CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

...my object is to show that the importation of immigrants is as much a commercial transaction as is the importation of a cargo of bale goods, and I am borne out in opinion by the fact that the merchants of Sydney are importing Chinese subjects as an ordinary matter of business,...[1]

The importations mentioned by Richard Jones in this 1850 statement, were into the colony of New South Wales and were undertaken over the six year period from 1847 to 1853. Although the numbers involved were relatively small, with only around 3,043 labourers arriving during this period, this does not, diminish the importance of these labourers, their importation and employment as a subject of study. The Chinese labour trade to the colony was part of the international migration of labour that characterised the nineteenth century and was essential for successful capitalist expansion. The importation of indentured Chinese labourers into the colony is also an indicator of the degree to which both the colony and China had become integrated into the emerging world capitalist system.

This system was based on the commodification of labour power and the transferral of labour from areas of labour surplus to areas of labour deficit and land surplus to produce raw materials to feed the British factories. To move this labour some form of coercion was required, whether in the form of violence and kidnapping that characterised the slave trade, or the binding of labourers to contracts. The re-introduction of pre-capitalist social relations, in the form of bonded labour, (Corrigan's "capitalist monuments"[2]) was essential to attract and control wage labour in regions of land surplus. Without some form of control over the labouring population in these regions, the available labour force could move outside the limits of the employers influence onto readily available land where they could compete for scarce labour.[3] Within the early nineteenth century Australian colonial context,

---

1 "Exportation of Capital for the Importation of Labour" by Richard Jones, *MBC*, 16th February, 1850.

2 Corrigan argues that the increasing utilisation of unfree labour during the nineteenth century was not a '...feudal relic, but part of the essential relations of capitalism'. P. Corrigan, 'Feudal Relics or Capitalist Monuments? Notes on the Sociology of Unfree Labour', *Sociology*, Vol. 11, No. 3, September 1977, p. 438.

3 Wakefield's scheme for systematic colonisation of the Australian colonies was a prime example of attempts to prevent labourers crossing the Von Thünen frontier. Hermann M. Schwartz. *States versus Markets: History, Geography and the Development of the International Political Economy*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1994, p. 124.

convicts constituted the bonded abour force that could be constrained by law to labour in a specific employment within a specific geographical region. The production relations of colonial wool growing dictated that once this form of bonded labour was no longer available a suitable substitute had to be found. The search for a substitute wage-labour force that could be constrained to watch over the pastoralists' capital, which took the form of sheep, was to eventually end in China.

This thesis details and analyses those forces which were at work in the colony, England and China, which coalesced at a specific period in history to bring indentured Chinese labourers to the colony. At the centre of this study are the employers and importers of the labourers, who formed a community of interests which forged the development path of the pastoral industry and effectively countered moves to undermine their social and economic position. These interests included banking, shipping, commercial agencies and wool-brokers located in the colony, England and China; and had been developed through the forces of, and assisted in, capitalist expansion. The financial, mercantile and familial interrelationships that were at the centre of English expansion overseas, and the development and extension of the colonial pastoral industry, would later be utilised to import indentured labourers from Amoy to New South Wales.

The introduction of various forms of indentured labour, South Sea Islanders and Indian labourers in particular, into the Australian colonies has undergone extensive research and analysis as to the place that such importations assumed in the global movements of population in the nineteenth century, and the impact that these movements have had on the Australian economy and society.[4] The migration of indentured Chinese labourers to the Australian colonies has, until now, been afforded neither the same degree of research and analysis as other migrations of indentured labour to Australia, nor the scholarship devoted to the migration of indentured Chinese labourers to other regions of the world.[5] The reason or reasons for this apparent

---

4 Refer in particular to the chapters by Saunders and Evans in Kay Saunders, (ed.) *Indentured Labour in the British Empire, 1834-1920*, London, Croom Helm, 1984; also chapters by Graves, Denoon, and Newbury, in S. Marks and P. Richardson, (eds.) *International Labour Migration, Historical Perspectives*, Middlesex, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, 1984; R. Evans, K. Saunders and K. Cronin, *Race Relations in Colonial Queensland, A History of Exclusion, Exploitation and Extermination*, St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press, 1993; Saunders, Kay, *Workers in Bondage. The Origins and Bases of Unfree Labour in Queensland, 1824-1916*, St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press, 1982; A. Graves, *Cane and Labour. The Political Economy of the Queensland Sugar Industry, 1862-1906*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1993; also of interest are the articles by A. Dwight, 'South Sea Islanders to New South Wales', *JRAHS*, Vol. 68, Pt. 4, 1983, pp. 273-291, and by the same author The Use of Indian Labourers in New South Wales', *JRAHS*, Vol. 62, Pt. 2, 1976, pp. 114-135; and D. Munro, 'The Labor Trade in Melanesians to Queensland; An Historiographical Essay', *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 1995, pp. 609-627.

5 Refer to the chapter by P. Richardson in Saunders (ed.) *op. cit.*; and by the same author a chapter within Shula and Richardson (eds.) *op. cit.*; David Northrup, *Indentured Labour in the Age of Imperialism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995; E. C. Arensmeyer, British Merchant

neglect is difficult to state, although the answer may be found in the relatively small numbers of Chinese that were imported into the colony, compared to the numbers of South Sea Islanders and convicts before them, or in comparison to the numbers of indentured Chinese imported to other regions, such as South Africa, Peru and Cuba. However, the number imported does not detract from their importance within the social, economic and political history of the colony, as this thesis will demonstrate.

Part of the reason for this comparative historical neglect may also be found in the fact that "gold-fever" from 1853 brought an influx of free Chinese, whose numbers overwhelmed those of the indentured Chinese labourers.[6] This produced a situation where the '...events of the more exciting "gold period" have persistently attracted attention at the expense of other less newsworthy but significant happenings'[7].In a global context, the Chinese who arrived on these shores under contract are also of interest, as their importation occurred prior to the mass movement of Chinese to the sugar plantations and guano mines of the Americas and the gold-mines of South Africa. Therefore it can be argued that the Australian contractors laid the basis for a trade that was to assume horrendous and inhumane proportions, aspects that were for the most part absent within the trade to Australia.[8]

While there have been a few works published on Chinese labourers imported under indenture into the Australian colonies the tendency has usually been to relegate the Chinese to a chapter or couple of paragraphs within a broader work, with little or no analysis made of the underlying social and political framework that motivated their contracting. Due to the small amount of space devoted to the contract Chinese within the historiography of the Chinese in Australia, and the unanalytical nature of what exists, a number of inaccuracies are being reproduced, and a number of important points are not being examined. Wang Sing-wu, in his otherwise excellent and informative book, *The Organization of Chinese Emigration*, devotes only about eleven pages to the contract labourers. The majority of the information details the methods by which they were contracted, and the numbers arriving in Australia. Wang includes no

---

Enterprise and the Chinese Coolie Labour Trade, 1850-1874, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Hawaii, 1979; Campbell, P. C., *Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries within the British Empire*, London, P. S. King, 1923; the most detailed work on the subject is Yen Ching-hwang, *Coolies and Mandarins: China's Protection of Overseas Chinese during the Late Ching Period (1851-1911)* Singapore : Singapore University Press, 1985.

6 12,396 free Chinese arrived in the year of 1858 alone, which is four times the total number of indentured labourers imported. Wang Sing-wu, *The Organization of Chinese Emigration, 1848-1888*, San Francisco, Chinese Materials Centre, 1978, p.268.

7 L. R. Marchant, 'Shepherds in Buckram. An episode in the History of the Chinese in Australia' *Westerly*, Vol. 1, Parts 2-3, 196[illegible], p. 123.

8 The fact that at least one of the major players in the contracting of Chinese to Australia, Robert Towns, was to become involved in the shipment of Chinese to Peru as the colonial trade became less profitable provides some justification for this viewpoint.

analysis of the motives for the r importation, nor any discussion of their lives once they reached the colony. C. Y. Choi in *Chinese Migration and Settlement in Australia*[9] disregards the indentured Chinese labourers, as does Andrew Marcus,[10] with Arthur Huck,[11] Patricia Draper,[12] Morag Loh,[13] and E. M. Andrews[14] considering these labourers in a paragraph or less.

An author who has purported to relate the history of the Chinese in Australia is Eric Rolls, within his tome *Sojourners*. This book admittedly deals with the contract labourers in greater detail than elsewhere, yet too often this detail is confused, unanalytical, too reliant on newspaper reports for an objective view on the subject to be presented, and in some places incorrect.[15] Although these can be claimed to be small and therefore inconsequential mistakes, a major problem with historical accuracy arises when this author is quoted in future accounts of the history of the Chinese in Australia and these erroneous figures and dating are accepted as accurate.

An example of where an inaccuracy has been repeated and accepted as the true situation concerns George and John Everett of "Ollera" Station in the New England district. Within a thesis on this station it is stated that the Everett's built a "special lodge" at a cost of £28 for their Chinese labourers,[16] this statement has been repeated

---

9 C. Y. Choi, *Chinese Migration and Settlement in Australia*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1975.

10 Andrew Marcus, 'Chinese in Australian History', *Meanjin*, Vol. 42, No. 1, March 1983, pp. 85-93.

11 Arthur Huck, *The Chinese in Australia*, Croydon, Longmans, 1967.

12 Patricia Draper, 'Chinese Immigration to Australia until the 1930's', *South Australian Genealogist*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1992, pp. 3-8.

13 Morag Loh, 'Historical Overview of Chinese Migration', *The Chinese in Australia*, Working Papers on Migrant and Intercultural Studies, Centre for Migrant and Intercultural Studies, Monash University, No. 12, Dec. 1988, pp. 1-6.

14 E. M. Andrews, *Australia and China: The Ambiguous Relationship*, Brunswick, Melbourne University Press, 1985.

15 Eric Rolls, *Sojourners. The Epic Story of China's Centuries-old Relationship with Australia*, St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press, 1992. The first example of inaccuracy is where the author has stated that one ship carried 430 Chinese to Sydney, whereas the true number was 213, the 430 figure was the tonnage of the ship that carried them to Australian shores. Another mistake is made during the recounting of the mutiny aboard the *Spartan* which is retold factually in most respects except in the dating of the *Spartan's* voyage, a mistake which at the best ignores the situation in China at the time of the *Spartan's* departure. The *Spartan* made two trips to Amoy to collect indentured labourers, the first being undertaken in 1852 arriving in Sydney in April 1852, with Captain Marshall in charge and on account of Robert Towns. The second trip was undertaken in December 1852, arriving in Sydney, via Port Phillip in May 1853, and it was upon this voyage that the mutiny occurred, not the previous trip as reported by the author in question. By relying upon newspaper reports that the Chinese were happy with their contracts, ignoring the extent of death and sickness encountered upon the voyage and incorrectly dating the actual mutinous voyage, the author in question has ignored the serious riots that occurred in Amoy at the time that the *Spartan* was in port, which occasioned not only an inquiry by the British Superintendent of Trade in China but also prompted the major "coolie" shipper, James Tait, to move his receiving ship the *Emigrant*, down the coast to Namao.(*ibid.* p. 59). All of these occurrences, which have been ignored by the author of *Sojourners*, impacted upon the trade in Chinese labourers to the Australian colonies (as detailed within later chapters), this disregard presenting an incorrect and unbalanced picture of the indentured Chinese labourers that arrived aboard the *Spartan* in particular, and the labourers generally.

16 A. V. Cane, Ollera, 1838-1900. A Study of a Sheep Station, M. A. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1949, p. 83.

in three other works,[17] which all imply that by constructing this "lodge" the Everett's were, to put it simply, very kind and Christian minded towards their Chinese employees. Firstly, the term "lodge" was unusual in the nineteenth century, especially if used for what was essentially a hut, and secondly, £28 would have been equivalent at the time to the amount spent on the overseer's or squatter's houses.[18] The truth, however, is that the Everetts did not pay £28 for a lodge to be built for their Chinese labourers, rather the monies referred to in the ledger for "Ollera" Station were to be paid as passage money to F. W. Lodge, the captain/agent of the ship on which the Chinese arrived in the colony.[19] The perpetual retelling of this, and other inaccurate statements have not only coloured the perception of how the Everetts treated their Chinese workers, but more importantly increases the likelihood that the indentured Chinese labourers will become mythical creatures, bearing no resemblance to their own reality and place within colonial Australian history.

This is not to denigrate all of the historiography pertaining to indentured Chinese labourers in New South Wales, as a number of works have added greatly to the store of knowledge on this subject. Monica Tankey has published a number of works on the indentured labourers from a Family History perspective,[20] and the work of Alan Dwight[21] is invaluable as a starting point for further inquiry. Overall however, the literature on the indentured Chinese labourers tends to be unanalytical, inconsistent, inadequate and even incorrect. Many faults are being reproduced in later works that have drawn on this information, thereby compounding the mistakes and moving the history of the indentured Chinese labourers out of the realm of fact. It is now over thirty years ago, that in regard to the indentured Chinese labourers imported into Australia, it was argued that:

---

17 Evadene B. Swanson, 'Chinese Immigrants in New England', *Journal and Proceedings of the Armidale and District Historical Society*, No. 11, 1968, p. 28.

18 The actual cost of labourers huts, which were constructed from bark and slabs, within the Northern Districts in 1847 was £6 in Wellingrove, from £5-7 in Armidale, £12 in Grafton, £5 in the Darling Downs, and £10 in Tabulam/Casino. All costs falling way below £28. Appendix B, Report from the Select Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1847, Vol. II, p. 298.

19 Account of W. Dawes, May 1853, *Ollera Account Book, 1841-72.* (UNE A103 V2259)

20 Tankey, Monica E. 'The Amoy Labourers- Australia's Pioneer Asian Immigrants', *Australian Congress on Genealogy and Heraldry,* (Proceedings of the 5th Conference), 1988, pp. 333-338: 'Armidale and the Amoy Labourers', *Armidale and District Historical Society Journal*, No. 29, March 1986, pp. 75-76: 'Chinese Immigration into Australia', *Australian Congress on Genealogy and Heraldry,* (Proceedings of the 3rd Conference), 1986, pp. 350-357: 'A Blueprint for Action', *Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*, No. 6, 1981, pp. 189-195: 'Chinese in Australia: One Family', *ANU Historical Journal*, Vol. 15 1981-82, pp. 71-79.

21 Dwight, A. 'Chinese Labourers to N. S. W.', *Eastern Horizon*, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1975, pp. 52-60: 'The Chinese in New South Wales Law Courts, 1848-1854', *JRAHS*, Vol. 73, No. 2, 1987, pp. 75-93: 'South Sea Islanders to New South Wales', *JRAHS*, Vol. 68, No. 4, 1983, pp. 273-291: 'The Use of Indian Labourers in New South Wales', *JRAHS*, Vol. 62, No. 2, 1976, pp. 114-135.

It is up to the historian to review this mythical figure, and see the part Chinese played in the history of labour, at least in the pastoral industry, even if this means upsetting some well-established theories.[22]

To review this "mythical figure" this thesis presents and analyses the motives and the outcomes of the Chinese labour trade to the colony, and the manner in which the importations were part of the changing balance of power within the colony and the emerging capitalist world economy. It is imperative to state at this point those aspects of the Chinese labour trade which are not dealt with in this thesis. Firstly, this thesis is specifically on the history of the Chinese labour trade to New South Wales, and not being theoretically driven it is not overly concerned with the international political economy of Chinese labour movements. Secondly, the focus of this thesis is on what I have termed the Northern Districts of colonial New South Wales, namely the pastoral districts of New England, Clarence River, Darling Downs, Moreton Bay, Maranoa, and Wide Bay.

The location of these districts can be seen within Figure 1 over the page. Although slight reference is made to individual Chinese labourers employed elsewhere the majority of information provided pertains to the labourers employed in these districts, as the majority of labourers were employed within the Northern Districts.[23] This emphasis has also been adopted as the northern employers of the Chinese were as a clique emerging as a significant political force, and had been initially responsible for the establishment of the trade.

Thirdly, little reference is made to the post-indenture lives of the Chinese labourers due to two factors: firstly, the lack of complete station records for even one station that employed Chinese labourers; and secondly, the problems of transliteration and anglicisation of Chinese names. The various transliterations of the labourers names that occurred between their embarkation at Amoy and their arrival at the sheep-stations, made tracing the course of the majority of labourers impossible as does the adoption of an anglicised name, usually John. One example of name changes causing difficulties that may be cited is that of Ung Chin, who was employed on "Ballandean" station. Archival research has shown that Ung Chin arrived in February 1853 aboard the *Eleanor Lancaster*, could speak English, and was a leader amongst the other Chinese on "Ballandean" and neighbouring stations, acting as interpreter in court

---

22 L. R. Marchant, *op.cit*, p. 124.

23 Of the total number of 3043 labourers imported, 407 were imported direct to Moreton Bay and 495 direct to Newcastle, which port also fed the Northern Districts. To these numbers must be added the 347 labourers transferred to Moreton Bay and the 203 transferred to Wide Bay and the Clarence River. In total 1,452 labourers were imported into the Northern Districts, or 47% of the total number imported, which as will be discussed later must be viewed as a lower estimate.

FIGURE 1

LOCATION OFCOLONIAL PASTORAL DISTRICTS IN 1850

Source: S. H. Roberts, *The Squatting Age in Australia 1835-47*, Carlton, Melbourne University Press,1935, pp. 170a and 210a

cases. For four years Ung Chin is denoted as such in the station and Bench records, and then, for some unknown reason, becomes King Johnny, a name he retained for two years, after which he disappears from all records. Given the number of "John Chinaman" listed in the Bench Books, newspapers and in station journals during the late 1850s any hope of tracing the later movements of Ung Chin is forlorn.[24]

Given these omissions, the focus of this thesis is on the economic and socio-political aspects of the importation of contract Chinese labour that occurred between 1847-53, with specific reference to the attitude of those involved in the importation and employment of this labour in regard to the whole question of "servile" labour.[25]The following four chapters of this thesis, Chapters Two to Five, trace out the development and integration of New South Wales, and China into the international trading system. Specific reference is made to the pastoral industry, the ascendancy of squatting, the development of links with China and the colonial labour market.

Chapter Two details the plans and proposals from prior to white settlement until 1817 which promoted the importation of Chinese labour into the colony; concentrating on the "ideal" of Chinese labour, and questioning why these proposals remained just that. The next chapter continues on from 1817 to examine the colonial economy and labour market with regard to capital movements and the development of the pastoral industry. The focus of Chapter Four is on the development of the Chinese labour market and the means by which it was exploited by colonial squatters and merchants. Chapter Five covers the period 1842-47 during which the squatters consolidated their position within the colony from where they were able to draw upon existing mercantile and financial structures to bring to fulfilment the earlier plans and proposals for Chinese labour importation.

The carriage, arrival, dispersal and employment of the Chinese labourers are the subjects of the next five chapters. Chapter Six discusses how the early trade was established and the factors that caused it to develop exponentially in 1852. Chapter Seven details the conduct of the trade by the shipping owners, agents and captains involved, and offers an explanation for the cessation of the trade in 1853, based on the effects of speculation and the profit motive on the conduct of the trade. Chapter Eight details how the importers assessed the demand for, and "sold" the Chinese labourers within the colony; including selling the concept of Chinese labour and the physical

---

24 Another example of name changes can be found with Kaw Hoe which is a Cantonese corruption of the Fukienese Xu Huì, with Kaw Hoe being further corrupted by the manner in which the name was pronounced, heard and written by his European master.

25 In using the term servile I am referring to the state of being subject to a master and living in servitude, with little or no independence of action, in the manner of a slave. *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles.*

sale of the labourers. This chapter includes an analysis of how the sales techniques used varied over time and across regions and came to encompass "selling" the employers (and their need to import Chinese) to their detractors and opponents. Chapters Nine and Ten relate where, and in what capacity, the Chinese were employed within the colony, emphasising the use of law to regulate their employment and attempt to enforce servility.

The concluding chapter details and evaluates the economic impact of Chinese labour importation into the colony, and the differing explanations that can be propounded to explain why the trade ceased in 1853 and was never repeated- employers sights having turned to other areas of labour supply.

CHAPTER TWO

THE IDEA AND "IDEAL" OF CHINESE LABOUR: NEW SOUTH WALES, 1783-1820

It may be argued that the true history of Chinese immigration to Australia begins at least sixty years previous to the arrival of the *Alfred* in 1847, prior to white settlement of the continent of New Holland when the British Government was contemplating the establishment of a colony in the South Seas. The reason for qualifying this statement with a "may" is due to the question as to the extent that these proposals influenced the Pitt administration in their decision as to the form that the Botany Bay settlement was to assume; a question that has its roots within the ongoing reasons-for-settlement debate.[1] Within three of the plans for the settlement Chinese labourers are included, and although there are suggestions or intimations of plantation work the actual nature of their part within the colony is unclear.

This chapter relates the various schemes to introduce Chinese labourers into the colony prior to 1820; the personalities behind and motivations for the schemes; and attempts to explain why all the schemes were unsuccessful, and then cease after 1810. The first section of this chapter details the various pre-settlement proposals and then questions the manner in which the authors perceived the role the Chinese were to play within the proposed colony. The second section of this chapter details the post-settlement proposals and, through inquiring into the background of the authors, attempts to establish to what extent such proposals would have influenced the British government. The final section of the chapter addresses two points in regard to the question of why Chinese labour was sought. Firstly, why the Chinese were included in the plans and proposals initially and secondly, why Chinese and not Indians or some other eastern population? This section concludes with a brief examination of the reasons why there was a hiatus in the calls for Chinese labour between 1810 and the latter years of the 1820s.

A: PRE-SETTLEMENT PLANS: MATRA, CALL AND YOUNG

The first suggestion that Chinese labourers should be incorporated as part of any new colony to be founded in New Holland came from John Maria Matra, a close friend and client of Sir Joseph Banks. Matra's interest in the decision as to the way in which a colony in the South Seas was to be constituted can be assumed to have been

---

1 Reasons of space have dictated that a discussion of how the Chinese labourers fit into the "Reasons-for-Settlement Debate", a debate that has occupied the time and attentions of so many historians over the past few decades, has been placed with n Appendix I.

derived from the fact that he had sailed with Cook on the *Endeavour* and had fought for the British in the American War of Independence.[2] Although a chance to further himself by being appointed to the Governorship of a colony can be perceived as a, if not the, motivating force behind the submission of his plan.[3] Matra's plan for colonisation, which was submitted to the Fox-North Coalition Government on the 23rd August, 1783, argued that, 'This country may afford an asylum to those unfortunate American Loyalists...', and, '...that we may draw any number of useful inhabitants from China, agreeably to an invariable custom of the Dutch in forming or recruiting their Eastern settlement.'[4] This latter suggestion was reinforced by noting that it was the opinion of Sir Joseph Banks that such labour would be useful, thereby lending it more credence within the eyes of those to whom it was addressed.

Although his plan essentially revolved around the establishment of a colony of free settlers, in the person of the American Loyalists, augmented by the inclusion of a Chinese labouring population, Matra later adjusted his plan to include the transportation of convicts. This revision of his plan, although an addendum or supplement may be a more accurate description, was undertaken after the author had discussed the subject with Lord Sydney, the British Home Secretary in Pitt's government, who reputedly informed Matra that '...what he was really looking for was a solution to the problem of felons sentenced to transportation.'[5] This supplement however does not mention the inclusion of Chinese in the proposed settlement, yet this should not be assumed to indicate that Matra had dismissed the idea of incorporating Chinese in the settlement. The supplement merely discusses the benefits to be gained both monetarily and morally from the transportation of convicts to New South Wales, and does not address any other ideas or aspects of the plan that he first lodged in 1783.[6]

---

2 aka Jean Mario Matra or Magra, (c) 1745-1806. P. Serle, *Dictionary of Australian Biography*, Vol. 2, Sydney, Angus and Robertson 1949, p.123. For a more detailed biography of Matra refer to A. Frost, *The Precarious Life of James Mario Matra*, Carlton, Miegunyah Press, 1995.

3 A. Frost, *Convicts and Empire; A Naval Question, 1776-1811*, Melbourne, 1980, p. 13: The same point is made by Mackay, *A Place of Exile, The European Settlement of New South Wales*, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1985, p. 6.

4 'James Maria Matra's Proposal' in *Historical Records of NSW*, Vol. 1 Part 2, Phillip 1783-1792, Sydney, Government Printer, 1879, p. 2 Also *CO. 201/1*, pp. 57-61 (AJCP Reel 1).

5 Manning Clark, 'The choice of Botany Bay', in Ged Martin, (ed.), *The Founding of Australia. The Argument about Australia's Origins*, Sydney, 1978, p. 67, also A. Atkinson, 'Whigs and Tories and Botany Bay', in Ged Martin, (ed.), *The Founding of Australia. The Argument about Australia's Origins*, Sydney, 1978, p. 192. The supplement actually opens with the statement 'When I convened with Lord Sydney on the subject, it was observed that New South Wales, would be a very proper Region for the reception of Criminals condemned to Transportation.' J. M. Matra, 'Supplement to Mr. Matra's Plan for the Establishment of a Settlement upon the Coast of New South Wales', 6th April, 1784, *C.O. 201/1*, p. 62, (AJCP Reel 1).

6 J. M. Matra, 'Supplement to Mr. Matra's Plan for the Establishment of a Settlement upon the Coast of New South Wales', 6th April, 1784, *C.O. 201/1*, pp. 62-65, (AJCP Reel 1).

In 1784 Sir George Young, (1732-1810), ex-East India service, an Admiral of the White Fleet, veteran of the American war, possible associate of Matra's from their days in Teneriffe, and one of the many who supported Matra's plan,[7] also composed a proposal although this one was submitted to Pitt personally.[8] Within this plan Young outlines his ideas as to the form that the proposed settlement should take, including Chinese labourers, yet with convicts playing an insignificant, almost afterthought position within the plan. Young's second version of his plan was submitted to Lord Sydney through the Attorney General Pepper Arden, on the 13th January, 1785 and, as with the first version, proposed that:

> *At a time when men are alarmed at every idea of emigration I wish not to add to their fears by any attempt to depopulate the parent state. The settlers of New South Wales are principally to be collected from the Friendly Islands and a so China.*[9]

The plans delivered by Young concentrated on the new colony as a centre of production and commerce, highlighting that flax could be produced and the '...country is everywhere capable of producing all kinds of spice, likewise the fine Oriental cotton, indigo, coffee, tobacco, with every species of the sugar-cane, also tea, silk and madder.'[10]All of these products England acquired either through the Indian and East Indies possessions or through China, but more importantly all were, and to some extent, still are produced under plantation conditions. The labour-intensive nature of the production of these crops can explain (although only partially) why Young was inclined not to engender fears of depopulation of the "Mother Country".[11] Suggesting instead, Chinese as labourers, with the addition of American Loyalists undertaking the function of "planter". In this respect Young was more forward than Matra by implying that these were the areas of production in which the Chinese were to be most beneficial. Young was also involved in the preparation or presentation of Matra's plan to Sydney as he states, within a letter to Alexander Davison in regard to his plan for the settlement of New South Wales, that

---

7 *DNB,* Vol. XXI, pp. 1288-1289

8 Atkinson has argued that this plan was written and submitted some time during 1784, and may be the one alluded to by Young in his 1793 letter to Alexander Davison. Young's plan, undated *PRO 30/8/342* part 2, pp. 283-4, (AJCP Reel 5992)

9 Young, along with Matra, was concerned about the American Loyalists due to his personal involvement in the war, and included them in his settlement proposal as he believed that in the new colony they '...would here find a fertile, healthy soil, far preferable to their own, ..., and with a greater prospect of success than in any other place hitherto pointed out for them'. Sir George Young's Plan for Settling New South Wales', in *HRNSW*, Vol. 1, Part 2, p.12. Also *CO. 201/1*, pp. 55-56, (AJCP Reel 1).

10 *ibid*, p.11.

11 This fear of depopulating England is interesting as at the time in question England was undergoing a period of social upheaval and unemployment, primarily due to the demobilisation of thousands of men after the American war and increased rates of population growth. To these factors has been aligned the growth in criminal activity and prosecution that resulted in the increased numbers of people sentenced to transportation.

'...this plan was presented by Mr. Matra, and myself to Lord Sydney in the year 1784,...'.[12]

One aspect that emerges from a study of these various versions is that Young appears to have recognised, albeit slowly, that in order to conform to the requirements of the government his plan should present Botany Bay not as '...a new convenient trading base, but as a site suitable for a gaol.'[13] The notable changes within Young's versions are the increasing distance that he places between Botany Bay and the coast of China, and the Cape of Good Hope, and the increasing amount of space devoted to shipping routes and possible supply points for the colony. One constant, however, throughout the plans is the idea that Chinese labourers should be incorporated into any settlement that was established.[14]

A third plan which incorporated Chinese into the proposed Botany Bay settlement was forwarded to the government supposedly by John Call, who, incidentally was Young's brother-in-law.[15] Call, born in Devon in 1732, had served with the East India Company in its military service, reaching the position of Engineer-General in 1761. After having his career cut short by quarrelling with his commanding officers, Call turned to a commercial career in which he also succeeded until incurring the Company's displeasure, leaving India in 1770. The plan that Call devised for the establishment of a settlement at Botany Bay was presented to Pitt

---

12 Young to Davison, 11th February, 1793, *C. O. 201/8*, p. 148, (AJCP Reel 4). In 'Whigs and Tories and Botany Bay', in Ged Martin, (ed.), *The Founding of Australia. The Argument about Australia's Origins*, Sydney, 1978, p. 192, Atkinson states that Matra's "whiggish connections" would have precluded him from playing any notable part in the submission of Young's plan.

13 A. Atkinson, 'Whigs and Tories and Botany Bay', in Martin, *op.cit*, p. 194.

14 This statement must be qualified as only two versions of Young's plan have been sighted; the *HRNSW* version (also in *C.O. 201/1*, pp. 52-56, AJCP Reel 1) and the version sent to Davison 11th February 1793, *C.O. 201/7*, pp. 152-53 (AJCP Reel 4), which appears to possibly be akin to the one discussed by Atkinson within the Granville Sharp Papers as the distances mentioned are the same. Frost actually dates this version as 21 April 1785, so unless any information to the contrary appears I will accept this dating. Refer A. Atkinson, Whigs and Tories and Botany Bay', in Martin, (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 194, and A. Frost *Convicts and Empire, A Naval Question, 1776-1811*, *op.cit.*, p.204, fn. 17 (e).

15 The reason for saying "supposedly" is that the plan alluded to, is attributed within the *Historical Records of New South Wales* to an anonymous author, however Alan Frost attributes this plan to John Call, on what basis this attribution is made is unknown. I will assume that Frost has attributed authorship correctly, and continue from that assumption. The following biographical information on Call has been taken from A. Frost *Convicts and Empire. A Naval Question, 1776-1811*, *op.cit.*, pp. 19-26.

about 1784,[16] and included the idea of incorporating into the proposed colony '....useful inhabitants thither from the Malay Islands, and even from China...'.[17]

As with the plans and proposals of Matra and Young the place occupied by the Chinese within Call's plan is admittedly very small, yet this does not diminish the relevance of these plans to this study. Despite the relatively small amount of space that the concept occupied, the idea of Chinese labour was within all of the proposals; was linked to the success of the proposed colony; and the Chinese continued to occupy a place in most other plans forwarded once settlement had occurred. Therefore the question needs to be asked why Chinese labourers, and what role did the planners allot to the Chinese in their concept for the settlement? The question as to why the Chinese were included in these plans is covered in more depth later in the chapter, as the answer to this question applies also to those plans and proposals submitted after settlement. Derived from the actual wording of the proposals, and reports from the Dutch East Indian settlements, the Chinese were obviously held in high regard, not as simple labour power but as an essential addition to the settlement if the success of the settlement was to be ensured. It remains to be adjudged however, to what degree the desired "opening" of the Chinese market to British goods impacted on the writing of the various proposals and the inclusion of the Chinese within these proposals.

This thesis is not the first work on the history of the Chinese in Australia to acknowledge the pre-settlement plans of Matra and Young, although the plan presented by Call has not been discussed previously. Where previous discussions have erred, in this writer's opinion, is that there has been the assumption that the Chinese were being recommended within these plans as labourers within the nineteenth century concept of "coolie labour". The following discussion examines the economic roles that the Chinese played within the Dutch East Indies, and the Philippines in the latter decades of the eighteenth century and assesses the applicability of these roles to the proposed settlement at Botany Bay.

---

16 It has not been firmly established, nor is it likely to be, when Call's proposal was actually presented to Pitt and his cabinet, nor to whom it was addressed. Mackay dates the plan as 1786, and Frost attaches a 1784 date, with these questions prompting some heated debate within the learned journals. Refer to David Mackay, *A Place of Exile: The European Settlement of New South Wales*, Melbourne, 1985, pp. 31-32; Alan Frost, 'Historians, Handling Documents, Transgressions and Transportable Offences', *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol. 25 April-October 1992, pp. 198-201; and David Mackay, 'Banished to Botany Bay': The Fate of the Relentless Historian', *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol. 25, April-October 1992, p. 215.

17 An Anonymous Proposal for the Settlement of New South Wales, *HRNSW*, Vol. 2, p.367. Call's proposal is in PRO HO, 42/7, ff. 49-57.

A(i): LABOURERS, MERCHANTS OR TAX FARMERS?

In the Dutch East Indies and the Spanish Philippines, at the time the proposals were written, the role of the Chinese within the economy was not as plantation[18] or contract labour; the latter did not occur until the nineteenth century. These Chinese were merchants, tax farmers or laboured on their own behalf within a separate community that catered to the consumption needs of the population. So, was Banks through Matra hailing the Chinese as merchants, as a separate community, or as tax farmers who would assist in the development of trade and the economy? Or did he have some futuristic notion of the labouring use to which they could be applied? It would be a case of committing the gravest of an historian's sins to presume to know definitely in the absence of concrete evidence in what capacity Banks through Matra, and the other planners and schemers, perceived the contribution of Chinese in the to-be-established colony. However, four possible roles, none of which are exclusive of the others may be suggested.

Firstly, the Chinese could have been suggested as a mercantile community whose task was to integrate the fledgling colony into the Southeast Asian merchant economy, although it is difficult to accept that such would have been the case given the distances involved. Botany Bay is a long way from the southeastern trade routes undertaken by the Chinese junks which the Dutch (and later the English) locked into, in order to reap some of the benefits accruing from this prosperous trade.

One major difference emerges here between the Philippines, the Dutch East Indies, particularly Batavia, and the settlement at Botany Bay, is that in the two former cases there already existed a Chinese merchant community when the Europeans arrived. Around Java, Bantam and the Mollucas, a scattered Chinese population serviced the junk trade that plied the islands trading bêche-de-mer, mother-of-pearl, bird's nests and spices for goods from the Chinese mainland. It was the extremely profitable spice trade, at that time controlled by Malay and Javanese Muslim traders, that the Dutch, along with the English and Portuguese, wished to enter and finally control, a wish that was fulfilled by the use of force.[19]The Philippines also had a Chinese population when the Spanish arrived, although the population was relatively small, (a report from 1570 numbers it at only 40 within Manilla[20]) and was not involved to any great extent in the junk trade.

---

18 Any plantation labour that the Chinese undertook in these areas was done so on their own or their countrymen's behalf, not for a "planter class" consisting of Europeans.

19 V. Purcell, *The Chinese in Southeast Asia*, London, Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 391.

20 *ibid.*, p. 506.

The shores of New Holland were completely different, as apart from some forays onto the northern reaches,[21] the Chinese had not established any formal or permanent settlements within the territory defined as New Holland. This lack of Chinese settlement can not, however, be assumed to have influenced any decision in regard to the incorporation of Chinese in the Botany Bay settlement;when the British settled at Penang (formerly known as Prince of Wales Island), there was no extant settlement of Chinese. This situation changed dramatically, as by 1794 Captain Francis Light, the founder of Penang was able to write that:

> *The Chinese constitute the most valuable part of our inhabitants; they are men, women, and children, about 3,000, they possess the different trades of carpenters, masons, and smiths, are traders, shopkeepers and planters, they employ small vessels and prows and send adventures to the surrounding countries They are the only people of the east from whom a revenue may be raised without expense and extraordinary efforts of government.*[22]

Secondly, it is possible that the Chinese were to be incorporated into the settlement at Botany Bay in the role of tax or revenue farmers, a system of deriving revenue in situations where the bureaucracy is weak and ineffectual. The revenue farming system, which was introduced by the Dutch into Batavia, is basically the '...sub-contracting by the state to private interests of the sovereign rights of tax collection',[23] for which rights a lump sum or periodic payments were made. The Dutch imposed this system of tax collection upon the Chinese settlement at Batavia, which incidentally was created by Jan Pieterszoon Coen (in 1619) by luring, bullying and kidnapping Chinese for the purpose.[24] This forced resettlement was only partially successful at first, as the rate of population increase was relatively slow[25], although by 1644 of the 21 revenue farms operating, the Chinese controlled 17, including gambling, trade with ships, the weigh-house, and the slaughter of animals.[26]

---

21 The most detailed exposition on early, pre-European contact of Chinese with what became known as Australia is provided by Liu Wei-ping, *A Study of Early Chinese Contacts with Australia*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Sinology, Taiwan, October 1981: Special thanks are due to Dr. Liu for forwarding me a copy of this paper.

22 Francis Light, quoted by V. Purcell, *op.cit.*, p. 244.

23 Howard Dick, 'A fresh approach to Southeast Asian history', in John Butcher and Howard Dick (eds.), *The Rise and Fall of Revenue Farming: Business Elites and the Emergence of the Modern State in Southeast Asia*, London, St. Martins Press, 1993, p. 3.

24 Anthony Reid, 'The Origins of Revenue Farming in Southeast Asia', in Butcher and Dick (eds.), *op.cit.*, p. 74. Coen, in his attempt to foster the growth of the Chinese population, even went to the extent of carrying out piratical raids upon the coast of Fukien, and transporting the "booty" back to Batavia, Amboyna and Banda. Purcell, *op.cit.*, 1965, p. 397.

25 Purcell states that in 1619, the year Batavia was founded, the Chinese population was 400, which increased to 2,000 by 1629, but took until 1725 to reach over 10,000; Purcell, *op.cit.*, p. 397.

26 Anthony Reid, 'The Origins of Revenue Farming in Southeast Asia', in Butcher and Dick (eds.), *op.cit.*, p. 75.

To transpose this concept to the proposed settlement at Botany Bay may have been the planner's idea of one way in which the infant colony could have become self-sufficient and cash revenues could be developed and increased without any capital outlay. As with the merchant community, the tax farming scenario is undermined by a number of factual problems which mitigate against its acceptance. For tax farming to be operable an established economy which caters to a relatively large population is required, a situation that did not arise in the Australian colonies for a number of decades after settlement. This lack of population and operable economy had not, however, hindered the imposition of tax farming in Penang. It was found that although 'For some time after the Settlement was formed the Population and resources of the Island were too limited to admit of the establishment of any public Taxes or of the Collection of any revenue'[27] once the settlement was established Chinese began to arrive in numbers. A taxable economy developed and taxes were imposed, the collection of which was farmed out to individuals.

A situation of '...neither abundance of native population nor a spirit of industry in the aboriginal inhabitants...'[28] in Banda and Amboyna also did not hinder the imposition of tax farming once a number of Chinese had been encouraged to settle. Yet, as argued earlier, Botany Bay was a long way from the route of the junks that carried the Chinese to the shores of these European settlements, so any tax-farming proposals would have been hindered in developing in this respect by this circumstance of geography.

Thirdly, there is the possibility that Matra and Young were suggesting the use of Chinese as labourers, primarily as a proletariat for the American Loyalists, who within the plans were to '...have the opportunity of prospering as gentlemen and plantation-owners...'.[29] Although, as with the other possibilities, problems are confronted. The nineteenth century witnessed the movement of Chinese as labourers throughout the world, however, prior to this period such movements were not undertaken by the Chinese as labourers for European interests. The Chinese migrated throughout Southeast Asia as either merchants or entrepreneurs, with any large-scale migrations or settlements being undertaken to support these enterprises. The lower labouring positions, within the British East Indian settlements, were left to bonded and chattel slaves procured from the west coast of Africa, usually

---

27 Report on Prince of Wales Island, 22nd March, 1805, *Lord Wellesly Papers* , Add. MSS. 13432, (AJCP Reel M1888), f. 92r.

28 Sir. R. T. Farquhar, *Suggestions Arising from the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, for Supplying the Demands of the West India Colonies with Agricultural Labourers*, London, John Stockdale, 1807, p. 19.

29 G. C. Bolton, 'The Hollow Conqueror: Flax and the Foundation of Australia', in Martin, (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 99.

acquired through Madagascar, a source that the East India Company utilised for its sugar plantations in West Sumatra.

Although evidence exists that indicates a '...policy to encourage Chinese settlements "as at Batavia" and encourage factors in China to recruit Chinese labor on the return voyage'[30], Chinese were never utilised in any specific labouring position by the East India Company. This casts doubts on the notion that the settlement plans were suggesting the Chinese as a class of purely servile labourers. During the eighteenth century the Chinese were involved and interacted with Europeans primarily in a commercial capacity, not as merely labourers, and in some circumstances the Chinese actually competed with the East India Company as employers.[31] Even when the China trade began to expand exponentially after the mid-eighteenth century,[32] slaves were still used as labourers for the loading and unloading of Company ships. The Company's settlement at Sumatra suffered extremely from the '...heavy expenses of labor...'[33] after the slave labour trade had been interrupted by the Seven Years War, and the slave population of the island had been removed to Mauritius by the French. Therefore, one could be led to expect that if the Chinese were perceived as a servile labouring population, the Company would have eagerly turned to either the China mainland or the various Chinese settlements throughout Southeast Asia to replace the lost labour.

Although there are objections to each of these three scenarios for the incorporation of Chinese into the settlement, the most likely suggestion would appear to be what I will term "a labouring support aspect". It is this role which is suggested within post-settlement proposals for Chinese labour, and is another aspect of the manner in which the Dutch formed their Eastern settlements. This labouring support role is not at all like the "coolie" role that the Chinese played in the nineteenth century but rather an independent settlement that catered to the needs of the colony particularly in the application of skills and the production of food. The quote from Francis Light above provides an excellent example of the degree to

---

30 Robert J. Young, 'Slaves, Coolies and Bondsmen. A Study of Assisted Migration in response to Emerging English Shipping Networks in the Indian Ocean, 1685-1765', in Klaus Friedland (ed.) *Marine Aspects of Migration* , Köln, Böhlau, 1989, p.394.

31 This is demonstrated by the fact that Chinese actually took the initiative and redeveloped the West Sumatran sugar plantations after 1735, with the Chinese being considerable slavers, having leased the slaves from the East India Company. Robert J. Young, 'Slaves, Coolies and Bondsmen. A Study of Assisted Migration in response to Emerging English Shipping Networks in the Indian Ocean, 1685-1765', in Friedland (ed.) *op.cit.*, p. 398. Young goes on to state that one Chinese plantation owner had 166 slaves on his plantation, of which 50 were leased from the East India Company.

32 The major impetus to the East India Company's China trade came from the passing of the Commutation Act in 1784 which reduced the import duty imposed on tea from 119% to $12^{1/2}$%, increasing the Company's sales of tea from 6,500,000 in 1783 to 16,300,000 pounds in 1785; C. H. Philips, *The East India Company, 1784-1834*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1940, p. 82.

33 Young, in Klaus Friedland (ed.) *op.cit.*, p 400.

which the Chinese settlement there supported the whole economy. These observations on the indispensability of the Chinese had been predated by those of Father Guy Tachard in 1685 who, in a visit to Batavia observed that:

> *...the Chinese are industrious and clever, they are of the greatest value at Batavia and without their help it would be difficult to live at all comfortably. They cultivate the land; there are scarcely any artisans excepting Chinese: in a word they are nearly everything.*[34]

Also within the Philippines, where the native population lacked the necessary skills and the ruling Spanish would not demean themselves by undertaking manual labour, a Chinese community was encouraged to settle.[35] This community not only undertook the responsibility of conducting and encouraging overseas and inland trade, but also provided the "...basic needs of everyday life; bricklayers, masons, carpenters, smiths, shopkeepers and restaurant keepers;...'.[36]

Thus since such a settlement can operate within a small and relatively closed economy, in contrast to the merchant and tax farming roles, the proposed colony at Botany Bay could have easily accommodated such a settlement, and probably to its benefit. As the following discussion on post-settlement plans shows, it is as a separate settlement within the colony, catering to the colonists needs that the Chinese are promoted, so it would not be too presumptuous to argue that it is within this sphere that the pre-settlement proposals saw the Chinese operating.

This argument is accorded more force when the lack of skills, particularly agricultural skills exhibited by the convicts is taken into account. The majority of the convict population was unskilled in agricultural tasks, inefficient, disinterested in the outcomes of their labours, and possessed little desire or motivation to apply or extend themselves. This lack of farming knowledge and agricultural skills severely constricted the colony during its early years, as it was in the provision of food that the greatest need for efficient labourers was required. The incorporation of a settlement of Chinese into the colony would have been expected to provide the infant colony with the required provisions, and prevent the need for such provisions

---

34 Father Guy Tachard, quoted by Purcell, *op.cit.*, p. 402.

35 The Chinese were definitely encouraged by the Spanish to settle in the Philippines, yet the Spanish took extreme measures against the settlement whenever the ruling class was feeling threatened by the increasing socio-economic tension between themselves and the Chinese. These feelings of being under threat resulted in the massacre of 25,000 people within the Chinese community in 1603, 24,000 in 1639, and in 1769 all Chinese were forced to leave the Philippines, an order that was subsequently revoked in 1788 when the economy collapsed into ruin. The Spanish were not the only imperial powers to be caught in this nexus of admiration, need, fear and suspicion with the Chinese, as the Dutch carried out their own massacre, the "Batavia Fury", in 1740 in which at least 10,000 Chinese were slaughtered: *ibid.*, p. 404 and pp. 526-7.

36 C. P. Fitzgerald, *The Southern Expansion of the Chinese People*, Canberra, A. N. U., 1972, pp. 153-4.

to be drawn from India when famine threatened the continued existence of the colony [37]

B: POST SETTLEMENT PLANS: WAUGH, BRERETON, BANKS AND KING

The first post-settlement proposal was tendered by Andrew Waugh[38] of Edinburgh to Henry Dundas in March 1791. Waugh, a previous resident of India, self-titled "Commander and Supercargo in the sea-line", proffered a suggestion designed to '...promote the workforce of the new establishment at Botany Bay.'[39]Waugh's plan to achieve this end involved the establishment of:

> *...a small Colony of Chinese made use of as Husbandsmen and Fishermen to be carried there from China- a detached tract of the country allotted to them, appertaining to the sea Coast- And from their well known habits of industry, and particularly their skill in agriculture- great good maybe expected from them to the settlement.*[40]

In addition to a colony of Chinese, Waugh suggested that Bengal would be able to supply all wants, 'Until your country thereabouts is in a state to support itself'. A suggestion that indicates that the colony had not achieved the self-supporting state that had been expected or intended, by the Home Office and Governor Phillip, the latter adamant that the colony would be of 'great advantage and consequence to England after a couple of years.[41] Waugh's appears to be a covering letter for another, by the same author, written on the same date detailing the provisions that may be gained from Bengal, and '...the average price of each distinct commodity at the Bengal market...'[42] That it is not in fact a covering letter seems to be evidenced by the fact that the recipients of the two letters were within different areas of the Pitt administration.[43]

---

37 A brief perusal of the number of listings under "insufficient provisions" in the indexes of the *HRNSW* volumes provides adequate proof that the colony suffered from the want of efficient agricultural labourers.

38 Who this Waugh was is unknown; there is no record for him in the *DNB*, the only Waughs found are one Colonel Gilbert Waugh of Gracemount Mid Lothian, and his son Gilbert. Possible that Andrew is brother of the elder Gilbert, as the latter was East India.

39 Letter From Andrew Waugh to the Right Honourable Henry Dundas. 15th March, 1791. *CO. 201/6.* p.267.

40 *ibid.*

41 Cited by Alan Frost, 'The East India Company and the choice of Botany Bay', in Martin, (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 235.

42 Andrew Waugh to The Home Office, 15th March, 1791, *HRNSW,* Vol. 1, Pt. 2, p. 477.

43 The fact that the letters have differing addressees is interesting as the letter cited above, regarding the Chinese is addressed to Henry Dundas, who at the time the letter was written was the Treasurer of the Navy, and President of the Board of Control (Of the East India Company), and succeeded to the Home Office in June 1791. One interesting aspect is that Dundas was the member for Mid Lothian 1782-90 and then Edinburgh 1790-1802, after the seat of Mid Lothian was abolished. The other letter, written on the same date was addressed solely to the Home Office, whose minister in charge at the time was William Grenville. There appears to be little reason why the former letter was addressed to Dundas personally, nor even why the letters were not sent together to both addresses.

Whether or not Waugh's letter was the result of a request on the part of the Home Office regarding the cost of supplying the colony from India is impossible to establish with any degree of certainty. What is clear, however, is that Waugh's letter must at least have been prompted by the Pitt administration's decision to allow the colony to be thus supplied. In September 1790, William Grenville, who had succeeded Lord Sydney at the Home Office, notified Lord Cornwallis (the Governor General of India) of the decision to supply the colony from India, and that he had been '...consulting several gentlemen who have resided in India on this subject,...'[44]. Although no mention is made of who those "gentlemen" were, it can be conjectured from the date of Waugh's letter that either he was one of those consulted by Grenville, or at least was privy to the discussion that had taken place. In the letter Waugh provides Grenville with exactly what he had requested from Cornwallis, that is '...a particular statement of the several articles which in your opinion can be obtained in Bengal...'.[45] From this it can be argued that unlike the proposals of Matra, Call and Young, Waugh's proposal was not motivated by self-interest. Nor does it exhibit the Utopian idealism that characterised the earlier proposals regarding the Botany Bay settlement, as it deals only with real, hard economic facts: the provisioning of the colony.

It may appear that this second letter has nothing to do with the subject at hand, that is the incorporation of Chinese labourers into the colony of New South Wales. In some respects this is true, yet the existence of Waugh's letter detailing the price of provisions added to the fact that it was written on the same date as the first letter discussed, raises questions as to why Indian labourers were not suggested rather than Chinese. As with many of the questions posed an unequivocal answer cannot be proffered. One answer is that the East India Company would have prohibited the export of Indian labourers to territories outside of its control (which it did in the 1830's), a fact that Waugh may have been aware of given his alleged experience in the east. This "eastern experience" would have presumably brought him into contact with the Chinese settlements at Batavia in particular, and may have assisted in the formation of Waugh's ideas on the benefits to be gained by introducing a Chinese settlement into the colony.

Waugh was not alone, however, in proposing that a separate Chinese colony be established, as one W. Brereton[46] also wrote to those in authority with the idea of

---

44 Right Hon. W. W. Grenville to Lord Cornwallis, 6th September, 1790, *HRNSW*, Vol. 1, Part 2, p. 403.

45 *ibid.*, p. 404.

46 In other works on the subject of the Chinese in Australia, Brereton is entitled Bishop Waltham, and admittedly the author of this paper did the same, until in attempting to discover more about Brereton it was found that Bishops Waltham is a town on the outskirts of Southampton where Brereton lived. W.

encouraging a Chinese settlement at Port Jackson. In Brereton's case the writing and forwarding of the proposal was motivated by self-interest and promotion.[47] In his letter to George Rose, Brereton wrote that:

> *The Chinese understand Agriculture well, and are the best Husbandmen in the World- and would sooner Cultivate New Holland, than all the practical Farmers in England.....To enter into a detail of all my observations of these industrious people, would be making this paper a History, instead of a Letter- I shall therefore cut it short, after saying that I think it would be easy for Lord Macartney to engage two, or three hundred Chinese, to form a Colony, at, or near Port Jackson, especially if his Lordship was authorised to promise them a Grant of Land for their own use.*[48]

Not only did Brereton suggest China as a source of labour but also pointed to the trade advantages to the colony that China represented, especially for timber and what he termed "Gamotte/Gamotti", which sea-weed reputedly made '...the strongest Cables in the World...and will endure for years...'.[49].

Post-settlement, Sir Joseph Banks, re-entered the arena by suggesting the introduction of Chinese labourers into the colony of New South Wales as part of his plan for the trade and commercial benefit of the colony. Banks suggested that the colony's level of intercourse with China could be based around the export of trepang, with the returning ships bringing '...back Chinese goods, and Chinese labourers.'[50] Although Banks obviously had considerable influence within the British parliament,[51] it would appear that such influence did not extend to within the East

---

Brereton is not listed in the *DNB*, however there is a Thomas (1782-1832) Kings County, Ireland, also Major Robert Brereton Carrigslaney, co. Carlow, half-brother Major-general Robert Brereton- New Abbey, co. Kildare. Only other reference found to W. Brereton is in the Chatham papers (AJCP Reel 5992; *PRO 30/8/116* ff. 110-1[illegible]) where a W. Brereton wrote to Pitt 12-7-94 requesting reimbursement for expenses incurred in expedition against Philippines 1762-64. Period of Seven Years War, during 1762-64 Manilla taken by the British, who were supported by the Chinese settlement, this support subsequently led to the execution and expulsion of the remaining Chinese. (See Purcell, *op.cit.*, p. 526.) In this letter to Pitt Brereton claims credit for the invention of the copper sheathing of ships, and appended a list of documents to support his case for recompense of his expenses incurred whilst in charge of the capture of Manilla. Also mentions a Captain Mathison of the *Panther* of 60 guns, Brereton was possibly in charge of H. M. S *Falmouth.*

47 It appears that Brereton wrote to Rose within a personal context as his plan is prefaced with a "My friend Mr. Serjeant Watson....communicated to me the conversation he had had with you upon the subject of my affairs..."and his plan was at least partially motivated by personal interest and a hope of compensation as, "...though I am groaning under their (his distresses) pressure, I do not fail to remember that I love my country." The letter to Pitt bears out this assertion as within this letter he states that he '...cannot support my family with credit...' (*PRO 30/8/116* f. 110- AJCP Reel 5992)

48 Letter From W. Brereton to George Rose, 28th July, 1792, *Scottish Records Office, GD51/1/479.* At the time George Rose was Secretary to the Treasury, and held this position until 1801.

49 *ibid.* It appears that Brereton may have been confused in his representations of Gamotte, as the only near reference found has been to "Cumaty", which is manufactured from the protruded fibres of the leaf of a species of palm tree, supposedly producing '...the best Cables in the World,...'. George Mackaness, *Alexander Dalrymple's "A Serious Admonition to the Public on the Intended Thief Colony at Botany Bay,"*, Dubbo, Review Publications, 1979, p.20.

50 Cited by J. Shepherd, 'Austral-Asia', *The Australian Geographer*, Vol. III, part IV, May 1938, p. 14.

51 Such influence can be observed when it was used by Banks within the *Lady Barlow* affair, in order to salvage at least part of what was the first shipment of colonial produce to England. See *HRNSW*, Vol. VI, and *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. V.

India Company's Board, as all suggestions regarding any intercourse between the colony and China usually met with a wall of silence indicating it would seem that such questions were not worthy of response.

The first, and possibly the last time, that the East India Company responded directly to suggestions regarding the importation of Chinese as labourers, occurred after Governor King in 1804 made his request in response to a labour shortage. In his despatch to Lord Hobart, King argued that;

> *Respecting the first of those objects (i. e. the intercourse with China) it would be attended with the most desirable consequences in introducing Chinese into these settlements, which from the knowledge your Lordship has of the industrious character of that people, and how much the Dutch Settlements in India have profited by their residence among them, I presume might be attended with great advantage to this country, were it only for the certainty of their applying themselves to raising cotton for the China Market...*[52]

This reference by King to the Dutch settlements and the profitability to be gained from the inclusion of Chinese in the colony, leads one closer to the conclusion that what King, Matra, and the other planners, had in mind was the establishment of a separate Chinese settlement within the colony. King's comment regarding the growing of cotton is quite interesting on a number of levels. Firstly, it is the first, but definitely not the last, aligning within the colony of Chinese labour and the growing of cotton. Secondly, despite King's efforts to encourage flax and hemp production and manufacture within the colony,[53] which efforts were concerned primarily with providing the population with clothes, he does not mention these staples as an area where the Chinese could be of assistance. Thirdly, this appears to be the first reference to the growing of cotton in the colony since those made by Governor Phillip, who, in attempting to cultivate cotton in the colony, obtained plants at Rio de Janeiro. Both of these suggestions, and later ones, refer to the export of raw cotton to China and not the cultivation of cotton for England, reaffirming David Mackay's tongue-in-cheek comment that 'No historians have as yet suggested that New South Wales was founded to supply raw cotton for England's industrial revolution'[54] and ensuring that such arguments could never be seriously accepted.

King repeated his call for Chinese labour in 1805, arguing that there was a dire need within the colony for a class of labourers that would '...work more assiduously

---

52 Governor King to Lord Hobart, 14th August, 1804, in *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. V, p. 9.

53 Refer to Governor King to Hobart, 14th August, 1804, in *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. V, pp. 12-13, and Governor King to Hobart, 20th December, 1804, *ibid*, pp. 204-205.

54 D. Mackay, *A Place of Exile The European Settlement of New South Wales*, Melbourne, Oxford university press, 1985, p. 64.

than the convicts felt disposed to do.'[55] The importation of Chinese would also, according to Governor King assist in relieving the colony which was experiencing '...a great want of labouring Men to perform the necessary Work of agriculture...' and that the few remaining labourers '...charge exorbitantly for their Labour'.[56] King stated that this shortage had arisen firstly through the increased numbers that were employed in the burgeoning seal and oil fishing industry, an area of rapid growth and massive profits. The second drain on the labour force was the tendency of 'The *bona fide* settlers and other cultivators,....who have procured more Ground than they are able to occupy...'[57] sub-letting this surplus land to emancipated prisoners, thereby transforming the potential labouring class into land-holders and future employers of labour.

In his 1804 despatch King recognised and gave voice to the problems that could be encountered with the East India Company by stating that '...I am well aware that a communication with the Honourable East India Company will be necessary...' in order to maintain '...obedience to the Royal Instructions respecting no intercourse being had with any part of the Honourable East India Company's Territories...'.[58] This obedience to "Royal Instructions" refers to the general instructions that had been issued to King and all other Governors in order to protect the monopoly of the Honourable Company throughout the east. The question of permitting trade between the colony and the territories controlled by the East India Company was at least brought into the open by King's request, if the reply from the Court of Directors to the Lords of the Committee of the Council of Trade on the same subject provides any evidence. Within this reply the East India Company argued that '...the proposition contained in the application of the Governor of New South Wales involves a question of very great importance, and requires the maturest deliberation-...'[59] The ensuing deliberations resulted in the drafting of "A Bill for opening the Trade of New South Wales, under Licenses from the East India Company and the South Sea Company". This Bill however, was never enacted as it was dropped after the Grenville administration lost office in 1807[60]. It was not until 1813, when the East India Company's charter was changed and the trading monopoly to India was disbanded, that traders within the colony were able to trade relatively effectively, given the level of tariffs imposed, with the east.

---

55 S. H. Roberts 'History of the Contacts Between the Orient and Australia' in I. Clunies-Ross (ed.) *Australia and the Far East- Diplomatic and Trade Relations,* Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1936, p.3.

56 Governor King to Under Secretary Cooke, 1st November, 1805, *HRA* , Series One, Vol. V, p. 601.

57 *ibid.*

58 Governor King to Lord Hobart, 14th August, 1804, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. V, pp. 8-9.

59 The East India Company to Sir Stephen Cottrell, 6th June, 1805, *HRNSW,* Vol. V, pp. 644-5.

60 Frost, Convicts and Empire; *op cit.*, p.195.

This is not to imply however, that no trade was carried on between the colony of New South Wales, India and China. Any trade had to be carried on in the ships of the East India Company or with direct permission from the Company in the form of a certificate issued by the Transport Board stating that the Company had agreed to load a homeward freight from China or India.[61] The '...systematic objection to the encouragement of a trade between New South Wales and their settlements in the east...'[62] on the part of the Court of Directors was exemplified in the case of the Bengal and Sydney merchants, Campbell & Company. Campbell had shipped spirits from India to Sydney in 1802 and 1804 in '...violation of public regulations..', resulting in both John and Robert Campbell being '...ordered to quit Bengal and embark for Europe...'[63], a decision that was later rescinded on appeal.

The "Quadrangular Trade Scheme" devised by John Macarthur[64] in 1806, which involved trading between Sydney, Fiji, Canton and Calcutta, also attempted to circumvent the monopoly of the East India Company by utilising the Indian connections of Walter Stephenson Davidson.[65] The exploitation of such "country trader" connections as those offered by Davidson[66] was one means by which the proposed scheme would have operated within the '...letter of the East India Company's regulations...', but it would certainly have conflicted with their intent.[67] Apart from not making the Fiji rendezvous on the maiden outing, therefore proceeding to Canton without sandalwood, the scheme did not succeed it is argued for a couple of other reasons: a lack of capital on the part of the scheme's partners to

---

61 East India Company to George Holford, 11th September, 1807, *HRNSW*, Vol. VI, p. 286.

62 *ibid.*, p. 285.

63 Margaret Steven, *Merchant Campbell, 1759-1846; A Study of Colonial Trade*, Melbourne, 1965, pp. 102-103.

64 Macarthur, (1767-1834), who has been hailed as "The Father of the Australian Wool Industry" arrived in the colony with the New South Corps in 1790. After duelling with Captain W. Paterson Macarthur was dispatched to England for trial, during which voyage he made friends with Sir Robert Townsend Farquhar. Farquhar's father, Sir Walter, supported Macarthur's return to the colony in 1805 in company with the formers nephew, Walter Stephenson Davidson. Macarthur was active in the establishment and operation of the Australian Agricultural Company, with his sons James (1798-1867) and William expanding the family pastoral and political interests as John aged and became less sound of mind. *ADB*, Vol. 2, pp. 153-159.

65 Davidson, (1785-1869), had only a brief stay in the colony of four years, and then most remarkable career in China where he established Davidson and Co., later Dent and Co., which shipped goods to Richard Jones and Alexander Riley in the colony by American ships in order to avoid the Eats India Company regulations. Davidson left Canton in 1822, leaving his company in the hands of Thomas Dent, and returned to England, joining his cousin Thomas Farquhar as a partner in Herries Farquhar. Davidson's nephew Patrick Leslie and cousin Edward Hamilton both entered the colony on recommendations from and as agents for Davidson, becoming large squatters, politicians and integral to the history of the Australian wool industry. Davidson was a director of the Australian Agricultural Company, becoming deputy manager in 1856 with Hamilton managing director. *ADB*, Vol. 1, p. 290.

66 Sadly, these Indian connection of Davidson, supposedly within the house of Hogue, Davidson and Co., which are referred to by D. R. Hainsworth, *The Sydney Traders; Simeon Lord and his Contempories*, Melbourne, 1972, p. 67n cannot be proved conclusively, although there is no doubt that the Davidson connections were intricate and became more so as the nineteenth century progressed.

67 Hainsworth, *op.cit.*, pp. 67-68.

sustain the scheme; and the colony comprised too small a market to prevent the occurrence of shortages and gluts which would have constrained the profitability of the scheme.[68] Aside from the economic proscriptions, the Quadrangular Trade Scheme was also hampered in achieving its potential by the direction of Governor King in July 1806 that there was to be strict adherence to Article 12 of his instructions, that is:

> *That no intercourse whatever will be allowed of between this Colony and the Honourable East India Company's Territories and the Coasts of China and the Islands adjacent thereunto, where European Nations resort.*[69]

This was the same article of instruction that King cited in his 1804 request for permission to import Chinese labourers that had to be negotiated with the East India Company in order for the importation to proceed legally.

Two reasons combine to make the preceding discussion on the trading attempts and connections of Campbell, Macarthur and Davidson of relevance to this thesis. Firstly, the ability of the East India Company to overrule the Governor's request for the right to expand the colony by trading with China, and importing Chinese labourers, and apparently the desire of Henry Dundas that such expansion should occur, appears to provide more justification for the "Dumping Ground" advocates. Secondly, the colonists-come-potential-merchants named above figure later on in this thesis, or at least members of their families do[70] when the attempts to import Chinese labourers become more explicit and are eventually successful.

It is possible that the East India Company prevented the shipment of labour to New South Wales from China for the same reason that it effectively stopped the movement of Indian labourers in the 1830's- as a response to the impending abolition of the slave trade. By the late 1700's the anti-slavery movement, led in parliament by William Wilberforce, had already achieved a great deal of influence. The East India Company was well aware of this growth and influence and the changing social attitude towards slavery. An interesting point is that Sir Robert Townsend Farquhar as Governor of Mauritius, published in 1807 a pamphlet entitled, "Suggestions for Counteracting any Injurious Effects upon the population of the West India Colonies from the Abolition of the Slave Trade", within which he

---

68 *ibid.*, p. 69.

69 cited in M. Steven, *op.cit.*, p.148.

70 These family members are Robert Campbell Tertius, R. Campbell's nephew, the Macarthur family, and W. S. Davidson's nephews the Leslies, two of whom were in the colony and one in China., and cousins the Hamiltons.

suggested the use of Chinese to replace the African slaves.[71] The company's definitive response to King's request and the attempts to intrude upon the Company's monopoly by Campbell et.al., can in the light of Farquhar's pamphlet, be viewed as an attempt to engross any Chinese labouring population for the benefit of its own interest. Conversely it can be viewed as another example of the East India Company expending '...its irritation...(over not being included in discussions and decisions regarding Botany Bay)...over succeeding years by a lack of cooperation with the new settlement.'[72]

This argument is given more force by the fact that in 1804 Farquhar included within a letter to Major Shave (Shawe), the Private Secretary to Lord Clive, a supplement entitled "Observations on the proposed plan of introducing Chinese settlers at Trinidad and other West India Islands, and establishing a new branch of Commerce, by opening a direct intercourse between the East and West Indies".[73]The plan that Farquhar alludes to was presented to the Company and the British government in 1802 by Lieutenant W. Layman, R. N., who suggested '...a plan of importing Chinese coolies on our convict ships returning from Sydney.'[74] The East India Company was starting to look to China for labour, as a result of the pending abolition of slavery, and in fact did import a small number into Trinidad at this time through the agency of a Mr. Macqueen (Macquin?).[75] The interest in '...peopling the British Colonies with Chinese, in lieu of African slaves,...'[76] on the part of the East India Company may explain why the Company was so prompt and emphatic in its response to Governor King's request to introduce Chinese into the colony of New South Wales. The existence of these plans and observations by Layman and Farquhar can also be expected to have prompted King's (and possibly even Waugh's) request. It can be assumed that as Governor of the colony King would have had

---

71 These family connections con inue and become more intertwined with the incorporation of Farquhar, who was, in no specific order of importance, Davidson's cousin, the son of Sir Walter Farquhar who had provided Macarthur with his letter of re- ntroduction to the colony in 1805, a Director of the East India Company, 1826-28, and initial proposer and director of the Australian Agricultural Company. Also, his brother Thomas was partner wi h Davidson in Herries Farquhar, 16 St. James Street, London.

72 Mollie Gillen, 'The Botany Bay Decision, 1786: Convicts, not Empire', *English Historical Review*, October 1982, p. 756.

73 Farquhar to Shave (Shawe), 1: th August, 1804, *Lord Wellesly Papers*, Add. MSS. 13870, (AJCP Reel M1889).

74 J. Holland Rose, 'The Conflict with Revolutionary France, 1793-1802' in Rose, J. Holland, Newton, A. P., and Benians, E. A. (General Eds.) *The Cambridge History of the British Empire*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1940, p. 68.

75 This point is made by Farquhar in Farquhar to Shave (Shawe), 15th August, 1804, *Lord Wellesly Papers*, Add. MSS. 13870, (AJCP Reel M1889). 93r, and in Sir R. T. Farquhar, *Suggestions Arising from the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, for Supplying the Demands of the West India Colonies with Agricultural Labourers*, London, John Stockdale, 1807, note p. 35.

76 Farquhar to Shave (Shawe), 1: th August, 1804, *Lord Wellesly Papers*, Add. MSS. 13870, (AJCP Reel M1889), f. 89r.

some notion of what the Court of Directors of the East India Company were proposing, even if it was through a second-hand source of information.

Another interesting aspect of Farquhar's published pamphlet of relevance here is that when discussing the areas to which Chinese have emigrated he states that:

> *They have visited New Guinea and New Holland, and from the proximity of the latter place to the islands of the eastern Archipelago, and from various obvious reasons connected with its climate, soil, and peculiarly favourable circumstances to the exertions of industrious settlers, there can be no doubt of their colonizing there ere long, if permitted so to do by government.*[77]

The reference to Chinese having already, at the time of writing, emigrated to New Holland is interesting in itself, although there is no evidence to indicate that this had occurred at the time other than the odd Chinese sailor jumping ship. What is more interesting is Farquhar's insistence on the permission of government, as it was the government's refusal that had disrupted the plan of his cousin W. S. Davidson, and his close friend J. Macarthur, for opening up trade between the colony of New South Wales, India and China.

One other attempt, or intimation at least, of bringing Chinese labourers to the colony should be mentioned here, not for the fact that it received any more attention that the other requests or suggestions, but rather for the economic role which the Chinese were to perform. This attempt, if it can be termed that, to introduce Chinese labourers into the colony was undertaken by Mr. J. C. Burton, a merchant in Bengal, and Mr. Thomas Kent, merchant and speculator, who had been granted 500 and 1230 acres of land respectively, by Colonel Patterson in 1809 for the purpose of cultivating hemp. In justifying the grant to Burton, Patterson refers to Viscount Castlereagh's '...wish that every encouragement should be given to the culture and propagation of Hemp in the Colony...[78], and enclosed Burton's "Proposal For Cultivation and Manufacture of Hemp". Within this proposal, Burton and Kent proposed to '...bring from India twenty native Indians or Chinese acquainted with the process of preparing Hemp and making Rope, Cordage, and Canvas;...'.[79] Although this plan did not make it beyond the proverbial drawing board, primarily due to the fact that the land grants were disallowed by Governor Macquarie upon assuming

---

77 Sir R. T. Farquhar, *Suggestions Arising from the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, for Supplying the Demands of the West India Colonies with Agricultural Labourers*, London, John Stockdale, 1807, pp. 18-19.

78 Lieutenant-Governor Paterson to Viscount Castlereagh, 9th July, 1809, *HRA*, Series 1, vol. VII, p.167.

79 J. C. Burton and Thomas Kent, "Proposals for Cultivation and Manufacture of Hemp", *HRA*, Series 1, vol. VII, p. 168.

office,[80] it is notable in that the proposal specifically states the tasks in which the Chinese were to be employed. This is the first indication that hemp production was to be undertaken in the colony on a commercial basis utilising Chinese labour.[81]

C: THE "IDEAL" OF CHINESE LABOUR

None of these suggestions regarding Chinese labour were adopted, and apart from King's request in 1805, all seem to have been disregarded or ignored by both the administration and the East India Company. Dallas is correct in arguing that the labour of the convicts in the hulks was invaluable in the maintenance of the British dockyards in particular, which explains why the system of transportation did not exhibit a great deal of continuity or consistency in numbers transported. However, such arguments do not explain why the convict population was not supplemented by Chinese labour when needs arose, casting doubts upon Dallas's argument that:

> *Transportation was a mercantilist device for providing any likely colonial venture with a sufficiency of unskilled labour. Some form of slavery was essential in a civilization which had not yet learned to respond to wage incentives* [82]

This is a nonsense argument as to even argue that "civilization" had not learned to respond to wage incentives is historically inaccurate. Even a brief perusal of the statements made by the colonial Governors, and employers on the subject of high wages demanded by labourers provides sufficient evidence to repudiate this nonsense argument. To counter this response on the part of emancipated convicts, the suggestion was to bring in Chinese in order to counteract the insufficiency of labour that transportation had created.

The question as to why Chinese labour was specifically suggested and requested within all the proposals outlined above can be answered on two levels, both of which draw upon actual statements made within the proposals. The

---

80 This action on the part of Macquarie was not directed towards Burton and Kent alone, but was applied to all grants made by Paterson and Johnston during the interregnum. All such grants were reviewed and the majority were subsequently allowed, as was the case with Burton and Kent. The latter did settle on his restored grant, and was involved in the growing of wool and grain and the importation of Bengal rum.(*ADB*, Vol. 2, 45) Although Burton's land grant was also restored, through the intervention of Lord Bathurst, despite Macquarie's refusal on the grounds that Burton was '...a Very bad Man and Very Unworthy of receiving any Mark of favor from this Government on Account of his Very Insolent and ungrateful Conduct towards it. (Macquarie to Bathurst, 18th March 1816, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. IX, p.66) it appears that Burton did not eventually take up the grant.

81 If one believes the commercial strategic argument outlined in the argument in Appendix 1, one would be led to assume that the manufacture of hemp would have proceeded apace after settlement. This proposal by Burton and Kent provides evidence to the contrary and its failure to come to fruition indicates that little effort previously and subsequently was expended in the establishment of hemp cultivation and production within the colony of New South Wales, apart from the efforts of Governor King.

82 K. M. Dallas, "The First settlements in Australia: Considered in relation to sea-power in world politics', in Martin, (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 49

comments contained within the plans and proposals reflect the changing economic, political and social climate that confronted not only the British administration but also the East India Company and the colony of New South Wales.

Derived from the actual wording of the proposals, the Chinese were obviously held in high regard, not as simple labour power but as an essential addition to any colony, especially for one in its infancy, if its success was to be ensured. The question of Chinese labourers was proposed in all cases and plans as an ideal, although this "ideal" underwent modifications with the passage of time. The common attitude was that the Chinese would comprise a class of labourers in the colony that would be industrious, subservient, productive with little means, and not demand high wages. These "ideal" labourers had been appreciatively observed working as labourers and merchants throughout South East Asia by the employees of the East India Company and private traders. The observations of one of these East India Company employees was that:

> *The Chinese are great speculators in agriculture, take indefatigable pains with their lands, and cultivate them at less expence than almost any other description of people.*[83]

The perceived general level of poverty in China led these observers and those who utilised the observations of the China watchers, to presume that such labourers would be more than willing to leave their homes and journey to a new land that offered work for all and a chance of comparative wealth. The extent of Chinese migration throughout South east Asia even as early as the seventeenth century prompted the Governor of Batavia, General de Carpentarier to conclude that Fukien, the province of out migration in China, must have '...been both overpopulated and impoverished so as to send so many thousands of people all over Southeast Asia...'.[84] The large colonies of Chinese that populated the major trade centres of South-East Asia, produced within the European observers a perception that wherever work was available the Chinese labourer would migrate, and would do so at least with the connivance of the Chinese government, if not its approval, as Chinese law forbade the emigration of Chinese subjects.

In another respect the Chinese were suggested over and above other eastern races due to what was perceived as their lack of religious proclivities or prejudices. These could, as in the case of Indians and Malays, constrain their employment pattern by placing constrains upon with whom or where they would work, what

---

83 Sir R. T. Farquhar, *Suggestions Arising from the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, for Supplying the Demands of the West India Colonies with Agricultural Labourers*, London, John Stockdale, 1807, p. 55.

84 Cited by, T'ien Ju-K'ang, 'The Chinese Junk Trade: Merchants, Entrepreneurs, and Coolies, 1600-1850', in Klaus Friedland (ed.), *op.cit.* p. 383.

they would eat, or whom they would marry, and could make their transportation difficult[85] Also, as mentioned previously, the East India Company would have been expected to counter any suggestion of removing Indian nationals from serving the specific interests of the Company.

Another reason expounded for expanding the labour supply base with Chinese labour, was the belief that convict labour, as with slavery, could not be relied upon to labour productively for the capital that employed it. Recourse was therefore required to another labour source that exhibited the same characteristics of subservience and cheapness yet was productive and industrious, and could be relied upon to constitute an efficient labouring population. The maintenance of the colony as a self-supporting entity is paramount in the majority of the following plans and proposals. The vision that some of them evince is one where the "refuse" of English society is disposed of and in concert with an industrious settlement of Chinese supports itself, and provides dividends to England in the form of a favourable trade imbalance and recouped capital earnings.

As clearly evidenced by the titles of Farquhar's supplement to Shave and later pamphlet, the Chinese were also viewed to some extent as an acceptable replacement for African slaves. The rapidly strengthening abolitionist and humanitarian movement was even in the 1780's, powerful enough to impose its will on the government, ensuring that the authors of colonial proposals would have never considered including slaves in their plans for the Botany Bay settlement.[86] Especially in light of Lord Sydney's vocal pronouncements against the slave trade, a question over which he resigned from the Home Office in 1789.

This move to China for labour can also be considered as being a reflection of the move in trade and commerce towards China and away from India that occurred during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The bankruptcy of the Indian establishments, apart from Bengal, which was supporting the others; the increased interest in all things Chinese within Britain; the change in the power relationship within the East India Company; the emergence of the "Shipping Interest" as a major force; and the profits to be gained within the east as evidenced by the Dutch establishments; drove this shift to the east. Checking this eastern movement was the perceived obstinacy of the Chinese government in not opening its

---

85 Farquhar to Shave (Shawe), 15th August, 1804, *Lord Wellesly Papers*, Add. MSS. 13870, (AJCP Reel M1889), f. 95r.

86 The proposal to transport convicts to the West coast of Africa, primarily Lemane on the Gambia River, was dismissed due to the high level of mortality experienced by Europeans in the region, attested to by witnesses to the Beauchamp Committee, and seized upon by Burke to argue against a penal colony being established in Africa.

borders to British trade and the Chinese Emperor's insistence that he could see no benefit to be derived by China from doing so, as:

> *Strange and costly objects do not interest me. As your Ambassador can see for himself we possess all things. I set no value on strange objects and ingenious, and have no use for your country's manufactures.*[87]

One way of counteracting these closed trade borders was suggested within the proposals of Matra, Waugh, Brereton, and King. All of whom argued that importing Chinese labourers would open up the Chinese market to British manufacturers, correcting the unfavourable (for England) balance of trade that existed between the two countries. Matra viewed the settlement of Chinese labourers in the Colony as a route by which the British Government could:

> *....enter into a commerce that would render our trade to China, hitherto extremely against us, very favourable....As our situation in New South Wales would enable us to carry this trade (furs) with the utmost facility, we should be no longer under the necessity of sending immense quantities of silver for the different articles we import from the Chinese Empire.*[88]

To Brereton, the integration of a settlement of Chinese was linked to the establishment of a trade in timber and Gamotte/Gumaty to save English ships travelling between the colony and China in ballast. The desired result was '...to provide for the Subsistence of the Colony, without any aids from England, after a few years have elapsed.[89] In the case of Governor King, introducing Chinese into the Colony would not only increase the level of intercourse with China through '...their applying themselves to raising cotton for the China Market...', but would '...also prevent that intercourse and employment of Americans..' which had been contemplated by some individuals in the Colony.[90]

It is interesting that both Waugh and Brereton suggested the granting of land to the Chinese immigrants, as the offering of land as part payment for labour services has a definite feudalistic ring to it. The only other mention made of granting plots of land to the Chinese emigrans is to be found within Farquhar's contributions noted above, where he advocates the measure as one way of overriding the Chinese tendency to return to his place of birth and align him closer to the West Indies.[91]

---

87 Reply of Emperor Ch'ien Lung to the Embassy of King George III headed by Lord Macartney, cited by M. Greenberg, *British Trade and the Opening of China, 1800-42*, New York, Monthly Review Press, Reprint, 1979, p. 4.

88 James Maria Matra's proposal, in *HRNSW*, Vol. 1, Pt. 2, p. 3.

89 Letter from W. Brereton to George Rose, 28th July, 1792, *Scottish Records Office, GD51/1/479.*

90 Governor King to Lord Hobart. 14th August, 1804, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. V p.9.

91 Farquhar to Shave (Shawe), 15th August, 1804, *Lord Wellesly Papers*, Add. MSS. 13870. (AJCP Reel M1889), f. 95r and 101r-101v.

Chinese labourers do not fit into any clear category when considering the calls for their introduction into the Australian colonies prior to 1820. On one hand they were to be a source of labour, not necessarily cheap labour, but rather on the basis of their "industrious" nature. The American south and the West Indies plantations had provided proof that slavery could lead to wealth in the end but that it demanded a very high price for its control. The exponents of eighteenth century political economy had espoused the ideas of the expense of slavery and the necessity of a sufficient labour supply with which to balance the existing available and unalienated land. By embracing the ideas of Thomas Malthus it is relatively easy to decipher the logic that equated economic success with the existence of a set labour force according to the available land: too much land would reduce the labouring population by allowing them to join the landowning class, and too many labourers for the given amount of land would produce want, possibly famine, and ultimately social unrest. The latter result was one, if not the greatest fears of the ruling classes throughout history. To ensure prosperity this balance had to be found and maintained, a idea that achieved its apotheosis in regard to the Australian colonies with the pronouncements of Wakefield and the Systematic Colonizers.

The calls for Chinese labourers to be introduced into the colony, in order to supplement the convict labour force, all occurred either prior to or at the start of the system of private assignment instigated by Governor King in 1804.[92] Assignment was the system whereby:

> *The convicts distributed amongst the settlers, are clothed, supported, and lodged by them; they work either by the task or for the same number of hours as the Government convicts; and when their set labour is finished, are allowed to work on their account.*[93]

The refinement of this system by Governor King had two immediate effects. One was to relieve the economic pressure on the colony's meagre resources that had

---

92 Governor Phillip had started assigning convicts to officers in an attempt to boost agricultural production, with the assigned convicts being maintained by the Government, an action which earned him the wrath of the Secretary of State for the Colonies at the time Lord Sydney. The response of Sydney to Phillip's initiative was to order that the assigned convicts were to be maintained by their masters. Governor Hunter attempted to establish the British government's stipulation that a maximum of two assigned convicts only were to be provisioned from the stores, to little or no avail however. Governor King did impose these restrictions, and more importantly for the assignment system instigated assignment as a "legal covenant" between the government and the employer, which dictated the mode in which the convict was to be maintained and for how long, the hours of labour to be worked and the general treatment of the convict in the area of feeding, clothing and medical care. T. A. Coghlan, *Labour and Industry in Australia*, Vol. 1, Melbourne, Macmillan, 1969, pp. 24-34. For a detailed albeit brief history of the system of assignment refer to Barrie Dyster, 'Public Employment and Assignment to Private Masters, 1788-1821', in Stephen Nicholas (ed.), *Convict Workers: Reinterpreting Australia's Past*, Cambridge Cambridge University Press, 1988.

93 Report of the Select Committee on Transportation, pp. 11-12, *British Parliamentary Papers*, 1812, II (341). (in C. M. H. Clark, *Select Documents in Australian History, 1788-1850*, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1958, p. 128.

been expended in maintaining and supporting the convicts, thereby increasing the numbers of transportees that the colony could absorb, and secondly to provide the agricultural sector and the emergent pastoral sector with a relatively secure labour force. The Governorships of both Hunter and King were characterised by the growth and strength of the large land-holders at the expense of the small-holders, which section of the economy the British Government wished to encourage. Governor King, in giving preference to large holders was reviving Governor Phillip's idea of feudalised farming[94] in which King's request for Chinese labourers was to supplement the assigned convicts within the serf class. In contrast to this both Governor's Bligh and Macquarie '...embraced the small-holders as the 'backbone of the colony', settled their debts, allowed them more convict labour, and generally played the benign patriarch,...'.[95]

The combination of the revamped assignment system, and the focus of Bligh and Macquarie on the small-holder, brought a measure of stability into the colonial labour market. Which can be presumed to partially account for the lack of interest evinced by potential employers in the subject of Chinese labour from about 1805 to the mid-1820's. It was not until this balance of power between the small and large land holders began to tip towards the latter, that China was again considered as a source of labour power for the colony. As this thesis progresses it will become more evident that the whole question of introducing Chinese labour into the colony of New South Wales is intimately linked with the degree of economic, social and political power that the large land holders could wield.

---

94 S. H. Roberts, *The History of Australian Land Settlement, 1788-1920,* Melbourne, Macmillan and Company, 1924.

95 M. Aveling, 'Imagining New South Wales as a Gendered Society, 1783-1821' in *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol. 25, 1977, p. 9.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MARKET FOR LABOUR IN THE COLONIAL ECONOMY: A SECTORAL ANALYSIS

In contrast to the first twenty years of the colony, during which there were many requests and suggestions regarding Chinese labour, the question of introducing Chinese labour into the colony was not raised again until the mid-1820s. The long period that existed between calls for Chinese labour could give the impression that the earlier suggestions were purely incidental. The truth, however, relates to the long apprenticeship undergone by the colonial pastoral industry with the post-1820 hints, suggestions, and attempts in regard to acquiring indentured Chinese labour increasing in incidence as the wool industry developed. Success was only assured once the leaders of this industry had gained political as well as economic control of the colony. This chapter outlines the development of the wool industry to the point where it achieved ascendancy as the "master" colonial industry, with specific emphasis on the labour market and changes and developments within this market.

To encompass the range of changes, this chapter has been arranged into three sections, which have been time delineated in order to provide a detailed exposition of the emergence of the pastoral industry. The first section covers the period 1817 to 1835, as 1817 can be isolated as the year when many of the changes that drove the development of the industry that occurred during the twenties, had been instigated or at least mooted. This section concludes with a discussion of the postulates of E. G. Wakefield regarding the colony and the impact on the colony of the immigration schemes he promoted. The year 1836 begins the second section, as during this year squatting was legally recognised, which recognition fuelled the movement beyond the limits of settlement and into the Northern Districts of the colony. The final section details aspects of the labour market in the post-1839 period, and why the influx of immigrants during this period were unsuitable to employers. Throughout these periods the colony underwent rapid changes, all of which propelled a coalition of merchants and squatters to economic and political supremacy in the subsequent decade. The result of this reign was the eventual importation of indentured Chinese labourers, bringing to fulfilment the abortive plans and attempts that arose as pastoralism expanded.

A: 1817-1835: PASTORAL EXPANSION

Despite an early acknowledgment of the advantages to the British economy emanating from a colonial wool industry, until 1817 pastoralism remained relatively dormant and the preserve of a handful of settlers.[1] The arrival of Bligh in 1806 and his preference for small-settlers; the cancelling of land grants made during the interregnum; and the anti-settler attitude of Governor Macquarie effectively stifled the migration of settlers with capital.[2] Macquarie praised the small settlers and emancipist farmers as '...the Yeomanry of the Country, they being the real Improvers and Cultivators of the Soil.'[3] Towards the large-holders, like Marsden, and the clans' Macarthur and Blaxland,[4] he was openly hostile, derisively terming them "Gentlemen Farmers". Any complaints regarding Macquarie's treatment and attitude towards free settlers he countered by arguing that:

> *New South Wales was a penal settlement intended for actual convicts or convicts who had served their sentences; other free people who came to the colony came merely on sufferance, and had no right to complain of the conditions of a community into which they had voluntarily entered.*[5]

---

1 Interest in the possibility of a colonial wool industry can be traced back to the early years of the nineteenth century, when English wool production had decreased substantially, primarily due to the fact that much grazing land had been given over to the production of crops. It was on the basis of this interest within England that Macarthur returned to the colony in 1805 with a land grant of 5,000 acres and sheep from the Royal flocks at Kew. (Jill Ker, 'The Wool Industry in New South Wales, 1803-1830', Part 1, in *Bulletin of the Business Archives Council of Australia*, Vol. 1, No. 9, 1959, p. 30.) In 1803, Macarthur produced a "Proposal for establishing a Company to encourage the increase of fine-woolled sheep in New South Wales" which company was to be formed with an initial capital of £10,000, and the suggestion of Sir Joseph Banks that a land grant of 1 million acres be made to the proposed company. Nothing came of this specific proposal although it and Macarthur's enthusiasm for the scheme of promoting fine wool production gained him permission to purchase and then export several rams and ewes from the King's Flock. Luckily a *Times* correspondent brought to Macarthur's attention the existence of a law dating from the time of Edward the First that prohibited the export of these flocks on pain of having the right hand amputated and the forehead branded. (T. A. Coghlan, *Labour and Industry in Australia*, Vol. 1, Melbourne, Macmillan, 1969, pp. 106-7.) Another of Macarthur's acts during his time in England was to submit a "Statement of the Improvements and Progress of the Breed of Fine-woolled Sheep in New South Wales" to Under-Secretary Sullivan, which is reprinted in *HRNSW*, Vol. V, pp. 173-175.

2 Until 1817 the only large capitalised settlers that had arrived in the colony were Macarthur, W. S. Davidson and the Blaxland brothers who had received a grant in 1805 of 8,000 acres, rationed convicts and rations for themselves, wives and children dependent upon the condition that they spent £6,000 on the establishment. (S. H Roberts, *History of Australian Land Settlement, 1788-1920,* Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1924, p. 4). Camden and Castlereagh had prefaced their introduction's of these settlers with the statement that they were welcome in the colony as the colonial situation had '...deemed ..(it)...expedient to encourage a certain number of Settlers in New South Wales of responsibility and Capital, who may set useful Examples of Industry and Cultivation...'. (Viscount Castlereagh to Governor King, 13th July, 1805, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. V, p. 490.) Regarding the emigration of Walter Davidson, Camden argued that '...it is extremely desirable to encourage gentlemen of such connexions to establish themselves in the colony,...'. Earl Camden to Governor King, 31st October, 1804, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. V, p. 162.

3 Governor Macquarie, cited by Derek Phillips, 'Development under Macquarie', in James Griffin (ed.) *Essays in Economic History of Australia*, 2nd Edition, Milton, Jacaranda Press, 1970, p. 27.

4 The attitude of Macquarie to "Gentlemen Farmers" was exemplified in his continual repression of Gregory Blaxland's attempts to publish within the *Sydney Gazette* plans for a joint stock company. Jill Ker, *op.cit.*, p. 44.

5 Macquarie cited by T. A. Coghlan, *op.cit.*, p. 188.

The rapid rate at which Macquarie created emancipists,[6] and appropriated convict labour for Government works[7] depleted the available labour supply, and stifled both agriculture and pastoralism. During the reign of Macquarie land grants, pardons and assignment were used to favour the emancipists and small-settlers to the detriment of the larger and relatively more affluent settlers:[8] However, emancipist and small-settler farmers were not on the whole, successful farmers[9] and only a small percentage of convicts possessed any agricultural knowledge.[10] The majority of convicts were urban dwellers, from the cities of London and Middlesex, '...even though, as Sir John Clapham has rightly insisted, the "man of the crowded countryside was still the typical Englishman", he was not the typical convict.'[11] Even those convicts and small-settlers with a rudimentary knowledge of agricultural techniques and practices would have experienced difficulties in New South Wales. Climate, vegetation and landforms were alien and any farming had to begin with the hand clearing of unfamiliar and relatively untouched forests.[12] In addition, the typical English peasant farmer or agricultural labourer possessed little knowledge of "good" agricultural practices such as crop rotation, fencing and the hoeing of weeds:

---

6 Between 1810 and 1820 Macquarie granted 366 free and 1,365 conditional pardons and 2,319 tickets-of-leave, with many pardons being presented to convicts who had not been in the colony for the stipulated three years. (A. G. L. Shaw, *Convicts and Colonies*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1977, pp. 83-84.) There were "degrees of", and "roads to", freedom for the convicts in colonial society. The emancipists were those that had received a pardon, either absolute, which was "freedom through servitude", or conditional, which was granted on the condition that during the remainder of their sentence the convict could not return to any part of Great Britain; and tickets-of-leave which were dependent upon reports of good behaviour, allowing the holder to seek work as a free labourer, yet within a defined geographical district, the retention of the ticket being dependent upon continued good behaviour. Barrie Dyster, Public Employment and Assignment to Private Masters, 1788-1821', in Stephen Nicholas (ed.), *Convict Workers: Reinterpreting Australia's Past*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, p. 130.

7 The convicts that had not received the Governor's pleasure in the form of a pardon or ticket-of-leave were rarely placed in private assignment, Macquarie preferring to utilise their labour in public works, a tendency which earned him the wrath of successive Secretaries of State for the Colonies. During Macquarie's reign there were '.. 10 convicts in government employ to every 6 in assigned service, whereas in 1827 there were only 10 in government employ to 26 in assignment'. Coghlan, cited by Phillip McMichael, 'Foundations of Settler Capitalism in Australia', in *Intervention*, No. 13, 1979, p. 14.

8 John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit*, Melbourne, Heinemann, 1970, pp. 182-3.

9 The small size of emancipist land grants, usually of only 30 acres, was unsuitable for New South Wales conditions, with Macquarie aggrieving the small farmers further when he provided them with only one assigned servant and rations for only six months, a reduction from the former eighteen months. (Shaw, *op.cit*, p. 85.) The need to maintain this servant and any other labourers whilst being '...squeezed between low prices for their produce and high costs of production in the form of imported commodities and relatively high wages for free labour...' increased the pressure on small farmers and led to the ruin of many. Ken Buckley, 'Primary Accumulation: The Genesis of Australian Capitalism', in E. L. Wheelwright and K. Buckley (eds.) *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*, Vol. 1, Sydney, Australian and New Zealand Book Co., 1975, p. 27.

10 During the period 1817-1821 only one male convict in six had a background in rural occupations with it being estimated that the demand for agricultural labourers was at least four times the supply. Barrie Dyster, *op.cit.*, p. 138.

11 Shaw, *op.cit.*, p. 151-52. Until 1827 45% of all convicts were born in urban areas with the counties of Middlesex and Warwick being over-represented relative to population: Stephen Nicholas and Peter Shergold, 'Convicts as Migrants' in Stephen Nicholas, (ed.) *op.cit.*, p. 46.

12 Barrie Dyster, *op.cit.*, p. 139.

Poverty and ignorance are the ordinary inhabitants of small farms; even the smaller estates of the yeomanry are notorious for bad management.[13]

Despite his entrenched antipathy towards the large-settlers Macquarie was driven to register his disgust at the results of his cherished emancipist and small-scale farmers attempts at colonial farming:

The great slovenliness and neglect of the most obvious and necessary duties of farmers were but too frequent and evident in their personal appearance and the state of their farms in regard to cultivation and improvement[14]

High convict retention rates for Government works and the degree of patronage that was operating in the assignment of convicts, caused the system of assignment to fail in its ascribed role of providing to '...the "most respectable settlers" a fixed supply of labour...'.[15]

Country masters believed they were lumbered with London thieves, undernourished half-skilled youths and broken-down older men, left behind after the government, Sydney residents and the magistrates had commandeered the knowledgeable, the robust and the mature.[16]

This was just one of the grievances against Macquarie aired by the large-settlers to J. T. Bigge during his inquiry into the state of the colony of New South Wales. Bigge, who arrived in the colony in September, 1819, had been commissioned by Earl Bathurst to ascertain '...how far in its present improved and increasing State, it is susceptible of being made adequate to the Objects of its original Institution,...'.[17] That is, to analyse the ways in which the colony could be adapted to again make

---

13 Cited by, Jill Eastwood, 'The Economy of New South Wales, 1788-1810' in James Griffin (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 7. Between 1814 and 1820, Macquarie retained between 52% (1816) and 81% (1819) of all mechanics: Barrie Dyster, *op.cit.*, p. 135.

14 Governor Macquarie cited by Eastwood, *op.cit.*, p. 8.

15 Roberts, *op.cit.* p. 113.

16 Barrie Dyster, *op.cit.*, p. 138.

17 Earl Bathurst to Governor Macquarie, 30th January, 1819, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. X, p. 2. A number of reasons have been propounded to explain why Bathurst took this decision when he did, which include a belief that the colony had the potential to supplant Germany and Spain as a fine wool supplier; an increased level of dissatisfaction with the governorship of Macquarie within the colony and England; a desire on the part of the British government to ensure that transportation remained a punishment and not an attractive alternative to poverty in England; and a desire on the part of the Treasury to curtail the expenses incurred within the colony. For a more detailed exposition of the reasons affecting Bathurst's decision refer to John Ritchie, 'The Colonial Office, New South Wales and the Bigge Reports, 1815-1822', in *Australian National University Historical Journal*, No. 4, Oct. 1967, pp. 29-37; and by the same author *Punishment and Profit*, *op.cit.*

transportation a feared punishment, and not an attractive alternative to poverty in England,[18] and at the same time to reduce the expenses of the colony.[19]

The massive clearing of the hulks that the British Government had undertaken in 1815 began to arrive in 1816, the increased numbers stretching further the resources of the colony, which were in a severely depleted state.[20] Gubernatorial policy, agricultural ignorance, lack of private capital and adverse climatic conditions[21] coalesced to create a state of economic inertia that was bordering on collapse when Bigge arrived. Macquarie had, prior to Bigge's arrival, recognised the warning signs and in 1817 sought permission to expand the colony beyond the Cumberland Plain, arguing that:

> *Disposable Lands are now getting Very Scarce in this part of the Colony, ...; and as More Male Convicts are now Sent than either the Government or the Settlers can possibly find proper Employment for,...*[22]

Although 1817 signalled the end of a three year period of "Very Extraordinary and Unprecedented Droughts', which had '...occasioned a very great Mortality amongst the Horned Cattle and Sheep throughout the Colony, as well as greatly

---

18 The benign rule of Macquarie towards the convicts had produced a situation whereby the "rosy" reports transmitted back to England of convict life within the colony was of a population whose dietary intake, level of required labour and housing standards surpassed those of the majority of the British labouring population, to whom transportation became a means of escaping their impossible and impoverished situation. David Meredith, 'Full Circle? Contemporary Views on Transportation', in Stephen Nicholas, (ed.) *op.cit.*, pp. 20-22.

19 The parsimonious attitude towards the colony of New South Wales arose due to the straightened circumstances that the British government found itself in after the cessation of hostilities with Napoleon. By 1815, interest on the national debt was consuming more than 60% of government income. (John Ritchie, 'The Colonial Office, New South Wales and the Bigge Reports, 1815-1822', *op.cit.*, p. 29.) However, it was not only this colony that was being made more financially accountable as the scrutiny and economic stringency measures of the Treasury officials fell upon all the British colonies with R. T. Farquhar, the Governor of Mauritius, attracting the ire of the Treasury as he was unable to account for £600,000 in bills. John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit*, *op.cit.*, pp. 18-19.

20 The primary reason why such an increased rate of transportation occurred was due to the need on the part of the British authorities to "do" something with the convicts that during the Napoleonic Wars had been put to labour in the dockyards and conscripted into the navy. With the cessation of hostilities this form of relief was no longer available, the "hulks" were again overcrowded, and New South Wales became the repository for this excess gaol population. This large convict population had been created by the increasing tendency of capital sentences to be commuted to transportation with the percentage of those thus sentenced that were actually executed decreasing from 71% in 1749-1755, to only 11% during the period 1812-1818. John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit*, *op.cit.*, p. 262. Refer to Table 1 in Appendix 2 for actual figures on transportation.

21 Macquarie's term experienced droughts in all years other than 1817-18, flooding 1817 and 1819, caterpillar plagues in 1810, 1812, 1814 and 1819, with bushfires wrecking havoc most years with extreme damage occurring in 1819. John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit*, *op.cit.*, p. 292.

22 Governor Macquarie to Earl Bathurst, 2th December, 1817, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. IX, p. 713. However, the settlers that moved beyond the plain were still primarily the favoured of Macquarie as between 1820 and 1821 only 31 land grants were given, with one contemporary declaring that '...only "Macquarie's pets" got to the promised land before 1822'. George Suttor cited by Jill Ker, *op.cit.*, p. 44.

Injured the Crops of Wheat, Maize, Oats, Barley and Potatoes;..'[23] the depleted Cumberland Plain was unable to respond sufficiently.[24] The increased rate of transportation since 1815[25] increased pressure on the Commissariat, as droughts, floods[26] and a lack of capital, prevented the assigning of many of the new transportees.[27] In this situation, Macquarie was forced to re-open the "Government Agricultural Establishment" wherein 300 convicts were employed and to alter his opinion towards the type of settler welcome in the colony.

> *As one Certain Means of greatly reducing the present very heavy Expenses of this Colony, I would strongly but respectfully recommend that no more* ***poor Settlers*** *should be permitted to Come out to this Colony* ***for at least three Years to Come;*** *...If therefore, instead of Allowing those poor Men, decayed tradesmen and Merchants and idle profligate Adventurers to Come out to this Colony, as Settlers, it were confined to respectable* ***Monied Men,*** *Who could support themselves,...and be able each to take Six to Eight Convict Servants or Labourers off the Store, the Expenses of the Colony would very greatly be reduced thereby, and the Colony itself would rapidly Increase, not only in Wealth, but in Respectability and Importance.*[28]

An increase in the level of capital was recognised by both Macquarie and Bigge as essential if the colony was to absorb and employ the increased number of convicts,

---

23 Governor Macquarie to Earl Bathurst, 18th March 1816, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. IX, pp. 52-53. Between 1814 and 1817 sheep numbers fell from 74,825 to 66,684. Refer to Table 1 in Appendix 2.

24 The Cumberland Plain measured only 40 miles from north to south and 20 miles from east to west, covering only 50,000 acres suitable for grazing. The period of drought, floods and confined pastures dramatically decreased the rate of increase in stock numbers so that between 1814 and 1817 sheep numbers decreased by nearly 11%, yet once new pastures were opened, and stock numbers were able to recover from the effects of confinement, drought and the increased demand for meat supplies, sheep numbers increased by approximately 80% by 1821. Jill Ker, 'The Wool Industry in New South Wales, 1803-1830', Part 2, in *Business Archives and History*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1962, pp. 23-4.

25 The actual figures for the years 1816-1821, male and female convicts landed in New South Wales are respectively: 1276; 1985; 3137 2372; 2579; and 1658, in comparison to the 4,146 that arrived in the five year period 1810-1815. Shaw, *op.cit.*, pp. 365-66, refer also to Table 1.

26 The arrival of drought breaking rains in 1817, which flooded the Hawkesbury and Nepean rivers wreaked not only damage to farms and homesteads, but also increased the pressure on the government stores as the small farmers along the banks of the rivers were forced to return 500 convicts due to their inability to support them. Barrie Dyster, *op.cit.*, p. 133.

27 The growth in the numbers of convicts within the colony increased calls on the government store or Commissariat to the extent that the 3,000 daily rations supplied in 1816 increased to over 21,000 daily rations in 1821, with meat imports from the South Pacific and Van Diemen's Land being undertaken to meet the demand. E. A. Beever, 'The Origin of the Wool Industry in New South Wales', *Business Archives and History*, Vol. V, No. 2, August 1965, p. 100.) The increase in meat purchases was massive- in 1813 548,000 lbs. of meat was purchased by the Commissariat, 1,372,000 lbs. in 1819; with the 1821 meat sales to the commissariat providing the pastoralists with £90,000 of income. J. Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit*, *op.cit.*, p. 290.

28 Governor Macquarie to Earl Bathurst, 16th May, 1818, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. IX, p. 797. Despite the vitriol that Macquarie directs towards the 'poor settlers" it is incorrect to assume that the colony was awash with failed and failing peasants as by 1821 there were only 846 men in the colony who had arrived free, with less than 300 residing on their grants. (John Ritchie, 'The Colonial Office, New South Wales and the Bigge Reports, 1815-1822', *op.cit.*, p. 34 and John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit*, *op.cit.*, p. 93.) Until 1818 any settlers had to demonstrate that they held £300 in capital for which they were given a free passage to the colony. In 1818 the capital requirement was increased to £500 with no free passage included. Eastwood, *op.cit.*, p. 3. and John Ritchie, 'The Colonial Office, New South Wales and the Bigge Reports, 1815-1822', *op.cit.*, p. 33.

and for the British government to maintain the high levels of transportation. Macquarie's request for "Monied Men" as settlers brought an exponential increase in the number of free emigrants arriving in the colony, with 56 men with the requisite £500 applying for a land grant in 1818, 133 in 1819 and 237 in 1820.[29] Although receiving no guidelines within his commission in relation to the support or extension of the wool industry Bigge conceived that the most effective and profitable way to remove convicts from the stores and away from the bright lights of Sydney[30] was to encourage the development of the pastoral sector. Pastoralism was suggested by Bigge above agriculture as the latter could only absorb a comparatively smaller amount of labour, due to its dependence upon the expenses of the Commissariat for survival. The fine wool industry however, was assumed to be capable of absorbing a greater quantity of labour and accommodating them away from civilization, which agriculture and the growing of sheep for meat could not do due to the need for ready access to market.[31] To accomplish the expansion of fine-wool growing, and absorb the excess labour, Bigge recognised the need for capital and land. The land was available, it only required opening. There remained the requirement of a system of land grants which would encourage the movement of capital from the British Isles and its dependencies. The role of this capital was to relieve the Government of the day-to-day discipline and victualling of a large part of the convict population.

To attract capital, Bigge broadened Macquarie's invitation by proposing that each emigrant receive 100 acres for every £100 of capital invested, to a maximum of 2,000 acres. The grants included the services of one convict for every hundred acres granted to a maximum of seven assignees being permitted, with no grants to be smaller than 320 acres. To ensure that the labour supply serviced this capital adequately and that servitude once again became an object of fear, Bigge proposed that the regulations regarding emancipation and the granting of tickets-of-leave be tightened. The right of Governors to grant parcels of land to emancipated convicts was removed and the practice of granting land to emancipists, which had reached an unprecedented level of abuse of patronage under Governor Macquarie, ceased with the arrival of Governor Darling.[32] Alterations were also made to the method and extent of

---

29 John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit, op.cit.*, pp. 92-93.

30 Bigge recommended that convicts be removed into the interior away from the "temptations of Sydney" where many had been forced to find their own accommodation due to the lack of barracks in which they could be housed, as he was concerned that '...servitude was no longer regarded as an object of fear by the convicts'. Derek Phillips, *op.cit.*, p. 46.

31 John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit, op.cit.*, pp. 293-4.

32 The instructions handed to Darling upon receiving his commission were the first not to include instructions regarding the supply of land grants to emancipists. The previous Governor's instructions for the granting of land to emancipists were that '...you do pass Grants thereof with all convenient speed to any of the said Convicts, so emancipated, in such proportions and under such conditions and acknowledgments...To every Male shall be granted Thirty Acres of Land, and in case he shall be married Twenty Acres more, and for every Child, ...a further quantity of ten Acres, free of

granting of tickets-of-leave whereby good behaviour became the only acceptable basis for the granting of a ticket, and the right of ticket-of-leave holders to acquire property was removed.[33] Proposals which were adopted, transmitted to Governor Brisbane post-haste by the British government, and acted upon with as much speed as possible by interested parties in England.

A(i): MONEY, MEN AND SHEEP

The welcome extended to capitalised settlers by Macquarie in 1819, the release of Bigge's report in 1822 and the removal of import duties on colonial wool in 1824[34] opened the way for capitalised settlers to emigrate to the colony and establish themselves in the growing of sheep for wool. Most of the settlers who received land grants during the early 1820s were '...men of substance and standing...retired naval and military officers, professional men, successful merchants, British farmers and their sons, relatives of the colony's civil and military officers, [and] the sons of these officers...'.[35] Amongst this grouping were a number who would become important in the later settlement of the Northern Districts and the importation of Chinese labourers; including T. P. Macqueen[36] and his employees,[37] John Pike[38] and several agents of British wool broking firms.[39]

---

all Fees, Taxes, Quit-rents or other Acknowledgments whatsoever, for the Space of Ten Years,...' Instructions to Sir Thomas Brisbane, 5th February, 1821, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. X, p. 599.

33 Earl Bathurst to Sir Thomas Brisbane, 9th September, 1822, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. X, p. 790.

34 Spanish and Saxony wool attracted a 1d per pound duty which was decreased to 1/2d. in 1825. Coghlan, *op.cit.*, p. 253.

35 T. M. Perry, *Australia's First Frontier. The Spread of Settlement in New South Wales, 1788-1829*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1963, p. 74.

36 Macqueen, (1791-1854), the son of a gentleman farmer had received a grant of 10,000 acres from Earl Bathurst and sent Peter McIntyre out to the colony as his overseer, who established "Segenhoe" in the Hunter Valley on Macqueen's behalf. McIntyre, and his party of mechanics, labourers, stock and machinery arrived in Sydney on 7th April, 1825 aboard the *Hugh Crawford* and the *Nimrod*. Between 1825-38 Macqueen spent at least £42,000 on stock and improvements at "Segenhoe". *Australian Dictionary of Biography (ADB)*, Vol. 2, pp. 195-6.

37 Many of Macqueen's employees were to become prominent within the Squattocracy of the New England district: notably Peter McIntyre and his brothers Donald, and John; H. C. Sempill and Alexander Campbell.

38 Captain Pike had first arrived in the colony in 1809 with Macquarie and the 73rd Regiment, departing in 1814. Pike, on returning to the colony in 1824 received a land grant of 2,000 acres and permission to purchase 4,000 acres adjoining the land that he had selected in the Hunter Valley. (W. Allan Wood, *Dawn in the Valley. the Story of Settlement in the Hunter Valley to 1833*, Sydney, Wentworth books, 1972, pp. 65-66.) Pike, who spent most of his time in financial trouble, expanded his pastoral interests into the New England and Darling Downs districts, and was one of the largest employers of indentured Chinese labourers.

39 Among the merchants who arrived in the colony during the early 1820s were James Brindley Bettington, Joseph Barrow Montefiore, Charles and Thomas Gore, Alexander Brodie Spark, Ranulph Dacre and John Lamb. D. E. Fifer, The Sydney Merchants and the Wool Trade, 1821-1851, *JRAHS*, Vol. 78, Pts. 1-2, 1992, p. 94.

The major source of capital inflow was the formation of the Australian Agricultural Company (AACo) in 1824,[40] although the migration of Macqueen and the movement of capital in the form of stud sheep were also of importance. The AACo transferred £300,000 of capital[41] to the colony, and imported 720 rams and ewes from France and Saxony, 15 thoroughbred horses and mares and 12 head of cattle aboard the ship *York and Brothers.*[42] These flocks were supplemented by large purchases within the colony; by the middle of 1827 the Company's flocks totalled 1,500 cattle and 6,000 sheep.[43] Of significance within the movement of sheep as capital to the colony, was the establishment of the "Joint Flocks" by Richard "China" Jones[44] and Walter Stephenson Davidson.[45] The cost of the "joint flocks" was £2000, including freight,[46] which can be assumed to have been funded at least partially from the profits gained from Davidson's participation in the Opium trade. The flock, which arrived on the *Prince Regent, Hugh Crawford* and *Elizabeth* in 1825 comprised '...a hundred and twenty ewes and Rams and our plan is to keep the flock wholly separate and distinct from all other breeds and kinds'.[47] The arrival of the *Hugh Crawford* with both Macqueen's sheep and the joint flocks has been heralded as '...one of the most

---

40 The idea of instituting a joint stock company to facilitate the flow of capital to the colony of New South Wales had been mooted in 1820, that is prior to the release of Bigge's reports and even prior to most of the evidence being collected and collated. From the work of Ritchie it appears that this proposed company, which incidentally was called the "Australian Agricultural Company" had been suggested by Gregory Blaxland, as a means by which stud sheep could be introduced into the colony as he perceived that the action of undertaking this was beyond the resources of any one pastoralist. John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit, op.cit*, p. 291. The formation of the Australian Company of Edinburgh and Leith with a proposed stock of £1 million must also be mentioned, as must the proposed Eastern Australia Company. This latter company, which ultimately did not eventuate, was to colonise the New England and Darling Downs regions, using £1 million raised in England. S. H. Roberts, *The Squatting Age in Australia, 1835-47*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1935, p. 4.

41 S. H. Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.*, p. 51.

42 Jesse Gregson, *The Australian Agricultural Company, 1824-1875*, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1907, p. 19.

43 S. H. Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit*, p. 53.

44 1786-1852- Arrived in 1809, became agent for Forbes and Co. of Bombay and then a partner of Alexander Riley. Resigned from business in 1823 and dedicated himself upon his return to the colony to the management of the "Joint Flocks". After losing his fortune during the 1840s depression, he followed the move north and became one of the most prominent squatters in the Moreton Bay district. Jones eventually denounced his previous employment of Convicts, Chinese labourers, and involvement in the very public agitation for exile labour that occurred in the Northern Districts, in order to gain political office- the ultimate goal of the majority of large squatters, as this was perceived as the only path that would ensure their future economic and social dominance. It may be presumed that Davidson and/or Jones played a part in either the actual shipment of Riley's Saxon merino sheep or at least in convincing Riley of the necessity of doing so, as the two were old friends to the extent that Davidson was an executor of Riley's will, Richard Jones and Riley had established the '...one Solitary Mercantile Firm...', with the three gentlemen having commercial dealings since the arrival of Davidson in the colony.

45 Davidson arrived in China circa 1811, after being offered a position in the merchant house of Baring Brothers, which offer it appears he did not take up preferring instead to establish his own trading house. Davidson left China in 1824 with a fortune, and began employment in the firm Herries Farquhar, a merchant bank of St James Place, which was instrumental in the movement of funds to and from the colony.

46 Walter S. Davidson to John Macarthur, 29th November 1824, *Macarthur Papers*, Vol. 62, W. S. Davidson Letters, 1815-1846, ML A2958 (CY 767)

important ships in the history of Australian pastoral history...'. This injection of new genes into the colonial sheep flock saved the fledgling wool industry from in-breeding and ultimate collapse.[48]

The rate at which land grants had been given to settlers, the substantial size of some of these grants,[49] and the distribution of convicts with each grant, reversed the earlier situation of over-supply of labour due to a lack of capital to employ it, to one where capital was starting to swamp the colonial economy. The result of the large flock purchases by the AACo, and the agents of Thomas Potter Macqueen in particular, was to drive up the price of wool-bearing, in contrast to mutton producing sheep, and brought about a period of intense speculation which ended only with the drought and depression of 1829-31.[50]

Another result of the massive capital inflow and the restriction on the number of convicts that could be assigned to a company or individual was to drain the colonial labour market and leave many of the large land holders short-staffed.[51] In May 1826, Governor Darling stated that, in regard to convicts, he would '...be glad to receive as many as are disposable'.[52] Expanding upon this in a July request for convicts:

> *...demands for Convict Servants are very urgent and numerous. I have withdrawn Five Hundred from Port Macquarie, and am distributing them amongst the Settlers; but they still Continue very pressing.*[53]

Darling's request did not go unheeded and transportation again increased to the point where in 1827 Darling was able to place 12,000 convicts in private assignment.[54] This increase was too late, however, to prevent the newly arrived capital looking towards China for relief from the labour shortage, with John Macarthur

---

47 *ibid.*, It is interesting that within a report in the *Australian* Richard Jones is mentioned in regard to acquiring more Saxon Merino sheep for the Joint Flocks and that '...his determination to possess a large flock of pure Merino sheep ...', is perceived as a move that will break the monopoly within the colonial pastoral industry. The report does not mention any specific monopoly by name, although it can be presumed to refer to one of two players, either Macarthur, who incidentally was grazing his sheep partly on Davidson's land grant anyway, or the Australian Agricultural Company, of which Davidson was a major shareholder with a cousin (Sir Robert Townsend Farquhar) as director, and soon to be director himself. Within the article, short though it is, mention is also made of three gentlemen who are venturing into the importation of Saxon Merino sheep, two of whom were connected with the colonial Government, and the '...third is wealthy, and well able to purchase on a large scale,...'.*Australian*, 20th May, 1826. The flock, included 20 pure Saxon sheep from the royal flocks of Electoral Saxony, the remainder drawn from the West Taring flocks of Thomas Henty

48 Jill Ker, Part II, *op.cit*, p. 29.

49 Apart from the large grants given to the AACo and Macqueen a Mr. Hart Davis of Bristol received 30,000 acres, and B. B. Thomas and partners acquired 20,000 acres.

50 John Ritchie, *Punishment and Profit*, *op.cit*, p. 292.

51 Sheep numbers increased from 19,777 in 1821 to 240,000 in 1825 and 600,000 in 1829. Refer to Table 1 in Appendix 2.

52 Governor Darling to Under Secretary Hay, 9th May, 1826, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. XII, p. 294.

53 Governor Darling to Under Secretary Hay, 26th July, 1826, *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. XII, p. 450.

54 For figures on the rate of transportation and assignment refer to Table 1 in Appendix 2.

proposing to import Chinese labourers on behalf of the AACo. On the 3rd May, 1826 the *Sydney Gazette* praised the '...great utility and vast importance of the Company...' to the colony, adding that it was:

> *With an intensity of pleasure we have learned that the Honourable John McArthur, one of the Managing Committee in this Colony, intends leaving the Country for a season, somewhat about August next, and proceeding to China, for the purpose of procuring some hundreds of mechanics, of all kinds and denominations, from that vast empire, and taking up a large ship for the purpose of conveying them to our fertile and prepossessing regions, where "peace and plenty" already begin to smile.*[55]

Although this proposal never proceeded beyond the proverbial drawing board, Macarthur declaring three days later that he was to proceed direct to England in order to procure a seat in the House of Commons,[56] it is worthy of interest and inclusion within this study for the questions and issues that it raises. Was the intention of Macarthur to supply the AACo with Chinese driven solely by his own design? Or was it upon instruction from the Company's directors in England?[57] That such a plan may have been mooted by the directors and major shareholders of the Australian Agricultural Company is not outside of the bounds of possibility; as one of the directors at the time was Sir R. T. Farquhar.[58] Macarthur may have been influenced by any discussions that had taken place on this subject within the board of the AACo, on which his son, John Jnr. sat when proposing this plan.

The Australian Agricultural Company found its operations hampered by an inadequate supply of "mechanicks", and the indifferent skills of the majority of those mechanics assigned to the Company, as well as the incompatibility of emancipist and

---

55 "The London Australian Agricultural Company", *Sydney Gazette*, Wednesday, 3rd May, 1826, p. 2. It is difficult to accept that this article was written with any degree of true empathy or interest in Macarthur's journey or the interests of the Australian Agricultural Company, as the editor of the Gazette, Mr. Robert Howe, and Macarthur had apparently been feuding for at least six months prior to the publication of this article, although Macarthur and Howe had jointly published articles deriding the Australian. Governor Darling actually despatched a secret transmission to Under-Secretary Hay regarding Macarthur and his relations with the press and the rest of colonial society: (Darling to Hay, 1st May, 1826 *HRA*, Series 1, Vol. XII, pp. 253-257.) Ellis argues that at the time of the articles publication that the Gazette had once again become Macarthur's "zealous champion and most servile adulater"; M. H. Ellis, *John Macarthur*, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1955, p. 499.

56 *Australian*, 13th May, 1836, and Ellis, *op.cit*, p. 499, and Darling to Hay, 2nd September, 1826, *HRA* , Series 1, Vol. XII, p.523.

57 Contemporary statements regarding Macarthur's proposed trip to China, and later biographical judgements link this proposal with others Macarthur made in that year, which have been dismissed as the apparent scheming and ranting of a '...wayward child...'. (Darling to Hay, 2nd September, 1826, *HRA* , Series 1, Vol. XI , p.523.) Hints of soundness of mind, "lunatic asylums at Castle Hill", and Macarthur's advanced age were utilised to explain this plan as just another sign that Macarthur had lost his wits. Ellis, *op.cit*, pp. 499-502.

58 The author of a pamphlet in 1817 which suggested the use of Chinese within the West Indian sugar plantations. For more information on Farquhar and this pamphlet refer to the previous chapter.

convict labour, due to the emancipist's "bad" influence upon the convicts.[59] Macarthur, recognising that the Company had difficulty in acquiring an adequate number of labourers, may have drawn on any, or all of the earlier ideas of Farquhar, Governor King, and his own Quadrangular Trade Scheme, and the connections offered by Davidson to supplement the Company's labour force from China.[60] Increased convict arrivals in 1827 would have removed any immediacy from bringing Macarthur's plan to fulfilment.

The movement of settlers further afield from Sydney led to the official proclamation of the Nineteen Counties in 1829 which designated the "Limits of Location" or "Bounds of Settlement".[61] Any movement beyond these limits placed the individual outside of the law and beyond the protection of the government. However, despite this official proclamation and the economic depression, settlers continued to arrive in the colony and push further inland. The move inland brought with it problems of control over assignees and their employees, with many assignees being subjected to abuse and violence.[62] Despite drought and depression in the late 1820s labour demand remained high, the 3,329 convicts who arrived in 1829 rapidly found employment.[63] Contemporaneously in England, many recognised the insatiable colonial labour market with its vast undeveloped lands as a solution to England's '...superfluous population, which would consume the excess capacity of her factories, and to which she could export the surplus capital which was driving down the domestic rate of profit...'.[64] Edward Gibbon Wakefield, being the first to publicly expound a connection between population relief in England and a chance of reforming colonial society.

A(ii): WAKEFIELD AND THE FAILURE OF SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION

Convict labour had its advantages, in that it was perceived as being cheap and relatively subservient, yet doubts abounded regarding the moral status of a nation that

---

59 Barrie Dyster, *op.cit*, p. 177.

60 The links between these people, Davidson, Farquhar and Macarthur and their combined knowledge of China underline the continuity of such ideas and links in the extended history of the importation of Chinese labourers to the colony of New South Wales.

61 Refer to Figure 1 on page 6 for a view of the area covered by the Nineteen counties.

62 The lack of control over the "worst" masters, a belief that transportation had lost its deterrent and reformatory aspects, and an increasing alignment of slavery and assignment was to lead to the formation of the Molesworth Committee, which ultimately led to the cessation of assignment in 1839 and then the abolition of transportation in 1840. There was also the increased risk of convicts absconding, with little chance of them being apprehended the further afield from Sydney the station was located. Many of the escaped convicts and emancipists became the first "squatters", stocking their runs with sheep and cattle stolen from other settlers.

63 J. M. Ward, *Empire in the Antipodes. The British in Australasia: 1840-1860*, London, Edward Arnold, 1966, p. 12.

64 Bernard Semmel, 'The Philosophical Radicals and Colonialism', *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1961, p. 514.

was populated primarily by convicts and ex-convicts (emancipists), doubts which took a long time to subside. Wakefield, an opponent of transportation as a system of punishment or colonisation, argued that the influx of criminals placed life and property in a position of constant insecurity. That proportion of the population not "legally criminal" was corrupted by the overwhelming presence of criminal elements, and that the employer of labour was effectively turned into a slave-driver.[65] Wakefield's reservations regarding the suitability of convicts as the basis for a new and free society and their lack of propriety and industriousness, were echoed by others within the colony and England.[66] These commonly held perceptions led to calls for another source of labour that did not exhibit these unacceptable qualities and which could be utilised by capital in order to increase the riches of the colony.

In order to direct the development of the colonial society away from a slave based system to one where free labour predominated,[67] Wakefield proposed that the colonial government begin selling, rather than giving away, the crown lands. The money raised was to be used to pay the passage of those wishing to migrate to the colony, particularly those sections of England's population experiencing distress. Selling the land, Wakefield argued, would prevent new emigrants from becoming land-holders and therefore increasing the demand for labour upon their arrival in the colony-

> *There is no such class as a tenantry in this country, where every man who has capital to cultivate a farm, can obtain one of his own for nothing.*[68]

The populating of the vast wilderness of Australia at any cost was utmost in Wakefield's mind, and the '...species of slave-labour...'[69] prevalent in the colony, convictism, had proved only partially successful, leaving few options.[70] Wakefield, in

---

65 M. F. Lloyd-Prichard, *The Collected Works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield,* Glasgow, 1968, p.15.

66 Many of those concerned with the moral status of the colony had been at the forefront of the Abolitionist Movement; a grouping that came to be known as the Philosophical Radicals. Refer to Semmel, *op.cit.*

67 Although Wakefield was an opponent of transportation, possibly due to his incarceration at the time that he wrote his "Letter From Sydney", he actively promoted the idea that the colonies gain '..permission to obtain slaves from Africa...' in order to boost the labour supply, despite the strength and impending success of the emancipist movement. Wakefield argued that the '...absolute want of hands at any rate of wages ...' in other new countries had '...been partially remedied by means of slavery...' and that in order for the colony to become '...anything but a half-barbarous, tartarian, ill-cultivated, poverty-stricken wilderness ..' the civilising effects of slavery was required. *ibid.*, p. 114.

68 *ibid.*, p. 104.

69 *ibid*, p. 113.

70 It is incorrect to assume through these statements that Wakefield totally disregarded the positive impacts of convict transportation and assignment on the development of the colonial economy. It was the moral effects of convict heritage on a youthful and impressionable society that worried him most, in combination with the fact that the precious balance between cheap land and cheap labour, '...the fire and water of political economy...'was under threat. *ibid.*, p. 127.

addressing the labour shortage also suggested the emigration of Chinese to the colonies as they:

> *...are by far the most industrious and skilful of Asiatics- might, not only supply the want of labourers now felt in the British Australasian settlements, but they might, in the course of a century, perhaps, convert the whole of this enormous wilderness into a fruitful garden.*[71]

In suggesting that employers turn to China for "indented servants at the cheapest of wages"[72] Wakefield cited the examples of Batavia and Penang, proposing that within the Australian colonies Chinese labourers could assume the place of the peasant propriety that the colonies were lacking. The Chinese in this scheme would not only provide the irrigation skills necessary but more importantly comprise a low-wage labour force that would redress the balance between land and labour; '...the fire and water of political economy...'.[73]

The British Government accepted Wakefield's assessment and prescriptions for the colonial labour shortage and instituted an Immigration Fund, based on the false assumption that labour scarcity was attributable to the ease with which the labouring class could obtain land.[74] The scarcity had actually been caused by the movement of capital into the colony during the 1820s, the tendency to grant large tracts of land to capitalised settlers, and the overwhelming predominance of grazing within the colonial economy.[75] As pastoral expansion continued unchecked, the demand for labour increased concurrently, the demand for cheap, relatively immobile, labour in particular.

With the failure of early attempts to finance emigration,[76] a land fund was formed, by halting in 1831 the practice of giving land away, and charging instead at

---

71 *ibid.*, p. 170

72 *ibid.*, p. 176.

73 *ibid.*, p. 127. Wakefield also suggested that the settlement of Chinese in the colonies would allow the British Government greater and more unfettered trade possibilities with Chin: 'But would it not be no advantage to British manufacturers to enjoy free trade with millions of fellow subjects of Chinese origin, and, through them, perhaps, with hundreds of millions of customers in the Celestial Empire.' *ibid*, p. 177.

74 Ken Buckley, 'E. G. Wakefield and the Alienation of Crown Land in N. S. W. to 1847', *Economic Record*, Vol. XXXIII, April, 1957, p. 81, and Peter Burroughs, 'Wakefield and the Ripon Land Regulations of 1831', *Historical Studies of Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 11, No. 44, April 1965, pp. 458-459.

75 Grazing, at least until the erection of vast lines of fencing in the latter part of the nineteenth century was an extremely labour intensive undertaking. As the greater portion of grazing was undertaken outside of the settled areas, a grazing establishment had to be virtually self-sufficient, supplies were expensive to acquire and could be disrupted by natural phenomenon in particular heavy rains and flooding which would make the passage of bullock drays difficult if not impossible.

76 The first ideas on an immigration fund suggested the application of a tax on assigned convicts, a suggestion that was soundly condemned within the colony. The next attempt to establish a land fund for emigration occurred in July 1831, however, this scheme applied only to female emigration. The Colonial Office then moved to assist male emigrants in particular mechanics, who were supposed to repay their passage money once employed in the colony, a situation that did not materialise. June

public auction an upset price of at least 5s per acre. The funds raised were to '..be devoted exclusively towards the encouragement and promotion of emigration'.[77] While the labour situation eased with the introduction of the assisted immigrants, the pastoralist's labour problems were not overcome.[78]

B: LABOUR, SQUATTERS AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICTS

Despite the efforts of the Land and Emigration Commissioners the rate at which assisted emigrants arrived was insufficient to meet the demand for labour occasioned by the expanding numbers of pastoralists.[79] By the mid-1830s employers within the colony again found themselves faced with a situation of labour shortage and high wage levels. The antipathy of free migrants towards moving into the interior presented a scenario where high rates of unemployment prevailed in Sydney, while stock was dying in the interior due to insufficient shepherds.[80] This situation provoked the squatters to forward a petition to the incumbent Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Glenelg, requesting the importation of coolies from India as;

> *..the want of labour is at present felt to an alarming extent throughout the Colony; that in many cases the plough remains idle; and that in order to wean the last spring lambs, flock-owners have been obliged, in numerous instances, to place two flocks of sheep in one, under the care of one shepherd.*[81]

Indian labour was the most obvious first choice for the petitioners due to the strong British influence within that country, compared to the closed door that China exhibited to the western world. The petitioners requested that the Government pay at least half of the costs incurred in importing the Indian coolies, arguing that the Government was responsible for the deficiencies exhibited by the labour market:

> *Having waited for some particular time in anxious expectation, the arrival of Emigrants and Convicts from the Mother Country to supply the wants of our Establishments in the interior,*

Philipp, 'Wakefieldian Influence and New South Wales, 1830-1832', *Historical Studies of Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 9, No. 34, May 1960, pp. 177-178.

77 J. D. Lang, *Transportation and Colonization*, London, A. J. Valpy, 1837, p. 136.

78 Refer to Table 1 in Appendix 2 for changes in the rate of free and assisted immigration.

79 Between 1831-1835 only 7,221 emigrants arrived in New South Wales under the Land Fund scheme, primarily because not all of the Land Fund was applied to emigration; part of it directed to the payment of officers salaries. S. H. Roberts, *The Squatting Age*, *op.cit.*, p. 12.

80 By 1835 two-fifths of the emigrants resided in Sydney and the surrounding county of Cumberland, (Roberts, *The Squatting Age, op. cit.*, p. 14.) This concentration within the urban area of the colony was a form of safety in numbers for these newcomers, as many that had moved beyond the bounds had been attacked and discriminated against by the convict population, emancipated and assigned, as they recognised that this new sector of society threatened their own position, culminating in the tendency of ex-convict overseers to find '...pleasure in oppressing free men.' M. Roe, *Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia, 1835-51*, Melbourne, 1965, p. 71.

81 Petition from certain flockowners, *NSWLC V&P*, 1836, p. 587.

and finding that there remains not the slightest chance of receiving from that quarter a sufficient supply of labourers to meet the wants of the Colonists,[82]

The Colonial Office in response declined to pay for any importations, yet declared that it would not prevent the importations being undertaken by private individuals; however, only 86 Indian labourers were privately imported to the colony by 1839. The major impediment to contracting Indian labourers was a law which prohibited the indenturing of '...any Native of India for service or labor to be performed by such Native out of the Territories under the Government of the East India Company, or cause any Native of India to depart from the Territories under the Government of the East India Company'.[83] The enforcement of this act produced a heated argument between the colonists and the Colonial Secretary over whether or not the labourers at the centre of the dispute were British subjects. Prospective employers within the colony argued that if the labourers were subjects of the Empire they should be allowed to move according to their will throughout the British Empire. Conversely, if they were not regarded as Her Majesty's subjects, the British Government had no right to introduce legislation impeding their movements.[84]

A year later, employers turned their attentions to China for labour:

So urgent is the demand for labour that many settlers have been obliged, in opposition to their own inclination, to send to India for Chinese and Coolies, to be hired and introduced at their individual expense.[85]

One attempt to broach the labour market in China came with the placing of the following advertisement[86] by G. F. Davidson[87] which called for expressions of interest from those wishing to import "Chinese Mechanics and Labourers".

---

82 *ibid.* The deficiencies were due to the changes that they the British Government, in the person of the Land and Emigration Commissioners, had instituted within the management of the Land Fund. The major change was that expenditure on the police service and gaols were now to be drawn from the Land Fund rather than from the coffers of the Colonial Office as had been the practice. (A. G. V. Melbourne, *Early Constitutional Development in Australia,* St. Lucia, University Of Queensland Press, 1963, p. 228) This produced a situation whereby, only one-fifth of the amount raised by the sale of land was actually used to assist migration from the United Kingdom. Roberts, *Squatting Age in Australia, op.cit.*, p. 13.

83 Act No. XXXII, of 1837 and then Act No. XIV of 1839. This prohibition was an attempt on the part the East India Company to protect its interests as the success of the Anti-Slavery Movement had narrowed the regions from which they could draw cheap labour. For more information on the importation of Indian labourers refer to A. Dwight, 'The Use of Indian Labourers in New South Wales', *JRAHS*, Vol. 62, Pt. 2, 1976, pp. 114-135.

84 Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.*, p. 339.

85 Evidence of Thomas Walker, 20th August, 1838, Report from the Select Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1838, pps. 55-55. Walker continued on to state that '...1203 such labourers have actually been sent for by 111 settlers, each of whom has paid an advance at the rate of £5 for each labourer, and entered into an engagement to pay the balance of the expense of their introduction on arrival of the parties here.

86 *The Australian*, 6th June, 1837, p.3 and *Sydney Herald*, 12th and 17th June, 1837. The full advertisement which included Davidson's plan and the listing of subscribers (which is reproduced as

CHINESE
MECHANICS AND LABOURERS

A proposal to bring from Singapore a number of Chinese Labourers and Mechanics to New South Wales now lies at the four Banks in Sydney, for perusal, and for the Signatures of those persons who may wish to join the undertaking. An early attention is invited. It will be seen that a number of the most influential Merchants and Settlers have entered their names as Subscribers.

This advertisement raised £700 in subscriptions to be used to procure 600 Chinese males through the agency of Davidson's brother living in Singapore and denotes the first systematic attempt to introduce Chinese labourers into the colony.[88] Although Davidson's plan did not come to fruition[89] it is of interest that he states that as '...shepherds, I doubt whether they would answer'; shepherding was to be the preserve of the bounty emigrants. The Chinese were to be employed in those areas where some skill was required, skills that the sweepings of England's poor houses (as the assisted and bounty emigrants were termed) were perceived as lacking. Both of the above attempts can be linked to the movement of many merchants and mariners into the pastoral industry, during the late 1820s and early 1830s, who had long-standing links to the country traders that plied the Indian and China trade routes.[90]

Appendix 3) was also published in China under "Importation of Chinese Mechanics and Labourers", *Chinese Repository*, Vol. VI, 1837, pp. 299-300.

87 Little is known about Gordon Forbes Davidson other than the fact that he had a property at Upper Paterson in the Hunter Valley, and in 1837 was registered as having 8 convicts assigned to him. (N. G. Butlin, C. W. Cromwell & K L. Southern, *General Return of Convicts in NSW, 1837*, Sydney, Australian Biographical and Genealogical Record, 1987, p. 715.) The brother referred to, Michie Forbes (married Isabella the daughter of General David Forbes *MM*, 12-9-57), was employed by Shaw and Whitehead in Singapore. Another brother, Robert was the Physician-General at Madras (daughter Sophia married Horatio Nelson of the Bengal Civil Service *MM*, 12-9-57). Going by newspaper of birth and death reports, Davidson appears to have spent a lot of his time travelling between Sydney and Singapore until leaving the colony for good about 1840. Unfortunately no link has emerged between W. S. Davidson and G. F. Davidson.

88 Alan Dwight, 'Chinese Labourers to New South Wales', *Eastern Horizon*, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1975, p. 53. In a note in the *Chinese Repository* article the figures given are 335 labourers for 57 subscribers, all of whom had paid an advance of $5. "Importation of Chinese Mechanics and Labourers", *Chinese Repository*, Vol. VI, 1837, p. 300.

89 It has commonly been argued that internal disturbances, specifically the prelude to the Opium War forced the cancellation of Davidson's attempt, yet there is some trouble accepting this explanation given the years in question. Dwight argues that the '...Chinese migrations were missed in 1838 and 1839....' which caused the attempted importation to be abandoned for those years, with the start of the Opium War preventing any future attempt by Davidson and his brother. (*ibid*, p. 53.) As to whether or not this reason proffered by Dwight is true it is close to impossible to say, as Davidson makes no mention of the attempt in his later book, and no mention of the reason is to be found in the contemporary newspapers.

90 Thomas Icely, previously the agent for Buckles, Bagster and Buchanan, A. B. Spark, the Gore brothers, Captain Thomas Collins and Richard Jones are included in this category. D. E. Fifer, *op.cit*, p. 95.

Despite the prevailing at itude that the prosperity of the colony was linked to concentrated settlement, the movement beyond the "Bounds of "Settlement" continued apace. The success of Australian wool in the British, and later world markets led to a "Wool-Rush" whereby '...every able-bodied man thirsted for the bush and pined to ride in the dust behind masses of smelling sheep'.[91] The intention of joining this wool-rush led many to seek their fortunes outside of the bounds or limits of settlement, culminating in the formation and recognition of the gentleman squatters or "Squattocracy".[92] As the costs of establishing and maintaining a station beyond the limits were substantial,[93] the majority of those beyond the limits were men of money and connections. These men desired legal recognition of the land they had claimed and recognition of their position within colonial society. By 1836, Governor Sir Richard Bourke realised that the best the Government could do in the situation was to afford the protection of the government to those beyond the bounds, as:

> *Not all the armies of England- not a hundred thousand soldiers scattered through the bush- could drive back our herds within the limits of our Nineteen Counties.*[94]

The Squatting Act of 1836[95] was introduced by Bourke to provide this protection, and in permitting any respectable person for the payment of £10 licence fee to graze stock over as much land as they wished sanctioned occupation of the Crown Lands outside of the Nineteen Counties. This act drew more men of capital to the colony, increasing sheep prices, furthering the push inland, and leading to the settlement of the Northern Districts.

---

91 Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.* p. 8.

92 Until the passing of the 1836 act the term squatter was one of reproach and denoted individuals within the settled districts who settled without permission on Crown Lands, stocking their "runs" with stock stolen from neighbours. A past-time of mainly emancipists and escaped convicts. Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.*, p. 55.

93 See Anon, 'Disadvantages of a Sheep Station out of the Boundaries of the Colony of NSW in a North West Direction in 1837, *The Australian Magazine*, Vol. 1, No. 2, February 1838, pp. 135-145. Matthew Marsh stated in evidence that it '...would be more advantageous for a man to give £800 for a station, for 7000 sheep, already formed, than to commence a station himself;...' Evidence of M. H. Marsh, Report from the Select Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1841, p. 41.

94 Roberts, *History of Australian Land Settlement, op.cit.*, p. 188. Governor Gipps would echo Bourke's sentiment four years later writing on the subject of closer settlement that: 'As well might it be attempted to confine the Arabs of the Desert within a circle drawn upon their sands, as to confine the graziers or wool-growers of New South Wales within any bounds that can possibly be assigned to them; and as certainly as the Arabs would be starved, so also would the flocks and herds of New South Wales, if they were so confined, and the prosperity of the country be at an end.' George Gipps to Lord John Russell, 19th December, 1840, Correspondence respecting the Sale of Crown Lands at a Fixed Price and the Division of the Territory into Three Districts, *NSWLC V&P*, 1842, pp. 87.

95 4 William. IV, No. 4.

B(i): THE NORTHERN SQUATTERS

Settlement of the Northern Districts[96] began in New England in 1832 with the arrival of Hamilton Collins Sempill and Edward Cory.[97] Sempill and Cory were soon joined by other settlers from the Hunter Valley, the "cradle of the north", and new emigrants eager to acquire the valuable pastures that were to be had for a paltry £10 licence fee.[98] The settlement of the Clarence River[99] and Darling Downs[100] districts quickly followed that of New England. Patrick Leslie,[101] Arthur Hodgson, Henry Hughes, the brothers George and John Gammie, John Dobie, St. George Gore, John Campbell, and Henry Stuart Russell following the move north and east. This movement of men and sheep continued north into the Maranoa, Burnett and Wide Bay districts, all of which were proclaimed in 1849.

Many of the Northern Districts squatters hailed from the legal, military, clergy or the new capitalist class in England and Scotland and arrived in the colony with capital and letters of introduction to the established colonial aristocracy.[102] The Everett brothers of "Ollera" for example, possessed thirty letters of introduction which

---

96 The Northern Districts are defined as incorporating the Clarence River, New England, Darling Downs, and Moreton Bay, pastoral districts, which extend from approximately 149°E and 31°S to 25°S.

97 Sempill had taken over the management "Segenhoe" in the Hunter Valley for T. P. Macqueen upon Peter McIntyre's retirement in 1830. *ADB*. Vol. 2, p. 195.

98 For a detailed exposition of the exploration and settlement of the New England District refer to R. B. Walker, *Old New England*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1966 and S. H. Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.*, pp. 169-177.

99 Possibly the best description of the history of white settlement in the Clarence District is found within *The Bawden Lectures, June 1886, July 1886 and August 1888, Grafton*, Clarence River Historical Society.

100 For more detailed information on the discovery, settlement and expansion of the Darling Downs district refer to, M. French, *A Pastoral Romance. The Tribulations and Triumphs of Squatterdom*, Toowoomba, USQ Press, 1990 and Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.*, pp. 202-15.

101 Leslie (1815-1881) was the nephew of W. S. Davidson and had arrived in the colony in 1834 to assist Richard Jones in the management of the Joint Flocks, eventually taking over management of "Collaroi" on Davidson's behalf, travelling to the colony on the *Emma Eugenia* with S. A. Donaldson. (W. S. Davidson to James Macarthur, 19th November, 1834, W. S. Davidson Letters, 1815-46, *Macarthur Papers*, Vol. 62, ML A2958). Was the first person to establish a run on the Darling Downs and was quickly joined by his brothers George and Walter, yet sold out to his brothers when an on-going dispute with Davidson over money left him bankrupt. At his marriage to Catherine, the daughter of H. H. Macarthur, S. A. Donaldson was his best man, with his brothers also marrying into the Macarthur clan. (*ADB*, Vol. 2, pp. 107-8) Another brother William was employed in Davidson's old firm of Dent's in China, and also gained the financial wrath of his uncle.('Statement, printed, respecting the conduct of his nephew, William Leslie, in connexion with the house of W. S. Davidson & Co. in China, 1833-43', W. S. Davidson Letters, 1815-46, *Macarthur Papers*, Vol. 62, ML A2958).

102 The predominance of Scots within the early population is abundantly clear from even just a brief perusal of the names of properties and areas within the region, for example, "Oban", "Tenterfield", "Dundee", "Bannockburn". The existence of ex-military is defined by the names of a number of properties such as "Waterloo", "Furracabad", "Hernani", and "Wellington Vale", whose owner (R. R. Robertson) was the godson of the Duke of Wellington. Matthew Marsh and Oswald Bloxsome were both lawyers, the former a son of the canon and chancellor of the diocese of Salisbury, the latter hailed from the landed gentry. Robert Ramsey Mackenzie was the son of a Scottish Baronet, and Stuart Donaldson was the son of a well established London merchant who had extensive colonial interests.

included ones to such colonial luminaries as Bishop Broughton, Governor Gipps and Alexander Macleay.[103] Oswald Bloxsome, of "Rangers Valley" and other numerous properties, arrived in Sydney in 1838 with letters of introduction from the Marquis of Normanby (the incumbent Secretary of State for the Colonies) and Lord Berkeley.[104]

It should not be presumed however that these men of means were all involved physically with the discovery and settlement of the New England region. People like Robert R. Mackenzie,[105] Stuart A. Donaldson,[106] Archibald Boyd,[107] Peter McIntyre[108] and William Dumaresq tended to reside in Sydney, or at their properties situated around Scone, while their "agents" pushed north and claimed lands on their behalf. One such adventure saw Oswald Bloxsome and the agents for Captain Henry

---

103 R. B. Walker. *op.cit.*, p. 22. Henry Stuart Russell found his letters of introduction useless at first when he was mistaken for another Henry Russell, for whose arrest a warrant had been issued, and was not "received" by Governor Gipps. H. S. Russell, *Genesis of Queensland*, Sydney, Turner and Henderson, 1888, p. 178.

104 Born 1802, second son of a Gloucestershire lawyer, arrived Sydney 1838 aboard *Florentia* and set out with the representatives of Archibald Boyd and Archibald Windeyer to take up land in the New England district. Returned to England in 1857 after having never lived on any of his stations. (Herbert S. Bloxsome, *A Short Biography of Oswald Bloxsome Snr*, 1942.) Magistrate; signatory to the Petition to the Governor-General of India; member of the Pastoral Association. Apart from his New England runs Bloxsome also owned approximately 400,000 acres throughout the western districts, nearly placing him in the land-holding league of the Dangar brothers with their 550,000 acres; 220,000 of which were located within the New England region.

105 Mackenzie (1811-1873) arrived in Sydney 1832 with his brother aboard the *Wave* and quickly established himself in colonial society. After over-extending himself financially Mackenzie had to sell many of his squatting runs yet managed to retain a partnership in 52 runs coving 1536 acres in the Northern Districts. Entered parliament on the separation of Queensland eventually becoming premier in 1867. On the death of his brother William he succeeded to the baronetcy and returned to Scotland in 1871. Mackenzie married Louisa Alexandrina the daughter of Richard "China" Jones, with two of his four daughters marrying into the Archer family- highlighting the connections that bound together the large squatting families. *ADB*, Vol. 4, p. 171. Member of the "Australian Club"; magistrate; and signatory to the 'Petition to the Governor-General of India'.

106 Donaldson (1812-1867) had one the most impeccable merchant heritages next to the Campbell's, being the son of Stuart Alexander Donaldson of Donaldson, Wilkinson & Co. of London the wool-brokers for Macarthur. Arrived in Sydney in 1837 and joined Alexander Riley and Richard Jones, the colonial agents for his father's company, yet proved himself as an extremely capable merchant in his own right. Was a leader amongst the squatting clique, leading the push for the establishment of the "Australian Club"; magistrate; also member of the "Coolie Association"; signatory on the 'Petition to the Governor-General of India'; pushed for the cultivation of cotton and steam ship services between the colony and China; employer of Chinese labour; and entered politics in 1848, eventually becoming the first premier of New South Wales. Left the colony permanently for England in 1859. *ADB*, Vol. 4, pp. 84-8).

107 Boyd (1801-1864), a lawyer, educated at Trinity College Cambridge, was the cousin of Benjamin Boyd and arrived in the colony in 1838 taking up land in the Clarence district (Newton Boyd 100,000 acres) and then New England ("Boyd's Plains" 80,000 acres and "Whitmore" 50,000 acres). Boyd spent most of his time arguing the cause of the squatters in London, an activity to which he was able to direct most of his time after having left the colony in 1847 under cover of darkness to escape his creditors. By 1852 most of his New England runs were transferred to Bloxsome. *ADB*, Vol. 3, pp. 139-140.

108 McIntyre(1783-1842) and his brothers Donald and John had arrived in the colony in 1824 under employment of T. P. Macqueen. After leaving Macqueen's employ, in an acrimonious situation, McIntyre guided Alan Cunningham over the Liverpool Range. On his death his properties in the New England district, "Byron" (128,000 acres), "Waterloo" (118,080 acres) and "Gyra/Guyra" (92,160 acres) passed to his sister Mary. *ADB*, Vol. 2, p. 168.

Dumaresq[109] Archibald Boyd and Archibald Windeyer become the first whites to travel beyond Ben Lomond and select runs.[110] The later arrivals, Matthew H. and Charles W. Marsh,[111] John and George Everett, Edward Clerkness, and Edward and Leonard Irby purchased their runs from these original squatters. To illustrate this, Robert Ramsey Mackenzie was the owner of "Tenterfield", "Bolivia", "Furracabad", "Ballindean", "Terrible Vale", 'Salisbury", and "Boorolong" stations. By 1841 these stations were owned by S. A. Donaldson, Edward and Leonard Irby, Major A. C. Innes,[112] H. Nicol, William Taylor and Richard Middleton, and M. H. Marsh respectively. However Mackenzie had originally acquired the runs of "Salisbury Plains" and "Terrible Vale" in 1837 from Edward Cory, who also sold "Gostwyck" to William Dangar in 1834.[113]

The size of the runs claimed by these squatters were unimaginable as the average acreage claimed exceeded the size of most English counties. For example, the 140,720 acres secured by Bloxsome in the New England region makes his family estate of 800 acres, "The Rangers" in Gloucestershire, appear a mere backyard.[114] Donaldson, with his various runs totalling nearly 160,000 acres, recognised that he was a '...sheep and cattle proprietor on a scale Suffolk people don't accustom themselves to think.'[115] The holdings in the Darling Downs and Clarence River were of equivalent size with the Leslies' property of "Canning Downs" engrossing 264 square miles or 168,960 acres; John Pike, "Pikedale" 76,800 acres; Russell, "Cecil Plains" 61,440 acres; Gore,

---

109 Henry Dumaresq was restricted in the extent of his land acquisitions due to his position as Surveyor with the Australian Agricultural Company, so land was taken up on his behalf by his brother William who held Henry's Power of Attorney.

110 Bloxsome, *op.cit*, p. 3.

111 Matthew Henry Marsh (1810-1831) and Charles William Marsh were the sons of the chancellor of the diocese of Salisbury, and the grandsons of Sir Benjamin Collins Brodie (1783-1862) the surgeon-superintendent to the Queen (*DNB* pp. 1286-1288). Matthew, a barrister and the most noteworthy of the two arrived in the colony in 1840 and immediately purchased runs in the New England district. Was the member for New England from 1851-1855 when he returned to England and was elected to the House of Commons, leaving Charles and E. C. Blomfield in charge of his properties. An early member of the "Australian Club", magistrate and employer of Chinese labourers. *ADB*, Vol. 5, p. 213.

112 Innes (1800-1857), 3rd. Regiment of Foot. arrived in Sydney in 1822 in charge of the guard aboard the convict ship *Eliza*. After acting as commissioner at the Port Macquarie penal settlement he resigned his commission in 1828 and set about acquiring land, first around Port Macquarie and then expanded into New England where, until declared bankrupt in 1852 he held "Furracabad" (aka "Glen Innes" 25,000 acres); "Dundee" (40,000- purchased by Bloxsome); "Mole River" (60,000); "Kentucky" (40,000); "Waterloo" (30,000). Magistrate and member of the "Australian Club"; and subscriber to Davidson's plan. *ADB*, Vol. 2, pp. 3-4. Ben W. Champion, 'Major A. C. Innes, 3rd Regiment of Foot', *JRAHS*, Vol. XXI, Part 3, 1935, pp. 103-116.

113 *ADB*, Vol. 1, pp. 247-48. Despite the fact that these squatters held no title to the land the properties were traded as if they were freehold. Mackenzie sold "Terrible Vale" to Taylor and Middleton on September, 11 1840 for £3500, with S. A. Donaldson holding a mortgage of £2500 on the property. (Letter from R. R. Mackenzie affirming sale of "Terrible Valley", *Terrible Vale Station Records*. UNE-A 214) Although the cost of "Salisbury" to Marsh is unknown, he reputedly paid Mackenzie £200 for the 200,000 acres of "Boorolong". *Reminiscences of Early New England by C. E. Blomfield*, Note 1.(UNE A4)

114 Bloxsome, *op.cit*, p. 1

115 *ADB*, Vol. 4, p. 84.

"Yandilla" 69,440 acres; and Hodgson, "Eton Vale" 102,400 acres; J. Dobie, "Gordon Brook" and "Strathe den" 86,400 acres; and Archibald Boyd, "Newton Boyd" 100,000 acres.

The Northern District squatters were the epitome of absentee landlords: Bloxsome never lived on any of his properties and spent his life in Sydney until returning to England in 1857; Donaldson also spent his time residing in Sydney, with constant visits to England, until 1859 when he returned to England permanently; Matthew Marsh did live on the property Salisbury, but only for part of the year, preferring the social whirl of Sydney;[116] and Mackenzie had to sell his properties due to financial failure caused by his tendency to prefer the social life of Sydney to that of a squatter.[117] The Northern district squatters were quick to insinuate themselves into colonial society in order to press their claims for labour, political and social representation, and legal recognition. To these ends the squatters formed the "Australian Club",[118] gave evidence to Select Committees on Immigration, placed their names to petitions requesting increased rates of immigration and formed the "Coolie Association".

C: 1839 AND BEYOND

By 1839 the squatting movement had expanded to the extent where approximately 4,380 persons located beyond the boundaries, grazing 233,000 cattle and 982,000 sheep.[119] In order to utilize the land that they had claimed the Northern squatters required labour, and in preference a large, cheap and relatively servile supply of labour, which the system of free and assisted emigration did not provide.[120] A

---

116 "The Member for New England at Home", *MBFP*, 9th November, 1852.

117 H. S. Russell wrote in regard to Mackenzie's living arrangements when visiting "Salisbury" in 1840 that 'He's not here, though; he won't go out of Sydney'. H. S. Russell, *op.cit*, p. 181. Mackenzie did live at Clifton (one of Donaldson's properties) for a time, yet the underlying motive for this sojourn in the country appears to have been to keep him out of trouble and the sights of his many creditors.

118 The "Australian Club" which was formed in 1838 was an attempt to recreate the atmosphere of the London clubs, with the '...purpose of facilitating the social and literary intercourse of individuals resident in the Colony, and for the general interests of the Country gentleman...'. Notable original members who had interests in the Northern Districts were, Archibald Boyd, S. A. Donaldson, G. Elliot, H. Gordon, A. C. Innes, R. Jones, P. Leslie, R. R. Mackenzie, H. H. and A. Macarthur, W. Ogilvie, Captain J. Pike, and A. B. Spark: J. L. William, *Australian Club Centenary, 1938,* Sydney, 1938, pp. 4 and 8-10.

119 A third of those beyond the bounds were bonded convicts, with the inland expansion increasing wool exports from 2.25 million to 6 million pounds. Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.*, p. 113. The Government wished to exercise some control over this expansion and ensure that grazing licences were paid, leading to the formal declaration of nine Pastoral Districts in May, 1839. The licence payments were to be used to cover the costs of policing the districts. The New England district was amongst those proclaimed at this date with George James MacDonald being appointed as the first Commissioner for the region. Walker, *op.cit.*, pps. 11-15. The Darling Downs and Moreton Bay Pastoral Districts were declared in 1842. Roberts, *Squatting Age, op.cit.*, p. 213.

120 The dependence of the Northern squatters on a cheap and servile labour force is illustrated by the fact that in 1841 of the 1,151 people registered as residing in the New England pastoral district, 711 were convicts or emancipists, and in the Darling Downs, convicts comprised 39% of the male labouring population in 1841. Maurice French, *A Pastoral Romance*, Toowoomba, USQ Press, 1990,

change in the nature of the assisted emigration scheme in 1835[121] had brought a new wave of assisted emigrants to the colony: 2,664 in 1837; 6,102 in 1838; 8,416 in 1839; 6,637 in 1840; and 20,103 in 1841:[122] a massive boost to the "free" labouring class of the colony, which would change the political landscape of the colony forever by the end of the 1840s.

Two factors however, mitigated against the acceptance of this free labouring force, and one was that this labour force was, as its name implies, free. For an employer class that had been accustomed to, or desired, a bound, servile labour force, in the form of assigned convicts, the lack of power to retain and constrain the actions of this mass of possible employees was more than just irritating. The free emigrants were clearly despised by the land owning class; they '...demand exorbitant wages, and more rations than they could possibly consume without waste...[and] many of them remain weeks and months in Sydney, out of employment... although in the meantime, eligible offers may have been made them'.[123]

The other problem related to the Irish Catholic heritage of the majority of the emigrant population, which upset the Protestant sensibilities of some within the colony.[124] One emigration officer when in correspondence with England requested the English end of the operation '...not to send Irish, if English or Scotch emigrants can be obtained'; he had '...observed a prejudice against those from Ireland'.[125] The Catholic dominance of the colonial population had arisen through the British Government's act of transporting to New South Wales all Irish convicts, of which

---

p. 30. For example in 1841 William Vivers of "Kings Plains" in the New England District employed five free males, one free female and six male convicts on a property of 106,000 acres carrying 1,300 cattle and 12,500 sheep and High Gordon of "Strathbogie" employed two free males, three free females and six male convicts to take charge of 15,000 sheep grazing across 90,000 acres. Both squatters would later employ Chinese as shepherds. E. Wiedermann, *A World of Their Own- Inverell's Early Years, 1827-1920*, Inverell, Devill Publicity, 1981, p. 246.

121 In 1835 the British Government began paying bounties to colonial employers that introduced suitable emigrants into the colony. This action on the part of the Government led to the entry of many shipowners who began shipping speculative ventures of emigrants to the colony. Some of these adventurers, notably Robert Towns, would later enter the Chinese labour trade, and also change this trade to a speculative venture.

122 Refer to Table 1 in Appendix 2. The number of free emigrants also rose but only from 813 to 2,380 over the corresponding time period. The majority of the free emigrants were capitalised to some extent as the cost of a passage to the colony was prohibitive to most labourers. The comparatively lower cost of travelling to America made the Australian colonies less attractive to the un- or under-capitalised emigrant. The comparative voyage costs continued to be recognised as a reason why the colonies had trouble attracting a constant flow of unassisted emigrants.

123 G.F.Davidson, *Trade and Travel in the Far East*, London, 1846, p. 200.

124 The Rev. J. D. Lang argued that '...extensive emigration from that portion of the United Kingdom...[would]..hereafter most injuriously affect the peace and prosperity of the colonies'. Lang, *op.cit*, pp. iv-v.

125 Letter from T. Frederick Elliot and E. E. Villiers to Colonial Land and Emigration Office, *NSWLC V&P*, 1841, p. 507. The Catholic menace if it can be termed that, was not solely imagined nor the fantasy of paranoid Protestants, as in 1850 Catholics made up more than twice the proportion of the Australian population as of the English population. K. Inglis, *The Australian Colonists. An Exploration of Social History, 1788-1870*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1974, p. 17.

approximately 95% were Roman Catholics. By 1839, Catholics comprised over one third of the population of NSW and '...at least nineteenth-twentieths of the Roman Catholics of that colony consist of convicts and emancipated convicts and their children'.[126] Within the Northern Districts the anti-Catholic feeling can be presumed to have been even greater given the Scottish background of the majority of Northern squatters; in 1847 Scots comprised 34% of the population of New England, 33% in the Darling Downs and 46% in Moreton Bay.[127]

The distaste for shepherding manifested by the free immigrants, a dislike on the part of the squatters for the immigrants sent out, and their inability to encourage labourers to sign contracts for periods longer than six months boded ill for the success of many flocks. The table over the page provides an idea of the shepherding requirements of the Northern Districts during the early 1840s.[128] Although complete population figures are unavailable for these years it is possible to determine the extent of the labour shortage in the New England and Darling Downs districts. In 1844 the population of the Darling Downs was 399, and in 1846, 658;[129] in New England the figure for 1846 is 2,200;[130] and in 1844 Moreton Bay's population was 471.[131] In these years the shepherding requirements of these districts, for flocks of 750 sheep were 147, 280, 662 and 99 respectively, or approximately 35% of the available labour force. As shepherds were not the only labourers required on a station, Marsh stating that he employed on average 140 labourers plus "hangers-on",[132] the shepherd requirement pressed extremely hard on the available population.

---

126 J. D. Lang, *op.cit.*, p. v. J. D. Lang was a leading proponent of the attitude that any other source of labour was preferable to letting any more Irish Catholics into the colony. Lang was one of the first individuals to privately import Chinese labourers, and argued passionately that the colony of NSW was in dire need of emigration that would '...neutralize and counteract, and not to increase and aggravate, the peculiar tendencies and characteristics of the south of Ireland population'. (*ibid.*, p. v.) The disproportion of Irish amongst the population of NSW was exacerbated by the distress occasioned by the Irish potato famine and then amongst the cotton handloom weavers of England, an industry that had been dominated by the Irish until the introduction of mechanisation. The exodus of the Irish from Ireland and England, and in particular from the county of Lancashire, was so marked that between 1st January, 1841 and 30th June, 1842, of the 25,420 emigrants arriving in the colony, 16,982, nearly two thirds, were Irish. Report from the Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1842, pp. 314-315.

127 Malcolm D. Prentis, *The Scots in Australia. A Study of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, 1788-1900*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1983, p. 94.

128 The calculations of the number of shepherds required have been averaged from a base of flocks containing 400-500 ewes or from 600-1000 dry sheep. 'Sketch of a Shepherd's Duties in New South Wales', Appendix D, Report of the Select Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1841, p. 435.

129 French, *op.cit.*, p. 28.

130 Walker, *op.cit.*, p. 19. The only other early population figure available for New England is 1,115 in 1841. *ibid.*, p. 26.

131 Coghlan, *op.cit.*, p. 299.

132 These hangers-on included bullock-drivers, wheelwrights, millers, cooks and shoemakers with extra hands required at shearing time When women and children and the hangers-on were included the figure increased to '...perhaps three hundred and fifty.' Evidence of Matthew Marsh, 9th July, 1852, Select Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1852, Vol. II, p. 54.

TABLE 3a

Sheep and Shepherd Numbers- Northern Districts, 1853-1847

DISTRICT	YEAR	No. of SHEEP	SHEPHERDS REQUIRED	
			PER 500 EWES	PER 750 SHEEP
CLARENCE RIVER	1843	119,129	238	159
	1844	122,599	245	163
	1846	148,957	298	198
	1847	179,561	359	239
DARLING DOWNS	1843	133,054	266	177
	1844	110,231	220	147
	1846	210,355	420	280
	1847	317,958	636	424
MORETON BAY	1843	156,052	312	208
	1844	74,420	149	99
	1846	190,558	381	254
	1847	218,622	437	291
NEW ENGLAND	1843	400,000	800	533
	1844	425,201	850	567
	1846	497,079	994	662
	1847	570,000	1140	760

SOURCE: Statistical Account of New South Wales, Return of Livestock in the Colony, various years, *NSWLC V&P.*

The cessation of assignment in 1839 and the abolition of transportation in 1840[133] combined with the problems noted above forced those wishing for a servile labour force equivalent to convicts to look elsewhere. During the 1840s the approach of those interested in importing cheap labour changed in a number of ways. Firstly, the cessation of transportation led to calls for transportation to be resumed with emphasis falling upon the transportation of exiles.[134] The second change occurred in the attitude of the prospective employers of cheap labour towards the existing labour force. Post-1840 petitions argued that it was not just the projected deficiency of labour but also the antipathy of British labourers towards undertaking shepherding work and the belief that '...the occupations of a shepherd are so light and simple, that to employ therein the great bodily powers of British labourers, would be a misapplication of strength'.[135] Edward Hamilton argued that with the introduction of coolies '...the moral condition of the European labourer will be elevated...' as the scarcity of labour

133 Lack of space dictates that the changes within England and the colony which occasioned the cessation of assignment and transportation cannot be dealt with adequately. The author therefore directs the reader to the work of John Ritchie, particularly, 'Towards ending an unclean thing: The Molesworth Committee and the Abolition of Transportation to New South Wales, 1837-40', *Historical Studies*, Vol. 17, Nos. 66-69, April 1976- October 1977, pp. 144- 164.

134 The "Pentonville Exiles" were those convicts that had served part of their sentence in either Pentonville or Parkhurst prisons in England and were therefore reformed characters. The plan was for the exiles to be landed in the colonies and were allowed to roam free to find work, but were never to return to England.

135 *NSWLC V&P*, 20th July, 1841, p. 19.

had led many to an '...utter disregard of the outward decencies of life.'[136] This change in the attitude of employers towards the suitability of British labourers, and the gains to be made in their moral and social standing through the introduction of Asian labour was prompted by the growing strength of the wage-earning class within the colony. This strength was demonstrated by the number of meetings and petitions organised to protest against the introduction of cheap labour in the form of convicts and coolies, and the publication of newspapers dedicated to the "labouring class". In order not to alienate this labour supply completely the employer groups therefore had to moderate their language towards, and descriptions of the existing labour force used within petitions for the cheap labour that they so desired.

The third perceptible change occurred in the terms used to describe the labour that the employers sought. After receiving no assistance from the Colonial nor British governments in their attempts to import Hill Coolies, the petitions began to use the generic term Asiatic labour, which encompassed Chinese as well as Indian labourers. The increased possibility of importing Chinese labourers with the cessation of the Opium Wars was clearly perceived by Captain Hume who reported to Governor Gipps that one result of the cessation of the war would be to bring '...the subjects of the Chinese Empire and British Colonists into close contact'.[137] G. F. Davidson was to also publicise the possibility of exploiting the Chinese labour market 'Now that we have a footing in China...', although there is no evidence to suggest that he intended to again become personally involved in any importations.[138]

Captain P. P. King of the AACo in 1839, with the imminent cessation of assignment and transportation had pre-figured Hume when, in an attempt to sate the company's labour needs he:

---

136 Evidence of E. Hamilton, 5th July, 1841, Select Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1841, p. 15. Matthew Marsh would later expand upon this in arguing that by introducing a lower class of labour in the form of Asiatics, the '...inevitable results must be ultimately to raise every European above the condition of what is called a working man...', resulting in their moral and material improvement. M. H. Marsh, *A Letter to the Colonists of Queensland*, Salisbury, 1859, p.28. Hamilton (1809-1898) was the cousin of W. S. Davidson, and arrived in the colony in 1839 with a letter of introduction from Davidson to P. P. King. Hamilton, his brother Captain H. G. Hamilton and George Clive (who was married to the daughter of Davidson's partner in Herries Farquhar) purchased "Collaroi" from Davidson in 1840. Hamilton eventually sold his interest in "Collaroi" and returned to England in 1855, joining the board of the AACo in 1856, becoming Governor in 1858. Gregson, *op.cit.*, pp. 174-196: W. S. Davidson to P. P. King, 30th September, 1839, *Phillip Parker King Letters* (ML A3599 CY1933): *ADB*, Vol. 4, pp. 329-330.

137 Captain Hume's Report, Governor Gipps Despatches, 1843. The Australian Agricultural Company also turned back to China after the worst of the depression had passed being disappointed with the 100 Irish labourers and 40 Welsh miners that had imported in 1841- '...many have proved worthless and unfit for the duties they had undertaken to perform; many others absconded or refused to ratify their agreements, and the few that still remain in the Company's service are in general so careless and insubordinate as to render their retention undesirable.' cited by Gregson, *op.cit.*, pp. 107-108.

138 G. F. Davidson, *Trade and Travel in the Far East; or Recollections of twenty one years passed in Java, Singapore, Australia and China*, London, Madden & Malcolm, 1846, p. 203.

...looked principally to Chinese, proposing to employ them as shepherds under their countrymen as overseers; I have been in correspondence with a gentleman in China on the subject, but the late disturbances there have put an end to my negotiations;...' [139]

The Opium Wars are the disturbances to which King refers, the cessation of which would permit the colonists to enter the Chinese labour market in force. In the meantime, depression gripped the colony, impoverishing many merchants and squatters, yet not stifling their attempts to acquire servile labour. Many of the Northern District squatters such Messrs. Everett and Marsh had no assignees and were therefore extremely anxious to able to acquire a cheap labour force which they could legally force to "crawl after their sheep".[140] This desire on the part of Marsh, Everett and their ilk was clearly perceived by the wage-earners that petitioned in 1843 against the activities of "The Coolie Association". The petitioners argued that the:

....attempt of the association to introduce so inferior a description of labour, to have been chiefly, if not solely caused by a desire to gain similar benefits from the labour so introduced, to those formerly enjoyed by a few indiviauals under the assignment system, to the manifest injury of the other classes of the community.[141]

In contrast to the earlier styles of attempts to acquire Indian or Chinese labour, gentlemanly proposals, petitions and newspaper advertisements, a more public unified approach was adopted with the formation of "The Coolie Association" in September, 1842.[142] To Wentworth and his associates a formal combination was imperative in order to press the claims of those involved for coolie labour as the prevailing state of the economy and labour market was such that:

...there is no hope of a return to assignment within twelve months, or even two years; if there is no Emigration Fund; and the expedients for creating such a fund are set at nought....;and

---

139 Evidence of Captain P. P. King, Report from the Committee on Immigration, *NSWLC V&P*, 1841, p. 475. At the same time King had organised to have "twenty mules, two asses, and three huasos (cowboys)" imported on the *John Barry* from Chile. In evidence to the 1841 Select Committee on Immigration it was stated that about three to four hundred labourers from Chile had been subscribed for at a rate of £20-25 per year plus rations, over a three year term of indenture. Thomas M. Bader, 'Before the Gold Fleets: Trade and Relations between Chile and Australia, 1830-1848', *Journal of Latin American Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1974, pp. 49-50.

140 Amendments to the Master and Servants Legislation in 1840 (4 Vic No. 23) brought the nine Pastoral Districts within the operation of the act and specifically detailed shepherding as an employment that came under the control of the act (section 2). These amendments ensured that the squatters within the designated districts could legally force employees whom they had contracted as shepherds to "crawl after their sheep" to the employers satisfaction or be brought before the local magistrates.

141 Gipps to Stanley, No. 37, March 27, 1843, *C.O. 201/331*

142 James Macarthur when presenting a petition to the Legislative Council requesting that employers be allowed to import Indian labourers argued 'That the subject of Coolie Immigration be referred to the Immigration Committee...', a motion that was defeated after three hours of debate within the Council. *NSWLC V&P*, 20th July, 1841, p. 19.

bearing in mind the necessity of he case, IS THERE ANY OTHER COURSE TO PURSUE THAN TO STRIVE FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF ASIATIC LABOURERS.[143]

The committee of the Coolie Association reads like a who's who of the squatting and "exclusives" class of the colony and amongst the signatories to this petition were a number of New England squatters.[144] The petition presented to the Colonial Secretary by this association in May 1843 was '...signed by 686 persons, including a very large proportion of the proprietors of land and stock in the colony, and 104 magistrates, out of a total number of 365.'[145] The attempts of the Association to acquire Indian labourers were forestalled by the British Government passing Act XV of 1842 and reinforced by XXI of 1844 which granted permission Indian emigration to Mauritius, Jamaica, British Guinea and Trinidad, yet continued to prohibit Indian emigration to New South Wales. This prompted the squatters to forward another petition, this time to the Governor-General of India requesting that the petitioners share '...in the advantages now enjoyed by the employers of labour at the Mauritius and other British colonies' arguing that within ...the interests of your petitioners...are involved the interests of the whole Colony of New South Wales-...'.[146] The proportion of magistrates signing these petitions may at first appear to indicate an impressive degree of support for the ideals of the association from the affirmants of law in the colony. As with many statistics this one also belies the truth, as many of the magistrates within the colony were also substantial land holders or the superintendents of stations.[147] In affixing their signatures to the Coolie Association's petition they, these "Merino Magistrates" were definitely not doing so as independent observers of the presiding labour market situation, but were attempting to protect their personal economic interests.

The major fear on the part of the Coolie Association was that once stability had been achieved in the colony's economy the increased demand for labour would lead to increased wage levels, a situation that was anathema to the large employers of

---

143 *Australian,* Monday, September 19, 1842.

144 *Signatures on Petition for Indian Labour.* 1842. (ML A2029: CY1017) Some of the New England petitioners were; George Wyndham, Archibald Windeyer, T. G. Rusden, Henry and William Dangar, John McIvor, M. C. O'Connell, Edward Clerk, Rowland Traill, Charles Blaxland, Alexander Campbell, and Hugh Gordon.

145 Gipps to Stanley, No. 63, May 5, 1843, *C.O. 201/331*

146 Petition to the Governor-General of India, reprinted in William Gardner, *Production and Resources of the Northern and Western Districts of New South Wales*, Vol. 2, 1854, new pagination, pp. 473-474. Northern District squatters signing this petition included William Dumaresq, George Gammie J. P., John McLean J. P., George Burgess JP., R. R. Mackenzie J. P., John Dobie, Joshua Whitting, O. Bloxsome J. P., G. Leslie , Clarke Irving J. P., S. Donaldson.

147 As late as 1858, of the ten magistrates on the bench at the Armidale Court of Petty Sessions nine were either a squatter or the supervisor of a squattage. (Walker, *op.cit*, p. 57). For example, George Polhill, of "Wellingrove"; M. H. and C. W. Marsh; W. Dumaresq, of "Saumarez" and "Tilbuster"; Thomas Tourle, "Balala"; Major A. C. Innes "Furracabad"; and E. G. Clerk of "Clerkness" were all magistrates for the region of New England *Bench of Magistrates,* Armidale, 1844-1859.

labour.[148] The surety of being able to obtain cheap labour in the near future was of importance for a fair proportion of the squatters as the depression of the 1840's pushed many to, if not over, the edge of bankruptcy, especially those who had borrowed heavily to establish their runs.

The colonial labour market continued in this manner for the rest of the decade with employers bemoaning the state of the labour market and labourers arguing that there was sufficient labour.[149] The problem was primarily one of servility, the squatters in the interior had trouble attracting and holding onto labour, and many labourers had no desire to undertake shepherding at the low wages offered. In the meantime the Chinese labour market was being readied, the subject of the next chapter, and colonial interests began to look closely at this market to gauge the possibility of importing Chinese labourers.

---

148 One factor at play in this was the changes undertaken to the application of the Land Fund, resulting in a situation whereby the available funds were not sufficient to meet the cost of all of those emigrating. In 1840-41 the Colonial office had outstanding bounty orders of £979,562 for 71,315 emigrants which it had no chance of meeting leading Governor Gipps to request that the Colonial Secretary restrict the numbers leaving England. Roberts, *Squatting Age*, *op.cit.*, p. 116. There is some substance to this argument of a future labour shortage as most of the migrants that had arrived in the four years preceding 1842 had been easily absorbed into the economy as evidenced by the fact that the wages of shepherds only decreased by £3 over that period.

149 This is evidenced within the number of Select Committees formed during the decade to look into immigration and the state of the labour market. These committees presented reports in 1841, 1842, 1843, 1845, and 1847, with a committee enquiring in 1846 on the prospects of transportation being renewed. The stance of the labourers that the colony contained sufficient labour is reinforced by the findings of the Select Committee on Distressed Labourers that took evidence in 1846.