups. Their work included the formation of migrant parties, usually at their own native village, securing shipping tickets and often accompanying the party on the journey to their destinations. See Wang Sing-Wu, "The Organization of Chinese Emigration 1848-1888, with Special Reference to Emigration to Australia" (Unpublished M.A. thesis, The Australian National University, 1969), pp.86-88.

2 See Chapter 1 above and Percia Campbell, Chinese Coolie Migration (London, 1923), Chapter II.
strictly prohibiting free migration, largely changed the system of Chinese migration by permitting only certain categories of Chinese to enter Australia. New Chinese migrants now had to be sponsored by some person or firm established in Australia. Under these immigration laws, the credit-ticket system, through which unconnected Chinese migrated independently, could no longer be practised. Chinese migrants having no connections in Australia, found it immensely difficult to enter Australia, even if the passage fare were raised. It is possible to argue that this type of legal restriction interfered only to a small extent with migration from villages already well represented in Australia - for which there are sponsors - but to virtually exclude the possibility of the formation of new chains from other villages and districts. This legal restriction, together with the universal desire to be close to one's kin and relatives, produced a migration situation very conducive to the continuation of chain migration from these villages in Toishan and Sunwui.

The concept of 'chain-migration' has been mainly used by Australian scholars to describe the pattern of free migration from Southern Europe to Australia and New Zealand. First developed by Lochore¹ and later elaborated by Borrie, MacDonald and

---

¹ R.A. Lochore, From Europe to New Zealand, (Wellington 1951), pp.23-4.
Price, a common form of chain migration consists of five stages: 1) pioneers deciding to stay; 2) other men arriving from the same region after the successful establishment by the pioneers; 3) successful migrants bringing out fiancées, wives and dependants and thereby causing large scale migration streams; 4) second generation reaching maturity and receiving fuller impact from the receiving society; and 5) third generation reaching maturity. The transition from one stage to another depends on numerous factors, ranging from village background, familial ties, shipping convenience, conditions of the receiving country and even international politics. Under favourable conditions, some chains develop to such massive scale that they depopulate whole villages, while other 'unproductive' chains die off without bringing many migrants.

Chinese migrants to Australia, however, have not gone through these stages. Although the first Chinese gold diggers can be described as adventurous, they were, nevertheless, not lonely pioneers. They came in groups, 

---

J.S. MacDonald, "Migration from Italy to Australia, with Special Reference to Selected Groups" (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Australian National University, 1959).
moved in groups and often left in groups. The loyalty to their native family—lineage in China and the fact that they did not bring with them women-folk even when it was possible (before 1901 when there was no extra restriction against women) cast serious doubts as to whether or not early Chinese migrants actually wanted to stay. In the United States and New Zealand, these early Chinese were described as 'sojourners' whose principal aims were not to settle but to return to China after the accumulation of wealth.¹ In the 1920's when large numbers of Chinese females started to emigrate to South-east Asia, Australia permitted only small numbers of merchants and well established families to introduce their wives and children. It was not until the 1950's that the important third stage of chain migration—the bringing out of wives and dependants—was extended to others. Admittedly it was possible to bring some relatives to Australia in other ways. A local trader, market gardener or cafe owner wanting his son or cousin to join him might, if his son or cousin were of school age, be able to sponsor him as a student. If the relative were an adult, he might be able to introduce him as an assistant or substitute or cafe worker. Some of those introduced as students became

assistants later on; and some of the assistants, substitutes or cafe workers, being close relatives of the original owner of the business, eventually took over the business and became new owners.

Persons introduced in this way could not, however, bring out their own wives until they became well-established themselves. The main links between them and their families in China were letters and, more significantly, occasional visits. Such visits, every few years if the financial condition of the migrants permitted, constituted what was described earlier as the commuting system. These visits were important, not only because they brought prestige and honour to the family-lineage, but also because marriages might be contracted and children might be conceived, and the family system continued. When such children reached maturity, brought up and educated in the village, some of them were sponsored in turn by their fathers or uncles in Australia.

The cycle of migration, or the commuting migration system - adult male children replacing retiring fathers generation after generation - is perhaps the one single characteristic which differentiates pre-war Chinese migrants from migration of other nationalities. In the Melbourne Chinese Community, there exist many who are foreign-born themselves although their fathers and grandfathers, some even great grandfathers, were in Australia before. In this way, the female portion of the lineage remained in China while some of the males commuted.
This migration situation has been most important to the integration of immigrants. Firstly, being sponsored by Chinese concerns and bound legally to their sponsors for specific lengths of time, new migrants have inevitably found themselves under the influence of the Chinese community instead of being able to receive the fuller impact of Australian society. The status of being sponsored implies much. A sponsored Chinese depends on his fellow countrymen for his sponsorship to enter Australia, his occupation and therefore his income, his extension to stay if so desired and his recreation and friendship.\(^1\) His activities are fairly well confined to the Chinese community. This strong legal tie between the long-timer and the new migrants strengthens and sustains the already existing social and cultural relationship among Chinese migrants. Secondly, having families in China and with limited expectation of being able to bring them to Australia before naturalization, these migrants learn to be thrifty and work hard so that they could accumulate enough to support and visit their families. This commuting system, together with the legally enforced 'chain-migration', severely limits the development of a sense of achievement and establishment in Australian society; in other words, they retard the switch from a reference group based on the Chinese society to a reference group based on the Australian society.

\(^1\) In contrast to sponsored immigrants, non-sponsored immigrants, i.e. those who are not sponsored by Chinese concerns in Australia, are not bound legally and in terms of occupation to the Chinese community. Non-sponsored Chinese immigrants such as war-time refugees and private students who became settlers are not restricted in their occupational choice. See the next section for a description of these groups.
Post-World War II Migrant Groups

Up to this point, the discussion has been mainly concerned with traditional migration from the Four Districts and nearby areas - traditional partly because her emigration has been related to the sponsorship system, and partly because this is the core group which was and still is the centre of the now changing Melbourne Chinese community. There are, however, other groups of Chinese in Melbourne which have arrived since World War II and have not come under the sponsorship system and which differ from the traditional group in several important ways.

First, there are the war-time refugees who were repatriated from the Pacific areas during the war years 1940-46. While three out of twenty-one refugees included in the sample were born in Toishan (Table 6.2), others were born in widely scattered areas ranging from Singapore and Malaysia to Shanghai (included in 'Other China'). Those born in China were either seamen recruited in Shanghai and were in Australian waters when hostility broke out, or were migrants who had come to Hong Kong in search of work and were recruited for work in the Pacific areas such as Nauru Island and North Borneo shortly before the war started, or had been part of the older Chinese communities of German New-Guinea and the Solomon Islands. In late 1940, massive evacuation to Australia

---

1 In the Melbourne survey, eleven of these refugees worked in Nauru Island, six were seamen in waters around the area; one worked in Singapore and another worked in Tahiti.
started from these areas which were under the threat of Japanese invasion. A total of about 9,000 non-Europeans came to Australia, some 900 of which stayed permanently, among whom twenty-one Chinese refugees were included in the Melbourne survey. Most of these refugees in the Melbourne survey had no connection with an established Chinese community in Australia and were placed in war industry production lines, in military camps working as cooks, or in factories until the war ended in 1945. Only five had friends already in Australia and found jobs with them, one as a market-garden assistant and four as cooks in Chinese cafes. After the war, these refugees were permitted to remain in Australia but without the right to introduce their families or assistants. They are now scattered in all capital cities and are not concentrated in any one locality.

The second group is the non-sponsored ex-private students (i.e. those who came to Australia for their education without a long-settled friend or relative to sponsor them) who have stayed on in Australia and become permanent residents or naturalized citizens. Like the war-time refugees, few of these students were from the Four Districts: of the 26 in the sample, eight were born in China (only two in Toishan), while the other 18 were born in Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia or some

1 The Chinese war-time refugees now residing in Sydney differ much from the Melbourne ones. Most had friends or relatives in Sydney and found employment with them. This is because many of the war-time refugees are from Chungshan and Kaoyao areas and these areas are also the main areas of origin for the Sydney Chinese.
other South-east Asian countries. All of them arrived after 1950 when the large scale influx of Asian students started. These students differ from other Chinese immigrants in the following ways. First, all of them had had some English training before coming to Australia, because competence in English is necessary for admission into Australian educational institutions and for a student visa. In fact, they all had been brought up in partly westernized societies and had a western education; even those born in China, had spent some time in Hong Kong and had received part of their education in bilingual schools. Secondly, unlike sponsored migrants, whose activities outside the Chinese community are limited, these non-sponsored students are in constant contact with the Australian society through schools and universities, friendship groups, and by boarding in Australian families or university halls of residence, etc. Thirdly, being educated in Australia, they are better equipped than most other groups to gain responsible positions within the Australian occupational structure, although this is also true of those few sponsored students who had a tertiary education and entered the professions.

The third group consists of professional and highly skilled persons who entered Australia in the special admission category of 'Distinguished and Highly Qualified'. This group was still small when the Melbourne survey was done in 1968 (the sample included only two). But as the entry conditions were relaxed in 1966 to include a wider range
of skilled persons, their number has almost certainly increased since the time of the survey and will probably increase more in the future. The two persons in the sample were both highly educated, having obtained university degrees, and were appointed to Radio Australia as Chinese programme staff. They have since gained permanent resident status.

Migration Background and Occupational Adjustment

We turn now to the occupational distribution of each of these three groups in Australia. Their very different mode of migration has, as might be expected, resulted in very different settlement patterns. The sponsored group, having come from traditional emigration areas and being connected, legally and in terms of kinship, with Chinese establishments in Australia, have had little chance to deviate from Chinese traditional occupations. Moreover, having been brought up mostly in their own villages and educated under the Chinese education system, few (only fifteen out of seventy-eight who came as assistants and substitutes) reached a level of education above primary school; of these 15, ten finished secondary school, four went to teachers training colleges and one to a university in China. Few spoke any English before they left China and only two had any special training at skilled occupations except as Chinese school teachers, carpenters or Chinese chefs. In fact, half (32/64) of those who

1 Few came in as 'Distinguished and Highly Qualified' persons until the relaxation in 1966. Since 1966, however, the number admitted increased. By June 30 1969, 331 applications were approved involving a total of 962 Chinese, and 316 of these actually arrived by that time. Figures released by the Department of Immigration as Progress Report on 30 June 1969.
had some occupation before they emigrated from China were labourers, farmers and the like working primarily in Chinese rural villages. Only nineteen had gained considerable urban experience by working in Canton City or Hong Kong for more than four years as shop assistants or clerks etc. In short, their background and orientation were primarily those of rural China, with little preparation for adaptation into a western society such as Melbourne.

The war-time refugees, though having different backgrounds from the sponsored migrants working in Hong Kong, the Pacific Islands and during the war in Australia, were mainly engaged in labouring work. When the war ended, most of these war-time refugees have joined the sponsored migrants in the Chinese cafe business, partly because the Chinese cafes have become prosperous and partly because some unions have rules restricting Chinese labour.

Non-sponsored students and professionals, being basically orientated towards the professions when they came to Australia, have few contacts with

1 The majority of these Chinese however had actually lived in Hong Kong (43/78) but mainly for transit purposes staying for a few months, sometimes a year or two, awaiting visas to Australia.

established Chinese community, although some of them have also entered the cafe business.

Chinese traditional occupations are called 'Chinese' either because the employers are often Chinese and those in the occupations have little contact with Australians, or because of traditional links with early Chinese occupations. The other occupations are called 'Australian' because those in them are mostly employed by Australian firms or by the government, or if self-employed, have contacts mostly with Australians.¹

---

¹ For details of the occupational classification system, see Appendix II.
Among the total sample of 206 foreign-born Chinese males, only four could be classified, on arrival, as minor professionals or white-collar clerical workers. There were none in the major professional occupations. Many came as assistants and employees of Chinese concerns, the majority working as chefs and waiters. Even more came as students and young dependants and were enrolled in some educational institutions; twenty-six were non-sponsored students and seventy-six sponsored dependants and students. Fifteen had skilled and unskilled blue-collar occupations, among whom 14 (including one who has since retired) were war-time refugees. There is, then, little variation in the initial occupation on arrival. Among sponsored immigrants arriving as adults, the restrictive legal system of sponsorship, together with the natural tendency of 'chain-migration', have produced a Chinese immigrant group whose members are not only connected with each other in terms of kinship, but also by common economic interests.

The pattern of present occupation shows a slight diversification from the concentration in Chinese traditional occupations, with 17 as medical physicians, engineers or other major professionals and seven as minor professionals, making a total of 24 (12 per cent) in professional occupations. The increase is mainly due to 17 non-sponsored students who have entered the professionals after they finished their

1 The two entering with university degrees were classified here as minor professionals. See Appendix II.
### TABLE 6.3
OCCUPATIONS OF FOREIGN-BORN CHINESE MALES, BY MIGRANT TYPES,
ON ARRIVAL AND AT PRESENT, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968 (N=206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>ON ARRIVAL</th>
<th>Non-sponsored</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Non-sponsored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td>Students &amp;</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sponsored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Prof.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Prof.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cafe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Cafe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chefs, Waiters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Gardener</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-work Force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, Dependants</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a) Clerical workers
- b) Cafes employing one or more help.
- c) Cafe not employing help
- d) Including four retired.
1 A comparison of the occupational distribution among the foreign-born Chinese with the general Melbourne population shows that the Chinese are concentrated in the categories of shop proprietors, managers and service workers. Most of these are connected with Chinese grocers and cafes. The distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Persons born in Australia</th>
<th>Persons Foreign-born Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Professionals</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graziers</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Professionals</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Proprietors</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>41.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Services</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Assistants</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>23.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Workers</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>404,282</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) 1966 census figures for Metropolitan Melbourne released to Department of Sociology, Institute of Advanced Studies, The Australian National University. I am grateful to Professor J. Zubrzycki for permission to use these figures.

c) 1968 Survey.
system is such that certain occupations are mainly controlled by migrants from certain districts. Among the sponsored migrants, for example, both major and minor cafes were controlled by the Toishan group: eight out of eleven major cafes and 20 out of 32 minor ones. In the vegetable distributing business too, there is a differentiation by birthplace groups. While the wholesale businesses were mainly in the hands of the Toishans (in the sample, all four wholesale firms were owned by Toishan Chinese), the retail stalls were mainly operated by Sunwui Chinese (in the sample, 13 out of 25 or 25 per cent). Most of these Sunwui stalls were in the Queen Victoria Market in North Melbourne. The Toishan stalls, of which there were six in the sample, were located in the Prahran Market which is a newer establishment than the Queen Victoria Market.

The pattern of occupational distribution so far indicates that the Chinese tend to concentrate in Chinese traditional occupations, especially in lesser cafes (without employee).

The following is an attempt to explain the situation through mobility analysis by cross tabulating present occupation by occupation on arrival:
## TABLE 6.4

POST-ARRIVAL MOBILITY AMONG MELBOURNE CHINESE, FOREIGN-BORN MALES ONLY, MELBOURNE SURVEY, 1968
(N=165)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation on Arrival</th>
<th>Australian</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>E F G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Profession A</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Profession B</td>
<td>- 2 - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar(^b)</td>
<td>C - - - 1</td>
<td>3 8 2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>D - - - 1</td>
<td>3 8 2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>E - - - 2</td>
<td>- - 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>F - - - 4</td>
<td>19 5 28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>G - - 1 10</td>
<td>21 18 51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Work-Force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Students,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>H 14 3 1</td>
<td>- 1 5</td>
<td>2 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sponsored Students</td>
<td>I 3 2 2 1</td>
<td>5 16 11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 7 4 3</td>
<td>26 69 39</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Persons not in work force excluded from table.  
\(^b\) Clerical workers.

Only two who had Chinese occupations on arrival moved to Australian occupations; i.e. two per cent of the total 99 persons who had some occupations on arrival. In contrast, 15 (15 per cent) who had Australian occupations on arrival moved to Chinese occupations, many being war-time refugees. The remaining 82 stayed within their Chinese or Australian occupations on arrival.
Among students and dependents who were sponsored, the proportion who later took up Australian occupation was much lower than that of those who entered Chinese occupation - 8/40 or 20 per cent versus 32/40 or 80 per cent. In contrast to this, the non-sponsored students were mainly engaged in Australian occupations (18/26 or 69.2 per cent) and the proportion who entered Chinese occupations was relatively low (8/26 or 31.8 per cent). Although both groups were students and had enrolled in some Australian educational institutions, the sponsored group, being fundamentally under the influence of their sponsors, did not exhibit a tendency towards professional occupations as did the non-sponsored private students. In fact, some of these sponsored students were only nominally students, while in fact spending a large part of their time working for their sponsors.

The occupational pattern for the foreign-born Chinese, except non-sponsored students, is then very clear, while the sponsored migrants stayed very much within Chinese occupations, the war-time refugees actually moved from Australian blue-collar to Chinese occupations, notably the cafe business. The explanation of this concentration in Chinese occupations can be found first in language and educational barriers which limit Chinese migrants to relatively low class occupations and severely curtail

---

1 The contrast between sponsored students and non-sponsored students is statistically significant. \( X^2 = 16.00, \) \( df=1, p < .001. \)
advancement and promotion. Moreover, as was noted before, some unions exclude Chinese from their membership, thereby limiting also the choice of blue-collar occupations.¹ A second reason is that Chinese occupations, especially the cafes, offer an attractive alternative. Indeed, it is very common for a Chinese assistant or cook to save enough in a short time to start his own small cafe, usually in one of the outer suburbs. In the present sample, among those whose movements were confined to Chinese occupations, 21 moved from the status of employee (cooks, waiters, assistants, etc.) to that of self-employed (lesser cafe owners, fruit and vegetable retailers, etc.). Ten others moved to the status of employers (major cafe owners, grocers etc.) In contrast to this, only five cases moved from the status of self-employed to become employees; four of these were market-gardeners (self-employed) who became chefs in cafes.

The significance of such occupational change is apparent if the conditions of entry of the sponsored migrants are considered. Legally tied to their sponsors, these migrants were admitted on the condition, among others, that they remained in their admission categories unless permitted to move by the Department of Immigration. In practice, this Department rarely gave its approval unless the new occupation was also in a special non-European category (i.e. the change of employment must not result in a position which a non-Chinese could easily hold); this permitted, however, upward mobility within the Chinese occupational hierarchy, as from cafe

¹ G.W. Ford, op. cit., p.105,
assistant to cafe owner or from market gardening assistant to substitute owner to permanent owner. In this sense, then, though Chinese did not have a free choice of employment but worked very much alongside their sponsors, they could move up the ladder of Chinese occupations. Once up, they might gain further rights, such as that of themselves sponsoring assistants or of eventually gaining permanent residence and bringing in wives and children.

The change of occupation status from employee to self-employed, then, signifies as important change in the opportunities of Chinese migrants. Not only does it indicate the achievement of a certain level of economic success, but also an alteration of the legal status imposed on entry.

The Position of the Australian-born Chinese

We have shown in Chapter III that the scarcity of Chinese women resulted in slow growth of the Australian-born Chinese population. Even today, a large proportion of the Australian-born Chinese population are relatively young, most being the children of Chinese families re-united or newly formed since the war. The Melbourne survey included 285 Australian-born full-Chinese and 152 part-Chinese. Only 97 (34.3%) full-Chinese and 41 (27.0%) part-Chinese were adults over 20 years of age.¹ Most of the adult Australian-born Chinese are descendants of well-established Chinese migrants who were entitled

¹ See Chapter V for a description of the age-distribution of the Australian-born Chinese.
to have their wives with them. The part-Chinese were all descendants of Chinese men who had married European-Australian women (the sampling procedure could not include descendants of European males and Chinese females).

Of the 47 Australian-born full-Chinese, nearly half (21/46) are from grocers', merchants' and vegetable wholesalers' families. As with the sponsored foreign-born Chinese, the Australian-born Chinese grocers are mainly from Sunwui families while the vegetable wholesalers are mainly from Toishan. The following table gives fathers' occupation.

---

1 Excluding one case whose father's occupation was 'not stated'.
TABLE 6.5

FATHERS' OCCUPATION OF AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHINESE WHO WERE ACTUALLY EMPLOYED AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968

(N=74)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers' Occupations</th>
<th>Full-Chinese</th>
<th>Part-Chinese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Professions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Professions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar(^b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue collar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Grocers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit &amp; Vegetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesalers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cafe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit &amp; Vegetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Cafe Owners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Gardeners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbalist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet-makers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               | 46           | 28           | 74    |

\(^a\) Two 'not stated' cases excluded.

\(^b\) Clerical workers.
The interesting point here is that, though Chinese men marrying European-Australian women were mainly in Chinese occupations (19/28), they were scattered through them all and not concentrated as were other Chinese, in Chinese grocers and vegetable wholesale business. Of the 28 fathers of part-Chinese, eight had non-professional Australian occupations. Only five were grocers and vegetable wholesalers. The other 14 were scattered in other Chinese occupations, including four herbalists and two cabinet makers.

The fact that Australian-born Chinese came mainly from families of high social status is important in understanding their present social position in both the Chinese community and the Australian society. Coming from families which were capable financially of supporting their higher education, many of them had the opportunity to receive post-secondary education and finally to move to professional occupations. Even when they stayed within Chinese occupations, they mainly succeeded their fathers' business and did not move downwards to become employees in Chinese concerns.

Compared with the foreign-born Chinese, there were relatively more Australian-born Chinese in the major professions (20 full-Chinese and six part-Chinese or 34 per cent of gainfully employed), more in white-collar occupations (five full-Chinese and 12 part-Chinese or 22 per cent), more in blue collar occupations (five full-Chinese and nine part-Chinese or 19 per cent), and fewer in Chinese occupations (17 full-Chinese and two part-Chinese or 24 per cent). None
were chefs and waiters which were major occupations for foreign-born Chinese. A father-to-son mobility analysis shows the exact changes in occupations among the Australian-born.

1 The occupational distribution among the Australian-born is closer to that of the Australian general population than among the foreign-born Chinese. While the Gini Index value for the foreign-born is high at .835, the value for the Australian-born is only .487. The concentration of the Australian-born Chinese is in the upper professions. The following shows the distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Persons born in Australia</th>
<th>Australian-born Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Professionals</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>34.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Proprietors</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>22.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Assistants</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.00        100.00
Total Number        404,282          76

a) ANU Occupation categories.
b) 1966 Census for Metropolitan Melbourne.
c) 1968 Survey.
d) Other categories omitted.
### Table 6.6

**Father-to-Son Mobility Among Melbourne Chinese, Australian-Born Males Only Melbourne Survey 1968 (N=74)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of Father</th>
<th>Occupation of Son</th>
<th>Australian</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar^b</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a)** Two cases whose fathers' occupations were unknown were excluded.
- **b)** Clerical workers.

Movement from Chinese to Australian occupations is 68.8 per cent for the Australian-born (as contrast with only 2 per cent for the foreign-born). There is no movement at all from Australian to Chinese occupations (as contrast with 15 per cent for the foreign-born). Table 6.6 shows that sixteen out of twenty-eight sons of Chinese employers, seventeen out of twenty-two sons of self-employed, and nine out of eleven sons of Chinese employees moved to Australian occupations.

Movements within Chinese occupations showed little change from fathers' occupations. Fourteen (74 per cent) had occupations similar to their fathers'. Most of these
were in the fruit and vegetable distributing business, having inherited their fathers' firms.

The Settlement of Chinese in Melbourne

Various studies have shown that ethnic groups differ considerably in their degree of residential concentration.\(^1\) Others have considered the relation between the degree of concentration and immigrant assimilation,\(^2\) and have often found them inversely related. While this may be true, in general, since physical proximity among migrants provides efficient channels of communication between members and therefore helps the preservation of old customs and behaviour, the causes behind ethnic concentration and dispersion are complex and vary with ethnic groups.

In the previous sections, we have noted the post-war suburbanization of the Chinese in both Melbourne and Sydney; and we have also noted the occupational spread to lesser cafes among the foreign-born Chinese and a professionalization of the students and Australian-born Chinese. In this section, an attempt will be made to relate their occupational mobility and residential change.

The occupational composition in each group of suburbs is shown in the table below.

---


### TABLE 6.7
OCCUPATION OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBURBS OF RESIDENCE,
MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968
(N=215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb Groups&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Australian</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Prof.</td>
<td>Minor Prof.</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>Employer Retail</td>
<td>Market Cafe</td>
<td>Lesser Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Melbourne City Suburb</td>
<td>2 - 1 1</td>
<td>2 - 17 1</td>
<td>16 4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Inner Outer</td>
<td>3 3 2 2</td>
<td>6 2 6 3</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Inner Outer</td>
<td>7 1 3 -</td>
<td>12 2 12 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Inner Outer</td>
<td>2 - 4 1</td>
<td>5 2 2 3</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Inner Outer</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - 2 -</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 8 20 10</td>
<td>30 25 39 34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> For the names of suburbs included in each group, see explanations to Table 4.4.
The concentration in Melbourne city is contributed mainly by those in Chinese occupations - especially the vegetable and fruit retailers and employees of Chinese concerns. The concentration of vegetable retailers in North Melbourne is connected with the early hours the Queen Victoria Market opens for business. One of the reasons often given for not moving to the suburbs is the inconvenience of coming to work early at 3 or 4 a.m. In total 17 out of 25 vegetable retailers live in North Melbourne in Capel, Walsh and Chetwynd Streets to the west of the Markets.\(^1\) Since many of these vegetable retailers are from Sunwui, this area in North Melbourne, especially Capel Street, appears as a district settlement of the Sunwui vegetable retailers. The Kong Chew (Sunwui) Old Men's Home, built in 1960, is also located in North Melbourne. Six of the remaining eight vegetable retailers live in inner suburbs within easy travelling distance from the Market. The second most important group in the North Melbourne concentration are the chefs and waiters. All the sixteen employees of Chinese concerns are employed by major cafes in Melbourne City. Fourteen of these sixteen chefs are married but nine of them still have their wives and children in China with little hope of bringing them out.\(^2\) These de facto 'single' persons, together with other never-married ones, live in boarding

\(^1\) Probably half or more than half of the houses in these streets are Chinese occupied. The Survey, being a sample, did not include all the Chinese houses in this area.

\(^2\) *Melbourne Herald* (November 1 1969), described the livelihood of some of the elderly men who were permanently separated from their wives and families.
In contrast to the vegetable retailers, the lesser cafe owners, mostly from Toishan, are widespread in the suburbs. There are altogether 39 lesser cafe owners in the sample. Only one of these lesser cafe owners live in Melbourne City. There are at least two major reasons why cafe families are widespread in the suburbs. First, most of these cafe owners were employees of Chinese firms before, having been sponsored by his relatives or close friends. Knowing little about Australia or Melbourne and depending much on their fellow countrymen to settle down in Melbourne (there is no government assistance to these migrants), they lived mostly in the North Melbourne-Carlton area with other employees of Chinese concerns. After years of working and saving enough money they introduced their wives and families from China (through Hong Kong), after becoming naturalized. Before or immediately after the arrival of their families, these Chinese had to find suitable housing for them. North Melbourne and Carlton are congested areas where the influx of Southern European migrants in recent years has made available housing scarce. Some of the Chinese migrants, willingly or not, had to move to the suburbs.

The second reason, and probably the more important one, is the trend of occupational mobility described earlier. The establishment of small cafes among sponsored migrants is intimately connected with the arrivals of wives and children. All of the 29 lesser cafes in the sample are operated as family units - husband and wife working in the kitchen and children helping in the evening at catering. Occasionally, where children are scarce, an Australian girl is employed working part-time. Since the
City of Melbourne already has a number of Chinese restaurants, these cafes are mainly established in the suburban shopping centres. The spread of lesser cafes to outer suburbs has been an important element in the general dispersion of Chinese.

In the eastern sector of Metropolitan Melbourne, the major professionals are found, two out of every three living there. Their homes are both in the wealthy suburbs such as Camberwell, Kew, Boxhill, Doncaster and Templestowe, and in various new suburbs which are still in the development stage. Almost one in every two live in the outer suburbs of this sector. In fact, eight out of the total 15 in the outer suburbs of this sector are in Boxhill.

The Chinese employers, which include major cafe owners and fruit and vegetable wholesalers, are not concentrated in any one area. Twelve out of a total 30, however, live in the inner suburbs of the eastern sector, or more precisely, eight of these can be found in Camberwell and four in the nearby suburb of East Kew.

In general then, apart from the market retail hawkers and chefs in North Melbourne, the Chinese are widely distributed in all suburbs. As is the case with the general population of Metropolitan Melbourne, the Eastern and Southern sectors contain the majority of the population.

The Melbourne Chinese survey included two other items which give some indication concerning the stability of this residential pattern. These two items are (1) address five years ago of each household and (2) home ownership; the first item indicates the rate and direction of movement within the last five years and the second item shows the permanency of present residence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address 5 years ago, 1963 (Broad Categories)</th>
<th>Present Address (1968), Broad Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>A 42 - 5 5 3 1 2 1 - -</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Suburbs</td>
<td>B 1 7 - 1 - - - - -</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (Inner)</td>
<td>C - - 17 1 2 2 1 1 - -</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (Outer)</td>
<td>D - - - 12 - - - - -</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (Inner)</td>
<td>E 1 - 3 1 36 6 - - -</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (Outer)</td>
<td>F - - - - - 1 23 - -</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (Inner)</td>
<td>G - - 1 - 1 - 18 1 - -</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (Outer)</td>
<td>H - - 2 - - 1 - 6 - -</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (Inner)</td>
<td>I - - - - - - - 3 - -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (Outer)</td>
<td>J - - - - - - - - 1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Arrivals since 1963 - - 1 - 1 3 - - - - 1 6
Total 44 7 29 20 44 36 21 9 3 2 215
The total movement, observable from Table 6.8 is slight and is towards the better suburbs. For the five years before 1968, the Southern and Eastern sectors had increases of 36 per cent and 11 per cent respectively.\(^1\) Much of these were contributed by movements from Melbourne City. Seventeen households out of 59 in Melbourne City in 1963 (29 per cent) moved to other suburbs and only two moved from other suburbs to Melbourne City: One was a doctor working in a city hospital who chose to live in a hospital flat in Carlton, and another was a chef who moved from Richmond to North Melbourne. No newcomers have made their home in Melbourne City. In total the number of households in Melbourne City decreased by 25 per cent from 59 to 44.\(^2\) Of 17 households which moved away from Melbourne City, 11 were cafe owners and chefs in 1968.

The pattern of home ownership also suggests that there will be further movement away from the City to the suburbs.

---
\(^1\) These proportions are biased, because although the present addresses are randomly sampled, their addresses five years ago are not a random sample. The bias comes from the addition of new address and addresses which no longer exist today through death or emigration from Melbourne.

\(^2\) The actual number of Chinese individuals (not households) have shown a slight increase from 1961-66 (see Chapter IV page 137). This is because of the arrival of dependants, some of whom stayed in Melbourne City thus compensating adequately for the individuals loss through moving away.
TABLE 6.9
HOME OWNERSHIP, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968 (N=215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb Group</th>
<th>Owner/Buyer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Sector</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Sector</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Sector</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home ownership is very low in Melbourne City, and high in other suburbs. The highest proportion of ownership (92.7 per cent) is in the wealthier suburbs of the Eastern sector. Since home ownership is often positively related with residential stability and new Chinese arrivals seem to prefer to settle directly in the suburbs, it can be safely hypothesised that the proportion of Chinese households in the City, and possibly the number of individuals as well, will further decrease in years to come.

The pattern of residential mobility and ownership described this far suggests several important changes. First, it is obvious that the Chinese do not, at present (except the market retailers), prefer Melbourne City to the suburbs as a place of residence. Second, much of this

---

1 There is very little difference between inner suburbs and outer suburbs in each of these sectors. They are therefore, combined to give a neater table. The proportion of home ownership (owner and buyer) in the whole of Metropolitan Melbourne was 76.38 per cent in 1961, slightly lower than the Chinese proportion. In the City, it was 47.32 per cent, considerably higher than the Chinese proportion. 1961 Census: Analysis of Dwelling in L.G.A. (Victoria), p.40 (Test of Significance, Z = 2.102, p < .05).
move from Melbourne City is accompanied by increasing home ownership. For those who move away from a sub-standard residential area to a newer and wealthier one, it is often a change from the status of tenant to the status of owner/buyer of residential units. The ambition of earlier temporary migrants - to earn money thriftily and either send the savings back or return - is now being replaced by the ambition of settling in decency in Australia. Homes of lesser cafe owners and chefs are mainly of high quality, built of bricks on sizable sites with small gardens. Many of the houses of the wealthier merchants and wholesale fruiterers are spacious homes with well attended gardens, some of these are even two storey 'mansions'. Residentially, at least the Chinese are well integrated into the Melbourne pattern.
Summary

It is a common phenomenon that migrants tend to concentrate in some occupations and that this concentration is influenced to a large extent by the backgrounds of the migrants, the form of migration and the environment of their settlement. The present pattern of occupational concentration of the Chinese is at once the result of all these three factors. The rural background of the Chinese migrants is, perhaps, not different from most of the peasant migrants in Australia, for example, the southern Europeans. But the process of migration among the Chinese is uniquely characterized by two important factors: (1) the restrictive sponsorship system which limited the occupational choice on arrival and influenced later the mobility away from Chinese traditional occupations; (2) the commuting system which forced upon the migrants a continued link between them and their home villages and, therefore, influenced to facilitate the formation of regional settlements. This unique migration process produces a situation not conducive to rapid integration into the Australian society. The environment, Melbourne, is also favourable to the expansion of Chinese cafes. In so far as Melbourne is affluent, the continued existence of large numbers of Chinese cafes seems likely, and the accommodation of the foreign-born Chinese is attained by the formation of the complementary occupational structure within Australian society.
For the private students who lie outside of the traditional migration system and the Australian-born, the movement away from Chinese occupations is oriented towards the professionals and not towards other sectors of the Australian occupational structure. There are, for example, none in banking, nor in major secondary industries, nor in the legal professions. Perhaps it is because they understand that competition and discrimination are least in occupations requiring special skill and knowledge; or perhaps the high value placed on education in Chinese society has been brought to the Chinese in Melbourne and put into practical use. It is not possible to pinpoint the exact reasons behind this; but the same phenomenon of occupational mobility has been noted among the Chinese in the United States.¹

More indicative of the gradual permanent settlement of the Chinese than the pattern of occupational change is the residential movements to the suburbs. These movements, though partly caused by the spread of cafes, have to be interpreted together with the high proportion of home ownership of Chinese homes in the suburbs. It appears likely that the pattern of suburbanization indicated in the analysis of census data (Chapter IV) will continue and will have important social consequences on the integration of the Chinese in Melbourne.
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General

Understanding of the Chinese community requires more than a description of occupations and residences, not only because this covers only part of Chinese life but because it can mislead us into unwarranted conclusions. The fact that the increase of lesser cafes and the residential spread are closely related to the arrival of wives and children is a good example here: residential dispersion, in this case, is not a direct function of the degree of 'assimilation', but a function of housing conditions in the City of Melbourne and the location of the suburban shopping centres, although this may lead to a more rapid integration of the Chinese in general.

For the Chinese in Melbourne at least two other aspects of settlement need discussion: marriage patterns, and primary and secondary group relations with the 'host' society.

The importance of marriage in the field of migrant assimilation, especially if it is intermarriage, has often been stressed. Those so doing argue: that intermarriage is the severest test of group cohesion; that the higher the proportion of intermarriage the higher is the level of
assimilation with other groups;¹ that intermarriage is the last stage in the total assimilation of two or more ethnic groups;² and that even if intermarriage ratios may not be directly relevant to economic, residential or other types of social integration, they are still the most useful index for complete assimilation.³ Hence the use of intermarriage ratios as a measure of assimilation.

Those who question the high value of intermarriage ratios either argue that a high rate of intermarriage is not always accompanied by a high rate of assimilation in other aspects: thus Marcson noted that some old and 'assimilated' migrant groups in the United States have maintained lower intermarriage ratios than new ones, suggesting that intermarriage may be a function of factors other than assimilation.⁴ Or they question the underlying assumptions that intermarriage occurs

---

¹ The earliest attempt in this direction is probably due to Julius Drachsler who studied the marriage records of Manhattan and Bronx of New York City 1908-1912. *Interracial Marriage in New York City* (New York, 1921), pp.18-9.


when ethnic group relations have reached a deeper, more intimate, level than economic accommodation, and that intermarriage greatly increases the frequency and intimacy of contacts with the host society. While these assumptions are true in many cases, some special studies have shown important deviations. Richardson, for example, studied ten intermarried couples and contrasted them with ten in-married couples; the results led him to maintain that, because of friction at home, at least some intermarriages "were more likely to slow down the rate of assimilation than to increase it". Again, Mapstone, in his study of the Greek Macedonian community in Shepparton, Victoria, found that a British-Australian girl who married a Greek-Macedonian adapted so much to the Macedonian community that she represented acculturation in reverse, so showing that one cannot always assume, as many scholars do, that it is the marriage partner from the minority group who becomes acculturated to the host group. Again, Glazer and Moynihan pointed out that intermarriages occurring between different religious groups did not weaken religious identity, but often resulted in an increase

1 For example, this assumption was made in J. Zubrzycki's *Polish Immigrants in Britain* (The Hague, 1956), pp.159-60.


in the number of one of the groups. In short, the relationship between intermarriage and assimilation depends on the coherence of the migrant group, on their numbers, and on the isolation of the migrant from his or her ethnic group.

Although there is no agreement among scholars on the exact strength of intermarriage as a measurement of 'assimilation' there is, however, a general recognition that intermarriage is an important aspect which needs special treatment; witness the numerous articles and books on this subject. In the case of Chinese migrants in Australia where the migrant group has noticeably distinct features, intermarriage represents a significant stage in the assimilation process.

Before presenting the marriage patterns of the Chinese in Melbourne, a word is necessary on the problems involved in the calculations of the indices. Most studies make use of relatively simple proportions, such as the proportion of intermarriages to total marriages

---


3 For a list of American studies before 1950, see bibliography notes to August Hollingshead's article, "Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates" American Sociological Review 15 (Oct 1950); pp.619-627.
within nationality or birthplace groups,\(^1\) while others use more complicated measures such as the H homogamy index.\(^2\) Both devices have been shown to have weaknesses in: 1) differentiating birthplace or nationality groupings from ethnic groupings; 2) differentiating sociological generations from birthplace generations (e.g. foreign-born who migrate as children and behave as native-born); and 3) in identifying the actual population at risk of intermarriage.\(^3\) While the first and the second difficulties do not arise with the Chinese in Melbourne, because ethnic

---

1 For a critique of these proportions, see C.A.Price and J. Zubrzycki, op.cit.

2 The H homogamy index = \( \frac{(AB)(ab) = (Ab)(aB)}{\sqrt{(a)(b)(A)(B)}} \)

where (AB), (ab), (a) etc. are derived from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridegroom</th>
<th>Bride</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Native-born</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>(AB)</td>
<td>(aB)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>(Ab)</td>
<td>(ab)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3 C.A.Price and J. Zubrzycki, op.cit.
groupings and ages at arrival can be adequately identified, the third difficulty is real because fiancees coming to marry in Australia are not actually at risk of intermarriage and those Chinese men who make visits to Hong Kong, Singapore or elsewhere, have been at risk of intermarriage in Australia. These will be discussed later at relevant points.

Another limitation in the Melbourne Chinese survey is inherent in the sampling procedure. Because the construction of the sampling frame is by tracing Chinese surnames, Chinese females who have married non-Chinese and therefore carry no Chinese surnames are necessarily omitted from the sampling frame. This confines detailed discussions of intermarriages to males only, although it appears that the extent of intermarriage among foreign-born Chinese females is small.¹

¹ A rough index of intermarriage among Chinese females is constructed by counting, among daughters of Chinese families in the sample, the number who intermarried and the number who in-married. These married daughters are then divided into foreign-born and Australian-born. Only one out of fifteen (6.6 per cent) foreign-born daughters and eight out of eighteen (44.4 per cent) of the Australian-born daughters are intermarried. A low intermarriage ratio is also reported in Mary Hodgkin's study of Asian students in Western Australia where she noted that the number of Asian girls who have married Australians was small. "When Australians marry Asians", Quadrant, VII (Aug-Sept, 1964), p.19.

Conjugal Conditions and Types of Marriage

In an earlier chapter, we have shown from census data a great disparity between both the total number of Chinese males and females and the total number of married Chinese males and females. The survey shows that much of this marriage disparity arises from the many Chinese men with wives and families still in China. The high masculinity rate among the never-married ones reflects both the shortage of marriageable girls of Chinese origin in Australia and the time lag required to obtain a bride from Hong Kong or elsewhere.

In 1968, at the time of the survey, much of the discrepancy between females and males had disappeared, many of those arriving married had been joined by their wives and families, and many who had arrived single as adults had either married in Australia or visited China or Hong Kong to marry and returned with their brides.

The statistics of conjugal condition on arrival show that a large number of the Chinese in the sample, seventy-two out of the total 206 foreign-born males, arrived married. (See Table 7.1). A great proportion of these, in fact over half, are sponsored migrants. The majority, however, came as single males (134/206). Among these, 15 married abroad afterwards, four going to their native villages of Toishan, ten to Hong Kong and one to Indonesia. All four Toishan visits were made before the Communist government took control of China. Marriages in Australia among single arrivals and foreign-born Chinese females are of two kinds: marriage between males and females
uncommitted on arrival in Australia (25 cases), and marriages between single men already in Australia and their fiancees coming to Australia for the purpose of marriage (7 cases). Although the proportion of visit marriages and fiancee arrivals is small comparing with the total number of marriages for those who arrived single and subsequently married (22/80), they are, however, major ways to obtain spouses of Chinese origin. For the sponsored migrants, these two types of marriage constituted 41.1 per cent (21/51)\(^1\) of all marriages of those men arriving single. (See Table 7.1).

All marriage visits to China were completed before the end of the Second World War, 1945, and before the Communist Government became established in China. After that such trips were made to Hong Kong because some families from the same districts had taken refuge there, in a sense forming small district communities. Similarly, arrangements to bring fiancees to Australia were often made in Hong Kong. In the present sample, all seven fiancee arrivals were post-war arrangements through relatives in Hong Kong.

For those sponsored migrants who did not make marriage visits and did not arrange fiancees to come to Australia many married in Australia to foreign-born Chinese (17 cases), to Australian-born Chinese (3 cases) and to Australians (10 cases). Among the seven sponsored migrants who remarried in Australia, six married foreign-born Chinese and one married an Australian.

\(^1\) One of the seven who brought out fiancees was a war-time refugee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Marriage</th>
<th>Arriving Married</th>
<th>Arriving Single</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not remarrying in Australia</td>
<td>Remarrying in Australia</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Married in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students &amp; Professionals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> FBC = Foreign-born Chinese.
<sup>b</sup> ABC = Australian-born Chinese.
<sup>c</sup> Five to Australians, three to Australian-born Chinese, and five to foreign-born Chinese.
The proportion of remarriages among the war-time refugees is higher than that of the sponsored, having six out of the total twenty refugees remarrying: one to a foreign-born Chinese, two to Australian-born Chinese, and three to Australians. Among those refugees who arrived single and married in Australia, four married foreign-born Chinese, two Australian-born Chinese and one Australian.

The non-sponsored students and professionals, however, have a different pattern with a much larger proportion arriving single (22/26), and among those who married in Australia, a high proportion married Australians.

One method, developed by C.A. Price, of measuring the degree of intermarriage in any community is to assume complete fluidity between the constituent groups, calculate the chances of intermarriage in such a situation, and then compare these chances with the actual number of intermarriages which occur. This method has the advantage

1 C.A. Price, "Italian Population at Griffith" (unpublished manuscript, Department of Demography, The Australian National University, 1955).

2 If in a community, the distribution of available females from origin A.B.C. and D are in the proportions of 10:40:30:20 respectively, the chances of any one male marrying in this community, under the assumption of fluidity, will be: 10 per cent into group A, 40 per cent into B, 30 per cent into C and 20 per cent into D. The actual distribution of married males in, say, group A may be as follows: 10 per cent into females of group A, 30 per cent into B, 30 per cent into C, and 30 per cent into D. By comparing the actual distribution with the expected distribution, we find that males of group A marry into group A and D as much as expected, less than expected to group B and more than expected into group D.
of allowing for groups of different sizes. Obviously, the smaller the groups, the lesser the chance of anyone marrying into it simply because of the small numbers, and therefore the greater the chance for members of this small group to marry out. By comparing the actual numbers of intermarriage with the chances, this factor is then allowed for.

Applying this method to the Chinese in Melbourne, the following results are obtained:
TABLE 7.2
TENDENCY TO MARRY IN OR OUT OF OWN BIRTHPLACE
GROUP, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968

A) MALES MARRYING IN AUSTRALIA PLUS VISIT MARRIAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace of Available Females</th>
<th>Other 4-Toishan</th>
<th>Other Kwang-tung</th>
<th>Other Foreign</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>Australian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toishan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 4 Districts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Kwang-tung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Foreign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) Assumes that females are distributed according to the distribution of the males marrying in the four districts.
a visit marriages are included because these males have actually been exposed to the risk of intermarrying in Australia, although they took the alternative to make marriage trips.

b Females available are estimated as follows:

Foreign-born Chinese females are those who married in Australia minus fiancee arrivals because fiancees have not been exposed to the risk of marriage. The number of foreign-born Chinese females who married Australians is estimated to be 2 assuming that they all came from "other Kwang-tung" area, using the rough intermarriage ratio estimated by counting the population of daughters who married out. (See footnote 1, page 227).

Australian-born Chinese females are those who married foreign-born and Australian-born Chinese plus an estimated 27 who married Australians. (See footnote 1, page 243).

Australian females are those who married Chinese, (both foreign-born and Australian-born).

c ABC = Australian-born Chinese.
## B) FEMALES MARRYING IN AUSTRALIA MINUS FIANCÉE ARRIVALS

### Birthplace of Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace of Males</th>
<th>Toishan</th>
<th>Other 4-Districts</th>
<th>Other Kwang-tung</th>
<th>Other Foreign</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males Available</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chances(c)</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toishan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 4 Districts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Kwang-tung</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Foreign</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%/c</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiancée arrivals are excluded because they have not been exposed to the risk of intermarriage in Australia.

Males available are estimated as follows:

Foreign-born Chinese males are those who married in Australia plus those who made marriage trips because they have been exposed to the risk of marriage in Australia.

Australian-born Chinese males are all those who married.

Australian males are those who married foreign-born Chinese (estimated 2) and Australian-born Chinese (estimated 27).

ABC = Australian-born Chinese.

The Tables, 7.2 A and B, show the marriage behaviour of those male and female Chinese who came to Australia single and married after some period of time (i.e. those who had the opportunity to marry outside of their own group) and the Australian-born Chinese males and females who married in Australia. The rows headed by "% / c" in each birthplace group represent the actual proportion divided by the chance : 100 is where the number of actual marriage equals expected, less than 100 means less than expected, more than 100 means more than expected.

It is clear from the above tables that, for both males and females, most groups tended to marry back into their own groups.

First consider the males (Table 7.2A) : The in-marriage tendency is strong among the Toishan and 'Other Four District' groups, and is weaker among the remaining groups. The Toishan males, for example, show the strongest in-marriage tendency in spite of the small number of Toishan females.
available; the discrepancy between the number of available Toishan females in Melbourne and the number of Toishan wives in the sample is due to the large number of Toishan men who made marriage trips to China, Hong Kong or elsewhere to obtain wives, most of whom were of Toishan origin. Many of the fiancee arrivals, too, were Toishan females. In the present sample, nine of the total fifteen marriage visits were made by Toishan men who brought out wives of Toishan origin, and five of the total seven fiancee arrivals were Toishan females. Even so, only half of the Toishan men have found Toishan wives.

The 'Other Four District' groups, of whom twelve out of seventeen were Sunwui men, did not marry as frequently through marriage-visits and through introducing fiancees as the Toishan group. Also partly because of the small number of Sunwui females available, only 58.8 per cent of the Sunwui men have found Sunwui wives. The other foreign-born males ('Other Kwangtung and 'Other Foreign') exhibit a very different pattern. While the tendency to marry into their own groups is still evident though not as strong as the Toishan and 'Other Four-District' groups, there is also a tendency to marry Australians. This pattern is also true of the Australian-born Chinese.

Now consider the females (Table 7.2B): The small number of foreign-born Chinese females who married in Australia, in total 30, makes interpretation difficult. However, the tendency to marry into one's own group is evident again in the Toishan and 'Other Four-District' groups. The 'Other Kwangtung' and 'Other Foreign-born' females have tended to marry more than expected to Australian men.
Intermarriages between Australians and Chinese have to be discussed more carefully, first, because the large proportion of intermarried males were born in 'Other Kwangtung' and 'Other Foreign' areas and it is known that these include many non-sponsored students and refugees. Secondly, it is important to discuss the two types of intermarriage ratios which are constructed to measure different aspects of the intermarriage patterns - Ratios A and B.¹

Ratio A is the number of intermarriages divided by the number of all marriages existing in a particular group and is appropriate to measure the extent of intermarriage among an ethnic group at any given moment of time.² Ratio B is the number of intermarriages contracted in a particular area divided by the total number of all marriages contracted in that area for any particular group. When Ratio B is adjusted for females who arrive as fiancées and for males who marry through visit marriages,³ this ratio is called Ratio B (t), the suffix (t) denotes a true value for all those having been exposed to the risk of intermarriage. This Ratio, then, "outlines the marriage pattern of those who have settled as single persons sufficiently long to have some opportunity for marrying outside their ethnic grouping; i.e. who have been exposed to the risk of intermarriage."⁴

¹ C.A. Price and J. Zubrzycki, op.cit.  
² Ibid., p.67.  
³ Ibid., pp.64-5.  
The intermarriage Ratios A and B are presented below for comparison between these three migrant groups.

**TABLE 7.3**

**INTERMARRIAGE RATIOS FOR MIGRANT TYPES**

**MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968 (N = 152)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant Types</th>
<th>Total No of Marriages</th>
<th>Total No. of Marriages in Australia plus Visit Marriages</th>
<th>Total No. of Inter-Marriages</th>
<th>Ratio A %</th>
<th>Ratio B(t) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War-time Refugee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sponsored student and Profesionals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>All figures including re-marriages.

<sup>b</sup>including 1 re-marriage.

<sup>c</sup>including 4 re-marriages.

All of the intermarriages (31 cases, including 5 cases of remarriage) were contracted in Australia, and except one, all in Melbourne. Judging merely by the number of intermarriages as a proportion of total marriages (Ratio A) in the sample of foreign-born males, intermarriage between Chinese and Australians is high, 20.4 per cent, i.e. the intermarried
element is numerically important in the total Chinese population. All those arriving married were married to foreign-born Chinese. If these marriages were excluded from the calculation, the intermarriage ratio, now resembling intermarriage ratio $B(t)$, will increase to $31/93$ or 33.3 per cent.

But mere proportions of inter-marriage may mislead one into premature conclusions concerning the exact implications to the nature of Chinese settlement. Table 7.3 reveals that 20 out of 31 intermarried husbands are non-sponsored. That is, they have entered Australia as non-sponsored students (15 cases) and war-time refugees (five cases including four re-marriages) and not through the traditional system.

If only the sponsored migrants are considered, the intermarriage ratio $A$ will drop to 10.4 per cent which is only about half of the figure obtained when the non-sponsored students, professionals, and refugees are included. On the other hand, if the non-sponsored students, professionals and the refugees are considered separately, they exhibit much higher intermarriage ratio. For the non-sponsored students and professionals, the ratio is 57.7 per cent which is significantly higher than the traditional sponsored migrants.¹ The ratio for the private student is actually biased. Only a minor proportion of non-sponsored students stayed in Australia after their studies and some stayed precisely because they were married

¹ Test of significance: $X^2 = 29.79$, df = 1, p < .001.
to Australians. Their ratio is necessarily inflated. For the refugees, the ratio is 25 per cent which is slightly but not significantly higher than that for the sponsored migrants.¹

In terms of B ratios which measure the intermarriage tendency of those exposed to the risk of intermarriage, the ratio among sponsored migrants rises by 8.6 per cent to 19.0 per cent; among war-time refugees, by 13.5 per cent to 38.5 per cent; among non-sponsored students and professionals, by 10.5 per cent to 68.2 per cent.

From the above discussion, it can be seen that, among the sponsored migrants, the tendency to intermarry is not particularly high. Borrie, for example, reported 14 per cent of Italian-born men marrying Australian-born women in Queensland in 1951.² Many migrant groups from Southern Europe have exhibited similar intermarriage ratios.³

---

¹ Test of Significance: \( \chi^2 = 3.50, \text{df} = 1, .05 < p < .10 \).

² W.D. Borrie, Italians and Germans in Australia (Melbourne 1954), p.84.

³ C.A. Price and J. Zubrzycki calculated A ratios (birthplace) for Greek and Italian men: Greek, 8 per cent; Italian, 12 per cent. "Immigrant Marriage Pattern in Australia", op.cit., p.126.
Intermarriage Among Australian-born Chinese

Australian-born Chinese males show a much larger tendency to intermarry. In the sample of 61 married Australian-born Chinese males, 35 were full Chinese and 26 were part-Chinese. The distribution of these 61 married males by types of marriage is shown below for full and part-Chinese.

**TABLE 7.4**

*Types of Marriage Among Australian-born Chinese Males, Full and Part-Chinese, Melbourne Survey 1968 (N = 61)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Full-Chinese marrying</th>
<th>Part-Chinese marrying</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born Chinese</td>
<td>10 27.8</td>
<td>3 12.0</td>
<td>13 21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born Chinese</td>
<td>12 33.3</td>
<td>1 4.0</td>
<td>13 21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born part-Chinese</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
<td>2 8.0</td>
<td>3 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Chinese Australian</td>
<td>13 36.1</td>
<td>19 76.0</td>
<td>32 52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 100.0</td>
<td>25 100.0</td>
<td>61 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the total Australian-born Chinese males (including both full and part-Chinese) the proportion intermarried is high, 32/61 or 52.4 per cent.\(^1\) This is less than the biased non-sponsored student-professional ratio of 57.7 per cent but is significantly higher than that of the war-time refugees (25 per cent)\(^2\) and still higher than that of the sponsored migrants (10.4 per cent).\(^3\)

If a comparison is made within the Australian-born between the full-Chinese and the part-Chinese, we find that full-Chinese show a much greater tendency to in-marry, about one-third marrying foreign-born full-Chinese, and another one-third marrying Australian-born full-Chinese, giving an intermarriage ratio of 36.1 per cent as contrasted to a ratio of 76.0 per cent among the part-Chinese.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) The proportion of intermarriages among the Australian-born Chinese females is estimated by assuming that the proportion of married to single persons is the same for both Australian-born males and females. From the survey it is known that this proportion is .37 (61/163) and that the number of single Australian-born females is 168; if the assumption is correct, the number of married Australian-born Chinese females is about 62. We know also that the total number of Australian-born females married to Chinese males is 35, including 8 divorced or widowed, leaving a balance of 27 married females who could be married to non-Chinese. On this assumption, the female inter-marriage ratio among Australian-born is 27/62 or 43.5 per cent. This estimate is not different from the previous estimates, a ratio of 44.4 per cent, from counting daughters of Chinese families who are married. (See footnote 1, on page 227).

\(^2\) Test of Significance : \(\chi^2 = 4.58\), \(df = 1\), \(.02 < p < .05\).

\(^3\) Test of Significance : \(\chi^2 = 21.48\), \(df = 1\), \(p < .001\).

\(^4\) Test of Significance : \(\chi^2 = 9.47\), \(df = 1\), \(.001 < p < .01\),
The relatively high ratio of intermarriage among part-Chinese is not unexpected; being children of mixed marriages, they are not subjected to disapproval from parents about marrying into the larger society; and having Australian mothers, their up-bringing and education have usually been oriented away from the Chinese community. This very largely explains why so few have married back into the Chinese community by choosing a Chinese spouse. In the Melbourne sample, only four part-Chinese men have married full-Chinese females, three being foreign-born daughters of wealthy merchant families who arrived at an early age, younger than twelve. In terms of 'sociological' generations,¹ these foreign-born females may be treated as second generation. The data concerning Australian-born Chinese females is less complete; but judging from the small numbers who married Chinese men (both foreign-born and Australian-born), it suggests that a large proportion have married Australians. This appears to be particularly true for the part-Chinese females.

Interval Between Arrival of Husbands and Wives

The importance of in-district marriage in fostering the solidarity of the Chinese community lies in the actual arrival of the wives and dependants. Indeed, the traditional Chinese community would probably not have survived had the wives and dependants not come to join their

¹ C.A. Price and J. Zubrzycki, "The Use of Inter-marriage Statistics as an index for Assimilation", op.cit., 61-3.
husbands and fathers. The remarriage of some Chinese separated from their families for long periods to other persons, often non-Chinese, and the pre-war weakening of many of the Chinese associations show the dangers here. The post-war influx of non-sponsored students, being different in nature, did not give much new strength to the declining community. But the arrival of wives and dependants after the Second World War gave a new impetus to the Chinese community, changing it from a dying male settlement to a young and more vigorous community. This section discusses the interval between the arrival of husbands and wives and its demographic consequences; the next chapter deals more specifically with sociological aspects of community activities and organizational participation.

The sex composition and conjugal condition on arrival of the foreign-born Chinese reveal the pattern of rapid family reunion.

1 The organizational aspects of the Chinese community in relation to their integration into the Australian society will be discussed in the next chapter.
## Chapter 7.5

Conjugal Conditions on Arrival by Period of Arrival, Foreign-Born Males and Females, Melbourne Survey 1968 (N = 367)

(A) Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Arrival</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed etc.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957-68</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 &amp; before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Arrival</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed etc.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957-68</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 &amp; before</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The periods of arrival are divided according to significant periods of Chinese migration; 1940-46 = war-time refugee arrivals; 1947-56 = assistant entries; 1957-68 = the beginning of wife and dependant arrivals.

The majority of the foreign-born Chinese in the sample arrived after the Second World War. Post-1947 arrivals constitute 88.2 per cent of the total male arrivals and 86.9 per cent of the total female arrivals. Sixty per cent of the females arrived after 1956 when the right of
naturalization was granted to the Chinese, while only 27 per cent of the males came in this period. For the period after 1956, female arrivals almost doubled.

Conjugal conditions on arrival for the males and females were very different for the recent periods 1947-56 and 1957-68. Forty out of 65 married men (61.5 per cent) arrived during 1947-56; this proportion decreased to 10.8 per cent in 1957-68.\(^1\) Married female arrivals, however, were more concentrated in the 1957-68 period during which 66.2 per cent (45/68) arrived.

The relaxation of naturalization regulations regarding Chinese migrants, by enabling the reunion of long separated families, certainly influenced the above pattern. But other factors are also important. The establishment of the Communist Chinese government in 1949 made it more difficult for Chinese to emigrate, at first because China had a tighter emigration control and later because the major outlet of Chinese emigrants, Hong Kong, adopted in 1956 a policy of restricting Chinese entry.\(^2\) After 1956, Chinese in Australia faced four difficulties in introducing their wives from China: the saving of enough money for the trip, the long period of waiting for naturalization in

---

1 Proportions across the rows, i.e. proportions of married among all arrivals in each period, are not used because of their dependance on single arrivals.

2 The numbers permitted to enter Hong Kong from China was determined by the numbers who departed from Hong Kong to China. *Hong Kong Government, Hong Kong Annual Report 1956*, p. 5-6; *ibid.*, 1957, p. 235.
Australia; the great difficulty in obtaining an exit permit from China for their wives; and the delay in obtaining an entry permit into Hong Kong. The Melbourne survey shows the effects of these difficulties.

**TABLE 7.6**

*INTERVAL BETWEEN ARRIVAL OF HUSBAND AND WIFE BY PERIOD OF ARRIVAL OF HUSBAND, FOR MARRIAGES CONTRACTED OUTSIDE AUSTRALIA, FOREIGN-BORN ONLY, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968 (N = 87).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Separation</th>
<th>Before 1940</th>
<th>1940-46</th>
<th>1947-56</th>
<th>After 1956</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Years of Separation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before 1940</th>
<th>1940-46</th>
<th>1947-56</th>
<th>After 1956</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Wife not in Australia | 1 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 20 |
| Re-married in Australia | 1 | 8 | 4 | - | 13 |

**Grand total**

| 13 | 16 | 52 | 6 | 87 |
In the Melbourne survey, slightly less than one-quarter (20/87) of the foreign-born husbands who married outside Australia did not have their wives with them. Fifteen of these were over fifty years of age. Only two of these wives were, at the time of the survey, in Hong Kong preparing to come to Melbourne, the rest being still in China with little chance of emigration. Only nine of the 87 men migrated with their wives, or arrived in the same year, of which five were visit marriages contracted after 1960. This contrasts with the Carlton Italians, one-fifth of whom migrated as family units.¹

Forty-five came ahead of their wives, the average interval being 13.0 years. The average interval, including those arriving with their wives, was 11.0 years. More specifically, sixteen out of eighty-seven (18.2 per cent) of the wives arrived after three years separation. Even by the nineth year of separation, only 27.6 per cent (24/87) of all wives were reunited with their husbands. This interval is long when compared with Borrie's 1951 Queensland sample of Italians,² and is extremely long if compared with Jones' 1960 sample of Italians in Carlton.³


² W.D. Borrie, op.cit., p.87. The Queensland sample showed that 60 per cent of all wives were united with their husbands by the end of the nineth year of separation.

³ F.L. Jones, op.cit., p.326, Table IX.4. The average interval is 3.77 years which is considerably lower than the Chinese average of 11.0 years (t = 5.192, df = 100 p < .001).
There is no significant difference in the interval of separation between the Toishans and Sunwuis - the two main groups among those who married outside Australia. Other birthplace groups are too small for meaningful comparison. The difference in the extent of separation, however, seems to lie in the time of arrival of the husband. As a general rule, those who arrived early had longer periods of separation than those who arrived recently, except the 1940-46 arrivals, which include twelve war-time refugees, who had the longest period of separation and the highest proportion of re-marriages. It is to those who arrived after the Second World War and particularly after 1956 that wives started to arrive in Australia within a reasonably short period of time.

It is not unusual that there is a time-lag between the arrivals of husbands and wives among migrant groups; in fact in describing the migration pattern of Southern Europeans to Australia, Price has noted that the bringing out of fiancees, wives and children is a vital stage in the process of settlement. What is significant, however, is the exceptionally long period of separation among the Chinese.

---

Age at Marriage Among Foreign-born Chinese

It is generally believed that, in pre-Communist China at least, age at marriage had traditionally been low. During the 1920's and 1930's when J.L. Buck did his extensive survey on land use in China, the average age at marriage (first marriages) was estimated at 20.5 years for males and 18.2 for females. There were slight geographical variations, ages at marriage in South China being higher, viz. 20.7 for males and 18.7 for females. Later studies showed a similar trend. So widespread were early marriages that Lang, writing in 1946, concluded that those clauses of the civil code prohibiting marriages of women under 16 and men under 18 were not observed. Conditions


2 Ibid.


in the Four Districts were not certain, but evidence which can be found in local gazetteers suggests that the trend of early marriages prevailed in Toishan and Hoiping, and probably also in Sunwui and Yanping.¹

There has been a significant rise in age at marriage since the 1930's partly because of the spread of education and urbanization and partly because of the communist government's periodic attempts to restrict births through encouraging late marriages.² However, there is little current data available from mainland China, although Hong Kong, which has received much of China's refugees, has shown a major postponement of marriages for both males and females, the average in the early sixties being apparently 28.8 for males and 23.7 for females.³

---

¹ Hsin-hui (Sunwui) Hsien Chih (Local Gazetteer for Sunwui District) (Reprinted Taipei, 1966), p.60 of reprint. Kai-ping (Hoiping) Hsien Chih (Local Gazetteer for Hoiping District) (Canton: 1932 edition) Vol. II, p.2. Both of these Gazetteers did not mention the specific ages around which marriages were usually contracted, although commented that early marriages were still common.


³ Estimates made by the Hong Kong Family Planning Association in "Hong Kong", Country Profile. (New York: The Population Council and the International Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction, November 1969) Irene Taeuber has shown, from the 1961 Hong Kong Census, that the percentages of single males was 56 per cent at ages 25-29, 27 per cent at ages 30-34; and for females 48.6 per cent at ages 20-24, 15.5 per cent at ages 25-29 and 6.0 per cent at ages 30-34. "Hong Kong: Migrants and Metropolis", Population Index 29 (January, 1963) p.17-8.
It is possible to compare this trend of early marriages in rural China with the results of the Melbourne survey. For the sample as a whole, the age at marriage of foreign-born Chinese is not abnormally high (25.9) if compared with the Victorian average of 25.3 for bachelors in 1967. It is, however, much higher than in pre-war rural China.

TABLE 7.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Marriage</th>
<th>Toishan Districts</th>
<th>Kwangtung</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 &amp; over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Age

Confidence Interval

Victorian Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>24.3</th>
<th>25.7</th>
<th>27.3</th>
<th>28.9</th>
<th>25.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>±1.63</td>
<td>±2.42</td>
<td>±1.52</td>
<td>±2.17</td>
<td>±0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excluding remarriages (13 cases) and age at marriage unknown (7 cases).

At .05 level of confidence.

Table 7.7 shows that there is a slight difference of average age at marriage between birthplace groups, the Toishan group showing the lowest while the 'All Others' group i.e. those not born in Kwangtung, the highest average. In the sample, those from Toishan and the Four Districts married at earlier ages than those not from the Four Districts, suggesting a plausible relationship between the size and duration of settlement on ages at marriage. However, partly because of the small numbers and partly because of the normal wide spread of ages at marriage, differences observed between other birthplace groups in the sample are not statistically significant.

Age at marriage, however, is closely associated with the type of marriage as shown in Table 7.8 below.

1 The difference between 'Toishan' and 'All Other' group is statistically significant: $t = 3.309$, $df = 67$, $0.001 < p < 0.01$.

2 The spread of ages at marriage among the Chinese is not different from the general Victorian population. The 1967 figures on ages at marriage in Victoria show 6.1% of the bridegrooms married at ages below 20 and 11.6% married after the age of 35. Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Victoria Office, Victoria Yearbook 1969, p.147.
### TABLE 7.8

**AGE AT MARRIAGE FOR FOREIGN-BORN CHINESE MALES BY TYPES OF MARRIAGE. MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968. (N = 132)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Marriage</th>
<th>Arriving Married</th>
<th>Fiancee Married Arrivals</th>
<th>Visit Marriage</th>
<th>Married in Australia to FBC</th>
<th>to ABC</th>
<th>Inter-Married</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 &amp; over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Age     | 23.2             | 28.2                     | 27.3           | 27.9                        | 29.0  | 27.8          | 25.9  |
| Confidence Interval | ±0.99          | ±3.15                    | ±2.99          | ±1.36                       | ±2.88 | ±1.32         | ±0.87 |

| Victorian Average | 25.3            |

---

*Excluding remarriages (13 cases) and age at marriage unknown (7 cases).

*FBC = Foreign-born Chinese.

*ABC = Australian-born Chinese.

*At .05 level of confidence.

In this sample, the average age at marriage for those married before emigrating is 23.2 years with 71.1 per cent (37/52) married by the age of 25. This age is higher than that reported by Buck and others for South China, partly because many such marriages were contracted when ages at marriages were beginning to rise in China. Indeed, if the nine marriages occurring after 1950 are excluded, the average age at marriage for these men drops to 22.9, i.e. close to the figure reported for rural China.
The significant finding concerning age at marriage is the large difference between those who arrived married and those who arrived single and either returned to marry or married in Australia. The range in age at marriage is considerable for all types, as evident in the confidence intervals shown in the above table, but the difference between those arriving married and those who return to marry is more than four years.\(^1\) Furthermore, comparisons with marriage contracted in Australia show even bigger differences for those married to foreign-born Chinese and those inter-married, and almost six years for those married to Australian-born Chinese.\(^2\)

The relatively high age at marriage for marriages contracted in Australia is by no means a phenomenon occurring only amongst the Chinese. Italians in Carlton area have shown similar, though less marked, high ages at marriage for those who married in Australia.\(^3\) But the great difference, on the average of more than four years, indicates a major postponement of marriage.

The postponement of marriage among females is less marked. For all types of marriages, the average age at marriage is 21.7 which is significantly lower than the Victorian average of 22.4 years.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Test of Significance: \(t = 3.253, \text{df} = 65, .001 < p < .01.\)

\(^2\) All of these differences are significant at the .001 level.

\(^3\) F.L.Jones, op.cit., p.334,Table XI.7. The average age at marriage for Italians who migrated single and married later fluctuated from 32.2 (return marriages) and 26.3 (proxy-marriages) according to types of marriage. The average age at marriage for those who migrated after marriage was 26.0 years.

\(^4\) Test of significance : \(t = 2.079, \text{df} = 98, p < .05.\)
TABLE 7.9

AGE AT MARRIAGE FOR FOREIGN-BORN CHINESE
FEMALES BY TYPES OF MARRIAGE, MELBOURNE
SURVEY 1968 (N = 99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Marriage</th>
<th>Married Prior to Husbands' Emigration</th>
<th>Married in Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married in Husbands' Returning</td>
<td>Fiancées Arrivals</td>
<td>FBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40c</td>
<td>14d</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Age 21.8 23.6 20.8 22.3 23.5 21.7
Confidence Intervals ±1.03 ±2.03 ±1.34 ±0.85 ±2.00 ±.69
Victorian Average 22.4

a Foreign-born Chinese.
b Australian-born Chinese.
c Excluding 19 wives still in China (one in Hong Kong).
d Excluding one wife still in Hong Kong.

A major proportion of women (78.8 per cent) in all types of marriages were married before 25 years of age; very few married between the ages 25 and 29, and almost none at age 30 and over. The youngest of all types of marriages is fiancée arrivals - 20.8 years. Because of the relatively
small numbers in each type of marriage none of these age-at-marriage comparisons are statistically significant. Nevertheless, overall, there is significantly less postponement of female marriages than male.

Interval between Arrival and Marriage

The reasons for postponement of marriage by Chinese males arriving single are many and complex. First are the obstacles imposed by the migration process - notably the years needed for settlement, naturalization, and the saving of enough money for marriage. Second is the marked surplus of males. Third is the time needed for single males to become sufficiently well acquainted with non-Chinese girls to propose marriage. All these force Chinese migrants to remain single for relatively long periods. The following analysis of the interval between arrival and marriage shows the extent of this delay (excluding 39 males aged less than 21 and 26 females aged less than 19 on arrival, as their arrival-marriage intervals are affected by age as well as other factors).

1 The closest to statistical significance at the .05 level is the comparison between fiancee-arrivals and return-marriages: Test of Significance: \( t = 1.73, \text{df} = 19, .05 < p < .10. \)

2 The overall difference of age at marriage between foreign-born males and females is 4.2 years and is statistically significant at the .001 level.
Similar to, and even more than, the distribution of ages at marriage, the spread of the interval between arrival and marriage is very wide. For the males, in total, few married within three years of arrival, in fact only $3/81$ or 7.3 per cent. Some, $4/81$ or 9.8 per cent, married after 14 years of arrival. But the majority, $28/81$ or 68.3 per cent, married within four to nine years of arrival, making the overall average for males 7.4 years.

In the sample, there is some difference in the arrival-marriage interval between birthplace groups. The Toishan husbands experienced the shortest length of interval between arrival and marriage and the 'Other Four Districts' group almost as short. All groups outside the traditional migration area experienced relatively longer intervals, notably those from 'Other Kwangtung'.

### TABLE 7.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval in Years</th>
<th>Toishan</th>
<th>Other Four Districts</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Other Kwangtung</th>
<th>All Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Interval: 7.0
Confidence Interval: $±2.48$

Average: 7.2, 7.8, 8.2, 8.8, 7.4
Confidence: $±2.20$, $±1.70$, $±2.62$, $±2.83$, $±1.17$
B: Females arriving aged 19 and over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval in Years</th>
<th>Toishan</th>
<th>Four Districts</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Kwangtung</th>
<th>All Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Interval 0.4 1.7 2.2 1.7 2.0 1.5
Confidence Interval $^a$ ± .43 ±2.44 ± .96 ±1.92 ±1.96 ± .78

$^a$ At .05 level of confidence.

and 'All Other' areas. There is little difference in this interval between types of marriages, except female fiancees arriving to marry in Melbourne. Neither is this interval associated with the occupations of the husbands or the year of their arrival.$^1$ Generalization outside the Melbourne sample is difficult in view of the small numbers and the large confidence intervals (Table 7.10), but it appears that the time needed to find a suitable spouse after arrival depends mainly on the settlement of each of these birthplace groups. When the group is large and has long settled in a particular area as are the Toishan migrants and 'Other Four Districts' migrants in Melbourne, it is

---

$^1$ The tables relating intervals between arrival and marriage to types of marriage, to occupations of husbands, and to years of arrival of husbands, are not presented here; but this interval is found not to be associated with any of these characteristics.
more likely that members of the group will be able to find suitable spouses in a shorter period of time than if they were isolated from the main migrant group. The importance of the duration and size of settlement among village and district concentration is shown again in the arrival-marriage interval as it was shown in the previous section concerning types of marriages.

The major finding concerning the arrival-marriage interval lies in the contrast of males and females. For the Chinese females, the interval is short. Fiancée arrivals (not shown in Table), naturally, married either in the same year of arrival or in the next. This partly explains the relatively short interval (0.4 years) of the Toishan women, for four out of the five Toishan women came as fiancées. Apart from the Hong Kong group which has a distinctly long interval period, the other birthplace groups have shown a moderate interval of 1.5 to 2 years, making an overall average of arrival-marriage interval for all foreign-born Chinese women marrying in Australia 1.5 years. This average for the women is 5.9 years shorter, and significantly so, than the 7.4 years average for men.¹

It is clear, then, that there are various reasons for this major postponement of marriage among male Chinese migrants. First, many of the single Chinese migrants arrived at a relatively high age. Secondly, they have often experienced economic and social difficulties at home, which partly motivated their emigration, and these

¹ Test of significance, $t = 8.112$, df = 58, $p < .001$.  

caused postponement of marriage. Thirdly, the long interval between arrival and marriage after they emigrated, which is partly caused by the time necessary to become settled and established and partly by scarcity of marriageable Chinese females in Melbourne, constitutes another reason why male Chinese migrants married at a high age. The Chinese women, however, experiencing a much shorter arrival-marriage interval, married at a much younger age.

### Age at Marriage Among Australian-born Chinese

Ages at marriage among Australian-born Chinese males are almost as high for foreign-born Chinese males arriving single and marrying later, this being true whether they marry foreign-born Chinese or Australian-born Chinese or non-Chinese. Moreover, this age is significantly higher than that of the population of Victoria in general.¹

---

¹ Test of significance: $t = 5.515$, $df = 60$, $p < .001$. 
TABLE 7.11
AGE AT MARRIAGE FOR AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHINESE
BY TYPES OF MARRIAGE, MALES AND FEMALES,
MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Marriage</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Age at Marriage</td>
<td>Confidence Interval</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Average Age at Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to FBC°</td>
<td>27.61 ± 2.40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.85 ± 2.85</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to ABCd</td>
<td>28.25 ± 2.20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.00 ± 1.53</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-married</td>
<td>28.65 ± 2.26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Marriages</td>
<td>28.31 ± 1.06</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.34 ± 1.43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Average</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Including 3 part-Chinese
b Including 5 part-Chinese
c Foreign-born Chinese
d Australian-born Chinese
e No Data.
The Australian-born Chinese females, however, married much younger than the males, at around 22 years of age. Again, here, there is almost no difference between those who married foreign-born Chinese or Australian-born Chinese. This age at marriage is similar to the Victorian average of 22.4 in 1967 for spinsters, and shows that the pattern of postponement of marriage among Australian-born Chinese is the same as that among foreign-born Chinese who married after emigration; that is, it occurs mainly to men and not to women. This is not unexpected because in the Melbourne Chinese community where single males greatly outnumber females, women tend to marry much younger than men.
Summary

This discussion of marriage patterns among Chinese in Melbourne has shown the importance of the village and district of origin in influencing the choice of marriage partners. Among foreign-born Chinese who married other foreign-born Chinese, in-district marriages dominate. Out-district marriages are rare, and appear to be largely the absorption of the non-Four-District males into the non-Chinese population and the females into the Australian-born Chinese population. The size and duration of settlement of each birthplace group appear to be an important factor which affected the interval between arrival and marriage. The importance of the origin of migrants can also be seen in their tendency to intermarry with Australians. The sponsored migrants, being members of well-established groups in Melbourne, out-marry less than the Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysian non-sponsored students and war-time refugees whose migration was unconnected with the traditional sponsorship system. Here, educational attainment and the ability to use English are involved. Obviously, the private students, not only being separate from the core group of traditional migrants, but also more highly educated are more familiar with Australian society. It is not possible to separate these two factors in the present discussion of inter-marriage. The large amount of inter-marriage among Australian-born Chinese, especially among part-Chinese, indicates that assimilation occurs with the second generation much more rapidly than with the first generation.
The analysis of age at marriage shows major postponement among foreign-born males who arrived single but no postponement among foreign-born females, a fact which is commonly found in migrant communities where the sex-ratio is highly favourable to the males, and where the migrants toil and work to establish for themselves normal livelihood.

The pattern of assimilation through intermarriage is clear, especially among the Australian-born. Under present conditions in China, much more emigration from the traditional areas of the Four Districts is not likely. This, together with the immigration restriction placed on Chinese assistants and substitutes, will weaken the Toishan and Sunwui groups in the future thereby causing more rapid assimilation. It will be discussed in the next chapter that the arrival of wives and dependants since World War II have so far helped foster the solidarity of the Chinese community in Melbourne. However, most of the separated families have been rejoined and those wives who are still in China are not likely to be able to emigrate. It seems that the next major development in the Chinese community in Melbourne is the increase of the second-generation Chinese and their effect on the Chinese community as a whole.
CHAPTER VIII

CHINESE SETTLEMENT IN MELBOURNE III:

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Education and Language
Participation in Community and Social Organisations
Friendship Patterns
Summary
Having dealt with the occupation, residence and marriage of the Melbourne Chinese, we now turn to the problems of education and community activities. The analysis will be limited to heads of households (N = 215) because during the interviews questions of opinion were asked of them only.

Education and Language

The majority of the Chinese migrants arrived as adults; apart from the private students and some who arrived young and received mostly Australian education, most of them had little training in English, although 88.2 per cent have had some formal education in China.

Only 22 of the total 144 foreign-born heads of households can be classified as not being able to communicate in English at all, while about the same number (23) can be judged as capable of speaking excellent English. The majority, however, fall between these limits.

The ability to speak English, as given in Table 8.1, appears to depend on whether or not the migrant received any Australian education. Thus, those who were classified as being able to speak 'excellent' English have largely been through Australian educational institutions, while only 24.6 per cent of those who spoke English fairly well have been educated in Australia. Only one in each of the 'poor'

---

1 Ninety out of 144 foreign-born heads of households arrived at age 21 and over.
TABLE 8.1
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY LEVEL AND PLACE OF EDUCATION FOR FOREIGN-BORN HEADS OF
HOUSEHOLDS ONLY, MELBOURNE, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968 (N=144).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency a</th>
<th>Technical College, University and Above</th>
<th>School Leaving</th>
<th>Some Secondary School</th>
<th>Primary School Graduate</th>
<th>Some Primary School</th>
<th>No Formal Education</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23 16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61 42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38 26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Communicate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>144 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australian Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency a</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Communicate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Ability to speak English was judged by the author during interviews. Those who spoke 'excellent' English are those who carried out the whole interview in English; those who spoke 'fair' English are those who understood the questions but needed some help in Chinese to answer them. Those who spoke poorly are those who could not understand sociological questions put to them but could manage day-to-day conversation. Those who cannot communicate are those who understand no English at all, except perhaps a few words.
and 'can't communicate' categories have had some Australian education, and then only for less than a year.

But the ability to speak English also depends on the level of education - those who are more highly educated are more likely to speak English well. Thus, among technical college and university educated Chinese, 17 out of 28 or 60.7 per cent spoke 'excellent' English; among those who finished school leaving, the percentage drops to 23.5 per cent, and to 10.0 per cent (2/20) for those who only had some secondary school, and none for those who are less educated than secondary schools.

Also significant is the relation between English proficiency and birthplace. This is, of course, partly because some of those born in Hong Kong or South-east Asian countries have received part of their education in bilingual schools before coming to Australia, and partly because many of them have come to Australia for higher education. A reasonable standard of English is a prerequisite for being accepted into Australian educational institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toishan Sunwui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Communicate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Melbourne sample shows that only three out of a total 82 born in Toishan, Sunwui and other Four Districts can be described as being able to speak 'excellent' English, while for those born in Hong Kong, other China and South-east Asia, the proportion is very much larger, 20 out of 62 or 32.3 per cent. A large number of the Four District migrants spoke 'poor' English and a sizeable number cannot communicate in English at all. This is not the case with those born elsewhere.

One other factor which influences the chance of learning English is the recent arrivals of wives and dependants from Hong Kong and China; this encourages the persistence of Chinese in the home. The Melbourne survey shows that in the homes of those foreign-born Chinese who did not intermarry, the overwhelming majority used Chinese as a medium of communication between husbands and wives. But countering the influence of the recently arrived wives is the relative ease with which the children adopt English as their natural language. It matters little whether or not these children were born in Australia as long as they arrived early in their school years. Being enrolled in Australian schools where instructions are given only in English and in which Australian children are usually a majority, these Chinese children rapidly become bilingual, using Chinese extensively only at home. Complaints were often heard from parents that their children were not using Chinese as much as they wished. In fact, the introduction of English into Chinese homes is mainly through the children. This constitutes one of the most powerful factors in influencing the parents to learn English. Table 8.3 shows that a sizeable proportion of the parents tend to use English as well as Chinese, and some use only English to their children,
although they themselves ordinarily converse in Chinese.

**TABLE 8.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between</th>
<th>Mostly English</th>
<th>English and Chinese Interchangeably</th>
<th>Mostly Chinese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband and Wife</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Children</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Children</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tendency of the children to use mostly English and to forget the Chinese language obviously worries most of the parents. Not only do they fear that relationship within the family may be unnecessarily strained by communication gaps, but they also think that the loss of Chinese is the first step in an irreversible process of losing all Chinese cultural traits, some of which they treasure highly. The need to preserve the Chinese language is recognised not only by foreign-born parents but by some Australian-born parents. The Chinese Christian Churches devote some time during their Sunday Schools to teach Chinese to students and the Chinese Citizens' Association (Chung-hua Kung-hui), in association with the Chinese Consulate, operates a half-day Sunday Chinese language school. Both the Churches and the Chinese Citizens' Association teach Cantonese Chinese. Since 1966, when
the number of Chinese children rapidly increased, due to the introduction of wives and dependants, the Chinese language school run by the Chinese Citizens' Association introduced a Chinese teacher (who spoke both Cantonese and Mandarin) from Taiwan to take charge of the school and to arrange social activities for the young. Although the attendance has been small - about 60 students - the effort points to the anxiety of the parents to keep the Chinese language alive.

Lack of ability to speak English is, at once, the cause and effect of the concentration in Chinese occupations among sponsored migrants. Having little English at the outset, the migrants' chances of learning English after arrival is largely handicapped by their isolation during their first years with Chinese employers. After they achieve legal and economic independance from their sponsors, they find themselves incapable of spreading into 'Australian' occupations partly because of educational and language barriers. This, together with the influence of their friends and relatives who find Chinese cafes and market stalls prosperous, causes them to remain within Chinese occupations.

This situation is largely reflected in response to questions on whether or not they think it desirable and difficult to move away from 'Chinese' occupations.
### TABLE 8.4

**Opinion on the Desirability and Difficulty to Move Away from Chinese Occupations for Self and for Children, by English Proficiency, for Heads of Households Who are in 'Chinese' Occupations, Melbourne Survey 1968**

(N = 115)^a

(A) For Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency</th>
<th>Undesirable &amp; Possible</th>
<th>Undesirable &amp; Difficult</th>
<th>Desirable &amp; Possible</th>
<th>Desirable Difficult</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Communicate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) For Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency</th>
<th>Undesirable &amp; Possible</th>
<th>Undesirable &amp; Difficult</th>
<th>Desirable &amp; Possible</th>
<th>Desirable Difficult</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Communicate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>20b</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^a) excluding 19 whose opinions were not stated.

^b) including 18 single households and those without children.
On the question of desirability, a majority (71/115 or 61.7 per cent) thought it was desirable to leave 'Chinese' occupations, but among these the overwhelming majority (65/71 or 91.6 per cent) saw very little chance of being able to do so. Even among those who spoke 'poor' English or 'can't communicate' in English, a large proportion still hope to move to 'Australian' occupations, although here again they do not entertain much hope. The reasons for this are clear. On the one hand, the long hours of work in the cafes or the early hours and very irregular income of the vegetable retail business, are not very attractive to those who have longed for some family life and have finally arranged for their wives and children to join them. On the other hand, their educational and language training prevent them from finding other non-Chinese employments which have as large an income as the cafes and market retail stalls.¹ This is also the reason for some thinking it undesirable to move away from Chinese occupations.

But the prospects these migrants hold for their children are very different. Having their children educated in Australian schools, they see little language and educational difficulties for their children. Many think that it is desirable and possible for their children to move to Australian occupations. Few wanted their children to carry on their small cafe business, irrespective of their own ability to speak English. A

¹ A question on income was not included in the questionnaire because it was thought that it would most probably be resented. On enquiry to different cafes, however, it was found that a turnover of $300-$400 per week for a lesser cafe was ordinary. Turnover amounts for major cafes varied but a cook in one of these cafes normally earns about $80-$100 per week. As a comparison, a lecturer in an Australian university earns a starting salary of about $120 per week.
typical feeling of this kind is well summarised by a lesser cafe owner who said:

I've never wanted to run a cafe; but what else can I do in this land. It is hard work, but the business is enough to support my family now that they are here. If I quit my cafe I will be at a loss what to do next. I can't speak English and I am too weak to be a labourer. Besides I'd rather work for myself...My children are now still in primary school and if they study hard, I hope they will become doctors or engineers or someone with some skill. I wouldn't like my children to be like me. (Schedule 115, 29 years old Toishan father of 4 children).

For the few who feel that even their children will find it difficult to enter Australian occupations, the explanation lies mainly in the fear that prejudice and discrimination will eventually prevent their children from being promoted into high positions. Even then, most of those who do not believe that there is equal treatment of the Chinese in Australia, agree on the positive value of education, often recognising it as the only way to raise oneself in Australian society.

The consideration of education and language then, points to one basic trend in the Melbourne Chinese community, namely, the strong emphasis placed by the parents on higher education and professional training for their children. It is partly because of this emphasis that a high proportion of the Australian-born Chinese have entered the professions.
Participation in Community and Social Organisations

Proficiency in the use of English, besides influencing their occupations and expectations on future advancements, is also an important determinant of their social participation in the Australian society. Many studies of migrant groups in Australia confirm the general assumption that the ability to converse adequately in English is a pre-requisite for participation in local activities. The Chinese in Melbourne conform to this pattern. It is, however, interesting to note that, except for a few, participation in Australian organizations is rare and limited to professional organizations, business organizations such as the Wholesale Fruiterers' Association, and the churches. The number who have joined sporting and social clubs is very small.


2 Among twenty-two who 'cannot communicate in English' none has joined any Australian organizations.
TABLE 8.5

PARTICIPATION IN AUSTRALIAN ORGANIZATIONS, BY PLACE OF BIRTH OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS. MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968 (N = 215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Social &amp; Total Participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toishan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunwui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 4-Districts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Asia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Foreign</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Professional, Church and Social and Sporting participations do not add up to total participation because some join more than one club or association at the same time.

For example, among eight Toishan-born who indicated that they participated in Australian organizations (Table 8.5), none joined sporting or social clubs. Similarly among ten Hong Kong participants, only two joined social clubs, one in a bridge club and the other a tennis club; the rest were members of mainly professional associations.

The same pattern existed among those born in South-east Asian countries; membership in a professional association is often the only formal contact with the Australian society.
But membership of professional or business associations is very different from having social contact with Australians through social organizations. In most cases, the former is no more than recognition of professional qualification; in other cases, it is mainly to qualify for the subscription of professional journals. Even for those in business organizations, relationships with other members are of a secondary nature. So far as attendance at Australian churches is concerned, not only is the number small among foreign-born Chinese, but contacts there with non-Chinese are often limited.

Lack of participation in Australian sporting and social clubs has risen first from the persistence of the Chinese language and cultural habits, especially the traditional tendency of not emphasising sports or physical exercise, and secondly from work, especially in cafes which demand work in the evenings and weekends and therefore leave little time for mixing with Australians. Among first generation Chinese, especially those who do not speak adequate English, there is also a fear that their participation in social activities will not be welcome - a fear which partly arises from their interpretation of the Australian restrictive immigration policy.

---

1 Part of the effort to modernize Chinese society during the 1920's was directed to promoting physical education. See Kuo Hsi-fen, Chung-Kuo T'ı Yu Shi (History of Chinese Physical Education) (Shanghai, 1931), especially Chapter III, pp. 3-4.
The Chinese in Melbourne do not attempt to force their way into social clubs, or to take positive steps to understand and adjust to the way of life of Australians. Leisure time is spent with families or visiting Chinese friends in stores or shops.

The contrast between the foreign-born and the Australian-born Chinese is very marked. Fifty-seven out of 71 Australian-born heads of households mentioned the participation in Australian activities. Of these, 19 had joined sporting or social clubs, while two had joined political parties (one Liberal and one Labor). Almost all of these 57 attend local churches for Sunday services.

It might be thought that the lack of social activities of a formal nature with Australians would be compensated by group activities among the Chinese themselves. Indeed, this was largely true of the Chinese in Melbourne, especially during the period from the 1910's when numerous Chinese clubs were formed, until the Second World War, when the Chinese population declined to such a low level that most of these associations became inactive. The post-war scene is rather different. Regional or speech group associations which survived the period of population decline, are now

---

1 Test of significance: $X^2 = 47.00$, df = 1, $p < .001$.

2 A question was not asked about the denomination of churches attended. Arthur Huck, however, in his study of the Chinese in Kew and Fitzroy, found that 37 out of 70 Chinese attended churches and that there were equal numbers of Methodists and Presbyterians and an exclusive Church of Christ group. *The Chinese in Australia* (Melbourne, 1968), p.42.
attempting to revive their activities,¹ although until now these are still limited. Most of them feel there is a case for re-activity now that many wives and families have come since the War. Thus, the Sze-Yap Society of the Four Districts, which owns a sizeable amount of real estate around Little Bourke Street in the city centre of Melbourne has built a two-story clubhouse, while the Kong Chew Society of the Sunwui District has converted a North Melbourne building to an Old Men's Home.

Non-regional associations have been similarly affected. A Chinese movie club has been formed recently catering mainly for the newly arrived wives and dependants. Chinese movies from Hong Kong (usually in the Cantonese language) are shown once or twice a week, either in the Nationalist Party Headquarters or in one of the bigger restaurants in the city. Similarly the Chinese Citizens' Association, besides managing the Sunday Chinese language school has started to organize a youth society and arrange dances and social evenings for the younger generation.

¹ Huck, writing on the decline of Chinese associations, was of the opinion that this decline will continue and that this is a sign of rapid disintegration of the Chinese community leading to rapid assimilation, op.cit., pp.40-1. While the decline of Chinese organisational activities was undoubtedly true, i.e. the present activities of most of these associations are not appealing to the younger generations, there is, however, at the same time an awareness of this deficiency among the organisers. It is as yet too early to see whether their efforts will be successful.
These are new activities organised by old Chinese associations to cope with the new waves of migrants arriving since the War; but the old activities still persist to some degree. Ancestral worship is still performed four times a year in the Chinese Joss House and in the Carlton Cemetery as the official functions of the regional associations. (They sometimes perform these functions together and sometimes separately). Many of the clubs are still providing recreational facilities and reading materials for the elderly Chinese, besides occasional movie shows and other functions.

Attendance in Chinese churches has always been small.\(^1\) Moreover, it is divided. In the city there are three different Chinese churches (the Methodist and Presbyterian combined, the Church of Christ and the Church of England) while in the suburbs some Chinese Christians are now attending local churches. The Chinese city churches also suffer from lack of co-operation arising from a distinct socio-economic differentiation between them. The Church of Christ, located in Queensberry Street, by far the largest and richest church, is largely dominated by two large family-groups whose head families are wholesale fruiterers - one Sunwui and one Toishan. Their sons, however, many of whom are Australian-born, have diverged into the major restaurants, greengrocers and professional occupations. These groups, together with many of their

---

1 Huck reported that the attendance is typically 25 to 50 for a service in Cantonese or English or both, *op.cit.*, p. 42. This was found to be the case in 1968, except that the Church of England has experienced decline in the numbers such that in 1967, their Cantonese service and Sunday School were cancelled, retaining only the English service. Even then, the English service is usually attended by 5 or 6 families, twenty persons or so including children.
relatives introduced by them, constitute the congregation. Membership of this church is so limited to those relating to two family-groups that one author described them as 'exclusive'. The Methodist and Presbyterian combined church has a membership of mainly professional or white-collar Australian-born Chinese with one or two vegetable retailers. To enable members of this combined church to attend services in their own local churches, the times for service are in the afternoon (Cantonese) and in the evening (English). In this combined church, as in the Church of Christ, family groups dominate the management of the church, this time the professionals rather than the wholesale fruiterers. The Chinese Church of England is the smallest of the three Chinese churches, partly because the family-groups here have not been prosperous, some without children, and partly because some of the original members have moved to distant suburbs and are not able to attend the morning service. Efforts to win more members is also handicapped by a rumour that one of the main families in the church is pro-communist, having direct trading relations with China.

The mutual indifference to each other among the Chinese churches, the lack of cooperation in common projects such as the evangelisation of the Chinese in cafe businesses, and a certain degree of 'familism' in the running of church affairs, have resulted in a situation where the activities of the Chinese churches do not reach very far into the Chinese community, nor do they reach to the private students, some of whom are Christians.

1 Huck, op.cit., p.42.
Two other organisations need comment. The first is the Young Chinese League, formed in 1906 by Australian-born Chinese youths as a social club. Though defunct for the period 1913-1930, it was reorganised during the Second World War to rally support to the war efforts in China. Since then, it has remained the only organisation among the Australian-born Chinese besides the Chinese churches. Providing outside social activities such as tennis and picnics, it also has a club room rented from the Sze-Yap Society in the South Melbourne Chinese Joss House, for dancing and other indoor activities. It boasts a financial membership of around 100 families, thereby making it the largest association among the Chinese. The clubrooms, however, are usually locked during the weekdays and is opened only on alternate Saturdays. The use of the clubroom is actually very limited except for occasional dances and table tennis tournaments. However, the annual balls held at the St Kilda Town Hall every year are consistently well attended, many of the participants being Australian guests.


2 Personal interview with Mr F.A. Chinn, President of Young Chinese League, 1945-1967.

3 Private conversation with Mr Russell Moy, present President of the Young Chinese League. The 1968 Annual Ball, for example, had a participation of more than 500 pairs.
The second is the Chinese Cultural Association formed by interested students and staff at the universities in Melbourne to promote the study of Chinese culture. The membership is mixed, both Chinese and Australians and include a few professional Australian-born Chinese. At present, the Chinese members are overwhelmingly students, and the Association does not appear to be well known in the Chinese community.

How are these clubs and associations meeting the needs of the Chinese community? The regional or speech group associations do not have formal membership, although they claim that every one 'belonging' to their place of origin is automatically a member, just as the Chinese Citizens' Association claims membership of every one who is racially Chinese. Membership fees are not collected and the expense of these associations are paid from rents collected from houses and land owned by the associations.¹

When the questions of how frequently they participated in Chinese activities were put to the respondents, it was found that only a few visit the clubs once in a while, for example, when a movie is shown by the Chinese Citizens' Association on Chinese New Year. Active participation is limited to the committee members of the

¹ During the 1900's, the regional associations, acting as travel agents and collecting fees from departing Chinese, were successful in obtaining sizeable amounts of capital which were used partly in purchasing real estate. See C.F.Yong, op.cit., p.329.
association. Reasons for lack of enthusiasm are not difficult to find. Many associations originally had aims of mutual aid, arbitration in case of disputes among Chinese, organising a united front against anti-Chinese legislations, and arousing political awareness in support of China. The present Chinese are much wealthier than before - the street hawkers and poor market gardeners have now disappeared - and need little benevolence from the associations. Travel arrangements between Hong Kong and China are now mainly managed by Australian travel agencies and not by Chinese organisations as before. Disputes are settled through the Australian courts and not by arbitration by these Chinese associations.

Even Chinese politics do not serve as a unifying force, not only because the communist Chinese government receives little support but also because the alternative, the Nationalist government in Taiwan, commands little respect from them. Bitterness about the loss of mainland China to the communists, in spite of strong support from the overseas Chinese, is strong; and the blame usually goes to the corruption and incompetence of the Nationalist Government.¹ Neither is the Australian political atmosphere favourable to active participation in Chinese politics. The Australian government, though recognising Nationalist China, trades extensively with Communist China. On the one hand, the Chinese Nationalist Party (Kuomintang)

¹ The rise of nationalism among the Chinese in Sydney and Melbourne has been described in detail by C.F.Yong, op.cit., Chapters VI and V. This nationalism resembles very much the Zionist Movement among the Jews, and has given the Chinese tremendous encouragement and pride at the time when they were treated discriminatorily during the 1900's and 1910's.
no longer has the strong support they once had; on the other hand, those who sympathise with the mainland government are careful not to make their feeling explicit for fear that they may come to the attention of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation. The general feeling among Chinese is definitely a desire to be free from involvement in Chinese politics. The sponsored migrants now see little hope in continuing the practices of their forefathers of returning to China to retire in comfort; the Hong Kong and South-east Asian students, partly Western educated and already alienated from the traditional Chinese society, rarely, if ever, participate in the activities of the traditional Chinese associations.

In short, then, either in terms of satisfying real practical needs among the Chinese or in terms of providing a rallying place for expressing mutual love and admiration towards China, the regional associations, the Chinese Citizens' Association, the Nationalist Party or the so-called Masonic Society (Chi Kung Tong) are not playing an important part. Similarly, congregations of Chinese churches have been losing their members to local Australian churches, although core family groups still remain. Only the Chinese language schools, the Young Chinese League and the Chinese Cultural Association are active; and it is uncertain whether or not new attempts to attract more participants, for example, the youth programme under the Chinese Citizens' Association, will be successful.

1 Huck, op.cit., p. 43-4.
This brief discussion of the activities of various Chinese associations shows at least two important points: 1) a lack of formal membership in traditional associations and 2) the limited influence these organisations have on the Chinese in Melbourne. The lack of formal membership or rather the lack of the knowledge of how many will attend meetings and activities, severely limit the range of activities which can be sponsored by these associations. Until now, movie shows have generally attracted sizeable crowds, especially of newly arrived women. But there are few other activities which are well attended. The quarterly ancestral worship seems certain to die off in a few years. The South Melbourne Joss House and the Chinese section of the Carlton Cemetery badly need repair. But to raise enough money at present for such big renovations is difficult. Even the Chinese language school on Sunday is running at a loss (the teachers are paid) because of fluctuating student numbers, and is at present operated by contributions from enthusiastic individuals.

The activities and functions of Chinese associations, then, have little bearing on the spiritual or material life of the Chinese. In terms of commerce, the Chinese cafes or vegetable retailers or Chinese grocers find it unnecessary to have an association to protect their interests. The former Chinese Chamber of Commerce is now defunct.¹ Even attempts to set up a Chinese restaurateur association to

---

¹ Chinese Chambers of Commerce exist among most Chinese communities in South-east Asia and are usually the representative of the Chinese communities in these countries.
regulate prices and to negotiate with the Australian government for a more relaxed attitude towards the admission of chefs during 1960-62 were abortive because wives and dependants began to arrive in large numbers thereby enabling cafes to be run as family units. In terms of politics and religion, the desire to disassociate from Chinese politics and the lack of strong religious sentiments function effectively to limit the influence of Chinese political parties and Christian churches. Broadly speaking, then, Chinese associations and their 'leaders' are not, at present, performing the role of being intermediate agents between newly-arrived migrants feeling their way in a new country and the 'host' society which is becoming more accustomed to these new faces.\(^1\) Not only is this because the leaders and their associations represent a culture which is under rapid change, but also because there is no burning issue among the Chinese the settlement of which requires group action and cooperation of a large proportion of the Chinese. Even the apparent discriminatory Australian immigration law has not become a concern of the Chinese associations, some leaders feel satisfied that post-war changes have made it much easier for the Chinese

1 S.N.Eisenstadt in his influential book, *The Absorption of Immigrants*, (London, 1954). found that in Israel the development of various migrant associations serves not only as foci of tradition but also as channels of communication with the 'host' society, pp.18-9. This role of the immigrant elites is also elaborated in "The Place and the Role of Immigrant Elite and Primary Groups in the Process of the Absorption of Immigrants" American Journal of Sociology LVII (November, 1951),p.222-31.
who are already in Australia. Others express the opinion that protest and petitions will most certainly be futile in view of past experiences. Some even fear that group action may arouse the suspicion of the Australian public and will therefore produce adverse results.

Under these circumstances, activities of Chinese associations are limited and do not, therefore, act as a centripetal point for the Chinese community in Melbourne. In the future, new associations may be formed. At present, efforts are being made among the ex-private students to form their own club. Old associations may be strengthened, for example, the Young Chinese League may expand, to cope with the more rapid increase of Australian-born Chinese, and the youth group under the Chinese Citizens' Association to organise the foreign-born young Chinese. But at present, organisational participation of the Chinese either in Australian or Chinese associations is at a low level.

1 Interview with Mr Dick Doon, President of the Chinese Citizens' Association. Mr. Chung Peng, President of the Sze-Yap Association, also expressed this opinion.

2 Mr David Chan, J.P., President of the Kong Chew (Sunwui) Association was of the opinion that fruitful results depended entirely on the efforts of influential Australians acting behind the scene and not on Chinese group actions.

3 Mr David Wang, J.P., presently member of the Melbourne City Council, felt that changes in post-war policies was mainly because of the weakening of the Chinese community and the economic achievements of some of its members. These developments, he said, showed that Chinese were as 'assimilable' as other migrants and therefore did not constitute a threat to the Australian public.
Friendship Patterns and Social Participation

In the relative absence of organised activities among the Chinese, the main contact between the Chinese and the Australian society is either through personal friends or through mass media such as T.V., movies, magazines and newspapers. We have seen that a large proportion of the Chinese have T.V. sets and own or are buying homes, many of which have gardens;\(^1\) indeed, much of their leisure time is spent in and around the home, visiting friends and other recreations which do not require joining clubs and associations. The importance of the mass media as the main channel through which the Chinese migrants obtain information and knowledge about Australia can be shown by the answers to two questions concerning recreations:\(^2\)

a) the importance of 'watching T.V.' among leisure time activities, and b) the relative frequency of reading Australian Chinese newspapers and magazines. On the question of leisure activities, the overwhelming majority mentioned 'watching T.V.' as the first ranking activity, while some claimed that they spent most time in visiting friends or gardening, especially at weekends.\(^3\) There is no

---

1 See Chapter VI, page 217.
2 See Appendix IV, Interview Schedule, pages 342-3.
3 Ranking of five most important non-associational leisure time activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Number of persons who indicated spending most time in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watching T.V.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting friends</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching sports including racing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahjong, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difference in this aspect between different types of Chinese migrants, either by occupation or by birthplace. It is quite likely that Chinese migrants who are in the professions watch different programmes from those in the cafes and vegetable retail markets, but the important point is that, for all groups of Chinese migrants, non-professionals and professionals alike, non-personal communication such as T.V. is of far greater importance and consequently carries much more influence to the Chinese migrant than personal contacts. Similarly, on the question of reading materials, Australian newspapers and magazines are much more frequently read than Chinese. This is undoubtedly partly because there is at present no Chinese newspaper or magazine published in Australia. However, unlike the watching of T.V., there is a slight difference between the Australian-born, the foreign-born who are in Australian occupations and the foreign-born who are in Chinese occupations.

For the Australian-born Chinese, 61 out of 71 or 85.9 per cent admitted that they almost never read any Chinese magazine or newspaper, only eight claimed to have read 'occasionally' and none read them to any regular frequency (Table 8.6). In contrast to this, 63 out of 71 or 88.7 per cent read Australian newspapers or magazines daily, two read them weekly and three read them occasionally; only one almost never read Australian papers or magazines. It is clear from this that the influence of Chinese newspapers and magazines is very slight in the homes of the Australian-born Chinese.
## TABLE 8.6
FREQUENCY OF AUSTRALIAN AND CHINESE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES READ BY PLACE OF BIRTH OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS, MELBOURNE SURVEY 1968 (N = 215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth and Occupation</th>
<th>Australian</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Occupations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Occupations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cafe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Cafe</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chefs etc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assis't</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Work-Force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foreign-born Chinese differ much from the Australian-born concerning the frequency of reading Chinese newspapers and magazines. A large proportion (34/144 or 23.6 per cent) of the foreign-born Chinese read them regularly either daily or weekly, while another sizeable proportion (62/144 or 43.1 per cent) read 'occasionally'. This is significantly more frequent than the Australian-born Chinese.¹

Looking at different occupational groups among foreign-born Chinese alone, it can be observed that those in Australian occupations, either in the professions or not, are more inclined to Australian rather than Chinese newspapers and magazines. All of them, for example, read daily newspapers, while none read daily Chinese ones and only three read them weekly. Among those in Chinese occupations, although a majority read daily Australian papers, a considerable proportion, 31 out of 117, are still in the regular habit of reading Chinese newspapers and magazines, either weekly or daily. The contrast between each Chinese occupational group cannot be made here because the number of cases involved are small and because the difference between these occupational groups are generally small (Table 8.6).

We have shown from the above that social intercourse between Chinese and the Australian public occurs mainly in an indirect form through public mass media and not through interaction within Chinese or Australian organisations. Another aspects of social integration is that of friendship.

¹ Test of Significance: $x^2 = 63.891$. df = 3, p < .001.
It was noted before that 'visiting friends' occupied an important place in the leisure activities of the Chinese. The questions of what constitutes friends and what types of friends are visited, are important criteria to judge the nature of these informal social intercourses. In the interview questionnaire, three questions relating to friendship were included, but unfortunately only one of them was completed by a large enough proportion of respondents for analysis. The discussion on friendship patterns is limited to results of the single question of whether the respondents' friends are mostly Australian or Chinese, but some remarks of a non-quantitative nature can also be made from general observations.

While an overwhelmingly majority of the Chinese have mostly Chinese friends, there are differences between birthplace groups. For those who were born in the Four Districts, 76 out of 86 or 88.4 per cent have mostly Chinese friends. This proportion of Chinese friends is

1 An attempt was made to record the names and particulars of three closest friends, but the non-response rate was 56 per cent in the first 90 or so interviews so that the question was dropped. The same was true relating to home visits.

2 Friendship patterns by birthplace:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Mostly Chinese %</th>
<th>50/50 %</th>
<th>Australian %</th>
<th>Stated %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Districts 76</td>
<td>88.4 2</td>
<td>2.3 2</td>
<td>2.3 6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>86 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other China 33</td>
<td>68.8 3</td>
<td>6.3 10</td>
<td>20.8 2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>48 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other foreign 2</td>
<td>20.0 6</td>
<td>60.0 2</td>
<td>20.0 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Full-Chinese 28.6</td>
<td>21 50.0</td>
<td>8 19.1 1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>42 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Chinese 1</td>
<td>3.5 7</td>
<td>24.1 18</td>
<td>62.1 3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>29 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124 57.7 39 18.1</td>
<td>40 18.6</td>
<td>12 5.6</td>
<td>215 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significantly higher than those born in other parts of China, including Hong Kong (33/48, 68.8 per cent)\(^1\) and those born in other foreign areas (2/10, or 20.0 per cent).\(^2\)

The Four District Group, with almost all of their members sponsored by relatives and with the longest history of settlement as well as being the largest in size, appears to be able to provide more opportunity for their members to find friends within the Chinese community. Those born in other foreign areas particularly those in South-east Asian countries, have very different migration, education and occupational background, are more isolated from the general Chinese community of Melbourne and are therefore more likely to be able to find companions among Australians.

The Australian-born Chinese, having a wider sphere of activities, show also a low proportion of Chinese friends - among full-Chinese 28.6 per cent, and among part-Chinese only one out of 29. This friendship pattern among Australian-born part-Chinese and together with their high ratio of intermarriage, shows that the part-Chinese population is rapidly being absorbed into the Australian population and cannot survive as a distinct, self-conscious group if the current trend continues.

It is difficult at this point to investigate the nature and type of these friendship relations. It seems very likely, however, that many of these Australian 'friends' of foreign-born Chinese are actually persons connected with the

---

1 Test of Significance: \(X^2 = 7.68\), df = 1, \(p < .01\).

2 Test of Significance: \(X^2 = 23.10\) (Yates' Correction), df = 1, \(p < .001\)
Chinese in their work, or simply neighbours with whom a friendly attitude is maintained. Some might fall into the category which Jean Martin described as merely 'acquaintances' who have taken an interest in immigrants, but whom the migrants have taken as symbolic links with the Australian society.¹ Examples of these can sometimes be found in the cafe-owner-customer relations where the Australian customers who came regularly were described by the cafe owners as their friends. Cafe owners who work seven days a week and who have little time off, are so limited in their personal contacts with Australians that their customers are sometimes the major source of information about the Australian society. One cafe owner in a suburb concluded that the Australian society is 'rotten' and that moral standards are low purely from observation of the sometimes rough and improper behaviour of his customers. Others may even 'exploit' their contacts with Australians, especially when the Australians are influential persons, to solve their own practical problems, to derive benefits from, or simply to take pride among fellow Chinese of their acquaintances.² Two cafe owners have pointed out to the author, for example, that they have made important friends including members of Parliament and how these friends have helped them to establish themselves in Melbourne and to introduce chefs and assistants to their cafes.


² Martin has described this type of attitude vividly about the Displaced Persons and has noted some of the negative reactions of the Australians against this type of social relations, op.cit., p.32,
Friendship between Australian and Chinese migrants who are new arrivals and still in the process of settling, is rarely on equal terms based on mutual interests. It becomes, under these circumstances, a temporary relationship between a donor and a recipient, or between an Australian who finds interest in things Chinese and the Chinese migrant who offers such in return for receiving help from the Australian friend. Such relations are usually short-lived, not only may the Chinese migrant feel tired of being reminded of his Chinese-ness, but the Australian friend may also feel less interested as time goes by. The difficulty in establishing durable friendships lies also in the dislike of accepting hospitality the migrants cannot return.¹ This is specially true among single migrants (or those whose wives are still in China) who usually reside in rooming houses and are so conscious of their poor condition that they do not entertain in return. More stable relationships develop only when Chinese migrants have established themselves economically at a level comparable with their Australian counterparts, can take pride in their achievements, and therefore be less conscious of their migrant status.

¹ Martin, op.cit., p.29.
Summary

For the traditional sponsored Chinese, the pattern of having few Australian friends, and then mostly of shallow relationships, helps to explain the lack of participation into Australian organisations. For many, in addition to distinct physical features and a deficiency in the use of English, there is also the feeling of 'marginality', a feeling which arouses embarrassment and consciousness of their ethnic and migrant status.

Significant differences in social participation and friendship patterns are found for the Australian-born, especially among part-Chinese. Integration into the Australian society occurs rapidly among Australian-born Chinese, not only in occupation, residence and inter-marriage, but also in their social activities. It remains to be seen, however, whether or not increase in Australian-born numbers in the future will affect this trend of rapid integration.
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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

This has been a study of the history of the Chinese in Australia with a sample survey of 215 Chinese households in Metropolitan Melbourne. Censuses, immigration and marriage registrations, joss-house and association records, documents from Kwangtung province, and other similar material have been utilized to reconstruct the general pattern of migration since colonial days; the Melbourne survey has been designed to go behind this general pattern, to delineate and describe in more detail the major factors which influenced Chinese settlement in at least one metropolis in Australia, so throwing more light back in the general statistics and material.

The study has shown that the Chinese background not only explains the desire to emigrate but to a large extent determined the system of migration. While population pressure on Kwangtung villages, together with frequent wars and disturbances, basically caused the emigration, the family-lineage system produced a commuting type of migration unique to the Chinese. In addition, the sponsorship system enforced by the Australian immigration regulations operated to perpetuate the commuting system, thereby causing a largely male Chinese settlement in Australia until after the Second World War. This combined commuting-sponsorship system is also responsible for the pattern of occupational concentration, as is shown in the Melbourne survey.
The pattern of settlement showed continuous urbanization, first during 1901-47 into segregated areas in the inner city areas and then after the Second World War into the suburbs of Metropolitan areas. The period 1901-47, also saw an abandonment of those Chinese occupations that were competitive with the Australians (furniture-making, laundries, etc.) in favour of those which were not (market-gardening, cafes, and vegetable distribution).

The post World War II period shows a stabilization of the Chinese population, the sex-ratio becoming more balanced and the proportion of younger persons becoming larger. Moreover, the commuting system no longer functioned as smoothly as before. First because of more Chinese staying permanently, secondly because of the weakening of the lineage system, and thirdly because it has become more difficult to visit China frequently. The Australian immigration regulations, too, have been changing, restricting the entries of assistants and substitutes since 1956. The main additions, through migration, are the wives and dependants, the war-time refugees and the non-sponsored students who became settlers. The impact of wives and dependants on the structure of the Chinese communities is not fully manifested yet because their arrival is relatively recent; but already, it is clear that there are efforts to attract them into the established Chinese communities. The war-time refugees, differing from the older populations in terms of mode of migration, places of origin, and in their original war time occupation have nevertheless moved from their blue collar occupations to the cafe business, thereby becoming more similar to the sponsored group in terms of occupations. The non-sponsored students are a very different group, being mainly professional in occupation and intermarrying much more.
There are two factors which have greatly affected the migration and settlement of the Chinese in Australia: the Australian immigration restriction and the Chinese attachment to their family-lineage. Since the Communist government took control of mainland China, the importance of the family-lineage has begun to decrease. The old system of substituting retiring Chinese will probably cease altogether. Future Chinese migration can be expected to differ from the commuting system; but the form will depend largely on changes in the Australian immigration restrictions. At present, the naturalization rights extended to the Chinese made possible the re-union of many families, but the restriction on the entry of assistants will weaken the traditional sponsored group. The professional group (including non-sponsored students who became settlers), however, can be expected to increase in numbers; and the impact of the formation of a new upper stratum on the social structure of the Chinese community will be of theoretical interest.

This thesis has not been concerned with all aspects of assimilation; stemming largely from demographic material, it has emphasized residential and occupational adjustment, marriages and general social participation. The psychological aspect of assimilation, for example, has not been touched. In any case, the thesis has not been designed to examine 'theories' of assimilation, but rather to unravel the story and to expose the patterns of Chinese settlement in Australia. Even so, some of its findings are relevant to assimilation theory.
Being largely historical, i.e. examining Chinese migration and settlement over many decades, this thesis has more to say about those theories which treat the assimilation process as a series of stages. It is less relevant for assimilation theories set out in terms of typologies of migration,\(^1\) typologies of migrants,\(^2\) and


2 S.N. Eisenstadt, for example, in his 1954 influential book, distinguished six types of immigrants: The isolated apathetic family, isolated active family, cohesive traditional group, self-transforming cohesive group, and instrumental cohesive group. The Absorption of Migrants (London, 1954), pp. 143-66. J.Martin, in her study of a group of post-war displaced persons in Australia, found that these migrants fell into four common types: middle-status functionally adapted, low-status functionally adapted, middle-status status conscious and lower status isolated types. Refugee Settlers (Canberra, 1965), pp.81-6. Each of these types described by Eisenstadt and Martin has its own particular mode of assimilation to the receiving society.
personal socio-psychological adaptation to environment.  

1 On this individual level, personal assimilation is often studied in terms of the presence or absence or prejudice and discrimination, the adoption of new identity, deviant behaviour, and participation in primary group relations etc. From this type of analyses arose concepts such as 'marginal man' (E.V. Stonequist, The Marginal Man, New York, 1937; R.A. Schermerhorn, "Marginal Man" in J. Gould and W.L. Kolg (ed.), A Dictionary of the Social Sciences London, 1964, pp. 406-7), 'anomia' (L. Killian and C. Grigg, "Urbanism, Race and Anomia" American Journal of Sociology, LVII, 1962, pp. 661-5), structural assimilation (M.M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, New York, 1964, p. 71), Satisfaction-dissatisfaction, acceptance, acculturation, and identification (R. Taft and A. Richardson's work on migrants in Western Australia, reported in Taft, From Strangers to Citizen, Nedlands, University of Western Australia Press, 1965), and re-socialization and the acceptance of new roles (S.N. Eisenstadt, op. cit., p. 9, and J. Rex and R. Moore's discussion on the acceptance of rights and norms of the host society, Race, Community and Conflict, London, 1967, pp. 14-8).
Theoretical Consideration

There are a number of theories dealing with assimilation over time. Some, having derived from studies of migrations other than the Chinese, seem unable adequately to describe the history of the Chinese in Australia. The theory of the three-generation Americanization cycle,¹ which asserts that assimilation is complete after three generations, for example, is not supported because some Chinese families have not assimilated in three generations and because there has been a constant inflow of new migrants. Neither does the chain-migration model for Southern Europeans in Australia² describe adequately the pattern of settlement among Chinese because restrictive laws have dominated the sponsor-sponsored relationship and have considerably delayed the arrival of wives and dependants. Nor is the Glazer and Moynihan's three-stage sequence of the transformation in New York city of nationality groups³ into divisions of colour and religion groups in New York City applicable to the Chinese³. Even the E.S.Borgardus race-relations

³ *Beyond the Melting Pot* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963).
cycle, while taking into account discriminatory legislation, dealt mostly with the change of attitude among Americans towards the Japanese and the Chinese and had little to say about the pattern of migration and settlement of these groups.

A theory which does not fit exactly, but which nevertheless is helpful, is that of the race-relations cycle postulated by Robert Park: That is, a process passing from 'contact' to 'competition' to 'conflict' to 'accommodation' and finally to 'assimilation'.

With the Chinese in Australia, the period of peaceful contact, the 1840's was short, passing rapidly to competition and conflict in the 1850's. Various changes of occupation and residence followed, and in the early part of this century the Chinese found themselves grouped together in tight communities, partly to survive the many discriminatory laws and actions against them and partly as a reaction to the unfamiliar atmosphere of Australian society. Numerous Chinese associations, newspapers, churches and other social groups sprang up during the 1910's and the 1920's not only as a growing result of Chinese nationalism in Australia, but also to fight against anti-Chinese laws. But the era of conflict


is long past. The Chinese gold-miners, cabinet-making shops and laundries are now memories of the distant past, having given way to the market-gardens, the vegetable retail stalls and the cafes which are not in direct conflict and competition with the Australian public. The more recent occupations of the professions, too, with their high degree of specialization are also accepted by Australian society. Almost all anti-Chinese laws have been repealed since the Second World War, in all states. Immigration restriction has become more liberal and humane and the post-war arrival of wives and children have helped to disperse the heretofore male-concentrated Chinese segregated areas in city centres. International politics and the situation in China, too, have discouraged Chinese migrants from regarding themselves as sojourners but to make them aware of the advantages of settling permanently in Australia. In short, in terms of Park's cycle, the post-war situation is favourable to the transition from 'accommodation' to 'assimilation'. The struggle for survival, so evident in pre-war Chinese communities in Australia, is at present not a vital issue. Instead, there is emphasis on the way to adjust to the living among Australians.

The story of the Chinese in Australia differs much from that of the Chinese in South-east Asian countries. Numerically small and economically unimportant since the 1890's, the Chinese in Australia soon ceased to exist as a threat to Australian society. The high masculinity among early Chinese migrants and the effective check on entry of Chinese females during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by the Chinese family-lineage system and later by the Australian immigration restrictions
were major determinants of the decline of the Chinese population in Australia. The immigration of Chinese males was also restricted. This decline of population was one of the important factors in the lessening of competition with the Australians, for example in the cabinet-making and laundry trade, and also to some extent in the fruit and vegetable distributing business. Discriminatory laws too were responsible for the decline of some of these Chinese businesses.¹

In terms of occupational adjustment and in terms of the decline of prejudice and antagonism, the Chinese experience corresponds well with the first four stages of Park's cycle. Although the initial contact was short, it was exploratory and peaceful as Park depicted for his ethnic groups in the United States. The stages of 'competition' and 'conflict' in the history of the Chinese settlement in Australia were similarly characterized by riots, antagonistic legislation and other forms of discriminatory behaviour. The fourth stage 'accommodation', too, was attained by the withdrawal of the traditional Chinese into niche occupations and generally into occupying an inferior social status. But the final stage of 'assimilation' in terms of progressive inter-mixture and intermarriage has only just begun to a significant extent, and only for the Australian-born Chinese and for the more recent non-sponsored students.

¹ Especially the Factories and Shops Act of New South Wales and Victoria (1896) and the Banana Industry Preservation Act of Queensland (1921).
Park was conscious of the problem of 'colour' as an obstacle to the smooth transition to assimilation, and had more to say about the assimilation of children of inter-racial marriages, especially between races of different colour. In fact, the race relations cycle was formulated not only on studies of the Negroes and other migrants in the United States, but also on studies of situations in South America, South Africa, the Pacific Area and Asia. Here Park recognised that while some 'mixed-blood' groups have assimilated into one of their parents original race, (such as the Portuguese Chinese in Macao which have assimilated into the Chinese population,¹ or the Anglo-Indians in the colonial period who held onto their Anglo-Saxon heritage),² there were many others which either developed into a new race dominating the whole country (such as the Brazilian 'intermixture' of Europeans, Negroes and Indians),³ or existed apart as permanent minority groups (such as the part Negroes and part American-Indians in the United States).⁴ It was also in the study of mixed-blood populations that Stonequist's concept of 'marginal man',⁵ describing these

---

¹ Race and Culture, op.cit., p.111.
² Ibid., p.130.
³ Ibid., p.121-2.
⁴ Ibid., pp.390-2.
persons trapped between two cultures, was incorporated and expanded.¹

Much less evidence concerning the part-Chinese in Melbourne is available to show that they exist as a group separated from both the Australian public and the Chinese community. Rather, the evidence from proportions of intermarriage, occupations and residence indicates that they rapidly assimilated into the Australian population.

Park's cycle has been variously criticised, firstly, for the suggestion that the nature of the cycle is inevitable and irreversible, although Park, in his later writing, did conceive of cases where the process might stop short of 'assimilation' as shown by the caste system in India and the permanent minority status of the Jews in Europe, or even where there was a possibility of a reverse of the cycle.² The case of the Chinese in Australia studied in this thesis shows that there is as yet no major regression from one stage to the previous one. Moreover, the pattern of intermarriage among the Australian-born, especially among the part-Chinese, indicates the possible beginning of a movement towards the final stage of assimilation. The post-World War II trend shows that if present conditions persist, especially if restriction on Chinese migration continues, the permanent existence of a separate Chinese community seems unlikely.

¹ Park, op.cit., pp.345-56.

The second criticism is that Park's cycle has the unfortunate biological overtone of a physiological process of "swallow(ing) and digest(ing) every sort of normal human difference.". Reacting against the more extreme views expressed by Fairchild and others, the opposition was raised not only by 'melting-pot' advocates who believed that migrant-minorities also had contributions to make to the host society, but also and more emphatically by the cultural pluralists who saw the possibility and the reality of some minorities being integrated into the host society without complete loss of their identity. Here, we arrive at the difficulty of envisaging the end-product of the process involving the permanent settlement of a migrant group. Not only does this final product of settlement depend on the difference and the compatibility of the habits, customs and social institutions of the migrant minority community and the host society, it also depends on the degree of acceptance of differences within the institutional structure of the host society. One author, Eisenstadt, considered the 'balance' between the status-structures of the migrant and the host society as an index of absorption. The difficulty of defining 'assimilation' is shown when a Unesco conference on assimilation decided to adopt the term 'integration'.

2 H.P.Fairchild, op.cit., p.396.
3 The concept of melting-pot and cultural pluralism are summarized and discussed in M.M.Gordon, op.cit., Chapters 3-6.
instead of the term 'assimilation' to denote this whole process.¹

Much of the discussion on the nature of assimilation, however, does not include the sizes of the migrant groups. Clearly, when the migrant group is very small, insufficient to form a community capable in itself of satisfying some of the social needs of its members, it is more likely to disintegrate and become absorbed into the larger host society. Many of the Melbourne Chinese associations and groups in the pre-war years became defunct and inactive mainly because the Chinese population was declining at a fast rate. The influx of new Chinese migrants since the war, however, has revived some of these associations, notably the Sze-Yap and the Chinese Citizens Association. On the other hand, larger migrant groups tend to create viable institutions and satisfying social life within themselves and also, by arousing fear and prejudice, are often segregated and made isolated.

Closely connected with the increase and decrease of migrant group populations is the proportion of foreign-born in these groups. The Chinese in Australia is different from other migrant groups; through the sponsorship-commuting system, and because of the high masculinity associated with a long period of Chinese settlement in Australia, the proportion of foreign-born remained very high, and among these many arrived at rather late ages. This, together with

the constant visits to their native villages, created a situation unfavourable to the assimilation of the Chinese. In other words, demographic requirements for the sustaining of group life must also be considered in any discussion of immigrant assimilation, whether in a physiological sense or not.

The third criticism of Park's cycle is that it fails to account for uneven assimilation (that is, assimilation occurring at unequal speed in different aspects of life). The occurrence of uneven assimilation is apparent among the Chinese in Melbourne. In terms of housing, apart from the small concentration in North Melbourne where many of the single persons are found, the spread of the Chinese to the suburbs with their high proportion of home ownership indicates a pattern of living very much alike that of the Melbourne population. But, in terms of occupation, especially among foreign-born who are sponsored migrants, the pattern is one that can be immediately recognised as 'accommodation'. The lack of assimilation for these sponsored migrants is even more evident in their process to learn the English language.

Uneven assimilation, however, does not necessarily imply the mal-adjustment of these migrants. Martin, in her study, observed that lack of assimilation in one direction may be compensated for by rapid assimilation in another, as when lower-status migrants derive such

1 Jean Martin, op.cit.
satisfaction from material success that isolation from Australian society and culture does not disturb their sense of well-being.\footnote{Ibid., p.89.} Indeed, this is shown among many Chinese in Melbourne who took comfort in political security and economic success that they had little desire to become involved into frequent social intercourse with Australians.

Summing up the discussion, it can be seen that although Park's race relations cycle is capable of outlining the general historical developments of Chinese migration and settlement in Australia, it, nevertheless, suffers from drawbacks which severely limit its power to explain some of the details. Even so, Park's cycle has been used in various modified form in recent research.\footnote{For example, J. Zubrzycki, \textit{Polish Immigrants in Britain} (The Hague, 1956), p.76. S Patterson, \textit{Dark Strangers}, (London, 1963), pp.13-23.}

\section*{Is a General Theory Possible or Necessary?}

The deficiencies of Park's race relations cycle, and indeed also of other theories of assimilation, point to one basic difficulty in the study of migrant assimilation. That is, the problem of whether it is possible, even advisable or fruitful, to generalize the
pattern found in one or several migrant groups to other migrant groups. To some extent, Blalock (Jr) has assumed that this is possible and necessary when he attempted to formulate a large number of inter-related theoretical propositions concerning minority group relations. In a similar way, Shibutani and Kwan, were hopeful that comparative and historical study of ethnic relations would reveal patterns of regularities which were generalizable to all situations, although they acknowledged, as Blalock did, that the task of such research required the co-operation of numerous scholars for a considerable period of time.

Other scholars are not as optimistic; the vast variety of conditions under which people migrate and the long list of factors that influence their livelihood led some writers to doubt the feasibility of a general synthesis. Here, the history of the Chinese in Australia shows that Chinese migration has been intimately related to historical events and international politics and policies. To a certain extent, it indicates that these events, though no isolated, cannot be easily analysed within theoretical frameworks established for other migrant groups. Even the very flexible concept of chain-migration, for example,


3 Blalock, op.cit., p.190-1; Shibutani and Kwan, op.cit., p.22.

cannot explain the whole of the Chinese migration pattern. This is not only because the historical events relevant to Chinese migration are unique but also because some background factors which motivated Chinese emigration are particular to the Chinese. A good example of this is the compound effect of the lineage-commuting system and the Australian immigration restriction. On the one hand, the commuting system of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries created a large male Chinese community, the continuity of which depended on the replacement of elderly Chinese men by younger men introduced from the villages. On the other hand, the Australian immigration restriction perpetuated this system by allowing in assistants and substitutes to replace the retiring Chinese migrants. These, together, produced a situation where Chinese establishments such as commercial firms, regional associations and other organizations were constantly under the influence of new migrants from China. Since the orientation of the Chinese in these days was mainly towards the family lineages, the community existed apparently in isolation from the Australian society, conforming to Australian norms and values only when it was necessary and obligatory. It was only after the Second World War when politics in China was unfavourable to the operation of the commuting system and when immigration restriction in Australia was relaxed that the Chinese communities in Australia became more settled.

So much have historical events affected the present that the Chinese community (1968) still shows signs of the past. The present occupational concentration is related to the historical development of their settlement.
The Chinese organizations are also mainly those established during the 1910's and 1920's, and the origin of the Chinese migrants remained more or less of the same districts in Kwangtung province.

Partly because of this difficulty in making generalizations and partly because these sequential theories of assimilation are broad statements sometimes incapable of accounting for all the facts, recent research on migrant groups tend to concentrate on specific areas, for example, membership of groups, community participations, conflict, residential and occupational adjustment, socialization and psychological adaptation etc.

Many scholars, such as Eisenstadt, Zubrzycki, and Gordon, for example, emphasized the importance of primary group affiliation in the study of migrants. Zubrzycki and Gordon especially considered the 'lower level of social organisation' and 'structural assimilation' respectively as the crucial factors influencing assimilation in other aspects. Although the Melbourne survey did not attempt specifically to trace the primary group net-work among the Chinese, in so far as can be inferred from the analysis

1 Eisenstadt, op.cit., p.7-9.
3 Gordon, op.cit., p.21.
4 Zubrzyicki, op.cit., p.21.
5 Gordon, op.cit., p.71.
6 A net-work study of Greek migrants in Melbourne by Fiona Macki of La Trobe University is now in progress.
of friendship patterns, for the Chinese the level of participation into Australian primary groups is low.

Here, some qualification should be made concerning the homogeneity of migrant groups. The possession of one common ethnic background is sometimes not strong enough as a binding force to produce a corporate organized community. Zubrzycki found that among the Dutch migrants in Moe (Victoria, Australia), there were few common ties, and that they could not be spoken of as a homogeneous community. Similarly, for the Chinese in Melbourne, three distinctly different groups of Chinese were found; and the relationship between them, especially the question of whether they identify with each other as parts of a common community, is of considerable importance. In terms of marriage pattern, intermarriage tendency, and occupational mobility, these three groups were shown to be distinctly different; but in terms of primary group participation and identification, the Melbourne survey does not offer a definite answer. Are the non-sponsored students, with their high level of education, a reference group for the now growing number of Australian-born Chinese thereby causing a disproportionately large number of Australian-born Chinese to enter the professions? Do the part-Chinese identify themselves as Chinese in spite of the rapid rate of intermarriage? A carefully designed study of the primary group networks among the Chinese will provide answers to these questions.

1 Zubrzycki, op. cit., p. 21.

2 Arthur Huck observed that in outlooks and ways of life, the dissimilarities between the individual Chinese may be much more important that the similarities. The Chinese in Australia (Melbourne, 1967), p. 75.
Conclusion

This thesis presented a picture of the Chinese in Australia under rapid change. The pre-war period of distinct separation of the Chinese community from Australian society is past; the new situation after the war is favourable to the successful assimilation of the Chinese. Much has changed since the first Chinese came to Australia. In China, social and political changes have encouraged Chinese migrants to take positive steps to settle permanently in and adjust themselves to their places of residence. In Australia, the uneasiness in confronting strange faces is declining rapidly; and Australia, through her immigration programme, is bringing large numbers of migrants from different countries. The integration of Chinese into the Australian society is definitely simpler than before. The hardship of the struggle for survival, and associated with it, the commuting system, will probably disappear in the future as one of the legends of the past.

The type of Chinese migrants themselves are also different. More educated and knowledgeable in world affairs and more predisposed to change, they will probably find it easier to settle in an acceptable place in Australia. In conclusion, then, among the three final configurations of Park's cycle (caste, permanent minority and assimilation), evidence considered so far seems to indicate that the Chinese in Australia are gradually moving towards assimilation rather than forming a 'caste' or 'permanent minority' within Australian society.
CATEGORIES OF CHINESE ADMITTED UNDER AUSTRALIA IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS

MERCHANTS

(1901) Admitted on Certificates of Exemption, valid for one year renewable.

(1912) Admitted on Passports, valid for one year renewable: £1,000 turnover per year required.

(1914) Admitted on Passports and proof of status; £500 turnover per year required.

(1934) Admitted on Passports, valid for seven years and renewable.

(1956) Turnover requirement increased to £10,000

(1966) Turnover requirement abolished; each case judged on individual merit.

ASSISTANTS

a) Merchant Assistants:

(1901) Probably admitted since 1901 on Certificates of Exemption.

(1934) Officially admitted on Certificates of Exemption, £500 turnover requirement per year for each assistant.

(1956) Turnover requirement abolished, admitted on necessity.

(1965) Admission of assistants abolished.

b) Local Trader Assistants:

(1934) Admitted on Certificates of Exemption, valid for one year renewable; £5,000 turnover for the first assistant, and £10,000 for each additional one, up to a maximum of five assistants.
(1940) Turnover requirement for additional assistants reduced to £5,000

(1947) Certificate of exemption valid for five years renewable.

(1956) Turnover requirement abolished, admitted on necessity.

(1965) Admission of assistants abolished.

c) Market-Gardeners Assistants:

(1940) Admitted on Certificates of Exemption, valid for one year renewable; turnover requirement £1,500.

(1947) Turnover requirement reduced to £750.

(1956) Turnover requirement abolished, admitted on necessity.

(1965) Admission of assistants abolished.

**SUBSTITUTES**

(1920) Temporary Assistants probably admitted during 1920's for three years on Certificates of Exemption.

(1934) Permanent substitutes admitted, £5,000 turnover requirement: Certificates of Exemption for temporary substitutes extended to five years.

(1965) Admission of substitutes abolished.

**CHEFS AND CAFE WORKERS**

(1934) Chefs admitted on Certificates of exemption.

(1947) If cafe established before 1947, £2,500 turnover requirement for each, maximum eight; if cafe established after 1947, £5,000 turnover requirement for each, maximum eight.

(1965) Only specialized chefs admitted; if from Hong Kong, governed by a Hong Kong ordinance that the employer must enter into a two year contract.
STUDENTS

(1904) Admitted on Certificates of Exemption, valid for one year renewable.

(1912) Admitted on Passports valid for one year, renewable for six years; age limit 17-24.

(1924) Age limit 14-19 on entry, permitted to stay until 24.

(1926) Minimum age limit on entry 10 if joining parents in Australia.

(1947) Maximum age limit for primary students, 15; for secondary students, 19; no age limit for tertiary students.

WIVES AND DEPENDANTS

(1906) Of well-established domiciled families, admitted on Certificates of Exemption, valid for six months renewable once.

(1913) Certificates of Exemption valid for one year, renewable to a maximum of three years.

(1920) Wives and dependants permitted to accompany passport holder.

(1947) Merchants' wives and dependants permitted to remain for seven years; Local traders' permitted for five years; Assistants' permitted on individual merit.

(1956) Wives and dependants permitted to remain as long as their sponsors were under exemption.

**APPENDIX II**

**CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONS**

a) According to the Australian National University Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Code</th>
<th>ANU Code</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>Architects, Engineers and Surveyors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Natural Scientists and University Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Medical Practitioners and Dentists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Accountants, Auditors and Economists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II Lower Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Code</th>
<th>ANU Code</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Nurses and Professional Medical Workers (n.e.c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Teachers (excluding University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Writers, Creative Artists and Entertainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Draftsmen and Technicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV Managerials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Code</th>
<th>ANU Code</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Public Service Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Industrial Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cafe Proprietors (with employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Green Grocers and Fruit Shop Proprietors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wholesale Fruiterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chinese Grocer Proprietors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chinese Food Product Manufacturers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V Self-employed (Shop Proprietors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Code</th>
<th>ANU Code</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cafe Proprietors (without employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fruit and Vegetable Retailers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chinese Gift Shop Proprietors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Herbalists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI Other Farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Code</th>
<th>ANU Code</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Market Gardeners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Small Scale Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Code</td>
<td>ANU Code</td>
<td>Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Clerical and Related Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Book-keepers and Cashiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Clerks, Typists and Office Machine Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Public Servants (n.e.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Insurance and Real Estate Salesmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sales Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Craftsmen and Foremen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Fitters, Turners and Toolsetters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mechanics and Vehicle Body Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Electricians and Radio TV Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Carpenter and Cabinet-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Shop Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wholesale Fruiterers' Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chinese Grocer Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chinese Food Product Manufacturers' Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Other Shop Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Operatives and Other Process Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Various Miscellaneous Operatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII Personal, Domestic and Other Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Cleaners, Caretakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Cooks, Chefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Catering Workers and Waiters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Bartenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Hairdressers and Beauticians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV Farm Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Farm Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI Labourers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>General Labourers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Other Inadequately Defined</td>
<td>44 99 Undefined, not stated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on L. Broom, F.L. Jones and J. Zubrzycki, "An Occupational Classification of the Australian Workforce", Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, I (Oct, 1965), Supplement. Group II (Graziers, and Wheat and Sheep Farmers), Group VIII (Armed Services and Police Force), Group XII (Drivers, Transport workers), and Group XIV (Miners) are excluded.
B) According to Australian-Chinese Division

**Australian**

---

(1) Upper Professionals

- 01 Architects, Engineers, Surveyors
- 02 Natural Scientists and University Teachers
- 03 Medical Practitioners and Dentists
- 04 Pharmacists
- 05 Accountants, Auditors and Economists

(II) Lower Professionals

- 06 Nurses and other Medical Workers
- 07 School Teachers
- 08 Writers, Creative Artists
- 09 Draftsmen and Technicians

(III) White Collar Clerical Workers

- 23 Book-keepers and Cashiers
- 24 Clerks, Typists and Office Machine Operators
- 25 Public Servants
- 10 Public Administrators
- 26 Insurance and Real Estate Salesmen
- 27 Commercial Travellers and Sales Representatives

(IV) Blue Collar Workers

- 28 Fitters, Turners and Toolsetters
- 29 Mechanics and Vehicle Body Builders
- 30 Electricians and Radio, TV Technicians
- 22 Small Scale Farmers
- 36 Miscellaneous Operatives
- 37 Cleaners and Caretakers
- 40 Bartenders
- 41 Hairdressers, Beauticians
- 42 Farm Workers
- 43 General Labourers

**Chinese**

---

(V) Employer

- 11 Merchants
- 12 Cafe Proprietors (with employees)
- 13 Green Grocers (with employees)
14 Wholesale Fruiterers
15 Chinese Grocers
16 Chinese Food Product Manufacturers

(VI) Self-Employed
17 Cafe Proprietors (without employees)
18 Fruit and Vegetable retailers
19 Chinese Gift Shop Proprietors
20 Herbalists
21 Market-Gardeners and other self-employed
31 Chinese cabinet-makers

(VII) Employees
32 Wholesale Fruiterers' Employees
33 Chinese Grocer Employees
34 Chinese Food Products Manufacturers' Employees
35 Other Shop Assistants
38 Cooks, Chefs
39 Catering Services and Waiters

(VIII) Inadequately defined
44 Undefined, not stated.
## APPENDIX III

### GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF CHINESE 1901-1966 (FULL CHINESE ONLY)

(A) **States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>10,222</td>
<td>8,223</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>4,503</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>6,447</td>
<td>10,325</td>
<td>11,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td>41.52</td>
<td>51.44</td>
<td>50.06</td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>50.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>6,347</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>5,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>7,672</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>2,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Aust.</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Aust.</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.C.T.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29,627</td>
<td>22,753</td>
<td>17,157</td>
<td>10,846</td>
<td>9,144</td>
<td>12,878</td>
<td>20,382</td>
<td>23,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Metropolitan Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>5,353</td>
<td>8,523</td>
<td>9,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney %</td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>51.08</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td>83.03</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>85.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>4,187</td>
<td>4,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne %</td>
<td>38.36</td>
<td>53.45</td>
<td>62.46</td>
<td>59.79</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>82.11</td>
<td>84.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane %</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>33.28</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>44.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Aust.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide %</td>
<td>78.54</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>47.41</td>
<td>67.89</td>
<td>45.03</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>66.01</td>
<td>94.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Aust.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth %</td>
<td>21.76</td>
<td>43.32</td>
<td>48.83</td>
<td>51.12</td>
<td>55.68</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>71.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart %</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>76.58</td>
<td>68.03</td>
<td>58.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.C.T. %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td>98.51</td>
<td>98.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Metropolitan area %</th>
<th>5,890</th>
<th>7,353</th>
<th>6,443</th>
<th>4,492</th>
<th>5,389</th>
<th>8,798</th>
<th>15,069</th>
<th>18,017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Metropolitan Australia % | 38.03 | 43.01 | 46.87 | 50.72 | 53.92 | 56.12 | 58.14 |

---

a) Persons born in China  
b) Including Half-Chinese  
c) Canberra included after 1954.
APPENDIX IV

A) Letter to Respondents  

Department of Demography  
The Australian National University  
16 May 1968

Dear Sir,

I am responsible, under the auspices of the Department of Demography, for a study on the pattern of Chinese migration and settlement in Melbourne. The aim of the study is to collect some facts concerning working and living conditions, social activities, and other general aspects of livelihood in Australia. This is an academic Ph.D. thesis research, and is not connected in any way with any government offices or private organisations.

Your name has been obtained from the "Sands and McDougalls Directory" of Victoria and I apologize for writing without any prior notice. I would be most grateful if you would allow me to ask some questions on this subject.

I shall be visiting Chinese homes during the next six months and would appreciate very much your kind co-operation when I call on you. I will show you a formal letter of introduction signed by the Head of the Department of Demography of the University.

Any information obtained from these interviews will be kept strictly confidential. In no way will the names of persons interviewed be identified, and in no case will the information be disclosed to anyone not directly connected with this research.

Thank you in advance,

Yours sincerely,

C.Y. Choi, M.A.  
Research Scholar  
Australian National University
B) Interview Schedule

CONFIDENTIAL MAY-NOVEMBER 1968

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
CANBERRA A.C.T.
DEPARTMENT OF DEMOGRAPHY

MELBOURNE CHINESE SURVEY

NOTE: This interview is absolutely confidential. No information obtained from this interview will be associated in any way with the names of the persons interviewed, nor will this form be shown to any other person or persons except those directly connected with this research.

Address No. ________________
Schedule No. ________________
Address ____________________________________________
____________________________________________________
Name of Head ________________________________
Date of Interview ______________________________
Time Taken ________________________________
### (A) FAMILY SIZE, MAINTENANCE AND EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Relation to Head</th>
<th>Whether maintained by Head</th>
<th>Date of Arrival</th>
<th>Present Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER MEMBERS OF FAMILY NOT INCLUDED IN ABOVE (FATHER, MOTHER AND CHILDREN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education (level and country)</th>
<th>Degree Diploma</th>
<th>Date of Naturalization</th>
<th>Years of English training</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>If not single to whom married (Specify race)</th>
<th>Birth Place of partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MEMBERS OF FAMILY NOT INCLUDED IN ABOVE (FATHER, MOTHER, CHILDREN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(A) FAMILY SIZE, MAINTENANCE AND EDUCATION (CON'T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Marriage</th>
<th>Place of Marriage</th>
<th>Date of Arrival of partner</th>
<th>Date of birth of partner</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER MEMBERS OF FAMILY NOT INCLUDED IN ABOVE (FATHER, MOTHER, CHILDREN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Address and Other Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B) OCCUPATION AND PLACE OF RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period from to</th>
<th>Occupation (Specify industry and firm)</th>
<th>Race and Place of origin of employer</th>
<th>Relationship to employer</th>
<th>Reasons for change of occupation</th>
<th>Residential address</th>
<th>Whether same as address at work</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole are you satisfied with the present occupation? In what ways? For example, what are some of the difficulties or special rewards?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
1) When did you first arrive in Australia? / / / / (With intention of migration including visits and tours which became de facto migration trips)

(IF ARRIVED AS A CHILD OR AUSTRALIAN BORN, SKIP TO QUESTION NUMBER 7)

2) Could you tell me some of the reasons why you have decided to come to Australia?

HEAD:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

WIFE:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3) I understand that there are many difficulties involved in coming to Australia; for example, the problem of sponsorship. What was your sponsor's occupation when you came?

HEAD                  WIFE
4) What was his (her) relation to you? _______ _______

5) Where did you live before you came to Australia? (Place of last residence) _______ _______

6) Did you pay your own fare or did someone else pay? Self _______ _______
   Sponsor _______ _______
   Other _______ _______

7) If your father migrated to Australia, could you tell me some of the reasons why he decided to come to Australia?

   HEAD: __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

   WIFE: __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

8) When did he first arrive? HEAD _______ WIFE _______

9) Was he sponsored by someone? Yes _______ No _______

10) What was the occupation of the sponsor? _______ _______

11) What was his relation to your father? _______ _______
(IF SINGLE SKIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>WIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) When did you marry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Where was this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Do you know each other prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to your arrival in Australia?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you two meet?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probe: Introduction through family members, arranged marriage as compared to "free choice" marriage

15) Do you have any one to take care of at home in China? (probe: multiple marriage)

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
(D) HOME AND DURABLE GOODS OWNERSHIP

1) Type of dwelling: (To be filled in by interviewer)

Detached _________________________________
Brick Bungalow _________________
Semi-detached__________________________
Terrace ______________________________
Flat _______________________________
Sharing Room) ____________________________
and kitchen )__________________________
Hostel/boarding house____________________

2) When did you move into this home?

/ / /

3) How did you move into this dwelling?

Built with own resources______________
Bought or buying____________________
Rented______________________________

4) Did you own any (other) houses before? (or do)

yes_______ no_________

if yes, address_________ period_________


5) Could you tell me why you have preferred Melbourne to other cities?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
6) Do you have:

Motor car
Refrigerator
T.V.
Washing Machine

Was it New when you bought it?
New 2nd hand Method of payment

7) Considering Housing and other facilities in the house, would you say that it is better, the same, or worse than the condition before you came to Australia?

very much better
better
the same
worse
very much worse

7) In what way?

------------------

(E) SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

TO HEAD AND WIFE:

1) (Since arriving in this country) have you joined or participated in any Australian organizations, clubs and societies etc?
(Indicate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>WIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>office</td>
<td>office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name held</td>
<td>Name held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional
Church
Sporting bodies
Social club
Political parties
Cultural societies
Civic or community organizations
Fraternal or mutual aid
2) What Chinese organizations do you join or participate in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of association</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>How Often</th>
<th>Office held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Do you regularly read Chinese Newspapers or Magazines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of magazine and type of paper</th>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>WIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4) Apart from formal club or associational activities, what other types of recreation do you frequently enjoy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>WIFE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horse racing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing, swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching T.V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you be able to tell me which ones you spend the most time in?

(TO HEAD)

5) Could you name three of your closest friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether friend at work or others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Are most your friends Chinese or Australian?

Chinese
Australian
Half-half
7) How often do you see them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Australian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many times have you visited their homes or have they visited your home during the last month?

8) Could you name three persons who you consider to be leaders of the Chinese community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(F) FAMILY LIFE AND LANGUAGES

TO HEAD AND WIFE

1) How many dialects of the Chinese language can you speak?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandarin (sam yap)</th>
<th>Cantonese (Sze yap)</th>
<th>Cantonese Teochiu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other Kwangtung dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fukien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

total number

2) Which one do you speak at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with your wife/husband</td>
<td>with your wife/husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with your children</td>
<td>with your children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among children</td>
<td>among children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Do your friends speak your dialects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) If no, what dialects do they speak?

______________________________(specify)

5) Can you read and write Chinese?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Do your Children appear to have settled easily into life in this country? In what ways? (Probe: friends and school adjustment, overt discrimination)


7) What type of school do your children go to?


8) What occupation do you want your children to follow?


9) Do you think that schools are providing the kind of education you expect your children to have? (Probe: conflict between values at home and at school). That is, whether the school is preparing your children well for the future?
1) In general, then, do you feel that your life in Australia is satisfactory?
   yes ___________ no ___________

   In what ways? __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

2) Would you encourage or discourage your relatives or friends to come here?
   yes ___________ no ___________

   Would you sponsor them if necessary?
   yes ___________ no ___________

3) If you decide to change your present occupation and become engaged in occupations normal for other Australians, do you think that you will be accepted among them? Or do you see conflict arising therefrom?

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

4) How do you compare yourself with New European migrants? In terms of security and economic well-being.

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________
5) The Australian Government has, from time to time, changed some of the regulations regarding Chinese entry into Australia. How do you feel about these changes? Are they a sign of relaxation of restrictive policies or different forms of the same substance?

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

6) Apart from yourself, are there any other Chinese around this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewer's Comment:

1. Interview Conducted in: Chinese______Dialect______ (Specify)
   English______

2. English Grade of Respondent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot communicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Attitude of Respondents:

   Head__________________________________________

   Wife__________________________________________

4. Reasons to suspect information unreliable:

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

5. Other Comments:

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________
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