A Study of the ‘lived experience’ of Citizenship amongst Exempted Aboriginal People in regional Queensland, with a focus on the South Burnett region

Submitted for the Master of Arts
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
University of the Sunshine Coast

Judith Anne Wickes
B Arts (Hons) and B Social Work

August 2010
Abstract:

Much has been written about the protectionist laws that regulated and controlled the lives of Indigenous Queenslanders during the twentieth century. However, much less is known of the estimated 4,092 certificates granted to some 5,257 people between 1897 and 1967 who sought exemption from these laws on the grounds that they were capable of managing their own affairs in a ‘civilised manner’. This research has sought to address this through a historical case study of the lived experiences of exempted Aboriginal people who had resided in the South Burnett region in Queensland through researching archival records, gathering oral history and an analysis of the personal diaries of an Aboriginal woman.

The policy of exemption was designed to simultaneously erase Indigenous identity and to produce a new civic identity in the discursive formation of Australian nationality and ‘citizenship’, whose juridical definition was itself problematic and shifted considerably in the period of this study. The archival records spanning four decades show that the process of determining exemption in Queensland was disorderly, inconsistent and subject to arbitrary changes as were the methods of record keeping. They reveal that decisions made by state officials imposed conditions on exemptions which enabled ongoing state control of exemptees’ lives and income under the threat of revocation. This extension of control into the non-institutional lives of exemptees is evident in the self-surveillance and self-disciplinary methods apparent in their personal narratives. Later archival records show that official confusion and ineptitude was such that the exemption system continued to operate in Queensland until 1967, even though the legislative authority for it had ceased in 1965.

The discussion of exemption as a conditional and subjugated form of citizenship is organised around Marshall’s three-fold typology of modern citizenship (civil, political and social). It also employs Foucault’s general concept of ‘discursive regime’ as well as Davidson’s work on Indigenous citizenship as predominantly shaped by a discourse of exclusion to frame the analysis. Through this lens, the lives of exemptees from the
South Burnett region reflect changes in the discursive regimes underpinning both the official requirements of exemption and their interpretation. The case study shows that during the 1940s, those prepared to disavow their Aboriginal heritage and live strictly according to the conditions of exemption, enjoyed a certainty of citizenship experienced by other Australians. However, as calls for racial equality began to emerge during the 1950s; later exemptees lived less according to the conditions of exemption but experienced greater uncertainty, alienation and marginalization through racial discrimination by the dominant culture. Therefore, the possession of an exemption certificate failed to guarantee equality with other Australian citizens.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Much has been written about the protectionist laws that regulated and controlled the lives of Indigenous Queenslanders during the twentieth century. However, much less is known of the estimated 4,092 certificates granted to some 5,257 people between 1897 and 1967 who sought exemption from these laws on the grounds that they were capable of managing their own affairs in a ‘civilised manner’. The current research seeks to address this issue through an historical case study of the lived experiences of exempted Aboriginal people who had resided in the South Burnett region in Queensland. The project involved analysing the personal diaries of an Aboriginal woman, gathering oral histories and investigating archival records.

The research presents opportunities to make a significant and original contribution to scholarship in the fields of Australian History and Indigenous Studies. Having graduated in 2006 in the Honours Program, the author is continuing research into the ‘Certificate of Exemption’ for Aboriginal people in Queensland which was commenced initially as an Honours thesis (Wickes, 2006). Both examiners of the thesis recommended extended research into this very important, yet under-researched part of Queensland’s history.

The Queensland Government exercised total control over the lives of Aboriginal people for seventy years through the passing of The Aboriginals Protection and the Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act, 1897 (Qld), now known as the 1897 Act. Section 33 of the 1897 Act allowed “half-castes” and later Aboriginal people who were inmates on settlements/reserves and missions to apply for the Certificate of Exemption from the Act. Gaining exemption allowed the exemptees to live in Australian society as citizens. However, citizenship entitlements were ambiguous and confusing, raising questions as to whether those who were exempted enjoyed the civil rights and privileges experienced by other Australians. Very little is known about the exemption system, its processes and its practices. This new phrase of post-graduate research into the Certificate of Exemption explores the lived experience of citizenship.
amongst Aboriginal people in the South Burnett region\textsuperscript{1} prior to 1967, when the final exemption was granted.

**Constructivist Epistemology:**
This research is informed by a constructivist epistemology, as the basis on which knowledge is located and understood, including the limits of such knowledge. Following Crotty (1998), constructionism can be seen as an epistemology midway on the continuum between objectivism and subjectivism. The objectivist view asserts that values and understandings are “objectified in the people we are studying and, if we go about it in the right way, we can discover the objective truth” (Crotty, 1998:8). On the other hand, an entirely subjectivist view asserts that values and understandings are of an individual and, being therefore subjective, are unavailable for scrutiny. The constructivist approach rejects both of these opposing positions and instead acknowledges that all values and understandings, from the non-scientific to the scientific, potentially have equal validity. That is, they “are all [social] constructions” (Crotty, 1998:16). For the constructivist, no knowledge can be absolute, objective or generalisable. Given the nature of social research, and in particular the current research that seeks to examine the lived experiences of individuals, the constructivist approach is the most suitable approach.

**Theoretical Perspective:**
This thesis adopts a Critical Inquiry approach and draws upon the work of T. H. Marshall, Michel Foucault and Alastair Davidson to make sense of the lived experiences of citizenship of exempted Aboriginal people from the South Burnett region. Marshall’s (1950) theory of citizenship, with its three dimensions of civil, political and social, provides a suitable analytical framework by which to examine the lived experiences of exempted Aboriginal people. Foucault’s (1977, 1991) theories elucidate the methods used by Queensland’s state government to control and regulate the state’s Indigenous population. Foucault’s (1991) concept of a discursive regime is an analysis of power relations. Davidson (1997) argues that prior to 1967, citizenship rights in Australia for Aboriginal people were based on exclusion. For Davidson (1997), to understand rights is to understand the methods of inclusion and exclusion.
Critical inquiry, as a form of research, questions the assumptions and values currently held, including challenging “conventional social structures” (Gray, 2004:230). In this way, it leaves open the possibility for new insights and understandings that might then inform future action in a more effective manner. Given that critical inquiry calls into question the values and structures of a given society, the underlying assumptions are that power relations within society mediate ideas, that inequalities within societies allow oppression to be exerted on subordinate members, that the notion of ‘truth’ cannot be understood without also recognising the self-interest and ideologies of the dominant group, and, that the usual practices of research have a tendency to reproduce “the system of class, race and gender oppression” (Gray, 2004:24).

Methodology:
The research methodology is an historical case study which utilised a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches to ensure that the experiences and lives of Aboriginal Queenslanders, including the historical context, were fully investigated. It is well documented that Australia’s Aboriginal people are the most researched minority group in the world, resulting in “mistrust and wariness toward social research” (Prior, 2007:163). Further, current scholarly literature lacks the voices of Indigenist researchers (Moreton-Robinson & Walter, 2010). Therefore, as an Indigenous researcher, I have had to be mindful of these issues in undertaking the fieldwork for this thesis.

Indigenist researcher, Martin (2008), has raised the central question as to how we can research as Indigenous researchers when we are constantly faced with Western models and concepts. Martin’s (2008) response is to create a research framework that recognises the distinctiveness of Aboriginal worldviews, knowledge and beliefs which it privileges and honours and gives emphasis to the social, historical and political context of Aboriginal lives and land. She states that in her research:

A major feature of this research study is its development of an Indigenist research paradigm founded on the principles of cultural respect and cultural safety and embedded in Aboriginal ontology, epistemology and axiology (2008:9).

However, adopting such a framework was problematic for this research. This is because the research centres on Aboriginal people exempted from the 1897 Act, who
were required to disassociate from Aboriginal worldviews, knowledge and beliefs or risk the revocation of their exemption. Honouring and privileging that which exempees and their descendants had been required to disregard or felt obliged to deny, had the potential to and did create tension in the field. Therefore, as an Indigenous researcher of exemption I could not make assumptions about sharing a common cultural identity with my Aboriginal research subjects, especially in regard to whether they acknowledged or embraced their own Indigenous heritage. This proved to be a challenge during the field work, as will be explained below.

Methods of Data Collections and Analysis:

Diaries
Daisy Smith, who was married to an exempted Aboriginal man, my grandfather Roy Smith, kept six diaries during the 1940s and 1951. The diaries encompassed two phases of living. The first three diaries were written during the war years, when the Smith household was living as an exempted family during the 1940s in rural Queensland. The three later diaries were written during the post-war years when the family was living in suburban Brisbane during the late 1940s and 1951.

The diaries were transcribed to a document, allowing for easy access to the data material. Each diary’s contents were then categorised and analysed using Marshall’s (1950) three dimensional typology of citizenship (civil, political and social) to illustrate the various themes as the diaries recorded the lived experiences of citizenship of the exempted Smith family. In addition, the researcher researched the films that had been seen by the Smith family and the various reviews of them.

A number of discussions were held with Gwen, the daughter of Daisy. These entailed talking about the diaries and what she remembered about the years they covered. This assisted in clarifying the spelling of names and places or events, as well as giving background information on what is written in the diaries. Also, the researcher had several telephone conversations with individuals mentioned by name in the diaries who had known the Smith family. These conversations resulted in a clearer understanding of the many ‘lived’ experiences of Daisy and her family.
Two fieldtrips to Brisbane, one to Purga Mission and others to the Burnett region, greatly assisted in the process of contextualising the diaries’ contents. The first fieldtrip was to the National Archives’ office in Brisbane. This was to search the records of Federal Electoral Rolls for Roy and Daisy’s enrolment to vote at Federal level. The second fieldtrip involved visiting the residential home at Teneriffe in suburban Brisbane, where Daisy Smith had lived prior to being removed to Purga Mission by government officials in 1920.

The fieldtrip to Purga Mission and its cemetery was organised by the researcher to show Gwen where she and her parents had lived when she was an infant. This was followed by a fieldtrip to the Burnett region to investigate where the Smith family had lived during the early 1940s. During this trip, visits were made to several local Historical Societies and museums where valuable conversations were held with long term residents of local towns, and historical books and pamphlets were purchased by the researcher.

**Oral Histories**

The researcher sought the views of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals who had resided in the Burnett region prior to 1967. The search for such participants was extensive, involving the development of an interview guide, visits to organisations and community talks. Eventually, eleven individuals comprising seven Indigenous and four non-Indigenous people were found. Interviews were conducted by the researcher with these individuals during 2008. Each interviewee chose the location of the interview, ranging from their homes to a library and a local park.

A semi-structured interview format was used which allowed for more of an informal communication style for the interviewees (Mason, 1996:38). Before the interview commenced, the researcher spoke with each participant about the consent form and their right to end the interview at any time. An information sheet about the research was given to each interviewee. Each participant was informed that the interview was being digitally recorded and would be later transcribed and that a copy of their interview would be forwarded to them on request. The average time of the interviews was about thirty minutes, during which time each interviewee was able to recall their
own lived experiences of citizenship or that of Indigenous people whom they had known about.

There were times in the interviews where the recording device was either stopped or paused by the researcher. This allowed the participant to gather their thoughts and continue. One participant’s interview was stopped at the request of the interviewee because someone knocked at the front door. On this occasion the interviewee subsequently lost her concentration and asked for another time. The researcher returned a few weeks later to conduct another interview. The interviews included a number of unpredictable factors such as background noise (library location), poor weather conditions (park location) and even participants who were reluctant to speak into a microphone. Despite these, the interviews were successful and accorded with the observation by May (2001) that, “[i]nterviews yield rich insights into people’s biographies, experiences, opinions, values, aspirations, attitudes and feelings” (2001:121).

As with the diaries, the interviews were transcribed and their contents categorised and analysed using Marshall’s (1950) three elements of citizenship (civil, political and social).

Archival Records
Data about exemption in the South Burnett region was investigated and gathered by the researcher at the Queensland State Archives during 2008 and 2009. The purpose of the research was to ascertain who gained their Certificate of Exemption from the Burnett region, how many exemptions were granted and the variety of ways in which officials in the Queensland Native Affairs Department granted each exemption. The materials searched included private letters, solicitors’ letters, telegrams, government memoranda, government reports, police records/reports and hospital reports.

Permission was sought by the researcher to undertake research into the Certificate of Exemption for Aboriginal people at the Queensland State Archives. This was achieved by submitting a letter from the researcher’s supervisor (see Appendix A). After approval was given, the research began. Discussions were held with the archivist and two staff members of the Queensland Department of Communities. This
proved invaluable as they were able to direct and support the work being done.\(^2\) Due to the policies of the department, the researcher was only given access to files from 1900 to 1940. Files from 1940 to 1967 were catalogued differently and were not available for research, reducing the amount of data collected for the project.

The procedure for the researcher to access the documents consisted of firstly viewing the Queensland State Archives website for records pertaining to Exemptions in the Burnett region and their codes. This information was lodged in a request for each record at the Inquiry desk in the State Archives. The request was then processed by the Inquiry desk staff who manually located the records, stored in boxes, and delivered them to the desk in the viewing area occupied by the researcher. Searches were conducted by looking for access details of files held on the computer, which then directed the researcher to either the microfiche or boxes of files. Searching through both was done manually and methodically. A very large ledger containing the names of Aboriginal people who had gained their exemptions was also examined by the researcher.

Whilst searching through the documents held in the boxes of files, the researcher uncovered old forms. Older governmental correspondence was actually either handwritten or typed on the backs of these forms. This paper-saving practice proved valuable as another source of research material which was included in the documentary analysis.

**Fieldtrips**

Three fieldtrips (14 September, 13 October 2007 and 19 April 2008) were made to the Burnett region.\(^3\) Discussions were held with various Burnett community organisations and contacts were also made with individuals. This failed to gain participation in, or support for, the research.

Numerous fieldtrips were made to the greater metropolitan area of Brisbane, in order to locate possible participants. In one instance, the researcher made arrangements to address an Indigenous organisation in a Brisbane suburb about the research project. In spite of these arrangements having been made and research information sheets being left on the noticeboard, no-one chose to participate in the research from this
organisation. On another occasion, the researcher was introduced to a possible research participant. It soon became apparent that this individual did not want to be part of the research because of the adverse impact of previous government practices, which she cited. This type of reaction gave the researcher an insight into the enduring impacts of government control over Aboriginal people, still evident decades later.

In August 2008, a fieldtrip to Brisbane was organised by the researcher to address a meeting to explain the research and invite participation in it. Unfortunately, a mix-up occurred. The researcher had phoned the group’s secretary who suggested that she attend the next meeting. However, the secretary failed to inform the group of the researcher’s attendance and the research project. Comments from the fourteen committee members in attendance at the ensuing meeting were hostile and included ‘What are you dragging that up for?’ ‘What is in it for us?’ and ‘What are you going to pay us?’

Predictably, none of the members of this group chose to participate in the research. Such a response also accords with the views of Prior (2007) that, in “Australia even the word ‘research’ arouses feeling of suspicion and an intuitive defensive reaction to researchers among Aboriginal people” (2007:163). On this occasion it meant that the lived experiences of exemption of a group of Aboriginal men and women, all aged over sixty years, were lost to the research.

Whenever the opportunity presented itself, the researcher spoke about the project. In particular, thirty-five one-hour guest lectures and community talks were given by the researcher, about the Certificate of Exemption, in Brisbane and Sunshine Coast communities from 2007 to 2009. None of the estimated 1,000 people who listened to these presentations indicated their wish to participate in the project and only two individuals subsequently volunteered information or personal knowledge about the Certificate of Exemption to the researcher. There could have been a number of reasons including that they did not reside in the Burnett region prior to 1967, they were not an Aboriginal person or did not know an Aboriginal person from that area, or they were just not interested. Alternatively, they may have been Aboriginal people or descendants of Aboriginal people who have disavowed their heritage through exemption and are reticent, uncomfortable or too poorly informed to participate in
research about it. These are noteworthy considerations given that the names of exempted Aboriginal Queenslanders on the Exemption Ledger are listed in three large names indices for the periods from 1908 to 1967, and have been freely available worldwide on the internet since 2006 (Mackett, 2006).

**Questionnaire**

As part of the fieldtrip to attend a school reunion\(^4\) in the Burnett region on 19\(^{th}\) April 2008, the researcher was able to talk to at least fifty local individuals about the Certificate of Exemption and the research project. From these conversations, contact details of twenty-five Indigenous and non-Indigenous people were volunteered and collected. Each one was informed by email of a follow-up questionnaire which they were invited to complete (see Appendix A). However, there was no response to the questionnaire.

**Ethical considerations:**

The research project gained ethical clearance from the University of the Sunshine Coast Ethics Committee.\(^5\) As an Aboriginal researcher, I adhered to both the University’s ethical requirements (*National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*, 2007) and the *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies* (AIATSIS, 2007). Indigenous authors, Huggins (1998) and Janke (2009), highlight the complexity of ethical considerations when participating in research in Indigenous communities. This project proved to be no exception with a low response rate to invitations to participate in the research and open opposition as noted above.

The interviews conducted comprised a central part of the data gathered for this research project. All interviews were conducted in accordance with the ethical considerations stated above. Values of trust, confidentiality and respect are basic ethical considerations when working with both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Each interviewee was informed of their rights as participants in this research project in accordance with the University’s ethics standards. The transcripts of the interviews are stored appropriately in accord with the University’s ethical guidelines regarding storing of research data. Each interviewee was given the option of having their name mentioned or withheld in this research; they all choose the former.
Given that the diaries of an Aboriginal woman are part of this research it has been important to inform her family members during each of the steps in the project, in order to respect their rights. The first step involved a discussion with members of the Smith family to inform them of the research and how the diaries would be used in the project. There were no objections. Personal information about the Smith family contained in the diaries has been withheld, in keeping with the ethical requirements concerning confidentiality and respect. The researcher has kept family members informed about the progress of the research throughout. The diaries are kept at the researcher’s home and stored appropriately.

The archival research involved working at the Community and Personal Histories Branch, Queensland Department of Communities, at the State Archives in Brisbane. The researcher signed an ‘access to restricted records at Queensland State Archives’ agreement form with the department. Part of that agreement involved ensuring the confidentiality and anonymity regarding the names of exempted Aboriginal people. Access to documents was on the proviso that the researcher “was the only person to have access to restricted items in the Public Search Room at Queensland State Archives” (see Appendix A). The researcher is mindful of the sensitivity of the data collected, and has stored the data securely.

Despite the difficulties associated with undertaking the fieldwork, this research has generated a rich volume of data about the lived experiences of citizenship for exempted Aboriginal people residing in the region of southeast Queensland. It represents the first collection of systematically gathered and theorised material about the implementation, operation and personal experiences of exemption in Queensland.

The next chapter reviews the literature pertinent to the thesis topic.
Endnotes:

1 For the purpose of this thesis, the research area is both the South Burnett and the Burnett regions.
2 The archivist informed the researcher that she was only the second Indigenous post-grad student to do research there that she was aware of.
3 Fieldtrips were made possible by being a recipient of a 2007 Rotary scholarship (valued at $2,000).
4 Phone contact was made with the Principal of school, permission was granted to set up a table at the school during the school’s 100 year celebrations.
5 The ethics approval number for the project is HREC: S/07/103.
Chapter Two

Literature Review and Context

This literature review critically examines scholarly debates and writing about the history and nature of the concept of citizenship with a focus on south east Queensland in the period 1897 to 1967. This is necessary for the study of the lived experiences of citizenship under exemption because the notion of exemption in the 1897 Act implies granting citizenship rights to those Aboriginal Queenslanders who were exempted, even though, as will be shown, the concept of citizenship in the Australian context is problematic. The review is divided into eight (not necessarily discrete) sections: background to protectionist legislation in Queensland, citizenship in colonial Queensland, citizenship in Queensland after Federation, the impact of legislation on Aboriginal Queenslanders, citizenship in Australia, the problematic nature of citizenship, the effect of policies of assimilation in Queensland and theoretical considerations.

Background to ‘protectionist’ legislation in Queensland:

Many authors note that the late nineteenth century Queensland government, like other Australian colonies, held the view that Indigenous Australians were in need of ‘protection’ (see, for example Hollinsworth, 2006; Donovan, 2002; Chesterman & Galligan, 1997). Social Darwinism appeared to provide an explanatory theory for the view that the demise of the Indigenous population was inevitable (Hollinsworth, 2006:32). The twin beliefs which informed Social Darwinism were that Indigenous Australians were not only biologically and physically inferior, but that their “inferiority was so profound as to condemn them to extinction according to the laws of natural selection and survival of the fittest” (Hollinsworth, 2006:81). Donovan notes that, for Indigenous Australians, the consequences of European occupation were “disastrous” (2002:122). She asserts that, as a result of dispossession, there was a general breakdown of Indigenous social organisation as well as physical well-being (Donovan 2002:82). The decimation of Indigenous Australians by genocide, abuse and dispossession is convincingly documented by authors such as Blake, 2001, Davis
& Watson, 2006; Hollinsworth, 2006; Kidd, 1997; Reynolds, 1987, 1989; Richards, 2008; Roberts, 2005, 2009; and Rowley, 1972. Further, this is generally accepted with the exception of a few conservative academics and commentators (see, for example, Windshuttle 2000). For Queensland, segregation and control of Aborigines by way of the powers legislated under the 1897 Act was seen as the solution to the perceived problem (Evans, 2007:139). Ganter and Kidd assert that institutionalisation was “the usual reaction of the state to those who came under its patriarchal wing” (1988:536).

Ganter and Kidd (1988) note that Archibald Meston, having been commissioned by the Queensland colonial government, submitted a report on the conditions of Aboriginal Queenslanders in 1896 which, along with recommendations of the Police Commissioner, William Parry-Okeden, became the basis of the 1897 Act. The two reports then allowed the Home Secretary to argue “for the formalisation of the reserve policy” (Kidd, 1997:45) as any ‘rescue’ of Aboriginal people would need to be compulsory. Chesterman and Galligan argue that the main difference between the recommendations of Meston and Parry-Okeden related to the future of the Native Police; Meston wanted the force totally abolished because of its harsh treatment towards Aborigines, while Parry-Okeden wanted the force retained and strengthened (1997:38). While the 1897 Act was the primary tool under which official segregation could occur, a large proportion of the Act relates to Aboriginal conditions of employment, as retraining for ‘useful’ service was seen as an essential element (Kidd, 1997). Davis and Watson (2006), however, note that protectionism involves the complex intersection of a number of factors including the spread of Christianity and fear of miscegenation, as well as benevolent intentions. Regardless of the number of factors influencing the genesis of the 1897 Act, the overriding reality of the legislation was that it concerned “control rather than care” (Copland, 2005:91).

Blake (1991, 2001) details how, prior to the establishment of reserves under the 1897 Act, missions operated mainly by Christians and other philanthropic individuals had existed in Queensland since the 1840s. While Meston argued that the idea of reserves was basically sound, Blake notes that Meston put the failure of missions to achieve their objective down to “the lack of effective management and control” (Blake, 2001:1). Further, Meston wanted reserves located so that Aborigines would “be
completely isolated from contact with whites [sic]” (Blake, 2001:2). McGregor points out that Meston’s approach was based on his own theory that, rather than being a doomed race, progress for Aborigines was possible, but required “a ‘gradual transition’ over the course of several generations” (McGregor, 1997:60). Whatever its official intention, Wickes asserts that the introduction of the 1897 Act “was the most significant legislation to affect the lives of Queensland’s Aboriginal people until its end in 1965” (2006:13) (see also, Appendix C).

**Citizenship in Colonial Queensland:**

Davidson (1997) and Irving (2004) have written extensively on the notions of subjecthood and citizenship in the Australian context. Davidson asserts that, in the colonial period Indigenous Australians ought to have automatically benefited from the British legal tradition of “ius soli” (1997:189 original emphasis). This is the convention that people born on British soil were automatically British subjects and, therefore, any person born on Australian soil should automatically be a British subject (Davidson, 1997). Subject-hood meant owing allegiance to the Crown and “was not alienable; it could not be renounced, abandoned or confiscated” (Irving, 2004:9). It carried with it the notion of rights such as common law enjoyment and protection, as well as the possibility of participating in government (Irving, 2004:9). It is not until the time of Federation (1901) that ‘citizen’ status was possible, and it was not until 1949 that “there existed for the first time a legal category of Australian citizen” (Irving, 2004:9).

The ideas of subject-hood and citizenship co-existed in the Australian context until the notion of ‘subject’ was formally removed in 1984. The Australian Constitution, however, still makes references to subjects rather than citizens (Irving, 2004).

On this theme, Walter and Macleod (2002) illustrate how citizenship is united by a shared system of beliefs and note that “the first Australian ‘citizenship’ constituted membership of the British Empire” (2002:17). Similarly, Farrell (2001) argues that a “history of citizenship in colonial Australia is a history dominated by a relationship with Britain” (2001:115). British colonies at that time were based on the ideology of British justice and its political, cultural and economic identities (Farrell, 2001; Walter & Macleod, 2002). As a series of British colonies and later as a British Commonwealth country, Australia adopted a system of government that mirrored that of Great Britain. As an independent constitutional monarchy, Australian ‘citizens’
were initially British Subjects until the passing of the Nationality and Citizenship Act in 1948 (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997; Davidson, 1997; Langton, 2004).

Davidson (1997) shows that in colonial Australia the status of Indigenous Australians remained problematic. The settlement of Australia by the British under the guise of *terra nullius* classified the land as uninhabited and belonging to no one, rendering Indigenous Australians ‘invisible’ (Davidson, 1997). As Davidson suggests, to make the Aboriginal people subject to British laws rather than to their own (given their supposed non-existence), required treating them as if they were migrants coming on to British soil. From the outset then, in their own country, they were half-equated by the Australian state with ‘aliens’ coming on to British soil (1997:189).

As with other migrants of non-British origin entering Australia, Indigenous people experienced the same problem concerning the rules of exclusion and inclusion from the nation. Indigenous exclusion, in relation to citizenship, began in the early nineteenth century when Indigenous Australians were denied protection from the law, unlike other British subjects in Australia (Davidson, 1997). Davidson asserts that the main argument justifying the exclusion was religious; Aborigines did not believe in God and as a result could not swear an oath of allegiance, as other migrants would be required to do (1997:190). Further legal obstructions for Aborigines related to the swearing of an oath. For example, since they were supposedly unable to understand the nature of an oath, they could not testify or give evidence in a court proceeding, although minor legislative changes in 1884 overcame some of the difficulties (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997). Indigenous Australians were treated similarly to other ‘aliens’, despite the fact that they were “British subjects by birth” (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997:34). In Queensland, Indigenous Australians were not the only group to be excluded and the late nineteenth century saw legislation aimed at the exclusion of all non-British persons. Monsour (2002) remarks that in the last decade of the nineteenth century, anti-Chinese legislation had been extended to all Asiatic and coloured persons. In the first part of the twentieth century, legislative discrimination increasingly segregated non-Europeans from the mainstream of Australian society by denying them citizenship rights and access to a variety of social services, and excluding them from a range of occupations. The legislative goal of a white Australia legitimised an intolerance of difference (2002:16).
Davidson notes that the various colonial parliaments, including Queensland, enacted legislation which excluded Indigenous people from citizenship rights (1997:193). Whether or not the term subjects or citizens was used in relation to Indigenous Australians, “it is understood that they were indigenous subjects with a highly restricted set of rights in comparison with those of other citizen subjects” (Peterson & Sanders, 1998:7 original emphasis). Chesterman and Galligan argue that, for all practical purposes, these restrictions were synonymous with “the denial of substantive citizenship rights to Aboriginal Australians” (1999: 257).

Citizenship in Queensland after Federation:

Within early Australia, each colony was self-governing and had few formal links with each other. Each of the colonies had their own constitution, parliament, government and courts. However, towards the end of the nineteenth century it was apparent that in matters such as defence, international trade, taxation and postal services, there was a need to unite with each other, whilst being independent in many areas (Saunders, 1998:12). The decision was made to form a federation of states and, after ten years of discussion, Federation became a reality and the Australian Constitution was finally achieved in 1901 (Saunders, 1998:12-13).

Davidson (1997) notes the ‘limited’ set of rights outlined in the Australian Constitution, for example, compared to those in the 1791 Constitution of the French Republic (1997:51). In relation to the French Republic, Dutton maintains that “the universal ‘rights of man’ were realised as the particular ‘rights of a citizen’, within specific national contexts” (Dutton, 2002:8). In the Australian context, Langton argues that the Federation of the Australian colonies into one nation in 1901 “was founded in racism” (2004:192) and not only to the detriment and exclusion of Aboriginal people. There was a general consensus at the time that a predominantly ‘white’ Australia was “an essential condition of the idealized nation the Commonwealth was meant to embody” (Deakin cited in Langton 2004:193). This meant exclusion from citizenship for all non-British residents and, while the Australian Constitution did not specifically exclude Indigenous Australians, “the States and Territories retained and exercised the power to determine the citizenship rights of ‘aboriginal natives’” (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997:121). That is, the
jurisdiction over Aboriginal affairs that the self-governing colonies had enjoyed prior to Federation was “jealously defended” (Galligan & Roberts, 2004:162).

Similarly, Davidson argues that another insult for Aboriginal people was that “the Convention debates of the 1890s show scant concern for the colonial denial of their basic rights of active citizenship such as the vote and to be counted in the census” (1997:190). Indeed, as Mercer (2003) observes, Australia’s Aboriginal people were not mentioned in the Constitution, counted in the national census, or considered as citizens. Dodds argues that Aboriginal Australians “were not simply ‘overlooked’ in the process of nation building; their status as rights bearers was actively undermined” (1998:106). Irving writes that in “constructing a white community through writing a constitution, the Aboriginal people upon whose land the nation was to be built featured scarcely at all” (1997:112). Here, Irving refers to the two sections (s.51 xxvi and s.127) of the Constitution that, due to official exclusions, affected the lives of Aboriginal people (1997:112). In this exclusion of Aboriginal people from the new nation’s political construction, the views of the second Prime Minister Alfred Deakin appear to have been crucial, given his centrality to the debates over Federation. In relation to Deakin, Mercer notes that, “his passion for social justice was not extended to Aboriginal people and in many ways his ideas and vision set the tone for at least the next 80 to 90 years” (2003:428). Some authors blame the Constitution for the exclusion of Indigenous Australians. Clarke and Galligan (1995), for example, examine citizenship for Aboriginal people through the workings of government officials, legislation and policy. Clarke and Galligan argue that the fact that it [the Constitution] chose to exclude Aboriginal Australians was not simply a result of colonial ignorance and bigotry, although both of those qualities could well be ascribed to some of the participants in the story. The exclusion of ‘aboriginal natives’ went to the heart of the very idea of those qualities thought by the administration to make up an Australian citizen (1995:542).

However, Chesterman and Galligan assert that it was not the Constitution that is to blame for the exclusion of Aboriginal people, rather the document “was drafted so as not to encroach unduly on the established regimes of the States and it provided no positive standard against discrimination” (1997:7). Federal legislation, however, was just as racist as previous and future state legislation and Walter and Macleod record that one “of the first acts enacted by the new parliament was the Immigration
Restriction Act 1901 (Cwth), commonly referred to as the ‘White Australia Policy’’ (2002: 50). This policy was actually a raft of different measures and was established as a means of excluding unwanted ‘coloured’ labour from Australia. The legislation was intentionally designed to discriminate on the basis of a flawed concept of “race” (Langton, 1999:26-27). This policy is a classic example of how exclusion can be introduced as an integral part of determining citizenship status.

Gray (1998) argues therefore that, despite being British subjects and de facto Australians citizens, Aboriginal people were “constrained by legislation and regulation” and could only attain citizenship under special circumstances (1998:63). Mercer (2003) concurs and asserts “that Indigenous people were regulated and controlled in every conceivable aspect of their lives and continually denied the basic citizenship rights and benefits routinely accorded white [sic] Australians” (2003:431).

The impact of legislation on Aboriginal Queenslanders:
For Queensland Aborigines, two of the most far reaching provisions of the 1897 Act were sections 91 and 152 relating to conditions under which they could be removed to reserves and conditions of employment. Numerous authors have documented convincingly that the 1897 Act resulted in the forced removal of Aboriginal people from their traditional lands and represented a major deprivation of rights, with multiple adverse repercussions, including the loss of family ties, language, culture, history and traditional lifestyles (Blake, 1991, 2001; Copland 2005, 2006; Haebich, 2000; Hollinsworth, 2006; Holt, 2001; Kidd, 1994, 1997 and Robinson, 2000). Thus, the 1897 Act excluded Aboriginal Queenslanders from participating as citizens on an equal basis with other Queenslanders, with “nominal” rather than substantive status (Pitty, 2009:28).

Native Police force remained, not all Aborigines were transported to reserves and there was no prohibition of Indigenous employment in the marine industry (Ganter & Kidd, 1988). The 1897 Act did, however, outline conditions under which Indigenous labour could be utilised and the circumstances under which Aborigines could be removed to reserves. Ganter and Kidd note that the 1897 Act parallels similar “models of welfare administration operating in the wider community” (1988:553). Whether or not Aboriginal Queenslanders became subject to the conditions of the Act, however, was a matter of subjective and arbitrary personal judgement of the officials designated, under the ultimate dominance of the Chief Protector (Ganter & Kidd, 1988; Davis & Watson 2006).

**Citizenship in Australia:**

While the earliest notions of citizenship were espoused by Aristotle (1962), Davidson (1997) argues that there have been three main understandings of what it means to be a citizen. Firstly, citizens are primarily defined by their actions and activities, and not by what they receive in life. Secondly, citizens conduct their activities within a political context, and it is this constituted world of the state that decides what sort of acts identifies who is a citizen. Finally, citizens are said to belong within a particular territorial dimension, and as such they have a right to participate in the acts of citizenship (Davidson, 1997:3). This definition highlights the role of the citizen within the family, community and state where those protocols and customs, with their inclusions and exclusions, abide. Additionally, there is a general consensus that those who now call themselves Australian citizens and are recognised as such, have a strong sense of belonging and an equally strong sense of self and identity (see, for example, Chesterman & Galligan, 1999; Irving, 1997; Walter & Macleod, 2002).

Whilst recognising that citizenship is not a singular concept, Rubenstein (1995) attempts to unscramble the difference between the ‘legal status’ of citizenship and the concept of ‘membership of the community’. Rubenstein freely admits that there is a large amount of confusion to be found in the public discussion on this subject. She asserts that “the debate so far has been confused, unclear, and lacking focus” (1995:527). Rubenstein attempts to explain the legal status of citizenship noting that a “singular statement of the legal consequences of the legal status in the *Citizenship Act 1948 (Cwth)* could clarify the consequences in an accessible manner”
(Rubenstein, 1995:527). However, she notes that no such singular statement is contained within that legislation.

There is a difficulty, then, in defining clearly the notion of ‘citizen’ in the context of Australia. Davidson (1997) argues that being a citizen entails a sense of belonging within a country and the role that citizenship contributes to the affairs of state. Furthermore, he claims that one’s self identity is an important part of the equation of citizenship. Therefore, the nature of identity raises the fundamental questions “Who are you?” and “where do you come from?” (Davidson, 1997:2-3).

Saunders emphasises the ongoing importance of these questions. She asserts that after celebrating 100 years as a nation in 2001, “Australians value individual rights and liberties, but tend to assume that they will be respected, whether we give them constitutional protection or not” (Saunders, 1998:18). Saunders argues that ‘these rights and liberties’ have been accepted as part of the Australian culture of citizenship. Most Australians assume incorrectly that these principles are written into the Australian Constitution, as they are in many other countries throughout the world. However, this is not the case because the framers of the Constitution did not include them (Saunders, 1998:19).

A number of writers argue that modern citizenship in Australia has been constructed through gender and divisions of labour. Maddern (2001) for example, considers a nation of Australians with differences of class, gender and ethnicity. However, she reminds us that “[f]ederationist optimism was predicated on tacit assumptions about the unitary identity of Australians, and the unitary nature of citizenship” (2001:10). Much has changed in the years since Federation, as noted by Saunders (1998), who observes that standards were different and there was less concern then about the need to protect minorities from majorities. Racial discrimination was more acceptable, with the Australian Constitution actually requiring discrimination against Aboriginal people. In addition, at the time of Federation, women were yet to be enfranchised (Saunders, 1998:19).

In her overview of Australia’s beginnings as a nation, Irving (1997) defines the values and beliefs that have become a uniquely Australian identity and stimulated pride in
nationalism. She identifies specific characteristics of citizenship as: “loyalty, civic involvement and membership of the Australian community” (Irving, 1997:13). The recurring themes of ‘belonging’ and ‘membership’, with their territorial and legal implications, are prime indicators of citizenship mentioned by most commentators. For Isin and Wood (1999), citizenship and identity are uniquely intertwined into Australian culture and “modern citizenship originates with territory, with birth and /or residence in a particular nation-state” (1999:50). Further, they assert that the “origins of the nation-state were necessarily accompanied by ‘founding fathers’, who identified the political membership and determined the first terms of citizenship” (Isin & Wood, 1999:50). Galligan and Roberts argue that without any definitive concept of citizenship in the Australian Constitution, “the Commonwealth and State parliaments have provided for particular rights, duties and benefits in a piecemeal and pragmatic way” (2004:20). These arrangements led to the systemic exclusion of Aboriginal Australians from the benefits of citizenship (Dodds, 1998; Gray, 1998).

The problematic nature of citizenship:
Despite much recent scholarship (see, for example, Dahrendorf, 1994; Davidson, 2000; Eriksen & Weigard, 2000; Hindess, 2004) the definition of citizenship in Australia, then, remains clouded and no closer to a satisfactory “resolution” (Dyrenfurth, 2005:87). Most agree, however, that citizenship entails some point of political and legal relation between individuals and the state (Dyrenfurth, 2005; Attwood & Markus, 2007; Gray, 1998). Brett asserts that in the early decades of Federation the concept of citizenship was a moral as well as political construct concerned with the obligations and duties of individuals to other citizens rather than simply conferring rights and entitlements (2001:423). She argues that, “the weakness of the Australian concept of citizenship generally begin[s] with its absence from the Constitution” (Brett, 2001:425).

However, for Indigenous Australians, resistance to the exclusion from citizenship is as important as debates about its definition. A documented history of the struggle for Aboriginal rights is charted by Attwood and Markus (1999), spanning 150 years of activism. They write:

Stories about the struggle for rights for Aborigines are well known in Aboriginal communities across Australia, being part of an oral tradition
passed on one generation to the next. By comparison, other Australians
know little of such histories. Many probably regard Aboriginal political
activity as a very recent phenomenon (1999:1).

Resistance and campaigns for “equal citizenship”, particularly in New South Wales,
South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia, gained momentum from the 1920s
onwards (Ferres & Meredyth, 2001:128). Maynard (2007), for example, describes the
setting up of an organisation called the Australian Aboriginal Progressive Association
(AAPA), an organisation that fought for Aboriginal rights. In New South Wales
during the 1930s, Patten and Ferguson vigorously campaigned for citizenship rights
for Aboriginal people and their political journey is well documented (Walter &
MacLeod, 2002). One of their successful campaigns was the Australian Aborigines
Conference that included a ‘Day of Mourning & Protest’, lamenting 150 years of
European settlement and exclusion. Gray records that:

| The 1938 Day of Mourning held in Sydney on 26 January, was (to the
| knowledge of many white Australians) the first public demonstration on
| the issue of citizenship rights by Aboriginal people. It was a demand for

As early as the 1940s, non-Indigenous activists banded together with Aboriginal
activists to bring about change for citizenship rights for Aboriginal people (Sekuless,
1978). Taffe writes that while “Aboriginal activists were organising and joining
forces, white activists in different parts of the country were developing a broad
approach to their agitation for legislative and social reform” (2005:22). However,
Davis and Watson (2006, online) note that the persistence of the removal powers
under protectionist laws in Queensland ensured that political activism amongst
Indigenous people in Queensland was less well organised and visible than in other
Australian states.

Aboriginal people were denied citizenship rights in Australia prior to the
argues for reform of the Australian Constitution and suggested that, “a call for
structured and comprehensive representation of Indigenous people in the Australian
Constitution was needed to address the discrepancy” (1997:57). Healy (2008) writes:

| The 1967 Referendum saw a zealous campaign result in the polity speaking
| loudly and (almost) as one in favour of what were couched as full citizen
| rights for Aborigines. In other words, while there was silence and absence in
|
some domains, there was clamour and presence in others. Yet, three decades on, the same question returns in a different form, ‘Why weren’t we told?’ (2008:17).

For many non-Indigenous Australians it was easier to forget the original inhabitants, the Indigenous people. This phenomenon became known as a ‘culture of forgetfulness’ or ‘a national silence’ regarding the plight and exclusion of the Aboriginal Australian (Healy, 2008).

The effect of policies of assimilation in Queensland:
For Queensland Aboriginals, exemption from the provisions of the 1897 Act was the only specific state practice which facilitated assimilation prior to 1965 (Haebich, 2002, 2004; Moran, 2005; Rowse, 2005). Haebich, writing in the context of the New South Wales experience, details the “compelling pressures on Aboriginal women to become agents of assimilation policy” (2004:6). Based on the notion of a standardised suburban nuclear family, Aboriginal women needed to be trained as responsible home-makers and home-managers. Haebich asserts that this “brought new levels of intervention and surveillance into the management of Aboriginal households” (2004:6). Further, the interventions were “intimidating and unwelcome” (2004:7). In relation to the broader Australian public, the concept of Aboriginal assimilation was presented as “deliberately reassuring and attractive” and “there was no acknowledgement of the seemingly insurmountable problems of institutionalised inequality or of the likelihood of Aboriginal resistance to the instruments and goals of assimilation” (Haebich, 2002:64). Assimilation policy was based on the assumption that a successfully functioning household promoted “success in the labour market” (Rowse, 2005:58). Rowse explains that “[h]ard work, careful money management, decorous sexuality, controlled alcohol use and domestic accomplishment – these were the dimensions of respectability” (2005:59). These criteria also provided the state with measureable factors of success.

In relation to the Certificate of Exemption, there is a dearth of literature. There has been little written about the exemption certificate in any Australian states and territories including Queensland. Therefore, it is understandable that very little is known or understood about the exemption provision of the 1897 Act and its impacts on Aboriginal people. The existence of the exemption certificate has been briefly
noted by authors such as Aberdeen, 2002; Blake, 2001; Donovan, 2002; Evans, et al 1993; Hall, 1995, Hollinsworth, 2006; Kennedy, 1985; May, 1994 and Rowley, 1972. However, in each case only scant detail about the exemption certificate has been given by these authors. Two exceptions are Castle and Hagan (1997) in their analysis of the economic situation concerning Aboriginal workers’ labour relations and Wickes (2006), who concentrates on the impact on identity for Aboriginal people. The lack of literature on exemption certificates specifically in regard to the lived experiences of citizenship in Queensland, then, is the point of departure for this research.

**Theoretical considerations:**
Marshall is widely regarded as having developed the modern conception of citizenship. Marshall theorised citizenship as consisting of three elements: civil, political and social rights for all citizens and centred his discussion on social inequality (1950:17). The civil element involves individual freedoms and rights of the citizen, including access to a court of justice and the role of trade unions (Marshall, 1950:40). The political element involves allowing citizens, in particular the newly enfranchised lower classes, the right to participate in the exercising of political power (Marshall, 1950:22). The social element involves offering citizens economic welfare and security to live and share in community standards, such as the education system and social services (1950:8).

Heater (2004) maintains that the two important aspects of Marshall’s theory are: firstly, that the equality inherent in citizenship could be compatible with the inequality inherent in class structure; and secondly, that the rights of citizenship are composed of the three bundles: civil, political and social (2004:113). Dahrendorf notes that Marshall had posed the question of whether the status of citizenship is compatible with the inequalities of social class (1994:296). Moreover, he discusses Marshall’s work on citizenship from the point of view of citizens and what it implies essentially for them and their rights within the community (1994:296). This view is supported by Eriksen and Weigard through their characterization of Marshall’s view of the role of the citizen as one who has civil, political and social rights that link to individual rights (2000:15).
However, in recent times a number of social commentators have questioned Marshall’s theories in their approach to modern democracy. Heater, for example, sums up his critique of Marshall’s theory of citizenship with a list of five criticisms: ‘he was too myopic’, ‘he was too exclusive’, ‘he was too optimistic’, ‘he was too simplistic’ and ‘he lacked historical understanding’ (1999:23-24). Barbalet claims that “the efficacious factor in Marshall’s argument is a social emotion, stemming from his patterns of class inequality” (1993:36). Additionally, Turner states that there are serious ambiguities in Marshall’s account concerning the exact relationship between citizenship and capitalism (1993:8). Roche claims that Marshall’s concept and history of citizenship should be more deeply analysed (1994:80). He argues that the concept of citizenship is “the nature of the citizen status and role, its rights, duties, and powers, and the nature of the community of citizens – is much used, but little analysed in social policy analysis” (Roche, 1994:80). Twine suggests that “Marshall’s work on citizenship may be criticised for its failure to specify the level, form and content of social rights” (1994:106). Mann criticises Marshall as “being Anglo-centric and evolutionist” (1994:63).

Feminist authors Crawford and Maddern argue that Marshall excludes the position of women in his schema for citizenship (2001:3). Marshall’s work was directed at male citizens, making the other half of the population invisible, therefore his theories were too narrow and he failed to produce a history of women’s citizenship (Crawford & Maddern, 2001:3). Lister concurs, and includes diversity as well as gender in the critique (1994:429). That is, Marshall fails to acknowledge the affects that gender and diversity have within conceptions of citizenship (Davidson, 2000; Eveline, 2001; Lister, 1994).

Theorizing citizenship rights in countries that the British government colonised from the seventeenth century is the theme that Pearson (2002) uses in discussing global citizenship for three Indigenous peoples groups in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Although Pearson recites Marshall’s citizenship tripartite concept, he believes that Marshall’s analysis is ‘too Anglo-centric to serve as a general comparative model and fails to supply a structure or a historical account of citizenship in the colonies’ (Pearson, 2002:989). Despite these criticisms, Broom and Jones utilise Marshall’s work on citizenship in reference to Aboriginal people and comment
that “[Aboriginal] Australians have until very recently lived under legal, political and social restrictions which, in most cases, white Australians rejected for themselves over a century ago” (1973:5). Chesterman and Galligan agree and state that “Aborigines have been specifically excluded from certain rights in all three of Marshall’s categories” (1997:5). Further, they utilise Marshall’s tripartite conceptualization of citizenship in their political and historical study of Indigenous Australians and citizenship.

Davidson notes that, during the first half of the twentieth century, Aboriginal Australians were still being treated as “aliens” without full citizenship rights (1997:189). As with other prospective migrants to Australia, for Aborigines to be included rather than excluded they had to prove that they had turned their back on their own culture, joined the Anglo-Celt national family; and then the state decided whether they had crossed the divide culturally (Davidson, 1997:189).

In other words, to attain citizenship Aborigines needed to “be trained out of their culture [and] into that of white ‘modernity’” (Davidson, 1997:193). While assimilationist policies that might allow inclusion to occur were being urged by the Federal government and acted upon by the southern states from the 1930s, as noted by Haebich (2000:528), in Queensland Aboriginal policies of segregation and protection remained in force until the 1960s. The only legal means of inclusion in the wider community was through a Certificate of Exemption from the restrictive demands of the 1897 Act and later amendments. Further, as Wickes (2006) has argued, the conditions of exemption for Queensland Aborigines required that exemptees relinquish their traditional culture and sever connections with their ancestral community in order to maintain their exempted status.

Alongside Marshall’s (1950) typology of citizenship and Davidson’s (1997) discourse of exclusion, when considering the historically coercive relationship between Aboriginal Queenslanders and the state, the work of Michel Foucault (1991) on the notion of ‘discursive regime’ and, in particular, ‘governmentality’ is pertinent. For Foucault, governmentality characterises a modern form of rule (or power) that is increasingly centralised (1991:103). For the ruled, governmentality creates a form of subjectivity through which the subject then conforms or resists (Foucault, 1991).
Most importantly, there need not be unity within aspects of government and reliance is on technologies, procedures and standardised mechanisms that inculcate habit. Foucault’s concept of governmentality is utilised by Kidd (1997) in regard to the administration of Aboriginal affairs in Queensland government departments. Kidd’s thesis, however, concentrates on that aspect of governmentality concerned with ‘congenital failure’ and her’s “is a study of the eternal optimism and the congenital failure of successive Queensland governments as their activities impacted on Aboriginal lives” (1997:xx-xxi).

More pertinent to the current context, in terms of conformity, governmentality creates subjects that become part of their own normalising force. In this conception government is less to do with formal administrative or political structures and more concerned with the conduct of individuals as they internalise conformity. The process of internalisation, for Foucault, is a form of disciplinary power imposed by the self (1977). He equates disciplinary power with the rise of capitalism and uses the example of the panopticon as a surveillance technique (Foucault, 1977). As will be shown below, self discipline, formally required of Aboriginal Queenslanders living as exempts from the provisions of the 1897 Act, is theorised in terms of a Foucauldian “technology of the self”, where subjects envision themselves as acting in a ‘natural’ manner. Foucault maintains that:

> Carceral continuity and the fusion of the prison-form make it possible to legalize, or in any case to legitimize disciplinary power, which thus avoids any element of excess or abuse it may entail (1977:302).

For many ‘exempted’ Aboriginal people, this form of on-going punishment became the norm and was far removed from the freedom experienced by other Australian citizens. In his work on panopticism, Foucault states that, “this surveillance is based on a system of permanent registrations” (1977:196). Clearly, both the carceral network and panopticism theory might demonstrate how effective government officials have been in controlling and suppressing the lives of Indigenous people over many decades. That is, the on-going surveillance of exempts literally kept them under the control of the government (see, for example, Huggins & Huggins, 1994).

The next chapter will examine the diaries of an Aboriginal woman who was married to an exempted Aboriginal man.
1 Section 9 of the 1897 Act states: It shall be lawful for the Minister to cause every aboriginal within any District, not being an aboriginal excepted from the provisions of this section, to be removed to, and kept within the limits of, any reserve situated within such District, in such manner, and subject to such conditions, as may be prescribed. The Minister may, subject to the said conditions, cause any aboriginal to be removed from one reserve to another.

2 Section 15 of the 1897 Act states: Every person desirous of employing an aboriginal or female half-caste under the provisions of this Act, shall forthwith, upon permission being granted by a Protector, enter into an agreement with such aboriginal or female half-caste, in the presence of any justice of the peace or member of the Police Force, for any period not exceeding twelve months. Every such agreement shall contain particulars of the names of the parties thereto, the nature of the service to be rendered by such aboriginal or female half-caste, the period during which such employment is to continue, the wages or other remuneration to be paid or given by the employer for such service, the nature of the accommodation to be provided for such aboriginal or female half-caste, and the conditions on which the agreement may be determined by either party. Every such agreement shall be in duplicate and be attested by such justice or member of the Police Force, who shall forthwith forward one of the said agreements to the nearest Protector.
This chapter examines the six diaries kept during the 1940s and 1950s by the researcher’s grandmother, Daisy Smith, wife of an exempted Aboriginal man. The ‘lived’ experience of citizenship for the Smith family can be observed throughout Daisy’s diary entries. The diaries offer a powerful narrative and rare insight into how one Queensland household, officially rendered without a past, succeeded in constructing a future.

Alaszewshi (2006) discusses the use of diaries in social research. He states that ‘a diary can be defined as a document created by an individual who has maintained a regular, personal and contemporaneous record’ (2006:1). Furthermore, Alaszewshi states:

The entries are made by an identifiable individual who controls access to the diary while he or she records it. The diarist may permit others to have access, and failure to destroy the diary indicates a tacit acceptance that others will access the diary (2006:2).

Holmes notes that the writing of diaries “has long been one of the few forms of writing available to women who sought to articulate their experiences in any enduring way” (2006:3). Daisy’s diaries can be classified as a ‘personal’ record kept by her as a female author who occasionally allowed others to access them and write in them. In addition, the Daisy Smith diaries are contemporary and largely autobiographical. They document her daily life experiences several decades before other Aboriginal women (for example, Hegarty 1999, 2003; Kennedy 1985; McKellar, 2000) began recording their life’s memories in print.

This chapter is divided into five sections: The diaries and their origins; How the diaries have been analysed; The ‘lived experience’ of the civil dimensions of citizenship and silences about civil dimensions of citizenship; The ‘lived experience’
of political dimensions of citizenship and silences about political dimensions of citizenship; The ‘lived experience’ of the social dimensions of citizenship and silences about social dimensions of citizenship; and Understanding of the outside world.

The Diaries and their origins:

It is unclear exactly how many diaries Daisy Smith wrote given that it was a private and personal activity. However, the six diaries in existence span a ten year period. Five of these were written in the 1940s and one was written in 1951. The six diaries cover two distinct periods. The first period covers the war years of 1942, 1944 and 1945. During this time, the Smith family lived on the Hollywell Estate, near Eidsvold in Queensland’s Burnett Region, working for the auctioneer Martin Snelling. Also, the Smith family lived and worked in Gayndah and Eidsvold in the Burnett region. The second period covers the post-war years of 1947, 1949 and 1951, when the Smith family lived in suburban Brisbane. Daisy’s diaries have appendices from other family members, including some brief annotations that were added to the 1951 diary by Roy, Daisy’s husband, in 1979 after her death.

The diaries are well-preserved, bound hardcover books and have survived over sixty years of handling by an unknown number of individuals. Each contains ‘three days on a page’. They are in two Imperial sizes: 5 inches by 8 inches (12.7cm x 20.32cm) and 8 inches by 10 inches (20.32cm x 25.4cm). The 1947 diary is in the larger size. The 1940s diaries, titled *Wood’s Australian Diary*, were printed in Sydney by John Andrew and Company with the cost ranging from 2/9 (2 shillings and 9 pence) in 1942 through to 3/6 (3 shillings and 6 pence) in 1949 for the smaller format; the larger 1947 diary cost 4/- (4 shillings). The 1951 diary titled *Collins’ Octavo Diary*, was published by Collins Brothers and printed in Sydney without its cost printed on it. The first few pages of the commercially printed diaries contain information that was intended to be useful to their owners. Items include public/school holidays in the calendar section, postal and miscellaneous information and a section for ‘Annual Cash Summary’ at the back. Closer examination of the diaries reveals that they are actually ledger account books. Inside the 1944 and 1945 diaries, the following statement is printed:

    The War conditions prevailing when these Diaries were printed, prevented the inclusion of the Land and Income Taxes and Stamp and
Probate Duties usually contained in former issues (John Andrew & Co., 1944 and 1945).

An inspection of the 1942 diary revealed that the above sections were included in that year’s publication.

Entries were written in the diaries with both lead pencil and pen and ink. The 1945 diary is the most detailed of the six, whilst the 1951 diary is the briefest. Why this is so is not known. Neither is the reason why Daisy kept these diaries in the first instance, as they were not the usual personal diaries used by women. It may be that she was following the practice of personal diary keeping undertaken by members of the Hillcoat family, which she had observed as an employee of that family, in order to keep a record of her own family life. Another explanation may be that Daisy felt obliged to keep an account of her family and how they lived in the wider community to demonstrate to government officials that they had been living ‘in a civilised manner’, in accordance with the conditions of Roy’s Certificate of Exemption (see Appendix B). It may explain why the diary entries are written in an unembellished, largely unemotional style which reads like a daily factual audit of the household’s activities, rather than a personal or reflective journal. Daisy’s writing style is direct and to the point, without any comments about her own thoughts at the time and could be best be described as minimalist. However, the use of well-known contemporary individual’s names and how they are intertwined with Daisy’s family life brings vitality to them.

Individuals mentioned in the diaries are primarily drawn from the Smith family, the Mittabong family and their employers, the Hillcoat/Snelling families. Other people mentioned in the diaries were neighbours, friends and work colleagues, all of whom formed part of the two communities in which the Smith family lived. In the 1942 diary, the name of a person has been blacked out numerous times, for reasons unknown. Supplementary interpretation of the diary entries has been given to the researcher by Roy and Daisy’s eldest daughter and only surviving child, Gwen, now aged 85 years. This additional information has generated another basis for understanding the diaries of the Smith family and their ‘lived experiences’. At the time of writing the dairies, Daisy (born 1900) and Roy (born 1901) were both aged in
their forties. The first diary of 1942 revealed their children’s ages as Gwen (17 years), Mervyn (16 years), Maurice (14 years) and Valma (9 years).

An important factor to be considered is how Daisy would have wanted her written text to be explored and opened up to scrutiny within the public domain, bearing in mind the diaries were written over sixty years ago. Holmes notes that diaries “are not simply private documents... [and that they]... exist at an intersection between ‘public’ and the ‘private’ and challenge our understanding of both” (2006:3). There are a number of ways that Daisy recorded information about public and private events. Some of the more private family matters have been excluded from this analysis.

**How the diaries have been analysed:**

The contents of the Daisy Smith diaries offer a unique opportunity to explore and understand the lived experience of citizenship of an exempted household in Queensland in the 1940s and 1950s. They have been analysed utilising the tripartite model of citizenship developed by British sociologist, T H Marshall (1950). Marshall characterised citizenship as “a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community” (1950:18) which consisted of three dimensions: civil, political and social. These provide a convenient means by which to examine and interpret the lived experiences of citizenship in the daily routine recorded by Daisy in the six diaries. Examples of the application of this method are demonstrated below using the following three entries:

**Civil:** “Packed up again for Dunwich for the long weekend & went down on the Morana. Arriving at 9.30.” (Friday, 27th April 1951).

Here Daisy recorded that the family was free to make multiple trips by boat to Dunwich on Stradbroke Island in Moreton Bay. It illustrates how the Smith family enjoyed the civil aspects of citizenship. This civil right to freedom of movement was not available to Aboriginal families still living ‘Under the Act’ in Queensland.

**Political:** “Letter for Roy. from Mr Ford, M, L, A,” (Monday, 15th January 1945).

In this excerpt, Daisy notes a letter received by her husband Roy from a Mr Ford, MLA. Its arrival highlights the fact that Roy was recognised as a citizen with the right and obligation to vote on political matters.
Social: “After tea Roy. went to the boxing. so Val. & I. went to the Princess, to see “Courage of Lassie” (Friday, 13th June 1947).

This excerpt shows the Smith family’s lived experiences of the social dimension of citizenship evident through mention of Roy’s attendance at an evening boxing tournament and Daisy and daughter Val going to the picture theatre to see a movie.

The ‘lived experience’ of the civil dimensions of citizenship:
The diaries indicate that as an exempted Aboriginal family living in the wider democratic Australian community, Daisy, Roy and their four children enjoyed the privileges of their civil rights, an element of citizenship.

One such civil right is the freedom of an individual to choose an education. Marshall asserts that “[e]ducation is a necessary prerequisite of civil freedom” (1950:16). Daisy was a firm believer in gaining an education and would often say that “education is the only way” (family member, 2010 pers. Comm., 29 March). Therefore, obtaining a primary school education was very much part of the Smith children’s young lives. The three older children attended primary school in country areas around Dalby, Queensland, studying the basic subjects of English, Mathematics, History and Geography (Hayman, G. 2009 pers. Comm., 18 March). Valma, the youngest child, attended primary schools at Eidsvold and Gayndah and at South Brisbane Intermediate School. Although only the youngest child attended a high school, each of Roy and Daisy’s children gained an education. The ‘lived experience’ of citizenship in this instance was realisation of the right to schooling in the wider society of Queensland. This contrasts with the very limited vocational education available to children living on Aboriginal reserves and missions such as Cherbourg (Sarra, 2008).

Many diary entries relate to education, particularly giving information about the schooling of Daisy’s younger child, Valma. In the 1942 diary, Daisy writes, “Valma did not go into school has a heavy cold. Mrs Wilson rang for her to go and stay with them again” (Monday, 20th July 1942). Mrs Wilson lived in Eidsvold and Valma boarded with her during the week, going home to the family at weekends to the Hollywell Estate. Similarly, Valma boarded with a family in Gayndah to attend
school (Hayman, G. 2009 pers. Comm., 18 March). The 1945 diary records her attending school. The diaries reveal that, ‘Valma attended school’ in the 1940s as there are hundreds of entries confirming those words and other statements such as “I. took Valma. up to start school at Gayndah State School. She got on well for her first day” [sic] (Tuesday, 30th January 1945). Diary entry states: “Valma. still at school came 2nd in exmams [sic] (Friday, 2nd November 1945). Two years later, Valma, now aged 14 years, was attending the Brisbane State High School at South Brisbane, a suburb of Brisbane. Daisy states: “Valmas big day started school at the 5th Brisbane Intermediate” (Wednesday, 5th February 1947). In Valma’s final examination, she records in the diary “Val got Scholarship results (55%)” (Monday, 24th January 1949). Valma passed the examination and worked as a machinist for a number of years.

Another civil element of citizenship is the right to peaceful assembly and association. This right was exercised by Roy in 1945, as indicated in a diary entry stating that, “Roy went to meeting at night” (Monday, 15th January 1945). It is not clear what type of meeting he attended, or with whom he met. The important fact here was that he was free to attend any public meeting that he chose. If Roy had chosen to exercise his civic right of freedom of speech he had the right to do so. In this instance, there is no diary entry affirming that he publicly voiced his political opinion on a subject, issue or event.

Another civil aspect of citizenship is the freedom and liberty of movement. Marshall argues that “when ‘freedom’ became universal, citizenship grew from local into a national institution” (1950:12). Chesterman and Galligan (1999) note that “Aboriginal people have been severely restricted in their ability to move freely about their own country” (1999:153). In 1926, Roy Smith gained his Certificate of Exemption, allowing him and his family to move about freely, after being inmates of Purga Mission for a number of years. All six diaries contain numerous entries that record the Smith family’s freedom of movement travelling on buses, trains, boats and in cars at their discretion. Daisy writes, for example, “Boys went to town. Gwen went to the hospital. Mervyn. left for Coolangatta 5-30.” (Friday, 7th January 1949). Another entry reads, “Maurice. landed up from Gayndah on train” (Saturday, 20th May 1944).
As the diaries reveal, on numerous occasions the Smith family went into hospitals for a number of reasons as part of their employment, to receive medical treatment and to visit family and friends who were patients (the issue of work and medical treatment will be discussed in the Social section below). For example, the Smith family went to visit their employer, Martin Snelling, in hospital when he was unwell: “All went up to the Hospital to see Mr Snelling” (Sunday, 19th March 1944). Other occasions when the family visited the hospital were to see family and known members of the community who had become ill, or had an accident. They also went to see new parents with their babies. All these references indicate that the Smith family experienced freedom of movement as a civil freedom, like other citizens.

Another civil right is the freedom of religion. Purga Mission was part of the Salvation Army Church, and it is probable that both Roy and Daisy attended Sunday church services there. Yet, that was not the religious denomination they chose to follow later in life. Amongst Daisy’s belongings there is a prayer book that was given to her as a gift when she was confirmed in 1917 by the Archbishop of Brisbane at the Church of England, St Thomas Church, Toowong, a suburb of Brisbane. This discovery indicates that Daisy was a member of the Church of England congregation before she was removed and taken to Purga Mission in 1920 at the age of 20 years. Therefore, it is understandable that the Smith family was actively involved with the Church of England (Anglican Church) during the years they resided in the Burnett Region. In one diary entry Daisy records that, “I. went to early church & we all went over to Bellings for Church” (Sunday, 10th September 1944). It was revealed recently that “the service was held at a house with a visiting rector, as there was no church building at the time” (Hayman, G. 2009 pers. Comm., 27 September). This was a practice that occurred in many communities until funds were raised to build a church (Hayman, G. 2009 pers. Comm., 27 September). Furthermore, throughout the year, members of the congregation would organise the use of different homes for the purpose of holding a weekly church service (Hayman, G. 2009 pers. Comm., 27 September).

The 1945 diary records that during the months from June to December, the youngest child Valma attended Sunday school on most Sundays, “Valma. went to S School” (Sunday, 23rd September 1945). Daisy recorded that her two daughters attended other Church functions together, “Gwen. & Valma. went to the Childrens fancy dress ball
(S.S.)” (Thursday, 29th November 1945). The 1945 diary also reveals that both Roy
and Daisy were present at some events held by the Church, “Roy. Valma. & self Went
to the S. S. picnic” (Sunday, 2nd December 1945) and

Church of England. S.S. held their Picnic rather dull day but had an
enjoyable day. I. Made a sponge Roy. & self went up after early lunch.
quite a good Crowd of Mothers there” (Monday, 18th June 1945).

There is no mention of the family going to church in the three later diaries of 1947,
1949 and 1951. The ‘lived experience’ of freedom of worship exercised by the Smith
family was apparently unhampered by other citizens who might oppose their
participation within the church community.

Following Marshall (1950:13), the right to own property is another part of the civil
element of citizenship. The diaries show that Daisy’s household exercised this right
as its members owned a range of property from small personal belongings to larger
household items and a motor vehicle. When the Smith family was residing in the
Burnett region, their possessions included household contents consisting of basic
furniture and kitchen equipment. Also, Roy owned and drove a 1929 Essex Tourer
motor vehicle which was a great asset to a family living in the countryside where
there was only very limited public transport. Daisy writes that “Roy & Valma.
arrived home in the Essex” (Friday, 3rd March 1944). Having a car entails car
maintenance as well, and on one occasion, the diary entry is: “Essex, still out of
Commission” (Saturday, 12th February 1944). Roy Smith gained his driver’s licence
in 1932 (See Appendix B).

In addition, the Smith family enjoyed the ownership of a wireless, more commonly
known as the radio. The wireless was part of the broadcasting network that gave the
listener an array of local information along with national and international news.
Diary entries indicate that the family listened to the wireless to find out about current
events and weather, horse races and various sporting matches. Boxing was a sport in
which all three male members of the family (Roy and his two sons Mervyn and
Maurice) were involved. When Daisy’s son Mervyn competed in boxing matches, it
gave her a personal interest to listen to the fights to hear the result as it happened. In
one diary entry, Daisy indicated that she had listened to the wireless for this purpose,
“I. stayed home to listen to the fights Mervyn. lost his fight with Law” [sic] (Friday,
27th June 1947). There were also numerous serials broadcast on the wireless for all age groups. In one such instance, the local Kingaroy station began a new radio serial akin to a modern day soap opera on television. Daisy records the occasion as “New Serial, 4.S.B. Started. 11.9.45. House that Margaret Built” (Tuesday, 11th September 1945).

The diaries record that Daisy also regularly exercised the civil dimension of citizenship to purchase items such as lottery tickets for herself or for others as gifts. Further, on a few occasions she won some money through this. She records her wins as, “Won share of £2. in the Mammoth Casket. Casket No 1095, Ticket 48949” (Wednesday, 8th January 1947) and “I. went another share in the Casket. in the ten pound prizes. so I got 2-10-0. out of it.” (Tuesday, 25th February 1947). The casket ticket was available in a variety of types. In one instance, Daisy writes about a competition casket that Val, her daughter, had entered. Daisy writes on two consecutive Saturdays about posting and receiving mail, “posted letter to “Dad’s Musical Casket”” (Saturday, 11th August 1945) and “Also received letter from her [Gwen] & one with Casket ticket in for Val from 4.B.C. for Dads Competition” (Saturday, 18th August 1945). The comments from the diary indicate that Daisy’s daughter, Val, had entered her father into a Father’s Day competition run by a radio station and had won a prize in the form of a casket ticket.

In summary, the entries in each of the six diaries demonstrate that all members of the Smith family were able to exercise the civil dimensions of citizenship freely and without any apparent impediment or objection by other members of the wider community.

**Silences about the civil dimensions of citizenship**

There are subjects and events that are conspicuous by their absence in the diaries kept by Daisy. For instance, there are no references to the family’s Aboriginal heritage in any of the six diaries. This omission could be understood as meeting the requirements of the strict conditions imposed by the system of exemption.

The payment of rent was never commented upon during the years the family resided with Martin Snelling in the Burnett region. It may be that there was an agreement
about rent included in the arrangements for the family’s living and working on the
property. There is no mention of rent or wages. There is also a silence regarding the
conditions of employment including the payment of wages to the Smith family
members as employees of auctioneer Martin Snelling on his property at Hollywell
Estate, where they worked for five-years from September 1939 to March 1944. On
the day of the family’s departure, Daisy comments, “I. left Hollywell for good”
(Wednesday, 8th March 1944). The diary reveals no other comments about the
sudden move. What the family thought about leaving their home of five years, why
they had to leave and whether this was due to Martin Snelling selling the property
because of his own poor health, is not apparent in the diaries.

The diaries are non-committal in revealing any details of wages earned by Roy and
Daisy and their two teenage sons, Mervyn and Maurice. Over sixty years later in a
deathbed conversation, Mervyn Smith, aged 80 years, stated “I worked my guts out
for Martin Snelling and never got paid. We were like slaves” (Smith, M. 2007 pers.
Comm., 16 August). Mervyn never chose to share his earlier ‘slave like treatment’ at
the hands of Martin Snelling with his family until the very end of his life.

The ‘lived experience’ of the political dimensions of citizenship:
As exempted Aboriginal citizens within Australian society, the Smith family was
aware of Australia’s political climate and citizenship obligations during the years of
the Second World War. Two main themes are mentioned in the diaries. These are the
individual’s right to vote in both state and Federal elections and, as an elector and
citizen, the right to participate in the war effort.

Many exempted Aboriginal people who wanted to vote in state and Federal elections
were denied this political right. Reid argues that:

Until at least 1949 all Torres Strait Islanders, and ‘full bloods’, or
persons with a ‘preponderance of aboriginal blood’, regardless of
whether or not they had been issued with an Exemption Certificate, were
still not allowed to enrol to vote (2004:74).

In contrast to Reid’s claim, Daisy records that both she and Roy (who was exempted
in 1926) voted in both the Queensland State elections of 1944 and 1947 and in the
1951 Federal election. This raises the question as to why were they allowed to vote
while other exempted Indigenous people were refused. According to Reid, the use of narrow racial definitions offers an explanation as to why some exemptees could vote and others could not. She states that:

By the early 1950s, however, the Director of Native Affairs was instructing local Aboriginal Protectors that the right to enrol to vote had been extended to those holding an Exemption Certificate (as long as they could produce it), and to those who were ‘half bloods or less’ (2004:74).

This situation was further complicated by the different criteria between Federal and state voting rules. Reid notes that “the Commonwealth rules about eligibility to enrol for Federal elections were slightly less restrictive than the Queensland rules about voting in state elections” (2004:74).

The Queensland State and the Federal Electoral Rolls reveal that Roy and Daisy Smith were eligible to vote in State and Federal Elections. For the Smith family living in the town of Eidsvold, voting in the State election of 1944 would have been part of a busy day. The diary entry states “All went down town to Vote” (Saturday, 22nd April 1944). As the voting age at the time was 21 years, only Roy and Daisy were entitled to vote on that occasion. Three years later, in 1947, the family was living in the Brisbane suburb of Holland Park. By this time, the two eldest siblings, Gwenneth, now 22 years, and Mervyn, aged 21 years, who were still living at home, would have been eligible to vote. However, Daisy’s only diary entry for Saturday 3rd May, 1947 states “Polling Day”. Thus, it is not clear if her adult children voted on that occasion. For some reason there is no diary record of the next Federal election, or indeed who voted, on Saturday 10th December, 1949. Perhaps Daisy simply forgot to write in the diary that day. This is in keeping with the 1949 diary in which there are quite a few gaps throughout.

The diary records that the family went to Dunwich on the M.V. Morana for the long weekend, during the 1951 Federal election. Daisy writes: “Voted down there” (Saturday, 28th April 1951), so it would seem to have been an absentee vote. Daisy did not record who went to Dunwich, only that the family arrived at Dunwich jetty at 9.30pm Friday and were “all very tired” (Friday, 27th April 1951). The purpose of the trip and where the family stayed is not revealed, although Daisy writes of a very busy
Monday morning, cleaning out the flat and packing, prior to returning to the mainland (Monday, 30th April 1951).

During the war years (1939-1945), the Australian government issued each Australian citizen with a ration book with 112 coupons. At the end of each year, used coupon booklets were exchanged for new ones. Clothing, petrol and wood were being rationed as supplies were restricted in some states in Australia. There were certain grocery items that were rationed, such as tea, sugar, butter meat, margarine, coffee, rice, prunes, milk and eggs, with many fresh fruit and vegetables. Daisy records the family collecting the ration books in June each time on four separate occasions (1) “Went down to Wynnum for our ration Books” (Sunday, 14th June 1942); (2) “Ration book day” (Saturday, 3rd June 1944); (3) “Gwens food ration book. (Registered.)” (Thursday, 24th May 1945); (4) “Ration Book day. got all our Ration book without any bother” (Saturday, 2nd June 1945). The diary entries refer to the ration books during the war years, yet Daisy gives no information about the ration books beyond their collection or how the rationing affected herself and her family.

During the Second World War, members of the Smith household departed overseas for service in the armed services like other families in the wider community. Daisy records the departure of a family member for overseas service in New Guinea, “Telegram to say Jack left for N.G.” (Tuesday, 17th April 1945). A diary entry a month later states, “I. received wire from Nancy. Jack, left” (Saturday, 19th May 1945). Jack Mittabong, the husband of Daisy’s sister Nancy, saw active duty in New Guinea. Daisy recorded the movement of a number of friends and community members who were enlisted in the Australian Armed Services and Daisy records, “Eileen Wilson Home on leave” (Saturday, 7th November 1942) and two years later she writes, “Hartwigs boys home on leave” (Thursday, 9th November 1944).

Overall, the diaries depict a valuable documentation of the war and its impact on one exempted Aboriginal family living in the Burnett Region. Daisy recorded a local event that supported the Australian Armed Forces participation in the war, “tonight. Diggers Ball in at Eidsvold” (Friday, 2nd October 1942). Later in the month she observed, “13 planes went over” (Saturday, 24th October 1942). Yet, as the diary indicates, life went on, as they went about their daily chores.
The 1944 diary describes the close proximity of the war, with a contingent of Australian troops travelling through the town of Eidsvold where the Smith family resided. Daisy comments, “large Convoy passed through” (Wednesday, 28th June, 1944). There is no indication as to how many trucks were involved in the convoy. A few months later she records: “Convoy of 28 Australian Army trucks camped in the Show grounds last night. they left at mid-day today” (Tuesday, 28th November 1944). In keeping with Daisy’s minimalist writing style, there is no particular emphasis placed on these observations, suggesting that the troop movements were part of everyday activities, which was not the case.

Daisy leaves the reader in no doubt about her patriotism, as it is recorded in a number of the diaries. In one instance she offered her own support and small participation in the War effort as she writes, “Soldiers in Show Pavilion, I. asked for loan of broom to sweep place out staying a few days” (Wednesday, 18th April 1945). It is not clear why she did it or in what context. Another act of patriotism was the purchasing of a badge, Daisy records, “Bought Fuzzy Wuzzy badge from Mr Harmer. 1/-.” (Wednesday, 13th June 1945). By this time, her brother-in-law, Jack, had been posted to New Guinea and the purchase of the badge could have been a symbol of support for the Australian Army posted there.

The day after Second World War in Europe ended and victory was declared by the Allies on 8th May, Daisy records the day as a holiday, “V.E. Holiday” (Wednesday, 9th May 1945). A few months later, when Japan surrendered, the diary entry states, “Japenese Surrender” [sic] (Saturday, 11th August 1945). On the following Monday which was declared a public holiday, Daisy writes, “Public Holiday for Japanese Surrender” (Monday, 13th August 1945). Then, the diary reveals, “News Came through at 9-15, Peace being Declared and what rejoicing” (Wednesday, 15th August 1945). Interestingly, this historical news event is written between “Roy on the tractor” and “I did my washing.” The following day, Daisy describes the events that were held in the town, “A procession from Town Hall at 2, p.m, then sports & football on the grounds and concert and community Singing in the “Town Hall” at night also Dancing” (Thursday, 16th August 1945). Daisy and her family would have heard these news flashes on their own wireless. As they were newspaper readers, they would have also read more detail about the war.
Daisy also makes note of the significance of the British flag flying once again in Singapore after three years of Japanese occupation, “Union Jack. flown in Singapore at 3 years” (Thursday, 6th September 1945). Another reference to events immediately after the war ending concerns large convoys of military trucks headed south, taking troops back to their homes and loved ones, “Big convoy left for Brisbane, (40)” (Wednesday, 12th September 1945) and “big convoy. left for Sydney.” (Sunday, 16th September 1945).

From the international political stage, Daisy records the deaths of three influential world leaders who all died within a few months of each other in 1945. One of these was the death of the President of the United States of America (USA), “President Roosevelt. passed away (63 years)” (Friday, 13th April 1945). As the Smith family owned a wireless, it is assumed that Daisy heard this news via a newsflash sometime during the day. Daisy’s 12-year-old daughter Valma wrote about the death of another world leader in 1945. She expressed her sentiment about the leader and his death “HitLER DIED. Yippee” [sic] (Wednesday, 2nd May 1945). Besides the record of Hitler’s death, there was no other information given about the war in Europe in this entry. The diary also reveals that Valma and Daisy were in Brisbane on a two-week holiday from Gayndah at the time of Hitler’s death and the end of the war.

Several months later, Australia’s war-time Prime Minister, John Curtin, died while in office. The entry in the diary reads, “The Prime Minister. Mr Curtain [sic] passed away. at 4. P.M.” (Thursday, 5th July 1945). Then a few years later, in 1951, the death of another Australian Prime Minister, Ben Chifley, was recorded by Daisy “Mr J. B. Chiefly [sic] passed away at 10-30. Heart attack” (Wednesday, 13th June 1951). Thus, Daisy Smith documents significant political events as well as personal aspects of life.

**Silences about the political dimensions of citizenship**

Although the diaries reveal that Roy and Daisy voted in both Federal and State elections, the diaries are silent about the elections and the outcomes, as they are about the name of the political party or parties for which they voted.
The diaries reveal the possibility that racism and discrimination were rife as Aboriginal people in Queensland were moving into the cities and towns. An entry in the 1944 diary describes a letter arriving stating, “letter from Dean, refusing to let us rent half-house” (Monday, 20\textsuperscript{th} November 1944). This refusal could have been based on discrimination. No explanation is given. An absence of any reference to any experiences of discrimination and racism does not necessarily mean that the Smith family did not experience them.

The Aboriginal political movement in Brisbane had its beginnings in the early 1950s through its struggles against discrimination towards Indigenous people (see, for example, Bell, 1997:27). One such activist was Celia Smith, who was at one time married to Roy’s cousin, Ernest Smith. Daisy only records the one visit to see Celia, “went and saw Celia and children” (Tuesday, 4\textsuperscript{th} January, 1944). It is unclear if Celia was discussing political issues with Daisy on that occasion as there is nothing recorded in the diaries to this effect. However, what is clear is that the condition of exemption about associating with other Aboriginal people made it unwise for an exempted person like Daisy to record details of conversation with other exempted people as these could be used against her or her family by people in authority.

The Smith family’s move to work at the Hollywell Estate coincided with the start of the Second World War in September 1939 (Hayman, G. 2007 pers. Comm., 16 August). Research by Castle and Hagan (1998) reveals that “[v]oluntary enlistment and then conscription stripped white labour from rural areas” and “The government called on Aborigines to fill the gaps” (1998:416). Exempted Indigenous people became part of the work force as well as Aboriginal workers from missions and reserves, who were placed on the government ‘work agreements’ (see for example, Blake 2001; Kidd 1997). The diaries remain strangely quiet about these issues.

The ‘lived experience’ of the social dimensions of citizenship:
The diaries provide a window through which the day-to-day activities and living conditions of the Smith family may be observed and appreciated. This wealth of information concerning the lives of an exempted Aboriginal family living as citizens can be analysed and understood in terms of Marshall’s (1950) social aspects of citizenship.
Along with the mundane daily household tasks, the diaries record a variety of community-based activities and relationships, each demonstrating the family’s ‘lived’ experiences. Exactly why Daisy recorded these events is unclear. Yet, it was a reminder that the household was integrated into the community unlike the past, when this was denied to Roy and Daisy as inmates of Purga Mission living ‘under the Act’.

The main aspect of the social dimensions of citizenship evident in the entries relates to employment and work schedules for each family member. In the war years, the diaries illustrate that Roy and Daisy were principally employed by the Snelling family on their property at Hollywell Estate, and in their family home at the suburb of Wynnum in Brisbane. At the Hollywell Estate property, Daisy worked in the home doing the daily house chores, “Cleaned all the House out” (Friday, 6th March 1942). Daisy also worked outside the home, helping Roy with the cattle. She comments: “Roy. Maurice & I. Dipped all the Bullocks today.” (Thursday, 15th October 1942). In the first diary, 1942, Mervyn and Maurice worked for Martin Snelling and other property owners in the Eidsvold and Gayndah districts. One recorded incident is when the boys were moving cattle from one property to another, further up the line. The diary reports that, “Maurice. & Mervyn. left with Mr Laidlers for Mundubbera with cattle.” (Monday, 27th April 1942). Seventeen-year-old Gwenneth was employed in a local café and also as a domestic worker in family homes in the district. The youngest sibling, Valma, attended school in both Gayndah and Eidsvold. Each Monday, Valma was taken into town where she boarded with a local family to attend school and on Fridays or Saturdays she would return home for the weekend. Daisy records the event, “Roy. took Valma. into school.” (Monday, 9th November 1942). On one occasion both Gwen and Valma stayed in town for the week, Daisy comments, and “All Went to town in afternoon Went to pictures brought Gwen & Val out for weekend.” (Saturday, 21st February 1942).

When their usual domestic workers went on holidays, the Snelling family called upon Roy and Daisy to provide labour for them in their Wynnum family home in Brisbane. For instance, the diary shows that Mr Snelling phoned on Tuesday 9th June, 1942; Daisy packed and left Eidsvold on the Wednesday and arrived on Thursday 11th June, 1942. The diary entry discussed what happened then: “Arrived in Brisbane at 6-30 Mr Snelling. Met us at Roma Street. started work as soon as I. arrived” (Thursday,
11th June 1942). On that occasion, Daisy writes that she was paid £1-5-0 on three occasions 19th June, 29th June and 3rd July 1942 for the duration of her stay. It was the only time that Daisy writes about receiving wages from the Snelling family in any of the six diaries.

After finishing work at Hollywell Estate, Roy began work for the local shire council in Gayndah, when the family moved to live there in 1945. Daisy records, “Roy. up early to start work for Gayndah Shire Council” (Tuesday, 9th January 1945). At the back of the 1945 diary in the Cash Memoranda section, Daisy has written six separate items of Roy’s wage amounts, “Paid wages. G. S. Council £10-0-7”. It is not clear if they were weekly, fortnightly or even monthly wages. In his role as a worker for the Gayndah Shire Council, Roy injured his back on Wednesday 23rd May 1945. The following week, the diary entry reveals, “Roy. went up town to see about his Compensation papers. came home at 10-15, then he & I. went up to the Hospital, for the Dr to examine his back” (Thursday, 31st May 1945). As an employee, Roy was entitled to receive Worker’s Compensation for the injuries that occurred at his workplace. Daisy records when he received correspondence concerning this, “one from the G.P.S. about Roys Compensation” (Wednesday, 6th June 1945), and “Roy. got Cheque. for Compensation from G.P.S. £13-3-6” (Friday, 22nd June 1945).

As citizens who were fully employed, members of the Smith family paid income tax. The issue of taxation is mentioned on occasions by Daisy in her diaries. She reports it in the following way, “2 letters for Roy. from Sports Club & Taxion [sic] office” (Friday, 15th June 1945). A few years later, when Mervyn was working and needed to complete an income tax form, one diary entry reveals “Mervyn came down at night to fill in the Tax papers” (Monday, 28th July 1947).

In the post-war years, Roy was employed as an unskilled worker for a number of companies in Brisbane, whilst Daisy worked as a domestic with the Snelling family and also at a school in Fortitude Valley in inner-city Brisbane. The four children were now aged from a teenager to young adults living their own independent lives. Over their working lifetime, both Roy and Daisy demonstrated that they were model ‘exempted’ citizens, actively engaging with many people from varying backgrounds.
Hundreds of diary entries show the Smith family’s behaviour to be very respectable, in line with all the conditions of the Certificate of Exemption.

As paid employees and citizens in Australian society, Roy and Daisy were entitled to Public Holidays. All six diaries reveal a number of state and national holidays ranging from King’s Birthday, Labour Day, and Exhibition Day to Easter, Christmas, Boxing Day and New Year’s Day. Each was celebrated by the Smith family like other citizens in paid employment within the Australian community. For example, “HOLIDAY. Kings Birthday. Val went and met her friends they all went to the Pictures. I. stayed in bed until eleven. got up & did a bit of tidying out the [sewing] Machine draws” (Monday, 11th June 1951).

As a working couple, both Roy and Dairy were engaged in employment outside the home. Daisy writes about being employed as a domestic worker at both the local hotel and the hospital in Eidsvold. She describes her work duties and how much she was paid for those services, “Did the Ironing at Brassells got £1-0-0 for the two days” (Tuesday, 28th March 1944) and “washed at Hospital. home at 11-30” (Tuesday, 18th April 1944). Seven years later, the 1951 diary discloses that Daisy was working as a domestic one day a week at a private girl’s Anglican school in Brisbane, St Margaret School. The entry for the day is as follows:

I. was up again early again got My Breakfast & Vals, then got ready to catch the 5 past seven tram, started work at St Margarets School at eight. ironed until 3P,M got 19/6 & 1/- fare. Got home at quarter to five, got tea & cut Mervyn. Lunch got to bed at nine. (Tuesday, 26th June 1951).

As the diary of 1951 has gaps where nothing is recorded, it is not possible to estimate accurately the duration of Daisy’s employment at St Margaret School.

There were a number of ways that Daisy supplemented the household’s income during the 1940s, when groceries were in short supply as a consequence of war time restrictions. One such enterprise was ‘the selling of eggs’ to members of the local community who were able to afford them. Daisy records, “1 Dozen Eggs for Mrs Harris.” (Saturday, 28th March 1942). Eggs were sold on twenty-two separate occasions in the 1942 diary. There is no record of eggs being sold in the other two diaries of 1944 and 1945. Another activity noted in the diaries concerned the keeping
of a vegetable patch and fruit trees which supplemented the household’s food supply. Daisy wrote, “Finished planting Corn & pumpkins” (Wednesday, 4th February 1942) and “I pruned all fruit trees in the morning” (Monday, 3rd September 1945). The making of jam derived from the fig trees was another source of food that the family enjoyed. The diary entry states, “Made 4 bottles Fig Jam” (Monday, 19th January 1942).

The diaries show that Daisy regularly prepared food and cooked cakes, for civic and social occasions such as church fetes, afternoon teas, birthdays and Christmas. She writes, “Roy. & self Made three Christmas Cakes” (Saturday, 23rd December 1944) and “Made 2 sponge sandwiches, one for the Church of England stall, both turned out well” (Friday, 1st June 1945), finally, “Also Made a Chocolate Cake” (Saturday, 13th October 1945). Activities recorded in the diaries show that Roy and Daisy did not divide domestic and other tasks according to traditional gender roles. For example, Roy helped in the house and Daisy helped down in the paddock.

Another way of purchasing goods for the home was through a store card, another right that allows citizens to manage their own finances. The Smith family had a store account with ‘Trittons’, a firm in Brisbane. The store had a mail order service catering for customers living in both Brisbane and the country. On one such occasion, Daisy requested a mosquito net, “Wrote to Trittons for Mosquito Net. £2-10-9” (Tuesday, 9th January 1945). “only one [letter] from Trittons regarding net” (Wednesday, 17th January 1945) and then “Mosquito Net arrived from Trittons” (Tuesday, 23rd January 1945). The purchased item took 15 days to arrive after an order was placed.

The social rights exercised by citizens in Queensland who did not own their own accommodation typically included arranging their own private accommodation and the payment of rent for this. Living in the community, the Smith family found suitable lodgings each time they moved to a new location. The diaries mention ‘rent’ in 1944. Daisy explains about rent in the following way, “also, sent rent down to Mrs Hawkins” (Monday, 6th November 1944). Reflecting on a negative outcome, the diary describes a disappointing situation, “letter from Dean, refusing to let us rent half house. Ruth rang, very disappointed” (Monday, 20th November 1944). There is no
further information about having being refused to rent a property. In the 1947 diary, ‘rent’ was written about thirty-seven times and once in the 1951 diary. Roy and Daisy were renting a ‘half a house’ during 1947, the diaries reveal how they applied, but there is no mention of leaving their accommodation. It may have been in the missing 1948 diary as there is no mention of renting the same half-house in the 1949 diary. Daisy writes

Roy. & I. went to town, went to see some of the agents re - some of the houses to let. Came home to Aunties, had dinner and decided to see what goes, re half house & was lucky enough to get same real pleased (Thursday, 6th February 1947).

Although the Smith family was renting accommodation that seemed adequate for their needs, they moved later to another address.

The diaries indicate that Daisy and Roy made an application to the Queensland Housing Commission for the purpose of renting one of its houses in 1947. The process of applying and being granted a house took several months for the Smith family. Daisy comments, “I. called & saw Mr Geir’s Secretary re house. was very nice took down our particulars & said we’d hear from him next week” (Wednesday, 28th May 1947). The following week, Daisy writes “I. went to town in afternoon. to lodge an application for house. brought a form home to fill in” [sic] (Wednesday, 4th June 1947). It was not until July, when someone called by: “Housing Inspector, came & took all details” (Tuesday, 22nd July 1947). In another diary entry, Daisy writes, “went to town after lunch. went & saw the Housing Commission” [sic] (Monday, 27th October 1947).

As there is no 1948 diary, it is unknown when the Smith household moved to the temporary housing address, although the 1949 diary’s inside cover has an address that reads, “Area 2 Hut 63 Flat 3, Temporary Housing, Holland Park.” Then, in 1950 the family moved from the temporary housing to a Queensland Housing Commission house at the Brisbane suburb of Holland Park. They lived there for thirty years until Roy’s death in 1980, paying rent fortnightly rather than applying to become home owners.
The rights of a citizen to have medical and hospital care fall within the social aspects of citizenship (Marshall, 1950:32). In Daisy’s case, hospital visitations are work-related and social-related, as well as for medical reasons. In a number of the diaries, Daisy writes about family members requiring medical treatment for various health conditions and in some instances hospitalisation was necessary. Furthermore, the Gayndah Hospital was also a workplace, as Daisy was employed there casually as a domestic worker. She states, “washed at Hospital. home at 11/30” (Tuesday, 18th April 1944). Visiting family and friends in hospitals was part of the life of the Smith family and their commitment to see others who were in need of friendship and support. Daisy confirms this with, “All went up to the Hospital to see Mr Snelling” (Sunday, 19th March 1944) suggesting a friendly relationship between the Smith family and their employer.

The Queensland public hospital system was utilised by the Smith family in different ways. Daisy wrote, “Took ill & had to call Dr taken to Hospital” (Tuesday, 16th May 1944) and “Mrs Muller. in to take Shirley home. gave me a lift home” (Monday, 5th June 1944). Daisy explained: “I. had to have an operation” (Thursday, 18th May 1944). Daisy needed surgery and spent twenty-one days in hospital recuperating. Although there was no hospitalisation for Roy, he did have some hospital visits to see the on-duty doctor when he suffered back injuries at work in May, 1945. When visiting Brisbane, Daisy’s son Mervyn became ill. The following day he was hospitalised for a few days. Daisy records “Hardly slept last night as Mervyn was very restless & coughing a lot Ambulance. Came for him at ten thirty took him to General Hospital” (Saturday, 28th April 1945). The diaries show that all members of the Smith family were able to access and receive treatment from public health facilities like other citizens in the state.

The diaries show that entertainment was another social dimension of citizenship enjoyed by the Smith household. Mostly this consisted of going to the local theatre to watch movies. The types of movie the Smith family watched included children’s, war, romance, comedy, western, musical and drama movies. Going to the movies (or more commonly called the flix or, the pictures) was the most recorded social activity for the Smith household in the diaries. It is noted that there are many gaps in the diaries; therefore the number of times the family went to the movies would be greater.
than what has been recorded: 1942 attended nine times, 1944 attended thirty-three times, 1945 attended fifty-three times, 1947 attended fifty times, 1949 attended fifteen times and 1951 attended six times.

In 1942 and 1944 the family went to see the movies, Daisy wrote: “family went to the Pictures” (Saturday, 27th May 1944). In 1945 and 1947 they went with other relatives and friends to see the movies together. For example, Daisy wrote, “Val. & self went to see “Beautiful but Broke” and R Taylor. in “Her Cardboard Lover”” (Wednesday, 12th September 1945). During the years from 1949 to 1951 Valma was a keen movie goer. A diary entry read: “Val. & Joyce went to the flix” (Friday, 13th April, 1951). The diaries reveal that not only did the Smith family regularly go to the movies and meet others socially; they were financially able to afford the costs.

Other forms of entertainment were going to the circus and attending the Brisbane Exhibition, which only occurred on a few occasions. Daisy recorded that the family attended the circus on at least one occasion, “All went to the Circus at night” (Sunday, 30th July 1944). Val recorded another occasion, “Roy and Val went to Wirth’s Circus” (Monday, 23rd July 1951). On this occasion, Daisy acknowledges the circus is in town for two nights, “Wirth’s Circus in Gympie last night and tonight” (Friday, 12th October 1945). The Brisbane Exhibition was held at the beginning of August each year. There was always a holiday held on a Wednesday – Show Day. Diary entries are, “Roy. Val. & self went out to the show after tea arrived home 10.30. big crowd out there” and “Another big day. At the Exhibition Roy. Has a holiday so spent it at the Show & stayed until nine” (Tuesday & Wednesday, 12th & 13th August 1947).

Involvement in sport played a major role in the lives of the Smith family, especially for the men. Roy and both his sons, Mervyn and Maurice, were all involved in football and boxing. Daisy recorded that Roy was still playing football in 1945, at the age of 44 years, “Roy. & Maurice. went up to Football. Gayndah played Eidsvold. Roy. Scored first try. Scores 11, all” (Sunday, 8th April 1945). Moreover Daisy recorded “Roy. & Maurice went up to Eidsvold to play football. Gayndah. Won 12-3” (Sunday, 5th August 1945). The diaries also record that the family often listened to the boxing tournaments (fights) on their wireless. The diary even comments about
others coming to the house to listen to the wireless, “Mrs Sinn, came up to listen to fights, Mervyn. Lost his fight, as also did Eric Boldery who was KO” (Tuesday, 2nd October 1945).

According to the diaries, another sport that the family enjoyed was horse race meetings, with their betting systems. Daisy made numerous entries concerning the men going to the races, as well as listening to ‘the races’ on their wireless. For example, Daisy records that the 1944 Melbourne Cup was one race to which they listened, “Melbourne Cup day also Armistice Day. Sirius 1, Peter 2, Cellini 3” (Saturday, 11th November 1944). It appears that Daisy was also fond of listening to the races on the family wireless, because she wrote, “Big Day. Races held in Gayndah. Newmarket Cup won by Jack Ryan’s horse” (Saturday, 8th September 1945).

Daisy frequently refers to her long and close relationship with the Hillcoat and Snelling families. On one occasion when Mr Snelling was at the Hollywell Estate, he was taken to the Eidsvold hospital. She wrote, “Mr Snelling taken to Hospital very ill” (Saturday 18th March, 1944). Another surprising entry in the 1944 diary records that while Daisy was in Brisbane she visited the graves of her long dead past employers, Reginald and Elizabeth Hillcoat. It was the only entry she wrote that day, “Took flowers out to Toowong Cemetery in Morning” (Sunday, 20th August 1944). In 1947, when the Smith family was living in Brisbane, they visited the cemetery again. It was around the anniversary of Reginald’s death in 1925. On this occasion Daisy wrote, “After an early dinner Roy. Val, & self, went out to Toowong Cemetery with some flowers” (Sunday, 19th October 1947). This behaviour indicates a strong and lasting relationship between an Aboriginal employee and her non-Indigenous employer continued even after their death. The relationship was to carry on through their descendants and persists to this day with an on-going friendship between the author and the Snelling daughters.

Daisy enjoyed the ritual of morning and afternoon teas with family and friends. In fact, her diaries mention attending or giving teas over a dozen times. Clearly, social interaction with other women was important to her. For example, the diaries show: “went down to Mrs McRoberts for afternoon tea” (Saturday, 18th November 1944).
Another entry reads: “Had Morning Tea. With the Snellings and Mrs. J. Woods.” (Monday, 9th April 1945). The diary entry read: “Auntie here for afternoon tea” (Wednesday, 25th June 1947). The breadth of their social circle and the Smith family’s respectability are evident in the diaries by reference to afternoon tea at the home of Doug Bleakley. This is a surprise discovery, the relationship between Doug Bleakley (son of John Bleakly, Chief Protector of Aboriginals, 1914-1941) and the Smith family. Daisy wrote these entries, “Valma. & self went to Bleakley for afternoon had a very enjoyable time Doug home on leave” (Sunday, 15th July 1942). Also, in the diary, “Roy. at station to see us off Went out to Chelmer” (Friday, 21st January 1944) and “Went out to see the Bleakleys at Chelmer, & Packed for Home, caught Rockhampton Mail at nine” (Friday, 25th August 1944). The three entries declare a friendship between them, although how their relationship began or ended is not disclosed in the diaries.

In two other entries in the diaries, Daisy announced a birth and an engagement of prominent families in the community, “Bill Parry-Oaken, a daughter” (Thursday, 24th May 1945) and “Muriel Cooper. engaged to J. Hosewood” (Friday, 1st June 1945). The Parry-Oaken family lived in the local Gayndah area. In the 1940s, Roy and Daisy worked for the Cooper family. This was another well-respected non-Indigenous family whom the Smith family had apparently befriended.

Women’s magazines were another type of media that was read by Daisy. In the 1940s, the ‘Weekly’ was a weekly magazine, she writes, “Got first weekly at Quinns” (Saturday, 9th June 1945). Daisy was an avid reader, who read widely and would spend hours reading from newspapers, magazines and books. In reference to this, Daisy writes, “put 2 Book shelves up & put all books on them” (Thursday, 4th January 1945). Also, Daisy became a keen devotee of crossword puzzles that helped and expanded her knowledge of words.

Throughout the six diaries, letter writing emerges as one of the main ways of communicating between Daisy’s family, friends and businesses. Daisy recorded receiving letters containing news about daily life: the birth of a child, the death of someone, engagements, and weddings. Some of the entries are about family members or friends; others relate to members of the local community as well as previous
employers and their families. Other letters came from businesses, insurance companies, the compensation board, the taxation office and even a local Member of Parliament. Two other forms of communication available to the Smith household were the telephone and telegrams or wires. Daisy records, “Telegram for Ruth from Leslie. Roy took same up, rang Ruth & read Telegram over phone to her” (Monday, 8th January 1945). In addition, she writes that for Maurice’s 17th birthday, “Maurice had three telegrams for his Birthday” (Thursday, 8th February 1945). These various forms of correspondence illustrate that the Smith family shared exactly the same ‘lived experiences’ of citizenship as other Australian citizens.

In the six diaries there are countless entries where the Smith family was mutually visiting families and friends. There are numerous entries recording where Daisy went to the aid of family and friends, staying in their homes to help and support them. Roy and Daisy were very community-minded citizens and participated fully in local community events. In this sense their ‘lived’ experience of citizenship accorded with Marshall’s description of citizenship as ‘a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community’ (Marshall 1950:18).

Silences about the social dimensions of citizenship

While the diaries reveal many ways in which the Smith family was able to enjoy the social rights of citizenship, there are silences concerning subjects that are seemingly ignored or neglected. For example, as an exempted person Roy and his family were legally not allowed to mix with Aboriginal people, other than immediate family members. This requirement remained in place until the passing of Aborigines’ and Torres Strait Islanders’ Affairs Act, 1965 (Qld) (Donovan, 2002:164). Accordingly, throughout the diaries there is no mention of Aboriginal individuals, activities or events. Not one Aboriginal person is named in all the diaries, other than family members. In reality, it is highly unlikely that Daisy lived her life completely isolated from other Aboriginal people. However, this is exactly what is implied by the lack of any reference to Aboriginal friends and Indigenous activities. It is clear that Daisy went to great lengths to ensure that nothing would be recorded that might endanger the family’s exemption status.
Gayndah had an Aboriginal School for its local Aboriginal children for twenty-five years ranging from 1924 to 1949 (Slack, 1997). For reasons unknown, the diaries make no references about this school. It is unknown if the children attending were of exempted adults or adults who had always lived and worked on properties in the area. Although the school was opened when Valma was a student in Gayndah, she did not attend it. Valma boarded through the week whilst attending the State Primary School, yet there is no mention of payment arrangements for this. However, the diaries show that Daisy was in receipt of Child Endowment. It is possible therefore that this income was directed towards the cost of Valma’s board.

Queensland Government records show that in 1941, Daisy was in receipt of child endowment for her four children. The documentation states

Smith is employed by Martin Snelling and Co., as a station hand on a property at Hollywell, via Eidsvold. His wife is receiving the child endowment for her children and is an intelligent person and capable of utilising the endowment to the benefit of her children (Source: QSA - SRS 505/1 Box 414. 1H/62 Administration Child Endowment).

In the government record of Daisy’s child endowment, it is stated that “she was an intelligent person” (as above). The method of government assessment of Daisy’s intelligence and her ability to use the child endowment money for her children’s benefit is unclear. At the same time, Daisy makes no reference in the diaries to receiving Child Endowment.

Yet another area of silence concerns personal ‘feelings’ throughout the diaries. Very little is recorded about Daisy’s emotions however, on a few occasions Daisy does mention her sense of loneliness. Some examples are “Valma went back to school miss her very much. & very lonely out here now” (Monday, 27\textsuperscript{th} July 1942) and “Very lonely” (Monday, 2\textsuperscript{nd} October 1944). A reference to the love shared between Roy and Daisy is illustrated with comments from each. Daisy writes “Very lonely without Dad” (Tuesday, 15\textsuperscript{th} May 1945). Similarly, Roy writes of his loneliness on Daisy’s birthday in 1979. They were married for over fifty years. Four years after her death, Roy was missing his wife and still grieving her loss, when he wrote: “Dear Mum how I Miss you” (Tuesday, 25\textsuperscript{th} September, 1951 in 1979). Roy passed away, exactly five years to the day after Daisy’s death.
The biggest silence of all was that Roy never told his children about his earlier life. However, he wrote in Daisy's 1951 diary as follows:

Left Nanangge in the Month of the end off 1914 went to Ipswich Purga Army Sav. Stad few Month There in 1915 got a Job at Loamside on farm to work for ?? ?? Stephens. Stead with them till Middle of 1918 [sic] (Thursday, 12th July 1979).

Roy’s short message written in 1979 is the only recorded narrative by him in the diaries that relates to his younger years; he died in June 1980. It remains unanswered as to why he only wrote those few short sentences and why did he did not write his life story.

**Understanding of the outside world:**

The participation of the Smith family in community life is well documented. Roy had numerous skills that allowed him to work successfully in various workplaces. He worked on a farm, with cattle and horses, and also as a factory worker. Daisy was also a hard worker. Domestic work in the home was something that Daisy did on a daily basis as stated in the diaries. Both Roy and Daisy were respectable, industrious workers in the community. The harmonious relationship between Roy, Daisy and their four children is noticeably evident through their close communication with each other as viewed by the letters, telegrams and phone calls.

The freedom of life in ‘the outside world’ represented opportunities for them that could be claimed locally, nationally and internationally. The wireless and newspapers brought educational news of current affairs into the Smith home each day. In addition, entertainment such as movies, circuses and Show Day at the Brisbane Exhibition, gives glimpses of the world at large, through scenery, cultures, languages, foods and fashion. The fact that Roy and Daisy entertained people from most walks of life served to give them a greater understanding of the world around them. The diaries reveal that as a family they had an extensive social network and participated in a wide variety of social events and activities.

The extant diaries of Daisy display a sense of citizenship including civil, political and social components. The writings are a testament to the achievements of Roy and Daisy, along with their sons and daughters, in the years of 1942, 1944, 1945, 1947,
1949 and 1951. The diaries continuously demonstrate that the family had an excellent understanding of the outside world. Clearly, their ‘lived experiences’ shared much in common with the majority of other Australian citizens.

The diaries demonstrate that Roy and Daisy lived a fully active life, enjoying the ‘fruits’ of what Queensland society had to offer. They were a well-respected couple who told their children and grandchildren nothing of their Indigenous lives. The conditions of Roy’s exemption effectively required them to erase those memories of their Indigenous heritage and live like ‘ordinary’ Australians, in order to enjoy the rights and freedoms denied to Indigenous Queenslanders still living under the ‘1897 Act’.

Thus, the ‘lived experiences’ of the Smith family have been analysed with Marshall’s theory of citizenship. The six diaries have generated an enormous amount of primary data along with certain secondary data obtained to support the documentation of various historical events that were written in the diaries. In this manner, the supplemented raw data reveals the diversity of the many activities that the Smith family was involved in, as they interacted as citizens within Australian society.

The following chapter will discuss the analysis of the interviews conducted for the thesis.
Endnotes:

1 Daisy Smith’s writing style to difficult to read at times with her constant use of capitals and full stops; not always in the appropriate places.
2 The researcher recalls serials such as: Greenbottle for the young and Blue Hills, Dad and Dave for the older listeners. Downloaded: 12/07/2010. See http://www.folktrax.com/npftrak2/UCM015.php
4 The Brassell Hotel was owned by the Cooper family.
5 Personal communication with Martin Snelling’s daughters in 2008, they told the researcher that their father had leukemia. Martine Snelling was the son-in-law of Mr and Mrs Hillcoat.
6 Mr and Mrs Reginald Hillcoat owned both properties (Boomarra and Teneriffe in Brisbane). Daisy was born at Boomerarra Station in 1900. In her teens, she moved to Toowong then to Teneriffe, suburbs of Brisbane with the Hillcoat family.
7 John Bleakley was the Queensland Chief Protector of Aborigines when Roy applied for this Certificate of Exemption in 1926. It remains unknown as to whether the Protector was present at these afternoon teas. Their obvious friendship with the Bleakleys in the 1940s suggests that Roy and Daisy held no bitterness towards John Bleakley.
8 The relationship between the Smith family and Doug Bleakley continued until Doug’s death in the 1970s. In fact, the researcher remembers meeting Doug on a few occasions during the 1960s at his workplace as a floor walker in the MacDonald & East store in Brisbane.
10 Mr and Mrs Cooper’s grandson Russell Cooper was Premier of Queensland from 1989 – 1989, a period of 73 days. Downloaded: 12/07/2010. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russell_Cooper
11 In 1949 Daisy’s son Mervyn won £5 in a boxing tournament. His prize money brought a 2,400 page Webster dictionary that Daisy often used.
Chapter Four

Interviews –

Lived experiences before exemption, and
Lived experiences after exemption

(1) Lived Experiences before Exemption:

This chapter critically analyses the interviews conducted in the research project based on the lived experiences of exemption for exempted Aboriginal people in regional Queensland. A requirement for the project was that each participant must have been a resident of the Burnett region prior to 1967.¹

The chapter consists of two parts. The first part has four sections: Removals to Settlement and Reserves, the Certificate of Exemption, Knowledge of the Certificate of Exemption, and the Rationale and Process of Gaining an Exemption. The second part has three sections: Civil Rights, Political Rights and Social Rights as described by Marshall’s (1950) three elements of citizenship.

Interviewees:

As mentioned in Chapter One, all interviewees were agreeable to being identified for the purpose of this research. Interviewees were categorised into three different groups: the first group consisted of four exempted Aboriginal people, the second group consisted of three interviewees who are descendants of exempees, and the third group consisted of four non-Indigenous people who had known Aboriginal people living in the community prior to 1967.

First Group

All four exempted Aboriginal people in the first group are Elders and live in Brisbane, where they are involved in the Murri² community. Ruth Hegarty was born in 1929 at Mitchell in south-western Queensland and is a published author³ and activist. Albert Holt was born in 1936 at the Cherbourg settlement and Albert has written an
autobiography. Both Ruth and Albert were retired from work at the time of the interviews. Robert West was born in 1942 at Eidsvold in the Burnett Region and works for an Aboriginal organisation in Brisbane. The fourth is Alexandra (Alex) Gater who was born in 1944 at the Royal Women’s Hospital in Brisbane. She is an ordained Anglican minister and works in the Murri community in Brisbane, where she is an activist.

Second group
Three descendants of exemptees comprised the second group. Gwenneth Hayman was born in 1925 at ‘Hillview’, Ipswich near Brisbane. Gwen is involved in the community as an active member of the Anglican Church and the Queensland Guide Dogs Association. Stanley Smith was born in 1932 at Dalby on the Darling Downs. Stanley is an Elder and actively involved in the Murri community in Brisbane. Both Gwen and Stanley are retired and live in the Redlands District near Brisbane. The third interviewee was Lesley Williams, who was born in 1946 at the Royal Women’s Hospital in Brisbane and works with the Murri community in Brisbane where she is an Elder.

Third Group
The third group comprised four non-Indigenous participants. Rod Lonsdale was born in 1941 at Wondai in the Burnett Region. He is a retired electrician, and lives at Hervey Bay, Queensland. Adrian Harvie was born in 1946 at Biggenden, also in the Burnett Region. Adrian is semi-retired and lives on Bribie Island, Queensland. His mother, Leila Harvie, was born in 1921 at Maryborough, and was interviewed for the research before she passed away on 15 March 2010. Elaine Darling, a retired Federal politician, was born in 1936 in Brisbane. She has strong connections with the Murri community and has researched and written about Brisbane’s Aboriginal community political struggles, 1958-1962 (Darling, 1996 and 1998).6

Removals to Settlements and Reserves:
The legislation authorising the Queensland Government to remove Aboriginal people is found in Section 9 of the 1897 Act (Qld), which states that Aboriginals may be removed to reserves. It resulted in the forced removal of Aboriginal people from their traditional lands and represented a major deprivation of rights, with multiple
adverse repercussions, including the loss of family ties, language, culture, history and traditional lifestyles (see, for example, Blake, 2001; Copland, 2005; Haebich, 2000; Hollinsworth, 2006; and Kidd, 1997).

Cherbourg (formally known as Barambah) was gazetted on 23 February 1901 as an Aboriginal reserve under the 1897 Act. Barambah developed a reputation for housing large numbers of Aboriginal people from many different areas. Evans (2007) verifies this fact when he cites a comment by the Philp ministry, boasting that, no “such collection of aboriginals has ever been brought together in Australia” (2007:140). With so many different tribal groups removed to Cherbourg by government authorities, it is understandable that Blake dubbed the settlement as “a dumping ground” and wrote of the inmates at Cherbourg as the “Barambah Mob – one big tribe” (Blake, 2001:197). This terminology came about because the Cherbourg residents were forced to become a single entity, amalgamated into one community. This is despite the fact that, traditionally, differing tribes would not mix at such close quarters, except for special ceremonial corroborees. Blake observes that ceremonies “were important because they provided a bridge to the past when so many other links had been severed, and helped to forge a common identity among the inmates” (2001:219). At Cherbourg, they all needed to overcome language and cultural differences, in order to function as a cohesive group. Blake cites inmate Hope Neill, who explained that “out of oppression evolved an additional kinship, an additional culture, an additional language” (2001:236).

Alex and Albert each explained the circumstances of their families’ removal to Cherbourg. Alex had family connections which meant that she was kin to many Indigenous groups throughout the state of Queensland. She stated that, “that’s where both of my parents grew up, at Cherbourg” (Gater). Similarly, Albert explained that his family was removed from Springsure in Central Queensland to Cherbourg in 1928. “We were recipients of being forcefully removed and they institutionalised us in – it used to be Barambah then, they changed the name to Cherbourg” (Holt). In his view his parents had “no choice of course because when the Protection of Aborigines Act [sic] was enacted, it gave the police the powers to remove” (Holt). His recollection accords with Haebich’s view that “Aborigines could be deported to reserves and
missions and forcibly and permanently detained, and their freedoms and rights strictly curtailed” (2000:171).

Robert and Ruth were the only interviewees removed as children to Cherbourg. Robert’s family had lived for generations in the same area of Eidsvold, in the Burnett region of Queensland. As a ten year old, Robert, rather than his parents, was removed to Cherbourg in 1952, along with his brothers and sisters. He recalled the official basis of his removal as being that, “they said mum was neglecting us” (West). In Ruth’s situation, on arriving at the settlement from Mitchell, her family was segregated into different dormitories. Ruth explained that, “mum and myself were put into the women’s dormitory – I was six and a half months old” (Hegarty, see also, Hegarty, 1999).

As for the descendants of exempted Aboriginal people, all three respondents spoke of their fathers’ removals from their traditional lands. Both Stanley and Gwen’s fathers were removed as boys in 1914. Ernest, aged 7 years, and Roy, aged 13 years, were removed from Nanango in the Burnett region and transported to the Salvation Army Church mission at Purga, near Ipswich, Queensland. Ernest was later moved to Cherbourg. Stanley recollected that his father “was born at [Nanango]” (Smith). Lesley did not recall the age of her father at the time of his removal, but stated that he “was removed from Mitchell and put on Cherbourg” (Williams). The widespread nature of such child removals in Queensland has been established through historical research (see, for example, Haebich, 2000). Robinson notes that the “separation of Aboriginal children from Aboriginal adults was a central policy of almost all missions in Queensland until well after the Second World War” (2008:125).

Cherbourg, the place to which Aboriginal people were transported from their traditional homelands, had become a unique community (Blake 2001; Bambrick 2008). Both Alex and Albert discussed their grandparents’ relationship with Cherbourg. In regard to her grandparents, Alex explained that, they “were very instrumental when they moved to Cherbourg. It was called Barambah; they helped to clear the land” (Gater). In addition, they were involved in the dormitory system, which was set up for boys, girls and unmarried mothers. Alex recalled that, “my
grandparents became the house parents, the carers for them when their Mums and Dads were sent out to work” (Gater).

Albert recalls when his grandparents, like his parents, were moved from their traditional lands at Springsure. “They were shifted to Barambah in 1922” (Holt). He experienced Cherbourg as a sinister place, as a result of the non-Indigenous staff who worked there and enforced strict rules and regulations. Albert recollected that his childhood in the 1940s was one of fear and control. “Cherbourg to me, when I grew up there, it was just so fearful. The control they had of our lives, they really caused great fear. You didn’t feel safe at any time at all” (Holt).

Each of the interviewees (Alex, Albert, Ruth and Robert) who spent time at Cherbourg had memories of their life there with family and of the non-Indigenous staff members. Albert remembered the

Third world conditions, the bigotry, the misery and suffering. It wasn’t a normal day unless you … living in misery or suffering. There were no services. We had a doctor visit the place once a week and if you got sick on any other day but the day he visited there, that was too bad. There were no dental services (Holt).

In spite of the many negative impressions expressed about Cherbourg, a number of activities gave the place more of a humane overview. For instance, there were all-Aboriginal football and cricket teams which played for Cherbourg, and were well-known in the district (Blake, 2001:179). During the 1950s, Cherbourg also had its own scout group. Rod commented that, “Mr O’Chin was the scout master and group leader. I was involved in Scouts from the 1970s onwards, but there were no Cherbourg people (scouts) then” (Lonsdale).

From the 1950s, the interviewees enjoyed entertainment in the form of dances and movies, held for the inmates and staff. Alex referred to the segregation in the hall, and she explained that they “were segregated in the community hall, this is where you had all the different activities, the social gatherings there and you had the pictures” (Gater). She recalled that they “weren’t allowed to go anywhere near where … the white officials, where members of their families lived. So the only time Aboriginal people went there was when they had to go to work” (Gater). These examples of
segregation, discrimination and authoritarianism served to reinforce racist attitudes that were common at the time. This kind of treatment, along with the many restrictive living conditions experienced by those living ‘under the Act’, no doubt prompted many Aboriginal people to seek their exemption certificates.

**Working at Cherbourg**

The daily running of Cherbourg until 1965 was carried out by the Superintendent with his officials and staff (Blake, 2001). Labour was provided largely by the inmates who were forced to carry out daily chores, or suffer the consequences. Both Albert and Robert affirmed this, as both worked as children at Cherbourg for little money and long hours in menial tasks. Albert discussed the strict discipline under which he worked, although he failed to mention details about the nature of his work. Albert recalled the pay he received

> Yes. I remember when I started off in the mission, 80 hours a fortnight; we used to get paid two shillings, which is 20 cents. Then after a year they raised it five shillings and six pence, which took our pay up to seven shillings and six pence. That was 75 cents that was after the second year (Holt).

Robert recollected his childhood work of getting the milk for the Superintendent each morning, which was a job for someone from the boy’s dormitory. He described that he “actually started about 15. I suppose, getting milk for the Superintendent, but he was only giving me four bob a fortnight, but that wasn’t a job” (West).

Ruth’s description of her early years of working at Cherbourg was typical of the work carried out by other interviewees such as Alex, Albert, Robert and Lesley. As Ruth grew up the work in the dormitories became harder, but there was no talk of payment for her labour. Both Alex and Robert also began their working lives at Cherbourg. Alex’s first work experience was as nurse’s aide at the Cherbourg Hospital in the nurses quarters (Gater). Robert recalled his first job in 1959, because it was at the Cherbourg “farm” (West).

Two interview respondents, Lesley and Alex, were born in Brisbane but were raised by their extended families at Cherbourg. Both of their mothers engaged in paid employment, because there was no government support in the form of child
endowment or child support. Lesley recalled that: “there weren’t any pensions around then [or] family allowances” (Williams).

Work Agreements

Since the 1990s, it has been revealed that for many decades, Aboriginal people living on settlements and missions were significantly defrauded of their wages by the Queensland government. Kidd (1997) argues this very point with her work on the stolen wages debate. The ‘Stolen Wages’ movement has been actively demanding reparation for its workers from the state government. This historical background relates to a time when Queensland’s Aboriginal people were forced to work on Work Agreements for little\(^{15}\) or no wages (see Appendix C; and for example, Kidd, 2006).

Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement was set up to train young Aboriginal girls for domestic work and Aboriginal boys for station work (Hegarty, 1999). Lesley recalls that when we were going to primary school, the emphasis was just to give us limited, just a basic education; but we were actually trained then to become [servants], so that we’d be contracted out, to go out and work as domestics (Williams).

This experience of inferior educational opportunities and facilities at Cherbourg State School accords with research into its history (see, for example, Sarra, 2008) and is indicative of a denial of the civil right of citizenship relating to education (Marshall, 1950:8).

As these girls and boys got older they were sent out on Work Agreements, organised by the Chief Protector's office of the Native Affairs Department and the Superintendent at Cherbourg. However, Lesley Williams wanted to find out “what happened to money earned by Aboriginal workers ‘but never paid’” (cited in Kidd, 2006:16). The common experience of the interviewees was that they were ill-informed about arrangements for payment of their wages, which left them open to exploitation. Blake argues that the “removal process played a critical role in maintaining a servile Aboriginal labour force. Aborigines played a vital role in the development of the pastoral industry in Queensland” (2001:42). All the Cherbourg interviewees placed a large emphasis on employment and lack of wages.
When discussing the issue of employment of Aboriginal people, both Leila and Adrian recalled the same memories. They provided similar details about their mother/grandmother having (female) domestic workers from Cherbourg during the 1950s. This employment of a ‘domestic’ could have been a Work Agreement. Leila commented that, “these girls used to go to Mum’s and they used to scrub the veranda and that’s about all (L. Harvie). Adrian also recollected that as a child he “can remember [his grandmother] having maids from the Cherbourg settlement” (A. Harvie).

All four of the interviewees from Cherbourg discussed Work Agreements. Lesley and Ruth told about being sent out on a Work Agreement when they were still in their teens. When Ruth was fourteen years old she was sent out on her first Work Agreement contract for domestic work, and she had more contracts over the next seven years. Ruth recalled that her mother Ruby was also employed as a domestic, being paid poor wages under Work Agreement contracts. Ruth explained that her mother “was paying a certain amount of her money towards my support and towards the community support. She got very little of what was coming to her” (Hegarty). Shortly after Lesley turned seventeen years of age, she was sent out on a twelve-month Work Agreement contract, to work on a property at Condamine on the Western Downs in Queensland. She explained that she “went out there to do all the housework, cooking etc. No one told how much money you were going to be earning” (Williams). Lesley’s next work contract was at Taroom, where she went with another girl from Cherbourg. Again, she worked long hours as a domestic. In reference to wages, she reported that she “worked for what money that I was given, like pocket money. I had no idea because we weren’t even told how much our wages was going to be” (Williams). Albert expressed the same view as Lesley when discussing their wages. He stated that, “you didn’t know the full amount. It was a done deal between the Superintendent they called him, and any person that wanted Aboriginal domestic workers” [sic] (2008). Robert was employed as a stockman on Work Agreements organised from Cherbourg. In regard to payment of wages, Robert affirmed

I had the same sort of good boss too, but they were required to take our money off us and send it to the mission. They were under the law to do that type of thing, but yeah, so I thought I’d make that point (West).
Although Albert worked at Cherbourg itself, he also went to work at Foleyvale (north of Woorabinda) which was part of Cherbourg’s properties. He recalled that, “Foleyvale was being developed as a future cattle property” (Holt, 2001:88). It is unclear if he was on a Work Agreement contract on that occasion.

**The Certificate of Exemption:**

In Queensland, the basis for exemption from the 1897 Act is contained in Clause 33 of the Act. Queensland’s Aboriginal people living on state settlements and church missions, as well as those living on rural properties, could apply for a Certificate of Exemption. During the first 42-year period, only ‘half-caste’ Aborigines could be exempted from the 1897 Act, and exemptions for other Aborigines were not available until the implementation of the amended Act in 1939. Both the Torres Strait Islanders Act, 1939 (Qld) and the Aboriginals Preservation and Protection Act, 1939-45 (Qld) amended the 1897 Act. Donovan points out that under “the 1939 Act, the Director retained the right to grant exemptions for an Aboriginal ‘who in his opinion, ought no longer to be subject to this Act’, but there were provisos to this” (Donovan, 2002:159).

One of the major ‘provisos’ mentioned by Donovan (2002) is that the “Director may at any time revoke any exemption, and thereupon the provisions of this Act shall apply to such aboriginal as if no exemption had ever been granted” (Aboriginals Preservation and Protection Act, 1939, part 2, ss.5(3) and (4)). Gaining an exemption certificate meant that Indigenous people could legally live outside the 1897 Act’s provisions as free citizens in the broader Australian society. That is, technically they could enjoy the civil, political and social aspects of citizenship (Marshall, 1950).

*The Aborigines’ and Torres Strait Islanders’ Act, 1965 (Qld)* finally repealed the repressive laws of the 1897 Act. In addition, the new Act of 1965 saw an ending to the exemption system, although it took another two years to cease its operations, with the last known exemption being granted on 13 March 1967 (Wickes, 2006). After the implementation of the new Act of 1965, Indigenous Queenslanders living on state settlements or on church missions gained autonomy for the first time in their lives. However, this was to be short-lived, as Chesterman and Galligan (1999) argue that even “more intrusive regulations were gazetted in Queensland the year after the 1965
legislation was enacted (1999:158). For example, the government introduced a requirement for Indigenous people living on communities to apply for residency (see Appendix C.) If this was unsuccessful the applicant then had to leave the Aboriginal community. In the case of an applicant later wanting to return as a resident, they had to gain approval first (QPP – Annual Report of Director of Native Affairs, 1965). Therefore, government policy moved from one form of control to another.

The 1897 Act and subsequent amendments controlled the lives of Queensland’s Indigenous population for a period of sixty-eight years. During those years that the Queensland exemption system was in operation, 4,092 exemptions were granted to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (Wickes, 2006). Since Wickes’s (2006) research was carried out, further searches have located Annual Reports dating from 1899 to 1907 not previously accessed by the researcher. Consequently, these Reports reveal that another sixteen exemptions were granted. The 1902 Annual Report of the Northern Protector of Aboriginals disclosed that the first recorded exemption was given to a female. The Report states that, “the first Certificate of Exemption to be granted has been issued to Annie Scott, of Canobie Station on the recommendation of the local Protector, Inspector Galbraith” (QPP – Annual Report of Northern Protector, 1902:2). The research also reveals that an unknown number of exemption certificates were issued that do not appear in the official Exemption Ledger.

**Knowledge about the Certificate of Exemption**

The interviewees displayed varying levels of knowledge about the exemption. A few were unaware that the Certificate of Exemption was a requirement for Aboriginal people who wanted to live in Queensland’s wider community prior to 1967. Indeed, no interviewee in the research group expressed a complete knowledge of the Certificate of Exemption.

Albert expressed the view that the certificate was ineffectual, stating that, “it wasn’t worth the paper it was written on because at any time at all, if you got into trouble, you’d have that certificate revoked and slammed back into the mission” (Holt). Robert commented about who could gain the exemption, saying that the “certificate was I suppose just for individuals at that time there, but I think families who did move, I think some of them were the whole families, were given exemptions” (West).
In Robert’s view eligibility for exemption was related to employment and he thought that it “was mainly given on what sort of worker you was, what sort of a person that you was in the community and all that” (West). This was in accord with his own experience of gaining the exemption and a description of himself as “an industrious, hardworking person” (West). These are qualities referred to on Robert’s original exemption application form.

One interviewee explained that gaining a Certificate of Exemption could be difficult, because it included many conditions. Stanley recalled that he knew a person who had applied unsuccessfully on three separate occasions before he was finally exempted. The government officials removed the applicant from Cherbourg to Purga, and finally to Myora before he gained his exemption. Even the Native Affairs Department required that the individual concerned had secured employment as a condition of his exemption, prior to it being granted. Stanley knew of other rules and regulations relating to the exemption, namely the requirements for weekly police contact. He recalled that the person concerned “also had to promise not to associate with other Aboriginal people and to behave himself. It was written out like that” (Smith).

Ruth explained about gaining her exemption certificate in the 1960s. In Ruth’s case, officials apparently prepared the exemption paperwork without her knowledge or consent. She stated that she “knew nothing about exemptions” (Hegarty). When Gwen was questioned about her knowledge of her father’s exemption certificate, she simply recalled the fact that it meant “he was free to go anywhere and do what he wanted” (Hayman). Alex also commented on the new found freedom afforded by the exemption and thought “that [it] gave us rights, freedom” (Gater). Furthermore, Alex described what the certificate had given Aboriginal people and herself and said that it gave “me the freedom to help others, and to let them know that there is hope, and not to give up hope. The certificate, yeah, gave a lot of Aboriginal people that freedom” (Gater).

The common thread of ‘freedom’ in the comments of Gwen and Alex is also evident in the description that the Queensland Aboriginal activist and author, Marnie Kennedy, (1985) wrote, about the meaning to her of gaining an exemption. Marnie
stated that being “free was like giving us something we never had before. We were told we could go anywhere and do anything we liked, provided it was within the law” (1985:25). Kennedy’s words on freedom resonate clearly with both Gwen and Alex’s answers about the exemption. Similarly, one of Albert’s sisters, Rita Huggins, emphasised the sense of freedom resulting from her exemption in her autobiography. “I did receive my exemption papers, and then I was free to leave and travel wherever I wanted to go” (1994:44).

In her interview, Elaine remembered Aboriginal children attending her primary school on Brisbane’s southside26 during the 1940s and early 1950s. She stated that she “had friends at school, out in a southside Brisbane school, who were Aboriginal people and maybe some Islander people too” (Darling). It was only during the current research that Elaine realised those children would have been either children of exempted Aboriginal people, or perhaps children of Aboriginal absconders.27

Both respondents Rod and Adrian knew of exempted Aboriginal people in the Burnett region. Rod knew of an Aboriginal woman who lived in the district, but stated that he “wasn’t aware even then of a Certificate of Exemption. All I know is she lived just on the outskirts of town with her kids” (Lonsdale). Rod also remembered an Aboriginal man who used to come to town, “once a month or something and get his car serviced. I knew he was – well, I assumed he had a Certificate of Exemption” (Lonsdale). Another interviewee, Adrian recalls befriending an Aboriginal fellow “whom [he] was pretty good mates with” when he worked on a property out at Bindoon (A. Harvie). He described the relationship as one where, “in our younger teens, in our 16, 17 years we’d sort of run into each other at dances and that sort of stuff” (A. Harvie). Adrian also knew of two Aboriginal women living in the community with their families. He remarked that “there was a lady there, a Mrs [name withheld] and I knew a lot more about her because she used to bank with us [where I worked] at Proston” (A. Harvie). Both Rod and Adrian would have been unaware that, prior to 1967, most Aboriginal people living in the community would have had a Certificate of Exemption.

The rationale and process of gaining an exemption
Blake comments on the exemption as a reward, when he writes that, “there was one incentive for workers to give faithful and diligent service – exemption from the Act”
Albert was born and raised on Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement. In his teens, Albert was sent to Woorabinda to work, possibly on a Work Agreement. He absconded from Woorabinda in the 1950s and lived without an exemption certificate. This was considered an offence under the *Aboriginals Preservation and Protection Act*, 1939. Albert recalled that at “Woorabinda, they had a system there if you broke any rules and regulations, 90 days in prison” (Holt). Albert then spent many years living in the community ‘looking over his shoulder’ as an absconder. His sister constantly reminded him of the trouble he would continue to experience, including being returned to a reserve, if he could not produce a Certificate of Exemption on demand. Consequently, in 1956, Albert finally agreed to his sister organising an appointment for him with Cornelius O’Leary, Director of Native Affairs, at his Brisbane office. Albert recalled that the interview lasted about thirty minutes, during which time the Director asked what Albert thought were “personal and stupid” questions, before granting the exemption (Holt).

Both Ruth and her mother Ruby Duncan gained an exemption, albeit in different situations. In recalling how Ruby became exempted, Ruth mentioned that she applied for the exemption once her daughter (Ruth) turned 14 and was sent out to work, since she felt that she was not being treated fairly (Hegarty). Not only was Ruth an exemptee, she was also the daughter of an exempted woman. Similarly, Robert was both an exemptee as well as the descendant of an exempted man, because his father George West gained his exemption when he was at Cherbourg in 1919.

When Robert was a teenager, he had absconded to Brisbane from Cherbourg; on his return he was sent out to his father. Robert recalled gaining his exemption at Cherbourg when he was approximately nineteen years old, so that he could go out to work. “I wanted to be a working person; I just wanted to get out of the mission, to make good money” and “I just wanted to get out and I did” (West). It was his work manager who instigated the exemption process, which was seemingly straightforward. “I think it was about ‘62 I think when I got my exemption and I had no trouble
obtaining it. The manager took me in to see Mr. Sturgess\(^{29}\) and he asked whether there’s an exemption for me, and then I got it” (West).

Both Albert and Robert were absconders, however, only Robert was captured. The Cherbourg superintendent, Mr Sturgess, sent him to work with his father at Auburn Station.\(^{30}\) Albert absconded from Woorabinda and remained at large until he eventually gained his exemption many years later. Stanley recalled the response of the Cherbourg staff when any of the inmates absconded. He stated that, “Aboriginal people would run away from Cherbourg and they would get down here [Brisbane] and they would send the native police down to take them back” (Smith).\(^{31}\)

Ruth was born at the Mitchell hospital,\(^{32}\) during the Depression. Later, Ruth and her family moved to Cherbourg, as a result of the Depression, believing that their life would be better. That was not to be the case; Ruth was sent to the dormitories where she lived and worked until she was married (Hegarty, 1999:131). The exemption issue was sometimes mixed with hurt, as in the time she eventually read her own departmental files.\(^{33}\) Ruth recalled that she didn’t ask for the exemption. 1955, after I got married, they decided it was time for us to leave. So they began to get the paperwork ready for us. It was 1966 that we decided to leave (Hegarty).

Albert, Robert and Ruth had all been residents of Cherbourg in the past. Each gained their exemption in different ways, yet the outcome was the same.

Although being born in Brisbane, Alex spent much of her young life at Cherbourg with extended family members. At the age of sixteen she left Cherbourg to go to live with her mother in Brisbane, but she was required to sign a document first. It is not clear if this was a Certificate of Exemption or, more probably, a permit pass to move to Brisbane. She recalled that she thought “it may have been in the late ‘60s when I had to sign a paper to say I was leaving Cherbourg to live in Brisbane with my mother” (Gater). Alex found out about the exemption, through being informed by the staff at Cherbourg. She stated that, “when we left Cherbourg, they let the residents know what they had to do to be exempt and to go out and find work and accommodation” (Gater). When asked whether the information included a notice
about the exemptions, Alex replied that “it was put up in the manager’s office and also the Department of Native Affairs (DNA) here in Brisbane as well” (Gater).

Many of Alex’s family members gained their Certificate of Exemption, leaving Cherbourg behind them. One of her aunts told Alex about her reaction to gaining the certificate and stated that, “when she left the Native Affairs Department in George Street, Brisbane, she walked around the corner, and then she tore it up into little pieces and she just threw it” (Gater). Ruth remarked that they “talk about this dog tag and all the rest of it” (Hegarty). A strong negative sentiment felt by Aboriginal people regarding the Certificate of Exemption is apparent by the use of derogatory terms such as ‘dog tags’ and ‘dog licences’. These references have been noted elsewhere (See Aberdeen, 2002; Clark, 2008; Haebich, 2008; Hollinsworth, 2006; Read, 1999).

The remaining Aboriginal interviewees (Gwen, Stanley and Lesley) were children of an exempted Aboriginal parent, and each identified differently. The year after her birth in 1925, Gwen’s father was exempted. This automatically meant that her mother was also exempted, because she was married to a man deemed to be ‘not aboriginal’ under Section 10 of the 1897 Act. Gwen’s father never talked directly about the Certificate of Exemption and told her “nothing about it” (Hayman). Stanley was born at Dalby where his family was living at the time. Stanley recalled that his father Ernest was removed to Cherbourg from Purga with other family members in the 1920s. Ernest was an exempted man before he was married to Celia, herself the daughter of an exempted man. Stanley recalled that his father “was able to get his exemption from there [Cherbourg]” (Smith). Like Gwen’s father, Stanley’s father did not speak about the past to his family. “No, he never spoke about his life” (Smith).

The processes by which the parents of Lesley Williams gained their exemptions indicate the use of marriage requirements as a qualifying requirement. Before a couple could marry they had to apply to the Chief Protector of Aborigines for permission (Gater). Lesley described the procedure

Once that was granted they could then apply for their exemptions and it was a matter of filling an application in. They didn’t have to fill the application in; it was done by the white official (Williams).
Many exemptees gained their Certificate of Exemption after the application form was filled in by a third party, usually a non-Indigenous government official.

Both Lesley and Alex’s fathers served in the Armed Forces during the Second World War. As returned soldiers they were entitled to an exemption. Lesley recalled that for her father “that was his way of getting out from under the Act, he joined the army and fought in the Second World War” (Williams). Alex also spoke of her father joining the Armed Forces, saying that “my father, he joined the Army when he was 18 at Toowoomba” (Gater). Both fathers found a way of escaping the living conditions of being under the Act by joining the army and in doing so qualified for a Certificate of Exemption (Kidd, 1997). Each of the Aboriginal interviewees spoke about the Certificate of Exemption from either their own life experience or that of their parent’s exemption. The main reason for gaining the exemption was to live their own life whatever way they chose, and not live under the 1897 Act anymore. That is, the desire to attain the civil, political and social rights of citizenship (Marshall, 1950).
(2) Lived Experiences after Exemption:

This part of the chapter critically analyses the interview data generated by the people interviewed about the lived experiences of citizenship of exempted Aboriginal people in the South Burnett area of regional Queensland. In their political and institutional account of Indigenous Australian and Australian citizenship, Chesterman and Galligan argue that “Aborigines have been specifically excluded from certain rights in all three of Marshall’s categories” (1997:5). Their own analysis, however, does not address ‘the less formal and cultural aspects of citizenship and community structures’ (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997:5) preferring as they do to leave that for Indigenous researchers to explore. Following this, the interview findings presented here are analysed according to the three elements of modern democratic citizenship, developed by Marshall (1950) of civil, political and social.

The interviewees are the same individuals referred to in the Part 1 of this chapter. For the purposes of analysis, they have again been categorised into three groups. The first group consists of four exempted Aboriginal people, the second group consists of three interviewees who are descendants of exempees, and the third group consists of four non-Indigenous people. The single criterion for their selection was that each participant had to have been a resident of the Burnett region prior to 1967.

Civil Rights:

Civil element is composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom-liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts and the right to justice (Marshall, 1950:8)

Throughout most of the twentieth century, many citizenship rights were denied to Aboriginal people who were living under the Act on government settlements and church missions in Queensland (see Chesterman and Galligan, 1997). Elements stemming from these denied civil rights are discussed below.
Freedom

As has been highlighted previously, the possession most treasured by Aboriginal interviewees was their ‘freedom’. Most exemptees believed that once they were exempted they would be free citizens, living within Australian society and enjoying the same civil rights and privileges as other Australians.

The issue of freedom was valued and portrayed in many different ways by the interviewees. Ruth understood the term freedom as being in thought and ‘mindset’. Ruth explained it in the following way:

I don’t know. I don’t know. Freedom is in the mind. We felt free. We felt free when we moved away from there, and it wasn’t the exemption that gave us that freedom. It was a mindset and once you get over that factor you’re able to live your life” (Hegarty).

Lesley also told of being free. She recalled the excitement around her as a result of the 1967 Referendum, “they said we are now free and I said what do you mean free?” (Williams). Alex referred to freedom as, “[f]ree from the act, free from that control” (Gater). She described the oppression of living under the Act. For Alex, gaining the exemption was a means to move away from the many controlling rules that were enforced at Cherbourg

I felt about, you know that we were free; we were free from the system. Free because I guess our lives were controlled, and our freedoms, rights, and identities taken from us, and we had to go and get permits to get married. Not only get permission from your parents, but from the Superintendent, permission to marry. Permission to leave, to go from Cherbourg to Brisbane, travel by train. And you had to write a letter to take to the native affairs, and the permit system, getting permission to go into Murgon to shop (Gater).

Robert also discussed the sense of freedom he felt after gaining his exemption, admitting that he had not really thought about it for quite a while. However, he still thought about the time when Cherbourg residents were sent out on Work Agreements, to new employment each time. Robert felt that he was very lucky to have been sent back home, to his family and traditional homelands. He recalled that, “I stayed then I had my Dad and uncle and them with me I was really at home all the time” (West). Robert explained what the exemption meant to him, “I suppose the only thing that I got from it I knew I wasn’t under the mission anymore, I wasn’t under the act and that
was it” (West). So, for Robert, it is clear that the main benefit of being exempted was the sense of freedom from being under the 1897 Act.

Gwen spoke of freedom in relation to her exempted father, “[j]ust that he was free to go anywhere and do what he wanted” (Hayman). Freedom and self-determination were highly valued by other exempted Aboriginal people living in the Australian community. Rita Huggins, for example, has written that after she received her exemption papers in 1946, she ‘was free to leave and travel wherever [she] wanted to go” (1994:44).

**Business/Property Ownership**

Marshall’s civil aspect of citizenship includes “the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts” (1950:8). Therefore, as citizens, those exempted Aboriginal people could freely go into business if they chose.

Three interviewees recalled enjoyment of this citizenship right in terms of Aboriginal business ventures. Each had either had a family member who owned a business or they knew someone who had owned a business. Stanley spoke about his grandmother’s laundry business in Dalby on the Darling Downs. He was aware that, prior to 1967, it was rare for an Aboriginal man to own a business, let alone a woman, especially as early as the 1920s (Smith). He recalled that,

> she was the only Aboriginal person that runned her own business, had the Lilly White Laundry. Yeah, for an Aboriginal person to have a business then, they weren’t really allowed to own businesses (Smith).

Celia Smith, in her biography, discusses the laundry business owned by her mother, Dolly Hatton. The laundry was called “Madam Hatton’s Lilly White Laundry” (Bell, 1997:7). The laundry operated from about 1927 to 1935. Celia married Ernie Smith and “they moved to Toowoomba with the rest of Celia’s family” (Bell, 1997:8).

Alex’s father had his own land clearing business which involved cutting down trees and clearing the land for future residents in western Queensland. It was Alex’s paternal grandfather, a non-Indigenous man, who supplied his forty-year old son with an axe to start his own business as a builder. Alex’s father built his business up to a point where people in western Queensland would say, “work for me” (Gator). Alex
recollects that, “they’d clear the land for people”, and “[s]o they were good workers, they were hard workers; they were clean workers” (Gater). Enjoyment of the freedom to operate a business enterprise on the land was part of this Aboriginal man’s newfound civil rights.

Adrian, one of the non-Indigenous interviewees, was born in 1946 at Biggenden. A few years later his family moved to Proston in the Burnett Region. He remembered an Aboriginal woman who owned and operated a successful mixed business at Proston, in the Burnett region, during the early 1960s. Adrian also recalled that, “[s]he was quite a proud person and her shop was always immaculate when you drove past in the school bus and saw the house” (A. Harvie). Each of these three business-owning exemptees was living in the community prior to 1967. They each demonstrated that they were capable of running flourishing commercial enterprises and demonstrated personally their capacity to manage their own affairs required by the conditions of exemption.

Exempted Aboriginal people were able to exercise the civil dimension of citizenship (Marshall, 1950:13) by purchasing property including their own homes. This was in contrast to most Aboriginal people in Queensland prior to 1976, who lacked the capacity to enjoy home ownership because of the practice of the Native Affairs Department’s retention of the wages of Aboriginal workers on Work Agreement under the 1897 Act (Kidd, 2006). Exempted people were not subject to these restrictions and were entitled technically to assistance from the fund into which Aboriginal wages were paid, the Aboriginal Welfare Fund. Kidd explains that in “the mid-1950s the government conceded that Aboriginals exempted from its control had a valid claim for assistance from the Welfare Fund” (2006:139, but see also Blake, 2001; Hollinsworth, 2006; May, 1994). The economic benefits of this were evident in the interviewees’ lived experiences.

Albert, for example, purchased his home in the 1960s when he was still a ‘working-class’ man. He planned for his home to be an inheritance for his children in the future, which is something that he was denied because his parents “had nothing” (Holt). Albert reflected that, “[w]e never ever thought we’d own something, having a roof over our heads. We were successful, I suppose, in being able to buy the place”
For many of the Aboriginal interviewees’ home ownership (post 1967) was a desired outcome, after paying rent for decades on a house from the Queensland Housing Commission or having come direct from settlements or missions. Alex Gater described her mother’s circumstance

So then they were able to buy their own home, and they own the house. That’s what I found with a lot of Aboriginal people today, they own their own homes, and they worked hard (Gater).

Alex stated that, “I own my home today” (Gater). Another interviewee, Lesley, explained that her mother “bought this house she lived there for about 30 odd years, 40 odd years” (Williams).

**Faith and Church**

The notions of faith and church in people’s lives can be viewed as a civil aspect of citizenship (Marshall, 1950:13). Some of the interviewees discussed the issue of faith and church in their lives. For instance, Gwen spoke of her long involvement with the local church: “I’m also a member of St Paul’s Anglican Church. I’ve been with their Guild, since 1961” (Hayman). As mentioned in the previous chapter, Adrian explained his grandmother’s role in hiring Aboriginal girls as domestics from Cherbourg. He recalled that, “she was a very staunch Methodist and probably thought she was helping and used to pass on the Lord’s praises” (A. Harvie).

Many of the interviewees considered their religious views as personal and private, and were thus reluctant to talk about such matters. However, Alex, Ruth, Robert and Albert chose to speak about the role their Christian faith and the Church had played in their lives. These four respondents had all been inmates at Cherbourg settlement, where they explained church attendance was mandatory, even for youngsters. Their comments concerning the Church were somewhat mixed. Both Alex and Ruth related their experiences of the Church in an affirmative way. In their youth, they attended the AIM (Aboriginal Inland Mission) church at Cherbourg and as adults they continued to be associated with the Church and its teachings. Ruth explained that, “I was involved with the church up in Cherbourg” (Hegarty). However, Alex had an even stronger relationship with her faith and the Church. She commented that, “I was influenced, I grew up and I was surrounded by good strong Aboriginal people, men and women, and who went to church, and what they instilled in us, just in the love of
God” (Gater). Over the years, Alex built on her strong religious values and continued to work within the Church community, eventually becoming an ordained Anglican Minister.

On the other hand, Robert was forced to attend church as a child and he became ambivalent towards religion in general. He stated that, “[i]n Cherbourg we were like in the dormitories, we were made to go to church” (West). In her book, *Bittersweet*, Hegarty also refers to the church’s negative influences on Aboriginal culture, language and dance, stating that, “[u]nfortunately, Church membership removed Aboriginal Christians from the importance of performing corroborees – the dances were considered evil by the missionaries. Many will blame the Church for their intrusion” (2003:109-110).

Unlike the other interviewees, Albert expressed strong negative views about the doctrines of the Christian Church. “It was just about brainwashing you and trying to change your religious beliefs that were put there by your ancestors” (Holt). Albert explained, “I suppose one of the worst things I ever felt; it was pretty humiliating and all that, was the fact that we had to feel inferior” (Holt). In his youth, Albert’s mother exerted a strong influence on him, and he recalled that, “[m]um used to more or less encourage us to go to Sunday school and that sort of thing” (Holt). In later years, Albert found that the three different churches and their teachings at Cherbourg left him with a sense of discomfort.

**The Court System**

Another part of the civil aspect of citizenship relates to interactions with institutions such as the justice system (Marshall, 1950:8). Three respondents, Stanley, Albert and Elaine, spoke about the court system and Aboriginal people. Stanley discussed discrimination and its effect on how the court system dealt with Aboriginal people. He mentioned as an example that the periods of incarceration for prisoners differed for Aboriginal people, when compared with non-Indigenous offenders. Stanley stated that, “my dealings with the prison visits and whatever the black people get stiffer sentences than the white ones. Yeah but that’s but I think that’s always been the way really” (Smith). It was clearly evident that Stanley believed the Australian court system discriminated against Aboriginal people on the basis of race. This observation
and the historic criminalisation of Indigenous Australians more generally has been borne out by The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (RCIADIC) (1991) amongst other sources (see, for example, Behrendt, Cunneen & Libesman, 2008).

Albert surprised himself in his later years by becoming involved with the Magistrates in the Murri Court, as an employee of the Queensland Police Service. He never expected to be working in that area, but admitted that, “it’s not only a state thing but now I’m on the national advisory bodies as well as state bodies, and I never thought I had that” (Holt).

Elaine mentioned the Courts in relation to her knowledge of the work of community activist, Joyce Wilding, and her care and support for homeless Aboriginal children in Brisbane (Darling). On many occasions, Joyce attended the Courts to support these children and to see that they got justice. Elaine recalled that, “she was always going to the courts. She wasn’t a solicitor but she made contact with police and built up a bond” (Darling). It is clear that Elaine was impressed by the efforts Joyce Wilding was making on behalf of homeless Aboriginal children. That is, Joyce Wilding actively promoted the civil rights of citizenship (Marshall, 1950) for Aboriginal children.

**Political Rights:**

By the political element I mean the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body. The corresponding institutions are parliament and councils of local government (Marshall, 1950:8).

It is the general view that the 1967 Referendum was also the time when Aboriginal people were given the right to vote. Hollinsworth reminds us that, the “[r]eferendum is often wrongly remembered as giving indigenous Australians citizenship or the vote” (Hollinsworth, 2006:138). Reid (2004) relates how the Queensland State government previously formed its own committee to inquire into voting rights for Aboriginal people in 1962. Then in 1965, the Queensland Government finally extended the right to enroll on the State’s electoral rolls to all Aboriginal and Torres
Strait Islander residents (Reid, 2004:77). Furthermore, Reid states that enrolment “was to be voluntary until 1971, when the electoral act was amended again (although once they were enrolled, voting was compulsory)” (2004:77). For Aboriginal people exempted prior to this, the right to vote would have been an important political right of citizenship (Marshall, 1950:9).

**Voting**

Voting is a political right and privilege for all current Australian citizens who are of voting age. Technically, Queensland’s Indigenous population who were exempted from the 1897 Act had been enfranchised in both State and Federal elections. That is, exempted Indigenous people could vote. However, the history of the Indigenous vote in Australia is extremely ambiguous, with different Federal and state laws existing, and varying interpretations of those laws over time (Reid, 2004). Many exempted Aboriginal Queenslanders though who managed to get their names on an electoral role could, and did vote. In the pamphlet titled, *History of the Indigenous Vote*, it states that “Electoral officials had the power to decide who was an ‘aboriginal native’ and who was not” (Australian Electoral Commission document, 2006:5).

Respondents Gwen, Ruth and Stanley viewed voting as a right and responsibility. When Gwen was asked if her parents voted in both State and Federal elections, she replied, “Yes. As far as I’m aware yes” (Hayman). When asked if she herself had voted, she stated, “Yes I’ve never been knocked back in voting” (Hayman). Both Ruth and her husband Joe, not only joined the Labor Party on leaving Cherbourg in 1966, but they have voted Labor in every election since. Ruth explained her belief in the importance of voting and how she and Joe encouraged each of their children to vote. She recalled, “[d]on’t complain about what the country’s doing if you haven’t voted. I used to tell them that” (Hegarty). Stanley recalled that he had voted in the elections and explained that those who were under the Act were not allowed to vote. However, those who were not under the Act were “classed as either a white person or just sort of got under the radar”, and Stanley also commented you “just voted” (Smith).

Interestingly, of the interviewees, those who did not vote prior to the 1967 Referendum were the ex-Cherbourg residents, Alex, Lesley, Robert and Albert, who
all left exercising their right to vote until much later. It was during the 1980s when
Alex first voted. At some point, officials visited Cherbourg and required all residents
aged 18 years and over to register to vote,

it would have been later I think, in the ‘80s I think. About the ‘80s I
think when I first started voting. I can remember people coming to
Cherbourg, this was about, when they did the [census], we all had to sign
papers, do up a little history” (Gater).

Voting was something of a mystery to Lesley, even after the 1967 Referendum. She
did not vote until sometime later. She discussed the issue of voting for Aboriginal
people who were inmates of a settlement, where in her view every aspect of life was
controlled and it was just a matter of surviving. With limited education and political
knowledge, voting was seemingly not a priority to inmates, it “was not as though we
rushed out to fill in a bloody voting form. I had no idea voting or elections were like”
(Williams). Robert spoke about his first experience with voting when he stated,
“[v]oting was something I never really worried about” and that it was “until I was
probably well into my 40s that I actually started voting” (West). When asked if he
had voted once he had gained the exemption certificate, Albert commented that he did
not vote until after the 1967 Referendum, “No. ’67 it would be on – when the
referendum in ’67 kicked in” (Holt).

The non-Indigenous group of interviewees, Adrian, Rod and Leila were each asked
about their knowledge concerning Aboriginal people voting. For Adrian, the subject
of voting when he lived in Murgon was something that he was too young to
remember. He recalled that, “I really could not answer that, because I don’t even
know whether they were allowed to vote at that – when they were accepted to vote”
(A. Harvie). Rod remembered befriending a few exempted Aboriginal people in the
Burnett region prior to 1967, but had no knowledge about whether or not they voted.
Another interviewee, Leila, spoke about not knowing any Aboriginal people and
therefore she didn’t know if they voted. She said that, “I wasn’t ever involved with
Aborigines” (L. Harvie).
Political Affiliations

Political affiliations are a basic right of citizenship (Marshall, 1950:8). Some Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander people during the 1950s and 1960s had associations with politicians, who supported their struggles for political rights. One such man was Elaine’s father (Jack Melloy), who, served as a MLA for Nudgee (1960-1977) when the Labor Party was in opposition. Elaine referred to the fact that, Stan McBride “used to work with my dad” (Darling). Stan (Lamby) McBride was an Aboriginal man and member of the Federal Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders (FCAATSI). Elaine also indicated that there were many Aboriginal people who were members of the Labor Party at the local branches (Darling).

In her interview, Ruth spoke of the political ties she shared with her husband Joe, and how members of their family all voted with similar sentiments. She pointed out that, “[w]e joined the Labor Party. We got onto that straight away” (Hegarty). As mentioned earlier, she strongly believed in encouraging her children to enrol to vote, rather than to complain about state and Federal political decisions.

Political activities

Respondents from each group discussed their connections with the Aboriginal rights struggle in Queensland. Brisbane’s Aboriginal population witnessed a new ‘grassroots’ movement for political rights from the late 1950s through to the 1960s (see, for example, Attwood & Markus, 2007; Bell, 1997; Darling, 1998; Taffe, 2005). In the 1990s, Elaine was involved in research that documented Aboriginal women’s fight for ‘political rights’ in the 1950s and 1960s. Interviewing Kath Walker (Oodgeroo) allowed Elaine to hear about the ‘black rights’ movement and the involvement of the Communist Party. Elaine notes that, “[t]he Communist Party was the party who stuck their head out for [a]boriginal rights during that era” (Darling).

Alex explained how her mother and some elders formed the Federation Council for Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders (FCAATSI), the first political Aboriginal organisation in Brisbane (Gater, see also Taffe, 2005). Alex recalled the names of some of the Aboriginal people involved
Hazel Mace, and my auntie was Julia Smith, uncle Lamby McBride, and auntie May McBride, they were just a group of Aboriginal people who started this movement back in the ‘50s, ‘60s (Gater).

Alex also spoke about the work of Don Davidson, Pastor Don Brady, and Kath Walker, who were all involved in the movement for recognition of the rights of Aboriginal people (Gater). Stanley recalled the people whom his mother worked with, “Kathy Walker, and Faith Bandler, she’d even known or got to meet Charlie Perkins and Reg Saunders” (Smith).

Political activism was also part of Stanley’s life. He explained that his mother, Celia Smith, campaigned for better rights for Aboriginal people (Bell, 1997:27). Celia’s biographer, Jeannie Bell, recorded that as part of her many political activities, “Celia became a member of the Queensland Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders (QCAATSI) soon after it was first set up in 1958” (1997:27).

Brisbane’s political activists involved in QCAATSI campaigned heavily for better rights for Aboriginal people living in Brisbane during those years (Bell, 1997:27). Furthermore, Bell states that

Some of the main issues that the Queensland Council were concerned with during these decades were to do with wages and conditions for workers, and discrimination in the workplace. The members of the Council also were concerned about the basic lack of human rights for Murries [sic] in those days, in terms not having easy access to pensions, unemployment benefits, jobs, education and decent housing (1997:44).

Alex and Stanley’s mothers were very much part of the movement that was to change the lives of those Brisbane individuals and families. Alex explained that the political outcomes resulting from this activism eventually gave Aboriginal people rights to access services, the same as other citizens:

So they were very supportive, fighting of the rights of Aboriginal people. Accommodation, and other, employment hours, and health … this group of people that started this movement here in Brisbane for fighting for the rights of Aboriginal people, better living conditions, and rights, employment had now been recognised. Recognised that Aboriginal people, the first [unclear] of Australia [sic] (Gater).

Whilst Alex was obviously well acquainted with the political struggles for Aboriginal rights, this was not the case for those inmates on settlements and missions, who
remained largely uninformed about such matters (Hegarty). For most of those Aboriginal people, the 1967 Referendum had no meaning. Ruth knew very little about the political struggles of Aboriginal people that led up to the 1967 Referendum. As an inmate, both Cherbourg’s staff and the bureaucracy of the Native Affairs Department strictly controlled all her activities. For all intents and purposes, the political world outside Cherbourg did not exist for inmates. Ruth stated that she “knew nothing about it. Didn’t know a thing about it. I thought, what’s all the fuss about? It was a whole new experience for me to think all of this was going on” (Hegarty).

**Social Rights:**

Social element – the whole range from the right to the modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society (Marshall, 1950:8)

As explained earlier, Marshall’s formulation of citizenship was not originally intended to apply to the world’s Indigenous people. However, in many respects it resonates with many of the ideals of citizenship for Australia’s Aboriginal people. In order to properly consider the influence of discrimination on Queensland’s Aboriginals, it is appropriate to also utilise *The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination Act, 1965* (Chesterman & Galligan, 1999:169). Although this Convention was not ratified in Australia until 1975, it is a useful template to gauge discrimination against Indigenous people in Queensland in this instance. This section delves into the lived experiences of the interviewees through employment, accommodation, health, social services, education, entertainment and sport. These lived experiences reveal the various levels of racism and discrimination that they encountered.

**Employment**

Prior to gaining their Certificate of Exemption, paid employment outside the restrictions of Work Agreements was a new concept for some of the Aboriginal interviewees. Work outside of the Work Agreements did exist for some people, although few employers would hire Aborigines (Aird, 2001:40). For example, the
Golden Circle cannery at Northgate in Brisbane, and the Mater Hill hospital at South Brisbane, were two exceptions, as they were known employers of Aboriginal workers prior to 1967 (Aird, 2001:40). This is possibly because of the low level of skill required. Both Lesley and Stanley affirmed that those two workplaces have employed large numbers of Aboriginal people over the years. Stanley explained that, “the women, the cannery down at Northgate was very popular and it also had another cannery just down from the valley” (Smith).

Both Alex and Ruth worked at the Northgate Cannery at different times. Alex discussed her experiences at the Cannery. “The thing is you know the money was good, people went down there and did a day’s work, and at the end of the day you were paid for service and the money was good” (Gater). Ruth also discussed the employment conditions at the cannery in comparison to those available for housework. She commented that, “Yes. The cannery was paying more money than scrubbing floors. I used to go out and do a bit of housework, and they were paying more money down there” (Hegarty).

Elaine also discussed the Northgate cannery including issues such as employment conditions. She recalled that, “in adulthood I worked within quite close proximity of Golden Circle, the Cannery as we call it” (Darling). Moreover, she stated that, there “were a number of people including [a]boriginal people and non-[a]boriginal but they were, I think you would say that they were all low income, and for some reason couldn’t get the jobs in other places” (Darling). Elaine’s comments highlight the plight of Aboriginal people, some of whom were possibly absconders. Finding work was difficult for those who were ‘on the run’. Also, the low standard of education provided by the settlements and missions failed Aboriginal people, making it difficult for them to obtain reasonably paid employment (Sarra, 2008).

Stanley recalled a number of places in Brisbane where Aboriginal women were able to find work prior to 1967 such as

Well the Northgate Cannery was one. They maybe thousands and all the young women could get employment at Mater Hill Hospital as domestics and whatever. And some of the Aboriginal women came from New South Wales too up to here and they came from all parts of Australia to
work there and some of them went back home and some of them stayed here (Smith).

Other employers of Brisbane’s Aboriginal women were the clothing factories, to be found in many of the suburbs. Stanley remembered that, “just about every suburb had about three or four factories where women worked sewing machines” (Smith). Also, Stanley stated that Aboriginal people worked at the “[p]oultry producing factory there right underneath Grey Street Bridge, William Jolly [Bridge] now and another big one out at Rocklea” (Smith).

Each of the exempted participants had many stories to tell about their working lives, and the things that contributed to their life experiences. They were all empowered by the ability to work for fair wages, and to be able to keep the money they had earned. Robert worked most of his earlier life as a labourer, doing various kinds of manual work for award wages. One of these jobs was as a miner at Mt Isa Mines. He recalled that

I went to Mount Isa mines and I was working on the surface up there and they said oh bigger money if you go underground. I went underground, had to go through an induction course” (West).

As for Albert, he found his own way as a labourer for most of his life and discovered that he was predominantly earning the same wage as others. Albert was employed on both cattle and sheep properties, in addition to the Queensland Railways and the Queensland Department of Main Roads. His working life involved mostly physical work as a labourer. Albert recalled that, “I really loved it. The thing about it was you were on the same pay as non-indigenous people” (Holt).

Working in the cattle industry, both Albert and Robert viewed racism and discrimination differently. Albert discussed racism in instances where Aboriginal workers were removed for no apparent reason, other than the colour of their skin. He stated, “I just felt for the people that they removed for no apparent reason at all, just because they were identified as Aboriginal people” (Holt). On the other hand, Robert spoke about the lack of racism and discrimination he experienced when he was living and working on a cattle property that his family had been working on for over one
hundred years. He stated, “I never particularly experienced anything out of the ordinary there” (West).

Gwen described her exempted father’s employment history, revealing that he worked all his life in a range of jobs including for the Queensland Department of Main Roads, Queensland Railways in the Burnett region and the Tramways in Brisbane. Gwen’s father was also employed on various properties. She explained that her “father followed cattle stations working there as overseer” (Hayman). In her interview, Gwen spoke of her own working life in the Burnett region. For example, she recalled a time in 1940 when she was 15 years of age and worked as a domestic for a family who provided a ‘back shed’ for her accommodation. Gwen commented, “I wasn’t very happy about it so unfortunately I didn’t stay that long. Told them to keep it” (Hayman).

Stanley also worked as a manual labourer all of his life. He recalled his working history when he left school at 14 to gain some money. Initially he was employed at a poultry abattoir for a short time and then spent the next thirty odd years employed in the building trade. He stated his final job was “the last 21 years I worked in Queensland Railways in the freight department” (Smith). Stanley indicated that he only worked in three different jobs throughout his life. As a descendant of an exempted parent, Stanley lived in the community and experienced his civil rights and responsibilities as a tax-paying worker.

Non-Indigenous people took for granted the social right, as citizens, to seek employment and wages. Yet, for Aboriginal people this right could only be pursued if they possessed a Certificate of Exemption. In the late 1950s or early 1960s, Rod recalled an Aboriginal man who lived in the Gayndah area whom he met when he was working for an electrical shop in Murgon. Rod commented that, “he used to come into town once a month or something and get his car serviced”, and “a tall fellow, very well spoken, you know a very nice fellow. I can’t remember his name” (Lonsdale). It is possible that this unidentified Aboriginal car owner was an exempted man who was employed and earning good wages.
Lesley spoke about her parents and their circumstances, and how her mother worked as a domestic in Brisbane. As for her father, Lesley stated that he “joined the Army and fought in the Second World War”, and that they “have control of my father’s wages and my mother was on a provisional exemption” (Williams). This provisional exemption was possibly mistaken for a conditional exemption. A conditional exemption had two parts: “Savings Bank account under the control of Department of Native Affairs, OR 12 months with Savings Bank account under the control of Department of Native Affairs” (Wickes, 2006). This accords with Lesley’s comments concerning the Department having control of her wages. Kidd notes that, “Bleakley demanded control of the wages of more than two hundred Aboriginal soldiers from Queensland” (1997:153).

Housing Accommodation

Being able to obtain suitable living arrangements in cities and towns was a major concern for Aboriginal people, who often experienced discrimination. After the passage of the Racial Discrimination Act, 1975 (Cwth) such discrimination became unlawful. The interviewees spoke both positively and negatively about their own experiences in trying to gain accommodation. For example, it was common practice for new individuals and families coming into towns and cities in search of jobs, to take up temporary accommodation with already established Aboriginal families (Smith).

In Ruth’s case, however, finding accommodation for her large family was not easy. She recalled that, “Joe got us very small accommodation. We probably wouldn’t have been able to get anything better than what we had. But we went to the Housing Commission” (Hegarty). Ruth revealed that she and her husband did not suffer any form of discrimination or racism when searching for accommodation. They were fortunate in being able to acquire a Housing Commission home soon after arriving in Brisbane. Discrimination however, was experienced by others. Ruth mentioned that had she personally helped other Aboriginal people find accommodation, and on one occasion, she had phoned ahead. Ruth recalled the following incident,

I’d ring up for a house and when we got there they’d say, oh I didn’t know they were Aborigines. But I just spoke to you on the phone and said, is the house available? (Hegarty)
That is, Ruth insisted that in some instances Aborigines were discriminated against in relation to housing and accommodation. Ruth stated that, “it was discrimination, but it didn’t happen for us, it happen for other people when I tried to help them get homes” (Hegarty).

Alex recalled moving from Cherbourg to Brisbane and having difficulties trying to find accommodation for herself and her young family (Gater). She viewed this as a result of discrimination against her because she was an Aboriginal woman. Alex described the search: “I found trying to get accommodation for myself and children, found it very hard, because of discrimination, and found it hard to fit in” (Gater). Moreover, Alex describes her disappointment when she was denied rental property due to her skin colour many times that happened to me, so I found it very hard trying to get accommodation for myself and for my family. That’s when I applied for a housing commission, and I was granted yeah, so I actually had my own place (Gater).

One of the interviewees who spoke positively about housing was Stanley. He recalled, “well we never had any trouble in Toowoomba either, like getting accommodation” (Smith). Gwen also spoke about accommodation, describing the time her family moved back to live in suburban Brisbane after living in the Burnett region for a number of years. She explained that in the 1940s, they “stayed with some friends first until we got a housing commission [flat] at Holland Park in the old American huts after the war” (Hayman). Gwen made no mention of having a difficult time finding accommodation.

Looking at accommodation from another viewpoint, Stanley explained how some Aboriginal families finally became tenants. For instance, new Aboriginal families would stay with established families in the suburbs, giving landlords an opportunity to assess their eligibility to rent a property. Stanley described how his family house was used for this purpose on many occasions: “Aboriginal people didn’t have a great history with rentals so the landlords would have to see that person around for a while before they would grant them a lease” (Smith). This was another form of discrimination, but in this instance it was accepted, apparently, as the price of being found responsible.
Gwen spoke about never having been refused accommodation. However, she did mention one occasion during the 1940s when, as a young girl aged 15 years, she travelled with a (non-Indigenous) family friend. She stayed overnight on route to Eidsvold where her accommodation was in an outhouse, instead of being a guest in the main house with her traveling companions. She explained that she “wasn’t put with the other people. I was put in, I don’t know what you call it, probably the worker’s quarters or something the like” [sic] (Hayman). The forms of discrimination described above are a denial of the social rights of citizenship (Marshall, 1950:8).

Health and Social Services
Leila, a registered nurse, had some surprising recollections concerning exempted Aboriginal families who failed to access medical and health care in the Burnett region. Leila worked for a few years as the Sister in charge of a nursing and antenatal clinic at Proston. The clinic had a weekly visiting doctor, in addition to fortnightly visits from a dentist. When asked if any Aboriginal women ever attended the clinic, she simply answered, “Well no” (L. Harvie). She also stated that, “I didn’t even nurse an Aborigine woman in all the years I nursed” (L. Harvie). It can thus be assumed that no Aboriginal women ever visited that clinic, at least during the years that Leila was in charge. In terms of non-female Aboriginals, Leila recalled, “that little boy I can remember and there might have been some old men in the men’s medical ward, but not enough for me to think - they’d be very few and far between” (L. Harvie). This form of discrimination is a denial of the social rights of citizenship (Marshall, 1950:32).

Later, Leila worked as a nurse in Murgon for a few years and, again, could not recall even seeing an Aboriginal person while she was employed there. She stated that, “I didn’t ever see an Aboriginal person when I lived in Murgon because I didn’t go out very much and because they were on the Settlement” (L. Harvie). During her interview, Leila mentioned that she only visited Cherbourg on one occasion, when she was invited by the Matron, a close friend, to view some brand new X-ray machines at the newly built Cherbourg hospital in 1958. She recalled her friend saying, “you will have to come out and see this gorgeous new hospital, she said, because it’s the very latest” (L. Harvie).
Quite different experiences were recalled by Alex, a respondent from the first group, who explained about health care in the community for exempted Aboriginal people. She maintained that she was treated well when she was in hospital: “all my children were born at the Royal Brisbane Hospital, and so didn’t have any problems there with the health that I can recall” (Gater). As previously stated, Ruth was born in a hospital and said that she “didn’t go into a ward at the hospital, [her] mother was given a small room in the back of the hospital” (Hegarty). In this instance, Ruth’s mother was subjected to racial discrimination as she was placed in a room at the back of the Mitchell hospital unlike non-Aboriginal maternity patients at the hospital.

Few of the respondents discussed being in receipt of government assistance such as unemployment, sickness benefits and child endowments. Stanley worked all his life and had no need for benefits, but stated that, “I never would claim” (Smith). Robert was unaware of unemployment benefits, saying, “I [doubt whether] there’s any such thing as the dole. I mean we never knew anything about the dole in the 1960s” (West). In her interview, Lesley talked about the lack of government unemployment benefits or the dole when she was younger. She explained that during those years, many Aboriginal families had relied on each other for help and financial support. Lesley stated that, if “you go out, you know, you would just have to rely on the good will of relatives or friends to give you a couple of dollars otherwise you had nothing” (Williams). Chesterman and Galligan comment that, in “1959 the social security legislation was amended and the exclusion of Aborigines was phrased in one new catch-all section. This was not repealed until 1966” (1999:237).

References to the experience of racial discrimination appeared regularly amongst the interviewees’ answers concerning ‘social rights’ and citizenship rights for Aboriginal people. For Albert, a racist incident that he experienced in the 1960s is still clear in his mind. It occurred at a time when he was not working and had been informed by a non-Indigenous acquaintance that he could apply for unemployment benefits at the local office of the Department of Social Security. Albert recalled that they “just looked at me and said no, you’re not entitled to it because you’re Aboriginal. I felt so embarrassed, so humiliated that because I was Aboriginal” (Holt). On this occasion, Albert’s exempted status from the 1897 Act did not ensure that he enjoyed recognition
of his eligibility to receive benefits available to other Australian citizens in the same circumstances.

Lesley mentioned that, in regard to her mother who was working in Brisbane, there “weren’t any pensions around then, family allowances. These child endowments came out after the Second World War” (Williams). Referring to the later period, Stanley spoke of his wife receiving child endowment, stating that, “yeah, child endowments. Yeah, everybody got the endowment payment, white or black, yeah” (Smith). Stanley’s statement echoed a common belief throughout Australia that all mothers were eligible for child endowment after its introduction in 1941, however, Kidd notes that “those Aboriginal mothers living nomadic lives were excluded from these benefits” (1997:166).

In another example of government departments mistreating Aboriginal people, Ruth described how the Native Affairs Department was intercepting Child Endowment Benefits payments that should have been given to each mother on the settlement. Cherbourg had its own store, ‘the ration shed’, for residents, which was stocked and operated by state government workers (Hegarty). Ruth claimed that, “the whole store was stocked with stuff that was bought from our endowments. And so what we were doing was buying back our own things” (Hegarty). This misappropriation of Child Endowment Benefits represented another blatant form of racial discrimination on the part of the Queensland government. Kidd describes how the government misappropriated the bulk of the Aboriginal child endowment money, with their reasoning being that, “the mothers might not use the cash for the child’s benefit [and so only] a fraction was paid to the parents” (1997:167). In a contemporary context, this form of discrimination is similar to the 2007 Federal Government’s interventions in the Northern Territory that are still current in 2010.

**Education**

Aboriginal people living under the Act were offered only elementary schooling, as their future roles were seen as domestics and farm workers (Sarra, 2008). Alex stated that, “in my parent’s generation, they were denied an education, they were only allowed in Queensland for education fourth year, to grade four” (Gater). Moreover, Kidd re-enforces this view of Aboriginal education, making note of the “low level of
educational goals – domestic training for girls, farm labour for boys” (1997:22). This educational discrimination severely limited the future development of Aboriginal children, thus perpetuating the disparity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous citizens.

Interviewees, namely Gwen, Robert, Alex and Albert, described their schooling days. Gwen attended a number of small schools on the Darling Downs when she was a child and has since returned for several school reunions. She commented about her education, saying that, “I’d say I was a fair student. I loved my school and I loved my work and that. I always seemed to be around the top of the class” (Hayman). Robert only went to school a short time whilst the family was resident in both Eidsvold and Mundubbera, in Queensland’s Burnett region. Consequently, when he was taken to Cherbourg the teacher expected him to have already achieved a certain level in the classroom. In this instance, Robert explained that his poor educational skills were due to working on station properties during his early childhood and “teachers expected a six or a seven or eight-year-old child to know something about ABCs and 123s and I had none of that; I couldn’t comprehend anything” (West). Some interviewees recalled the influential role played by teachers in their experiences at school. Alex, for example, spent some school days at Cherbourg, recalling with sadness that, “I felt that some of the teachers didn’t show kindness to the Aboriginal students, and I for one was treated unfairly” (Gater). Albert discovered that his school teachers were not at all professional and recalled that, “school at Cherbourg, it was so cruel – I’ve got terrible memories of those school days because we’d be subjected to corporal punishment and I mean corporal punishment” (Holt, but see also Blake, 2001; Holt, 2001; Mok, 2005; Sarra, 2008).

With a family of seven children, school was an important part of the ‘social rights’ that Ruth was determined her family would not miss out on. She recalled the family’s routine when the children were young and that, “they all knew what they had to do and so the big ones always looked after the other ones and made sure that everybody went to school” (Hegarty). Ruth described how, through her sporting abilities, one of her daughters gained a scholarship to Brisbane Girls Grammar, where she gained an education, thus increasing her employment prospects in the future (Hegarty).
Rod, responding to questions about Aboriginal children attending school in Murgon, spoke very highly about Laurie, one of the first Aboriginal students at Murgon High School in 1958. He recalled that Laurie, as one of the first students “he’s done quite well for himself … I did meet him at one of the reunions and he was one of the first high school students” (Lonsdale). Rod indicated again that he was impressed by Laurie who had “done quite well for himself” (Lonsdale). Laurie, then, was one of the first Cherbourg residents to enjoy the social rights to an education consistent with the mainstream population.

Only two interviewees mentioned incidences of outright racial discrimination during their schooling. As a young child, Stanley was subjected to a situation where he was forced to identify as an Aborigine at school. The teacher repeatedly asked the question “are you an Aborigine?” Stanley got up and went home. His mother returned to the school and spoke harshly to the teacher and principal. Stanley remembered that, “well, like the teacher claimed that there was no discrimination, but he seemed to insist that I answer” (Smith). The teacher’s treatment of Stanley prompted his mother to move him to another school where racism was not an issue for him. Alex, who only achieved a primary education at Cherbourg, dreamed of furthering her studies. However, “one of the teachers said I’d never amount to anything, and that I was a dunce” (Gater). This comment stayed with Alex all her life, giving her a purpose to challenge it by becoming an educated woman (Gater).

In her interview, Elaine, a non-Indigenous interviewee, explained that she attended primary school in Brisbane during the 1940s and 1950s. She argued that Queensland’s Education syllabus was discriminatory and devoid of Aboriginal history. Elaine recalled that the “invasion was a real cover up”, and “it was amazing how deeply that went and how widespread was the acceptance of that because we wouldn’t see many Aboriginal people around” (Darling).
Social Activities and Entertainment

Living as free citizens with full rights in society, exempted Aboriginal people spoke of many social activities in to which they participated. Sporting events, like football games, cricket matches and boxing tournaments were always popular amongst the boys and men. Other activities involved movie going, church and school fetes, dances and going out to the local hotel and nightclubs. The social activities described are similar to those recorded in the diaries of Daisy Smith (see Chapter Three).

Adrian’s uncle owned and ran Murgon’s only picture theatre (the Star Theatre) during his childhood in the 1950s. He believed that there was no discrimination or racial segregation in the theatre. In his view, his uncle was “a man who could be friends with anybody and he treated everybody as equal” (A. Harvie). Rod also spoke about going to the movies at the picture theatre in Murgon. In his recollections the theatre patrons were not segregated,

I don’t know whether they would have been allowed in the dress circle. That was a bit exclusive, but as far as I know, the rest were canvas seats and they were never segregated that I can remember, no” (Lonsdale).

Alternatively, Stanley recalled the use of chicken wire to segregate the people in some picture theatres. His own experience with chicken wire was in Kempsey, New South Wales. Later when Stanley retold his experience to an Elder, the Elder recalled that many years previously chicken wire was used in a similar manner in the township of Hervey Bay, Queensland (Smith). Robert also discussed segregation in picture theatres in a number of towns. He recalled that, “when we were kids there we all had to go to a certain area” (West). On the other hand, Gwen, when asked about the issue of discrimination at the movies, stated that, “never in my life have we been sent away from anything. We always were respected wherever we went and still are” (Hayman).

Still in relation to segregation, one area of discussion concerned the question of who had access to public toilets in towns prior to 1967. Rod remembered that in the township of Murgon, in the Burnett region, that

back in the 1950s there was a toilet for native people … the ones in the centre of the street – that was labelled for white people only. Coloured people [sic] had to use the other one (Lonsdale).
As Alex illustrated, there were segregated public toilets in Murgon, such as those in the main street, at sporting venues and in hotels. She recalled that, “you had to go into the toilet, the Aboriginal this one” (Gater). In fact, a conversation with a community member informed the researcher that during the 1950s the female toilet for Aboriginal women was painted a distinctive red colour (name withheld 2008, pers. Comm., 19 April). However, another long-time local non-Indigenous citizen insisted that there were never any segregated toilets in the town (An ex local government official who did not wish to be identified 2008, pers. Comm., 19 April).

Another popular form of entertainment enjoyed by a number of interviewees was attending dances, which were held weekly throughout Brisbane during the years researched. Stanley explained that dances were held in places such as the Caledonian Club at Kangaroo Point, the Barona Hall at Paddington, a hall at Red Hill, halls hired at Buranda and a hall in Elizabeth Street, in the centre of Brisbane. Stanley also recalled that they “were mainly our own dances like of a Saturday night dances … my mother [Celia] was organising the dances at one time on behalf of the Brisbane All Blacks rugby league side” (Smith). Lesley remembered that there “were dances at the boathouse. I remember going there once when we come down for holidays” (Williams).

Another form of entertainment was the gambling schools which Lesley spoke about. She explained that, “it was also, not only a gambling school, it was like a big social thing … where you had other Aboriginal people there as a form of networking support” (Williams). Similarly, Aird comments that

> There used to be a lot of card games, big gambling schools, run by Mrs Burke and Auntie Ettie Meredith. There used to be people at those games like Auntie Hazel Mace and Auntie Cecelia Smith” (2001:40).

Blake also comments on the long standing popularity of gambling at Cherbourg (2001:219). That is, it was social common practice that Aboriginal people continued to enjoy after life on the reserve.

Often, however, the social rights associated with citizenship were not accorded to Aboriginal people. Both Alex and Stanley discussed how poorly Aboriginal servicemen were treated by the Returned Soldiers League (RSL) in Queensland.
There were a number of occasions when Alex and her family faced discrimination in their lives. Alex discussed the injustices and racism her father suffered during a visit to the local RSL club, prior to 1967. She recalled her father’s story,

the barmaid said “sorry we don’t serve blacks here”, my father’s response was, “I’m a returned serviceman, and I helped to fight for this country, and if you don’t serve me, I will jump the bar and serve myself.” He was served (Gater).

Stanley spoke generally about the rules and regulations regarding the treatment of Aboriginal patrons at the local RSL venue. For Stanley, it is blatantly clear that Aboriginal servicemen were denied entry because of racism. However, while the Aboriginal servicemen were denied entry, non-Aboriginal servicemen inside the club would purchase the drinks and pass them to the Aboriginal men outside. Stanley stated that, “the soldiers would get the drinks and hand them through the window to the Aboriginal soldiers who would sit outside and drink the beer outside” (Smith). The practice was apparently overlooked by staff.

Stanley remembered another occasion when a family friend was discriminated against at a local hotel. He recalled that the friend was “just back from war services, still in his army uniform and he was refused service at a Spring Hill [Brisbane] hotel” (Smith). Stanley recalled that the incident must have been reported, since a comment in the afternoon paper, the Daily Telegraph, read “good enough to serve his country but not good enough to be served” (Smith).

Several of the interviewees recounted times when they or their friends were refused entry into public social venues. When Alex and her friends decided to go out for the night to a nightclub, she was denied entry as a result of which the others with her decided not to enter the nightclub themselves. Alex recalled that, “I was denied access, I was denied entry” (Gater). Stanley also recalled a fellow worker who was refused entry into a nightclub. “It was an [island] bloke and he was refused entry” (Smith). Both Alex and Stanley described the incidents as a blatantly racist action because the door attendant allowed other non-Aboriginal members of the group to enter the venue.
Moreover, Alex spoke from personal experience about the attitudes of sales and wait staff when an Aboriginal person entered a shop or cafe. The relationship between the shop assistant and the customer can be difficult because discrimination and racism are sometimes evident on the part of the non-Indigenous people serving Aboriginal customers. She explained that if, “you were the first in the shop, you would be the last to be served, or even the snack bar, when you went to sit down to have a meal” (Gater).

When asked if she had ever experienced discrimination or racism, Ruth stated that, “it never came up” (Hegarty). Seemingly unclear as to the interpretation of what discrimination meant, she nominated ‘fear’ as a more suitable word. “It was my fear of white people that I had to deal with. It wasn’t the discrimination from white people; it was my fear of them” [sic] (Hegarty). Furthermore, Ruth talks about surveillance and commented that there would “always be this thing that there are people watching you and the [white] people won’t touch that orange once you’ve touched it” (Hegarty). Many years later Ruth gained access to her files under the Freedom of Information Act, 1992 (Qld) and discovered that, “they [Department of Native Affairs] were still in control of us even down here because most of the records I’ve got go up into the 1970s” (Hegarty, also see Huggins & Huggins, 1994).

Lesley commented that discrimination and racism have not yet been eradicated from Australian society. Lesley recalled an incident in the 1960s where a carload of young people spoke to her in a racist way and other times where they would compare her to weather conditions by remarking “we’re going to have a big storm tonight because they see a lot of black clouds around” (Williams). In another incident Lesley recalled a racist taunt one night when, “I got off the bus and walking back to the place I was working at and this car load of young hoons drove past and said get home midnight” (Williams). That is, despite being exempted and theoretically enjoying citizenship rights, Lesley still experienced racism and discrimination.

**Sport**

The male respondents indicated that sports, such as football, cricket and boxing, played a big role in the lives of Aboriginal men, regardless of whether they lived on settlements and missions or in towns and cities. Only one female respondent
mentioned sport, while none of the interviewees made mention of women participating in sport of any kind.

Robert was involved in the sport of boxing during his younger years. He spoke of Adrian Blair who was the first Indigenous boxer in the 1964 Olympic Games in Tokyo, Japan. Adrian and Robert were sparring partners in Cherbourg together. After Robert was exempted, he had a few boxing tournaments around his home town of Eidsvold, but having worked in the bush for so long, his boxing experience and ability were limited. In ending his boxing ‘career’, Robert admitted that, “I think it was I never had a glove on and I went then” (West). Another of Robert’s boxing colleagues, Jimmy Skinner, was selected for the 1962 British Empire and Commonwealth Games in Perth, Western Australia.

A few of the interviewees responded to questions about discrimination and racism in sport. Albert discussed the foul language that spectators called out to the Aboriginal players in some of the towns they played in. He commented that there used to be [comments] from the spectators themselves, just targeting the Aboriginal people and calling them all sorts of derogatory names. It’s a way of inciting racial hatred really. You just feel so embarrassed by it all (Holt).

Many top level sports, especially football, were segregated prior to 1967. There were a number of all-Aboriginal teams in Brisbane playing in the season’s competition. Stanley recalled playing football for a Brisbane All Blacks team, but not having access to mainstream competitions. He stated that, “this was the time before when Aborigines weren’t allowed into the mainstream Brisbane competition and also the Sydney competition too, they weren’t allowed in that” (Smith).

Albert commented directly on racism in the sport of cricket. He discussed the great Aboriginal cricket player, Eddie Gilbert, who was never selected to play for Australia (see also, Colman & Edwards, 2001). Albert remembered seeing Eddie play and stated that they “made that point – they weren’t psyched in Aboriginal people representing Australia” (Holt). Albert was proud of Gilbert’s ability and said that, “I was only small but I had the privilege of seeing him play just great cricket” (Holt). Colman and Edwards recall Eddie Gilbert’s moment of triumph, noting that, “it was
true. Gilbert, our Gilbert had just dismissed Don Bloody Bradman. For a duck” (2002:129). In relation to the event, Blake writes that, “probably no single ball bowled in the history of cricket has had as important socio-cultural ramifications” (2001:227). Racist attitudes, however, meant that Gilbert never played for Australia.

This chapter has examined the “less formal and cultural aspects of citizenship and community structures” (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997:5) through the interview data and it shows that Aboriginal people formally deemed to be citizens through exemption did enjoy ‘certain rights in all three of Marshall’s categories’ (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997:5). Yet at the same time, exempted Aboriginal people were “excluded from certain rights in all three of Marshall’s categories” (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997:5) largely because there was no protection afforded to them as Indigenous citizens to combat racial discrimination, including the discriminatory nature of exemption itself, which denied recognition of their cultural heritage and their right to enjoy that heritage afforded to other Australian citizens.

The next chapter examines Archives pertaining to the system of exemption regulated by the Queensland Government.
Endnotes:

4 Hillview was a nursing home in Ipswich near Purga Mission. Darling, Elaine (1998) *They Spoke Out Pretty Good*.

Section 9 of the ‘1897 Act’ states that: It shall be lawful for the Minister to cause every aboriginal within any District, not being an aboriginal excepted from the provisions of this section, to be removed to, and kept within the limits of, any reserve situated within such District, in such manner, and subject to such conditions, as may be prescribed. The Minister may, subject to the said conditions, cause any aboriginal to be removed from one reserve to another.

8 See Evans, R, (2007) *A History of Queensland*. “Durundur, reopened near Caboolture in 1899, was to receive Aboriginal people taken from 109 different areas by 1903, before they were redrafted in large batches to Barambah (later Cherbourg), near Murgon.” p. 139-140.

9 Inmates refer to Aboriginal residents at Cherbourg settlement.

10 My family, our spiritual homeland was up in the Carnarvon Ranges, a little town called Springsure. The Carnarvon Ranges – there’s Carnarvon National Park and Mt Moffatt National Park that’s ironic in that area. They were shifted from there (Interview with Holt).

11 Robert’s father was born on Auburn Station in 1895 and his mother was born on the adjoining Hawkwood station in 1932.
12 Stanley Smith and Gwen Hayman (nee Smith) were cousins through their father’s side – Roy and Ernest.
13 Roy Smith and Ernest Smith were sent to Purga Mission in 1914. Attendance Records of Purga School had them both enrolled. (QSA- EDU/AA857; SRS3212 – Admission Register – State School).
14 The Superintendent and staff were all non-Indigenous personnel at Cherbourg during those early years.
15 Referred to as ‘pocket money’.
16 Taroom (situated 485km west of Queensland's capital city, Brisbane).
17 The Certificate of Exemption will be known as: Certificate of Exemption, or exemption certificate or exemption.
18 Settlements and reserves are as one.
19 “By the passing of the new “Aboriginals Preservation and Protection Act of 1939,” the term “half-caste” was changed to “half-blood.” Under this Act persons with 50 per cent, or less aboriginal blood, who do not live with or habitually associate with aboriginals, are not subject to departmental control unless directly declared by a judge or magistrate to be in need of such care. This provided an incentive to ambition” (Report of Director of Native Affairs, 1940 p.4).
21 These residents were now referred to as ‘Assisted Aborigines or Assisted Islanders’.
22 The number of recorded exemptions granted was 4,092. From 1908 to 1942 children were granted their own exemption, but from 1943 to 1967 children were placed under their parent’s exemption and that number totalled 1,165. Therefore, the total of Aboriginal people in Queensland who were exempted from the ‘1897 Act’ numbered: 5,257 approximately. See Wickes, J (2006) Unpublished thesis.
23 The researcher’s own relative had possessed an exemption certificate but her name did not appear on the Ledger of exemptions granted.
24 Purga Mission run by the Salvation Army Church and was located on the outskirts of Ipswich, Queensland.
25 Myora mission was on Stradbroke Island in Moreton Bay, Queensland.
26 The Brisbane River divides the area of Brisbane city into two distinct regions: north of the river and south of the river.

27 Aboriginal absconders were Aboriginal people who for whatever reason failed to return to their settlement or mission after finishing or during being employed on a Work Agreement’. A Work Agreement was where an Aboriginal inmate was sent out to work for a certain amount of time, usually for six or twelve months. The agreement was between the government and the employer. See Kidd (1997) *The Way We Civilise* for a more in-depth discussion on work agreements and wages.

28 Woorbinda Aboriginal settlement is west of Rockhampton, Queensland.

29 Mr Sturgess was the Superintendent at Cherbourg, when Robert got his exemption.

30 Auburn Station, located between Chinchilla and Mundubbera, Queensland.

31 This reference by Smith to the ‘Native Police’ refers to local Liaison Officers attached to the Police Station at Cherbourg.

32 I was born in Mitchell, around about the time when Aboriginal children weren’t born in a hospital so I was one of the fortunate ones that my father at the time took my mother and me to the hospital. Although I didn’t go into a ward at the hospital, my mother was given a small room in the back of the hospital and so that’s where the birthing took place. My birth was recorded – I do have a birth certificate there, so they recorded my birth (Hegarty, 2003).

33 Ruth Hegarty read her own departmental files, held at Department of Native Affairs.

34 *The Aboriginals Protection and the Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act, 1897* - Section 10 (c) “A female lawfully married to, and residing with, a husband who is himself an aboriginal”. Therefore, an Aboriginal man who gained a Certificate of Exemption is seen as ‘not aboriginal’.

35 “The Aboriginals Protection and the Restriction of the Sale of Opium, Act, 1897,” (Qld). This Act will be referred as from this point: the Act; under the Act; and the 1897 Act.

36 See Part A – Aboriginal soldiers and their wages.

37 The 7th British Empire and Commonwealth was held in Perth, Western Australia from 22nd November to 1st December, 1962. Downloaded: 04/04/2010.

Chapter Five

Data Analysis – Archival Research

This chapter examines a sample of government records pertaining to the system of exemption as it operated in the South Burnett region dating from the early 1900s to 1940. Exemption records for the 1940s to the 1960s were unavailable for this research because administrative changes introduced in 1940 resulted in material being placed in personal files not accessible to the researcher (see Kidd, 1997:149). The chapter analyses the recorded process by which applications for exemptions were granted or denied and sometimes later revoked.

While the Diaries (Chapter Three) analysed the lived experience of Aboriginal exemptees from the perspective of Marshall’s conception of the civil, political and social aspects of citizenship (1950), the archival material in this chapter is comprised largely of official documents which do not readily lend themselves to such an analysis. Therefore, it will be analysed using Foucault’s (1991) general concept of a discursive regime and in particular his notion of governmentality. From this perspective, the notion of being granted a Certificate of Exemption is equated to fulfilling bureaucratic requirements for citizenship. The data analysed during the archival research phase included Annual Reports, the Register of Exemptions, applications for exemption, Barambah reserve accounts, and miscellaneous correspondence to and from the Chief Protector’s Office relating to marriages, complaints and Aboriginal bank accounts.

All the government records examined for the study were located and viewed by the researcher at the Queensland State Archives from August 2008 to January 2009. Searches were conducted into the Index to Register of Exemptions (1942 to 1964), Exemption Lists (1947 to 1964), Register of Exemptions (1908 to 1967), and Exemption Card Index (1908 to 1935 and 1936 to 1941, microfiche search). All of the records held the names of Aboriginal people. However, the research was
hampered to a degree by the fact that official records generated by the system of exemption were not categorised according to the names of individual applicants nor were they categorised according to any geographic regions. Instead, they were found scattered throughout a range of files in seemingly unrelated subjects such as ‘Marriages’, ‘Crimes’, ‘Army’, and ‘Removals’, from correspondence generated within the Chief Protector of Aboriginals Office and filed chronologically.

Each box examined contained up to about six files. However, there was no mechanism to identify in advance which particular documents were stored in a box. Therefore, seventy-five boxes of files were searched through by the researcher, before a total of ninety-three files that pertained to the operation of the exemption system in the Burnett region were identified for examination. This search identified that in this region from 1908 until 1940 forty-five applications for exemptions were granted, seventeen were denied and the status of the remaining thirty-one is unknown because the records were incomplete.

For convenience the analysis of the archival material in the chapter is divided into sections: The Certificate of Exemption, Annual Reports, Other Queensland State Government Forms, and Selected examples of individual applications for exemption.

**The Certificate of Exemption:**

In previous research, Wickes (2006) found that the Department of Native Affairs had various categories such as free, conditional, or unconditional with the exemption system which meant that once an applicant had gained exemption, he/she was not necessarily ‘free’ from government regulation (Wickes, 2006). Wickes (2006) counted over four thousand certificates of exemption recorded as being granted to Queensland’s Aboriginal people from 1897 to 1967 (2006). However, she found information missing in the recording of certificates in the official Exemption Ledger which means that the total number of exemption granted can only be estimated (Wickes, 2006). Therefore, the exact number of applicants from the Burnett region requesting a Certificate of Exemption is uncertain, but to date, this research has located more than 250 applications for exemption sent from the region to the Chief Protector for approval. That is, information is filed in differing ways (for example,
sometimes by year, sometimes alphabetically) and information for any particular region needs to be collated from a number of sources.

As a result of the research, it soon became apparent that applications for the Certificate of Exemption from the Burnett region could be readily categorized into four groups. The first and largest group consisted of individuals from Cherbourg who applied for the exemption. The second group of applicants was descendants of exemptees living in the Burnett region. The third was made up of individuals whose families were either traditional people or had lived in the wider community for a long time. The fourth group comprised of Aboriginal people sent to the Burnett region by the government to fulfil work agreements whose applications for exemption coincided with the end of their employment contract.

**Annual Reports:**

As a result of the 1897 Act, reports from the Chief Protector of Aboriginals detailing the status of his department were required to be prepared and tabled annually in the Queensland parliament. Prior to 1966, the Annual Reports were prepared by the Office of Chief Protector of Aboriginals (1908-1939) and later the Office of the Director of Native Affairs (1939-1966). These reports were submitted to Queensland’s Parliament each year by various government departments for inclusion in their particular portfolios. Consequently, in the timeframe given for this research (1897-1967), Aboriginal people were under the control of several different government departments. This is evidenced by the amount and quality of information contained in the Annual Reports which were found to vary considerably. While several government departments were involved in the administration of Aboriginal affairs in Queensland, the role and influence of the Chief Protector remained paramount throughout most of the twentieth century. In 1914, Mr Bleakley was appointed Chief Protector/Director of Native Affairs, holding the position until 1941. Mr O’Leary took over his role in 1942, serving until 1965.3 The Annual Reports also chart the shifts in government policy from one of segregation to that of assimilation and related notions of citizenship.

The status and operation of the exemption system during each year were recorded from 1899 to 1967 in the Annual Reports. That is, it was usual for the Chief Protector
to report to the Home Secretary the number of applications for exemption, the number refused and the number revoked. The first mention of Certificates of Exemption was made by Dr Roth in the Annual Report, Northern Protector of Aboriginals, 1900. Roth referred to several applications received from employers on behalf of certain ‘half-castes’, whom he refers to as ‘little girls’ (QPP – Annual Report, 1902:2). These applications were denied.4 The Annual Report for 1902 shows that Queensland’s first Certificate of Exemption was granted in that year5 to an Aboriginal woman who resided on a cattle station in north western Queensland. Her exemption was on the recommendation of the local Protector. The last exemption certificate was granted in 1967 to an Aboriginal woman residing in Mt Isa.

Due to the 1934 amended Act, exemptions were temporarily suspended, with the result that there were only four exemptions reported in 1935 and two in 1936. For some undisclosed reason, Torres Strait Islander exemptions were included in the 1937 and 1938 reports only. During the Second World War approximately 439 certificates were granted in Queensland, with 81 (the highest number) exempted in 1943.

The numbers of exemptions granted to Aboriginal people (males and females between the years 1899 to 1939) which were reported in the Annual Reports of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals Office correlate with the numbers found by the researcher. However, Annual Reports of the Director of Native Affairs Office issued after 1939 only occasionally mention the exemption system and do not give actual figures for the number of applications or approvals/rejections.

Example A: Comparisons - Exemptions by Gender and Government records
The Annual Reports of Native Affairs Office do not report the number of exemption certificates granted from 1940 to 1967, with the exception of the years 1951 and 1952 (See example B). In the 1957 Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs, the system of exemption was mentioned for the last time under the heading of ‘Policy’ (previously known as Exemptions). In the following year, the Annual Report of Native Affairs, 1958 stated that “The policy… aims at the ultimate assimilation of all aboriginals and half bloods into the State’s community life” (QPP - Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs, 1958:2). However, the 1960 the Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs recognises that there were 20,780 Aboriginals not living under the Act, that is, ‘Non-controlled’ in its description of the Queensland Indigenous population as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Non-controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginals -</td>
<td>10,284</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Bloods -</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres Strait Islanders -</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Population: QPP – Annual Report, 1960:1)
Unfortunately there is no breakdown of the figures, thus it is unclear how many of those people were exempts and how many had never been under the Act. In the Torres Strait Islanders category, the figures are not divided as in the other categories. Statistics from the 1937 and 1938 Annual Reports of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals reveal that there were 162 exemptions granted for Torres Strait Islanders. No other statistics for exemptions relating to Torres Strait Islanders have been located. However, from 1957 onwards, overall population figures are given in the Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs with no breakdown as to whether Torres Strait Islanders are living in a controlled or non-controlled environment. It seems likely that separate statistics pertaining to Torres Strait Islander exemptions would have been available from 1939 onwards as a result of *Torres Strait Islander Act, 1939* (Qld).

The lack of precise record keeping is evident in other areas besides the Annual Reports. For example, the Exemption Register did not include the names of some Aboriginal people known by the researcher to have been exempted. For instance, the personal files of N (family member of the researcher, name withheld) show that she was an exempted Aboriginal woman, yet her name does not appear on the Exemption Register. Similarly the Certificate of Exemption granted to Daisy Smith’s husband, Roy Smith, of Purga and dated 25th March 1926, did not appear in the Exemption Ledger. It is unclear to what extent this may have occurred. It can be assumed that there were a greater number of Certificates of Exemption issued than the official figure of 4,092. The exact number remains uncertain. Darling (1998) comments on discrepancies in general and argues that, “the elasticity of the departmental estimate was based on the unavailability of relevant statistics in the era” (1998:28).

Given the confusion over the term citizenship discussed in Chapter Two, the Annual Reports were examined for the use of the term citizenship. It was found that as early as the 1937 Annual Report, the word ‘citizenship’ is used in supporting the government’s educational training program. The report states: “Training will be given in all the manual trades and also rural occupations to fit them to take their places in all avenues of useful citizenship” (QPP – Annual Report of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals, 1937:12). The term ‘citizenship rights’ appeared for the first time in the 1955 Annual Report, which states: “Under this provision of the [1939] Act many
coloured people [sic] obtained full citizenship rights” (QPP – Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs, 1955:6). The word ‘assimilation’ under the heading of Policy, first appears in the 1956 Director’s Annual Report. It states that the “Government, therefore mindful of the difficulties involved in the ultimate assimilation of the race into the white community has based its policy accordingly with highly successful results” (QPP – Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs, 1956:2). In the 1957 Annual Report, the Director (Mr O’Leary) writes

Our native people have the assurance that the Queensland Government will help them in every aspect along the road to assimilation and they can justifiably feel that the influence of the Queensland Government towards their acceptance in the white community will bear fruit. Therefore, they become ordinary citizens of the State, fully equipped to accept the responsibility which such citizenship places upon them (QPP – Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs, 1957:2-3).

As noted previously, from the Annual Reports of 1958 onwards the use of the words ‘exemption or Certificate of Exemption’ was discontinued. This in itself is interesting, as gaining the Certificate of Exemption continued for another ten years, until 13th March 1967. There is no explanation in the Annual Reports as to why the exemptions continued after 1965. Towards the end of the exemption system, the Annual Reports indicate that the Queensland Government seemed to be shifting towards policies of assimilation and full citizenship for Indigenous people. This is noticeable in the reports under the headings of ‘departmental policy and education’. That is, official discourse shifts to policies determined to overcome the barriers to inclusion for Aboriginal people. In the 1958 Annual Report, for example, there is an acknowledgement that the “mere granting of full citizenship rights” is insufficient and that other inequalities need to be addressed concurrently (QPP – Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs, 1958:2).

In relation to the legal barriers to Indigenous inclusion, the 1965 Annual Report refers to the introduction of The Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders’ Affairs Act, 1965 (Qld), the act that repealed the laws authorising the system of exemption in Queensland. The Director of Native Affairs states

The new legislation virtually removes or establishes machinery to remove all legal restrictions now applying to Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders and their descendants (QPP – Annual Report of the Director of Native Affairs, 1965:1).
With the new Act, “any Aboriginal or Islander living on a reserve was considered ‘an assisted person, and therefore, subject to the provisions of the 1965 Act’” (Frankland, 1994:10). Residents (or assisted persons) now had to apply to live at Cherbourg Aboriginal community. Government legislation and policy affecting Aboriginal people’s lives had been reversed in some aspects, whereby residents now had to apply to live on their settlement. Failure to do so meant that the resident could be forced to move away (as discussed in Chapter Four).

Other Queensland State Government Forms:
The archival research found that many different types of printed government forms associated with Queensland’s 1897 Act, and its amendments, tightly controlled the lives of Aboriginal people for a period of seventy years. For example, there are forms relating to where Aboriginals could or could not live, where and when they were sent to work and if they could marry and whom they could marry. Other forms regulated removals to reserves, permits to travel and permits to employ Aboriginal people (see below). These techniques which afforded a high level of control and domination can be seen as a form of Foucauldian surveillance, “based on a system of permanent registrations” (1977:196). That is, it demonstrates how effective government officials have been in regulating the lives of Indigenous people. These numerous documents might explain why so many Aboriginal people wanted to escape the regime. The only two ‘escape’ options available to those living under the 1897 Act were to abscond or to qualify for an exemption certificate (see Appendix C).

In the process of researching the archival records, the researcher found that some documents had been written on the back of old government forms. That is, the backs of unused forms such as an Order for Removal were used for non-related purposes. Further investigation found that the templates for these forms were located within both the 1899 Annual Report of the Northern Protector and the Regulations under The Aboriginals Protection and Restrictions of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1901, showing that the forms were purposely designed and sanctioned by the legislative powers. The forms were utilised within the Department for decades. For example, the application for exemption form remained virtually unchanged during the research period (see Appendix C).
Examination of the forms shows that they were used for a range of administrative and legal processes. For example, in relation to ‘convictions’, the most serious offences recorded were signed off by the Home Secretary, under advice from the Chief Protector of Aboriginals. The Home Secretary had the legal power to remove or incarcerate Aboriginal people. This is evident, for example, from the Order for Removal of Aboriginals and Half-Castes form (see Appendix C). The forms themselves were forwarded to the Magistrate, Police or local Protector, and it was their role to investigate those written orders and to act accordingly. In fact, the wording of forms demonstrates that departmental forms, memorandums and circulars of lesser importance were signed off by the Chief Protector of Aboriginals and enforced by the local Protector, the Police and the Superintendents of settlements and reserves (see, for example, Appendix C). A directive indicates that Aboriginal individuals were transferred to locations far from their own families and homelands (as seen about in Appendix, C). Whole tribes or family groups were removed from traditional lands. They were then taken to settlements and missions, where the inmates were forced to learn a new way of life, as reserve regulations prohibited cultural practices including the use of traditional language (Copland, 2005; Blake, 2001; Haebich, 2000; Hegarty 1999).

All forms relating to the employment of Aboriginal people originated in the Office of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals. A sixteen-point memorandum was discovered, which sets out the employer’s responsibilities regarding the ‘Hiring of Female Aboriginal or Half-Caste Servants’ as domestics (see Appendix C). Another Memorandum of Agreement form (see Appendix C) lists the types of work each employer expected of their Aboriginal employee, and how the government expected the employer to maintain certain duties on behalf of the employee. In an employee’s Work Agreement form (see Appendix C), the Protector writes that the employee “wished to be exempted”. Wages were recorded on forms, with small amounts going to the worker and the bulk of the payments going to the state government (see Appendix C). A miscellaneous form (see Appendix C) indicates that the failure by employers to comply with directions resulted in the wages being deemed unpaid. All Work Agreement documents discovered during the research were for periods of twelve-month duration. A memorandum appointing a new local Protector, who had the right to operate the Native Savings Bank Accounts, was revealed by the research
A further form revealed that the Protector was to notify the Office if there had been any mismanagement of these accounts under the term of the previous Protector (see Appendix C). Government mismanagement of accounts has been detailed elsewhere (see, for example, Kidd, 1997; Robinson, 2008; Sharp & Tatz, 1966).

Examination of the monthly forms used by the Superintendent shows that they were utilised to account for all costs relating to food, wages, transportation, welfare relief and health services (see Appendix C). Before Aboriginal people could marry they had to fill in the ‘Application for Permission to Marry’ form, which was then sent to the Chief Protector. He in turn sent a ‘Permission for Celebration of Marriage’ form to the local protector, who finally responded by sending a memorandum in the form of an acknowledgement of the marriage back to the Chief Protector. This form was filed as proof of the wedding having taken place (see Appendix C). A ‘miscellaneous form’ relates specifically to the distribution of blankets (see Appendix C). Blankets distributed by the Protectors were made available only to unemployed and ‘poor’ Aboriginals, and viewed as another government relief effort. The issuing of blankets has been noted extensively (see, for example, Blake, 2001; Broom & Jones, 1973; Reid, 2006).

**The Application Form – Exemption**

The Application Form used for gaining a Certificate of Exemption in Queensland remained largely unchanged throughout the years 1899-1967. Copies of the application form from various periods show that only the smallest of changes occurred in the wording over that seventy year period. For instance, the records show that the actual title of the form changed a few times as indicated by the Chief Protector in his Annual Reports during those years. The first form was titled *The Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1901 ‘Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the Provisions of the Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of Sale of Opium Acts’* (see Appendix C).

A change, albeit superficial, in the title of the form was introduced some time after 1934. It was titled *The Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1934 - ‘Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the*
Provisions of the Acts’. Other changes in 1934 (the addition of the ‘Recommendations of Protectors’ at the bottom of the form), changed the format only slightly (see Appendix C). The final change on the form appears after 1939, with a new title, *The Aboriginals Preservation and Protection Act, 1939* ‘Report on Application by Aboriginal or Half Blood for Exemption from the Provisions of the Act’ (see Appendix C). The inclusion of the term ‘Aboriginal’ was perhaps the most significant change in the seventy years, as it meant that exemptions were now available to all Aboriginal people, and not just ‘half-castes’. This form was still being used up until 1967 when the exemption system was abolished.

Since all application forms located during the research were completed fully, it can be assumed that it was compulsory to complete all the questions on each form, as part of the involved process, which included the provision of references and participation in various interviews. Relevant details concerning the applicant’s lifestyle and history were used to inform the Chief Protector/Director of Native Affairs and assist him in making his final decision about each applicant. That is, many of the questions are ‘lifestyle-type’ questions (see Appendix C).

All application forms required that the applicant’s personal particulars such as their name, age, sex, and place of birth were recorded. Questions were also asked concerning family history, nationality of parents and the legal status of their parents’ marriage. Further questions asked if the applicant was married, which if responded to in the affirmative, then asked “If so, what is nationality of wife (or husband)?” “Has applicant any children? If so, what were their ages?” The last question relating to children was not asked on the new 1934 version of the form.

Other more intrusive questions (see below) on the form indicate the attributes thought to be either desirable or undesirable for exemption at the time. For example, applicants were questioned as to their relationships with other Aboriginal people. For instance: “Does applicant (or his family) habitually associate with aboriginals?” “Does applicant drink?” “Or, procure it for other aboriginals?” Other questions related to the applicant’s lifestyle, behaviour and level of education achieved. The application form also required the local Protector to express an opinion about the intelligence, business dealings and thriftiness of the applicant. Furthermore, the form
inquires: “Does applicant live in a civilised manner and associate with Europeans usually?” Finally, the applicant’s Savings Bank credit details and the nature of his/her character, industry and employment records were required. The last question asks: “Is it applicant’s own wish to be exempt?” On the new 1934 form, this question was replaced by: “Has applicant previously been granted exemption?” and there was a section for ‘Remarks’ at the end of the questions, before the Recommendations section on the form. This is indicative of a governmental approach that rewards ‘internalisation’, or a ‘technology of the self’ (Foucault, 1977).

The questions and answers on the Application Form for exemption have affected the lives of many of Queensland’s Aboriginal families since it was introduced with Section 33 of the ‘1897 Act’ and its Amendments (Wickes, 2006). For example, a major condition for the granting of the exemption involved disassociation from other Aboriginal people, a condition which would obviously affect cultural ties. Although there were very few changes made to the application forms over the seventy years, it is clear to see changes slowly taking place in social expectations and accepted community values within the answers. For instance, a noticeable relaxation can be seen in the areas of ‘drinking’ and ‘associating with Aboriginal people’. In the latter years of exemption system, an assimilatioist approach, including changing attitudes within society, challenged the context of the answer given, therefore affecting the application outcome.

**Selected Examples from Correspondence:**

As already noted, the researcher found the archival records of exemption to be fragmentary, incomplete and categorised according to years (such as 1910, 1911 up to 1939), alphabetically (such as A-C), by subject matter (such as Marriages, Correspondence, Complaints) rather than by applicant or geographic region. Nevertheless, it was possible to construct a number of examples of Aboriginal people in the South Burnett region who applied for the Certificate of Exemption with different outcomes. The archives examined show that many of the application letters had been written or typed by other individuals (for example, employer, solicitor or the local Protector/police officer) and the applicant either signed their name or signed with a cross. Those applying for the Certificate of Exemption were men, women, children and women with children, and their ages ranged from under nine years to
older than seventy years. Some exemptees requested a copy of their original Certificate of Exemption because their exemption certificates had been lost, stolen or damaged (for example, ruined by rain). The involvement of various government officials at different levels (for example Protector/police officer, Superintendent of Cherbourg, the Chief Protector and the Home Secretary) during the decision-making process indicated that, not only was the system arbitrary, the granting of a Certificate of Exemption was a difficult and prolonged process for Aboriginal people seeking an exemption.

Example One ('exemption request' - outcome not apparent)
The first example concerns an Aboriginal woman named B (name withheld), who applied for an exemption certificate when she was on a twelve-month work agreement as a domestic on a property in the Charleville district, Western Queensland. The researcher located a total of thirteen documents concerning B’s application. These documents were dated from 5th October 1929 to 21st April, 1930 (see Appendix C). All correspondence from B is handwritten, indicating that she could read and write.

This process of seeking an exemption appears to have been initiated by B in a handwritten letter she addressed to Mr. Bleakley, Chief Protector of Aboriginals Brisbane on 5th October 1929. B maintained that “I think I have behaved in B.A.S [Barambah Aboriginal Settlement] & I have never asked to leave it before”. She requested to take six months leave of absence from her employment, towards the end of her work agreement contract, during which time she proposed to reside with her uncle, and thereafter be granted an exemption. The Deputy Chief Protector of Aboriginals, Mr Watkins, responded to B’s application in a memorandum dated 19th November, 1929 (29/5619 Apps. Misc.). He acknowledged her letter and requested the name and address of her uncle. Ten days later on 24th November 1929, B wrote back, providing these details to Mr Watkins.

Four days later, a typed memorandum (29/6673 Exemptions) on official government stationary was addressed to The Protector of Aboriginals, Dirranbandi. It requested that a report be written on the suitability of the applicant staying with her uncle. The following month, the Dirranbandi Protector of Aboriginals replied with another typed memorandum, dated 2nd December 1929 (29/6673 Exemptions). This report consisted
of three paragraphs which explained the living conditions of the applicant’s uncle, and concluded with the suggestion that B’s request be – ‘not recommended’.

The Chief Protector, Brisbane, then wrote to the applicant in a typed memorandum dated 7th December, 1929 (29/6841 Exemptions) informing her that: “The local Protector considered that your Uncle has no room for you and moreover is not in good circumstances”. However, this advice does not appear to have ended the application process. On 31st March, 1930, B wrote to Mr. Watkins, Deputy Chief Protector, Brisbane, in reference to her bank account. She indicated that she had knowledge of savings and managed her own income, as required in order to gain exemption from the 1897 Act.

B queried the amount of savings reported to be in her bank account, considering the length of time she had worked. A typed memorandum shows that an investigation was ordered (30/2041 Bar. Accounts). The memorandum was sent from the Chief Protector, Brisbane, to The Superintendent, Barambah Aboriginal Settlement, dated 4th April 1930. A copy of her account was requested. Three days later, a handwritten memorandum (missing] /2041. Bar. Accounts) was received from the Acting Superintendent, itemising the applicant’s account. The outcome from this investigation revealed that the applicant had between £10/0/0 and £11/0/0, in spite of having been originally informed that she had only £3/0/0 to her credit.

B’s application involves herself (the applicant), her uncle, her employer, the local Protector, the Superintendent of Cherbourg, the Deputy Chief Protector and the Chief Protector. It spanned a period of five months and resulted in a large amount of complex correspondence, reports and inspections, all deemed necessary before a decision could be made by the Chief Protector. However, in spite of all this, there is no documentation of the outcome of B’s application for exemption. This example highlights the absence of any clear and transparent official process by which an exemption certificate could be procured. It also reveals the absence of any avenue of appeal available to the applicant, in the event of unfavourable recommendations made against his/her application by the local Protector.
Example Two (‘exemption granted’)
This example concerns an Aboriginal man named L (name withheld) who applied for an exemption certificate. The researcher discovered that this original application generated a total of thirty-one different documents concerning issues raised, questions asked, enquiries made, answers confirmed, findings evaluated and finally a decision was made and the exemption was granted. The resulting file of correspondence was compiled over a period of seven months or eight calendar months from 16th May, 1938 to 12th December 1938 (see Appendix C).

L applied for an exemption or a six month trial exemption period in a handwritten letter to the Chief Protector (dated 16th May 1938). In it he mentioned that he had been “away from the mission nearly seven years now” and had been voting for two years at Maryborough. L’s file steadily grows, with three letters from the Chief Protector to The Superintendant, Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement (dated 20th May 1938, 6th June 1938, 20th May 1938); three memoranda from The Superintendant, Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement, to the Chief Protector (dated 23rd May 1938, 1st July 1938); three letters from the Chief Protector to The Under Secretary, Department of Health and Home Affairs, Brisbane (dated 15th June, 15th June, 3rd October, 1938) with one typed version of the last letter for department records.

In the course of these exchanges, authorities discovered that L was an absconder from the Cherbourg Settlement who was currently illegally employed (with no approved Work Agreement) and earned award wages as a cane cutter and a railway sleeper cutter. This discovery triggered more correspondence which include one completed form titled “Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the Provisions of the Acts” (no date); four reports from a Police Officer (dated 16th June, 15th July, 26th September, 24th October 1938) forwarded to Inspector of Police, then to Chief Protector (dated 17th June, 29th July, 27th September, 25th October 1938); one ‘Order for Removal of Aboriginals and Half-Castes’ for the applicant, signed by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs (dated 18th June, 1938).

Further departmental enquiries revealed that the applicant had made claims concerning a work contract he had with the Railway Department to cut and supply 300 railway sleepers, along with a claim that he was financially supporting his
mother. Meanwhile, the Superintendent at the Cherbourg Settlement requested that the absconder be apprehended and returned to the Settlement, however, Police investigations concerning L’s circumstances seemed quite favourable, resulting in their recommendation that he be exempted.

Further correspondence included; one memorandum from the Chief Protector to The Superintendent, Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement, forwarded to the Chief Protector (dated 27th June, 1938); three memoranda from the Chief Protector to The Protector, Maryborough (dated 7th July, 1st September, 11th October 1938) and one typed version for all letters (for Department records); one letter from Chief Protector to The General Storekeeper, Railway Department, Brisbane (dated 5th August, 1938); one letter from General Storekeeper to Chief Protector (dated 8th August, 1938). Slowly further details concerning L’s claims are discovered which resulted in action being taken to advertise in three local newspapers that it was illegal to employ Natives without a proper Work Contract.

As the applicant’s claims were only partially validated, the Superintendent at Cherbourg revealed that he doubted most of them, and if L were to be exempted, he must be warned not to come near the Settlement, as he had been upsetting people by boasting about the award wages he has been earning “illegally”. In the light of all investigations, and a seemingly good report concerning L’s character and lifestyle from the Police, the Chief Protector agreed to grant the application for exemption. The file continued to grow, with the addition of the following documents: one acknowledgement of receiving the exemption (dated 22nd October, 1938); one letter from Reverend Taylor, Rector – Church of England, Maryborough to the Chief Protector (dated 6th December, 1938); one letter from the Chief Protector to Reverend Taylor, Rector (dated 9th December 1938 with a letter half written, kept on file); one governmental record file. These final documents concern the newly exempted L’s plan to marry a “coloured” girl, and the fact that Reverend Taylor required confirmation from the Chief Protector that this could be permitted to happen.

This example demonstrates the power and control of a government department over the life of an Aboriginal man who wanted to be exempted from the 1897 Act. This is revealed by the number of documents, government officials, reports, investigations
and man-hours involved over a period of eight months. The example also demonstrates how the process of applying for exemption was cumbersome and unpredictable and, in this case, largely determined by the personal views of state officials.

**Example Three** (*exemption granted*)

This example concerns an Aboriginal woman named F (name withheld) who had applied for and was granted an exemption certificate. Five documents ranging in date from 8\textsuperscript{th} August 1916 to 1\textsuperscript{st} September 1916 were located by the researcher in regard to the applicant’s status\textsuperscript{10} (see Appendix C).

The process of gaining an exemption in this instance took only a matter of four weeks. There was no written letter by the applicant in the file. The first document is a memo from the Inspector of Police, Maryborough (dated 8\textsuperscript{th} August 1916). Its contents relate to a [half-caste] named F who was under a Work Agreement contract in the district. An inquiry was made as to whether she was still working under the same work contract or whether she was now employed elsewhere. The reasons why this information was necessary are not given. The next correspondence is a handwritten first page of a two-page letter. The words “EIDSWOLD, QUEENSLAND” [sic] are stamped on the top of the page, which revealed that a conversation had occurred between two parties. The writer stated: “I have had three of her sisters previously in my employ, none of whom were under agreement & all had Government Savings Bank accounts”. “Two of the sisters were employed as parlour-maids and the other sister as a nurse maid”. Down one side of the document was a message regarding the sisters: “These girls have all been very respectable and well-behaved, decent girls, excellent servants & are all well married”.

A typed report by Sgt Clare, Eidsvold (dated 16 August, 1916) gives the whereabouts of the applicant, F. It refers to an interview with her employer which established that she was not under any agreement and stated that the girl “is more white than black and therefore he was of the opinion that it was not necessary to apply for a permit”. It is also indicated that the employer has known F since her infancy. Her mother was: “half Aboriginal and half Chinese, and the girl’s father evidently a white man”. When F was interviewed at her workplace, she stated that she: “is now 18 years of age, and
is receiving 12/- per week and food”. F is well cared for by her employer and she is a sensible girl and she can “sign her name, but she cannot read or write”. The last sentence of the report states that: “I am of the opinion that this girl is more white than black and is capable of taking care of herself and should not be classed as an Aboriginal”. The report was addressed to the Inspector of Police, Maryborough, who then forwarded to the Chief Protector with instructions written by the Inspector on the side of it.

A fortnight later, a memorandum was sent from the Chief Protector to the local Protector, Maryborough, granting an exemption to F. The request states: “Kindly deliver it to the owner and obtain an acknowledgement, which should be returned to this Office”. There are a number of other comments typed on the memorandum, such as: Inspector of Police Maryborough with his signature, giving instructions to Acting Sgt Clare re: F and her exemption. Acting Sgt Clare typed his response, indicating that the instructions had been carried out (8/9/16). A comment was written by the Inspector of Police, Maryborough, who then returned the memorandum to the Chief Protector (13/9/16). The acknowledgement states, “received Certificate of Exemption under The Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1901”. It is signed by F and witnessed by another person.

Although the granting of the Certificate of Exemption to F was seemingly straightforward, it involved numerous transactions, as seen in the paperwork. Many government officials, such as the Chief Protector and his clerk, the local Protector and the Inspector of Police handled the correspondence, which recorded three signatures of officials as well as those of a witness and F’s employer. This example again demonstrates the bureaucratic complexity and arbitrary nature of processing applications for exemption.

**Example Four (‘exemption denied’)**

This example concerns an Aboriginal man named J (name withheld) who had applied for the exemption certificate, but had it denied. A total of thirteen one-page documents ranging in date from 18th December 1917 to 15th September 1937 were located by the researcher in regard to the processing of J’s application (see Appendix C).11
On the 18th December 1917, the Royal Humane Society of Australasia sent a letter to the Chief Protector of Aboriginals in Brisbane. The letter requested that J, an Aboriginal man from Barambah, be present to accept an award from the Governor at a ceremony to be held in Brisbane for saving a man’s life. He was on a Work Agreement contract in the Charters Towers region at the time. Mr Bleakley, Chief Protector, attended the function instead of J and received J’s certificate, which was then hung in the Superintendent’s office at Barambah. That is, J never received the award.

J served two and a half years in the 5th Light Horse Brigade during the First World War. Twenty years later, he wrote a letter to the Returned Soldiers League and the Home Secretary, concerning his living conditions at Cherbourg. His letter was forwarded to other government officials. The Chief Protector requested a report on J which was consequently written by the Superintendent, and sent to the Chief Protector. The report described J as

not a very good Native he is very lazy and has not been out working for years. He does little on the Settlement complaining of being sick when asked to work. He usually camps down by the Murgon gate. He is supposed to look after the gate and report if any one enters who should not do so. In this he is not reliable. In my opinion it would never do to give him exemption, he would only loaf around the country Hotels and drink.

The applicant’s request was denied on the basis of an unfavourable report by the Superintendent, in which he suggests that J was “not a good type of native”. This situation accords with Kidd’s observation that it “was official policy that all returned soldiers were entitled to exemption, but in practice this was conditional on their conduct being reasonably satisfactory” (1997:153).

This example regarding J shows that the system was fundamentally flawed in failing to give the applicant an exemption. The processing of his application was manifestly unjust, with State officials failing to consider J’s war service overseas or his bravery award when deciding on his suitability for exemption. Further, his refusal to be employed on a Work Agreement because of its inadequate remuneration resulted in him being characterised negatively as ‘lazy’.
Example Five (‘exemption revoked’)  
This example involves an Aboriginal man named A (name withheld), who had applied for and successfully gained an exemption certificate. Within a few years, exemptee A found himself in a position where the exemption was revoked. In all, ten documents relating to A’s circumstances were located by the researcher, ranging in date from 10th August 1919 to 23rd October 1923 (see Appendix C).12

In this example the application process began with A’s father (W), who lived away from the Settlement, writing a letter to the Superintendent at Barambah, requesting an opportunity to have his boys (A and T) stay with him for a while, whilst he was on holidays. (10th August 1919). In the memorandum (dated 13th August 1919) from the Superintendent to the Chief Protector, the following information was passed on: “[W] received his exemption with an understanding that he does not come within the district” (the handwriting is almost illegible). The Superintendent also wrote: “I think this application of A was a move to go out and then apply for his [own] exemption”. There are no further documents relating to the exemption of A’s father in this file.

Just nine days later, a memo (22nd August 1919) was sent from the Chief Protector to the Superintendent at Barambah in relation to A’s application. It states: “Does the boy wish to be exempt? If so would he adhere to the same conditions as his father?” The memo also has an attached blank form to complete. The file contained no completed “Application for Exemption” form. A handwritten statement by Supt. B.A.S, reads: “A does not wish to apply for exemption till he gets away from Sett.” A similar comment reveals: “B/C for Chief Protector - he does not wish to apply just yet as his people would (illegible) but he will as soon as he goes out. He is intelligent enough to manage his own affairs. He wants to go to his father for a spell”. The response is a brief “No objection” signed 25/9/19. A final comment advises: “C.P.A. - exemption of the applicant fill paper of questions”. This one page memo again highlights the plethora of bureaucratic paperwork often associated with exemption applications. The following correspondence continues to expand this file. On the next day (26th Sept. 1919) a typed memo was sent from the Deputy Chief Protector to the Superintendent Barambah: “With reference to your B/C. re A wishing to go to his father for a spell, I have by direction, to advise that this office has no objections”.
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About four weeks later, whilst staying with his father, A wrote a two-page letter (dated 29/10/19) to the Chief Protector, regarding his intentions to apply for his exemption. The first page of this letter has the comment “...for exemptions from the AP Acts, as he can do better without its restraint”.

The next bureaucratic agency involved in A’s exemption was the Home Department. A memo was sent (27th January 1920) from the Deputy Chief Aboriginals informing them that, “As A [applicant] Barambah A/cs. has been granted his Exemption, please transfer his balance to this office to be forwarded to his”. A memorandum (dated 8th March 1920) from the Deputy Chief Protector to the local Protector, Maryborough, explaining that a cheque has been drawn for the applicant who had been granted his exemption and requested that the official receipt be forwarded to the office. A handwritten comment at the bottom of the page demands: “Miss Bennett, have these receipts come in!”

In 1923, a cancellation of the applicant’s Certificate of Exemption was signed by the Home Secretary of the State of Queensland, the Minister administering the 1897 Act. An official document (dated 25 Oct 1923) revealed why, in the following instance, it was necessary to revoke an exemption that was given to an Aboriginal man only four years previously. It states that

A [applicant] was granted his exemption in December 1919. With his wife and two small children he has landed in Brisbane destitute, and made application to go to the Barambah Settlement. They have been sent there this afternoon and he has expressed his desire to become an inmate.

Mr Watkins, the Deputy Chief Protector wrote “I recommend that his Certificate of Exemption be revoked. Form for signature herewith.” The final memorandum in the file from the Chief Protector to the Superintendent Barambah (dated 23rd October, 1923), revealed that the Home Secretary had cancelled A’s exemption, stating: “in the future this man and his family are to be considered inmates”.

It is unclear if A had any conditions placed on his exemption, when he was originally granted an exemption. There is no evidence in the file to indicate whether the applicant found suitable work and accommodation in the Burnett region before he
moved to Brisbane with his family. Therefore, the basis of the revocation remains unclear and raises the question as to whether A himself fully understood the reasons for this action.

Example Six (‘exemption and request for own money’)
In this example, the issue was not only about gaining an exemption, but also about the applicant gaining access to his savings which had been placed in a government-held bank account. It is a straightforward account of an Aboriginal man named H (name withheld), who wished to apply for an exemption. A total of nine one-page documents, ranging in date from 3rd April 1928 to 24th August 1928, were located by the researcher in regard to H’s application (see Appendix C).13

H requested exemption in a letter (dated 3rd April 1928), to the Superintendent at Barambah. His application included the statement that, “I have not visited the Settlement for over six years and have no friends or relatives amongst the coloured [sic] people”, indicating that H was aware of the exemption requirement which separated Aboriginal people from their families. There is a handwritten comment from the Superintendent on the original letter of application, referring to a sum of over £200-0-0, and a note that he has written to the applicant. The rest of the comment is illegible. A further handwritten comment reads: “And Maryborough to obtain report”, with the initials J.B. dated 20/4/28. The subsequent report outlines H’s life as follows: “Went to school at the Settlement, went to work for an employer for four years. Since then, he has been working on the current property”.

The employer’s letter of support (dated 3rd April 1928) accompanying H’s application, described H as “a respectable, honest, saving, competent lad” and “during the period he has been with me I have never known him to touch drink.” Those character qualities comply with the conditions necessary to gain a Certificate of Exemption. The copy of the subsequent application form, in which all questions have been answered, (dated 10th May 1928) revealed that H had bank savings of “£230 – money banked by Superintendent, Barambah” held in the government’s saving account. It also stated that H’s parents were unknown and that he was a single man.
An official memorandum was forwarded to the local Protector/Inspector of Police from the Chief Protector (dated 24\textsuperscript{th} April 1928), instructing them to carry out inquiries regarding H and to write a report. A report dated 10\textsuperscript{th} May 1928 was sent, regarding the findings of the investigation. The report notes that H had been working in the community for about 10 years since leaving Barambah Settlement, and that he has all the qualities necessary for gaining an exemption. It also states that his employer “is a most respectable person”. Whilst being processed, this report was handled by the local Protector and the Inspector of Police, Maryborough, signed by Deputy Chief Protector (dated 2.6.28) and it was to be B/C’d to the Under Secretary, Home Dept. The annotation, “exemption recommended”, appears on the bottom of the letter.

Three weeks later, a memorandum from Mr Watkins, Deputy Chief Protector (dated 23\textsuperscript{rd} June 1928) was sent to the local Protector. Although the memorandum is only half a page in size it has been copied to a full page with a letter of acknowledgement, stating that H received his exemption on 7\textsuperscript{th} July 1928. The following month an official memorandum was sent from the Deputy Chief Protector of Aboriginals to the local Protector, to ascertain from H “whether he is prepared to allow his money to remain in the care of the department, to be available to him as required?” The Protector’s report revealed that H has been interviewed and that: “He desired this money, now in the care of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals, transferred to the Nanango Branch of the Commonwealth Bank to his credit”. The report also states that, “He is desirous of controlling his own money and that he does not wish it to remain any longer in the care of the Aboriginal department”. A request dated 26.6.28 is written by Mr Watkins, to ask “B.A.S what [H’s] current ‘credit’ is, so that it can be transferred”. Other research has revealed that, during this period, when Aboriginal people had bank accounts with considerable amounts of money, the government preferred to remain the official caretaker (see, for example, Kidd, 1997, 2006).

The final document pertaining to H’s application for exemption was an official memorandum sent by Mr Watkins, Deputy Chief Protector, to the Superintendent of Barambah Settlement (dated 24\textsuperscript{th} August 1928). It stated: “Referring to previous correspondence, please advise what the Bank Credit for [H] is now. Are there any outstanding accounts against it?” The reply to this question was written on the
memorandum: “B/C, D.C.P.A credit £255-15-1” and signed by the Superintendent, dated 28/8/28. Further handwritten notes on the page showed that a cheque was drawn, with the reference number 76830.

Given the requirements for exemption, H represented a model applicant because he had managed his own affairs without accessing or requesting funds from his government bank account. Nevertheless this did not ensure that his application was processed efficiently. H’s combined request for both an exemption and money took six months to finalise. Following Foucault, Kidd (1994) notes that within the notion of governmentality “there is no necessary unity to the multiple components of the governmental field”, nor does the field “operate according to a single general principle such as expression of the sovereign will of state” (1994:9).

Example Seven (’applicant required to marry’)
This example concerns an Aboriginal man named M (name withheld), who applied for an exemption certificate after having worked for about three years for his employer in Ayr, North Queensland. A total of six different documents, ranging in date from 28th January 1924 to 24th March 1924, were located by the researcher in regard to M’s application (see Appendix C).14

In this case, the process of seeking an exemption appears to have been initiated by M in a letter addressed to the Protector of Aboriginais, which arrived at the Chief Protector’s office on the 28th January, 1924 (06/1829 Home Office). The application letter was handwritten by M, indicating that he could read and write. M explained that he was “born in Brambh [sic] Mission Station” and states that, “I am 23 years of age married” and “I do not smoke or drink”. Two comments are written by Mr Watkins, stating: “(1) send copy to Ayr for report inform. (2) Ask Barambah whether he knows this boy & what was his behaviour like while there”? The letter of application is signed and dated 28/1/24. On his application form for an exemption, M declares that he has £17/18/7 in his bank account, however it is not clear if the department holds the bank account or M has his own account.

Two days later, Mr Watkins, the Deputy Chief Protector acting for the Chief Protector, responded to M’s application. He wrote a memorandum on an official
government letterhead, dated 30\textsuperscript{th} January, 1924 (Ref. No. 24/505 Exemptions) to “The Superintendent, Aboriginal Settlement Barambah”, requesting information about M as stated above. The handwritten reply from the Superintendent dated 4/2/24 is on the same memorandum. The comment reads: “M was sent here from Mitchell 18/7/1906” and “while on the Settlement his conduct was satisfactory.” On that same day (30\textsuperscript{th} January, 1924), Mr Watkins wrote a memorandum to the Superintendent in which he requested a “report on form please”, in order to determine M’s eligibility to gain his exemption. He also forwarded a typed copy of M’s letter to the Protector, Ayr.

The next document is the completed form, “Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the Provisions of the Acts”. The application form originated from the office of the Protector, Ayr, and is signed by Mr. P Davis, the Local Protector office and stamp dated 13\textsuperscript{th} February, 1924. The following day, on 14\textsuperscript{th} February, 1924, the Chief Protector of Aboriginals wrote a Memorandum (24/906 Exemptions) to Protector Davis, stating: “Please advise [M] that his application for exemption will not be considered until he is legally married to the woman he is living with”. It continues with “he cannot expect to obtain the privileges of a white man and live in the custom of an aboriginal”. There is an underlined handwritten word, “away”, near the top of the document, suggesting the file has been closed.

Ten days later, Mr. P. Davis, Protector Ayr, wrote to the Chief Protector of Aboriginals stating that:

I beg to report in reference to your Memorandum of the 14\textsuperscript{th} Ultimo No.24/906 Exemptions M was legally married to P [name withheld] by the Rev. Mr Edwards in the Church of England Ayr on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} Instant.

This example is another demonstration of the power of the Department to control every aspect of the lives of Aboriginal people, even to the point of demanding that the applicant must marry, prior to gaining his exemption. As there is no further correspondence on record concerning this matter, it is unclear if M ever gained his exemption.
Example Eight (‘application for exemption sent by Solicitor’)

This example concerns an Aboriginal woman B and her son named J (names withheld) who resided in the Burnett region, and had applied for an exemption certificate. A total of four different documents, ranging in date from 18th December 1937 to 22nd December 1937, were located by the researcher in regard to B and J’s application (see Appendix C).  

The typed application form for exemption is completed on behalf of J (dated 18th December 1937). The form was signed by the local Protector and stamped with the date. In the recommendation section, the Protector wrote:

In this instance the application for Exemption is not recommended by me, it is very hard to get him to work under an Agreement, and he is hard to control. He also indulges in intoxicating liquor of [sic] he can possibly procure it and also will supply it to other Aboriginals if possible.

This report, forwarded to the Chief Protector of Aboriginals, is a damning one for J. Other facts included in the report are that J “attended the Aboriginal State School at Gayndah for seven years” and had the total sum of £5-5-3 in his account. There is no documentation in the file relating to J’s mother’s application for exemption; therefore it is unclear if she continued with her own application.

The local Protector (Gayndah station, Maryborough District) sent a report on J to the Chief Protector Brisbane (22nd December 1937). This report was written after the local Protector had interviewed various people in the community to ascertain the character of the applicant. The report records that the applicant: “is a single man and resides with his mother in a small cottage on the outskirts of Gayndah”. The applicant had a Work Agreement contract with a local employer for approximately six weeks (27/10/37 to 8/12/37) and that the employer stated that, “he would never again take this lad on employment as he is too lazy and will not work”. This was the applicant’s first time under a Work Agreement contract. It remains a mystery why J was placed on a contract when he lived in the mainstream community. Work Agreement contracts were supposedly for inmates at Cherbourg Settlement only.

The report states that J’s parents lived apart and that J had a fair education. In the last paragraph the local Protector mentions Aboriginals who engaged a solicitor before
being interviewed by him in relation to their exemption application. In relation to payments to solicitors for services rendered, the local Protector states that his office had not received any accounts for payment and “no accounts for such matter will be recommended by me for payment.” The local Protector states that, “This applicant is one that should be under the provisions of the Acts” and “I would not recommend that this applicant be granted Exemption owing to the fact that he is only 19 years of age”. This report highlights the arbitrary powers held by local Protectors, as there was undoubtedly no recourse for the applicant to take regarding the report’s contents.

One week later, the Chief Protector sent a memorandum (dated 30th December 1937) to the local Protector at Gayndah. He acknowledged the letter sent by the local Protector in a memorandum which stated that, “I would advise that as he is under 21 years of age, he is not entitled to be exempted”. The memorandum further stated that “if the applicant rehabilitated himself in the eyes of the department he might stand a possible chance of a favourable outcome in the future”. The last sentence stated, “He might be further informed that if you have any difficulty in controlling him, he will be removed to a Settlement.” The threat of removal is apparent in the last sentence of the memorandum from the Chief Protector.

Although the initial application was for both mother and son, it is clear that only the son is the applicant, as evident in the documents. It is not clear to whom the letter from the solicitor is addressed. The solicitor gave a character reference for both parties, stating that, “Both the applicants are deserving cases, and I would be grateful if you would also favourably consider their applications for their exemptions”. In this letter, statements about J’s character differ somewhat from the local Protector’s report: “both are good workers, and really require their wages to support the home.” In fact, the solicitor had employed the mother, but failed to mention in what capacity. It can be assumed that she was a domestic in his home. There was no documentation to indicate that J received his exemption certificate, therefore the final outcome is unclear. This example again demonstrated how the process of attempting to obtain an exemption certificate was not uniform and the rationale for the success or failure of an application was not transparent.
In conclusion, these examples demonstrate how controlling the government practices were in regards to the Certificate of Exemption for Aboriginal people. The power of the bureaucracy over Queensland’s Indigenous population was widespread, especially within the Department of Native Affairs. In particular, the examples demonstrate a Foucauldian discursive regime of governmentality that rewards internalisation of the values and beliefs of the dominant culture.

Overall the archival material investigated confirms the consistently arbitrary interpretations by officials of the 1897 Act and its amendments in deciding ‘who could be exempted’ or ‘who was not entitled to be exempted’ as has been noted previously (see, for example, Ganter & Kidd, 1988; Davis & Watson, 2006).

The next chapter contains the Interpretations of Findings and analyses the research carried out on the exemption certificate.
Endnotes:

1 Since its conception in 1959, the Queensland State Archives has stored the bulk of official records of Queensland’s government departments. The Department of Aboriginal Affairs was one such department that transferred their historical documents to the State Archives (see Frankland, 1994).

2 The government records were held in seventy-five boxes under the following headings: two boxes of Marriages (1901, 1941), one box of Applications – Miscellaneous (1915), one box of Barambah Accounts (July to September, 1927), three boxes of Barambah – Complaints (1906, 1935, 1941), twenty-one boxes of Miscellaneous and Complaints (1904-1932), two boxes of Complaints – Miscellaneous (1921, 1930), one box of Complaints (1941), sixteen boxes of Exemptions (1909-1937), three boxes of Exemptions A-C (1938, 1939, 1940), two boxes of Exemptions K-M (1938), one box of Exemptions N-R (1939), twenty-one boxes of Marriages (1909-1939) and one box of Native Affairs General (1954).

3 Annual Reports were sent from the Office of the Southern and Northern Protector of Aboriginals (1898-1904 Mr Meston and Dr Roth), Office of Chief Protector of Aboriginals (1904-1939 Mr Howard and Mr Bleakley) and Office of Director of Native Affairs (1939-1966 Mr Bleakley, Mr O’Leary and Mr Killoran) and Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs – 1966-1967 Mr Killoran).

4 Age is subjective. Research data reveals that Aboriginal men and women in their twenties were classed as ‘boy’ and ‘girl’. Therefore, it is hard to ascertain the correct ages of those wanting an exemption in 1900.


6 The Aborigines’ and Torres Strait Islanders’ Act of 1965 came into force on 28 April 1966 and the Department of Aboriginal and Islander Affairs was formed.

7 The title changed over time: the Chief Protector, Director of Native Affairs.

8 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/69428 File No: 30/2499. Exemptions – 1930.

9 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58777 File No: 38/18965. Marriages – 1938.

10 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58740 File No: 16/2680. Exemptions – 1916.

11 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58741 File No: 37/2135. Exemptions – D-J.

12 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58735 File No: 23/5897. Exemptions – 1923.

13 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58737 File No: 28/5042. Exemptions.

14 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58772 File No: 24/1696 Marriages – 1924.

15 Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/69971 File No: 37/2993. Exemptions A-C. (restricted)

16 The Northern and Southern Protectors of Aboriginals, The Chief Protector of Aboriginals Office, Director of Native Affairs Office and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Department
This chapter interprets and theorises the findings generated by research into the diaries, interviews and archives. The research exposes aspects of the lived experiences of citizenship by Queensland’s exempted Aboriginal people prior to 1967. This research has been informed by a critical inquiry perspective that characterises relations between the state and its exemptees as fundamentally coercive. For over a century Queensland’s Aboriginal people had their lives controlled and coerced by legislation, rules and regulations enforced by the state’s bureaucracy. Interpretation of this research focuses on the ways in which exemptees resisted, endured and engaged with the social order imposed on them by the state, as they attempted to negotiate an end to this coercion and attain a place in the mainstream community, albeit at the expense of connection to family, culture and heritage. The three areas of research contain themes that encapsulate the essence of citizenship for those Aboriginal people and their families who applied for a Certificate of Exemption.

**Diaries:**
First and foremost, it appears that these six personal diaries written by an exempted Aboriginal woman are extremely rare, and may well be unique. Extensive research has failed to reveal the existence of any other such records kept by a female Indigenous author prior to 1967.\(^1\) In writing about non-Indigenous women diarists’ in the era of the 1920s – 1930s, Holmes notes that

> Many women gave no space at all to their emotional lives, and disclosed no secrets about their private thoughts, feelings or actions. Rather they fill their pages with insistent domestic detail – washing, ironing, cleaning, cooking and childcare (1995:ix-x).

This describes the writing style of Daisy Smith, who gave no indication of her Aboriginal heritage. In the six surviving diaries, five written during the 1940s and one written in 1951, Daisy methodically wrote about her family life and their
experiences, as they lived a new life, ‘out from under the Act’. As the wife of an exempted Aboriginal man, she maintained the invisibility of herself and family as Aboriginal people, throughout the diaries.

In 1942, Daisy started to record their lives and continued over the next ten-year period. It is unclear why she became a diarist, although it is possible that she was ensuring that a written record of their full compliance with the exemption requirements existed. Roy had gained his exemption at Purga Aboriginal Mission in 1926, and soon became fully integrated into the community, with his wife and family. The diaries give ample evidence that Roy was well able to manage his own finances, as required of every exemptee. Six years after gaining his exemption, he was issued with a drivers licence and later became the proud owner of an Essex motorcar. The diaries reveal that the car was used as a way of Roy getting to and from work, and Valma to and from school, as well as driving the family to various sporting and social outings. The diaries also reveal that Roy was driving as part of his employment, which gave him another dimension to his enjoyment of citizenship.

The order of the day could be seen in the daily entries. Holmes (1995) argues that, “diary writing itself was a means of ordering experience and establishing control over one’s life” (1995:xiii). The job of getting ‘the man’ off to work first thing in the morning, then the children off to school, was a daily script written from Mondays to Fridays. Housework consisted of childcare, washing, ironing, cooking and cleaning, which was fundamentally the role of the ‘good wife’. Added to this workload was the shopping, mailing, gardening and sewing; all were meant to keep the home running smoothly. This in turn allowed the male of the house to continue going to work outside the home in his role as the primary breadwinner. In the case of the Smith household, the housework performed and diarised by Daisy enabled a stable domestic situation which demonstrated that the family could manage its own affairs and was not in need of ‘protection’ under the Act.

Scholarship regarding home is defined by the dominant European Australian culture of women, therefore, there is little written about the home from other perspectives. For instance, Aboriginal women were invisible, rather than being described by writers as homemakers. They were more commonly referred to as domestics (see Huggins,
Holmes (1995) claims that the “cleanliness, whiteness, hygiene and efficiency of the modern home were values against which was counterposed the perceived degradation of the Aboriginal race” (1995:45). This is disputed by the diary’s entries written by Daisy, who had a regime of daily cleaning, orderliness and efficiency that never faltered.

In early research, work performed in the home was seen as not valued and as secondary to the primary provider. The feminist movement began to recognise the work performed by women in the home. Oakley’s (1985) seminal, sociological and feminist analysis of housework argues that it should be seen as work. She argues that, “women’s lives as workers in the home provided the foundation of new knowledge about women” (Oakley, 1985:138). Gender roles within the workload were traditional tasks that Daisy and Roy seem to overlook. As work arose they tended to help each other, regardless of traditional roles. Numerous comments in the diaries relate to Daisy helping out in the farm work, and there were occasions when she notes Roy’s participation in domestic activities in the home. This somewhat blurred division of labour recorded in the diaries demonstrates a close relationship between Daisy and her husband, enabling an harmonious engagement with the community at large. For example, this enabled them to mix with European society, thereby meeting the requirement of exemption not to associate with Aboriginal society. Roy and Daisy’s wedding anniversary was noted in each of the diaries on 2nd January every year. This serves as a subtle reminder (to the reader) that they were indeed married, and met another potential condition of exemption addressed on the official application form by the question which asked, “Is the applicant married (legally)?”

Daisy’s diaries reveal in much detail a clear example of someone who knew how to maintain a home and the financial affairs of the household. There are many instances in the diaries where Daisy demonstrated her skills in that area. Apart from mentioning Roy’s paydays, wages were rarely discussed in the diaries, and when they were, they usually pertain to Daisy’s earnings. Nevertheless, the diaries show that the Smith family’s lives were centred on routines determined by their paid work. Each member of the family contributed to the workforce within their own abilities. All three of the older children participated in paid employment, the eldest in domestic work and the other two in farm labouring. Daisy herself worked both inside and
outside the home as a domestic in a private home, a hotel, a hospital and a school, to maintain their standard of living. The Smith family’s working lifestyle contrasts with Pettman’s observations that as “the family is constructed ideologically with the husband/father as breadwinner, women’s paid work is seen as secondary and conditional” (1992:61). Daisy’s domestic labour at home was not marginal and undertaken solely in exchange for economic support. It enabled a fully functioning household, whereby Roy could maintain his paid employment. Further, the family finances were greatly improved by the extra income earned by Daisy and the children. This ensured the household’s financial viability and demonstrated that its members could manage their own affairs, which was a central aspect to maintaining their exempted status. It suggests that Daisy never forgot the exemption requirement implied in the question on the application form: “Is he (or she) thrifty, and does he (or she) understand the value of money?”

It is commonly held that companionship amongst women can be described as being supportive of each other, and in this instance it was in both the rural community and suburbia. Diary entries record that morning and afternoon teas were held in Daisy’s home and that she also visited other women’s homes for the social network of understanding and encouragement. It is clear that Daisy actively cared for her circle of friends and neighbours. When they were in need, Daisy stepped in and often stayed until the crisis was over. Above all, Daisy supported her own family at all times. Holmes (1995) records that

In the diaries of married women, it is their families who feature most prominently. Other women move in and out of the pages, their friendships important but not portrayed as central to the writer’s life (1995:126).

Daisy wrote sparingly about her own thoughts. Personal affection and feelings are seldom mentioned in the six diaries. This absence accords with Holmes’ (1995) finding that “[m]any women gave no space at all to their emotional lives, and disclosed no secrets about their private thoughts, feelings or actions” (1995:ix). The diaries expose the household as opened and welcoming to all and this is evident in the number of visitors to the Smith household. References to phone calls, telegrams and personal mail are frequent in the diaries, demonstrating that the Smith family
maintained a relationship with others, thereby ‘associating with Europeans’ as per the relevant condition of the exemption.

Social and community life are strongly represented in the six diaries. Sports such as football and boxing were part of the Smith men’s lives. Horse racing is portrayed as something the men attended, whilst Daisy stayed home and listened to the races on the wireless. Daisy also listened to the boxing competitions on the wireless, usually with family or neighbours. In addition, the wireless provided its listeners with local and overseas news, sporting events, serials and a community noticeboard. The diaries record that the family attended community activities such as school and church fetes and social dances. Daisy competed in cooking competitions, making cakes and jams and sometimes winning prizes. Crossword puzzles were Daisy’s forte, especially when she won prizemoney in the competitions. Going to the picture theatres and watching a movie or two were social outings that were heavily patronised and greatly enjoyed by the family. Movies gave the household members a worldview, as they observed activities and places beyond Australian shores. In the intermission between the night’s two movies, usually a screening of the current Newsreel (of news events) was shown, adding graphic visual images of the War in Europe and in the Pacific.

Some notable events of the Second World War were documented throughout the first three diaries. Interspersed amongst the regular entries of housework and daily activities were very important new items, such as: ‘Japanese Surrender’ or ‘Hitler died. Yippee’. The entries always continue on to inform of other mundane events that happened for the rest of the day, giving washing and ironing the prominence and importance of military victory. The contribution that Daisy made was small, yet it was significant in demonstrating that she saw herself as able to actively participate in the civilian war effort. On the home front, Daisy records her brother-in-law going to New Guinea as part of the Armed Forces. The diaries of the war years also demonstrate the impact of war on the Smith household, as evidenced by Daisy’s mention of the use of food stamps and ration books, as well as the hardships of wartime clothing, food and petrol shortages. Comradeship and patriotism were written about, and even the passing of influential leaders was mentioned in the diaries. Gall (1986) documents a bibliography of literature about women during the Second World War, yet there is no mention of Aboriginal women’s contributions to the war.
She comments: “I have attempted to chart both the strengths and lacunae of secondary and primary source material relating to Australian women on the homefront in World War II” (Gall, 1986:215).³

Education was a major factor in the Smith’s family lives. In the first four diaries, the youngest child attended school each week, evident in the daily comments such as ‘Valma at school’. This was a disciplined routine – Roy could participate in the workforce and Valma could attend school regularly.⁴ This occurred when the family lived on a property in the Burnett region during the war years. Valma continued with her education when the family moved back to the city, where she attended Intermediate School at South Brisbane. Education was another potential condition of exemption, making it important for all family members to be educated in order for exemption to be maintained.

Questions arise as to why Daisy chose not to comment on Aboriginal issues, even in the basic area of communicating with other Aboriginal people. The diary writing was silent in this regard, even to the point where the writer’s nationality was ambiguous; certainly there were no clues as to her Aboriginality. In 1926, Roy, Daisy’s husband, gained his Certificate of Exemption. This allowed them to move away from Purga Aboriginal Mission.⁵ There were conditions attached to gaining the exemption.⁶ One such condition asked: ‘Does applicant (or his family) habitually associate with aboriginals’? If this condition was broken, the applicant could have their exemption revoked and be sent back to live on the mission. For the Smith family, those words were upheld even decades later, as the adult children continued ‘not associating with aboriginals’ well after the end of the exemption system in 1967. This can be interpreted as an internalisation of the values of the dominant culture, as well as a discipline of the self (see, Foucault, 1977).

Marshall’s (1950) three-dimensional theory of citizenship involves civil, political and social rights. As an exempted Aboriginal family, the Smith family enjoyed these three rights in the same manner as other citizens within a democratic society, provided that they did not maintain their Aboriginal cultural heritage or associated with others who did. Their apparent freedom to go wherever they wished is evidenced by the diaries. That is, while there are numerous diary entries relating to travel, there are no
diary entries that indicate that they found movement to be problematic or oppressive. As citizens, Roy and Daisy were entitled to vote in both state and federal elections. In one election, it is revealed that they voted whilst they were away, indicating that ‘the vote’ was seen as an important political privilege. Other social rights that the Smith family utilised included the state’s public facilities of hospital, school, transport and housing.

As the Smith family assimilated fully as citizens within the community, the evidence from the diaries is that they were apparently well respected. That is, there are no diary entries that contradict this conclusion. When Rita Huggins gained her exemption, she noted that, “I was considered a respectable and ‘free’ Aboriginal woman now” (Huggins & Huggins, 1994:45). The diaries display throughout that maintaining respectability was something the family took pride in. As Rowse points out, the idea of an “Aboriginal sense of respectability” appeared to substantiate assimilationist views (2005:66). Again, this is also in accord with Foucault’s (1977) notions of internalisation and discipline of the self. The process of assimilation is clearly demonstrated in the diaries, with the family participating fully as citizens within the Australian culture even though, as Haebich has argued, it “was only in the late 1950s that Queensland began to express a ‘clear and purposeful’ policy of assimilation” (2000:528).

Roy and Daisy spent twelve and six years respectively at Purga Aboriginal Mission, before Roy gained his exemption in 1926, and both had lived with European Australian families prior to their removal. Combined with the training they received at the mission, this positioned them well to live in civilian lifestyles. The entries in the diaries indicate that Daisy never forgot any of the important things she had learned in her formative years. For instance, it is evident in her well-developed sense of purpose and a sound knowledge about how to manage a household and family. The records remain a matter-of-fact account of life as a positive experience, with little or no expression of negativity. They suggest that Daisy and her family were optimistic about their future and positive in their outlook, or carefully concealed anything that might be seen as negative. Each diary was written such that it indicated compliance with all the conditions set out in the exemption application document. This compliance was borne out by Roy’s exemption file, with a document titled: ‘Record
Since Granted Exemption’. The document shows a blank page indicating that Roy had ‘no misdemeanours’.

In conclusion, the diaries present a unique view of six years of the everyday lives of an exempted Aboriginal family, showing how a particular family became fully assimilated and well-adjusted to the ways of citizenship in Australian society, notwithstanding that the notion of citizenship itself is a contested issue. Apparently, as Roy, Daisy and baby (thirteen months old) left Purga Aboriginal Mission on 25 March 1926, a parting comment from an official was: ‘Forget the past and get on with the future’ (family member, 2010 pers. Comm., 28 March). They succeeded in this regard, but it was at the expense of their Aboriginal culture and identity. This suggests that exemption gave them a conditional and subjugated form of citizenship and that those prepared to disavow their Aboriginal heritage and live strictly according to the conditions of exemption, enjoyed a substantial portion of citizenship experienced by other Australians.

Interviews:
This research project conducted interviews with eleven participants who had lived in the Burnett region prior to 1967. The interpretation of this collated interview data is discussed by themes. The interviews demonstrate that later exemptees lived less according to the conditions of exemption than had members of the Smith household, but experienced greater uncertainty, alienation and marginalisation through racial discrimination by the dominant culture.

The interview process for this research was difficult for the researcher at times, due to a general reluctance of potential interviewees to speak about previous state government’s rules and regulations affecting Aboriginal people’s lives. The fieldwork situation revealed the whole issue of the Certificate of Exemption was very much attached to the past, and that was where many Aboriginal people wanted it to stay. Overall, only a very small group of eleven people agreed to be interviewed on the topic, out of a total of over fifty people who were approached by the researcher.

The responses to general knowledge questions about the Certificate of Exemption indicated that most interviewees had little to say on the subject. In particular, the
interview data reveal that little was actually known about Clause 33 of the 1897 Act, the clause relating to exemption. Very few interviewees spoke about the conditions and consequences attached to the exemption if, for example, the rules and regulations were broken by the exemptees. Verbal responses regarding the actual experience of gaining an exemption varied, with interviewees viewing the situation in both a positive and negative light, depending on the circumstances under which they had been granted exemption.

Gaining an exemption certificate could be viewed as a legitimate passage into the community. Yet, for some interviewees it was tokenistic in its delivery. Those rights and privileges were challenged on a daily basis by the ever-increasing discrimination and racism that faced exempted Aboriginal families. Some of the interviewees spoke of abuses that had occurred earlier in their lives. The non-Indigenous participants also highlighted knowledge of these abuses collectively. This accords with the views about abuses recalled by other writers such as Holt (2001), Darling (1998) and Huggins & Huggins (1994).

Throughout this research the lived experience of citizenship has been analysed using Marshall’s (1950) three-dimensional theory (civil, political and social). At the time in 1949 when Marshall wrote, he made no specific reference to the world’s indigenous populations, resulting in citizenship being viewed without regard for the marginalised position of indigenous people. As noted earlier, this silence has been a source of criticism of Marshall’s work. Nevertheless, the three categories provide a basis on which to examine and evaluate the access to rights to citizenship of exempted Aboriginal individuals and their families.

When questioned about how they experienced their newly awarded civil rights, ‘freedom’ was the most common experience mentioned by Aboriginal participants. Being free from the power of authority for the first time gave them rights and privileges to live as other Australian citizens in society. For example, the freedom to travel – how, when, where and with whom - epitomised and encapsulated that sense of freedom. Huggins & Huggins (1994) and Kennedy (1985) also discuss ‘freedom’ in their autobiographies, in regard to the experience of being exempted.
Another important dimension of civil rights was the new-found ability for Aboriginal Queenslanders to participate in business and property ownership. When exemptees succeeded in business and provided economically for their families, they were fulfilling the potential condition of exemption question: “Is he/she intelligent enough to protect himself in business dealings?” Some exempted Aboriginal people eventually developed thriving businesses. Other Aboriginal participants bought their own homes over the years through the state’s Housing Commission Department. Many of those homeowners were originally renters, who were able to purchase their home from the department, thus giving them their first experience of property ownership.

The topics of faith and church drew varying responses from the interviewees. Some participants embraced both faith and church, whilst other responses ranged from having some interest, to blaming the church for the demise of Aboriginal culture. Church was part of the Cherbourg life for its inmates. Blake states that: “Inmates were encouraged to attend church and Sunday School” (2001:76). There were a number of denominations represented at Cherbourg at any one time. Some interviewees who were descendants of exempted Aboriginal people spoke about having supported a religious belief throughout their lives, whilst others chose to remain silent in regards to faith and church.

The final dimension of civil rights is the legal jurisdiction of the court system. Only a few of the interviewees spoke about the court system, mainly from their own experiences as a worker or court supporter. The civil rights of citizenship had finally provided many legal entitlements for exempted Aboriginal people, living for the first time as free citizens within the realms of civilised society. However, this has not always been the case. The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (1991) and Hanks and Keon-Cohen (1984) reveal many past injustices towards Aboriginal men, women and children in terms of their legal rights.

Citizenship is embedded in political rights for its members in society. Voting was a significant legal right of citizenship that was now extended to exempted Aboriginal citizens. Many of the participants commented favourably on having the freedom to vote in State and Federal elections. The descendants of exemttees interviewed all
seem to have voted on reaching the voting age. Of the interviewees who grew up on Cherbourg, several admitted to not having voted until many years after gaining their exemption. One exemptee stated that voting “was something I never really worried about” (West).

Some interviewees spoke of their political affiliations and knowledge of, or participation in, political activism. The political rights of citizenship, newly available to exempted Aboriginal people and their descendants, resulted in their involvement in various forms of political activism. This Aboriginal participation in the grassroots political movement in Brisbane during the late 1950s to 1960s was evident in one of the interviews. Darling (1998) researched the grassroots movement, including the political struggles during that era. In her book, she comments on the work of Rita Huggins at OPAL: “Huggins’ work centred on providing accommodation, food and clothing for Brisbane Murris who were denied basic necessities” (Darling, 1998:149). One People of Australia League (OPAL) began in Brisbane in 1961. Huggins & Huggins writes: “OPAL was for people like me who no longer lived on reserves and had moved into the towns” (1994:86). The goals of the movement were welfare-focused, bent on achieving better living conditions for Aboriginal people in the areas of housing, health, education and employment. Bell (1997) writes about the work of Celia Smith. One of the interviewees was Celia’s son and he spoke of his mother’s activism and her involvement in the ‘yes’ vote. During those years, discrimination and racism directed at Aboriginal Australians was widespread (see, Aird, 2001).

The social rights of citizenship are usually afforded to all citizens within a democratic society. However, the integration or assimilation of exempted Aboriginal people into a community sometimes failed in its approach to employment for those newly qualified citizens. Some of the interviewees experienced that finding employment was a difficult process, whilst others found it relatively easy. Education would have played a role in the availability of jobs for Aboriginal people. Prior to 1967, there were a small number of employers in Brisbane who were willing to employ Aboriginal people with limited education. These employers included the Northgate Cannery, the Mater Hospital, sewing factories in Brisbane’s suburbs and poultry factories at South Brisbane and Rocklea. As a condition of the exemption, a question was asked: “Is applicant of good character, steady in employment, and industrious?”
Failure to obtain employment resulted in the possibility of being returned to Cherbourg settlement and placed back under the Act, as explained by some of the interviewees.

Accommodation is another social right of citizenship. Many Aboriginal families arriving in Brisbane found it difficult to find accommodation for themselves without the help of other Indigenous families. Ruth Hegarty tells of how quickly her family found support. She reveals that

Joe located to Brisbane with the help of Bowman and Edith Johnson. They had moved to the city many years earlier. Their home became a haven for many ex-Cherbourgites who were seeking work and accommodation (2003:124).

Interviewees spoke of their lived experiences regarding the housing issue, and comments again ranged from positive to negative. On the one hand, they enjoyed the assistance of those Aboriginal families who were already established in Brisbane in making the transition from settlements to the city. On the other hand, a major contributor to both lack of employment and accommodation was the high level of discrimination and racism encountered by many. Most of the participants discussed some of their painful experiences, when they were subjected to prejudice and racism.

Social rights for Aboriginal people included access to health and social services. The interviewees spoke on the topic of health in terms of health service provisions and their own lived experiences. For the female participants, the common dominator was giving birth to their babies in hospital. They spoke of good practices by the staff. When working in the Burnett region as a nurse, one of the non-Indigenous interviewees recalled not treating a single Aboriginal person all the years she worked there during the 1940s-1950s. This raises the question of whether, or where, exempted Aboriginal people in the South Burnett region sought medical treatment.

Some of the participants referred to the unemployment benefits as "the dole," and spoke about the stigma attached to being seen by some as "dole bludgers". However, one interviewee recalled how upset he was when he was told that "he was ineligible for a benefit, because he was an Aboriginal". The racial attitudes of bureaucratic services for many years failed to meet the needs of all citizens. Chesterman (2005)
argues that there had been a fifty year old “traditional discrimination levelled against
the aboriginal natives of our country, who, for a variety of reasons...were unable to
qualify for social service benefits in the normal way” (2005:50). Interviewees
recalled that when work was unobtainable, and there was no dole, they either went
without, or relied on the generosity of family and friends.

Education was another social right of citizenship for those living as citizens in the
community. Most of the Aboriginal interviewees told of their schooling days, whilst
others recorded Aboriginal participation as students in schools. The children of
exemptees were free to attend Queensland’s state school system that allowed students
to continue to Grade Seven, the final year of primary school. In comparison, for those
still on Cherbourg, education was only offered to Grade Four level. As Sarra (2008)
has noted, a District Inspector for the Department of Public Instruction, 1932-1936,
reported in regard to the syllabus: “The work does not extend beyond that of Grade
Four” (2008:115). Even though each student attended school for nine years, they
could only achieve a Grade Four standard education, and were then sent to work at the
age of fourteen years.9 The flow-on from this lack of proper education was that life
chances for each student were dramatically reduced. In spite of their limited earlier
education, some interviewees achieved their goals later in life.

The interviewees explained that prior to 1967, Brisbane’s licensed venues such as
hotels and Returned Services League (RSL) Clubs, often either excluded Aboriginal
citizens, or were segregated in some way. This was also the practice at some picture
theatres, stage show events and dances. Exempted Aboriginal people had begun to
attend and enjoy many of these social rights of citizenship in the community with
their families. Most of the Aboriginal interviewees recalled those early days when
they had attended numerous social activities and engaged in the local Murri10
community’s organised events. Two interviewees reported that social dances were
very popular in Brisbane, and they provided opportunities for families and friends to
spend time together. Information concerning family news and the availability of work
and accommodation was often passed on at these venues. They were also social
events where young people met and fell in love. Aboriginal people felt safe mixing
with each other at these events and discrimination or racism was not an issue.
Kinnane (2003) discusses similar dances held in a suburb of Perth during the 1940s:
“the Coolbaroo League dances united the small and dispersed group that made up the urban Aboriginal population of the time” (2003:341).

The data reveals that entertainment came in many different forms. Interviewees spoke of the card games that were often held at someone’s house, with this activity having flowed on into Brisbane’s suburbia from Cherbourg. Blake writes about the prevalence of gambling at Barambah, where “gambling on the settlement became tolerated although not encouraged” (2001:220). Blake also points out that: “For the Barambah inmates, gambling was one of the few avenues available through which they could overtly express their defiance of the settlement regimen” (2001:222). As exempted people relocated to Brisbane, this pastime changed from a form of rebellion to a social activity.

A number of the interviewees spoke of either having personally encountered or witnessed some form of racial discrimination whilst attending nightclubs in Brisbane in the late 1950s and early 1960s. These interviewees reported that such incidents were not uncommon during that era. For example, interviewees also reported that movie going was marred by racist attitudes from some picture theatre owners and that Aboriginal people were sometimes forced to sit in assigned seats within the theatre. Several respondents spoke harshly of some of the treatment given to Aboriginal people when going to the movies, recalling that chicken wire was used to create separate areas within the theatre.

Some of the interviewees spoke of racist attitudes within sports such as football. Before the mid-1960s Aboriginal footballers were forced to have their own teams and competitions, for example the Brisbane All Blacks. Aboriginal teams or players were not allowed to play in the Brisbane League competition. Other interviewees spoke of playing with some Aboriginal players during the time they played as teenagers in the Burnett region. At the time, those players were living away from Cherbourg. Boxing was another sport that a few of the male interviewees recalled participating in when they were young. Prize money was one of the reasons why so many Aboriginal men went into the boxing ring, for it added to the weekly earnings. Aird argues that “[e]ntering the boxing ring was seen by many Aborigines as a way to earn some extra money and lift their status in the wider community” (2001:57). The interviewees
spoke of well-known Aboriginal athletes who achieved success in all areas of sport, including at world championships and Olympic level. It was usually the male interviewees that spoke about sport in their younger years. There was a silence about female sport from the interviewees. However, sport was very much a family affair where exempted Aboriginal families came together and supported the players and the team.

In summing up, the interviewees spoke frankly of the lived experiences of citizenship for exempted Aboriginal people living in the Australian community. Using the conditions set out in the exemption certificate’s applicant form as a guideline, the lived experiences of those exemptees and their families were seemingly matched to the proposed expectations of the government. Throughout the interviews, the common thread was predominantly one of ongoing discrimination and racism for those who were exempted. As noted with the diaries research above, the interview data confirms a conditional and subjugated form of citizenship for exemptees, who experienced uncertainty, alienation and marginalisation through racial discrimination by the dominant culture.

Archives:
The archival records spanning four decades show that the process of determining exemptions in Queensland was disorderly, inconsistent and subject to arbitrary changes and decisions, as were the methods of record keeping. They reveal that decisions made by state officials imposed conditions on exemptions which enabled ongoing state control of exemptees’ lives and income under the threat of revocation. Whilst some personal files were brief one page documents, many consisted of multiple pages regarding issues relating to the exemption. It became apparent that personal exemption files were frequently kept in more than one section. Productive searches were organised in other categories such as, ‘Barambah’, ‘Complaints’, ‘Crimes’, ‘Marriages’ and ‘Removals’, and most of these were frequently required in order to reveal the complete paperwork relating to specific exemptees.

The result of the research data shows that there was no ‘blueprint’ consistently associated with granting a Certificate of Exemption. Over the course of the exemption system, there were no fixed benchmarks in continual use for accessing the
application forms. Although the application form itself changed very little over the years, earlier applicants appear to have had to meet the requirements in a far more stringent manner than later applicants. For instance, the question concerning whether or not the applicant was a drinker of alcohol attracted answers ranging from ‘no’, ‘very seldom’, ‘very little’ and ‘yes to a degree’. However, in later years, all these answers appeared to be satisfactory and many exemptions were granted that would have been denied in earlier years. This reflects changes in the discursive regimes underpinning both the official requirements of exemption and their interpretation. As a result, an understanding of the thinking behind the past policies and practices of the Queensland state government might explain why consecutive governments continued to treat Aboriginals as less than full citizens.

Foucault (1991) equates the functions of bureaucracy with those of governmentality and he writes of the coordinated techniques of modern government and the multiple levels of domination utilised in producing a particular type of compliant citizen. Perhaps Kidd best illustrates Foucault’s conception of a governmental bureaucracy when she observes that “the optimism of governmentality is generated by government expediency, which has no necessary coincidence with the best interests of the governed” (1997:347). This was certainly the case in relation to the power exercised by governments over Queensland’s Aboriginal population in constructing them as citizens. Again, Kidd discusses government bureaucracy through Foucault’s “concept of governmentality which he describes as denoting the field of reformative intentions and bungled operations of governments” (1997:xx, original emphasis). In relation to whether intended or bungled, for example, archival ledger entries belonging to numerous exempted Aboriginal people revealed that many had saved hundreds of pounds (£) in their bank accounts and it is not clear if all exempees were given access to their own money.

Blake (2001) refers to Foucault’s Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison in relation to the Aboriginal settlements. The theories concerning domination, control, discipline and punishment relate to the treatment of inmates by the officials. Blake reminds us that a “principal objective of the Barambah settlement was to control and discipline those removed there” (2001:56). Blake argues that from “the outset, a primary purpose of the settlement regime was to reform, subjugate and dominate the
inmates” (2001:57). Overall, the Queensland government wanted to destroy the cultural identity of a race of people, namely the Aboriginal people, firstly by segregating and controlling all aspects of their lives, and latterly by attempting to assimilate them.

Surveillance, as illustrated by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish*, (1977) was very much part of the power and control wielded by the Queensland government over Aboriginal people. Foucault argues that “surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary” (1977:201). For example, archival research reveals that Roy Smith, Daisy’s husband, had a blank page attached to his exemption files. This was commonly used to record later details of an exemptee’s activities. As Roy’s page remains blank, this indicates that he kept himself and his family out of any trouble that might warrant a ‘misdeanour’ being written on his file. Other exempted Aboriginal people were not so lucky. Access to their own departmental files often delivered a shocking truth; years of surveillance orchestrated by the Queensland government. For example, when Rita Huggins finally had the opportunity to examine her own file, she found departmental records that itemised surveillance of her over a period of more than 30 years (Huggins & Huggins, 1994:5).

Controlling power, as exercised by the government appointed Chief Protector of Aboriginals, is a central recurring theme that was evident throughout the archival searches. Foucault’s major work, *The Will to Knowledge: History of Sexuality, Volume1*, (1998) recognises this power and how it is deployed. Foucault states that power “is tolerable only on condition that it mask a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms” (1998:86). This research reveals a multitude of ways in which the Queensland government has hidden many of its own mechanisms, in its efforts to coerce and control Aboriginal people. Predominant amongst these mechanisms is the guise of ‘protection’, evident from the outset by the name given to the Act that controlled these people for so many years: the 1897 Act (Qld). Foucault’s (1991) concept of a ‘discursive regime’ is an analysis of power relations. In this instance, it includes forging links between the state and Queensland’s Indigenous population, thus it illustrates the overwhelming power of the
state government. In particular, it highlights the inconsistent, disorderly and arbitrary nature of such control.

The next chapter is the conclusions drawn from this research data on the Certificate of Exemption for Aboriginal people.
Endnotes:

1 The exemption system operated in a Queensland government department until 13th March, 1967.
2 The original certificate of competency as an operator, No: CC13622 was issued to Roy Smith on 24th April, 1933 of Haystack, Warra Qld. Smith family, Memorabilia.
4 It was later revealed that Valma boarded during the week and came home for the weekends.
5 Purga Aboriginal Mission (ex Deebing Creek) was located near Ipswich, Queensland. It was funded by the Salvation Army Church.
6 The Certificate of Exemption was part of Clause 33 of Queensland’s The Aboriginals Protection and the Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act, 1897.
7 The Northgate Cannery built in 1947 by the Growers Co-Op at Northgate, a suburb of Brisbane.
8 The Mater Hospital was started in a residential home in 1906 at North Quay in Brisbane. They later moved across the river to its current location at South Brisbane, Queensland.
9 Cherbourg - At fourteen, boys and girls were sent out to work on Work Agreement contracts. Boys were farm labourers, and the girls were domestics. Those workers are now seeking their Stolen Wages from the Queensland Government.
10 ‘Murri’- Aboriginal term for Aboriginal people living in Queensland. Other states have their own names such as Koori for New South Wales and Victoria.
11 This position had a series of titles and departments:
   Northern Protector of Aboriginals 1899-1903 in Home Secretary’s Department,
   Chief Protector of Aboriginals 1904 in Department of Public Lands,
   Chief Protector of Aboriginals 1905-1934 in Home Secretary’s Department,
   Director of Native Affairs 1935-1960 in Department of Health and Home Affairs, and
   Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs 1961 - 1967 in Department of Education.
Chapter Seven

Conclusion

This chapter concludes the thesis by examining some further considerations and implications about its findings. It also addresses limitations of the study and suggests directions for future research. As a result of the 1897 protectionist legislation, Aboriginal Queenslanders had all aspects of their lives officially regulated by the State. It was, however, possible under certain conditions to gain exemption from the restrictive conditions of the 1897 Act.

This research has examined the lived experiences of citizenship of Aboriginal people exempted from the legislation who resided in the south Burnett area within southeast Queensland prior to 1967. It takes the form of an historical case study and includes oral histories gathered from Indigenous exempted persons as well as descendants of exempees and non-Indigenous participants. A central theme apparent throughout these histories is that for the period researched, the Certificate of Exemption brought the only official mechanism for ‘freedom’ from protectionism for Indigenous Queenslanders. Such freedom, however, was incremental and came at the expense of the exempees’ connection to Indigenous communities and culture.

The findings suggest that there were three distinct phases in regard to exemption pertaining to Indigenous people in southeast Queensland which reflect changes in the discourse of citizenship within the researched timeframe from 1897 to 1967. In the first phase from about 1900 to 1930, the formal requirements to qualify for and maintain exemption specified on the application required unwavering conformity to a European Australian model of citizenship. Initially available only to ‘half-caste’, they included the necessity to marry if co-habiting, some formal education, steady employment, a capacity to handle money and associating only with European Australians, thereby renouncing Aboriginal culture and identity. The archival records for this first phase indicate that these conditions were applied, albeit unsystematically,
by government officials, in effect enforcing a narrow definition of Australian citizenship. This excluded most Indigenous Queenslanders in the south Burnett region who as wards of the State could not qualify for exemption. It saw exemptees who failed to adhere to the conditions of exemption lose their status as citizens through their forcible return to Aboriginal reserves or settlements.

Not unexpectedly during this phase, social or political activism which questioned or challenged the exclusion of most Indigenous Queenslanders from citizenship was not apparent amongst exemptees. Such activity would have jeopardised their hard-won citizenship status through the revocation of their exemption by the Chief Protector and confinement to a reserve. It may also have intensified hardship for non-exempted family members who remained on reserves.

From the 1930s to the 1950s, a second phase of exemption is apparent. With availability now extended to all Indigenous Queenslanders. It was similar to the first in that exemptees were required to assimilate into mainstream Australian social life which accorded to a narrow definition of citizenship. The possibility of surveillance and, at the extreme, the revocation of the exemption required exempted people to maintain a high level of self discipline that accorded with the conditions of exemption. The six diaries of Daisy Smith kept during this period indicate close conformity to dominant cultural expectations of respectability as an Australian citizen. The diaries demonstrate that as long as the members of the Smith family managed its own affairs in a manner that mimicked the colonisers, they were relatively although not entirely free from discrimination or surveillance. Their exempted status ensured enjoyment of rights similar to non-Indigenous Australian citizens, albeit at the expense of maintaining connection with their Indigenous heritage and community.

However, a key difference between the first and second phase was apparent in urban areas of Brisbane where Indigenous social networks were beginning to emerge to overcome difficulties in areas such as housing and employment. The oral histories indicate greater diversity of lived experiences, particularly experiences of overt discrimination and racism, such that Indigenous families grouped together to assist other families experiencing difficulties. This social activism did not result in the automatic revocation of exemption, indicating the emergence of a less exclusive
discourse of citizenship which accommodated an incipient, albeit circumscribed, urban Indigenous identity.

The third phase of exemption distinguishable from the research is from the period 1950 to 1967. During this time, social and political activism by Indigenous exempees resident in Brisbane became noticeably apparent. Despite the fact that exemptions could still be theoretically revoked, this does not appear to have been common during the period. Evidence from the oral histories confirms the widespread emergence and persistence of activism by Indigenous people in Brisbane in search of social justice during the period. Official tolerance of Indigenous outspokenness indicates a gradual shift in social attitudes and government policies. Further, during this phase, although the application forms for exemption remain essentially unaltered, their bureaucratic processing was more lenient. For example, the archival records show that an exemption application was granted in 1965, even though the application stated clearly that the applicant was a ‘drinker’. Such an application would have been unlikely to have been granted during the earlier phases of exemption.

Thus the third and final phase of exemption witnessed a broadening of the discourse of citizenship such that the civil, political and social aspects of citizenship were enjoyed increasingly by exempted people without the need to publicly disavow their Indigenous heritage and identity. It also demonstrated to Indigenous people that, just as exemption was never complete, as it always remained conditional, the power of government itself was not absolute.

The research for the thesis is limited by a number of factors. Firstly, the research has focused on southeast Queensland, while the 1897 Act and its various amendments affected and controlled almost all Indigenous Queenslanders throughout the State. Of the 4,092 known certificates of exemption granted in Queensland, only the documents relating to 93 applicants from the relevant geographic area have been examined in detail. Secondly, the research has been hampered by the dearth of literature or previous similar research relating to the system of exemption. Much has been written, for example, in the area of Indigenous assimilation (particularly relating to experiences in New South Wales and Western Australia), and the Stolen Generations nationally, yet with few exceptions (Wickes, 2006 and 2008), exemptions have
received little attention or scholarly analysis in Australia. Thirdly, the research has been limited by the inherent difficulties resulting from the generally inconsistent and inadequate practices of record keeping by the Queensland government.

A fourth limitation is that the oral histories generated by the research rely on a limited number of participants. This is accounted for by the general reticence of contemporary Indigenous Queenslanders to speak about their lived experiences under previous Queensland government policies and practices. It is indicative of the intergenerational nature of a system that required those who had gained exemption to be disassociated from and silent about their cultural heritage. Today, there remains a silence about the exemption story which is not spoken about generally in the Indigenous community. It is therefore not unexpected that very little has been documented about the system of exemption, especially about an exempted Aboriginal person’s lived experiences.

The research points to the need for a state-wide Queensland project into the system of exemption, to develop an Exemptions database similar to the Removals Database for Queensland developed by Copland (2005). This would contribute to a knowledge base about the implementation and operation of Aboriginal exemption in Queensland and overall understanding about its meaning and varying impacts on Aboriginal people. It could also help raise awareness about the need for cultural safety protocols and access for Indigenous people in regard to personal data about exemption online (see for example, Mackett, 2006).¹

A further research opportunity could explore the exemption system Australia wide. This would enable comparisons between state practices and the extent to which the lived experiences of citizenship varied amongst exemptees within the dominant culture of the Australian nation.
Endnotes:

1 Currently there is no cultural warning to prepare Indigenous viewers for the sensitive and confronting nature of these online indices.
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Write as much as you can remember. The questions are only a guide, and please add anything else that you remember.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for participating in the research.

Cheers,

Judi.
Research Project Information Sheet

Project Title: The lived experience of citizenship amongst exempted Aboriginal people in regional Queensland, with a focus on the South Burnett region.

Ethics approval number: (Project S/07/102) 5

Researcher: Judi Wickes

Contact telephone number: 0406 957 669 (mob)

Email address: jw687a@usq.edu.au

Supervisor: Dr Lucinda Aberdeen

Name of the University: University of the Sunshine Coast

Faculty: Arts and Social Sciences

This project is a study towards meeting the requirements for a Master Degree by research.

The purpose of this research is to explore the lived experience of citizenship amongst exempted Aboriginal people in regional Queensland, with a focus on the South Burnett region.

I would like to request your participation in the research project. Participation in the project is voluntary and involves participating in a 60-minute interview. Non-participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled. Participants may discontinue their involvement at any time without penalty or the need to provide an explanation.

Any information provided during the research will be used for the purposes of the research project. There will be no incentive or reward for participating in the research.

You may wish to take your time to think about whether you want to participate in this study. If you are agreeable to participate, please keep page 1 of these sheets and complete and return page 2 to the researcher as soon as possible. If you decide later to participate, please contact the researcher at the telephone number/email address given above.

If you have any complaints about the way this research project is conducted, you can either raise them with the researcher or, if you prefer an independent person, contact the Chairperson of the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of the Sunshine Coast: c/- Jodie Thomas. The Committees Officer, University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore DC, 4558; telephone (07) 5430 1114; email hrec@usq.edu.au

The University of the Sunshine Coast and the researcher greatly appreciate your assistance with this project.
Consent to Participate in Research

Attachment 4.4.1

Project Title:

The lived experience of citizenship amongst exempted Aboriginal people in regional Queensland, with a focus on the South Burnett region.

I know about the purpose and nature of the project from the information sent to me inviting my participation in it. I understand that:

- My participation in this project is voluntary;
- I can withdraw from this research at any time without explanation;
- If I withdraw, no information provided by me at any time will be used in the research;
- This research project will seek to interview Aboriginal people who were granted a "Certificate of Exemption" and their descendants as well as non-Aboriginal people to look at the issue of citizenship for Aboriginal people.

I know what is in this Consent to Participate in Research form. I freely consent to participate in this project about the issue of citizenship for holders of “Certificate of Exemption” for Aboriginal people.

I agree / do not agree (cross out inappropriate) to be identified in research findings.

I know that I do not need to participate in this interview unless I want to, and that I can choose not to continue at any time, without having to explain my reasons. All my questions about this research have been answered to my satisfaction.

Name of Participant ___________________________ Date ______________

Signature of Participant _________________________ Date ______________

Signature of Researcher _________________________ Date ______________
Attachment 3: 1.3

Office Use Only

(b) Check list for personal information to be gathered from participants:

Part I – Contact Information

Name: ________________________________

Home Address: ____________________________________________________________________

Telephone Number: ______________________ Mobile: ______________________

Email Address: ____________________________________________________________________

Convenient Time: Morning: ___________ Afternoon: ___________

Time: ______________________ Date: ______________________

Part II – Background Information:

1. Sex  (a) Female  (b) Male

2. Age   (a) under 40    (b) 41 to 50    (c) 51 to 60    (d) 61 to 70

   (e) 71 to 80    (f) over 80

3. (a) Exempted  (b) Descendant  (c) Other ______________________

Part III – Background Information

For the exempted person and the descendant -

1. Date of birth: ________________ Place of birth: ________________

2. Marital status: ________________

3. Number of children and grandchildren: ________________

4. Religion: ________________

5. Highest formal education achieved: ________________

6. Occupation: ________________
(c) Indicative questions for interviews with individuals who interacted with Aboriginal people who lived in the community (and not on Cherbourg), who gained the Certificate of Exemption and/or their descendants: Please attach (if needed more paper).

1. Can you tell me a little bit about yourself and about the Aboriginal person who gained the Certificate of Exemption that you have interacted with in the past?

2. Can you tell me about the relationship(s) between you and those persons?

3. What type of relationship did you have with the exempted person or persons? (e.g., acquaintance, friendly, close, or official).

4. Do you know what citizenship rights the exempted persons were entitled to?

5. Did you know of any differences between the experiences of citizenship for Aboriginal people living in the wider community and for other Australians until 1967?
Appendix B

Diaries

(1) Roy Smith – Certificate of Exemption

"The Aboriginal Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1887 to 1901."

CERTIFICATE OF EXEMPTION.

This is to certify that Roy Smith of Durga is hereby exempt from the provisons of "The Aboriginal Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1887 to 1901," and the Regulations thereunder.

Date: 28th March 1906

Handwritten signature:

N.B. - If at any time he thinks it necessary so to do, the Minister may revoke any certificate issued to him under this Act.

(2) Roy Smith – Driver’s Licence

CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCY AS AN OPERATOR. No. CC13622

Issued to Roy Smith

Address: Wanganella

Age (at date): 22 years 6 months

Sex: Male

Height: 5 feet 10 inches

Colour of Eyes: Dark

Hair: Dark

Complexion: Dark

Available for operation of Motor Vehicle

Date of issue: 24th Day of April 1932

Signature of Operator: W. H. Ryan

Testing Officer: Constable

N.W.A. - Wanganilla

W. H. RYAN, Commissioner of Police.

Station Wanganilla
(3) Excerpts from the Daisy Smith’s Diaries –

1. **Friday, 27th April 1951.**
Packed up again for Dunwich for the long weekend & went down on the Morana. Arriving at 9-30. After a cup of tea & something to eat went to bed all very tired.

2. **Monday, 15th January 1945.**

3. **Friday, 13th June 1947.**
Roy. away to work & Valma. to school. then Gwen. & I. set to work & cleaned out the place. Alison pretty cranky. Gwen. & Alison. Left at 3-30. for Acacia. Ridge for the weekend. After tea Roy. went to the boxing. So Val. & I. went to the Princess, to see “Courage of Lassie”.

4. **Monday, 20th July 1942.**
Valmas did not go into school has a heavy cold. Mrs Wilson rang for her to go and stay with them again.

5. **Tuesday, 30th January 1945.**
Got up early & got Roy. To Work he posted letter to Gwen. I. took Valma. up to start school at Gayndah State School. She got on well for the first day. rang Gwen & did some shopping & Paid Bentons. Account while up town letter from Gwen. All Went to flix at night, hot day.

6. **Friday, 2nd November 1947.**

7. **Wednesday, 5th February 1947.**
Valmas big day started school at the Sth Brisbane Intermediate. Came home in afternoon very pleased with herself only a form lower than Gwen. Roy. arrived in from the farm all well out there, weather still unsettled.

8. **Monday, 24th January 1949.**
Wrote to Mr Kruger. Also to Geoff & Daphney. Horn. I. got the men. Away to work Did a little working and a fair amount of mending. Val. went to the pictures with Joyce. Then she did some ironing. – Val got scholarship results (55%) [written by Val].

9. **Monday, 15th January 1945.**
10. **Friday, 7th January 1949.**
up very early to clean out the House. Mervyn. up early also & gave a hand. Boys.
went to town after breakfast & Val. met Joan in town & went to the Pictures. Gwen.
went to the Hospital & got some medicine. Alison stayed here. lovely day. Mervyn.
left for Coolangatta 5-30. very quiet at night.

11. **Saturday, 20th May 1944.**
All the family up to see me. Maurice, landed up from Gayndah on train

12. **Sunday, 19th March 1944.**
All went up to the Hospital to see Mr Snelling.

13. **Sunday, 10th September 1944.**
I. Went to early church & we all went over to Bellingers for Church

14. **Sunday, 23rd September 1945.**
Valma. went to S School. beautiful day. all had a quiet afternoon.

15. **Thursday, 29th November 1945.**
Roy. on tractor. over North - side. I. did washing & nearly all the ironing washed my
good flocks & Vals New one. had a very hot day. & a dusty dry storm in afternoon.
Gwen. & Valma. went to the Childrens fancy dress ball (S.S.)

16. **Sunday, 2nd December 1945.**
Roy. Valma. & self Went to the S. S. picnic. Les. played cricket. Very hot day. had
storm in the evening.

17. **Monday, 18th June 1945.**
Church of England. S.S. held their Picnic rather dull day but we had an enjoyable day.
I. made a sponge. Roy. & self went up after early lunch. quite a good crowd of
Mothers there. A letter from Gwen, also Mervyn. All went to bed early.

18. **Friday, 3rd March 1944.**
Roy and Valma. arrived home in the Essex.

19. **Saturday, 12th February 1944.**
Went to town in Squires car Essex, still out of Commission stayed to flix & Squire.
brought us home.

20. **Friday, 27th June 1947.**
After getting Roy. Away to work & Val away to school early. Gwen. & I. got to the
cleaning finished at 9-30. then did some sewing. & Gwen went to town in afternoon.
Auntie was down for Afternoon tea. All went to Pictures. I. stayed home to listen to
fights Mervyn. lost his fight with Law.

21. **Monday, 10th September 1945.**
New serial 4.S.B. Started. 11.9.45 House that Margaret Built. [wrote later]
I. did the washing & ironing Maurice. went up town for me at Lunch time. Valma at
school. No Mail. few light showers early Morning.
22. **Wednesday, 8th January 1947.**
Got up early to get Roy’s breakfast & get him off to work first time in the New Year. He was out at Reads Creek stone pitching. Mr Phenson. Called with milk first time. I. had a very large Wash. & did not get done until 12 o’clock. Gwen, did some of the ironing & then went up town for goods. very very hot day no sign of rain. Won share of £2. in the Mammoth Casket. Casket No 1095, Ticket 48949

23. **Tuesday, 25th February 1947.**
I. went another share in the casket. In the ten pound prizes. So got 2-10-0 out of it. Roy. Still at work. Val. at school with young Gwen. Did a fair wash to day & Gwen did the ironing.

24. **Saturday, 11th August 1945.**
Roy. & I. went up town in morning did shopping & met The Frank Simpsons. got home had lunch got letter from Ruth. posted letter to ‘Dad’s Musical Casket. Beautiful day.
Japnese Surrender.

25. **Saturday, 18th August 1945.**
Posted letter to Gwen with a pound enclosed. Also received letter from her & one with Casket ticket in for Val from 4 B.C. for Dad’s Competition Roy. & self went to Woods furniture Sale. very dear.. Dad. rang Maurice.

26. **Wednesday, 8th March 1944.**
Mr Badgery. Came out brought Bill Hale. Mervyn. left on Horseback. I. left Hollywell for good with Mr Badgery. Went to Hawkins Sale in afternoon. [sic]

27. **Saturday, 22nd April 1944.**
All went down town to Vote. then to the flix at night washed at Hospital home at 11.
o.clock. [sic]

28. **Saturday, 3rd May 1947.**

29. **Saturday, 28th April 1951.**
All went for a walk & a good look around. Voted down there

30. **Friday, 27th April 1951.**
Packed up again for Dunwich for the long weekend & went down on the Morana. arriving at 9-30. After a cup of tea & something to eat went to bed all very tired.

31. **Monday, 30th April 1951.**
had a very Busy morning cleaning out the flat & packing. Caught the boat at a quarter to four, arrived home at 8-30.

32. **Sunday, 14th June 1942.**
Went down to Wynnum for our ration Books.
33. **Saturday, 3rd June 1944.**
Legs still very sore but swelling nearly down. Ration book day lot in town. Sylvia Muller down to see baby.

34. **Thursday, 24th May 1945.**
Bill Parry-Oaken, a daughter.
Have Roy at home. In bed have been putting hot towels on his back all day is a little better, now. Valma. at school. I. went up town about 3-30. got a letter from Nancy. also one from Ruth. and Gwens food ration book. (Registered.)

35. **Saturday, 2nd June 1945.**
Ration Book day. got all our Ration book without any bother. Dull hot day, had one good shower of rain about 1-30 could do with more. posted letter to Maurice. No Mail from anyone. Met Mrs Hafemeister in town. Jim got home train.

36. **Tuesday, 17th April 1945.**
Telegram to say Jack left for N.G. up early as usual got Roy. away at 6-30 as usual. House all in muddle, don’t know where to start Cleaning. I. went up town 2. letters for Gwen. train late Dean’s. furniture trucked for Gympie, Wrote to Nancy, & Mervyn. Gwen got her parcel from McWhirters.

37. **Saturday, 19th May 1945.**
A week ago since we arrived home from Brisbane. Maurice. Left with Tim Downing per Car for Eidsvold to go out to Jack Aherns. I. did washing. Roy went up town. No letters, I. received wire from Nancy. Jack left.

38. **Saturday, 7th November 1942.**
Good steady rain had 25 points. 45. points. Roy. & self went to town Joe. & Elsie. came in with us. took in 8 Dozen Eggs 10/-. Mervyn rang from Mundubbera. Eileen Wilson Home on leave.

39. **Thursday, 9th November 1944.**
Did all the Washing ironing & cleaned all the House out. Valma. went to school. Miss Bellinger spent the evening with us. Went to bed at ten o’clock. one letter from Maurice. Hartwigs boys home on leave

40. **Friday, 2nd October 1942.**
Roy. shifting cattle. one of the heifers has a Calf. very hot & dry, but windy. tonight. Diggers Ball in at Eidsvold. found new nest 14.E.

41. **Saturday, 24th October 1942.**
Roy. & self went town also Elsie 13 planes went over. & Children. got letter from Gwen. Val home for weekend. Went up Hospital to Elsie. took 1. Dozen Eggs. 1/3. 8/ ½ . see Lid & baby. Took in 6 ½ dozen Eggs.

42. **Wednesday, 28th June 1944.**
Up early & got Mervyn away at 6-30. to meet Blundell, at Mundubbera. with cattle. Roy. working out at ‘Locharber’ road. large Convoy passed through
43. **Tuesday, 28th November 1944**
Ruth, Val & self all at home still very hot. Ruth’s sister Fay came in for a few minutes. Convoy of 28 Australian Army trucks camped in the Show grounds last night. they left at mid-day to-day.

44. **Wednesday, 18th April 1945**
Got Roy. to work at 6-30 as usual They are out on Humphrey road. Les. & Self went, up town. No Mail for anyone, posted letter to Maurice. Leslie. & Ruth. Dean. left per train for Gympie. 5-30. Fay. in to see them. Soldiers in Show Pavillion, I. asked for loan of broom to sweep place out staying a few days. dull, cool, Cloudy day.

45. **Wednesday, 13th June 1945**
Got Roy. away to work as usual I. did the washing, then wrote letter to Nancy. went up town 12 noon. home at 12-40. No mail. Valma, at school. Nasty, westerly blowing all day. fairly cool at Night. Wrote to Mervyn. & Maurice still waiting for letter from Ruth. brought Fuzzy Warrzy badge from Mr Harmer. 1/-.

46. **Wednesday, 9th May 1945.**
up early Auntie, Gwen, Valma. & self went down to Wynnum for the day got home at 5-45. then all went down to the Princess to see “Naughty Marietta,” & “Riders of the Desert”. All very tired at night. Mervyn. & a friend went to Lone Pine for the afternoon. V.E. Holiday.

47. **Saturday, 11th August 1945.**

48. **Monday, 13th August 1945.**
Public Holiday for Japenese Surrender. Roy. went up town in Morning for Mail & papers. in the afternoon, Roy. Val, Phillis & self went down the river for the picnic, down near Krugers got home just before sundown. posted letter to Gwen.

49. **Wednesday, 15th August 1945.**
All Went to pictures (written by Valma). Roy. & gang down at Wethern, Roy on tractor. News Came through at 9-15, Peace being Declared and what rejoicing. I. did my washing & hosed out the Kitchen. Val. went up town but were too late to shop.

50. **Thursday, 16th August 1945.**
Mervyn’s Birthday (19 years) [written by Val] and Oh what a day. A Procession from Town Hall at 2,p.m, then sports & football on the grounds. and concert & community Singing in the “Town Hall” at night also Dancing. All in bed at 10-30.

51. **Thursday, 6th September 1945.**
Roy. again on tractor ploughing drains at Wethern, then brought Tractor in to yards for New oil. Val at school. Maurice did some Chipping & went up town. posted letter to Mervyn. & received one from Gwen I. did some washing also some ironing. Union Jack. flown in Singapore at 3 years.
52. Wednesday, 12th September 1945.
Roy. took Tracor out to Reids Creek to do some rolling Maurice. at Home. went up town for Me. No Mail. Valma. at school. First Day of Gayndah Sports. fair crowd in for some fights at Night Roy. & Maurice went. Val, & self went to see “Beautiful but Broke” and R.Taylor. in “Her Cardboard Lover”. Big convey left for Brisbane, (40)

53. Sunday, 16th September 1945.
Valma. at Sunday School. very quite day. No sports. big convoy. left for Sydney.

54. Friday, 13th April 1945.
President Roosevelt. passed away (63 years) Did out all the House. got Roy. away to work at 6-30. Gwen. finished Ironing. Ruth, & Leslie, went up town, No Mail for anyone. Valma. at school. Carrier Came for Ruths, Cot and Stroller, took bathery away also. Cool wind day. still dry. All went to the Pictures.

55. Wednesday, 2nd May 1945.
HitLER DIED. Yippee (written by Valma)
Valma. & self went into town for a few hours. I. had lunch. & went out to see Gwen, then I. went up to see Mervyn at night on my own. Cool day. Gwen at school. Letter from Roy.

56. Thursday, 5th July 1945.
The Prime Minister. Mr John Curtain [sic] passed away. at 4. P.M.

57. Wednesday, 13th June 1951.
Mervyn. got is [sic] own Breakfast, Val & self out of bed at 6-30. Dave & Cliff down before we were out of bed. Gwen. gone to get some teeth out Alison. at school. Val. at Work. very foggy. & light rain falling.
Mr J.B. Chiefly[sic] passed away 10-30. Heart attack.

58. Monday, 20th November 1944.
Posted letter to Maurice, Roy & Mervyn left for work at 5-30. doing Abercorn Street up. Valma, went to school. Gwen at the Café, I. went down town had lunch at Waltons. letter from Dean, refusing to let us rent half house, Ruth rang very disappointed.

59. Tuesday, 4th January 1944.
All into town for the day. went and saw Celia. and children. Also saw Bob. Quinn.

60. Friday, 6th March 1942.

61. Thursday, 15th October 1942.
Roy. Maurice & I. Dipped all the Bullocks. today.
All went out to Rashleighs took Valma. out with us she was not very well. Maurice. & Mervyn. left with Mr Laidlers for Mundubbera with cattle. Wet afternoon. smash Nearly killed little skipper

63. Monday, 9th November 1942.
Roy. took Valma. into school. & then went out to Evans & had a look at the cattle. Home all on my own.

64. Saturday, 21st February 1942.
All Went to town in afternoon Went to pictures brought Gwen & Val out for weekend. 1 Dozen Eggs for Harris.

65. Tuesday, 9th June 1942.
Mr Snelling rang for me to go down to Brisbane

66. Thursday, 11th June 1942.
Arrived in Brisbane at 6-30 Mr Snelling. Met us at Roma Street. started work as soon as I. Arrived

67. Friday, 19th June 1942.
Teddy & I. Went to town Met Nancy. in there was very surprised we were down. Paid £1-5-0 Went to see “Joan of Paris.” “Perfect Snobs.”

68. Monday, 29th June 1942.
Auntie Mollys Birthday Teddy. & I. Went to town Met Auntie, went to see “Son of Furey” [& “Week-end For Three” (written by Valma)] Paid £1-5-0.

69. Friday, 3rd July 1942.
Went to town by 10.30 train. Met Nancy. had lunch. Went to town shopping all day. Nice sunny day. got home at a quarter to nine. Paid £1-5-0.

70. Tuesday, 9th January 1945.
Roy. up early to start work for Gayndah Shire Council left for work with G Thelman. at 6-30. Val. & self finished housework at 9-30. I. wrote to Mervyn. & sent his Money for Saddle down to him also Wrote to Trittons for Mosquito Net. £2-10-9. Val. went up town to get goods & post letters. only 1 letter from Valda. Beck. Eidsvold

71. Wednesday, 23rd May 1945.
Up early to Wash Valma. went to school. Almost finished washing at 9-30. when Roy. came in from work. with a sore back. Herb. Wayne, drove him in went up to see the Dr. but he was at Mundubber, [sic] went up again in the afternoon but he was away so went at night, got a mixture from him. put Roy. to bed with hot packs. No mail. [3 letters from Ruth. Auntie & Gwen crossed out].

72. Thursday, 31st May 1945.
Roy. went up town to see about his Compensation papers. came home at 10-15, then he & I. went up to the Hospital, for the Dr to examine his back. came home had lunch
and I. went up town a letter from Ruth also 1 from sister. I. wrote to Gwen. Val, posted it. I. mended Roy’s old dark grey suit pants. Wrote to E. Banks.

73. **Wednesday, 6th June 1945.**
up early & did the washing had a nice summery day so washed Roys camping out Blankets got them all dry. went up town got letter from Gwen. & one from The C.P.S. about Roys Compensation. Wrote a few lines to Roy. Mervyn & Gwen, Val. went up on the bike & posted it. Got Telegram from Roy. at 3-30.

74. **Friday, 22nd June 1945.**
Roy. to work as usual. down the line again. I. Cleaned all the house right through, also did alittle washing and ironing and some cooking, then went up town to meet Roy. letter from Gwen. & Casket ticket for W.W.& S. Roy. got Cheque. for Compensation from GPS £13-3-6. Thirteen pounds. 3/6.

75. **Friday, 15th June 1945.**
Up early to get Roy. away still down near Ban Ban. I. did out all the house & washed out all soiled cloths. went up town after lunch. 2 letters for Roy. from Sports Club & Taxion [sic] office. Valma at school. Cool day.

76. **Monday, 28th July 1947.**
Roy. away to work as usual in his fifteenth week. Valma. away to school. then I. did all the coloured then I. went down the Gabba. & paid. Valmas Dentist Bill. came home had lunch. then Auntie & I. went into town & did some shopping. Mervyn came down at night. to fill in the Tax papers.

77. **Monday, 11th June 1951.**

78. **Tuesday, 28th March 1944.**
Valma. at school. Did the Ironing at Brassells. got £1-0-0 for the two days.

79. **Tuesday, 18th April 1944.**
Bill. Came up to see if Mervyn could give him a few days. Gwen. still at home. washed at Hospital. home at 11.30.

80. **Tuesday, 26th June 1951.**
I. was up again early again got My Breakfast & Vals, then got ready to catch the 5 past seven tram, started work at St Margarets School at eight. ironed until 3P,M got 19/6 & 1/- fare. Got home at quarter to five, got tea & cut Mervyn. Lunch got to bed at nine.

81. **Saturday, 28th March 1942.**
Roy. Maurice. & self went to town. Gwen left Whelans. and came home with us. 1 Dozen Eggs for Mrs Harris.
82. *Wednesday, 4th February 1942.*
Elsie Cass over  Finished planting Corn & pumpkins  1 Dozen Eggs Elsie.

83. *Monday, 3rd September 1945.*
Roy. at Wethern this morning did some ploughing, then brought tractor into town, then took Tractor out to Plateau School for Roller. which he brought in part of way. Cool day. I. pruned all fruit trees in morning then went down town in afternoon. No Mail. posted letter to Gwen. Maurice. cut wood. Val. at school.

84. *Monday, 19th January 1942.*
Feb showered a little. Men grubbed suckers. did some mending. Made 4 bottles Fig Jam.

85. *Saturday, 23rd December 1944.*
Up again at 4-30. Roy. & self Made three Christmas Cakes before breakfast while Ruth Cleaned out Main part of house had dinner. Maurice arrived for dinner, also Jim then all Went up town. Pictures at Night.

86. *Friday, 1st June 1945.*
Did all the House out except The Kitchen as it was very like rain. Made 2 sponge sandwiches one for the Church of England stall, both turned out well  No Mail for anyone.

87. *Saturday, 13th October 1945.*
After breakfast I. did the Kitchen out for Ruth. as she was not feeling very well. Also Made a Chocolate Cake.  Pat O’Brien out for week-end  Had a nice heavy shower of rain.

88. *Tuesday, 9th January 1945.*
Roy. up early to start work for Gayndah Shire Council left for work with G Thelman. at 6-30. Val. & self finished housework at 9-30. I. wrote to Mervyn. & sent his Money for Saddle down to him also Wrote to Trittons for Mosquito Net. £2-10-9. Val. went up town to get goods & post letters. only 1 letter from Valda. Beck. Eidsvold

89. *Wednesday, 17th January 1945.*
Wet day Roy. left for work at 6-30 came home at 9-30. we did some gardening Val went up to see if there was any Mail. only one from Trittons regarding net  Truck came & took Roy. & Pop Thelman at 12-45. Ruth. came home from Kirk’s. per Service Car  Roy met her they got home at 8-15.

90. *Tuesday, 23rd January 1945.*

91. *Monday, 6th November 1944.*
Roy. left here 4-45 had trouble with truck left town 5-50. got Mervyn. away at 5-40. Valma, went to school. & Gwen went down to Café to work. Wrote & posted letter to
Maurice. also, sent rent down to Mrs Hawkins. No Mail for us today Very disappointed. Still no rain.

92. **Monday, 20th November 1944.**
Posted letter to Maurice, Roy & Mervyn left for work at 5-30. doing Abercorn Street up. Valma, went to school. Gwen at the Café, I. went down town had lunch at Waltons. letter from Dean, refusing to let us rent half house, Ruth rang very disappointed.

93. **Thursday, 6th February 1947.**
Valma. & Gwen, at school, Mervyn, at work as also is Uncle Jack. Roy. & I. went to town, went to see some of the agents re - some of the houses to let. Came home to Aunties, had dinner and decided to see what goes, re half house & was lucky enough to get same real pleased

94. **Wednesday, 28th May 1947.**
Had a very busy day. After getting Roy. to work & Val. to school. Gwen. Did the rest of the ironing & I. did some cooking then Gwen. Alison. & I. went into town. I. called & saw Mr Geir’s Secretary re house. was very nice took down all particulars & said we’d hear from him next week. Valma. went to the Dentist. Elvie. Had another son. This afternoon. Beautiful day but very cold. & cold night No Mail.

95. **Wednesday, 4th June 1947.**
After getting Roy. away to work & Val. to school. I. did all the Kitchen shelves. Gwen did a big ironing with our new iron. Very much like rain. dull at times. no rain. I. went to town in afternoon. to lodge an application for house. brought a form home to fill in. Auntie. Came home sick, so I. had to go up & cook tea for her. Gwen. & Val. went into the flix at “Princess” Roy. got letter from Gayndah. Shire Council.

96. **Tuesday, 22nd July 1947.**
I. was up early & started the washing then got Roys Breakfast & cut his lunch after getting him to work & Valma. to school. Gwen. & I. got the washing out Housing Inspector, came & took all details, No Mail dull day. Paid half. Of Teddys . Dentist.

97. **Monday, 27th October 1947.**
Got Roy. away to work as usual in his 27th week at Denhams. And Valma. away to school. had a very quit day. did some mending, and went to town after lunch. went & saw the Housing Commission. & took my new shoes back to Coulsons. To be fixed all had an early night rather dull but very little rain. Posted letter to Maurice.

98. **Tuesday, 18th April 1944.**
Bill. Came up to see if Mervyn. Could give him a few days. Gwen. still at home. washed at Hospital. home at 11/30.

99. **Sunday, 19th March 1944.**
All went up to the Hospital to see Mr Snelling.

100. **Tuesday, 16th May 1944.**
Mervyn. went out for Goody horses & Meet Cattle. Took ill & had to call Dr taken to Hospital.
101. **Monday, 5th June 1944.**
Mrs Muller. in to take Shirley home. gave me a lift home. Gwen down town. Mervyn arrived home from Monto  Roy. also home for the night

102. **Thursday, 18th May 1944**
Roy. stayed home from work as I. had to have an operation not very well. All up to see me at night.

103. **Saturday, 28th April 1945.**
Hardly slept last night as Mervyn was very restless & coughing a lot Ambulance. Came for him at ten thirty took him to General Hospital, received letter from Ruth. sent Roy. wire. Went out to see Gwen. on my own.

104. **Saturday 27th May 1944.**
Back in bed again legs all swollen up very painful. family went to the Pictures Maurice. went back to Work

105. **Wednesday, 12th September 1945.**
Roy. took Tractor out to Reids Creek to do some rolling Maurice. at Home. went up town for Me. No Mail. Valma. at school. First Day of Gayndah Sports. fair crowd in for some fights at Night Roy. & Maurice went. Val, & self went to see “Beautiful but Broke” and R. Taylor. in “Her Cardboard Lover”. Big convey left for Brisbane, (40)

106. **Friday, 13th April 1951.**
We had 2 swims again & did a little cleaning Val. & Joyce arrived down at 7-15 we all talked till late.  Val. & Joyce went to the flix.

107. **Sunday, 30th July 1944.**
All went to the Circus at night.

108. **Monday, 23rd July 1951.**
Roy & Val went to Wirth’s Circus. [written by Val]

109. **Friday, 12th October, 1945.**
Still very tired after long journey. had a rather lazy day. Leslie away all day cutting Lantana. Very warm day. hope we get some rain, Wirths Circus in Gympie. last night & tonight.

110. **Tuesday, 12th August 1947. AND**
Up early & got 2 tins of cloths boiled before giving Roy. his breakfast & getting him off to work. got all the cloths dry, & ironed. Roy. Val. & self went out to the Show after tea arrived home. 10.30. big crowd out there,

110. **Wednesday, 13th August 1947.**
Another big day. At the Exhibition Roy. Has a holiday so spent it at the Show. & stayed until nine, we all went to the Pictures at nine. Gwen. Cleaned out the house. up early & got 2 tines
111. Sunday, 8th April 1945.

112. Sunday, 5th August 1945.
Roy. & Maurice went up to Eidsvold to play football. Gayndah. Won 12-3, Mrs Geiszler. Pauline & Rita, came to see us, stayed for while Daphne. Came for old clock.

113. Tuesday, 2nd October 1945.
Valma. went to school. I. did the washing & went up town also did most of the ironing. No Mail from anyone, Mrs Sinn, came up to listen to fights, Mervyn. Lost his fight as also did Eric Boldery who was K.o.d.

114. Saturday, 11th November 1944.
No mail last night or today. Roy. & self went down town in Morning I. helped at Café, had lunch there. All went to the Pictures at night. Melbourne Cup day also Armistice Day. Sirius 1, Peter 2, Cellini 3.

115. Saturday, 8th September 1945.

116. Saturday, 18th March 1944.
Cleaned front room & Verander Mr Snelling taken to Hospital very ill.

117. Sunday, 20th August 1944.
Took Flowers out to Toowong Cemetery in Morning.

After an early dinner Roy. Val, & self; went out to Toowong Cemetery with some flowers. Then out to Lynches. but they were not at homes. had early tea all tired.

119. Saturday, 18th November 1944.
Roy. took Council truck down for Dick Bannah. I went down with him, in the morning went down to Mrs McRoberts for afternoon tea. All went to Waterloo Bridge at night letter from Hawkins.

120. Monday, 9th April 1945.
up & got Roy. to work as usual they are still working near the butter factory. I. went up town & saw the Snellings. on their way to Brisbane. Collected all my good 1 letter from Beryl. Gwen. Had Morning Tea. With the Snellings & Mrs. J. Woods. Did All Maurices Washing.

121. Wednesday, 25th June 1947.
After getting Roy. away to work & Valma. to school. Gwen. & I. started with the wash. Got done at 9-30. then Gwen. & I. started cleaning under the house & backyard. Got all the Cloths in before dinner. & the folding & damping done the after dinner. Gwen. started ironing got nearly all done Auntie here for afternoon tea. I.
received a letter from Mum. Scheruber, was very pleased to hear from her. rather Cold today also at night. Mervyn, down to have his leg done.

122. Sunday, 12th July 1942.
Valma. & self went to Bleakley for afternoon had a very enjoyable time Doug home on leave.

123. Friday, 21st January 1944.
Valma. & self left Brisbane at nine o’clock by Northern Mail. Roy. at station to see us off Went out to Chelmer.

124. Friday, 25th August 1944.
Went out to see the Bleakleys at Chelmer, & Packed for Home, caught Rockhampton Mail at nine [sic]

125. Thursday, 24th May 1945.
Bill Parry-Oaken, a daughter.
Have Roy at home. In bed have been putting hot towels on his back all day is a little better, now. Valma. at school. I. went up town about 3-30. got a letter from Nancy. also one from Ruth. and Gwens food ration book. (Registered.)

126. Friday, 1st June 1945.
Did all the House out except The Kitchen as it was very like rain. Made 2 sponge sandwiches one for the Church of England stall, both turned out well No Mail for anyone. Muriel Cooper. engaged to J. Hasewood.

127. Saturday, 9th June 1945.
After breakfast did some ironing then went up town very disappointed as No letters from Roy. Or Mervyn. Telegram Roy. Did Not go to pictures at night. as was wet. Maurice did not arrive. Got first Weekly at Quinns.

128. Thursday, 4th January 1945.
Roy. & self got up early & did all the Washing finished at 7-30, started Ironing at 10-30. got finished at 1-P,M. Roy. Went up town after dinner, put 2 Book shelves up & put all books on them. Jim went home about 11,a,m.

129. Monday, 8th January 1945.
Roy. went up town. for Bread & Meat. got up early & took Gwen over to station to meet Railmotor Telegram for Ruth. Roy took same up rang Ruth, & read Telegram for Ruth, & read Telegram over phone to her. from Leslie. No Mail. posted letter to Nancy. Roy. got posted Mervyn. Cheque for his Saddle from T. Downing. £11-2-0. Jim. went home after dinner.

130. Thursday, 8th February 1945.
Maurice Birthday 17 years [written by Valma]
Roy. & gang out at the Plateau Maurice. went with Downing Mustering at Bushnells. Valma. at school. Did the Washing & ironing Ruth. went up town Les. In bed no well Maurice. had three telegrams for his Birthday No Mail.
Valma went back to school miss her very much. & very lonely out here now.

Roy. went camping, they are working up at Cynthia. Very lonely. went down town. Valma at school.

133. *Tuesday, 15th May 1945.*
Very lonely without Dad. Valma went to school. Maurice. Went up town for goods. I. did some tidying up & also washed all the colours & woollies. Cold day. letter for me from Gwen.

134. *Tuesday, 25th September 1951 (for 1979).*
Dear Mum how I Miss you. Went with him [Mervyn] …gone the cost [coast] with the Truck [sic]

135. *Thursday, 12th July 1951 (for 1979).*
Left Nanangge in the Month of the end off 1914 went to Ipswich Purga Army Sav. Stad few Month There in 1915 got a Job at Loamside on farm to work for ???? Stephens. Stead with them till Middle of 1918 [sic]
Appendix C

Archival Searches, Documentation and Examples

(1) APPENDIX C: - Archival Searches

Northern Protector of Aboriginals Office –
Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Marriages
Queensland State Archives Item ID 337186. A/58764
Circa 1/1/1901 to 12/31/1901

Chief Protector of Aboriginals Office –
Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Applications – Miscellaneous
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336051. A/70627
Circa 12/23/1915 to 12/23/1915

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Barambah – Accounts.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336124. A/58677
Circa 7/19/1927 to 9/22/1927

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Barambah – Complaints.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336129. A/58676
Circa 1/1/1906 to 12/31/1906

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Barambah – Complaints.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336230. A/69429
Circa 1/1/1935 to 12/31/1935

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Miscellaneous and complaints.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336501. A/58782
Circa 1/1/1904 to 12/31/1904
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336502. A/58782
Circa 1/1/1905 to 12/31/1905
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336503. A/58782
Circa 1/1/1907 to 12/31/1907

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Complaints from Aborigines.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336235. A/69460  
Circa 1/1/1931 to 12/31/1931
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336236. A/69460  
Circa 1/1/1932 to 12/31/1932
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336239. A/58695  
Circa 1/1/1915 to 12/31/1915
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336240. A/58695  
Circa 1/1/1916 to 12/31/1916
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336241. A/58695  
Circa 1/1/1917 to 12/31/1917
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336242. A/58695  
Circa 1/1/1918 to 12/31/1918
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336243. A/58695  
Circa 1/1/1920 to 12/31/1920
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336244. A/58695  
Circa 1/1/1921 to 12/31/1921
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336245. A/58696  
Circa 1/1/1922 to 12/31/1922
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336247. A/58696  
Circa 1/1/1924 to 12/31/1924
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336248. A/58696  
Circa 1/1/1925 to 12/31/1925
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336249. A/58696  
Circa 1/1/1926 to 12/31/1926
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336250. A/58697  
Circa 1/1/1927 to 12/31/1927
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336251. A/58697  
Circa 1/1/1928 to 12/31/1928
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336252. A/58697  
Circa 1/1/1929 to 12/31/1929
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336253. A/58698  
Circa 1/1/1930 to 12/31/1930
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336254. A/58699  
Circa 1/1/1931 to 12/31/1931
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336255. A/58699  
Circa 1/1/1932 to 12/31/1932

---------------------------
Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. Files. Complaints - Miscellaneous.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336256. A/70009  
Circa 1/1/1921 to 12/31/1921
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336257. A/58700  
Circa 1/1/1930 to 12/31/1930
Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. Files. Exemptions.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336262. A/58730  
Circa 1/1/1909 to 12/31/1909
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336330. A/58731  
Circa 1/1/1915 to 12/31/1915
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336334. A/58732
Circa 1/1/1919 to 12/31/1919
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336336. A/58733
Circa 1/1/1920 to 12/31/1920
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336337. A/58733
Circa 1/1/1921 to 12/31/1921
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336341. A/58735
Circa 1/1/1923 to 12/31/1923
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336343. A/58736
Circa 1/1/1925 to 12/31/1925
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336345. A/58737
Circa 1/1/1928 to 12/31/1928
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336347. A/58738
Circa 1/1/1929 to 12/31/1929
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336350. A/58739
Circa 1/1/1932 to 12/31/1932
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336352. A/58740
Circa 1/1/1933 to 12/31/1933
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336365. A/58741
Circa 1/1/1937 to 12/31/1937
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336333. A/69426
Circa 1/1/1918 to 12/31/1918
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336346. A/69427
Circa 1/1/1929 to 12/31/1929
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336348. A/69428
Circa 1/1/1916 to 12/31/1916
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336331. A/69430
Circa 1/1/1916 to 12/31/1916
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336359. A/58743 Files. Exemptions A-C.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336369. A/58744 Files. Exemptions K-M.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336370. A/58745 Files. Exemptions K-M.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336863. A/58746 Files. Exemptions A-C.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336874. A/58746 Files. Exemptions N-R.
Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Marriages.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336478.  A/70627  
Circa 1/1/1938 to 12/31/1938

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336454.  A/69433  
Circa 1/1/1912 to 12/31/1912

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336445.  A/69434  
Circa 1/1/1917 to 12/31/1917

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336466.  A/69435  
Circa 1/1/1926 to 12/31/1926

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336468.  A/69436  
Circa 1/1/1928 to 12/31/1928

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336472.  A/69438  
Circa 1/1/1930 to 12/31/1930

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336442.  A/58766  
Circa 1/1/1909 to 12/31/1909

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336467.  A/58766  
Circa 1/1/1915 to 12/31/1915

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336453.  A/58768  
Circa 1/1/1915 to 12/31/1915

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336456.  A/58769  
Circa 1/1/1918 to 12/31/1918

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336456.  A/69414  
Circa 1/1/1920 to 12/31/1920

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336461.  A/58770  
Circa 1/1/1922 to 12/31/1922

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336462.  A/58771  
Circa 1/1/1923 to 12/31/1923

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336463.  A/58772  
Circa 1/1/1924 to 12/31/1924

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336464.  A/58773  
Circa 1/1/1925 to 12/31/1925

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336470.  A/58774  
Circa 1/1/1929 to 12/31/1929

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336475.  A/58775  
Circa 1/1/1934 to 12/31/1934

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336476.  A/58776  
Circa 1/1/1936 to 12/31/1936

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336477.  A/58777  
Circa 1/1/1938 to 12/31/1938

Queensland State Archives Item ID 336891.  A/58778  
Circa 1/1/1939 to 12/31/1939

------------------------
Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Marriages – (including marriages Laura Aboriginals)
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336479.  A/69439  
Circa 1/1/1937 to 12/31/1937

------------------------
Director of Native Affairs Office –
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336864. A/58747
Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files Exemptions A-C.
Circa 1/1/1940 to 12/31/1940

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Barambah – Complaints.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 33837. A/69416
Circa 1/1/1941 to 12/31/1941

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Complaints.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336837. A/69416
Circa 1/1/1941 to 12/31/1941

Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.
Files. Marriages.
Queensland State Archives Item ID 336895. A/69437
Circa 1/1/1941 to 12/31/1941

Queensland State Archives Item ID 717467. A/69973
Files. Native Affairs General
Circa 1/1/1954 to 12/31/1954
Queensland State Archives Item ID 10189. A/58978
Files. Index to Register of Exemptions
Circa 1/1/1942 to 12/31/1964

Queensland State Archives Item ID 10131. A/58992
Files. Exemption Lists
Circa 1/1/1947 to 12/31/1964

Chief Protector of Aboriginals Office –
Director of Native Affairs Office –
Aboriginal and Island Affairs Department –
Queensland State Archives Item ID 10190. A/58979
Files. Index to Register of Exemptions
Circa 1/1/1908 to 12/31/1967

Chief Protector of Aboriginals Office –
Director of Native Affairs Office –
Queensland State Archives Item ID 4924. SRS4924
Files. Exemption Card Index
Circa 1/1/1908 to 12/31/1941
(2) APPENDIX C: - Documentation

(i) Form: Certificate of Entitlement – Resident of Reserve/Community

**Certificate No. A/69612/07**

**Queensland**

"The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Affairs Act of 1965."

Section 32

**Certificate of Entitlement - Resident of Reserve or Community**

I, [Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs for the state of Queensland], hereby certify that each of the undersigned Aboriginals for the community of [Name of Reserve/Community], was at the commencement of the Act a resident of or usually resident upon [Name of Reserve/Community].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age/Year of Birth</th>
<th>Effective Date of Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Person]</td>
<td>[Male/Female]</td>
<td>[Age/Year of Birth]</td>
<td>[Effective Date of Entitlement]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed at [Place], this [Day] of [Month], [Year] 1966.

Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs.

*Delete whichever is inapplicable*
(ii) **Form: Order for Removal – A**

ORDER FOR REMOVAL OF ABORIGINALS AND HALF-CASTES.

To all Officers and Constables of Police, Prison Officers, and Others Whom it May Concern.

**WHEREAS** by Section 9 of "The Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1904," and Sections 21 and 22 of "The Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts Amendment Act of 1904," it is enacted that the Minister may cause Aboriginals or Half-castes within any District to be removed to any Reserve, Institution, or District, or from any Reserve, Institution, or District, to any other Reserve, Institution, or District, and to be kept there for such period as the Minister may direct:

NOW THEREFORE, I, the Honorable Edward Michael Banfield, Minister for Health and Home Affairs of the State of Queensland, the Minister administering the aforesaid Acts, do hereby order that the Aboriginals or Half-castes hereinafter named be removed from ______ in the District of ______ to the ______ Settlement ________ for the reasons stated in connection with their names respectively, and to be kept within the limits of the said Reserve or Institution, in such manner and subject to the conditions prescribed hereunder, for the periods specified against their respective names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>OFFENCE OR OTHER CAUSE FOR REMOVAL</th>
<th>DURATION OF ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During the Minister’s pleasure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given under my hand, at Brisbane, this ______ Day of ________ 19____.

Made by Health and Home Affairs.

**This Order shall be retained by the Officer or other person accompanying the Aboriginal or Aboriginals named herein, and when such Aboriginal or Aboriginals have been handed over to the Superintendent or to the person to charge of the Reserve or Institution to which the said Aboriginal or Aboriginals are removed he shall deliver this Order to such Superintendent or Officer in Charge. Such Superintendent or other Officer shall notify the Chief Protector of Aboriginals for the date on which the Aboriginal or Aboriginals named herein are received at the Reserve or Institution. He shall also retain this Order during its currency, and shall report any breach thereof.**

Marriages, 1938 38/1137 – 38/3217)

QSA – A/58777 File No: 38/3165
Office of the Chief Protector of Aborigines,
Brisbane, 9th May 1910.

Sirs,

I have the honour to enclose herewith order by the

Honourable the Home Secretary for the removal of the

aboriginal

from [redacted] in the district of [redacted]

to the Aboriginal Settlement at [redacted]

and to ask you to be good enough to have it put into effect.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

Signed J. W. Sleekley

pro Chief Protector of Aborigines.

The Commissioner of Police,
Brisbane.
Memorandum with regard to the Hiring of Female Aboriginal or Half-Caste Servants.

1. Intending employers are to apply direct to the Protector.

2. All Aboriginal servants must be put under agreement, as provided in the Aboriginal Protection Acts.

3. The wages, as per agreement, are to be paid to the Officer authorised therein to receive them, who will have them placed to the servant's credit in the Government Savings Bank, and act as treasurers.

4. Servants may draw on their bank account at any time on application to the Protector or Officer in Charge of Police, who will see, if necessary, that the money is judiciously expended for clothing or other requirements.

5. No servants are to be allowed to be absent from the premises of an employer after 6 p.m., unless accompanied by a female member of the employer's family.

6. Food of a reasonable quantity, quality, and variety must be provided, and should include sugar, milk, butter, and vegetables or fruit.

7. Where clothes are provided by the employer, they should consist of serviceable articles suitable for the climate and sufficient in quantity to allow at least three changes of underclothing.

8. The accommodation should consist of a room so situated as to provide sufficient space, ventilation, and light, and, in addition to means of security, to ensure the occupant being under reasonable care and supervision. Conveniences for health and cleanliness should be provided and a receptacle or cupboard for the storage of clothes.

9. In no case, without written authority from the Protector, is any employer to expend any of the servant's wages for clothing, pocket money, or amusement.

10. Employers are to at once notify the Protector if they find that servants are unaccountable, or not worth the wages agreed upon, or when they desire to discharge them, or in the event of discharge.

11. Servants falling ill in the course or execution of their duty are to be provided with medical attention and accommodation at the employer's expense.

12. Employers must allow their servants every opportunity to wash their clothes and keep them in repair; and where clothes are provided by the employer, the said employer will be held responsible that the servant is returned at the completion of engagement with clothes equal in quantity and value to that supplied at the commencement of service.

13. Every facility must be given to the visiting Protector to interview the aboriginal servant, inspect her clothing and accommodation, or inquire into any complaints.

14. Unless in exceptional circumstances, no permit will be allowed for the employment of an aboriginal or half-caste female in the city or near suburbs, and no employer may employ her aboriginal or half-caste servant in the city without the consent in writing of the Protector.

15. A heavy penalty is provided under Section 17 of the 1897 Aboriginal Protection Act for removing aboriginal servants to another district or employ without advising and obtaining the consent of the Protector.

16. Failure to observe the above conditions will render the agreement or permit liable to revocation.

Protector.
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT made this day of , 1897, between (hereinafter called the Employer), of the one part, and (hereinafter called the Employed), of the other part. Whereby the said Employer agrees to serve the said Employed as , and otherwise make and generally useful, and obey all the reasonable commands of the said Employed for the period of months, commencing on the day of .

In consideration of which services the said Employed agrees to pay wages at the rate of , payable and to provide the said Employed with the following accommodation, namely—Suitable shelter, blankets, rations (including tobacco), clothing, and maintenance during sickness, and to return the said Employed to his native place on the expiration of the period of this Agreement at the expense of the said Employed.

And it is further agreed that this Agreement may be determined by the said Employed forthwith upon the happening of any of the following events:—Ill-treatment by the said Employed, or failure by the said Employed to provide the proper accommodation hereinafter set out, and it may also be determined forthwith by the said Employed if the said Employed deserts from the service or refuses to obey the lawful commands of the said Employed.

In Witness Whereof the parties hereto have affixed their signatures the day and year first above mentioned.

Employer.

Employed.

The above Agreement was explained to me in presence to the said Employed, who appeared to me to understand the same, and was then signed by , mark thereto, and by the said Employed in my presence.

[Signature]

* "An Aboriginal" or "Prisoner Brigade." * "The said Employed" as in a Prisoner or Police Officer as a Prisoner in full details" as agent for the said Employed. }  
| 1909 (Restricted) |
| QSA – A/58700 File No. 09/2273 |
Form: Wages Agreement to be paid to Protector

Barambah Misc., 1917, 1925, 1928, 1929 Restricted

QSA – A/58677 File No: 17/3228

To

In pursuance of the authority given me by Section 13, Subsection (2) of "The Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897-1901," I hereby direct that the wages of the

[Signature]

[Name]

be paid to me

[Signature]

[Name]

[Date]

(100)

The Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1901.

[Signature]

[Name]

[Date]
(vii) Form: Memo – Appointment of Protector to access Native Bank Accounts

Office of Chief Protector of Aboriginals.

South Brisbane, 192

Memorandum to

I have to advise that you have been appointed Protector of Aboriginals at ........................................, for the Petty Sessions District of ................................................................. as from ........................................ Authority for you to operate upon the Native Savings Bank Accounts has been arranged.

Kindly make yourself conversant with the Aboriginal Protection Acts, Regulations and Circular Instructions, and notify this Office if the Aboriginal Accounts were not satisfactorily balanced and wages due collected when handed over to you.

Chief Protector of Aboriginals.

Exemptions, 1933 (Restricted)
QSA – A/58740  File No: 33/1329
Form: Commonwealth Bank – Native Bank Account

Exemptions, 1921

QSA – A/58733  File No: 21/2807
(ix) Form: Local Protector’s Report – employee

Marriages, 1936
QSA 0 A/58776 File 36/582
### Barambah Aboriginal Settlement

**RETURN of WAGES RECEIVED during the Month of**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
<th>Name of Native</th>
<th>Amount Due to Native</th>
<th>Amount Due to Settlement</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Rate of Wages</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that the above is a correct Return of all Wages received.

*To The Chief Protector of Aborigines,*

*Brisbane.*

(Signed)  
[Signature]

---

(QSA - A59732 File No: 19/3004)  
Exemptions 1920 - 20/83, 20/2088  

---
MONTHLY RETURN of ABORIGINAL ATTENDANCE and GOVERNMENT RELIEF at:
MISSION STATION for

Amount of Monthly Government Grant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pupil</th>
<th>Relief</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barambah School, 1906, Restricted
QSA – A/586777 File No: 56/2065
(xii) **Form: Application for Permission to Marry**

---

### APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO MARRY.

**By any two parties—one of whom is a female aboriginal.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name—Christian and Surname. Identification No. (if any)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>10/8/1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality of parents—</td>
<td>Deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Half Caste Aborig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous marriage (if any)—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To whom married</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Place</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally or Tribally</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If legally married in husband or wife still living?</td>
<td>Never married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and ages of children</td>
<td>No children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for future custody of children</td>
<td>No children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegitimate children (if any)—Number and ages</td>
<td>No children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulars of—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present custody</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future custody</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have parents given consent to marriage (required if under 21 years)?</td>
<td>Consent not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House or other accommodation available for couple after marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of present employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulars of wages or income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Savings Bank Account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Report of Protector or Superintendent.

Are the above particulars correct to the best of your belief? Yes
Are applicants of good character? Yes
Are they free from disease? Yes as far as I know.
Is male applicant capable of maintaining a wife? Yes
Do you recommend the granting of permission to marry? Yes

Date: 13/7/38

(Signature) [Signature]

Protector of Aborigines.

---

Marriages 1938 38/1137 – 38/3217
QSA – A/58777 File No. 38/2270
(xiii) **Form: Permission for Celebration of Marriage**

---

I, Walter Roth, Protector of Aborigines, having been duly authorised, under section 9 of "The Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts. 1892 to 1907," to give permission, in writing, for the celebration of the marriage of female aboriginal with persons other than aboriginals, hereby give permission for the celebration of the marriage of the half-caste, with

*female of Winton, Carrier.*

WALTER R. ROTH,
Protector.

To Captain & Mrs. Barrow

12. 8. 04.

Marriages 1904 (Restricted)
QSA – A/58764 Folder – Marriages, 1904.
(xiv) **Acknowledgement of Marriage taking place**

Office of Chief Protector of Aboriginals,
South Brisbane, 30.6.19

Memorandum:

The Protector of Aboriginals,

Enclosed please find permit for the marriage of the half-caste woman [redacted] of [redacted] to [redacted], a native of [redacted] as recommended in your report of [redacted].

Kindly advise when the marriage has taken place.

Chief Protector of Aboriginals.

Marriages, 1919.
QSA 0 A/694 File No: 20/2631
Office of Chief Protector of Aboriginals,
South Brisbane.

To the Protector of Aboriginals,


Re ABORIGINAL BLANKETS.

Kindly ascertain from the undermentioned centres in your district their absolutely necessary requirements only for the ensuing year, exclusive of the blankets on hand, and showing the number of men, women, and children to benefit. Also, please ascertain the changes in previous list of recipients caused by removals, deaths, marriages, births, left district, etc., during the year.

Blankets are not to be supplied to—

Other than Aboriginals;
Aboriginals at present or usually in employment;
Aboriginals known to have sufficient funds in Savings Bank to enable them to purchase their own blankets;
Uncivilised natives in mild climates who are not in need of blankets.

Where it seems to the distributing officer that the blacks entitled to benefit are sufficiently supplied with past issues or otherwise not in need of blankets, other more necessary goods, such as clothing, tomahawks, fishing lines, etc., may be applied for in lieu.

To more evenly distribute and facilitate the work of issue, where such appear necessary, the opening of new distribution centres may be suggested.

Distributing officers might show on their returns the most economical and expeditious route by which the supplies can be forwarded.

The returns are required as early as possible to allow despatch to distant centres not later than the end of December.

Exemptions – 1929 (29/4047 – 29/6676)
QSA – A/69427 File No: 29/6132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where born</td>
<td>Boondooma, Burnett Dist, Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Half caste native of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality of parents, father</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were parents legally married?</td>
<td>Not legally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant married (legally)?</td>
<td>Not legally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, what is nationality of wife (or husband)?</td>
<td>Three quarter caste aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has applicant any children? If so, what are their ages?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant (or his family) habitually associate with aboriginals?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant drink?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or, procure it for other aboriginals?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant educated, to what extent?</td>
<td>Not educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is he (or she) intelligent enough to protect himself in business dealings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is he (or she) thrifty and does he understand the value of money?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What amount has he or she to credit in the Savings Bank?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant live in a civilized manner, and associate with Europeans usually?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant of good character, steady in employment, and trustworthy?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it applicant's own wish to be exempt?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Smith
Inspector of Police
Maryborough

QSA – Exemptions, 1920
QSA – A/58732 File No: 20/2330
Form: Application for Exemption 1897 – 1934


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41 years approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where born</td>
<td>Atherton, N.Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality of parents—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Aboriginal (P/Blood).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Aboriginal (Full Blood).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were parents legally married?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant married (legally)?</td>
<td>No. Married according to tribal rites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, what is nationality of wife (or husband)?</td>
<td>Wife - [redacted] - Full Blood Abc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant (or his family) habitually associate with aboriginals?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant live in a civilised manner and associate with Europeans usually?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant of good character, steady in employment, and industrious?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant drink?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or, pressure for other aboriginals?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant educated, to what extent?</td>
<td>Yes. Can read and write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is he (or she) intelligent enough to protect himself in business dealings?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is he (or she) thrifty, and does he (or she) understand the value of money?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What amount has he (or she) to credit in the Savings Bank?</td>
<td>[redacted] has the sum of £78/7/2 to his credit at the present date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How applicant previously been granted exemption?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Protection—

The question whether exemption is recommended. If so, whether from all provisions of the Acts or only in part. (In latter event, state provisions which should remain applicable.)

I would not recommend exemption in this case. The applicant is not capable of controlling his own affairs. He is easily led, and would finish up in a hopeless muddle if he were allowed to manage his own affairs.

Signed: [Signature]
Protector of Aborigines.

QSA - Exemptions, A-C.
QSA – A/58846 File No. 41/114
Form: Application for Exemption – 1939

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of applicant</td>
<td>Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Over 55 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where born</td>
<td>Pavemahoe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breed of parents -</td>
<td>Full Blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Full Blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Tribal marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were parents legally married?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, what is nationality of wife (or husband)?</td>
<td>Full Blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant (or his family) habitually associate with Aboriginals?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant live in a civilized manner and associate with Europeans usually?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant of good character, steady in employment and industrious?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does applicant drink?</td>
<td>Very little.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or, procures it for other Aboriginals?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is applicant educated; to what extent?</td>
<td>Not educated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is he (or she) thrifty, and does he (or she) understand the value of money?</td>
<td>Reasonably thrifty and understands value of money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is he (or she) intelligent enough to protect himself in business dealings?</td>
<td>Not particularly intelligent but is usually to be undertaken business capably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What amount has he (or she) to credit or debit in the Savings Bank?</td>
<td>£6.11.4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has applicant previously been granted exemption?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Endorsement of Protector:**
I recommend that applicant be exempted from the provisions of the Act; likewise his wife.

(State whether exemption is recommended. If so, whether from all provisions of the Act, or only part. In latter event, state provisions which should remain applicable.)

Applicant's wife, Kabel, is an intelligent, trustworthy and industrious person. She has an amount of £20.1.6 in her general account and £20.1.6 in her child endowment account. She would, no doubt, support herself if exempted.

Signature: [Signature]

QSA - SRS/4429. File 8M/447
Date: 14 January 1953
(xix) Form: Application for Exemption – 1939

QSA - SRS 4429/1 File 8/766
Date: 28 September 1965
(xx) **The Granting of a Certificate of Exemption**

---

**CERTIFICATE OF EXEMPTION.**

This is to certify that [Name] is hereby exempt from the provisions of "The Aboriginal Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1901," and the Regulations thereunder.

Date: [Date]

[Signature]

---

Exemptions, 1930 (30/3146030/6700)
QSA – A/69428  File No. 30/5600

---

(xxii) **Acknowledgement of receiving his/her Exemption**

---

I do hereby certify that I have this day received from the Protector of Aborigines, [Authority], a Certificate of Exemption dated [Date], exempting me from the provisions of "The Aboriginal Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1901," and the Regulations thereunder.

Witness: [Signature]

---

QSA – A/58776
Marriages, 1936, 36/1910
(xxii) **The Cancellation of a Certificate of Exemption**

Exemptions, 1928. 928/28/2-28/7075
QSA – A/58737 File No. 28/5058
Queensland ANNO SEXAGESIMO PRIMO VICTORIAE REGIAE No. [17]

A Bill to make Provision for the better Protection and Care of the Aboriginal and Half-caste Inhabitants of the Colony, and to make more effectual Provision for Restricting the Sale and Distribution of Opium.

Preamble: Whereas it is desirable to make provision for the better protection and care of the aboriginal and half-caste inhabitants of the Colony: And whereas great and widespread injury is being caused to the aboriginal and half-caste and certain other inhabitants of the Colony by the consumption of opium: And whereas the restrictions heretofore imposed by laws upon the sale and distribution of opium are found to be insufficient, and it is expedient to make more effectual provision for restricting such sale and distribution, and for preventing the evils arising there from: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advise and consent of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of Queensland in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:-


2. Repeal. [Schedule.]
3. Interpretation.
4. Persons deemed to be aboriginals
5. Proclamation of Districts.
6. Protectors to be appointed.
7. Superintendents to be appointed.
8. Reserves to be subject to Act and Regulations.
9. Aboriginals may be removed to reserves.
10. Aboriginals excepted from liability to removal to a reserve.
11. Persons who are prohibited from entering a reserve.
12. Aboriginals and half-castes may be employed.
13. Duration, renewal, and revocation of permit.
15. Aboriginals and female half-castes to be employed under written agreement.
16. Aboriginals and female half-castes in employment to be subject to supervision.
17. Prohibition of removal of aboriginals from one District to another or beyond the Colony.
18. Possession of blanket, &c., issued to an aboriginal or half-caste a punishable offence.
19. Penalty for supplying liquor to aboriginals and half-castes.
20. Persons supplying opium to aboriginals or half-castes, guilty of a punishable offence, and penalty therefor.
21. Possession or sale of opium by certain persons unlawful.
22. Penalty for unlawful possession or sale or delivery of opium.
23. Premises may be searched for opium believed to be kept contrary to provisions of Act.
24. Travellers suspected to be in unlawful possession of opium may be searched, &c.
25. Opium found in unlawful possession to be forfeited.
27. Persons by whom certain proceedings may be instituted.
28. Persons by whom certain complaints may be made.
29. Provision for penalties where not specified.
30. Offences to be prosecuted before any two justices.
31. Regulations
32. Regulations to have the force of the law.
33. Certain half-castes may be exempted from provision of Act.

Source: OPA – n6173-6183.
(3) APPENDIX C: - Examples from Chapter Six

Example One
The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of B consisted of the following documents all contained in one large file: two letters (2 pages each) from the applicant to the Chief Protector (5th October, 1929) stamped “Chief Protector of Aboriginals” and inscribed with the words “Applics. Misc” for filing purposes and the other dated 21st April, 1930) two memoranda from the Deputy Chief Protector to the applicant (19th November, 1929 and 14th April, 1930); one letter from the applicant to the Deputy Chief Protector (24th November, 1929) stamped, “Chief Protector of Aboriginals”, and inscribed with the word “Exemptions” for filing purposes; one memorandum from the Chief Protector to The Protector, Dirranbandi, (28th November, 1929); one memorandum from The Protector, Dirranbandi to the Chief Protector (2nd December, 1929) stamped “Chief Protector of Aboriginals” and inscribed with the words “Exemptions”; one memorandum from the Chief Protector to the applicant (7th December, 1929); one letter from the applicant to the Deputy Chief Protector (31st March, 1930), stamped “Chief Protector of Aboriginals” and inscribed with the words “Bar. [Barambah] Accounts,” and a typed version of this letter (for Departmental records). In addition, the file contained one letter from the Chief Protector to The Superintendent, Barambah Aboriginal Settlement (4th April, 1930); one letter from Barambah Aboriginal Settlement to the Chief Protector (7th April, 1930) and one letter from the applicant’s employer to the Chief Protector (20th April, 1930).

Source: Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/69428 File No: 30/2499. Exemptions – 1930.

Example Two
The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of F consisted of the following thirty-one documents: a handwritten letter from the applicant to the Chief Protector (dated 16th May 1938), three letters from the Chief Protector to The Superintendent, Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement (dated 20th May 1938, 6th June 1938, 20th May 1938); three memoranda from The Superintendent, Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement, to the Chief Protector (dated 23rd May 1938, 1st July 1938);
three letters from Chief Protector to The Under Secretary, Department of Health and Home Affairs, Brisbane (dated 15th June, 15th June, 3rd October, 1938) with one typed version of the last letter for department records; one completed form titled “Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the Provisions of the Acts” (no date); four reports from a Police Officer (dated 16th June, 15th July, 26th September, 24th October 1938) forwarded to Inspector of Police, then to Chief Protector (dated 17th June, 29th July, 27th September, 25th October 1938); one ‘Order for Removal of Aboriginals and Half-Castes’ for the applicant, signed by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs (dated 18th June, 1938). One memorandum from the Chief Protector to The Superintendent, Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement, forwarded to the Chief Protector (dated 27th June, 1938); three memoranda from the Chief Protector to The Protector, Maryborough (dated 7th July, 1st September, 11th October 1938) and one typed version of all letters (for Department records); one letter from Chief Protector to The General Storekeeper, Railway Department, Brisbane (dated 5th August, 1938); one letter from General Storekeeper to Chief Protector (dated 8th August, 1938); one acknowledgement of receiving the exemption (dated 22nd October, 1938; one letter from Reverend Taylor, Rector – Church of England, Maryborough to the Chief Protector (dated 6th December, 1938); one letter from the Chief Protector to Reverend Taylor, Rector (dated 9th December 1938 with a letter half written, kept on file); one governmental record file.

**Source:** Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58777 File No: 38/18965. Marriages – 1938.

**Example Three**
The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of F consisted of five documents ranging in date from 8th August 1916 to 1st September 1916. These consisted of a typed memo from an Inspector of Police, Maryborough, to an Acting Sgt, Eidsvold (dated 8th August 1916) signed and stamped with inscription “Inspector of Police, reference no: Abor. L.B.265”; a two-page letter (second page missing) from unknown official to Sgt Clare, Eidsvold (dated 13-8-16); a two-page report from Sgt Clare, Eidsvold, to the Inspector of Police, Maryborough, forwarded to the Chief Protector (dated 16 August, 1916); a memorandum from the Chief Protector to the
local Protector, Maryborough (dated 1st September 1916) and an “Acknowledgement of Exemption” (dated 7th September 1916).

Source: Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/69430 File No: 16/2680. Exemptions – 1916.

Example Four
The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of J consisted of a total of thirteen one-page documents ranging in date from 18th December 1917 to 15th September 1937. The file contained two letters from Honorary Correspondent, Royal Humane Society of Australasia, to Chief Protector (dated 18th December 1917, 3rd January 1918); one letter from Deputy Chief Protector to Superintendent, Barambah (21st December 1917); one letter from Chief Protector to Mr Mackay, Police Department, Brisbane (31st December 1917); one memorandum Deputy Chief Protector to Superintendent, Barambah (21st December 1917); one memo from Deputy Chief Protector to J (dated 10th January 1918); one memo [sic] from Deputy Chief Protector to Superintendent (dated 10th January 1918); one memorandum from Deputy Chief Protector to Superintendent (dated 4th March 1918); one letter from J to Secretary, Returned Soldiers League (dated 17th August 1937); one letter from State Secretary, the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League of Australia (dated 23rd August 1937); two letters from Chief Protector to Superintendent, Cherbourg Aboriginal Settlement (dated 4th September, 15th September 1937); one memorandum from Superintendent to Chief Protector (dated 7th September 1937).

Source: Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58741 File No: 37/2135. Exemptions – D-J.

Example Five
The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of A consisted of a total of ten documents: one letter from the applicant to the Superintendent, Barambah (dated 10th August 1919) unmarked without any departmental messages, stamps or references; one memorandum from the Superintendent, Barambah, to the Chief Protector (dated August 1919); two memoranda from the Chief Protector to The Superintendent (dated 22nd August 1919 & 23rd October 1923); one memo from the
Deputy Chief Protector to The Superintendent (dated 26th August 1919); one letter (2 pages) from the applicant to the Chief Protector (dated 29th October 1919). Additional documents included: one memo from the Deputy Chief Protector to The Accountant, Home Department, Brisbane (dated 27th January, 1920); one memorandum from the Deputy Chief Protector to the local Protector, Maryborough (dated 8th March 1920); one “Cancellation of Certificate of Exemption” (1923) and finally, a letter from the Deputy Chief Protector to the Under Secretary, Home Department (18th October 1923).


Example Six:
The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of H consisted of one letter from the applicant to the Superintendent of Barambah Aboriginal Settlement, Murgon (3rd April 1928); one letter from the applicant’s employer to the Superintendent of Barambah Aboriginal Settlement, Murgon (3rd April 1928) unmarked with no writing or date stamp; one memorandum from the Chief Protector to the local Protector, Maryborough (dated 24th April 1928) stamped “Inspector of Police, Maryborough” and for filing purposes dated 25 April 1928 “28/2134 Exemptions” a report from the local Protector, which was forwarded to the Inspector of Police, Maryborough (dated 10th May 1928), before being forwarded to the Chief Protector’s Office (dated 12th May 1928); one completed form titled ‘Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the Provisions of the Acts’ (stamp dated 11th May 1928); two memoranda from the Deputy Chief Protector to the local Protector, Maryborough (23rd June & 6th July 1928); a report from the local Protector, Maryborough to the Chief Protector (13th July 1928), and one memorandum from the Deputy Chief Protector to the Superintendent of Barambah Settlement (dated 24th August 1928) inscribed with the reference number 4463 and the words “Bar. Accounts/Supt” and stamped with the Chief Protector’s stamp.

Source: Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58737 File No: 28/5042. Exemptions.
Example Seven

The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of M consisted of six documents: one letter from the applicant to the Chief Protector (no date, received at office on 28th January 1924); one memorandum from Chief Protector to The Superintendent, Aboriginal Settlement, Barambah (dated 30th January, 1924); a copy of the applicant’s letter, sent from the Deputy Chief Protector to local Protector, Ayr (dated 30th January, 1924); one completed copy of the form titled ‘Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the Provisions of the Acts’ (stamp dated 13 February, 1924); one memorandum from Chief Protector to Protector, Ayr (14th February 1924); and a letter from the local Protector, Ayr, to the Chief Protector (24th March, 1924).

Source: Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/58772 File No: 24/1696 Marriages – 1924.

Example Eight

The records located and examined by the researcher for the case of Mrs B and her son named J consisted of the following four documents: one typed copy of the ‘Report on Application by Half-caste for Exemption from the Provisions of the Acts’ (dated 18th December 1937); a report from the local Protector at Gayndah to the Chief Protector (dated 18th December 1937); a memorandum from the Chief Protector to the local Protector, Gayndah (30th December 1937) and an Extract of communication to this office from A.L. Macnaughton, Solicitor Gayndah, 22/12/37. All these items were located in one file inscribed with the words “Chief Protector of Aboriginals Office”.

Source: Queensland State Archives – Correspondence, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. QSA – A/69971 File No: 37/2993. Exemptions A-C (Restricted).