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INTRODUCTION:

The past neglect of the Australian city by historians is frequently the subject of lament. The neglect can be highlighted by noting that not only has the impact of the city been generally avoided in Australian historiography despite its overarching importance but also by the fact that Melbourne and Sydney still lack biographies. By contrast, major British and United States cities have had substantial treatment. Therefore, in the circumstance of very considerable gaps in Australian urban historiography, there is probably little need to justify a research topic which tackles the emergence of Sandringham, a Melbourne suburb in the late 19th century. Apart from the narrow and local purpose of providing a means by which local residents can further identify themselves with their community, a suburban history can provide a case study in urbanization which can be of relevance to the whole field of urban history and more specifically, it can enrich the written history of the city of which it is part.

1. e.g. Sean Glynn, Urbanization in Australian History, 1788-1900. Melbourne 1970, Ch.7 or 'Approaches to Urban History: The Case for Caution', Australian Economic History Review, X, 2, September 1970, p.225; J.W. McCarty, 'Australian Capital Cities in the Nineteenth Century' Ibid., pp.107-9 or "Commercial Cities" and the Growth of Melbourne in the Nineteenth Century', Historian No.17, September 1967, p.24. The latter is a paper delivered by Dr McCarty to the Victorian Historical Association in May 1967, on which parts of the former are based.

2. James Grant and Geoffrey Serle (eds.), The Melbourne Scene,1803-1956. Melbourne 1957 and Alan Birch and David S. Macmillan (eds.), The Sydney Scene, 1788-1960. Melbourne 1960 remain useful, but suggestive, filling a gap as Grant and Serle hopefully claimed in 1957 'until a historian... is found who will treat the subject on the scale it deserves' (Melbourne Scene, p.xv).

In the case of Melbourne in the second half of the 19th century when no such history exists, the suburban history becomes of major importance. Bate's and Blainey's works, for example, remain the best accounts of the development of the suburban railway network and of the ways in which semi-rural areas like Brighton and Camberwell were encompassed by the metropolis at a time when the 'walking city' was giving way to the 'public transport city'. Apart from the suburban railway, topics of enormous importance to late 19th century urban studies remain virtually untouched except in local histories—the tramways, the sanitation services, water and gas supplies, the uses of leisure time and holiday-making to name a few of direct relevance to Sandringham. Indeed, there is no full-scale examination of the development of local government in Victoria so that the answer to the question: why is local government so weak? remains conjectural; historical demography remains, as Glynn has suggested, 'almost untouched since Coghan'; the formation of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works deserves to be treated fully, and so on. Thus, there is plenty of scope for research both from the point of view of the historian anxious to view the city from one of its suburbs or the historian concerned more with the whole or

7. These terms used by McCarty in A.E.H.R. article cited above.
some theme relating to it. Whilst it may be regrettable as Lampard has stated that

microscopic work in local history, though monumental in detail, rarely furnishes its facts in forms that are amenable to macroscopic treatment 10,

the situation in Australia is that there has been no agreement on these forms and as Bate has argued recently, in the 'primitive state of the historical industry', there are compelling arguments for work in local history 'despite the fact that the evidence is rarely deposited in favour of local generalization'. 11

Given the state of the historiography of late 19th century Melbourne, any suburb would be acceptable as a research topic; in the case of Sandringham, there are some additional intrinsic reasons to justify the choice. It has no written history, nor, in 1970, even a local historical society; secondly, it provides the case of a bayside suburb of later development than neighbouring Brighton; thirdly, it provides the case for a study of Melbourne's land 'boom' in the 1880's; and fourthly, it displays the rural/residential conflict with the expansion of the suburbs in the late 19th century when a more enlightened concern for public health and sanitation was beginning to appear. It is largely with the development of this rural/residential conflict that the thesis is concerned; it is, then, a history of the emergence of a distinctive bayside community at Sandringham within the largely rural Shire of Moorabbin. Comparison can usefully be made with neighbouring Brighton and an attempt has been made to set Sandringham's development within the context of Melbourne's development as a whole but the comparisons are mostly between parts of Moorabbin as Sandringham for most of the period of this thesis was an unnamed part of the West riding of the Shire of Moorabbin whose affairs were dominated by market gardeners, a group whose unity of purpose in local affairs successfully resisted the impact of coastal suburban developments into the twentieth


century.

The boundaries of the suburban city of Sandringham (see Map 1) were not fixed until severance from Moorabbin shire was obtained in 1917, outside the time span of this thesis. Taking in the bayside between New Street in Hampton and Cramer Road in Beaumaris, Sandringham occupies an area of nearly six square miles between 7½ and 12 miles from the centre of the city of Melbourne; its main northern boundary is South Road which separates it from Brighton, the city which developed from the 1840's in part of Henry Dandy's Special Survey 12; to the east and south, it adjoins parts of the cities of Moorabbin and Mordialloc, which, along with present-day Sandringham, formed the old west riding of the Shire of Moorabbin i.e. the area bounded by South Road, Point Nepean Road, Mordialloc Creek and the bayside. Administratively, then, for the period of this thesis, Sandringham is submerged in its surroundings; disentangling Sandringham is always a major research problem - a problem which is complicated by the disparate methods of collecting and presenting census statistics as well as by the inaccuracy, fairly endemic in the 19th century census figures.

The end-point of the thesis, roughly the beginning of the twentieth century, has not been selected because of a belief that Sandringham then ceased to have a 'coherent history' of its own or that it acquired 'historical meaning only as part of the larger city', as McCarty has claimed of Hare's Brighton and Blainey's Camberwell 13; a person, a group

---

12. Henry Dandy, a yeoman farmer from the Sussex-Surrey border, arrived at Port Phillip early in 1841, armed with an order for eight square miles of land, made in England as part of Crown lands' policy, for which he had paid £5120. After some difficulties, he selected and had surveyed the northern part of the parish of Moorabbin. The western part of his survey became Brighton and the eastern part, the old North Riding of the Shire of Moorabbin. See Hare, Brighton on Dandy and the subsequent history of Brighton.

13. See McCarty in Historian No.17, p.31; the same argument is rephrased in A.E.H.R. X, 2, pp.108, 128.
or a community, I assume, always acquires historical meaning in relation
to a wider world - a suburb is no different. Rather it was selected
because, by the start of this century, the major outlines of the conflict
between the coastal area that eventually became the city of Sandringham
and the rest of Moorabbin had been cast and requirements as to the length
of the thesis, in any case, prevented me from doing justice to the more
recent history of the area. Thus the focus of the thesis is on the
period before 1900 and the task of writing a coherent history of
Sandringham through the twentieth century remains for the future.

The nature of Moorabbin and its various parts in the period before
the 1880's is discussed in chapters 1 and 2; chapters 3 and 4 consider
the material and human ingredients of change in the boom of the
'seighties which resulted in the distinctive growth of the coastal
sections and the demands for severance in 1885 and 1887, discussed in
chapter 5. Finally, in chapter 6, the issues raised and never really
settled during the disputes of the 'eighties and which resulted in the
emergence of Sandringham are considered in the context of the
'nineties.

14. If McCarty's claim that both Bato's Brighton and Blainey's Camberwell
'peter out' in the twentieth century were true, (I do not think it
is) it may be much more that the sheer volume of the material has
been somewhat daunting and that now techniques are necessary (a
point mentioned by McCarty in A.F.H.R. X, 2, p. 108) than that the
suburbs lacked coherent histories.
CHAPTER 1 : BEGINNINGS c. 1845-1863

PHYSICAL and ABORIGINES:

Whilst overall, there are only slight differences in height above sea level throughout the Parish of Moorabbin, the city of Sandringham has more variation than the rest. Its coastline is broken by a series of bluffs and crescent-shaped bays which have proved since its early settlement attractive to people seeking bay views, beach walks and sites for seaside residences rather than sites for market gardens. This particular stretch of the coast of Port Phillip Bay contrasts quite sharply with the much flatter Carrum area to the south and also, with the western shores. Most of the parish is part of the Brighton Coastal Plain, an area of uplifted sea-floor, dating from Tertiary times, with its southern boundary formed by the Beaumaris Monocline, which stretches from Table Rock Point inland to Clayton, and south of which the Carrum Swamp occupied the depression thus formed.

The surface shows a series of parallel, broad, shallow valleys trending north-west, the ups of which are seen as corresponding to the bluffs of the coast and the downs with the beaches. The bluffs are areas where an earlier and harder Tertiary deposit known as the Black Rock Sandstone has been raised to the zone of wave attack whilst the later and more easily eroded Red Bluff Sands, made up of poorly consolidated sands, fine sands, grits and gravels with clay, occur as soft capping on the bluffs and have been eroded to form the beaches. The Red Bluff at Black Rock provides the best example of the relationship between the Tertiary sediments. On land, this succession of folds is seen as the major control over the present surface development and drainage; in parts, it has been accentuated by erosion and deposit of wind-blown sands.\(^1\)

The characteristic light soils of the area, formed on these Tertiary deposits have attracted golfers for their year-round suitability for playing and market gardeners more for their ease of working than their fertility. In parts, drainage was poor, shown clearly by the swamps marked on early maps² and drained only in recent times. There were a number in the area of Cheltenham (or Spring Grove) which now form part of Cheltenham Park and the Victoria Golf Club links; another was located in Portion 32 adjacent to Balcombe Road between Hayden's Road and Reserve Road, now occupied by Beaumaris High School; another was located in Portion 33, now occupied by Royal Melbourne Golf Club. Most drainage over the whole area was simply through the sub-soil and water supplies both last century and in recent drought could be obtained from ground water sources. Especially along the coast, springs occurred at the base of the more permeable Red Bluff Sands. These were the sites of a number of native water-wells. Settlement, of course, has caused many of these springs to disappear as swamps were reclaimed, drains and canals constructed and the foreshore eroded.

The light soils gave support to the 'heath, with occasional patches of gum scrub', seen by the government surveyor, Henry Foot, as covering most of the area that now makes up Sandringham. This description perhaps suggests a sameness not seen by T.S. Hart who found a profusion of wild-flowers, more than three hundred species in all, including large numbers of orchids - the whole 'a wealth... striking by

² The swamps are most clearly shown on Cuningham and Pickett, Parish of Moorabbin, Contour Plan, Scale, 20 chains to 1 inch, contour interval, 10 feet. Plan No. 386 P, Lands Department, 1896. The fact that some of these patches of water are not shown on Henry D. Foot, Plan of the Parish of Moorabbin, Plan No. M 164, Lands Department, 1852 and Commander Henry L. Cox, Point Ormond to Red Cliff (Sheet VII), Coast Survey Plan No. 25, 1861 and Red Cliff to Sand Station (Sheet VIII), Coast Survey Plan No. 24, 1862 may suggest that these swamps were man-contrived but it is also feasible that the Cuningham and Pickett survey was the first large-scale surface mapping of the parish and therefore, more accurate. These maps are all kept at Central Plans Office, Lands Department, Melbourne.
comparison with many other parts of Victoria. Bruton's claim that
ti-tree was unknown in the 1860's seems rather extravagant; certainly
the dense ti-tree may form a secondary growth in much of the area.
There were commercial stands of red gum in the southern sections
particularly and Foot's marks for the corners of allotments include
gum, box, banksia and oak.

Moorabbin supported sporadically a fairly thin population of
aboriginal visitors. Native water-holes, extensive kitchen middens
along the coast, bones found by early settlers along the Mordialloc
creek suggest this. But by 1859, William Thomas, Protector of
Aborigines, could record only twenty-one survivors of the old Wawoorong
(Yarra tribe) and fifteen of the Boonoorong (Coast tribe). He showed
a high proportion of old and middle-aged in the tribes and emphasised
that the death rate was highest amongst younger aborigines with only
one birth surviving infancy in the previous ten years. Thomas saw
the survivors as reasonably content and generally able to survive without
the hand-outs of food and clothing that had been available since 1852.
He blamed alcohol for the decline in numbers and was prepared to take
drastic steps to prevent the extinction of the race, arguing that the
government should take children away from their parents and forbid
aborigines from coming within town precincts.

By the time of settlement in the Moorabbin area, the tribal
aborigine was almost gone and no-one in the area seems to have noticed
very much, his departure.

3. Foot, Plan M164; T.S. Hart, 'Wild Flowers' in Southern Cross, 10
November, 1900.
5. Foot, Plan M164; Bruton, op.cit., p.5; Thomas Bent in speech,
August 30, 1876 in V.P.D. 1876, p.599.
6. Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the
Aborigines, 1858-9, p.25. This is a substantial drop from the
figures of 118 in Wawoorong and 62 in Boonoorong in 1840, cited by
Weston Bate, A History of Brighton, Melbourne, 1982, p.5, from
Statistical Register of Victoria, 1854, p.231.
7. Report ... on the Aborigines, 1858-9, passim but see especially
pp. 27, 28, 33.
SQUATTING, SALES and SETTLEMENT:

Brighton's expansion in the 1840's had some carryover to the wider area of the Moorabbin parish but there was no security of tenure in the unsurveyed land outside Dendy's survey so that settlement was sparse on the leases granted for extensive and ill-defined cattle runs on the wooded and, in parts, swampy plains. To the east of the Dendy survey were the King brothers established since 1846; south at Beaumaris was J.B. Moysey, holding his land since March 1845; and John O'Shanassy, later Victorian premier, had a cattle run, 'Windert', of around 40,000 acres covering much of Moorabbin which he abandoned in 1846.

---

8. Rate, Brighton, ch.5 describes the growth of rural settlement inland from the marine villas of the coast particularly in the late 'forties.

9. Records of leases granted under the 1841 Proclamation are not complete; leaseholders did not have to file annual returns. See David Wilkinson, 'The Early History of the Diamond Valley', 1836-54 (Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1969)p.9. In the case of Moorabbin, the early occupancy does not seem important except in the case of the King brothers and Moysey who eventually bought land. Their runs are clearly shown on Ham's 1851 Squatting Map.

10. Commissioner of Crown Lands, County of Bourke, Box: Correspondence Received 1842-1858. A note on John O'Shanassy's licence dated 30 September 1845 states that licence should be 'renewed in favour' of the Kings, 10 July (1846) (V.-S.A.)

11. Titles Office Search Note No. 18505. The official search notes for land brought under the Torrens system provide evidence taken from the early memorials of land transfers. These are available in the 'Old Law' Room of the Titles Office, Queen Street, Melbourne and hereinafter, they are referred to as T.O. Search Notes. On their use, see Peter Balmford and J.L.O'Brien, 'Dating Houses in Victoria', Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand, volume 9, No.36, May 1961, Part 2, pp.387-389.

12. Licence No. 94 for "Windert near the Dandenong Creek" dated 30 September 1845. In letter dated 2 July 1846 he stated that he had held licence 'for the last four years and upwards'. See also O'Shanassy's speech at opening of Mordialloc line in December 1881 in Southern Cross, 24 December 1881.
East Brighton within the Dandy survey developed agriculturally as Little Brighton spilled eastwards but the remainder of the parish had to wait for the survey and sales that coincided with the land boom of the early 'fifties. This served to restrict the remaining squatters, the King's, who, using the privileges of pre-emptive right, applied for 640 acres and were granted Portion 57 of 237 acres at £1 per acre on 30 April 1852, and Maysey, who applied for 266 acres 3 roods 20 perches, presumably all of Portion 49, and was granted 80 acres on 12 May 1852 (see Map 2).

In May, 1851 shortly before the first Victorian gold discoveries, the smaller coastal portions close to Dandy's survey, were sold at public auction. The other Moorabbin allotments followed as the survey was completed in 1852. The first coastal lots sold for 15 above the reserve set: Thomas Turner a Beckett, for example, paid £20 per acre for the six acres of Portion 1, now part of Brighton, well above the reserve of £2,10.00 per acre. The inner blocks further from the bay sold lower but still at least doubled the initial prices; J.P. Murphy paid £3 per acre for the eighty acres of Portion 12 which had a £1,10.0 reserve. The Argus commented that these prices realized were far higher than at any former sale for years past.

The buyers were mostly outside speculators, many of whom had been active in land sales during the 'forties. In many cases, their land was resold in the 'fifties, sometimes in comparatively tiny plots.

---

13. Completed by Fott in 1852. The comparative slowness of survey south of the Yarra to north of the Yarra is very clearly shown in Fott's Map of the purchased and measured lands, counties, parishes, etc. of the Melbourne and Geelong districts, Melbourne 1849.
15. Argus, 8 May 1851; 13, 20 January 1852 shows sales of allotments 1-14.
16. Argus, 8 May 1851.
but for more cases, in larger parcels and almost invariably with quick
and hefty profits. The only portions of the later Sandringham area
bought by resident farmers were 49A by William Rusk and 49B by James
Bickford Moysey. Of the other buyers, John Matthew Smith was the
only one to take up residence; a'Beckett, Nicholas Were and William
Highett had previous and continuing ties with the district but the rest
were outsiders whose interest was normally fleeting but profitable.
(See Map 3).

Josiah Morris Holloway, the largest purchaser at the sales, had already
established a reputation for speculative real estate activity in the
lands around Melbourne. Operating from a Bourke Street address,
Holloway advertised a series of subdivisions of his extensive purchases.
The first of these was his 'Gipsy Village' subdivision of Portion 21,
280 lots in all, advertised as early as April 1852 and with sales
legally registered from November. This area, opposite Picnic Point and
bounded now by Bamfield Street and Bridge Street and bisected by the
railway, was extravagantly presented as 'the most healthy, delightful and
promising [site] within the same distance of the city' with emphasis on
its views, beach, fishing, 'an unlimited supply of the purest water'
which 'may be obtained by digging', timber and 'the best road leading
the same distance from Melbourne, being good both summer and winter'.
Holloway expanded on its merits with curious logic, arguing that 'the
simple fact of this place having obtained the name of Picnic Point ...
alone proclaims it the locality indicated by nature as the site of a
future populous and fashionable town'. In these happy circumstances,

17. Holloway bought Portions 21, 25, 27, 33, 34, 35 and 55 — a total of
around 1786 acres at the Moorabbin sales. He was also an important
buyer of lands north of the Yarra; for example, in Collingwood (see
A.H.B. Barrett, 'The Making of an Industrial Environment: Collingwood,
Victoria, 1851-91'. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Melbourne
1970. p.7)and at Eltham where Wilkinson (op.cit. pp.121-123) shows
that Holloway made an unsuccessful attempt in the late 'forties to
found 'Separation Township' out of Portion XVIII of the Parish of
Morang and a much more successful and influential subdivision of
Portion IV of the Parish of Nillumbik to form Holloway's Township
soon after, in March 1851, advertised as Little Eltham. The
earliest memorials for land transfers by Holloway date from 1845.
Holloway presented himself as 'not merely benefiting himself, but at the same time conferring a boon on the discerning portion of the deserving public'.

Holloway's estate name, 'Gipsy Village', stuck to this area, along with Picnic Point until the adoption of Sandringham in the land boom of the 'eighties. A wide-ranging local lore has been woven around the Gipsy Village name with no evident justification. Bate's suggestion that perhaps the name 'gipsy' was adopted to describe the existence of a primitive fishing community is closer than the fanciful notions, oft-repeated that the names of the streets commemorate the names of the gipsy residents whose leader was Bamfield Moor Cerew and that Queen's Square was named for a resident gipsy queen. If the internal evidence of the street names means anything, there is some similarity with Holloway's names for Little Eltham where Henry and Susan also appeared.

That 'discerning portion of the deserving public' responded to Holloway's plan to the extent that 213 of the 280 lots were sold by July 1853 and a further 44 by early 1854. Most of the buyers bought small land parcels, often just one lot, paying in most cases £10 per lot. Nearer the beach, prices were slightly higher; for example, lots 165 and 166 on the Esplanade north of the present Bridge Street sold for £60 in February 1853.

The success of these sales doubtless promoted Holloway's further subdivisions. His township in Portion 25 had sales registered from

---

18. Plan of Subdivision in John Vale, Collection of Maps, vol. III, folio 107. (La Trobe Library); Argus 10 April 1852; T.O. Search Note 5343B.


20. T.O. Search Note 5343B.
March 1853 and a year later almost all of its one hundred lots had been sold at around £10 each. 21 Less success attended sales of his 'Bluff Town' lots in Portion 27, where only 45 of the 177 lots had been sold by April 1854. 22 Sales in his 'Town of Moorabbin' which subdivided Portions 34 and 35 into no fewer than 573 lots of roughly one acre each proceeded much more slowly with prices often as low as £2 per block. 23 In Portion 55, east of Point Nepean Road, sales in his 'Two Acre Village' were slow too. 24 Only in Portion 33 was there no plan of subdivision. 25 Holloway also bought Portion 51, now part of Cheltenham, from William Mitchell, the Crown Land purchaser, and subdivided it as 'Ranumaria', named 'on account of its enchanting position, and its striking resemblance to that most delightful WATERING PLACE', he said. 26

The particular buoyant argument that Holloway was able to use from 1853 was that railway was imminent and this may well have been an important factor explaining his capacity to unload so much land.

That Holloway was exploiting a market for small lots that the government was slow to command is suggested by his claim that he was selling at the low rate of £20 a lot 'for the sake of undertailing the Government'. 28 Reference in a number of the advertisements to the Government Reserve at Cheltenham as a 'Villa Reserve' gives

27. Used in the advertisements for 'Two Acre Village', 'Ranumaria', and 'Bluff Town', for example.
28. Argus, 30 August 1853.
credence to the notion that Holloway was competing with a potential, if slow-moving, government competitor. 29

Whether Holloway was meeting a demand for actual blocks on which buyers wanted to settle themselves is highly doubtful, given the availability within the Dandy survey of small lots for settlers since the 'forties. Certainly, the enormous number of blocks created were bought in the main by people anxious for a return on their outlay, modest as it often was, in the same proportions as Holloway had received.

In many ways, the advertisements epitomised boom logic - the views were always unsurpassed; when the estate was a coastal one, some emphasis was placed on facilities for boating, fishing and bathing but when they were inland, there was 'a golden opportunity' for 'those who wish to luxuriate under the genial influence of the sea air, without enduring the bleakness of the beach'. 30

Considerable emphasis was placed on the availability of water, closeness to good roads, timber and soils. Assured profit was so near at hand that one wondered why the magnanimous Holloway was selling. His rhetoric was unsurpassed in his 'Beaumaris' advertisement when, inexorably, he decides that the projected, i.e., talked about, railway to Brighton 'will be continued to that extensive agricultural district, Western Port', and that then a railway station must arise in his township 'as in no other part of the parish does the Great Western Port Road approach so near to the SEA,' 'In fact', he continued, 'so confident is the advertiser on this point that it was

29. For example in 'Beaumaris' advertisement; see Wilkinson, pp. cit., pp. 122-123, 132, for Holloway's successful undermining of the government's village plans at Eltham. Holloway and his activities could well be the subject of fruitful research on Melbourne in the period 1845-1860. The last Directory listing for Holloway is in 1862 at Acland Street, St. Kilda.

30. For example in advertisement for 'Two Acre Village'.

originally intended that the property should bear the name of STATION TOWN.\textsuperscript{31} If this name had prevailed, one assumes that an enterprising Holloway of a later boom would have had to alter it.

For Beaumaris, his fancy knew few bounds:-

The property is accessible from the city either by land or by water; a fact worthy of notice in connection with the railway and the proposed CANAL TO THE BEACH.

In a very short time we may see a JETTY erected opposite the township, and goods being landed here for the transmission by rail to Western Port. It will then be seen that Beaumaris is destined to eclipse many of our most thriving Government townships.\textsuperscript{32}

The impact of all of these subdivisions on the present is clearest in the street pattern of Portion 21 and in the position of Royal Avenue in Portion 25 but any effect of the subdivisions in the blocks away from the coast was partly \textit{foresailed} by the relative failure to sell but more especially from the failure to settle. This failure to settle enabled the Royal Melbourne Golf Club, as late as 1930, to consolidate many lots in Portions 34 and 35 to form much of their present area.\textsuperscript{33}

Holloway's profits are difficult to calculate overall but certainly his Gipsy Village sales were very profitable: on an outlay of £300 to the Crown, he must have grossed over £2500 within two years - not quite at the rate of the 'certain profit of 150 per cent in less than a month' which he promised buyers of his 'Town of Moorabbin' blocks but certainly benefiting himself.\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Argus}, 30 August 1853.
\item \textit{Ibid}.
\item \textit{Argus}, 12 June 1852.
\end{enumerate}
success may have inspired Benjamin Heape and Richard Grice, the joint purchasers of Portions 2, 8, and 9 who disposed of all their land by the end of 1855 after subdivision and sales which grossed over £5,000, on an outlay of £436/11/4; given this sort of return, it is surprising that some of the other Crown purchasers in the favoured coastal blocks closest to South Road did not subdivide too. Francis Dawe Wickham, a big buyer at Crown Land Sales and resident in Launceston, disposed, in large lots, of Portions 3, 11 and 18 by March 1853 with at least 100 per cent profit. Similar successes attended John Dane (Portions 15 and 16), David Gibson (Portion 19) and John Gibson (Portion 20); William Hightett, once a leaseholder in the area, sold Portions 10 and 17 in 1853 but retained Portion 6 with John Anthony Cowle and later, with Henry Jennings, until 1872.

Most buyers from these Crown purchasers bought large lots and if they resold, it was still fairly large and usually irregular pieces. Exceptions were Henry Cooke who bought much of the Heape and Grice land in December 1854 and Leopold Beit who, in 1853, bought and subdivided a total of 75 acres in Portions 17 and 18 into blocks 230 feet by 470. Some buyers from the Crown purchasers cut up their land, Holloway-style, into quarter-acre blocks or smaller. (See Map 3 for disposal c1852-1862.)

35. T.O.Search Notes 1208, 1532, 5018.
36. No transfers appear to be registered for Portion 5 until 1873 - see T.O.Search Note 5762; for Portion 6 until 1864 - see T.O.Search Note 10749; for Portion 7 until 1904 - see T.O.Search Note 34896.
37. T.O.Search Notes 3585, 19000, 1454.
38. T.O.Search Notes 37697 and 15138 for Dane, 6681 for D. Gibson and 50818 for J. Gibson.
40. T.O.Search Notes 1454, 1208, 1532 and 5018.
41. This comment applies to the southwest corner of Portion 20 sold by John Gibson to John Whitelaw and Albert Calder for a total of £625 in October 1854 and January 1855 and subdivided by them into small lots known as 'East Gipsy Village'. See T.O.Search Note 50818. Many allotments remained unsold when those remaining passed to Orlando Fenwick and creditors in October, 1875.
DISPOSAL BY CROWN PURCHASERS OF
PORTIONS OF PRESENT CITY OF
SANDRINGHAM : 1852 - 1862

(Based on Titles Office Search Notes)

Portions 1 and 2 are part of Brighton.

Large lot sales by Crown purchaser.

Sale and subsequent subdivision.

Small lot subdivision by Crown purchaser.

Sale but remains largely intact.

Portion still intact.

No sales.
But sales did not mean settlement; agricultural and residential Brighton may have expanded eastwards and southwards as the Point Nepean Road was developed and schemes for a railway to Brighton Beach were discussed and finally effected in 1862, but most of the area that was to become Sandringham was largely undeveloped in 1860. Evidence from Cox suggests that even where the Titles Office search notes show substantial subdivisonal sales in the 1850's, fencing, clearing and building were still minimal.

Already, however, one feature had appeared which makes the Sandringham area comparable with the early Brighton front: a small number of substantial houses set in extensive grounds had been built by city gentlemen. John Matthew Smith, a leading Anglican layman and city solicitor, was already living in 'Castlefield', now part of Haileybury College, in South Road. This 'Substantial Brick-built Residence, containing Five Rooms with Kitchens, Sculleries, Pantry, Servant's Rooms, Double-Coach-house, Three-stall-stable, Harness-rooms, Foul-houses, Piggeries &c., in all forming one of the most Compact and Gentlemanly Residences in this favourite locality' was bought by Smith from Thomas Splatt for £4,000 in December, 1856. At that stage, the auctioneer could claim that

the grounds are beautifully laid out and the garden is stocked with the choicest fruit trees and vines, and at the rear of the house is a five-acre paddock fenced-in with close paling. Ten acres of the land has been cleared, and five acres of the same are now under crop. The whole property is fenced in with a three-rail fence, with handsome entrance gates. 43

42. Commander Henry L. Cox. Maps: Point Ormond to Red Cliff and Red Cliff to Sand Station, 1861-2, Land Department, Melbourne. These maps form part of the Admiralty Survey but show settlement of the coastal sections and therefore much of the present area of Sandringham. The positions of houses, tracks, roads, fences, even a suggestion of ground cover are all provided. Taken with Bate's splendid 1859 map of Brighton (in his Brighton, facing p.196) drawn painstakingly and independently from the ratebooks, one has a substantial mutual verification of accuracy.

In the 'fifties, Smith accumulated large holdings in the Sandringham area, adding to his Crown purchase of Portion 23 by acquiring Portions 12, 13 and 14, a total of more than 250 acres which he held intact until the 'eighties.  

Charles Hotson Ebden, early overlander, financier and conservative politician, had built 'Black Rock House' in 1856-7 on Portions 29 and 30 bought on April 14, 1856 for £1500/10/0. Standing today at 36 Ebden Avenue, Black Rock surrounded by twentieth century suburbia, this building has generated much local mythology, partly because it stood for fifty-six years, largely unoccupied and often untended, in its original 112 acres, and partly because of its curious construction in two parts — one, a stone structure, 'apparently only the first part of an architectural concept of tremendous scale' and the second 'a very fine, almost perfect example of what is generally referred to as "Colonial-style house"', in the words of a recent student of its architecture. Said to be modelled on 'Belmont House' near Ebden's

44. T.O. Search Notes 25353, 35204. The evidence for Portion 12 is not entirely clear but the land was originally leased in the 'fifties and Smith certainly owned it before it was subdivided as 'Hampton Park' estate in 1886; the ratebook acreage for Smith tallies with Smith's owning all four portions. Smith acquired Portion 14 for £1140 in March 1858; he was then a member of the provisional committee for 'The St.Kilda and Brighton Railway Company', formed in 1857. Talk of the railway undoubtedly boomed the price of land at the beach end of South Road. Smith paid Glasgow £1140 for Portion 14, for which Nicholas were had given £89/6/- early in 1852 and Glasgow £348 as late as June 1857, even though the coming of the railway was mentioned in the 'Castlefield' advertisement, Argus, 19 November 1856.

45. T.O. Search Note 38526. Ebden bought from Rolleston who had previously bought from Frederick Gonnerman Dalgety, the Crown purchaser.

46. Trevor Westmore, 'Black Rock House'. (Unpublished B.Arch.project, 1961, numbered HOU 3 in Architecture Library, University of Melbourne.) See also David Saunders (ed.), Historic Buildings of Victoria, Melbourne, 1966. p.129. This house carries the 'B' classification of the National Trust — Highly significant; to be preserved.
birthplace in the Cape of Good Hope, the battlemented structure was
built of local beach stone but why it was not completed remains a
mystery. At the time of its construction, Ebdon was chairman of the
Brighton, St Kilda Railway Company, whose efforts to extend the
railway to the beach continued through the 'fifties.

William Mair, the professional soldier and leading figure in
early Moorabbin political life, bought land in Portion 2 in 1855 and
probably built there shortly afterwards. James Linacre, a leading
building contractor, bought land in Portion 11 and was a house-owner
in the first ratebook of 1862.

Some of the best clues, in the absence of maps other than Cox's,
to the spread of clusters of settlement throughout the parish can be
provided by plotting hotels, churches and schools. Jesse Morley's
strategically placed 'Plough and Harrow' at the corner of Point
Nepean and South roads was the only hotel rated in 1862 but the
'Retreat' in the coastal section in Portion 9 appeared on Cox.
East Brighton had a Wesleyan chapel in Centre Road and an Anglican
church in Tucker's Road. Another Wesleyan church existed in
Cheltenham Road (now Wickham Road), Moorabbin, a Disciples'
Meeting House in Chesterville Road and a further Anglican church in
Cheltenham. Towards the coast, there was another Disciples'

47. T.O.Search Notes 1208,5081 show purchases by Mair from Heape and
Grice in April 1855, from Henry Cooke in September 1856 and from
Thomas Turner a'Beckett in 1858.
48. T.O.Search Note 18000; Moorabbin Road Board, Ratebook, 1862,
Enter No. 579 a weather-board house rated at £3/10/- (M.T.H.)
49. Board Ratebook, 1862, Entry No.1.
50. Ibid. Entry No. 110; C.Irving Benson (ed.) A Century of Victorian
51. Board Ratebook, 1862, Entry No. 115.
52. Ibid. Entry No. 285.
53. Ibid. Entry No. 291; The Australian Christian Witness, June 1885,
p.193 describes the establishment of the Meeting House by the
Disciples, later the Church of Christ, in 1858.
Meeting House at Beaumaris, a Wesleyan chapel at Spring Grove and a Church of England at Gipsy Village.

On the grand Holloway subdivisions, very few of his 'discerning portion of the deserving public' who had bought land had built on it. This is hardly surprising given the distance from both the rail terminus at Brighton Beach and the Point Nepean Road. By mid-1855, settlers around Gipsy Village had erected part of a small wooden school-house and applied to the Denominational Schools' Board through the Reverend Samuel Taylor of Brighton for assistance in establishing an Anglican school but there were only 10 petitioners who collectively accounted for 28 children living within half a mile of the school. Taylor claimed that there were 'as many more living about a mile from it'. Of the petitioners, at least two, James O'Mara and Richard Stewart were fishermen suggesting one reason for the settlement's existence. That numbers in the area did not increase much during the 'fifties is suggested by the reported 22 children on the school roll in 1856 and the smattering of around a dozen paling and weatherboard houses reported in the 1862 ratebook and shown by Cox.

55. Ibid. Entry No. 423; The Australian Christian Witness July, 1885 p.217 describes the origins of this group.
57. Ibid. Entry No. 816.
59. Denominational Schools' Board, Report for 1856-7 in V. & P. L.C. 1858-9 vol. 2; Board Ratebook, 1862, entries numbered 512 to 526.
A small farming community was established in the area between present-day Beaumaris and Cheltenham in the areas known then as Spring Grove and Beaumaris adopted from Holloway's estate name, and including a number of areas bought from the Crown by resident farmers including William Rusk, Stephen Cherman, Henry Wells, William Coleman and Samuel Munday. In this area, amidst sectarian bitterness, both the Wesleyans and the Anglicans established schools in 1855 with a total of 76 on the rolls for 1856. At Cheltenham, east of Point Nepean Road, another Anglican school reported 31 on its rolls; 60 children were enrolled at the Wesleyan school at Moorabin and 66 at East Brighton Anglican school suggesting the eastward and southward expansion from Brighton rather than the rapid development of areas removed and isolated from Dandy's survey and the Point Nepean Road.61


61. Ibid.
PEOPLE:

Establishing the population of Moorabbin before the 1861 Census with any precision is difficult. Figures expressed in the categories of Brighton Electoral District, that is, the area of Moorabbin parish north of the southern boundaries of Portions 25, 35, 44, 45 and 55, and of Moorabbin parish including Brighton should enable the calculation of people in Moorabbin in the areas furthest from Brighton, that is, outside the Electoral District of Brighton. According to the Census of 1854, however, there were 359 males and 254 females, a total of 613 in this area but since the 1857 Census shows 98 males and 86 females, a total of 184, a figure which probably tallies reasonably well with the school enrolment figures mentioned above, the 1854 figures cannot be accurate.62 This unreliability of the 1854 Census may be responsible for the apparent fall in Brighton's population between 1854 and 1857 mentioned by Bate.63 According to the Census figures, the fall is 10 people if one accepts the figures given for 'Brighton Town' in each case but the 1854 Census gives the same figure of 2731 for Brighton Town and for Brighton Electoral District and the 1857 total for the Brighton Electoral District is 3702, so that a 'fall' for Brighton Town is most unlikely in the face of such a substantial increase in the whole area.64 The confusion in the Census(es) can be partly attributed to the lack of local government boundaries within the parish and also to the confusion of Brightons which confounded contemporaries.65


65. In this case, South Brighton could be added to the confusion of Great, Little, New and East Brightons mentioned by Bate, Brighton., p.75 and one would probably have the Brighton Electoral District.
In 1859, the boundaries of the municipality of Brighton were set so that the 1861 Census could present its figures in terms of population in the parish of Moorabbin which was 'extra-municipal' and either within the Electoral District of Brighton or the Electoral District of South Bourke. The total for the parish outside Brighton was 2227 with 85 per cent in the areas more to the immediate east and south of the municipality.\(^{66}\)

The communities still had a predominance of males over females, shown, and presumably felt, in the adult groups where the ratio between unmarried females over fifteen years and unmarried males over twenty was 64:100 which was slightly better than the colony-wide figure and almost identical with the figure for the town of Brighton. The imbalance of the sexes is particularly apparent in the 15–25 years group and the 45–65 years group, in both of which the overwhelming majority of females were married. If one compares the figures for males over twenty with that for females over twenty, the imbalance is even more striking and perhaps, critical. Certainly marriage before the age of twenty-five was much less common for males than females.\(^{67}\) It is also likely that there was an appreciable emigration by females in the 15–25 years group.\(^{68}\)

---


67. In 1861, there were 1185 males, 1042 females for the parish of Moorabbin outside Brighton Town. The ratio is calculated for extra-municipal Moorabbin within the Electoral District of Brighton by subtracting Brighton Town figures from Brighton Electoral District figures for 'Conjugal Condition' which results in 159 unmarried males over 20 years and 102 unmarried females over 15 years. The figure for unmarried females over 20 years is 37.

68. In 1861, in extra-municipal Moorabbin within the Brighton Electoral District, there were 180 males and 133 females in the 15–25 years group.
Something of the place occupied in the family and the community of those under fifteen years can be inferred from re-construction of some of the census tables. Using the figures given in the 'Occupation' tables for sons, daughters and relatives under fifteen years and for scholars, and the figures for ages of the people, it is possible, on the reasonably safe assumption that the scholars classified in the Census were overwhelmingly between five and fifteen years, to construct tables for those under fifteen years who were working and therefore classified elsewhere in the occupation tables and for those between five and fifteen years who were dependants but not scholars.

---

69. Census, Class XIII in the Occupations tables in V.P.P., 1862/3 volume 4 and ages in V.P.P., 1864, volume 2.

70. Inspector Orlebar's report on the Gipsy Village school showed one child aged three and five aged four years so that the constructs must be tentative. See Board of Education, Report 1863 in V.P.P., 1864 volume 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish of Moorabbin</th>
<th>Parish of Mordialloc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra-municipal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Brighton</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within South Bourke</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral District</td>
<td>Electoral District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholars</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Dependents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5-15 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less than 5 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasonable confirmation of these constructs, allowing presumably for attendance by some children of school within Brighton municipality and for some tuition in schools not receiving aid is given by the totals of 107 boys and 158 girls on the rolls of schools receiving aid in 1863.\(^{71}\)

\(^{71}\) Figures for 1863 at Beaumaris, Cheltenham, East Brighton, Gipsy Village and Moorabbin schools in Board of Education Report in *V.P.P.* 1864/5 volume 4. I have found no sign that any children had tuition at home within Moorabbin.
The table shows that parents tended to keep girls at school longer than boys in the face of little employment available outside the home. It also suggests the degree to which Moorabbin provided educational opportunities and incentives; most children, on the basis of these figures, attended school for a time but education was not compulsory nor considered essential by some parents. The wide discrepancy between numbers on the rolls and average attendances supports this notion too; for at the five aided schools in the area, there was an average attendance in 1863 of 152 as against a total enrolment of 265.72

In Inspector Orlabar's Report in 1863, much information about scholars at the Gipsy Village school is given incidentally in a discussion of the methods of reading assessment. For his visit, there were a total of twenty-three children ranging in age from three years to thirteen years. The fact that six were four years or less and that a further six scholars were considered below the first standard suggests that for many children and their parents, school was a sort of child-minding centre.73

The level of literacy, which usually meant very minimal reading and writing, suggests that 84 per cent of those over twenty years could read and write, a figure which equates very closely to Brighton Town and the colony as a whole.74 The effectiveness of teaching on the literacy rate may be inferred from the age tables for 'Education of the People'. More children in the Moorabbin parish outside Brighton Town but within the Brighton Electoral District could read and write at the age of eight years than could not but the total figures for ages eight to twenty years show a literacy rate of only 82 per cent; at best, the schools were maintaining the literacy rate.

72. Ibid.
74. 1861 Census, 'Education of the People' in V.P.P. 1864/5 volume 3.
For the same group within Brighton Town, there was a 90 per cent literacy rate, providing some measure of difference between ‘town’ Brighton and ‘rural’ Moorabbin. 75

By 1861, slightly less than half of the population were Australian born; most of the rest were from England with sizeable minorities from Ireland and Scotland. 76

**TABLE 1 : 2  PLACE OF BIRTH 1861**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish of Moorabbin, Extra-Municipal</th>
<th>Electoral District of Brighton</th>
<th>Electoral District of South Bourke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust. cols. &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1848</strong></td>
<td><strong>379</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the more remote areas of the parish outside the Brighton Electoral District had a significantly larger non-native element suggests the expansion of Brighton families eastward and southwards in the second generation. Certainly there is some evidence of this link with Brighton’s gardening families in the 1862 ratebook. 77 The age

75. *Ibid.* For the town, 561 over-eights could read and write against 56 that could not. For the parish outside the town but within the Electoral District, 370 could read and write and 80 could not.


77. e.g. Charles Allan (1862 Ratebook Entry No. 547) in Highett Road, had first settled in Brighton on his arrival in 1848 — see A. Sutherland, *Victoria and Its Metropolis*. Melbourne 1888 v.2, p.663, *Southern Cross*, 28 October 1893. The link also applies to George Stayner, at least.
structure of the South Bourke portion of the parish shows a smaller proportion of people in the 15-30 years group than in the Brighton portion, suggesting a significant migration of new families to the areas away from Brighton. 78

The nominal church adherence figures mirror fairly closely the figures for national origins, with a 15 per cent Catholic population and 13 per cent Irish-born and 7 per cent Presbyterian and 7 per cent Scottish-born. Forty-three per cent of the population declared themselves Anglican adherents, 18 per cent Wesleyans and 5 per cent Baptists. 79 The comparatively low proportions of Catholics and Presbyterians may account for their failure to build churches outside the town in this period.

The Census presents man as a mere statistic and in this period before local government and local newspapers, it is hard to pump much blood through real people, without the survival of diaries and letters - none have been seen. But a series of letters to the Denominational Schools' Board in the period, 1855-60 reveals a lively personal and sectarian squabble at Beaumaris.

In August 1854, Rev. James Bickford, the Wesleyan superintendent of the Brighton Circuit was asked, as he wrote,

to visit Beaumaris with a view to the establishment of a school for the education of the children in the village and neighbourhood and to the introduction of the Gospel for the benefit of the adult population, they having been up to that time unvisited and uncared for by any other body of Christians whatever. 80

78. 1861 Census, 'Ages of the People' in V.P.P. 1864 volume 2.
79. 1861 Census, 'Religion' in Ibid.
Bickford had the area canvassed for subscriptions and proceeded to apply to the Board for aid.\textsuperscript{81} Almost simultaneously, Rev. Samuel Taylor of the Brighton Church of England, wrote explaining that in Beaumaris and its immediate neighbourhood, 'out of 25 families, 3 only belonged to the Wesleyan body and that all the others were professedly members of the Church of England - under these circumstances', he wrote, 'I deemed it not only justifiable, but my duty to send round Beaumaris and its neighbourhood a counterpetition'.

This, he enclosed:

We the undersigned, inhabitants of Beaumaris and its vicinity beg to state, that on a former occasion, upon being solicited to subscribe our name to a circular, sent around in order to procure aid for the erection of a school (Wesleyan) in our neighbourhood did so, simply from a desire to have our children educated. But all who subscribed that document in our neighbourhood (with 3 or 4 exceptions) being ourselves members of the Church of England, and desiring that our children should be trained up in the same faith, beg distinctly to state that we give a decided preference to a school in a connexion with the Church of England.\textsuperscript{82}

Bickford later claimed that many of the inhabitants were told by the Anglican canvasser that the 'Wesleyans could not establish a school for the education of their children.'\textsuperscript{83}

Meanwhile, the Wesleyans invited Mr Meares who conducted a private school including some boarders, in the area to bring his school under their superintendence. This action occasioned another letter by Samuel Taylor complaining that:

the Wesleyan minister and Mr Charman made a point, without our knowledge, of using their influence with a Mr and Mrs Meyers (sic) who had hitherto professed themselves members of the Church of England, were regular attendants at and communicants in our Church to join the Wesleyan body \textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid. 55/79 from James Bickford, dated 19 January 1855.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid. 55/78 from Samuel Taylor, dated 17 January 1855. The underlining was Taylor's.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid. 55/587 from James Bickford, dated 30 June 1855.
He went on:

Having thus successfully won over I had almost said tampered with these people, they in order to anticipate us, send in at once to your Board a claim for a Master's salary. . .

This led him to question:

whether a Private school, kept in a Private house hitherto carried on by a professed member of the Church of England can as in a moment, be looked upon as a Public Wesleyan School representing the sentiments or wishes of the people in the neighbourhood, as in favour of Wesleyanism in preference to the teaching of the Church of England.84

Local swords drawn, the Board sent R.H. Budd, their inspector, to report and pacify, but without satisfaction. 'I have endeavoured in vain', Budd wrote, 'to induce the two parties to unite in a combined school; but party spirit runs too high at present to admit of peace.'85 What Budd found was that the Wesleyans had the children whilst the Anglicans were putting up a building. Frederick Meeres was, according to Budd, annoyed at losing some of his pupils when the Church of England school at Cheltenham was established and therefore objected to trafficking with the proposed Anglican school at Beaumaris. The number of scholars was scarcely enough to qualify both schools for aid and this eventually forced a compromise upon the locals. Taylor proposed that 'a Female school be held in one of the present Buildings, and a Boys' school in the other, both schools being under the superintendence of the 2 ministers or a committee appointed by them'.86 This proposal was accepted and operated in 1857 but presumably under pressure from someone in the Beaumaris area, the Anglicans withdrew on the grounds that the site of their school had been granted for Church of England purposes and that therefore combination with the Wesleyans was illegal.87

84. Ibid. 55/238 from Samuel Taylor, dated 13 March 1855.
85. Ibid. 55/261 from R.H. Budd, dated 19 March 1855.
86. Ibid. 56/1421 from Samuel Taylor, letter dated 24 November 1856.
87. Ibid. 58/367 from Thomas a'Beckett, letter dated 15 February 1858.
A separate Anglican school reappeared at Beaumaris and lasted until February, 1859 when it lapsed until it was re-opened in 1860. 88

Through all of this dispute, Meares and his wife continued to operate a school, sometimes two, sometimes with aid from the Denominational Board and sometimes, without. What the squabbles show is something of the tension within the locality, involving religious conviction and personal antipathies; what it also shows is the inefficiency and extravagance of a public school system left to the denominations.

The occupation figures 89 leave no doubt that gardening was the economic force in the community as a whole. No fewer than 444 males appear either as agricultural masters or labourers for the Brighton Electoral District section of Moorabbin out of a total male population over 15 years of 595. The same pattern holds for the South Bourke section. Roughly half the gardeners were owner-farmers. There was a small number of people whose social status probably exceeded that of the larger gardener — people like Mair, two pastoralists, one engineer, one doctor, three lawyers, one merchant, one banker or auctioneer, and the six gentlemen and four ladies of independent means that the Census specifies. The two clergyman, and eleven teachers may have shared, along with the five shopkeepers, one nurse, two contractors and the inn-keepers, roughly the same place in this dominantly rural society as the better-off owner-farmers. The clerks, artisans and carriers may have approximated to many of the other gardeners — in this group were 16 tailors, 5 masons or brick-layers, 7 blacksmiths, 15 builders or carpenters, 1 cabinet maker, 3 coach and cart makers, 4 clerks and 33 engaged in forms of food production, presumably including the Gipsy Village fishermen. For the rest, the

88. Ibid. 59/524 from Frederick Meares, letter dated 3 March 1859; 60/561 from Samuel Taylor, letter dated 22 March 1860.
89. 1861 Census. 'Occupations' in V.P.P. 1862/3 volume 4.
Census mentions 31 quarrymen, possibly working the beach-stone but more likely digging clay for brickmaking, 22 labourers and about 240 agricultural labourers. This last group undoubtedly was largely composed of members of owners' families. One last group which provides some clue to the nature of the community compared to neighbourhood Brighton was the domestics - 16 male and 30 female according to the Census for Moorabbin in the Brighton Electoral District. This represents only about 5 per cent of the Moorabbin workforce compared with around 25 per cent in Brighton Town. Clearly, Brighton municipality had shut out many of its gardening neighbours when the municipality was created in 1859.

In terms of the fabric of houses, Moorabbin presented a contrast to its older and more substantial neighbour with 72 houses of brick or stone and 367 or wood, iron, or lath and plaster whereas Brighton had 227 brick or stone and 294 of wood, iron or lath and plaster. Brighton houses were appreciably bigger too - 220 were of five rooms or more and 297 of four or less whilst Moorabbin had 83 or five or more rooms and 382 of four or less. Some 78 people were found by the Census to be living in tents in Moorabbin, whereas there were only 16 in Brighton. Most of the houses were owner-occupied; in fact, only about 20 per cent of houses were rented and in many cases, these were family affairs, or where the owner was a gardener's widow. Confirmation of the 1861 Census figures is provided by the 1862 Ratebook which also gives a clearer picture of population distribution within the parish - of 519 dwellings, 331 were in areas east of Point Nepean Road, with most in the area north of South Road, that is, in East Brighton. The Ratebook shows little regional variation in ownership or house construction, with the exception of the four stone houses rated, which were all west of Point Nepean Road, suggesting the use of beach stone as at 'Black Rock House'.

90. In Brighton, there were 36 male, 221 female domestic servants in total workforce of 1029, compared with Moorabbin, where there were 16 male, 30 female in a total workforce of 761.
91. 1861 Census in V.P.P. 1862/3 volume 3.
92. Board Ratebook 1862.
LOCAL GOVERNMENT:

Somewhat belatedly, these un-co-ordinated developments of the 'fifties bore fruit in formal political organization when somewhere over two hundred people met at Jesse Morley's 'Plough and Harrow' on 16 June 1862 to form a Roads Board. This progenitor of Victorian local government was already widely established in the colony; 'an Act for making and improving roads in the Colony of Victoria' had gained Lieutenant-Governor La Trobe's assent on 8 February 1853 and under this act and the 1854 Municipal Corporations Act, local government had burgeoned through the colony with beneficial results in work on the major trunk routes and in some municipalities or roads board districts, great improvements in local roads. Under the terms of the 1853 Act, 'any number of not less than five landholders and five householders' could 'present to any Justice of the Peace resident . . . a requisition in writing thereby requesting such Justice to convene a meeting of the landholders and householders . . . to form a District Roads Board for the purpose of completing the construction repair and maintenance of the Roads . . . and for carrying out therein the provisions in this Act.'

In Moorabbin, the requisition was presented to William Mair, a Justice resident in Portion 2, for an area comprising all of Moorabbin parish outside Brighton municipality and also Portion XXIV of the Parish of Mordialloc, the part around the Point Nepean Road where it reached the coast at Mordialloc.

93. 16 Victoria XL.
94. 18 Victoria XV.
96. Section X.
97. V.G.G. 1862, p. 840 Proclamation dated 5 May 1862. An unsuccessful attempt to exclude any part of Mordialloc and to form a Road district of Mordialloc and Dandenong was made. See Argus, 17 June 1862.
The formation of the municipality of Brighton in 1859 had already involved many East Brighton residents, who, omitted from the municipal area, nevertheless had the same interest in good roads as the Little Brighton gardeners who successfully challenged the proposed boundaries for the municipality and were subsequently included. A petition by inhabitants of the parishes of Dandenong and Mordialloc for a road district to be proclaimed in their parishes had been later joined by an application to include Moorabbin late in 1861 but this apparently lapsed. One might well conjecture that it was this move which stimulated action amongst East Brighton and South Brighton people, who might well and reasonably have seen their resources being used to promote road buildings in remote areas to the south and east.

Indeed, the requisitioners all came from areas close to the 'Plough and Harrow' in and near South and Point Nepean roads. The prime movers were possibly Edward Townsend and James Brown, who were both successful candidates for places on the Board. One of the householders, James Wilkins was living in a house owned by Townsend in Cheltenham (now Wickham) Road.

Under the act, voting for the board at this initial meeting was by simple majority of landholders and householders and it would appear that at least 130 voted at the meeting held in the heart of the

98. Bate, Brighton, pp.219-220.

99. V.G.G. 1861 p.2464. Application for a Road District. Dandenong, Mordialloc and Moorabbin, dated 18 December 1861. The petition is apparently not extant and a search of the Register of Letters of the Board of Land and Works (V.- S.A.) and of the 1862 Gazette revealed no sign of the fate of this petition.

100. Board Ratebook 1862. Entry No. 284

1. A total number of 1157 votes were cast for the 23 candidates. Assuming that each voter could vote for nine, a minimum figure of around 130 voting results; an attendance of over 200 was reported in Moorabbin Roads Board Minutes, 1862. Entry for June 16. (M.T.H.)
gardening district. Of the nine elected from the field of 23, only Mair did not come from the gardening districts close to Point Nepean Road and the main roads east of Brighton. The first Board was clearly a gardener's one but more than that, it was very much composed of men from the north-east of the area, where the majority of the population lived and which had most to gain from organization. For those living outside this area, election was difficult, unless you had Mair's prestige, as William Coleman and G.H. Warren of Mordialloc, James Jamison of Cheltenham, and Henry Wells of Beaumaris - all fairly substantial farmers - discovered.² No candidate from the area between Brighton Beach and Beaumaris even offered himself for election.

The meeting fixed rates of a farthing per acre on waste lands, one penny per acre on pasture lands, one shilling per acre on cultivated lands and a shilling in the pound on the rental value of other property, in accordance with the 1854 amendment of the 1853 Roads Act.³ The board, thus created by this public meeting, was empowered to

"form, construct, improve, manage and maintain any new or existing Parish or Cross Road as hereinafter directed and any Bridge thereon subject nevertheless to be controlled therein by such general plan as it shall seem fit to the ... Central Roads Board with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor to promulgate in such behalf.⁴"

A week later, the Board met and elected Mair Chairman, and began grappling with the business of Moorabbin roads, adopting rules of operation and arranging for sub-committees to find a meeting place, to prepare specifications and advertisements.⁵ A week later,

² Warren and Jamison narrowly missed election, polling 52 and 51. 54 votes would have elected one of them.
³ Board Minutes, 16 June 1862; 17 Victoria XXIX.
⁴ 16 Victoria XL
⁵ Board Minutes 23 June 1862; rules dated 8 August 1862 in V.G.G. 1862, p.1401.
tenders for the valuation were received. Of the eight tenderers for the valuation, at least four were from locals, including Clayton and Jamison, the successful ones. The Brighton Rate Collector, Thomas Bent, an unsuccessful candidate at the first Board election, and Joseph Ostler tendered jointly. The surveyors all appear to have been outsiders and of eleven applicants for the secretaryship, only three — John Miller, Joseph Ostler and Bent (again) were locals; Ostler got the job.\(^6\) Financing the planned operations of grubbing, clearing and forming roads made it necessary to employ a rate collector and fairly quickly too because the act prevented the Board from borrowing or even anticipating funds. Six tenders, including three locals were received and Thomas Bent at £23 per annum was successful. Two weeks after his appointment, he resigned and Samuel Clayton, another local, took his place.\(^7\)

The impression one gets in all of this is of a flurry of activity with a high degree of local participation and interest — a sort of pioneer democracy, one might even argue. This level of interest was certainly sustained into the second year when twenty candidates presented themselves for the nine places at the annual meeting in June.\(^8\)

The board's area, enlarged by the addition of a substantial area of the Mordialloc parish taking in all the land to the new eastern boundaries of the district Clayton and Boundary roads,\(^9\) was still not subdivided in any way for representation. Four members of the first Board did not offer for re-election, two lost their places so that six new board members joined Mair, West and Francis.\(^10\) Again, it was the area north of South Road that dominated — six including Thomas Bent and William Ward, both destined to play large parts in the life

\(^6\) Board Minutes 30 June 1862.
\(^7\) Ibid, 6 August; 3 September 1862.
\(^8\) Ibid, 16 June 1863.
\(^9\) \(V.G.G.\) 1862, p.1773 dated 5 September 1862.
\(^10\) Board Minutes 16 June 1863.
of their community, were from that area. Mair from Brighton Beach, Exley from South Brighton and Francis from Cheltenham were the others. The unsuccessful candidates, again, mostly came from areas to the south—Cheltenham and beyond to Mordialloc; apparently the tightly-knit market gardening majorities in the north could carry off an election of this type with considerable success.

* * * * * * * * *

What these beginnings of local government and analyses of population make very clear is that Moorabbin was a market garden in spite of Holloway and the 'fifties speculators; the railway, prophesied by Holloway so frequently, had come to the beach end of South Road by 1862 but it had not been extended further and settlement in the coastal portions of modern Sandringham remained sparse; even the most conservative of Holloway's dreams had not been realized and Holloway's plans survived in the offices of land agents and the relics of his little purchasers, ready to run again when conditions would allow another boom like that of the 'fifties. Apart from the slight southward extension of the Brighton 'front', near the western end of South Road, there was little permanent settlement between Brighton Beach and Beaumaris, except for the small cluster of houses at Gipsy Village. The beaches attracted visitors especially in the summer months and the sandy, largely unfenced land made it suitable for hunting and horse-riding generally, but the driving force in the community was the gardener from East Brighton and southwards along and near Point Nepean Road.

If the seeds of later conflicts were implanted in the geography, in the early development of the coastal railway and in the suburban allotments of the coastal sections, then the 'fifties failed to germinate them.
CHAPTER 2: A GROWING MARKET GARDEN, 1863-1880

SUB-DIVISION of the DISTRICT:

The legal framework under which an attack could be made on the regional dominance of East Brighton in Moorabin affairs was provided by the 1863 Act 'to generally provide for the administration of local affairs without the limit of the boroughs'.\(^1\) Introducing the bill, O'Shanassay, the Premier, stated that 'local improvement is . . . a local matter' and that the function of the colonial government was 'to place the means of local improvement as cheaply and simply as possible within the reach of the population'; he argued further that the government 'cannot coerce people even into being clean and healthy . . . ' concluding that it was 'better in all matters of local concern [to have] a real progress of local opinion, however slow, than premature and delusive action of the authority'.\(^2\) Proceeding from the twin and mutually dependent aims of increasing local involvement and decreasing the financial burden of the colonial government, the Act did not depart from the old local government boundaries, defective as they were generally considered to be. Instead of a system of municipal endowment, characterised by O'Shanassay as one in which 'members of Parliament, instructed like delegates, came to the House, joined in a little "log-rolling" and made an attempt upon the Treasury without any definite principle whatever', the Act sought to make endowment 'conditional upon the anxiety shown by the inhabitants to tax their own property' by introducing a system of tapering endowments for shires and road districts beginning in 1864 with £2 for every local £1 for five years followed by £1 for £1 for a further five years.\(^3\)

---

1. 1863 Victoria 176.
2. O'Shanassay, 28 November 1862 in V.P.D. 1862-3 pp.142-146.
The Act provided for the subdivision of the road districts and for more precise budgeting so that revenue could be spent equitably in the various parts of the districts. In October, 1863, a meeting of ratepayers at the Cheltenham Hotel moved to subdivide the district into three portions — the first, the area north of South Road; the second, the area within the Brighton Electoral District south of South Road; and the third, the area within the Electoral District of South Bourke. Their proposals were endorsed by the Board although Bent and Ward pressed for no action until after a general meeting.4 Moorabbin's subdivisions were gazetted the next year with the North subdivision, the area north of South Road and east as far as Warrigal Road and the rest of the district divided by Point Nepean Road into the East and West subdivisions.5 (See Map 1) This was not as the Cheltenham meeting had proposed but it was probably a more even subdivision in terms of population, which in 1871, the next year for which there are precise figures, was North 920, West 940 and East 979.6

Doubtless, Point Nepean Road was a simple dividing line between East and West but the division had the effect of splitting both Cheltenham and Mordialloc villages. A majority of the Board supported the gazetted subdivisions in opposition to a group including Board members, James Jamison and Henry Comport of Cheltenham, who favoured the subdivision proposed at the Cheltenham meeting the previous year,7 which would have kept Cheltenham within the one subdivision. The petition of the Cheltenham group is not extant but the Board attitude is clearly shown in the minute of 18 August 1864,

'that in the opinion of this Board a subdivision of this District as proposed in the Petition referred to the Board for opinion thereon would be highly

4. Board Minutes, 8 October 1863.
7. Argus, 26 August 1864.
injudicious and has been signed by a number of ratepayers who state that they signed it under the impression that it proposed dividing the southern part of the District by the Point Nepean Road and has been signed by a number of non-ratepayers.8

This subdivision ended the ascendency of East Brighton in Moorabbin affairs by giving them three members of a Board of nine but it was still very much a gardeners' council with Mair and Thomas Attenborough, a grazier from Centre Dandenong Road in the East, the exceptions.9

8. Board Minutes 1864. The Register of Correspondence, Commissioner of Roads and Bridges, 1864, Inwards Letters, entries 2817, 2849, 2972, 2973, 2974, 2975 - dated between August 20 and September 3 show that letters were received from the Board and Jamison and Comport concerning the subdivision; the letters themselves are not extant. An interview was sought by Jamison and Comport and Outward Letters, Roads and Bridges, Folio 454 dated 24 August 1864, F.436 dated 26 August 1864 and Folio 418 (V.-S.A.) make arrangements for a time for an interview, the substance of which was reported in the Argus 3 September 1864 - the Commissioner thought it 'not a matter of much importance which division . . . was adopted'.

9. The 1871 Ratebook is the first to give occupations and it has been generally assumed that designations given for 1871 would be the same as those for 1865. In 1865, Thomas Bent was a gardener as well as being the Brighton Rate Collector.
PEOPLE:

In the first twenty years of organized local government in Moorabbin, there was a steady, but not spectacular, population increase. By 1871, there were close to 3000 inhabitants and by 1881, 3733, compared to the 1861 total of 2227. The community retained its male preponderance with, according to the Census figures, 86 females to each 100 males in 1871 and 87 to 100 in 1881. This contrasts markedly with Brighton Town where, in 1861, there were already more women than men and where, in 1881, the ratio was 113 females to 100 males. The disparity in Moorabbin was very clear in the adult group where the ratio of unmarried females over 15 years to unmarried males over 20 years was still 77 : 100 in 1871 but significantly, it was 100 : 100 in 1881; by contrast, Brighton Town’s ratio was 188 : 100

10. There is a fairly substantial disparity between the figures in the Council Ratebook and those in the 1871 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Riding</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Riding</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no ground for considering one collection more reliable than the other for 1871 but figures in one collection can probably be safely compared with other figures in the same collection.

11. Ratios calculated from figures taken from 1861, 1871 and 1881 Censuses. For Moorabbin shire -

1871 - 1636 males, 1412 females
1881 - 1994 " 1739 "

For Brighton Town -

1861 - 1198 males, 1303 females
1871 - 1441 " 1618 "
1881 - 2183 " 2572 "
in 1871, which partly compensates for the disparity in Moorabbin; in fact, the figures show that it was very likely that many gardeners' daughters worked in Brighton Town households.\textsuperscript{12}

The community was still dominantly a gardening one but there were some regional differences as the Census and Ratebooks show. In 1871, for example, of those occupying land in the North riding, 149 out of 205 were gardeners, and of 232 land-holdings rated, 137 were of more than 10 acres. By contrast, the West riding, and to a lesser extent, the East riding, contained a much more varied population; indeed, if one linked those parts of the villages of Cheltenham and Mordialloc in the East with the parts on the other side of Point Nepean Road in the West, then the North and the East were fairly similar. In the West, of those occupying land in 1871, only 129 out of 224 were gardeners and of 241 land-holdings rated, less than half were blocks of more than 10 acres. The landholders included 19 'gentlemen',\textsuperscript{13} 4 fishermen, 6 merchants, 11 labourers, 6 storekeepers and a variety of professional and tradespeople. Certainly, most people in the West lived outside the tiny villages of Cheltenham, Mordialloc,

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
For Moorabbin shire & 1871 & 220 unmarried females over 15 years \\
& & (80 " " " 20 " ) \\
& & 290 unmarried males over 20 years \\
1881 & 343 unmarried females over 15 years \\
& & (154 " " " 20 " ) \\
& & 345 unmarried males over 20 years \\
For Brighton Town & 1871 & 419 unmarried females over 15 years \\
& & (263 " " " 20 " ) \\
& & 234 unmarried males over 20 years.
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{12} Ratios calculated from 1871 and 1881 Censuses:

\textsuperscript{13} This is the designation given by the Ratebook; its precise meaning is not clear but it should be noted that 'retired' gardeners were designated 'gentlemen'.

Beaumaris and Gipsy Village but it did have elements of population almost completely lacking in the rural North. The village community at Mordialloc grew steadily during this period. In 1865, Orlebar found only 'about twenty houses in the township' with 'the greater part of the population . . . to the north east towards Dandenong' when he recommended that a school was 'required and desirable'. He also reported that 'the people on the township are fisherman and wood-cutters. In the country about, small farmers and graziers. People generally poor'.

By 1881 there was little change in the direction of growth in Moorabbin as a whole; proportionately, the population of the villages within the shire had increased more than the shire as a whole with a substantial increase at Mordialloc, for example, but there were still 2664 out of 3733 classified by the Census as living 'outside' the villages. The majority of these were on market gardens and orchards and the majority of holdings in the north and east ridings were of more than ten acres. Of occupiers of land rated in 1881, 203 out of 263 were gardeners in the North, 191 out of 320 in the East but in the West, only 170 out of 403. The West also had 266 rated blocks of less than ten acres and 191 of more. The Census classified Gipsy Village separately for the first time claiming a settlement of 183 people in 34 houses, 21 of which were of four rooms or less and all but two of which were wooden.

Throughout Moorabbin, the rate of owner-occupation was high in 1871, but there was significantly more renting both of houses and land in the North riding than elsewhere; 45 of a total of 166 houses rated.

14. These figures are based on the 1871 Ratebook, which was the first to include the occupation of the owner or occupier. The 1871 Census breaks down the population figures for Moorabbin Shire into North riding; West riding - Beaumaris, Mordialloc (part of), Cheltenham (part of), Outside; and East riding - Cheltenham (part of), Mordialloc (part of), Outside, which gives a rough picture of distribution which the Ratebook verifies and enlarges.


and 25 of a total of 66 land areas, were being rented, whereas in the West riding, only 34 of 177 houses were rented and 11 of 76 blocks of land. This difference may simply reflect the greater demand for land for gardening in the North than elsewhere rather than any fundamental difference between the quest for ownership in the North and that in the West; the Ratebook details do not permit clear judgement on this point.\(^{17}\)

Although the Census figures for numbers of houses differ from the Ratebook figures, both sets give similar evidence of an increase in the size of houses. From 18 per cent of houses with more than four rooms in 1861, there was an increase to 23 per cent in 1871 and a substantial leap to 38 per cent in 1881, still well below Brighton Town which had 56 per cent in 1871 and 59 per cent in 1881.\(^{18}\) This rise in the size of the houses together with an actual fall in the number of small houses, indicating extensions to existing houses, is confirmed by the Ratebook, which shows in 1871, 257 houses of four or more rooms and 274 of less than four and in 1881, 443 of four or more and 240 of less than four.\(^{19}\) That there were proportionately more larger houses in the West riding than in the shire as a whole is evidence of slight social differentiation; in 1871, 29 per cent

---

17. Analysis of 1871 Ratebook.

18. Figures from 1861, 1871 and 1881 Censuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>houses</td>
<td>houses</td>
<td>houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rooms</td>
<td>rooms</td>
<td>rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less</td>
<td>less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more</td>
<td>more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Analysis of 1871 and 1881 Ratebooks.
and in 1881, more than 38 per cent; Gipsy Village itself had 38 per cent in 1881.  

Throughout the period 1861-1881, brick and stone were not widely used in Moorabbin with around 17 per cent of houses for each Census year; again, Brighton's 43 per cent brick or stone houses for 1881 gives further indication of social difference; again Moorabbin's West riding had an appreciably higher proportion of brick houses in this period.  

From 1871, when 53 per cent of the shire's population was Australian-born, there was a steady increase to 64 per cent Australian-born in 1881, closely matching similar proportions in Brighton. In the break-down given by the 1871 Census, there is no wide disparity in the distribution of national groups; the fact that there were only 5 Irish-born in a total of 166 people at Beaumaris probably bears out the strongly evangelical Protestant flavour of the area, but it also suggests the distance from church for Catholics outside Brighton. For the shire as a whole, there is a marked disparity between English-born men and English-born women, 446 to 320, particularly noticeable for the North riding where there were 141 to 95, indicating the settlement  

20. Figures from 1871 and 1881 Censuses.  

| Moorabbin - West riding 1871 | 151 houses with 4 rooms or less | 62 " " 5 " " more | 1881 | 193 " " 4 " " less | 120 " " 5 " " more | Gipsy Village | 1881 | 21 " " 4 " " less | 13 " " 5 " " more |

21. Figures from Censuses.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moorabbin</th>
<th>Brick or Stone</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Riding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Riding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 204 |
| cf. Brighton Town 1881, 379 brick and 479 other. |
of some the immigrants from the 'fifties and earlier in the gardening lands. 22

Religious adherence provides another means of comparison between Moorabbin and Brighton and suggests a social differentiation along religious lines (see Table 2 : 1). The Anglicans were significantly stronger in Brighton than Moorabbin; in 1881 over 45 per cent in Brighton against 37 per cent in Moorabbin; the same was true for Presbyterians in 1881 - 14 per cent in Brighton to 10 per cent in Moorabbin; whereas the churches with less social prestige were proportionally stronger in Moorabbin with 20 per cent Wesleyans against 10 per cent in Brighton, 17 per cent Catholics against 13 per cent in Brighton; Moorabbin also included a very strong Church of Christ comprising 6 per cent of Moorabbin's population. The 1871 Census gives a break-down of adherence throughout Moorabbin, clearly showing the regional strength of the Church of Christ in the gardening communities of Beaumaris and Cheltenham where there was a total of 105 of the 171 adherents in the shire as a whole. It also suggests the relative strength of the Catholics in gardening areas in the North riding and in and around South Brighton. The Wesleyans were especially strong at Cheltenham where their numbers were very nearly the same as the Anglicans. The Presbyterians were relatively strong at Mordialloc; according to the 1871 Census, there were 30 adherents in the village, which had a total of 134 people; earlier, in 1865, when a local committee applied for aid for the building of a new school, they claimed a total of 60 children within two miles radius of their site.

22. Figures from Censuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australian Born</th>
<th>British Born</th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>2379</td>
<td>1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>2993</td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including 33 Presbyterians and 25 Church of England children. The degree of regional differentiation in these sects suggests religious adherence as a factor in choice of residence within Moorabbin in this period.

TABLE 2: 1 RELIGIOUS ADHERENCE, 1871 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorabbin</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>No. of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adherents</td>
<td>Adherents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>3048</td>
<td>3059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source - Census figures from 1871 and 1881 Censuses. The figures for Primitive Methodists have been combined with other Methodists, for Free Presbyterians with other Presbyterians, and for Protestants unspecified with Anglicans in order to get a rough measure of social differentiation.

That the regional differences in religious adherence could contribute to inter-regional bitterness can best be shown from the education archives. These squabbles probably re-inforced the dominance of sects in particular locations. In the areas around Cheltenham and Beaumaris, the Anglicans based on their old school at Cheltenham came into conflict with the supporters of the old Wesleyan school at Beaumaris. Accommodation at the old Beaumaris school had become critical by the end of 1865 and the local correspondent, Henry Wells

wrote to the Board of Education requesting aid, and, in October 1867, asking for a grant in Charman Road from the Government reserve, the present site of the Cheltenham State School, and reporting that £75 could be raised locally. The Board sent its inspector, Sasse, to report and it was his recommendation that the Beaumaris and Cheltenham schools be amalgamated that brought on the local hostilities. Wells, writing on behalf of Beaumaris, suggested that there were very few inhabitants on the east side of Point Nepean Road and that the site in Charman Road could be easily reached by those attending the Cheltenham school and also that most of the children at the Beaumaris school lived between it and the sea. This second point he confirmed later with a map showing the houses from which the children came.

It was Samuel Taylor, as in the 'fifties, who was the spokesman for the Cheltenham Anglicans. His protest about the proposed amalgamation was that it 'would be decidedly injurious to the religious well-being of the children of the locality, through the watchful jealousy of rival sects', that, referring to the temporary union of the Anglican and Wesleyan schools in 1857 already noted, the 'previous attempt had failed signally', that where the Wesleyan school was at that time was less than two miles from the Cheltenham school and therefore 'anomalous' in relation to the act and also, that 'on account of the very tender age of the majority of the children in attendance at both schools', the increase in the distance to be travelled 'would virtually shut out from education the majority'. This last point, he argued, would be a permanent feature because 'the services of the children to their parents

24. Ibid. 66/12105 from Henry Wells dated 29 October 1866
25. Ibid. 67/12696 from Henry Wells dated 1 October 1867
26. Ibid. 67/13456 from Sasse dated 16 October 1867.
27. Ibid. 68/824 from Wells dated 5 February 1868.
28. See above p.30
become too valuable, when once the children attain the age of 9 years, to allow of their longer continuance of school'.

The Beaumaris parents, on the other hand, were happy to amalgamate as long as the school site was not too far away — the Charnam Road site was satisfactory in their view. Inspector Sesse recommended the site but Budd, his superior, contended that there was a better site and supplied a map to support his view. This map has not survived but his proposed site was clearly further east than the Charnam Road one because he did not think there could be much increase in Beaumaris population with the sea to the south and poor land to the west limiting expansion; in fact, Budd thought that there would be a drop in Beaumaris population until the rise of the next generation. The wrangle over amalgamation and site went on through 1868 and the Beaumaris school fell into even worse repair.

Eventually it was this disrepair which forced the Board to act early in 1869 when they ordered the amalgamation of the two schools and the building of a new schoolhouse in Charnam Road. Many of the Cheltenham group decided to continue their school without aid rather than amalgamate and in a petition, signed by 31 parents, of which only Robert Trail, the Cheltenham storekeeper, had had children at Beaumaris in 1868, set out their intentions. But the issue did not sleep for long — doubtless spurred on by the pinch felt through having to sustain their school fully, the Cheltenham residents found a new, if not always willing, champion for their cause in the Shire President, J.A. Macarthy. In letters to the Board, Macarthy stressed that the private school was in a very dilapidated state and that parents would not

30. Ibid. 68/4340 petition from Beaumaris parents dated 9 March 1868.
31. Ibid. 68/4537 dated 28 April 1868.
32. Ibid. 68/6289 dated 4 May 1868.
33. Ibid. 69/2482 Petition from Cheltenham parents dated 15 February 1869.
send their children to the Beaumaris school, but when asked to supply details, he could only forward the names of 118 children, mostly Church of England, but insufficient for a new school under the Board. A year later, Macarthy wrote under the severe pressure that the private school had been closed because of dilapidation. He argued that there was insufficient accommodation at Beaumaris and stressed 'that from 160 to 200 children are now shut out from complying with the Act in consequence of the entire absence of school accommodation (sic)'.

This pressure from Cheltenham forced the Education Department, created the previous year, to act. About a week later, its inspector, Topp recommended that additions be made to the Beaumaris school and that halls be hired in Cheltenham until the additions were completed. Topp also suggested that the school should be moved into the town and that one of the central characters in the whole dispute, Walter Meeres, the Beaumaris teacher, was unpopular with the towns-people. Macarthy appears to have made efforts to have the Beaumaris school closed; according to Meeres, 'Mr Macarthy makes no secret of his determination to "turn me out"'. and William Ruse, the Beaumaris correspondent to the Education Department, wrote to the local member, J.A. Crews, asking him to counteract Macarthy's influence. Meeres and the Beaumaris school survived, but barely; whilst an order that a hall

34. Ibid. 71/20756 from J.A. Macarthy dated 28 October 1871.
35. Ibid. 72/997 from J.A. Macarthy dated 17 January 1872.
36. Ibid. 73/5534 from J.A. Macarthy dated 16 March 1873.
37. Ibid. 73/6898 Report by Inspector Topp dated 25 February 1873.
38. Frederick Meeres had returned to England in 1864. See Bruton, Carrum to Cheltenham p.12. Walter Meeres's relationship to Frederick is not known. Both appear in the 1862 Ratebook: Frederick No. 428 in Latrobe Street and Walter No. 397 in Balcombe Road and , in 1871 No. 642 in Elizabeth Street.
39. Education Department, Inward Letter 73/12522 from Walter Meeres dated 26 April 1873.
40. Ibid. 73/9835 letter dated 18 March 1873.
be leased and that an additional building be put up at Beaumaris was made in October 1873, tenders were not let for a new building until December 1877, this only after a report that the building put up in 1869 was unsafe. Meeres was a frequent correspondent on the subject in this period: insufficient accommodation will always supply a ready excuse for the absence of children whose parents seek to evade the provisions of the Act; and thus it will inflict injustice both upon the children who, in consequence of it, will be kept from school, and upon the teacher whose salary depends very much upon his average attendance. Well might Meeres rail about accommodation, caught as he was in the payment-by-results system.

The schools presumably had helped bring about a slight rise in the literacy rate since 1861. In 1871, Moorabbin had an 86 per cent rate but there was still a clear disparity with Brighton which had 91 per cent. This rise in Moorabbin continued to 1881 when there was 90 per cent, still behind Brighton's 94 per cent. The censuses do not give figures within Moorabbin, so any regional variations are not known.

After the Board's district was subdivided in 1864, the character of representation on the Board and later, the Shire Council, in the period 1864 - c.1880 gives further clues to the nature of community identity within Moorabbin. In the North, of eight representatives, all were gardeners or members of gardeners' families. Certainly, Thomas Bent was much more than a gardener and his interests expanded during this period; William Ward was the East Brighton postmaster as well as a gardener and John Bent was, in fact, a publican, but it would be quibbling to claim that representation of the North did not reflect the unanimity, normal in the riding and broken by occasional family feuds.

41. Ibid. 73/28077 Order dated 6 October 1873; 77/29549 Report dated 31 July 1877.

42. Ibid. 74/837 Letter from Meeres dated 24 December 1873.

43. Figures from 1871 and 1881 Censuses. Taking people over 20 years, there were, in 1871, 137 who could not read and write out of a total of 1,577 in Brighton cf. Moorabbin - 200 out of 1,451. in 1881, 131 out of 2,362 in Brighton cf. 174 out of 1,796 in Moorabbin.
and personal antipathies.

In the East, of a total of ten representatives, only five were gardeners; of the others, Trail, admittedly only in for one year, was a Cheltenham storekeeper; Bloxsidge owned the Mordialloc Hotel; F.A. Etheridge ran the Cheltenham Hotel; and Jonathan Parker and Thomas Attenborough were graziers. Regionally, both Cheltenham and Mordialloc had members in most years so that there are clear signs of divisions within this large and scattered riding.

In the West, of a total of eleven representatives in the period, seven were certainly gardeners; Southcott was probably a gardener; and Mair, John Macarthy (described as an engineer and a gentleman), and Alfred Harston, the law stationer, were non-gardening representatives. Significantly, there was at least one of these three on the Board or Shire Council throughout the period, reflecting often the non-gardener view, perhaps more so than the publicans from the East and North. Amongst the gardeners, there were regional differences too — with Ruse, Munday and Mock from the southern part of the riding and Exley, Southcott, Magee, Stayner and Clayton from the area closer to South Brighton.

Overall, local politics was tied in the hands of the market gardeners who formed more than half the council through this period. 44

44. Occupations and place of residence were taken from the 1871 Ratebook where possible and inferred for earlier representatives from that year. Where councillors were not residents in 1871 e.g. Harston, occupation and place of residence was taken from their first appearance in the Ratebook.
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES:

Board disputes were fairly common, having their roots in personal antipathies and regional loyalties, which could cut the common occupational links shared by members.

Moves to establish permanent headquarters for the Board reflected the growing permanency with which the Board faced the future, even as early as 1864, but they were moves which raised regional hackles. The first attempt by Francis and Thomas Bent did not have the support of the rest of the Board but early in 1865, tenders were received for a Board-room site, and a quarter-acre site with frontage to Point Nepean Road owned by Charles Burgess was apparently accepted. Two weeks later, the Board authorised the Chairman to buy the corner acre of Mrs Bryant's paddock for £100 sterling - the present site of the Moorabbin Council Chambers on the south-east corner of South and Point Nepean Roads. This move drew a strong protest from the members of the East subdivision and from William Ruse of Beaumaris. Geographically, these were the members who lived furthest from the site and apparently they hoped to make Cheltenham the centre of the district. This regional division persisted through much of 1865 and the opponents of the South Brighton site were able to postpone consideration of a building with the help of Exley, a gardener in Dane Road but in February 1866, the Board voted 5 - 4 to build on the South Brighton land in spite of the concerted opposition of Ruse, Comport, Jamison and Attenborough. Five months later, the rooms

45. Board Minutes 19 May 1864.
46. Ibid. 9 February 1865.
47. Ibid. 23 February 1865.
48. Ibid. 13, 24 July 1865.
49. Ibid. 22 February, 17 March 1866.
were in use and members forsook the 'Plough and Harrow' for the other side of South Road. 50

Forceful characters like Thomas Bent were involved in bitter personal feuding which periodically plagued the early local bodies. For example, in 1867, a select committee of the Board reported 'that the conduct of Mr Thomas Bent, in taking the printed roll from the hands of the clerk's messenger and altering it, was highly reprehensible and opposed to the best interests of the ratepayers', after investigating a claim that Bent had inserted the name of his father-in-law, John Huntley, on the revised roll before the preceding elections. Bent had the support of his brother, Edmund, and the Mordialloc land-holder, Jonathan Parker but the majority of the Board was for censure and for appropriate redress. 51 Feelings against Bent were still running high when Parker and Edmund Bent nominated him for chairman at the next annual meeting. Bent's opponents nominated Thomas Attenborough, who declined, and then a new member, John Macarthy. When Attenborough 'retired' from the room, Parker was voted to the chair; Macarthy withdrew his name and Parker decided that Bent was elected. 52 Attempts to have the minutes of this annual meeting confirmed and therefore to have Bent's election confirmed, foundered at a series of meetings in December, when dissenting members left the meeting leaving no quorum to carry the minutes. Eventually, the minutes were confirmed, with Attenborough handing in a formal protest. 53

Six months later, the storm had blown itself out and the Board was expressing its gratitude to Bent for 'the valuable services rendered to this Board ... such services being an extra duty imposed upon him through the absconding of the late clerk, Mr Ostler', 54 on the motion

50. Ibid. 28 July 1866.
51. Ibid. 29 August, 19 September, 24 October 1867; Argus 17, 31 August 1867.
52. Board Minutes 20 November 1867.
53. Ibid. 5, 9, 11, 14 December 1867.
54. Ibid. 18 June 1868.
of Comport and West, his main antagonists on the 'roll-stuffing' issue. Ostler had left in early 1868 with at least £135/3/10 of the Board's funds, and thereby, fortuitously, provided the energetic Bent with considerable scope through which to redeem his local standing.\(^{55}\) He was re-elected Chairman of the Board for 1868–69\(^ {56}\) but his handling of the elections of the chairman in the following year resulted in the resignation of all the members of the East subdivision – Jamison, Attenborough, and Comport – and Daniel McGee (sometimes Magee) who thought that Jamison had been elected and not Macarthy.\(^ {57}\) At the time the North was represented by a whole phalanx of Bents – Thomas, Edmund and John.

While much of the squabbling described seems to have been petty and personal, a much clearer and more lasting sectional struggle emerged in 1870. From February 1869, the Board had kept separate accounts for each subdivision and provided that amounts be debited for the following year if receipts were less than expenditure.\(^ {58}\) When the Board moved late in 1870 to debit the North's account for £297/11/10 Bent and his fellow northerners protested very strongly,\(^ {59}\) but the Board and the Shire Council constituted in 1871, eagerly carried this out – the early dominance of the North, the thwarting of the Cheltenham ambitions in the 'sixties, and a well-developed feud between Bent and Macarthy all played a part.\(^ {60}\)

55. Ibid., 19, 27 February 1868.
56. Ibid., 16 November 1869.
57. Ibid., 17, 18 November; 2, 16 December 1869; Argus, 25 November 1869. Precisely what happened is not clear from the minutes but an editorial nearly five years later, in the Southern Cross, 8 August 1874 claimed that Macarthy was nominated by Bent after a show of hands had given Jamison four votes and that Macarthy had then obtained five votes.
58. Board Minutes, 11 February 1869.
59. Ibid., 5 October 1870.
60. Southern Cross, 8 April 1871.
Macarthy first appeared in the area in 1866 and when first elected to the Board in 1867, he was rated for a house and land in Point Nepean Road, Cheltenham.\(^1\) In 1871, he was described as a gentleman and apparently he was a civil engineer.\(^2\) He had stood for the Legislative Assembly for South Bourke in 1871 but finished at the bottom of the poll with success only in the Mordialloc subdivision, although the Argus had thought he might 'run well'.\(^3\) The acrimony between Bent and Macarthy may have partly stemmed from partisanship in the 1871 election; Macarthy was a 'ministerial candidate' and Bent who won Brighton, was not. Certainly, the local shire elections brought a bitter struggle in the West riding against Macarthy, then the president. William Mair, retired since 1867, was brought out to oppose Macarthy, but was defeated, 154 votes to 132,\(^4\) to the disgust of the newly-founded local paper, the Southern Cross which, commenting on his handling of opposition at council meetings, stated:

Per favour of the fickle goddess and short-lived Sladen ministry, he has reached a social position that he hardly dare aspire to in times gone by; and like most men who are so placed without proportionate experience in the role, he occasionally forgets the duties he owes to his position.\(^5\)

But Macarthy retained the support of East and West councillors who voted him to the presidency again and who prevented action being taken to rescind the debiting of the North's accounts.\(^6\) The early dominance of Moorabbin affairs by the North riding gardeners was now past.

---

61. Board Ratebook 1866 Entries 349, 350; 1867 Entry 634.
62. Ibid. 1871 Entry 651. 10 acres, 7 rooms, gentleman. *\(^*\)1874, p.1943. V.G.G. noted that John Arnold Macarthy's estate 'has been sequestrated'. The bundle which would include Macarthy's insolvency papers has not survived in the State Archives.
63. Argus. 4, 13, 14, 15 February 1871.
64. Southern Cross. 22, 29 July; 5 August 1871.
65. Ibid. 22 September 1871.
66. Council Minutes, 21 September 1871.
The 1869 'Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to Road Districts and Shires',\(^{67}\) removed the distinctions between road districts and shires which meant that the scope of local activities could be enlarged by the accession of new powers, especially through the provision which allowed them to issue debentures, secured on mortgage of special rates which could be up to five times the ordinary rate, for permanent works.\(^ {68}\) These new powers provided opportunities for men with visions for the future to promote new ventures in the area; they also placed new demands for expertise on the Council and among its officers. Moves for a loan were made by McCarthy and Thomas Bent in 1873 but these failed after a poll of ratepayers was taken.\(^ {69}\) Four years later, Bent successfully moved for a loan which was effected in July 1878 for £7500, scheduled to be spent on the shire's roads with large amounts for the major roads in each of the ridings; for example, £1100 for Beach Road and £675 for Centre Road.\(^ {70}\) Loan financing of public works was a significant step which enabled better road-making and real and permanent improvements, scarcely possible under the system which had operated since 1862, where the colonial treasury provided well over half the total income of around £2000 and where existing roads were barely maintained.

After Ostler, the first Board secretary, absconded, John Keys of Dandenong was appointed rate collector, clerk of works, dog registrar, and toll manager at £70 per annum.\(^ {71}\) For a time, after the resignation of Frederick Bull, the first engineer, in 1872, Keys was engineer, secretary and valuator as well, at £200 per annum. This 'Pooch-Bah' role thrust on Keys led the Southern Cross to comment that 'After the horse [Ostler] had been stolen, the board proceeded to lock the stable door by separating the various offices... but that the possibility of embezzlement had been created by the Council's warm and generous support for Keys.'\(^ {72}\) Shortly afterwards, George Bodley

---

67. 33 Victoria 358, assented 29 December 1869.
68. Ibid., provision 236.
69. Council Minutes, 12 June; 10, 21 July 1873.
70. Ibid., 13 September; 6 December 1877; 17 January, 18 July 1878.
71. Ibid., 26 March 1868.
72. Ibid., 17 October 1872; Southern Cross, 19 October 1872.
was appointed rate collector and dog inspector at £30 per annum\(^73\) and later he accumulated the jobs of clerk of works and inspector of nuisances with Keys combining the jobs of secretary, engineer and treasurer. Rodley was a gardener from the South in Balcombe Road.\(^74\)

John Keys was part of a family which had emigrated from County Tyrone in 1840-1 and after dairying at Preston\(^75\) had moved South to take up a lease, 'Moodie Yallock', at present-day Keysborough, in 1845. John, the fifth son, did not follow his father and brothers into active farming for long; he made a career for himself in public service as secretary and engineer at both Moorabbin and Dandenong and, for a time, as MLA for South Bourke.\(^76\) John Keys had strong family links with Moorabbin council; James Jamison, a member of the Board 1864-6, 1868-9 and the shire council 1878-9, was his brother-in-law and Robert Keys, his eldest brother, was a councillor 1874-1887, after his move to a Cheltenham orchard from Brighton where he had kept a hotel in the Little Brighton village since 1847 and had been an active Brighton Councillor from 1859 to 1876.\(^77\) Whilst John Keys was criticised during his long association with Moorabbin, his competence was invariably acknowledged.

---

73. Council Minutes, 14 November 1872.
74. Board Ratebook 1862, Entry 452 - land in Church Road; Shire Ratebook 1871, Entry 523 - 8 acres, 4 rooms in Balcombe Road.
76. Sholto Keys, 'Some Family History'. Roneoed. (Photostat in my possession). The Keys were very big buyers of farming land at the Crown sales in Moorabbin, Mordialloc, Lyndhurst, and Dandenong parishes.
77. Ibid.; *Bate Brighton*, p.74.
TOLLS:

Whilst local roads and sites for Board-rooms were purely matters of local politics, the gardeners were always concerned with roads to market and conditions at the markets; for all of them, this was a necessary contact with the outside world; for most, it was their sole concern outside the locality. Tolls were charged on all the main roads out of the city and, for Moorabbin gardeners in the 1860's, this meant payment at both the Point Nepean Road Toll-gate at the end of Cummins Lane and also at the Toll-gate in St. Kilda Road. From 1867, a further toll was collected at the bridge over Mordialloc Creek. The tolls fixed in 1862 for horse-drawn waggons ranged between threepence and a shilling, depending on tyre width, for a return trip on the same day. A special toll of one penny applied to loads of manure. Operating the Point Nepean Road Toll necessitated co-operation with Brighton and, for a time, Caulfield, but more frequently it was the subject of inter-municipal squabbles from the time Joseph Ostler was appointed manager in 1864. The Moorabbin Board, according to a motion the next year could not 'agree to permit itself to be placed in a secondary position in the management of its affairs' as it had 'the largest interest in the Toll Fund', in fact 15/29 to Brighton's 10/29 and Caulfield's 4/29. In the next three years, Moorabbin maintained this position with the result that both Brighton and Caulfield refused to pay their share of Ostler's salary and refused to attend meetings to confer. until May 1867, when the three local bodies agreed to appoint the manager in turn and generally to make arrangements by mutual agreement. Moves to lower the toll rates were eventually successful in 1872, by which time Brighton and Moorabbin had equal

78. V.G.G., 1867, p.878 dated 6 May 1867.
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80. Ibid. 1864, p.363, p.1542.
82. Board Minutes, 14 December 1865, 14 June, 14 July 1866, 31 January, 11 April 1867.
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84. Ibid., 7 October 1869, 29 September, 2 November 1871; V.G.G., 1872, p.127 dated 18 December 1871.
shares in the tolls. 85

The tolls question was one of the issues in Bent's successful campaign against George Higinbotham for the Brighton seat in the Assembly in 1871, but East Brighton, the part of the electorate which stood to gain most from the abolition of tolls, still gave Higinbotham a majority in spite of Bent's advocacy of abolition and his local stand. Certainly, Bent picked up many votes in the East that had previously gone to Higinbotham but the Southern Cross's incredulous comments on the election scarcely understood the election figures it published:

Can it be that he [Bent] has been placed in the proud position of representative of Brighton, because that he is known to his own class as a jolly good fellow or is it that the happy idea of abolishing tolls, and we suppose by denouncing the Melbourne Corporation from his place in Parliament - abolishing market dues, that he has gained the unbounded confidence of the electors? 86 In discussions on amendments to the Local Government Act in the Assembly in 1869, Higinbotham had voted with a majority of the house for clause 320 which allowed tolls to continue. By contrast, J.A.Crews, one of the members for South Bourke, which included the southern parts of Moorabbin, 'regarded tolls as a relic of barbarous ages' and was consistent in pressing for their abolition in later years. 87

When Bent joined the Assembly he campaigned too and as a member of the 'Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the desirability of making amendments in the boroughs and shires statutes and road districts act', he shared in the Commission's contention

85. Ibid., 1871, p.2347 dated 18 December 1871.
'that the toll system should be as speedily as possible abolished, it being an expensive and unsatisfactory means of collecting revenue'.  

The view of the government when introducing amendments to the local government laws in 1874 was summed up by Gillies, then Minister for Roads and Railways, when he argued that tolls were 'so purely a local matter that Parliament is not justified in interfering with it', but opposition on this matter enabled Crews's amendment to abolish public tolls at the end of 1875 to be carried against those who wanted a substitute source of revenue named first. Subsequently, bills were passed to extend the collection of tolls until the end of 1877. Bent opposed all these extensions arguing throughout that the government could simply recoup the losses of the local government bodies by giving subsidies.  

In 1876, a wheel tax, a firm alternative to the tolls, was proposed but in the opinion of the Moorabbin Council, a tax on wheels was a worse evil than the tolls. By 1877, opponents of the toll could not only provide details of the particular evils that beset their districts, for example, Bent had mentioned the wood-carriers in his district but they could also argue with some justice, that it was unfair to impose tolls when all districts did not have railways. Finally, in 1877, all tolls on roads to the Melbourne market from Moorabbin were removed; the toll on the Dandenong Road at Oakleigh remained and a strong move to retain the St. Kilda toll was made. Against this, Patterson, then Minister for  

90. Ibid. 1874, 13, 19, 26 August; 3, 4 November, 1875-6 p.1543 8 December 1875; 1876 p.494, 23 August 1876.  
91. Council Minutes, 17 August 1876.  
92. V.P.D. 1876 p.599, 30 August.  
93. Ibid. 1877, p.51 Bent on June 28.
Public Works, argued that the City Council should improve the markets instead of taking sixpenny tolls from the pockets of a few, poor hardworking, miserable market gardeners - the people whom, to the disgrace of the metropolis, we see clearly on market mornings, the women as well as the men huddled together indiscriminately on the flags - .96

For the purpose of abolishing tolls, the Mooreabbin market gardener was happy to be so described.

96. Ibid. 1877 December 5, p.1776. The Bill passed the Assembly on December 19.
RAILWAYS:

That the over-riding interest of the market gardeners was in roads rather than railways, is clear. As early as 1856, Samuel Toynbee had asserted before the Select Committee on the Melbourne and Suburban Railways Bill that 'the people residing in those two localities [East Brighton and Little Brighton] ... will continue to bring in their farm produce on their carts, and their wood too, as now'.

The pressure to develop the railway to the beach came mostly from the landholders who, apart from J.M. Smith, were not residents.

Intermittent pressure for a railway through the gardening districts of East Brighton, South Brighton and Cheltenham came after the Road District was proclaimed but it was more usually an attempt to have the railway to South Gippsland routed through the area rather than to have a railway for its own sake. Failure to bring the Gippsland railway further west into Moorabbin led to a demand for railway connection to Mornington with much interest in Cheltenham and Mordialloc from local businessmen like Etheridge who, in 1874, opened a general store at Cheltenham after running the Cheltenham Hotel, and Bloxsidge and Rennison, publicans at Mordialloc. They were joined by local boosters like Bent who 'considered a man living at Mt. Macedon in closer communication with Melbourne than persons from East Brighton' when he spoke at a railway meeting at Moorabbin in 1875. Eventually a deputation to the minister from the district pressed for the connection of Brighton Beach to Mornington via Cheltenham but were told that the government had no money for a survey and that either

98. Board Minutes, 20 October 1866, 24 October 1867; Council Minutes 12 November 1874.
99. The first part of the line from Oakleigh was opened 8 October 1877.
100. Council Minutes, 5 August 1875; Southern Cross, 21 August 1875.
1. Southern Cross, 20 August 1875.
the proposed line would have to be connected to Spencer Street, the
Government's terminus or the Hobson's Bay Company, which ran the
Brighton line, bought by the Government.²

Whilst this pressure slowly mounted for railway connection in
the areas removed from the Brighton line, a service which enabled commuters
to live near Brighton Beach was operating right through the 'seventies.
In 1870, there were thirteen trains a day with the first leaving the
beach station at 8.12 a.m. and the last arriving at 12.16 a.m. but the
fares were 2/3 for 1st. and 2/- for 2nd. return with monthly tickets at
40/- for 1st. and 35/- for 2nd., effectively barring commuting by the
great majority of Melbourne's wage-earners, most of whom still walked to
work. These high rail fares help explain the social differentiation of
the Brighton commuters; in any case, the rail fares were continuing the
pattern which had been effectively imposed already by the toll charges
on the Brighton Road before the railway had appeared.³

By 1875, there were 18 trains per week-day and fares had been
substantially reduced to 1/6 for 1st. and 1/3 for 2nd. return with
monthly at 30/- for 1st. and 25/- for 2nd.⁴ Without figures for
passenger journeys or revenue from the various lines, it is not possible
to establish whether the fare drop had an appreciable effect on
passengers carried. Certainly the railway in the 'seventies was partly
grounded to a week-end excursion service. In 1870, return tickets at
single fare were issued at all stations on the Windsor line for North
Brighton, Middle Brighton and Brighton Beach.⁵ By 1880, there were 22
services a day including some expresses at times suited to commuters and
fares had been further reduced to 1/- for 1st. and 9d. for 2nd. return.⁶

---

² Ibid. 9 October 1875.
³ Bradshaw's Guide, January 1870. Fares and time-tables have been
sampled from these monthly guides.
⁴ Ibid. January 1875.
⁵ Ibid. January 1870.
⁶ Ibid. January 1880.
The railway thus enabled a greater variety of occupancy in the area near the beach end of South Road but its precise effect for this period cannot be stated.
THE FORESHORE:

The foreshore was of early and lasting concern in Moorabbin. Reserved in 1864 for 'public recreation', the Board unsuccessfully sought control of reserves in the district as early as January 1867 when a deputation with strong representation from Beaumaris in addition to the Board met the Commissioner of Lands. When it was reported that stone was being removed from the beach by contractors for the Point Nepean Road south of Mordialloc, the Board and most of Moorabbin's 'gentlemen' including Charles Ebden, William Mair, J.M. Smith, W.M. Bell, Charles MacMahon, William Coleman and Cleeland waited on the Minister but the results of their interview are not known.

In 1871, MacMahon, Bent, Mair, the Mayor of Brighton and the President of Moorabbin were named trustees for the foreshore, partly meeting the earlier claims of the Board but the Council was granted management five years later after Mair had apparently threatened to clear all the fisherman off the reserve. The Council was apparently anxious to control the issue of fisherman's licences on the reserve, previously granted by the Lands Department.

By 1879, the Council was adopting regulations for the management of Moorabbin Beach Park, Cheltenham Park, Mordialloc Public Park and the reserve from Picnic Point to Mordialloc, which had all been permanently reserved between 1872 and 1874. These rules sought to prevent damage

8. Board Minutes, 10 January 1867.
9. Ibid. 12 September 1867.
11. Ibid. 1876 p.479.
12. Council Minutes, 11 November 1875; Southern Cross 13 November 1875.
13. Council Minutes 17 August 1876.
to ti-tree and fences, to regulate grazing and commerce and to remove residents. In many respects, there was concern to conserve rather than to despoil. Their concern to keep the foreshore open to the public and unspoilt for the future succeeded in providing a long stretch of coast with free access, in contrast to much of Brighton where property rights extended to the high water mark and where Nicholas Were nearly succeeded, as late as 1876, in selling off beach frontages.

15. Bate, Brighton, pp. 346-347.
PUBLIC HEALTH:

Public health and sanitation did not concern rural Moorabbin in the ways that affected Melbourne city and suburbs in this period; the disposal of Moorabbin's 'night-soil' within the area was not a major problem; certainly there was concern that wells could be polluted by percolation from privies or manure heaps but the vast areas of unoccupied land meant that dumping of waste materials could take place easily and, in the contemporary view, safely and profitably.

Medical opinion in the 'sixties and 'seventies was that the zymotic diseases were caused by 'mysterious poisonous agencies' and especially in the cases of typhoid, cholera and some types of diarrhoea, it was agreed that the diseases were closely connected to pollution of water by sewage. Diphtheria, on the other hand, did 'not appear to be so much under the influence of known sanitary conditions as other epidemics'. Generally, it was argued that 'all matters which give off a disagreeable smell' were dangerous but this applied particularly to sewer-gas. The connection between 'favers' and marshy districts was well-known too. The implications for public health of all this were drainage and the disposal of night-soil and other organic material by 'incorporating it with the great natural deodorizer - the earth'.

In Moorabbin, where for most of the period before the 'eighties, swamps and smells could be largely avoided, the typical town health

16. See Barrett, Collingwood pp.61-66; Ch.4 pp.161-172 for the clearest account of the problems.
19. Ibid. vol. III 1862. Entry on 'Diphtheria'.
20. Ibid. vol. VIII, 1866 Entry on 'Sewage'.
21. Ibid. vol. VI 1864 Entry for 'Miasma'.
22. Ibid. vol. VIII 1866 Entry on 'Sewage'.
problem involving the removal of cesspits and the search for alternatives was largely irrelevant but the demand for manure for Moorabbin gardens was not and as Melbourne municipalities took action to remove night-soil, Moorabbin became an attractive dump or market. A Select Committee on Night Soil in 1866 which recommended the general adoption of earth-closets to replace the cess-pools and water-closets, saw great value in 'the fertilizing properties of prepared night-soil', which would result from their proposal. The Committee largely echoed the evidence of Edward FitzGibbon, the Melbourne Town Clerk, who asserted that:

There is a large tract of country round Melbourne from which Melbourne is supplied with the vegetable produce it consumes, and if it were possible to carry the refuse and nightsoil from the city on to the lands around it would be a great gain to the cultivators, and be very much prized by them . . .

By contrast, the manure depots then operating received so much water in the loads brought to them, that the quantity that remains suitable for removal for agricultural purposes is almost infinitesimally small. 24

Thomas Audsley, the only market gardener called, said that gardeners would take night-soil, claimed by him to be four times more valuable by weight than horse dung, if it was in a form that they could get at during the day. He also agreed that depots in outlying areas like Moorabbin would be beneficial to market gardeners. Andrew Livingstone, the East Collingwood Health Officer, was the only witness to advocate the water closet and an underground sewerage system but it was the FitzGibbon view that generally prevailed with the Committee. 25 In fact, expense enormous in the case of underground sewers and greater in the case of earth-closet - and the generally prevailing view that matters should be left in the care of local government, 26 largely prevented action until

24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. See O'Shanassy, above p.38 for a typical statement.
near the end of the century; when councils did take action, it was usually to provide a system of portable earthless pans.

The slowness of action by municipalities in and around the city, in spite of the increased powers given to them by the 1867 amendments to the Health Act, meant that Moorabbin remained a potential rather than an actual dump. Certainly private arrangements between gardeners and contractors were made but it was the threat of the establishment of a deodorizing depot by the Melbourne City Council in Moorabbin in 1875 which first brought hostility. As the Southern Cross editorialised:

However desirous it may be to the residents of Moorabbin to have such a permanent nuisance established in their midst, is it right or just that those who do not appreciate the advantage of being made a receptacle for the city refuse should be obliged to suffer from it,27 foreshadowing the controversy which raged over night-soil in Moorabbin for the next twenty years. A letter writer in the same issue thought that the use of night-soil would lead to the 'ruin of hundreds of families' because it would prejudice buyers against Moorabbin produce but on this point, gardener opinion was divided.

The Council, acting as the Local Board of Health, quickly moved to prevent the establishment of the depot by passing a bye-law which allowed deodorized material to be deposited but which required written permission and immediate covering for untreated material, subject to a fine of not less than 5/- nor more than £10.28 The Southern Cross in a rare burst of wit, satirized the arrival of some Melbourne night-soil before the bye-law was confirmed:

---

27. 17 April 1875.
The odiferous detachment, was, we are informed in proper military order, the advanced guard consisting of the first load being under the immediate command of the town clerk, and the rear of the Mayor, the city colors flying over the certainly contraband material. Under such protection it of course passed without question, as a matter of course being supposed to be something nice for the Moorabbin natives. . .29

The byelaw seems to have stopped the flow of untreated night-soil for a time30 but five years later, Henry Comport gave notice of motion 'that the question of allowing night-soil to be brought into this shire be fully considered with a view of taking the necessary steps to prevent its further introduction into this shire' - to the acclam of the Southern Cross.31 When Comport's motion was put, William Ward was the most active opponent, contending that 'while it night-soil is disagreeable . . . it was not more injurious than other manure', as the vital statistics of the district, collected by Ward, showed. The motion was strongly rejected but Comport continued to campaign by further notices of motion and by seeking outside help. Writing on behalf of the Cheltenham Board of Advice to the Central Board of Health, Comport claimed 'that sickness was prevalent in the district through . . . the use of night-soil' and he therefore called on them to take action to maintain the health of the district. The Central Board referred the letter to the Council, who rejected the matter.32 Comport remained a vocal member of a minority until later in the 'eighties by which time, new forces had appeared to produce more support for him but also to arouse considerable community feeling on the issue.

That the Council had been little concerned with health is suggested by the fact that they did not appoint an inspector of nuisances or a medical officer until 1875 when George Bodley added nuisances at £10

29. 29 May 1875.
30. Southern Cross, 26 June 1875.
31. Council Minutes, 10 May 1880; Southern Cross, 15 May 1880.
32. Southern Cross, 10 July 1880.
per annum to his growing local portfolio and Dr Woolhouse became
honorary medical officer. 33 The individual ratepayer, by his own
actions of moving his privy and of applying night-soil to local
gardens, could obviate the necessity of council action, but if
metropolitan councils established depots and the roads became full of
'foreign' night-certs, or if individuals did not cover night-soil
after it was applied to their land, then the Council was obliged to act.
That they saw few problems before 1875 is shown by their late
appointment of officers and then, part-time and honorary ones. Their
failure to support the moves made by Comport, after 1875, shows that
the problems were still not insistent and this was understandable
without a germ theory of disease. On local health matters, they were
apparently satisfied and they were prepared as Bent was in the
Assembly to champion the cause of local authority in health matters. 34

33. Council Minutes, 11 November 1875.
WATER:

Water-supply was largely a matter of individual conservation and action in rural Moorabbin. Collection and storage of roof-water and ground-water sources were usually enough for most households for most years but periodic droughts such as one in the 1873-4 summer could bring the demand for action on a municipal scale. Bent, whose boosting actions, whether in Council or in Parliament, whether on water, roads, tolls, railways, loans or the foreshore, did so much to make changes in Moorabbin, suggested that the Council should favourably consider the best ways and means to utilize the Carrum Swamp, that water may be laid on to every household in the district.\(^{35}\)

Again, in 1877, it was Bent with Alfred Harston, a city law stationer from the West, who acted to have a stand-pipe erected at the beach end of South Road.\(^{36}\) Two years later, unsuccessful moves were made for a stand-pipe at the 'Plough and Harrow'\(^{37}\) but the following year, a deputation to the Minister of Public Works, in fact, Bent, for water extension to both South Brighton and Picnic Point was told to guarantee 6 per cent on the capital outlay. As a result, water was extended to Picnic Point but not to South Brighton, thereby accentuating regional difference and causing indignation meetings from the gardening communities close to South Brighton. The upshot of these meetings was that the Council re-considered the question and unanimously rescinded their previous action and moved for an extension of water to South Brighton, as well as a further extension to Gipsy Village from Picnic Point.\(^{39}\) By 1881, water, at a price of sixpence per load was available

---

35. Southern Cross, 24 January 1874.
37. Southern Cross, 17 May, 7 June, 5 July 1879; Council Minutes 3 July 1879.
38. Council Minutes, 10 May 1880; Southern Cross 1, 8, 15 May 1880.
39. Southern Cross, 29 May; 5, 12 June 1880; Council Minutes, 5 July 1880.
from the stand-pipes, so that the drain on coastal residents' water by picnickers and on gardeners' supplies by drought could be offset. This extension of water to the coastal sections as far south as Gipsy Village was clearly a boon for those holding land from the 'fifties subdivisions.
ECONOMY:

Whilst occupational analyses from the Census and Ratebook can establish the forms of Moorabbin's economy, it is very difficult to supply a precise statistical skeleton before 1870, partly because the published series from 1857 to 1868 is for Moorabbin parish and therefore includes Brighton but excludes Mordialloc, and partly because the published figures are unreliable. This latter point can be demonstrated by taking the figures for enclosed land and for land under tillage for 1861–2, 1862–3, and 1864.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enclosed Land</th>
<th>Land Under Tillage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861–2</td>
<td>5043 acres</td>
<td>2907 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862–3</td>
<td>6526</td>
<td>3723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>4998</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one discounts the 1862–3 figures as a collector's aberration, one still has to account for the destruction of fencing enclosing nearly one thousand acres between 1861–2 and 1864. If erratic collection occurred for these comparatively easy categories, then production figures, much more difficult to collect, may have little substance, even on a comparative basis with those collected by others in other areas. One obvious difficulty faced by the collector was deciding if a market garden should be classified as a market garden or a paddock of potatoes.

By 1870, gardening was not only the economic mainstay of Moorabbin but it was clearly vital in the Melbourne fresh fruit and vegetable market, as the following table shows:

---

40. From *V.P.P.* 1861–2, v.3; 1862–3, v.4; 1864, v.2.
### TABLE 2:2  GARDENS AND ORCHARDS AROUND MELBOURNE, 1870

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Gardens acres</th>
<th>Orchards acres</th>
<th>Holdings more than 10 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Town</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boronunda Shire</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunawading Shire</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin Shire</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh Shire</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templestowe Shire</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - VICTORIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>7742</strong></td>
<td><strong>4043</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source - *V.C.G., 1870*, p.748.

This dominance, the Collector put down to 'proximity to market' and 'ability to get return loads of manure'. The Collector's reasons suggest the main reasons for the uneven spread of gardening in Moorabbin: infertility and poor drainage were important ones but accessibility of market and manure was vital.

Drawing firm conclusions about Moorabbin production and acreage from the published figures after 1870 is difficult, but the steady rise in acreage devoted to gardens from 1114 acres in 1870 to 2460 acres in 1879, accompanied by a drop in acreage specifically under potatoes from a peak of 726 acres in 1871 to 297 acres in 1879, a drop in the area producing hay from 587 acres in 1870 to a low of 68 acres in 1879 and the almost complete absence of grain crops and vegetable crops classified separately from the market gardens, do show that, by the end of the 'seventies, Moorabbin's economy was dependent on the

---

42. *V.C.G., 1870*, p.748.
43. Ibid., 1879 p.1082.
44. Ibid., 1971 p.778
45. Ibid., 1879 p.1082.
46. Ibid., 1870 p.748
47. Ibid., 1879 p.1082.
varied production of the market gardens. Orchards remained important occupying between 200 and 300 acres throughout the 'seventies but grapes, apparently of some value for fruit and wine in 1870 when 215 cwt. of fruit was produced and a further 168 cwt. of fruit produced 1021 gallons of wine, declined to insignificance as early as 1872 when only 47 cwt. were produced. These conclusions must remain tentative given the nature of the figures. The figures also show a growth of area under permanent artificial grasses from 105 acres in 1870 to a high of 660 acres in 1878 which parallels the drop in the area producing hay noted above. Part of these areas, one assumes, would have included the dairy herds of people like Moysey and Rusk at Beaumaris, recalled by Bruton. ⁴⁸

Something of the methods employed throughout the district can be gauged from the equipment listed in the Statistical Register of 1874 when there were 435 holdings of more than one acre in Moorabbin and 660 carts, 202 chaff-cutters, 357 harrows, 2 horse hoes, 404 ploughs, 51 rollers and 4 waggons. Clearly the cart, the harrow and the plough, and the horse to go with them, were crucial to the commercial market gardeners who employed in the same year about 900 hands. ⁴⁹ Gardening was then, and remained, a labour-intensive industry, its tireless and unrelenting nature caught simply in an appreciative verse from a local poet, Richard Hooppell Long ⁵⁰

These are the men that I revere
Who labour on from year to year
In the open with bent backs
Or with knees wrapped round with sacks,
Kneel on furrowed lands and wrest
A living from Earth's stubborn breast.

The ability of the gardeners as a group to carry the Council with

---

⁴⁸. Bruton, Carrum to Cheltenham p.15
⁴⁹. Statistical Register, 1874.
them in the 'seventies is clearly shown by the grant of £20 to the Sparrow Club in February 1875, followed by another £20 in November. Born at a meeting in November 1874 and bent on the destruction of the sparrow— the committee had paid out £9/8/4 for 455 heads and 3611 eggs within a month. The Southern Cross soon after reported 20,000 young and eggs destroyed—'pretty good proof of the energy with which the war has been carried on', was their rueful comment. The sparrow was not altogether without support as a local, 'C', writing in the Cross, testified in the following part of a six verse poem entitled 'The Orphan Sparrow':

This mornin' my fither an' mither was shot,
An' here I sit chirpin' in sorrow
Pursued an' harassed by a "larrakin" lot,
That wid torture the life out a sparrow

But the Club, and the Council with them, dismissed such humane arguments as 'unreasonable and emanating solely from parties who had neither gardens or orchards and did not get their living therefrom', as Exley had put it at the Club's inception.

51. Council Minutes, 18 February 1875.
52. Ibid., 11 November 1875.
53. Southern Cross, 19 December 1874.
54. Ibid., 9 January 1875.
55. Ibid., 30 January 1875; see also 'The Sparrow Again' in 6 March 1875.
56. Ibid., 28 November 1874.
SOCIAL INTERACTION:

Churches and schools remained the major foci of community interaction in this period. By 1880 there were Anglican and Wesleyan congregations at Mordialloc, Presbyterian congregations at Cheltenham and Gipsy Village and Wesleyan congregations at Pic-nic and Kingston in addition to those established by 1862. Notably absent from the shire was a Catholic church and clearly, the expansion had come mainly from the Wesleyans who had built a church in Gibson's Road in 1874 and who were using the Anglican church at Mordialloc on Sunday evenings from 1877 onwards.

The Church of Christ remained very strong in the gardening communities of Cheltenham and Beaumaris. Differences between the groups at the two chapels were finally resolved in June 1874 and a new brick chapel in Charman Road was opened in December 1878. With a hard core of membership amongst families like the Kierns, the Judds, the Ruses and the Moyseys, the church had periodic upsurges in membership related to vigorous evangelism; for example, after the new building was opened, 27 members were added with G. Bickford Moysey, son of the Beaumaris farmer, as evangelist. The group was linked with the Wesleyans in their attack on alcohol, shown in the strength of the temperance friendly societies based at Cheltenham in this period; the Star of Moorabbin branch of the Sons and Daughters of Temperance, founded in 1869, had 54 members in 1881, for example. But they separated themselves from the Wesleyans and other sects partly through their self-conscious adoption of the name Christian. The nature of this position is made

57. Ibid. 30 October 1880.
59. Ibid. p.424.
61. Ibid. vol.8, January 1879, pp.28-9.
62. Ibid. vol.8, January 1879, p.62.
63. Third Annual Report on Friendly Societies in V.P.P., 1881 vol.2.
clear by G.B. Mozsey who, in 1879 denied the assertion that he had said that 'John Wesley was a good man but is now in Hell' but went on to the following: 'but while I respect Mr Wesley, I must maintain that to call myself by his name as a religious designation, is contrary to both the latter and spirit of the Word of God, and a dishonour to that holy name which has been called upon us...'.

Glimpses of some other public activities can be seen in the Southern Cross. Ploughing matches were popular; the Council was asked to set aside some of Cheltenham Park for cricket; concerts occurred irregularly. One in 1872 in aid of the Moorabbin new Vested School was 'well patronised, the audience appearing to be well pleased with the entertainment'. The programme included items by a male vocal quartet and the Moorabbin Brass Band, and included two numbers of local flavour - 'The Market Gardener' and 'Mordialloc Creek'. This last number was a melodramatic tale of Harry and Matilda, or in another version, Sophia, who drove to Mordialloc, hired a boat, hit a snag -

'and both went down.
Unconscious - they were rescued
And taken back to town.'

It was composed and sung by Richard Clayton; his family had an enduring interest in amateur musical performance as William Clayton was the first conductor of the South Brighton Musical Union, founded in 1879.

Bruton recalled the fun of the annual school picnic at Rose's paddock which everyone attended; the same entertained involvement characterised a Gipsy Village Sunday school fete of 1879 attended by

64. Southern Cross, 15 November 1879.
65. e.g., Southern Cross, 3, 10 February 1872.
66. Council Minutes, 17 October 1872; Southern Cross, 19 October 1872.
67. Ibid., 3 August 1872.
68. Ibid., 7 September 1872; Bruton, Carrum to Cheltenham, pp. 7-8
69. Southern Cross, 29 January, 24 September 1881.
70. Carrum to Cheltenham, p. 14
70 children, \textsuperscript{71} and the 'Banquet and Grand Demonstration' which ushered in the new State School at Beaumaris.\textsuperscript{72} Scattered events like these show Moorabbin making its own diversions relatively free from outside contacts.

Parts of Moorabbin were also sites for diversions for outsiders. The coast was always attractive; Kenny's Baths at Brighton Beach were re-opened in 1872 after an earlier fire\textsuperscript{73} and they could easily be reached by rail. The beach always attracted picnic parties especially at Christmas and Easter times\textsuperscript{74} when it took on a carnival appearance with 'roundabouts, beach sellers and amusements' in 1880. In a guide for excursionists as early as 1868, the whole beach between Brighton and Picnic Point had been acclaimed for picnics. Walkers were recommended to go along the beach from Brighton to Mordialloc and then to Cheltenham.\textsuperscript{75} Some of these visitors to Moorabbin's beauty spots were criticised - the very large boys 'who unnecessarily disported themselves on the beach in Nature's clothing' that William Ward complained of, or the 'fat Scotch woman' who did likewise and thus 'placed [Alfred Harston] in rather an awkward position as he had no umbrella to screen himself'\textsuperscript{76} were not isolated instances of unwelcome, nay indecent, visitors.\textsuperscript{77}

As market gardening had grown in neighbouring Brighton, parts of Moorabbin became sites for hunting, that sport of gentlemen;\textsuperscript{78} in 1862, [Footnotes]

\textsuperscript{71} Southern Cross, 19 April 1879.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid. 6 July 1878.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid. 21 September 1872.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid. 28 December 1872, 3 April 1880.
\textsuperscript{75} H. Thomas, Guide for Excursionists from Melbourne, Melbourne 1868.
\textsuperscript{76} Southern Cross, 27 September 1879.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid. 3 April 1880.
\textsuperscript{78} See Bates, Brighton, pp. 161, 165, 185-6.
the 'Plough and Harrow' was described as the 'new rendezvous' for the Melbourne Hounds 79 and it was still possible ten years later for Anthony Trollope to hunt at the first meeting of the Season at W.M. Bell's property at Brighton Beach. 80 If Trollope's account is true, many top rails of fences were broken, 81 good reason for the opposition of all market gardeners including the one who complained in the Southern Cross of damage to ploughed fields. 82

Clearly, the attractions of the beach and of the sandy heaths for hunting and horse-racing like the meeting advertised for Boxing Day 1874 at the 'Plough and Harrow' 83 brought outsiders to Moorabbin and, more especially, to the areas away from the market gardens, like the coast. The outsiders were often people with whom the market gardener had little in common and with whom, say in the case of the hunters, he could actually conflict. Potentially, there was conflict over the priorities of Council spending and activity - in a small budget, how much should be spent on Beach Road vis-a-vis Centre Road, for example? There was potential conflict too between those who could profit from the visitors e.g., publicans, shopkeepers, even speculative landholders and the gardener who tended to distrust those who did not live (and die) in the shire. 84 But, in 1880, these largely remained potential conflicts.

79. Argus, 19 June 1862.
80. Southern Cross, 25 May, 1 June 1872.
82. 8 June 1872.
83. Southern Cross, 19 December 1874.
84. See below p. 85; n.196
RETROSPECT:

By the end of the 'seventies, Moorabbin was a thriving gardening community; whilst issues over which interests could conflict like water supply, night-soil deposit, foreshore works and conservation, had arisen, the differences were ones that could be accommodated in the largely 'face-to-face' community. Gardening with its essential Point Nepean Road was the axis round which the various parts of Moorabbin rotated. At the start of the 'eighties, there were potentially disturbing forces, especially the differing density of settlement and the differing land use of most of the West riding compared to the North. The clearest evidence of this comes from the entries in the Ratebooks for which no name of owner is given. From the 1863 Ratebook onwards there are large parcels of land with these 'owner' entries; the names of owners can be established pretty conclusively from Titles Office records but in the local area, these unknown owners largely escaped the minimal rates and clearly held their land rather than developed it. In 1869, the Board received a return of 'unoccupied land': which corresponded to those for which the Ratebook gave no names—'only 86 acres in the North riding compared with 1907 acres in the East and 1537 acres in the West. 85

By 1880, there were still 2104 acres for which no owner's name was known, with 400 acres of a total of 723 acres in the West riding in Holloway's portions 34 and 35. 86 Admittedly, many of these areas were not as favourably placed for market gardening as those of East Brighton; nor were they as fertile but their existence without capital improvement made them potential prey for real-estate speculation in any future boom. Cutting up market gardens into villa allotments was not nearly as attractive as cutting up unimproved land and if

85. Board Minutes, 8 April 1869; Ratebook 1869.
86. Shire Ratebook 1880.
subdivision was succeeded by settlement, then a marked regional differentiation could occur, something which had not happened as a result of the speculative subdivisions of the 'fifties.

The Boards and Councils of this period had all felt the influence of the non-gardeners. Macarthy, insolvent and resigned from the Council in 1874, may well have left a legacy of bitterness which affected relations between the gardeners and the others on councils. The others were often seen as 'smart' and Macarthy's name was sometimes resurrected for timely admonition in much the same way as that of the defalcating Ostler, who, in 1881, began to refund the money taken in 1868. Alfred Harston, generously described by the Southern Cross, after his success in the 1879 election for the West against Mook, a Beaumaris gardener as 'the mainspring of the Council' was a new sort of councillor - forward-looking, shown in his strong advocacy for improvements in roads, water-supply and foreshore, and business-like in his watchful desire that council officers did their jobs. But a stronger case could be made out for Thomas Bent as the 'mainspring' of the 'seventies, when he combined his parliamentary place with an almost unblemished record of attendance at Moorabbin council meetings, and, from 1874, at Brighton Town Council. In almost all fields of the Council's operations, Bent's hand can be seen and his capacity to straddle the gardening community to the East and the city men to the

87. Council Minutes, 19 February 1874.

88. Ibid. 25 May 1881; Southern Cross, 28 May 1881. Repayment was completed in 1884 - Council Minutes, 13 August 1883, 28 January 1884. When Ostler died in August 1905, the Southern Cross did not mention the reason for his departure for America in 1868 but stated that he had returned to Australia as Professor Howard, author of 'The Art of Reckoning'. See Southern Cross 26 August 1905.

89. Southern Cross, 10 August 1878.
West, already noted by Bates for Brighton,\textsuperscript{90} applied also to Moorabbin; in fact, Bent alone was one reason for differences between areas remaining potential rather than becoming insistent. This capacity in Moorabbin is shown by an attempt to have him accept nomination for the West rather than his native North, where a very popular and highly respected gardener, William G. Burgess was nominated in 1879; Bent declined the West and won election for the North, yet again.\textsuperscript{91} Harston, by contrast, could not straddle the East and West like Bent and probably in a more limited way as Mair and Macarthy could. Harston was then a new type of Moorabbin councillor for that reason, as Mock's campaign against him suggests - Mock claimed that from long residence, he knew the roads and district better than Harston whom he considered was a 'newcomer' - in fact, Harston had already been a Moorabbin councillor for five years.\textsuperscript{92}

Early in the 'eighties, the mayor of Brighton was urged to call a meeting to press for railway extension to Picnic;\textsuperscript{93} the urging were substantial business and professional men, mostly from Brighton but Harston, David Abbott and John Matthew Smith were among the requisitioners. This project along with the line to Mordialloc were the ingredients capable of producing greater differentiation of West from North in the 'eighties but there were few who could have anticipated this; at the start of the 'eighties, Sandringham was still unnamed and a barely distinguishable part of the web that was Moorabbin.

\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Brighton}, p.246
\textsuperscript{91} \textit{Southern Cross}, 2,16 August 1879.
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{Ibid}, 3 August 1878.
\textsuperscript{93} \textit{Ibid}, 16 July 1881.
CHAPTER 3: INGREDIENTS OF A 'BOOM': THE 1880'S: I

In the 'eighties, Victoria and more especially, Melbourne underwent an enormous expansion against a backdrop of capital and population inflow. One phenomenon of this expansion was the 'land boom'; its relationships to the economy as a whole have been discussed by economic historians such as Butlin and Hall; its social dimensions in Melbourne have been recently examined by Davison; and Cannon has attempted a more popular description and analysis in The Land Boomers but its precise manifestations in the experience of a suburban society have never been fully explored.

Since the evolution of Sandringham is so bound up with the experience of the 'eighties, it is necessary to examine the ingredients of the boom and their application to Sandringham.

4. Bate, Brighton pp. 195-203; Blainey, Camberwell, c. 5 and Forster, Preston, c. 4 do give outlines of the 'boom' for their suburbs.
THE EXTENT and NATURE of SUBDIVISIONS:

The name 'Sandringham' with its connotations of Royal Family holidays was first used when Portion 22, the area on the coast surrounding the present Sandringham station was subdivided and sold on 12 March 1881. This block of nearly 70 acres had remained in the hands of the Crown purchaser, Samuel Jackson until his death in 1876, and in July 1878, when his daughter sold it to Roger Leech, a land agent, it was fenced and known as 'Fernhill', but otherwise unused. In the 'eighties, it was the most subdivided section of Moorabbin and with the building of the railway, it became the hub of Sandringham, usurping its neighbouring portion, 'Gipsy Village' as the name of the district and also as the service core for that part of the Moorabbin coastline.

5. Southern Cross, 12 March 1881.
6. T.O. Search Note 11332 E.
7. Southern Cross, 22 June 1878. Council Ratebook 1879, Entry 822 Leech had 56 acres left from his subdivision; most of the rest had been sold to David Abbott.
MAJOR LANDSALES IN PORTIONS OF PRESENT-DAY SANDRINGHAM IN THE 1880s.

[Estates rarely covered whole Crown portions but positions of names are suggestive of locations within portion]
Subdivisions and sales of land in the period between the end of the 'fifties and the start of the 'eighties had generally been of fairly large lots. Delgety's subdivision of Portion 48, an area of 289 acres, into 33 lots, most of which were around 10 acres, was fairly typical.\(^8\) Admittedly, 'Delgety's Paddock', as Portion 48 was known was remote from the villages but when C.J. and T. Ham subdivided the less remote Portion 5 and 6 in the same year, as 'Bay View Estate', the 63 blocks were roughly one acre each.\(^9\)

In the 'eighties, there was a great change in tempo and in the nature of land sales in Moorabbin. In some ways, these sales recalled the fruitless subdivisions of the 'fifties but they were much more clearly related to real service improvements in the area than were those of the 'fifties; now, it was not just talk of a railway but an actual railway, or tramway, which was necessary to 'boom' land successfully. Where services were merely talked about, then the subdivisional sales could easily fail.

Until the end of 1885, the areas subdivided (see Map 4) may be clearly linked to the actual railway line from Caulfield to Mordialloc or the double line to Brighton Beach and the planned extension to Picnic Point (Sandringham). Towards the coast, the subdivision and re-subdivision in Portions 5 and 6 known first as 'Bay View Estate' and later as 'Roccaccio Park', 'Linnacre Park' in parts of Portions 10 and 11, 'Linnacre Park Extension' in part of Portion 10, 'Sandringham' in Portion 22 and 'Sandringham Extension' in Portion 24 were all able

---

8. T.O. Search Note 9573; S.P. Simmonds, Plan Book, folio 62 plan of the subdivision dated 13 March 1876. (Melbourne University Archives) The 1877 Council Ratebook shows that the chief purchasers were F.A. Etheridge, the Cheltenham publican, 52 acres and W.F. A. Rucker, 'investor', 63 acres but James Monk and George Mock were gardener buyers. See also sale of T.J. Thomas's land comprising all of Portion 32 on 1 February 1876 in Ibid. f.63.

9. Ibid. f.58. These two portions had passed to Roger Leech in 1873 and 1874 - see T.O. Search Notes 10749, 5762.
to claim benefits from an actual projected government railway connection. Inland, along the Mordialloc Line, a series of subdivisions could claim an actual rail connection from the end of 1881. 'East Brighton Park', 'Railway Park', McKinnon Road, 'South Brighton Village Estate', 'Fern Villa' later 'Highett Town', 'Tibrockney', 'Cheltenham Railway Estate', 'Mentone' and a number at Mordialloc.

In the period after 1885, (see Map 4) whilst subdivision and re-subdivision continued in some of the parts already mentioned – notably 'Orlando Estate', 'Bolton Park', 'Hampton Park', 'Trafalgar Estate', 'Picnic Point Park', 'Osborne Park' and further subdivisions of 'Sandringham', there was also greater activity outside. Many of these – 'Beaumaris Park', 'Charman Estate', 'Glebe Estate' and 'Sandringham Rises' (or 'Picnic Heights') may be firmly linked to proposed, in some cases constructed, tramways. Indeed, of the major subdivisions in the Moorabbin district, it would be fair to argue that only in the cases of the first 'Black Rock' sale and 'Saratoga' was there no railway or tramway mooted at the time the lands were sold.

Not only were the sales of the major subdivisions clearly related to a proposed or developing transport network but they were almost entirely outside the portions subdivided in the 'fifties. Subdivision rarely took place in land which had been intensively cultivated – a notable exception was 'Fern Villa' in 1884 where a considerable

10. For plans and details of sales, I have drawn on the S.P. Simonds' papers (Melbourne University Archives), the Vale Collection of Plans (La Trobe Library) and the advertisement and results of sales columns of the Age, the Argus and the Brighton Southern Cross for the period of the 'eighties. Of these sources, the Simonds' collection is the most useful; it comprises practically all the plans of sales and results in Brighton and Moorabbin in the 'eighties.
12. See below p.100-104
13. 21 March 1885 see Simonds Plan Book f.76.
14. 20 March 1886 see Ibid. f.74.
15. 15 March 1884 in Ibid. Brighton Box 1.
area had 'fruit trees in full bearing'. Sales of land according to the old plans of the 'fifties boomed too in the 'eighties but clearly the most attractive land for the 'eighties developers was the large tract surviving virtually intact as was the case with Portion 22.

Land sales in Moorebbin received little check from the tighter money market in 1886; in fact, there was a steady progression of subdivisions through the 'eighties with a high boom in 1888 when no fewer than 13 subdivisions, mostly of land not previously cut up, were made. That there was plenty more land waiting to be subdivided while the market lasted is clear from the Ratebook, which in 1889, shows more than 1400 acres in the West and South ridings held by land companies.  

16. The West riding was subdivided to form West and South ridings in 1888.
RAILWAYS:

To the subdivider, the railway was always an important factor affecting his capacity to sell and the price he could obtain. As an editorial in the Times, a Melbourne boomers' newspaper, concluded, after comparing prices at Hawkesburn before and after railway construction there was a very practical and profitable lesson, which is that if you want to acquire land or invest money in the most profitable manner, known as well to Melbourne citizens as to country folks with small capital, it is imperative to choose your land right in the locality to which a railway is certain to be constructed at a very near date. This is an axiom that every investor in land should fix on his heart and in his mind.

In Parliament in the early 'eighties, a majority of members seem to have supported the notion that railways should precede, and thereby promote, settlement; the justification for a new railway was that it would bring in a future return rather than serve a present need. As one member put it in the 1882 debate on the proposed railway from Brighton to Cheltenham:

Wherever lines had been extended to any of the suburbs eight or ten miles from Melbourne, villa residences had sprung up in all directions, and he believed that, if the present railway was constructed, the same result would follow.

To the majority of members, it was not necessary to calculate precisely the needs and the likely returns that railway extension would bring and

17. Times (Melbourne), 27 June 1885; the La Trobe Library holds most copies of this four-pager, usually bi-weekly paper for the period 18 October 1884 to 2 October 1886. The numbering of the issues is most irregular but it was probably first printed in October 1883. See below p.128 for discussion of its place in the 'boom'.

18. Emphasis is original.

Graham Berry spoke for a minority when he complained that:
no proper statements as to the probable traffic
and the revenue which would be earned by the line had been submitted.

Also in the minority for this particular railway was James Munro, then member for North Melbourne, who argued that 'there were only a few scattered dwellings between Brighton and Cheltenham' and that members 'would certainly not sanction this line' if they 'had a desire to deal with the Bill in a business manner, with the object of seeing that public money was expended on railways that were required'.

Speakers for the Bill like W. Madden, the Minister for Lands, argued that 'the present marine suburbs were too crowded and it was desirable to induce the people to go further away'; he outlined a further reason:
he had been informed that a considerable area had recently been purchased by a syndicate of capitalists who intended dividing it into villa sites, and contracts to the extent of nearly £20,000 had been, or would be within the next month, let for the erection of marine residences.

Berry's interjection that this was 'a good reason why the line should not be passed' and Alfred Deakin's argument that 'the business of the committee was to supply the wants of the people; the capitalists could look after themselves' logically demolished Madden's point but theirs was a minority view. Thomas Bent, the local member and currently Minister for Railways in the O'Loghlan ministry, replying

---

20. A.D.B. III, pp.151-6
22. For Munro's part in the 'boom' see Cannon, Land Boomers esp. ch. 12
23. V.P.O. 1882, p.1118; see also Langridge p.1119.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid. - presumably a reference to the Mentone syndicates.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
to Deakin, took up the position that 'the market gardeners had as much right to a railway' as selectors in the Country but as J.B. Patterson, the member for Castlemaine, pointed out:

The market gardener would continue to do as he had hitherto done - put his produce into his cart and bring it to the Melbourne market by road, and stay with it till it was sold.

The discussion of the Chaltenham and Brighton proposed line became the test for the rest of Bent's 1882 Bill and the large majority for it - 41 to 21 - suggests not only that members saw railways as promoting the future rather than serving the present but also that there were a large number of members interested in the success of other parts of the Bill. It is difficult to escape the impression of considerable 'log-rolling' despite Premier Sir Brian O'Loughlan's statement that 'every honorable member was perfectly untrammeled as to the way in which he should vote in regard to any line'. In the discussion of this line, Bent's persistent advocacy of the interests of his electorate since his arrival in parliament made his position sensitive especially if, as Sir John O'Shaassy bitterly urged: 'the railway policy of the country should embrace a higher and more truly public object' than that 'of enabling people to go a little further along the Brighton coast than they could go now'.

Bent's administration of the railways helped defeat the O'Loughlan ministry at the 1883 elections but Gillies' 1884 Act included practically all of Bent's lines and the grandiose Outer Circle, affirming the willing and active collusion of a house of 'boomers' in matters of

28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., pp.1125-6. See also comment by Zox. Toynbon's view in 1856 - see above p.63 - still held.
30. Ibid. p.1128.
31. Ibid. p.1121
railway construction rather than any narrow localism. It was thus in a parliament that apparently espoused the idea that all areas were entitled to be connected that the lines from Caulfield to Mordialloc and from Brighton to Picnic Point were proposed and accepted. As Davison has shown, Brighton certainly used its railway in 1881 when there were 178 outward train journeys per unit of suburban population, the highest use rate of all suburbs except Hawthorn but whether this meant that a line to Picnic Point would pay or whether contemporaries realised this high rate of use was never brought out.

When Gemmell, Tuckett advertised 'Sandringham' in March 1881, they stated bluntly: 'Railway extension to the point fully contemplated and may be regarded a certainty'. The first recorded local moves for that extension followed soon after when a group of substantial Brighton and Moorabbin coast residents requested the Brighton Mayor to call a public meeting to urge railway extension to Picnic Point. Significantly, the group included Thomas Crisp, a city solicitor and prominent speculator in the area; David Abbott a city solicitor who had recently built 'Coggeshall' in Beach Road, adjacent to his holdings in portion 22; Arthur Wastab, the agent for Wera's Brighton land and J.M. Smith, the owner of vast areas in the northern parts of the West riding since the 'fifties. Shortly afterwards, Wastab and Son could claim that some lots they had for sale in 'Gipsy Village' were 'in the Direct Line of the Projected Extension of the Railway' but in spite of the certainty of the route implied by this advertisement,

32. See Davison, AEHR, X,2, pp.175-179 for discussion of this and other points.
33. 44 Vic. No. 682.
34. 48 Vic. No. 821.
35. Davison, AEHR, X,2, p.177.
36. Southern Cross, 12 March 1881.
37. Ibid, 16 July 1881.
38. Sutherland, Victoria and its Metropolis, II, p.510
39. Age, 13 August 1881.
the Assembly debates in 1882 clearly indicated that no route had been decided or even the terminus. There was, in fact, strong support for the continuation of the line closer to Mordialloc on various pretexts; that people were prepared to spend money at Beaumaris; that it would be 'extremely useful' to have a further link with Mordialloc 'especially for the conveyance of troops to encounter any foe that might invade the colony'; and that 'it would afford facilities for the conveyance of dead bodies from Prahran, St Kilda and Brighton to the proposed new cemetery at Frankston'. After the Assembly decided that the terminus would be Picnic Point, a local committee was formed to decide on a route and to urge the government to continue the line to Cheltenham. Alfred Harston, the prime force behind a meeting organized at the Gipsy Village school-house, urged on the local community the fact that the railway would increase land values which would enable the shire to collect more rates and therefore to build better roads. This argument apparently appealed to most resident land-holders including local gardeners like George Mack and Charles Allen, who were on the local committee.

Late in 1882, the opening of the double line to Brighton Beach eclipsed the Picnic Point extension as a motive force for subdivision. The sales in the north-western sections of Moorabbin especially in Portions 2, 5 and 6 of 'Glan-y-Mor' and 'Boccaccio Park' (formerly 'Bay View') were clearly associated with the double line which, as the Southern Cross pointed out, allowed trains at less than twenty

40. W. Madden in V.P.D., 20 July 1882, p. 1125.
41. Duffy in Ibid., p. 1119.
42. Harris in Ibid., p. 1123.
43. Southern Cross, 12 August 1882.
44. Ibid.
45. Simmonds' Plan Book f. 12, 16 December 1882.
46. Ibid., f. 58 – 23 September 1882.
minute intervals. The duplication and the increase from 24 trains per week-day to 34 were the work of the local member, then Minister for Railways.

The local agitation for the Picnic Point railway was replaced for a time by a proposal to the Council from a group led by Thomas Crisp, to build a tramway from Brighton Beach to Picnic Point. This tram, according to the Southern Cross, would 'prove an incalculable boon, not only to the residents, but to the general public and families who could then make the Point, the most charming spot on the whole line of beach, a place of daily resort'; the Council received it favourably too and agreed to wait upon the Commissioner of Public Works. This new proposal was used by Thomas Crisp in his 'Linacre Park' subdivisions of the summer of 1883-4 and also by Charles Henry James in his re-subdivision of much of 'Sandringham' in November 1884 which showed a 'proposed tramway' running along the Esplanade from Brighton Beach. The railway proposal was still used by Crisp, when he acclaimed with finality 'that the proposed RAILWAY EXTENSION will run through the least elevated portion of "Linacre Park"' but whilst James mentioned the railway extension, he did not hazard a guess at the route.

By the start of 1885, there had been four years of sales talk but no train or tram had eventuated in the coastal portions, and even when 'Sandringham Extension' was advertised as 'RIGHT OPPOSITE THE

47. Southern Cross, 23 September 1882.
49. Council Minutes, 17 December 1883.
50. 1 December 1883.
51. Council Minutes, 17 December 1883.
52. 'A line of trams will pass in front of the property ...' in an advertisement in Simmonds Plan Book, f.56 - 8 December 1883. See also Age, 2 February 1884.
53. Simmonds Plans, Loose, 15 November 1884.
54. Age, 2 February 1884.
Railway Terminus of the BRIGHTON EXTENSION, the route was still not finalised. After the passing of the 1884 Railways Construction Act, local agitation for the Picnic Point line re-appeared. In May 1885, a strong deputation of local landholders comprising Derbin Willard, David Abbott, Alfred Harston, Charles Bradley, J.P. Brown, C.H. James, Harold Sparks and Thomas Crisp, all 'City gentlemen' and Charles Allen, a West riding Councillor and leading gardener, was appointed after a meeting at the 'Duke of Edinburgh' to press for work to begin. A fortnight later, the Cross reported that work would be started as soon as possible.

An attempt to put the line between the road and the beach aroused strong opposition but eventually, it was resolved to take the present route east of Beach Road, thereby incurring greater expense. The construction contract was not let till the following year; with the actual line being laid, David Abbott wrote hopefully to the Railways Commissioners seeking a special train to Picnic Point on the day of his sale of lots in 'Gipsy Village' and 'Sandringham' on 27 November 1885 but the line was not opened until almost a year later.

55. Ibid. 14 February 1885; capitals in original. 56. Ratebook 1885, Nos. 737, 738. 57. Southern Cross, 2 May 1885. 58. 16 May 1885. 59. Ibid. 18 July 1885. 60. V.P.D. 1885 Dent and Gillies, p. 552. 61. Southern Cross, 8 May 1886. 62. Railways, Register of Correspondence, Inwards 1886/10833 letter dated 27 October 1886. The letter itself is not extant; very few railways letters for this period have survived (V.-S.A.) 63. Southern Cross, 3 September 1887.
when a large crowd heard no fewer than 18 speeches, including a number from local parliamentary representatives and local councillors.

When the train did run, six years after its first appearance in the auctioneers' advertisements, there were 22 per day which meant that roughly half the Brighton trains connected with the single line to Sandringham, as it was now called. The fares were appreciably higher than those to Brighton Beach where a 2nd. class return was ninepence as against a shilling for Hampton and Sandringham. Compared with the booming railway to the eastern suburbs, it was much less frequent and more expensive: Camberwell, for example, had 67 trains per week-day with the 2nd return at 7½d. and one could go east as far as Box Hill for the 9d. return which applied at Brighton. The Sandringham extension was not then, in 1887, a service designed to move large numbers of commuters offering cheap fares and frequent service; nor could it, while there was only a single line.

On the Mordialloc line, land sales close to the stations occurred in the 'eighties but the infrequency of service and the high fares contrasted sharply with the Brighton, and later, Sandringham line. When it was opened in December 1881, it had four trains per week-day with the 2nd. class return to Mordialloc and Mentone at 2/3, and no Sunday trains; it was, in fact, a 'country line'. After the first sales at 'Mentone' there was local pressure to improve the service and to bring the line within the suburban radius but the line was

---

64. Bradshaw's Guide, September 1887.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid.
68. 5 May 1883. Plan in Simmonds, Box, Other.
69. Southern Cross, 29 September, 13 October 1883; Council Minutes, 8 October 1883.
still pretty much a rural one in 1885 when there were still only ten trains per week-day and when a 2nd. class return to Mordialloc was 2/6. One concession which suggests the official view that it was a 'resort line' was the special seaside one month return of 2/- to Mordialloc. 70

By the time the Sandringham line was opened in 1887, the 2nd. class return to Mordialloc was down to 1/7½ 71 still well in excess of the 1/- of its new competitor. By 1890, there were 18 trains per week-day but, of these, only two left Mordialloc in time to reach the city by 9 a.m., compared to four out of twenty-two from Sandringham. 72

The increased traffic on the Mordialloc line was possible after duplication in 1888.

Through the 'eighties, various proposals for further extensions, usually involving some sort of link between Sandringham and the Mordialloc line and sometimes with the Gippsland line at Dandenong were discussed. 73 In fact, a line connecting Sandringham with Cheltenham was reported upon by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Railways under Bent's chairmanship in 1891 74 but consideration of this line was postponed the following year when new construction was curtailed. 75

For most of the 'eighties, the Mordialloc line was a country service and the Picnic Point line was coming; the fares remained high and the services infrequent compared with many other 'boom' suburbs. Thus the railways acted to make Moorabbin land attractive more for land speculation than for building speculation, more attractive for visitors than for residents.

70. Bradshaw’s Guide, January 1885
71. Ibid. August 1887.
72. Ibid. 1 January 1890
73. Southern Cross, 21 April 1888.
74. V.P.P., 1891 v.2 Parliamentary Standing Committee on Railways, First General Report.
75. Ibid. 1892/3 v.2. Parliamentary Standing Committee on Railways, Second General Report.
TRAMWAYS:

If the developing suburban railway system of the 'eighties served to link outer areas more strongly to the metropolis, then the tramways tended to intensify development in the inner areas. The spectacular early growth and success of the Melbourne Tramway and Omnibus Company aroused enormous interest amongst municipalities not included within its scope and amongst landholders looking for a means of 'booming' their land. Despite high hopes that the central system would reach them, Brighton and Moorabbin remained remote from it; in fact, as the trams pushed outwards into the areas served by the railway, their profitability dropped sharply and the slump in the 'nineties came well before Brighton had come within their scope. In Moorabbin, then, the tram's function was to provide an additional and varied transport service.

A tram from Brighton Beach to serve the coastal sections had been proposed when the Picnic Point railway was in abeyance but once the railway proposal was firm, the Moorabbin Council, on the motion of Bent and Abbott, agreed 'that permission be granted to any bona fide company that will construct a tramway from the termination of the proposed Picnic line towards Mordialloc.' In September, they received an application to construct such a tramway from Charles Henry James, one of the largest 'boomers' both in Moorabbin and elsewhere, and after discussions between James and a committee of the Council, Bent was able to report the terms of a proposed agreement: James was to be given a 21 year lease of the tramway in return for bearing the costs of construction and application; in addition, the Council was to approve the scale of tolls and charges. Three connected sections along the Beach Road were scheduled: the first from Bay Road to Balcombe Road.

77. See above p. 96
78. Council Minutes, 20 July 1885.
to be completed within nine months of obtaining the order; the second from Balcombe Road to Cromer Road within eighteen months; and the third from Cromer Road to Mordialloc within three years. A year later, no tramway had been built, and in advertising further sales of his 'Black Rock Estate', James had made no further mention of it, thereby giving some credence to the belief that he did not intend to build, which was often raised in later disputes over the tram.

But late in 1886, James transferred his rights to the Beaumaris Tramway Company registered in December, 81 with himself as the main subscriber, the others being David Munro, Brighton resident and leading railway contractor, 82 John F. Hamilton, solicitor and at the time, 83 Harold Spinks, James's managing clerk, 84 George Sutton, an owner of land served by the route, 85 Robert Walker, a leading auctioneer and major subscriber to the Saratoga Land Company and its successor, the Union Property Investment Company 86 which had extensive land in the southern coastal area of Moorabbin, and George Thomas Langridge, a leading auctioneer.

When the company applied to the Council to construct a tram in three sections: the first from Cheltenham station to Rickett's Point; the second, from near Sandringham station to Rickett's Point; and the third to join the system to Mordialloc, 87 (see Map 5) the Southern Cross predicted:

79. Ibid., 5 October 1885.
80. 3,17,24 July 1886 - advertisements in Simmonds' Plan Book f.76; Times, 10 July 1886.
81. Defunct Company Bag No.1075(V.-S.A.)
82. Rate, Brighton p.250; Cannon, Land Boomers p.106.
83. Rate, Brighton p.250; Sutherland, Victoria &c. II p.520.
84. Discussed below pp.130-141, 144-145.
85. Shire Ratebook 1886, Entry No.1579 - 12½ acres, Lots 1 & 2 Dalgety's Paddock.
86. Defunct Company Bags 977 and 1101.
87. Council Minutes, 13 December 1886.
TRAMWAYS IN THE 'BOOM

--- Beaumaris Horse Tramway: built.

---------------- Beaumaris Horse Tramway: proposed.

--- Union proposed route.

It is not clear how the trams were to operate in the shared section in Balcombe Road. Tramway Reserve was then known as Beaumaris Parade.

George Street is now cut by golf links and does not join Bay Road to Balcombe Road.
'a new era in the history of Moorabbin' arguing that the extension of the Brighton Beach Railway to Picnic Point will remove a few of the difficulties of transit which, in common with all sparsely settled localities, the district has experienced; the Beaumaris Tramway will do the rest.\textsuperscript{88}

The Beaumaris Tramway Company became embroiled in local 'boom' politics\textsuperscript{89} and the first section from Cheltenham station to Rickett's Point was not opened until January 1888.\textsuperscript{90} Clearly the timing of sales of estates in Charman Road like the 'Glebe'\textsuperscript{91} and 'Beaumaris Park' sales on Moysey's old farm in Portion 49B in April and November 1888\textsuperscript{92} were closely related to the opening of this section of the tramway. James's original agreement with the council had not contained this section from Cheltenham to Rickett's Point and the council only accepted it after acrimonious discussions in April 1887.\textsuperscript{93} It would seem likely from the location of land held by the major subscribers to the Beaumaris Tramway Company that this section was included to link that land by the shortest and therefore cheapest route to a railway; since Cheltenham was very much closer than Sandringham, this section was included in the plan and also built first.

It is impossible to prove conclusively that the reason for the change in plans was the location of shareholders' land partly because many of James's land transactions in the late 'eighties were conducted through 'dummies' and 'dummy companies'. In the case of 'Beaumaris Park', for example, James had clearly bought Moysey's land in 1884.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{88} 11 December, 1886.
\textsuperscript{89} See below pp.187-197
\textsuperscript{90} Southern Cross, 14 January 1888.
\textsuperscript{91} 21 January 1888 in Simmonds' Plans.
\textsuperscript{92} A series of sales in Simmonds' Plans.
\textsuperscript{93} Council Minutes, 4 April 1887.
\textsuperscript{94} Southern Cross, 17 February 1883, advertisement for sale; 1884 Shire Ratebook Entry No. 1105 suggests that the land was still owned by Moysey but T.O. Search Note 18505 shows sale, 17 April 1884 to James and Dobson and Shire Ratebook 1885, Entry No.1107 shows C.H.James 80 acres as owner.
he also owned Portion 49A by 1885 but the sales in 1888 were on behalf of the Beaumaris Park Company formed in April 1888. James was not listed as a subscriber but the direction of the company's sales was largely in the hands of Harold Sparks. The public documents filed by the company suggest that James sold his land to a syndicate of investors, the Beaumaris Park Company, including Thomas Lincoln and Henry Byron Moore as well as Sparks, his managing clerk and, for this transaction, possibly his 'dummy'.

Under strong pressure from the Council, the second section from Rickett's Point to Sandringham was opened in February 1889 but the final section to link Mordialloc along the coast was never built. Thus the great new era predicted by the Southern Cross never really dawned as the horse tram staggered through the 'nineties, but certainly the Beaumaris tram constituted a significant ingredient in the boom of the eighties.

Late in 1887, the Union Land Company was also given power 'to construct tram lines subject to the conditions of the Council'. Its proposed routes were originally to link Sandringham with Mentone using Bay Road, Bluff Road or George Street and Balcombe Road but final approval was given for three routes: (see Map 5) the first, connecting the Mentone station with the beach and the newly established racecourse; the second, connecting Mentone with the beach at Rickett's Point using Balcombe Road and Reserve Road; and the third connecting Mentone with Sandringham using Balcombe Road, Reserve Road, George

95. Shire Ratebook 1885, Entry No.1109.
96. Defunct Company Bag 1299.
97. Third.
98. The evidence does not clearly show that Sparks was a 'dummy' in the Beaumaris Park syndicate—see below p.135
99. Southern Cross, 16 February 1889.
100. Council Minutes, 28 November 1887.
1. Ibid., 19 December 1887.
2. Ibid., 25 June 1888.
Street and Bay Road and an agreement was signed in August 1888. The Union Property Investment Company was registered in March 1887 and took over the large land holdings in the areas which its routes would serve from the Saratoga Land Company, formed in December 1885 and wound up in January 1887. Principal among the shareholders and subscribers in both these companies were Robert Walker, Robert Kingston and Edward Dyer, all of whom were large shareholders in the Beaumaris Tramway Company. Dyer was also a large shareholder in the Mentone, Cheltenham and Mordialloc Gas Company, the Mentone Hotel Company, and the Mentone Racing Club. In June 1888, the Union Property Investment Company was voluntarily wound up but a new company, the Union Property Tramway and Investment Company had been registered in April with Robert Walker among the chief subscribers and it was with this last company that the Council finally signed an agreement in the high 'boom' of 1888; in the ensuing slump in land prices, no Union lines were ever built.

The combined plans of the Union and the Beaumaris companies would have provided a network of lines linking the two railways at Cheltenham, Mentone and Mordialloc with tram connection in most parts of the southern sections of present-day Sandringham. Such a system would not have attracted commuters because trams were slow compared to trains; if the lines were at all practical there was an obvious emphasis on catering for visitors to the beach or the racecourse but their major purpose may well have been to promote land sales rather than carry passengers.

3. Ibid., 20 August 1888.
5. Defunct Company Bag 977.
6. Ibid.
WATER SUPPLY:

Water supply was an important ingredient if building and increasing population density were to follow land sales. In the 'eighties, there were few areas for which sellers could claim 'the Yan Yean [water supply] laid on to the ground'.¹² and these areas were concentrated in the coastal sections between Brighton Beach and Sandringham. Further east, there was a stand-pipe at the 'Plough and Harrow' and there were a number of stand-pipes east of Brighton in Moorabbin's North riding. Gardeners wanted assured domestic supplies and were not so much concerned to irrigate summer crops. For the rest of Moorabbin, tanks and springs were used but there was increasing demand for more permanent supplies for the townships of Cheltenham, Mentone and Mordialloc. This led to a series of drillings at Mordialloc by the Mines Department for underground water in 1888-90 with the sixth bore finding water at 198 feet which rose to the surface and which, with pumping, could be delivered at 2,700 gallons per hour.¹³

The demand also gave birth to a joint investigation in June 1889 with the Oakleigh and Dandenong Councils of the possibility of supply from a dam at Ferntree Gully.¹⁴ Four months later, delegates from Dandenong, Oakleigh, Moorabbin and Mornington conferred on a scheme to cost £40,000 of which Moorabbin's share was to be more than half.¹⁵

At the time, the colony was encouraging water conservation and irrigation by assisting local areas and John Keys, to whom the scheme had enormous importance in both his Dandenong and Moorabbin positions, claimed that Alfred Deakin had stated that a 'trust' would be lent £40,000 for three years without interest.¹⁶ As proposed public

---

12. 'Sandringham' in Age, 12 March 1881.
14. Council Minutes, 10 June 1889; Southern Cross, 15 June 1889; Cheltenham Leader, 15 June 1889.
15. Cheltenham Leader, 19 October 1889.
16. Ibid.
spending conducive to land sales in the area, it had come too late, and in Moorabbin, Bent was not alone when he claimed that the scheme was to provide Dandenong water at Moorabbin's expense. On the other hand, the scheme would have brought water to vast areas of the shire; if that could be done cheaply, there was little reason for opposition and the Council solidly supported an application to form a water trust with Oakleigh, Dandenong and Mornington. By the time the trust was formed early the next year, the projected cost had risen to £61,000 and shortly after, the Yan Yean was further extended into Sandringham. The cost, especially to ratepayers who did not want it, and the promises of further extensions of the Yan Yean were good reasons why 'Dandenong was left alone in the field' by 1891, when the land boom was dead and pest revival.

17. Ibid., 7 December 1889.
18. Council Minutes, 23 December 1889; Cheltenham Leader 28 December 1889.
19. Council Minutes, 10 March 1890.
20. Southern Cross, 12 April 1890.
21. Ibid, 14 June 1890.
22. Dandenong Express, 30 September 1891.
Parts of Moorabbin were served by gas in the late 'eighties; this was partly due to the formation by Bent in 1885 of the Central Brighton and Moorabbin Gas Company, whose vigorous competitive expansion brought a price war with the older Brighton Gas Company, founded in 1877 which resulted in considerable expansion as well as amalgamation in 1888. Bent had applied to lay pipes in Moorabbin for the new company in 1886 and extensions were made into Sandringham in 1888 when the Council agreed to erect six lamp posts between Brighton Beach and Sandringham. The Mentone promoters formed the Mentone, Cheltenham and Nordialloc Gas Company in 1888 which by the end of the year, had 7½ miles of mains and early the next year opened their works at Mentone. The company crashed with the other Mentone enterprises and the works were finally bought by the Council in 1900.

23. Fate, Brighton, pp.208-211.
25. Ibid., 27 February 1888.
27. Cheltenham Leader, 8 December 1888.
28. Southern Cross, 16 March 1889.
29. Council Minutes, 20 November 1899, 22 January 1900; Southern Cross, 6 January 1900; Cheltenham Leader, 6 January 1900.
PUBLIC HEALTH:

In the 'eighties, the land advertisements reflected the prevailing beliefs about health. Lots near the coast were especially favoured because there, one could 'drink in draughts of the purest ozone, and enjoy unbroken slumber' presumably rejoicing in the fact that 'families reared within sound of the breaking waves are possessed of more energy, determination and hardihood than those raised at inland places'.

Show us the man who lives within the sound of the surge and he needs no surgery; show us the man who loves the surf and he never gets a surfeit of it. Punned a later editorial boosting Black Rock. By contrast, in Melbourne, the Times later urged:

the ozone driven over the city by the southern gales, is so vitiated by the exhalations of the city effluvia, that its best properties are exhausted before it reaches the writhing patient on the hospital wards.

Elevation, implying good drainage and therefore health was often emphasized - sometimes in a name like 'Picnic Heights' or 'Sandringham Rises' and frequently in description as in "Linscoe Park" is the most elevated and picturesque land at Brighton.

If before the 'eighties, Moorabbin was relatively free from miasmatic 'exhalations of the city effluvia', there was a considerable

---

31. Ibid., 21 July 1886.
32. See also advertisements for 'Sandringham' in Age, 12 March 1881 and 'lots at Picnic Point' in Ibid., 21 May 1887.
33. 21 July 1886.
34. Actually the same estate in Portion 36 - sales: 8 January 1887, 6 October 1888.
35. Simmonds Plan Book f.58 - 8 December 1883.
struggle to maintain this in the 'eighties and for those selling land, it was a struggle in which they willingly engaged. Even before the Times expounded on the health of the district, the Southern Cross had warned that night-soil was 'said upon the very best authority, to be the most effective means of conveyance for every description of contagious disease subject to man'.

Dr. Woolhouse, the Moorabbin health officer thought that typhoid in particular was coming into the district in the night-soil but significantly he also stated that 'people will not come to live in our neighbourhood where such fearful smells exist, which would result in the depreciation of property values. It was in this atmosphere of typhoid scares and threat to property values and sales that the Council moved to regulate the flow of night-soil into Moorabbin.

In 1884, Henry Comport could count on the support of most of his fellow councillors at least in seeking joint action from surrounding municipalities. Under Moorabbin sponsorship, a conference of representatives from Brighton, Moorabbin, Malvern, Oakleigh, Nunawading, Bulleen and Heidelberg was called but they rejected a motion which sought that all councils represented should appoint the hours of ten o'clock p.m. and 12 o'clock midnight between which night-soil can be carried on or deposited in the respective municipalities and the Moorabbin Council rejected a similar motion later in the year.

Opponents of the motion like William Ward argued that it would be prohibitive to night-soil entry and thus many market gardeners would be deprived of much of their livelihood.

36. 26 July 1884.
37. Southern Cross, 14 July 1883.
38. Ibid.
40. Ibid., 25 January 1885.
41. Ibid., 17 August 1885; Southern Cross, 27 August 1885.
42. Ibid.
Comport's persistent efforts to regulate entry brought forth a new claim of jealousy on the part of Cheltenham because they were unable to get night-soil but in December 1885, the Council finally agreed to prevent the night-carts on the shire's roads except between midnight and 6 a.m. in the cooler months and between midnight and 5 a.m. in the warmer months. They also passed a bye-law to regulate deposit. But for many people, regulations which hid the carts in the night and ruled on the depth and times of trenching were not enough. Dr. Simons of Brighton claimed that several cases of typhoid in East Brighton were 'traceable to the presence of night-soil.' Comport continued to initiate discussion of what he called 'the present increasing obnoxious disgusting and dangerous use of nightsoil in the shire' thereby evoking Ward's remark that:

in view of Councillor Comport's *rabid (sic) antipathy to night-soil, and the use thereof under any circumstance or condition he did wonder that Councillor Comport did not abstain from making any.

By 1887, Ward was the only councillor who did not see night-soil as a problem; the rest of the council could agree that a conference was necessary even if they disagreed about solutions. As the Cheltenham Leader saw it, Moorabbin's contaminated air 'undoubtedly hinders settlement and depreciates the value of suburban property from a builder's and residential point of view' and in a Melbourne, made

---

43. Ibid. 10 October 1885.
44. Council Minutes, 21 December 1885.
45. Ibid.
46. Southern Cross, 6 March 1886; Ward denied Simons’s statements — see Ibid. 20 March 1886; Simons replied further — Ibid. 3 April 1886.
47. Council Minutes, 17 January 1887 — see also Southern Cross, 18 September 1886.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid. 3 July 1887; Cheltenham Leader, 23 July 1887.
50. 10 September 1887.
increasingly aware of its lack of sewerage by the persistence of typhoid, the Central Board of Health's belief that to defeat typhoid, 'a war must be unremittingly waged against decomposing refuse and the reckless diffusion of night-soil' was pretty unanswerable, except for Ward.  

But in Moorabbin there were substantial tactical problems in waging war on night-soil; one was that it was welcomed and used by numbers of gardeners especially in the North riding and in areas served by the iron trams on the roads and the other was the huge volume which the inner areas had to dispose of — by 1889, most of the collections in Melbourne, South Melbourne, St Kilda, Prahran and North Melbourne and some from Richmond found its way to Brighton or Moorabbin. The problem was not one which Moorabbin could tackle on its own but it was very difficult to get fellow councils to arrive at a mutual policy necessary if the problem was to be solved. The joint efforts on night-soil and on water supply made by Moorabbin provide good reasons why the formation of an intermunicipal body like the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works was so protracted.

Within Moorabbin, 'night-soil outrages', usually a failing to cover at the time of deposit or worse, a 'dumping' on the road, were deplored, and the Council was concerned to prevent them but vigorous Council action required a thorough inspector of nuisances to see that regulations were enforced. By the end of the 'eighties, Moorabbin could draw little

53. *e.g.*, *Cheltenham Leader*, 1 September 1888; *Southern Cross*, 7 September 1889.
hope from the recommendations of Dr. Cresswell that the double pan
system and disinfectant be used. Their roads would still be choked
with night-carts and some of its acres would be depots until Melbourne
was sewer; those with land to sell had to contend with Moorabbin's
stinking reputation in spite of their efforts.

55. V.P.D. 1890 v.4, Report on the Sanitary Condition and Sanitary
Administration of Melbourne and Suburbs.
'A WATERING PLACE':

There were few Sandringham estates that could not claim, at sale
time, 'a grand PANORAMIC VIEW of Hobson's Bay, Williamstown, You Yangs,
Frankston, Schnapper Point', \(^{56}\) at the very least; that the view
disappeared when others came to share it is abundantly clear in the
present suburb.

Sellers in the coastal portions in the 'eighties could make
aesthetic overtures to buyers on that 'charm about the seaside which
defies description' and which made 'the possession of a seaside residence
in some romantic rocky nook of Hobson's Bay ... the ardent desire of
every man who has accumulated a moderate fortune on the scalding plains
of the up-country districts.' \(^{57}\) The attractions of the beach were
realistic inducements; by the 'eighties, it was appropriate to conjure
up visions of a 'fashionable watering place'; Thomas Crisp's claim for
his 'Linacre Park' 'that for all time Brighton must be the FASHIONABLE
WATERING PLACE' \(^{58}\) was typically exaggerated but was surpassed by the
claim in 1887 that Picnic Point 'Bids Fair to Equal St. Kilda as an
Aristocratic and Popular Residential District and Holiday Resort ...' \(^{59}\)
To the subdivider, the earlier picture of marine residences set in
extensive grounds like 'Black Rock House', still in the hands of
Ehden's executors, was not appropriate.

Making Sandringham and the coast beyond Brighton into a 'fashionable
watering place' implied more than mere selling of land and in the

---

56. 'Ye Banks and Braes O' Port Phillip Bay', 10 April 1882.
57. Simmonds Plan Book f.58; see also 'Sandringham' in Times
58. 7 February 1885.
59. Ibid. 21 May 1887.
'eighties, there was concern to protect its natural beauties and also to provide a range of public amenities. In the interests of the former, efforts were made to remove squatters and campers from the beach and foreshore, to control vendors in the summer months, to prevent the cutting of ti-tree, to stop new fishermen's licences being issued on the beach, and to prevent contractors from taking stone from the foreshore. The major initiative on this last point came from David Abbott, who complained that the Council had allowed stone to be taken from the beach and in the ensuing debate was elected to the council where he successfully campaigned for preservation and for the undivided control by the Council of the whole reserve. In an area generally lacking in stone, vigilance was essential to keep the cliffs from destruction by man but it was wave erosion which gave rise to the demand for sea walls to protect the cliffs as early as 1889.

Improvements calculated to make the area 'a watering place' came rapidly in the 'eighties. A pier at Picnic Point was built by the government at the behest of locals led by Harston and with £250 voted by the council. This was followed by the council's building of the Sandringham baths, opened in 1886, their taking over of the baths at Mentone built by the National Land Company and the construction of baths at Mordialloc. The Council also had to ensure that the use

60. Southern Cross, 21 January 1882.
61. Ibid. 18 December 1882.
63. Ibid. 25 February 1884, 20 April 1885.
64. Southern Cross, 16 February 1884.
65. Ibid. 23 February, 1, 15 March, 12 April, 10 May 1884.
66. Ibid. 20 July, 15 October 1885.
67. Ibid. 26 January 1889.
68. Council Minutes, 13 February 1882.
69. Ibid. 16 November; Southern Cross, 6 March, 13 November 1886.
70. Council Minutes, 21 December 1885; Southern Cross, 24 December 1885.
71. Council Minutes, 15 February 1886.
made of the baths was 'proper' to a 'fashionable watering place' and regulations enforcing segregated bathing were applied. 72

There were already three hotels along the Esplanade before the 'boom' - the 'Retreat', the 'Duke of Edinburgh' and the 'Red Bluff'. Late in the 'eighties, plans were laid for two coffee palaces and a new hotel, aimed at catering for the increased trade of a watering place. In March 1888, a company to build the 'Great Southern Hotel' at Beaumaris was announced with Harold Sparks and C.H. James amongst its shareholders, most of whom were outsiders. 73 In May, Sparks laid the foundation stone, 74 but the building was not opened until June 1889 75 well after the failure of the adjacent 'Beaumaris Park' sales in November 1888, and at a time when the directors' dream of year-round visitors was being dimmed by the slump. In June 1888, the South Road mansion, 'Wellington', owned by J. B. Were in 1886 76 was bought with 1½ acres of land by a group which included Bent, Abbott, H. W. Mills, the former teacher at the East Brighton school and J. Mac. Howden, a leading Brighton speculator, with the object of making it the 'Brighton Coffee Palace'. 77 At the same time, another group was laying plans for the Sandringham Coffee Palace (on the site of the Sandringham Hotel) in the Esplanade near the station, with strong local support. The largest shareholder was Adam Clapperton, a Sandringham contractor but most of the larger shareholders were 'City men' with land interests in the area like Robert Walker, J. B. Crews, J. W. Dixon and C. H. James. 78

72. Ibid. 5 June 1886. Bye-law No. 7 for Sandringham. Similar regulations were adopted for Mentone and Mordialloc. 29 November 1886.

73. Southern Cross, 3 March 1888; Defunct Company Ban 1270, registered 13 March 1888.

74. Southern Cross, 19 May 1888.

75. Ibid. 1 June 1889.

76. Shire Ratebook 1489.

77. Defunct Company Ban 1422.

78. Defunct Company Ban 1406.
CHAPTER 4: INGREDIENTS OF A 'BOOM': 1880's: II

SELLERS and SALES METHODS:

For many of the significant 'boomers', Michael Cannon has provided pioneering portraits, including the Davies brothers and Bent, who were active in Moorabbin, but he has also been criticised for presenting his subjects as 'arch-villains', intent on exploitation and deception from the outset, and clearly marked off from the general public - the victims of their activities and for the bias in his selection. The Sandringham area in the 'eighties provides an opportunity to test both Cannon and his critics at the local level by examining the sellers and their methods.

In an editorial, entitled 'Caution to the Public', the Times warned its readers against buying at sales where neither the vendor nor his solicitor were named. In the Sandringham area, this applied at least to the 'Christmas Gifts' sale in Portion 3 and to 'Picnic Heights' in Portion 36. Whilst it is possible to find out ownership from Titles Office records, this would not necessarily show who was selling for as the Times claimed in one case, when the buyer wanted to pay cash for land which had been offered on long terms, 'the vendors could not take cash, since they themselves had not then paid for the land they had cut up and sold.' The examination of sellers that follows is necessarily a selection, based as it is on the combination of Ratebook

3. Ibid., pp.122-3.
4. 30 September 1885.
5. 26 December 1885 - Simmonds Plan Book f.58.
6. Age, 8 January 1887.
7. 30 September 1885. Emphasis in original.
and sales evidence from newspapers and real estate records; it cannot include any sellers of the type the Times warned against because their names did not appear in the records; nor can it include much of the activities of the syndicates unless they registered as companies or unless their activities were exposed in insolvency or other proceedings by the press. On the other hand, the major sellers of land in the Sandringham area are clearly known so that worthwhile examination is possible.

THOMAS CRISP:

Thomas Crisp, a Brighton Councillor 1865-74 and partner in Crisp, Lewis and Hedderwick, city solicitors, bought the land in 1882 for his 'Linacre Park' subdivisions (see Map 4) for a total of £3610 and late the following year, he plunged into sales of lots in streets named Service, Deakin, Gillies, Sargood and Kerferd - all members of the Service ministry - as well as Thomas and Crisp. In spite of his claim 'that all lots at the FIRST SALE were SOLD', he still had 39 lots left out of the total of 145 lots in 1885. Crisp's advertisement gave the appearance of certainty on matters on which there was considerable doubt in 1884, e.g.:

5. That the proposed RAILWAY EXTENSION will run through the least elevated portion of the property
6. That it has been decided to lay a TRAM LINE at once from the Beach Station which will pass immediately in front of the Estate.

8. Rate, Brighton, p.209
9. T.D. Search Notes 18263 and 18000; Shire Ratebook 1883, Entry No. 889
10. Advertisement in Age, 2 February 1884.
11. Shire Ratebook 1885, Entry No.889.
12. 'Linacre Park' in Age, 2 February 1884; see above p.96.
This doubt was apparent to contemporaries too, as an addendum to an earlier advertisement makes clear:—

N.B. In consequence of opposition reports that TRAMS WILL NOT BE LAID past Linacre Park, the vendor will undertake, by the condition of the sale—THAT SHOULD NEITHER a RAILWAY or LINES of TRAMS BE MADE or COMMENCED to PICNIC WITHIN ONE YEAR, the PURCHASE MONEY will be RETURNED to any purchaser ASKING for it. 13

There is no evidence of this rash offer being taken up by purchasers when neither tram nor train had appeared. 14 For the rest, his advertising was somewhat exaggerated e.g. '4. That from all parts of Australia people are RUSHING to BRIGHTON'; 15 but it is hard to see him as a villain; if he was, then the rash offer would never have been made, one can assume. In September 1889, he shot himself in his office and the cause was claimed to be melancholy induced by the failure of his land speculations; 16 his executors were left with more than 30 of his 'Linacre Park' allotments.

DAVID ABBOTT :

David Abbott, city solicitor and leading Sandringham citizen in the 'eighties, was a large seller in the Sandringham sales of the 'eighties. Born in Essex in 1844, he had arrived in the colony in 1863 and begun work in a solicitor's office; after matriculating at Melbourne University in 1869, he was articled and admitted to practice as a solicitor in 1874. 17 In 1876, he bought land and built the first part of his 'Coonawhale' (now the Sandringham Club) in Beach Road on part of Holloway's old 'Gipsy Village'. 18 He added further to his holdings from Samuel

13. Advertisement in Age, 8 December 1883.
14. Shire Ratebooks 1885–1888 show no changes to original purchasers.
15. 'Linacre Park' in Age, 2 February 1894.
17. Sutherland, Victoria &c. II p.510; Southern Cross, 4 November 1893, 25 March 1882; Attorney's Papers (V.-S.A.).
Jackson's Portion 22 in 1878.\(^{19}\) In 1883\(^{20}\) and at James's 'Sandringham' sale in November 1884\(^{21}\) he added a further 13-3/4 acres in Portions 21 and 22 so that he was able to offer 70 lots in his own 'Sandringham Estate' sale of 27 November 1886\(^{22}\) at the time that the railway was being built; according to the Ratebook\(^{23}\) only 15 of these lots were sold and a further 17 lots were held in partnership with J.H.Hood and Henry Hodnes but in 1888, after the railway was opened, he disposed of all but 8 acres around his house\(^{24}\) to the Sandringham Property Company\(^{25}\) which, in October 1888, re-subdivided the unsold parts from the 1886 sale and included some business frontages of 20 feet each next to the 'Duke of Edinburgh'.\(^{26}\)

Apart from these sales of his own land, he was involved with Bent and Howden in the Brighton, Caulfield and Moorabbin Property and Investment Company\(^{27}\) and the Brighton Coffee Palace.\(^{28}\) He did not come through the 'honour' entirely unscathed: in Robinson v. Abbott\(^{29}\) in 1893, he was acquitted of fraud but forced to refund to his client, Mrs. Robinson, the purchase money, calls and 6 per cent interest for

---

19. Ibid. 1879 Entry No. 701 - 10 acres 8 rooms Gipsy Villages.
20. Ibid. 1884 Entry No. 730 - 5-3/4 acres in Portion 22.
22. Simmonds' Plans Brighton Box 1.
23. 1887 Entries Nos. 1114, 1115, 1116.
24. Shire Ratebook 1889 Entry No. 1372.
25. Defunct Company Baq 1423 - registered 22 June 1880 with the object of acquiring from Frederick McArthur at £5 per foot land comprised in contracts of 23 May 1888 between David Abbott and Frederick McArthur. Abbott is listed as having 1000 shares in the return of shareholders dated 20 December 1888 along with a string of well-known syndicators like J.F.Hamilton, John Marshall, T.B.Muntz and Harold Sparks but also locals like J.J.Daly and George Orford. The Company was voluntarily wound up 15 August 1889.
26. 20 October 1888 - Simmonds' Plan Book f.66. The 1892 Ratebook shows these lands against Abbott's name again and they were finally sold after 1901.
29. Southern Cross, 18 February, 3 June 1893; Age, 3 June 1893.
some shares that he had advised her to take in the Brighton, Caulfield
and Moorabbin Property and Investment Company at a time — July 1888 —
when he was selling his own shares. Abbott's promotion of the district
especially as a member of the council from 1884 to 1898, and the fact
that he lived on in the area with no sign of bitterness at any
deceptions in the 'eighties suggests that he was not regarded as a
villain by his contemporaries. Rather he and Crisp represent cases
of professional men entering the land market with considerable local
knowledge — in Abbott's case, with some success.

J.M.SMITH:

By contrast, J.M. Smith of 'Castlefield' owned well over 300 acres
in Moorabbin's West riding, mostly bought in the 'fifties, right through
to the high boom of 188830 when he was apparently constrained to sell all
of Portion 12 and 75 acres in Portion 17 to the Brighton, Caulfield and
Moorabbin Property and Investment Company whose subdivisions as 'Hampton
Park', late in the 'boom',31 of the parts nearest Hampton Street left
them with 101 of 180 lots unsold and a further 120 acres of land.32
Also in 1888, he subdivided 29 acres of his Portion 23 as the 'Trafalgar
Estate'33 What Smith's arrangements were with the auctioneers of these
lands is not known but at his death in 1898, practically all his

30. Shire Ratebook 1884 Entries Nos. 1258 — 231 acres including
'Castlefield' and all of Portions 12, 13 and 14 and 75 acres in
Portion 17; and 1259 — 100 acres being Portion 23.
32. Shire Ratebook 1890 under names of W.L. Smith, F.C. Stewart,
W.T. Moffat — 'Hampton Park'.
33. Simmonds PlansA — Sales : 21 April 1888, 5 May 1888. The evidence
that Smith was the seller is based on Southern Cross, 21 April
1888 notice stating that the sale was 'under instructions of
J.M. Smith' and on items in Insolvency Schedule 71/5921 for Harold
Sparks showing debts to J.M. Smith for land in 'Trafalgar Estate' contracted on 5 May 1888. Shire Ratebook 1889, Entry No. 1999
has 71 acres of 'Trafalgar' for J.M. Smith.
holdings of the mid-'eighties were in his hands. Smith played little part in the promotion of Moorabbin in this period and the slowness with which his lands entered the market is in striking contrast to both Crisp and Abbott; his ownership and retention of so much of the favoured West riding land must have constrained the boom in the sections between Bay Road and South Road by limiting its spread; on the other hand, by limiting the amounts of land available, they may have served to give the land an added value through scarcity as well as to force the 'boomer' further south in his quest for land to cut up.

**THOMAS BENT:**

Thomas Bent, too, had profound local knowledge of both Brighton and Moorabbin but he was also the local M.L.A. and, more especially in the early 'eighties, he had ministerial positions in works and railways. In these positions, he was able to add ingredients to the local boom by his own actions - the duplication of the Brighton line in 1882 was a case in point; so too was the extension of the Yan Yean to Gipsy Village. His ministerial actions in 1881 in what became known as the 'Kensington Hill job' justifiably placed him under suspicion, but viewed from Brighton and Moorabbin, Bent was not an arch-villain. Cannon's judgement that 'Bent was the outstanding example of a man using his political position blatantly for personal profit and degrading the standards of public life' does not really square with the enormously energetic M.L.A. and Brighton and Moorabbin Councillor that Bent was; nor does it take sufficient account of the 'system' of patronage which formed part of colonial politics in the period before the existence of modern political parties and a well-organized and professional civil service.

---

34. Simmonds Other Papers. Letter dated 3 August 1898 from J.M. Smith and Emmerton requesting valuation of Smith's land. The 1892 Ratebook shows most lands back in Smith's hands.


36. Ibid. p.182.
service. For these reasons, in Cannon's words: "Honest Tom" must have been genuinely surprised by the continual charges of jobbery laid against him.  

As far as his Moorabbin lands were concerned, it is clear that he was not guilty of selfishly benefiting himself by his actions in ministerial office, parliament or local councils. As Bates has shown, Bent had very little land in Brighton until 1873 when Nicholas Were decided to sell almost all his holdings from the old Brighton Estate, which included nearly 200 acres in Moorabbin's North riding. Most of this land he retained, usually rented to gardeners, until at least 1883; very little of it was subdivided in small lots and when, with J.S. Vickery, he carved up the 'East Brighton Estate', he was not at all successful. His first activity in the West riding was in 1876 when he bought 30 acres in Portion 5 and 6 on the Esplanade and 10 acres at Red Bluff. A year later, he had added 17½ acres in Portion 32 but by 1883, all of this was sold, and for the rest of the 'eighties, he personally is listed for only a few allotments in the West riding. Thus at the time of his ministries in Public Works and Railways, he was not a large landholder in the West riding and certainly he did not gain directly from the Picnic Point railway. In the East riding, Bent was no more successful; in 1885, with Benjamin Fink, he had bought James Jamison's 'Mayfield Park' but most of this was still unsold by 1890 in spite of subdivision as early as May 1886. He was more successful,

37. Ibid.
40. Ibid 1888 Entry No.34 shows many lots unsold since 1885.
41. Ibid 1877 Entries Nos. 647, 648, 649.
42. Ibid. 1878 Entry 698.
43. Ibid. 1883 No entries for Bent in West.
44. Advertised Southern Cross, 19 September 1885.
45. 1.8 acres out of 145 acres unsold - Ratebook 1890.
46. Simmonds Plan Book f.66 dated 22 May 1886.
with Fink and Houden, in the subdivision of 'Picnic Point Park' by the Metropolitan Land Company in January 1887. None of these transactions really support Cannon's dictum; Bent's following in Brighton and Moorabbin was not simply compounded from Cannon's formula for Bent's own 'ethos' - 'what was good for Bent was good for Brighton, what was good for Brighton was good for the whole colony, and what was good for the colony was good for Thomas Bent'. Rather, his motives may have started from a belief in progress, a progress in which he could play a considerable personal part not necessarily for his own material and political gains but simply because he had considerable organizing and political talent to use.

In 1894, Bent lost his seat to W.H. Moule, a Brighton lawyer, at a time when vengeance on 'land-boomers' and punishment for political jobbery seemed appropriate. Locally, the Southern Cross campaigned against him, and when judgement was made in a case where Bent had transferred to a 'straw man' named McMahon, a parcel of 36,000 shares in the Australian City and Suburban Investment & Banking Company on which calls were liable, they were able to claim wisdom for those who had elected Moule. But significantly, Bent was never displaced from either of the local councils and in 1900, was re-elected to his old seat; any sins had been forgiven by the majority.

47. Ibid. p.66 dated 15, 29 January 1887.
48. Land Boomers, p.182.
49. 13 October 1894.
50. He continued to be unopposed in the North riding at Moorabbin where the support of the gardeners for his past performances outweighed their aversion to 'boomers'. 
CHARLES HENRY JAMES and HAROLD SPARKS:

By far the largest single buyer and most active seller of land in the West riding in the 1880's was Charles Henry James to whom Cannon has given only passing reference.\textsuperscript{51} This neglect of James, clearly of importance from the fragments in Cannon himself for his influence on Matthew Davies\textsuperscript{52} is a major argument supporting Beever and Freeman in their critique.\textsuperscript{53} As they say, 'he was a central figure in the boom and depression, reputed in his day to have pioneered the subdivisional mania of the 'eighties' but he did not become insolvent until 1897, shortly before his death, and he therefore is suggested as a 'complex variation on the normal theme that would have well rewarded further examination.'

Further examination of James reveals surprisingly little personal detail. According to the Argus obituary, James had come from Adelaide, 'where, in the early "eighties", there had been unwonted activity in the real estate market'\textsuperscript{54} but as the Leader\textsuperscript{55} had it, he was a grocer in Queensberry Street, North Melbourne in 1873-4.\textsuperscript{56} By 1880, C.B. James is recorded as manager of the General Credit Co. at 81 Collins Street West with a private residence at St. George's Road, Toorak and in partnership with his brother-in-law, Percy Dobson as wine and spirit merchants in the city\textsuperscript{57} but the precise outlines of his life and work

\textsuperscript{51} Land Boomers, pp.4, 13, 104, 106, 157.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., pp. 13, 36.
\textsuperscript{53} Beever and Freeman in Economic Record, March 1967, pp.122-3. Cannon's neglect is more surprising given the full and persistent attack on James made by Table Talk edited by Maurice Brodzky, one of Cannon's major sources.
\textsuperscript{54} 3 October 1898.
\textsuperscript{55} 8 October 1898.
\textsuperscript{56} Sands' Directory entries.
\textsuperscript{57} Sands' Directory 1880.
in this period are obscure. 58

The first entry for James in the Moorabbin Ratebook appeared in 1878 59 but it was in the early 'eighties that massive buying by James and Dobson occurred 60 and in 1883, they had enormous holdings in the southern parts of the West riding, including Mentone and much of Mordialloc, all relatively close to the new Mordialloc line 51 and mostly land which had not been improved. In the next two years, much of this had passed to syndicates like the National Land Company 52 and the Colonial Investment and Agency Company, but some was subdivided by James himself and freely advertised as such.

58. No biographical details of James appeared in any of the encyclopaedic compilations of the time like A. Sutherland, Victoria and its Metropolis. The Directory shows the following series of entries for C.H. James; they are by means conclusive:

1874 Chas. H. James (Lands & Survey) 25 Victoria Pde. (also shown as grocer &c., 71 Queensberry Street.)
1875 Chas. H. James (Lands & Survey) 25 Victoria Pde.
1876 C.H. James (Gooch & James) Green St., Windsor.
1877 C.H. James (Gooch & James) Green St., Windsor.
1878 C.H. James (Gooch & James) 10 Green St., Windsor.
1879 C.H. James manager General Credit Co., 81 Collins St. west.


59. Entry No. 819 allotment 46 Esplanade.

60. Ratebooks show the confusion that contemporaries must have felt about James's land dealings - ownership was registered under various names e.g. Percy Dobson, Southern Investment Co.

61. Entries Nos. 847-903 totalling over 1400 acres.

62. Defunct Company Bag 646 registered 23 January 1882; original subscribers included Dobson, James, G.W. Taylor and J.H. Davies. James and Dobson were no longer shareholders in August 1884.
The claim that James pioneered the subdivisional 'mania' of the 'eighties has some validity if one considers the volume of his sales, the terms offered, and the size of the allotments; his methods of buying and selling also developed into those most characteristic of the high boom of 1888. In the Sandringham area, he held important sales at Sandringham (in Portion 22) in 1884 and at Black Rock (in Portion 28) in 1885–6 at which he offered the same terms as he had been offering at his almost weekly sales in the northern suburbs especially at Fairfield, Alphington, Northcote, Heidelberg and Ivanhoe. 63 – £5 deposit, no interest if the balance was paid in four quarterly instalments over the next year and 2½ per cent interest if payments spread over two years. 64 A year later, he was also offering to lend three quarters of the value of the house and land at 2½ per cent. 65 His claim to be the first to offer such terms seems justified. In Sandringham sales earlier than James and also later the terms were not nearly as attractive. When Thomas Crisp, for example, asserted that the terms offered to purchasers at 'Linacre Park' were 'within the reach of the poorest' 66 he was, of course, exaggerating but he did offer repayment over three years at 3 per cent interest on a deposit at £10, terms which were appreciably steeper than James's. By the high boom of 1888, interest rates were much higher: the vendors at 'Trafalgar' 68 offered £5 deposit, 8 quarterly payments at 5 per cent per annum interest. Terms they erroneously labelled as 'unparalleled in the History of Australia' whilst at 'Osborne Park' in the last flush of the 'boom' a £10 deposit and 6 per cent over two years was offered. 69

63. Based on scrutiny of auction advertisements in Age.
64. Times, 5 November 1884.
65. Ibid., 2 December 1885.
66. Ibid., 26 November 1884, 8 July 1885.
67. Age, 2 February 1884.
68. Simmonds Plans dated 21 April 1888.
69. Ibid., 6 October 1888.
James played on the ideal of 'ownership' in his promotions and certainly attempted to link his terms to that quest. That ideal 'where every little family possesses its own comfortable little freehold surrounded with both flower and vegetable garden' could be reached it was argued:

if the people could only be brought to see their way to the steady and persistent investment in small suburban freeholds of the money they now literally waste in unrequired drink and gambling on the racecourse.\textsuperscript{70}

Failure to achieve the ideal made one an object of reproach it was argued - 'young men and women of spirit hardly dare to confess they do not possess an inch of the soil of the country in which they live' and really there was no excuse for it because land was 'easily obtainable on cheap terms and without any conditions or taxation' so that 'every clerk, mechanic aye and even the laborer' could 'acquire a house of his own, on his own freehold'.\textsuperscript{71}

It was James's peculiar contribution, it was further argued, that had made land available on terms to 'the toilers at the mercantile desk, at the factories, and in the shops' thereby providing for the city what the government's selection acts had provided for the country.\textsuperscript{72} James returned to this theme of friend and helper of the working man when he successfully stood for the Legislative Council for Southern Province in 1887. At a Northcote meeting, he claimed that he had done his best to get the workingmen homes of their own, as he believed that every man should have a place to call his own'.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{70} Times, 5 August 1885. This link between temperance advocacy and land promotion has been commented on by Cannon, Land Boomers, pp.71, 118-119 especially in relation to 'Jimmy' Mirans and James Munro.

\textsuperscript{71} Times, 5 November 1884.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 9 May 1885.

\textsuperscript{73} Collingwood Mercury, 14 October 1887.
The size of allotments in James's 'Sandringham' sale was smaller than most of those in earlier subdivisions in the 'eighties. In Crisp's 'Linacre Park', for example, most lots were nearly 100 feet by 200 feet whereas at James's 'Sandringham' later that year many of the lots were 60 feet by 130 feet and in subsequent sales of coast land, blocks normally had 60 feet frontages.

Apart from his efforts to gain railways or build tramways James suggested that Sandringham was 'admirably situated for the erection of a large Conservatory and National Marine Aquarium' and in the Times, a drawing was reproduced of 'The Fountain Court' proposed, complete with 'a portrait of Her Majesty the Queen, in stained glass' on one side and portraits of the Prince and Princess of Wales in another.

James promoted his sales in the period 1884-5 through the daily press but also in a four-page paper, extravagantly called The Times, published from 5 Queen Street, usually bi-weekly. In spite of its claim to be 'the raciest and funniest paper in Australia', containing 'a variety of instructive and Amusing Reading', its major content was stories about James - his sales and terms and its own admitted purpose was of 'widely advertising the terms which Mr C.H.James had resolved to offer to the public as an experiment'.

The inference that investment at his sales would bring a rapid

---

74. Simonds Plans 3 February 1884.
75. Ibid. 15 November 1884.
76. See pp. 97, 100 above.
77. 5 November 1884.
78. The numbering and dates of the issues held by the La Trobe Library are most erratic. I have not found any direct statement that James was its owner. It was probably printed by Dunn & Wilkinson (earlier Barton, Dunn & Wilkinson) printers at 5 Queen St. in 'Sands' Directory and printers of many of James's auction notices.
79. 20 October 1885.
return was always there in James's promotion but was never stated in quite the blunt terms used by Crisp: 'Every purchaser of an allotment in this park will make a large profit within a few months.' Along with the ideal of home ownership, editorials in the *Times* emphasized the comparative attractiveness of suburban land as an investment—

'It cannot run away, and it cannot abscond... It gives independence to the purchaser, a certain large return for his outlay, and a security that can never be impeached, and which no future Berry-blight can ever affect.'

Investment in suburban land, money-making and success in life were all equated in a later Darwinian editorial—investment in suburban land was 'the one ray of light breaking in upon the gloaming', the one means by which men of all walks of life, caught in 'the bitter struggle for existence in which the great law of the survival of the fittest is the final arbiter', could make money—'the absorbing pursuit of life', without which 'you are a nobody. You may as well be buried in the Sahara or sent into exile amongst the Esquimaux (sic)'. Even when money was tighter in 1886, the *Times* argued that:

*there is no investment now offering to the public so full of promise and so certain of profit, as that of investment in suburban land...*

because 'under the mathematical laws which govern the world and all modern society land must increase.

---

80. Simmonds Plan Rock F.58.

81. *Times*, 18 November 1885. 'Berry-blight' was the term used to describe the depression in the late 'seventies by the opponents of the radical Graham Berry, whom they said had caused the depression by the wholesale dismissal of public servants on 'Black Wednesday' on 8 January 1878 during the constitutional crisis between the Assembly and the Council. 'Land Boomers' frequently used this emotive term when purveying their wares and it is certainly conceivable that an emotional reaction to the 1870's depression, however it be described, was a factor in the 'eighties boom'. See also *Times*, 22 July, 12 August 1885.

in value. It is the anchor of capital and the foundation of all mundane happiness. 83

In late 1886, the weekly sales of suburban lots by James stopped 84 lending credence to his statement made in the Legislative Council late in 1888 that he had not 'sold any [land] for two years'. 85 On the other hand, whilst James ceased to operate in the pattern of subdivisions with splendid terms and was thus less noticeable, he was selling land after 1886 as a series of court hearings showed in 1889-90. These 'sensational revelations' that the daily papers and the weekly Table Talk 86 seized upon, began on 30 August 1889 when the estate of Harold Sparks, James's former manager, was voluntarily sequestrated. 87

Sparks was first employed in 1883 at the time that the partnership between James and Percy Dobson, his brother-in-law was dissolved, at a time when James later said that Sparks was 'in straitened circumstances'. 88

83. Ibid., 14 July 1886.
84. The last one seems to have been 'Darebin Glen' – see Collingwood Mercury, 1 October 1886.
85. V.P.D., 1888 p.2488. James was elected for the Southern Province seat in the Council in 1887 but he spoke rarely – in 1889 and 1890, for a total of only three times. His speeches add very little to our picture of the man – an anti-Chinese speech in Ibid., 1887, p.2593 and a speech against the principle: 'one man, one vote' in Ibid., 1888 p.2586 were exceptions.
86. Maurice Brodzky, the editor reported very fully on James's activities; one can only conjecture that his dealings were so complicated and his life so obscure to explain Cannon's failure to write him up in the Land Boomers.
87. Insolvency Papers 71/5921 (V.-S.A.); also reported fully in Age, 31 August 1889.
88. Argus, 5 May 1890.
in Adelaide but his life before coming to Melbourne remains obscure. His particular importance in Moorabbin is examined in the next chapter, when for two years he was a West riding councillor and the leader of a vigorous, if unsuccessful, severance movement but he is clearly of importance in any examination of the booming activities of the 'eighties of which Moorabbin was a part.

From late in 1885, Sparks appeared in advertisements for some of James's sales as auctioneer and according to the reports of evidence in the court hearings of 1889–90 he was first employed for £3 per week and a house, and later at £200 per annum. Relations between James and Sparks were apparently amicable until Sparks left James in June 1889; public mutual praise of one another was common before this. Of James, Sparks had claimed 'a larger-hearted, a nobler-minded man was not to be found in the colony of Victoria' and when Sparks laid the foundation stone of the Great Southern Hotel, James spoke of Sparks as the 'valued friend'.

89. Boothby's Adelaide Almanac and Directory 1882 and the South Australian Directory 1882/3 show Harold Sparks, farmer, Tuyford, Meqill for 1882; in 1883 he is designated 'accountant' in Boothby and in 1884, there is an entry for Harold Sparks & Co., accountants Victoria Chambers, Flinders St., also Pirie St., Adelaide.

90. Sparks, as James, does not appear in any of the biographical dictionaries of the time. The only reference to a possible earlier career for Sparks that I have found was in a speech by W.T. Carter (the paper gives his initials as 'W.G.' but it is almost certain that it was W.T. Carter, a land syndicate associate of Sparks in Moorabbin) at a dinner given by Sparks at Riddell's Creek on 1 September 1888. He claimed that he had known Sparks for 15 years, 'had seen him tried as a leader of men in the interior of the Australian continent where he had opened cattle tracks'. See Ramsay Examiner, 7 September 1888.

91. e.g. for 'Fairfield Park No. 20' in Collingwood Mercury, 2 October 1885 and for further sales 16 October, 27 November, 4 December 1885, 5 February, 12 February 1886.

92. Argus, 5 May 1890.

who had been responsible for his success. But when Sparske filed his schedule, he claimed that the reason for his insolvency was that

whilst in the service of a land speculator (James) I at his request and under his advice made myself liable for large purchases of land some from him and others in which he was interested to further and advance his interest on his promise to finance such purchases for me and for that purpose I deposited with him the most of my available assets which he still retains but has not performed his said promise.95

In subsequent proceedings in Sparske's insolvency and the case Sparske v. James, in which Sparske was tried and acquitted of charges of embezzling and theft, something of the complexities of James's affairs was revealed.

In the Times, early in 1886,96 a letter to the Argus describing 'dummying' at suburban land sales had been republished: the writer, 'SOLD', described how he had bought a corner lot at a sale in which it was reported that 121 out of 169 lots were sold but that a few weeks later 125 of the lots at the first sale were re-advertised. This letter evoked the following editorial comment:

If the above tricks of certain land-sellers were the only ones practised upon honest and willing buyers, they would be grave enough to demand the most severe condemnation, but, unfortunately, ... there are far more serious tricks practised on the public by unscrupulous land vendors.

The 'far more serious tricks' included the taking by unknown vendors of cash deposits for land to which they did not have title. Whilst James does not appear to have been guilty of selling land that he did not own,

94. Southern Cross, 19 May 1888; see also Table Talk, 6 September 1889.
95. Insolvency Papers 71/5921 - 30 August 1889.
96. 13 January. 1886.
the evidence of the inquiries does show clearly that 'dummying' was normal at his sales.

Just after Sparks had filed his papers, Table Talk\textsuperscript{97} published an examination of his schedule, in which it high-lighted apparent anomalies in the operations of the Dominion Banking and Investment Co.\textsuperscript{98} It pointed out that the 'Dominion Bank' had been formed in August 1888 to buy from James about 964 acres in the Heidelberg district for a sum of about £500,000; this gives the lie to James's statement in the Legislative Council even if James held half of the 60,000 £5 shares, paid to £2/10/-\textsuperscript{99} Further, it showed that the apparently successful sale of part of this Heidelberg land, concluded by James for the bank, was in fact to Sparks and 'another' (John Marshall) who paid for it partly with money advanced by James.\textsuperscript{100} Thus they called into question the whole operation of the Dominion Bank and expressed the hope 'that the Hon. C.H. James who has ever been known as a humane man will do the praiseworthy and commendable act of repaying to the shareholders the monies they have invested, close the unfortunate Dominion Bank in its infancy and re-instate Sparks.'\textsuperscript{1} In the next issue, it showed how James had purchased the land sold to the Dominion Bank for £37,160 at public auction on the liquidation, in 1885, of the Heidelberg Land Company,\textsuperscript{2} a company in which all the shares were held by James, his family and employees.

\textsuperscript{97} 6 September 1889.
\textsuperscript{98} Defunct Company Reg 1493 - formed 14 August 1888.
\textsuperscript{99} See also Sparks's schedule which shows contracts for sale by James in 1888-9 for land at Black Rock and in the northern suburbs.
\textsuperscript{100} The schedule shows amounts of £17,595 due on 29 April 1889 to C.H. James.
\textsuperscript{1} Table Talk, 6 September 1889.
\textsuperscript{2} Defunct Company Reg 636, registered 30 November 1881.
The next week, Table Talk sought legislation which would make prospectuses more informative.

In Sparks’s schedule, it was these Heidelberg lands which he claimed were bought 'at the request and in the interest of James' but for the rest of the land no such claim was made in the schedule suggesting that, in spite of claims made later in the trials, Sparks was himself involved on his own account in the boom. It was largely on the Dominion Bank transactions that subsequent hearings centred but it was only after six months of disagreements between James and the trustees of Sparks’s estate over a proof of debt that James issued a summons on Sparks for misappropriating funds. In the case which followed, James was subjected to a searching examination of his affairs, in which he revealed that Sparks had arranged 'dummies' to buy for him, that the Heidelberg Land Company shareholders at the time of its liquidation were 'dummies' for him and that he had sold 'Beaumaris Park' to a syndicate in April 1888 but he denied the suggestion that he had misrepresented the sale by the Dominion Bank to Sparks and Marshall and also claimed that he had offered to take back lands bought from him by Sparks and return his deposits. The criminal examination was temporarily suspended whilst the Insolvency Court examined Sparks who claimed that in his position as manager for

3. 20 September 1889.
5. Debts to J.W. Smith for 'Trafalgar' land and to the Beaumaris Park Company suggest his own involvement.
6. Insolvency Papers 71/5921 - a series of papers trace this agreement through numerous adjournments between September 1889 and February 1890.
7. Argus, 28 February 1890.
8. Ibid., 5, 6, 8 March 1890.
10. Argus, 11 March 1890.
James, he attended sales at which he got others to bid and at which the contracts were made out in his name, with James providing the funds. Sparks also claimed that he made private purchases of lands in which James was interested for which James was also to pay. On the Dominion Bank affair, Sparks claimed that it was James who was to finance his share and who organized the whole series of deals, providing Sparks with the money to give to the Dominion Bank, which promptly passed it back to James i.e. that Sparks was, in fact, a 'dummy'.

For the Beaumaria sales, Sparks claimed that James had requested him to float a company to buy land from him and for evidence, he used a letter written by James in April 1888\(^{11}\) which commented on the way the 'dummies' named as Thomas Major\(^{12}\) and George Bodley, 'behaved' and also on the prices. The letter does not provide conclusive evidence for Sparks's point; because James asked Sparks to send 'lists of purchasers and all particulars' and because he concluded the letter with: 'see that all will settle up at once especially as you have next Saturday and it might no cheaper' could well be friendly advice from James to Sparks, evidence of sale tactics rather than support for Sparks's case. On the next day of the hearing the breach between Sparks and James was clearly shown in two letters quoted by Sparks's counsel. Sparks had written to James:

> The time has now come when, not only for my own protection, but for that of others, I shall be forced to give you the lie direct . . .

to which James had replied:

> To such a tissue of falsehoods no reply is needed, and, indeed, no reply should be given other than to acknowledge its receipt, and to state that no attempt of yours by insolence and

---

11. Letter dated 9 April 1888, Exhibit 1, filed in Insolvency Papers 71/5921.

12. A denial by Major appeared as a letter in _Arrows_, 12 March 1890.
lies to extort money from me to pay your debts, 
the contraction of which I had nothing to do 
with, will succeed.13

The embezzling and theft charges were resumed on 13 March with 
Sparks's counsel claiming the James 'would never have initiated a 
prosecution at all if Mr Sparks had not been obliged to go into the 
Insolvency Court, and he only did so to stop his mouth'14 but Sparks was 
nevertheless committed for trial at the end of March.15 The insolvency 
case was then resumed16 and James was examined very closely, again admitting 
that Sparks got other people to bid at the auctions and that he had signed 
contracts and paid for land in his own name but denying that Sparks had 
obtained loans or transfers of land from James or that Sparks had assisted 
by promoting companies on James's behalf and for his benefit. On the 
Dominion Bank land, James was vague, even evasive, but he agreed that his 
fellow directors did as he suggested. Almost three weeks later, the case 
was struck out by Judge Molesworth17 after he had refused to grant a 
further adjournment, asserting that 'the examination is of such a character 
that I suspect when I am asked for an adjournment that the examination may 
be used to force some compromise the Court might not approve of',18 and from 
the report of the court proceedings and from the £2500 from James as 
'settlement of all matters' reported in the insolvency papers,19 Molesworth's 
contention seems justified.

13. Argus, 12 March 1890 — Letters dated 27 July 1889 for Sparks and 
29 July 1889 for James.
14. Ibid. 13,14 March 1890.
15. Ibid. 28 March 1890.
16. Ibid. 2 April, 2, 3, May 1890.
17. Ibid. 23 May 1890.
18. Ibid. see also Southern Cross, 24 May 1890.
19. 71/5921. Statement of receipts and disbursements of trustees dated 
7 April 1891 shows payment by C.H. James on 14 February 1891.
Six weeks later, the stealing charges against Sparks were resumed. When MacDermott, Sparks’s counsel, made his final address to the jury, he emphasized that not only was Sparks entitled to the benefit of the doubt, but that the jury ‘ought not to believe one word that Mr James had said,’ claiming that ‘if James could only shut the mouth of Sparks by a conviction, then James’s complicated transactions with a large portion of the community could never be explained’. He was followed by Sparks himself, who addressed the jury, concluding:

This was not a prosecution; it was a persecution, and a persecution for one particular object. That persecution had been done in such a way as to heap every indignity on him; . . . if he had been prepared to stand up in public and say Mr James was not the cause of his trouble, nothing of the sort would have been adopted. He never dreamt for a single moment that the case would have come into that Court, knowing that he had done no wrong as well as Mr James himself did.

After Judge Hood had commented on the confusions of the case, the jury retired for about an hour and gave the verdict, not guilty.

All these proceedings had partly achieved Table Talk’s object of exposing the activities of the Dominion Bank; Brodzky’s attack had continued during the proceedings when he was able to show that the Bundoora Park Company registered on 27 February 1890, was an attempt by James to satisfy Dominion Bank shareholders by shares in a new company to take over the Dominion land at Bundoora for £123,500. Certainly, the techniques of company flotation to promote land sales has been clearly revealed by these Heidelberg Land Company - Dominion Bank - Bundoora

20. Argus, 21, 23, 24 June 1890.
21. Ibid. 24 June 1890.
22. Ibid.
23. Table Talk, 14 March 1890.
Park Estate Company connections.  

The proceedings also provide clear evidence of the 'dummying' characteristic of many sales and well described by Table Talk.

Clerks in his [James's] office on salaries ranging from 30s. to £3 per week and one or two relatives attended the sales and apparently acted as 'dummies' and decoys, or, as described by Mr James, under the more delicate name of 'agents'. They bought 'by direction', signed contracts, gave bills for large sums of money, which were immediately discounted by the banks for cash . . . [Thus] the prices of the first lots were 'run up' to a good figure, which gave a tone to the allotments afterwards offered. When the genuine buyers were exhausted, the leading dummies came in and swept the board, thus preventing a fall in prices, which otherwise would most assuredly have occurred.

But the hearings did not establish precisely the relationship between Sparks and James. Contemporaries seem to have extended greatest sympathy to Sparks; certainly the hearings showed that James was not all that he had pretended to be and he became a suitable scapegoat for a community in 1890, guiltily trying to rid itself of its previous excesses. But it is difficult to see Sparks simply in the martyr-role, carrying the cross for James, given the tone of blackmail in his letter of July 1889, to James: 'remember, . . . that slight concessions now, which concessions should be given by you without my even asking for them, would avoid the necessity.'

The question posed by the Journal of Commerce, 'who would have had the profit had his [Sparks's] speculations been successful, and who has been most benefited by the comparative affluence, which of late he has apparently enjoyed?' just after Sparks has filed his schedule was never really answered during the

25. 9 May 1890.
26. Quoted in Argus, 12 March 1890.
27. 6 September 1889.
hearings. Certainly, Sparks enjoyed his affluence as Moorabbin discovered in the late 'eighties and so too did Riddell's Creek in 1888, where from July, Sparks had lived at intervals. Situated in James's electorate of Southern Province and in an area which it was hoped to 'boom' late in 1888, it could be claimed that Sparks was following James's instructions and protecting his interests but the intense personal involvement with which Sparks threw himself into local affairs in both there and in Moorabbin, make it difficult to see Sparks in an entirely subordinate role. Local opinion at Riddell's Creek even suggested that Sparks would be a candidate for the Assembly seat of Kilmore and Dalhousie at the next election but this did not eventuate - apart from the slump in land sales, his wife had a buggy accident early in 1889 and died in May. Sparkes at Riddell's Creek echoed the sentiments of James and the Times editorials when he stated that 'he had always found that wherever land was quoted at a low price there was no prosperity, and that the progression of a community ran concurrently with the advance of its real estate.' With that boundless optimism characteristic of 'boom' society, Sparks claimed that 'there was no reason why ... [the boom] should not continue,' echoing the notions, characteristic of the Times that the demand for land and land values was bound to increase now that 'the people had turned from Radicalism to Conservatism.'

28. *Romsey Examiner*, 25 May 1888; see also 24 August 1888, report that Sparks spoke of the need for a business train to connect Riddell's Creek with the city so that 'the beautiful hills at Riddell's Creek and between that place and Romsey would soon be dotted with the villas of leading commercial men of the city'.

29. See *Romsey Examiner*, 10 August, 21 September, 12 October 1888.

30. Ibid. 9 November 1888.

31. Ibid. 22 March, 21 May 1889.

32. Ibid. 7 September 1888.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.
The most likely explanation of the whole series of episodes would seem to be that both James and Sparks shared a view of a yet more wonderful future for the areas in which they operated. Sparks, as an efficient and highly personable employee was of great assistance to James in the boom of the late 'eighties but he became highly involved himself, probably backed by James himself. With the slump late in 1888, which neither forewarned, the breach appeared: James could no longer finance Sparks's operations and the recriminations of the insolvency and the criminal charges followed. While Brodzyk and his Table Talk remained hopeful 'that the whole truth must become known', these hopes were never realized.

Although Abraham, Sparks's lawyer, had asserted that it was convenient if Sparks signed contracts on James's behalf because this meant that they would 'have an insolvent estate to go on', there is no evidence that James had calculated this way. Rather it would appear that neither James nor Sparks shared that concern of the Collingwood Mercury early in 1887, when it claimed that:

> the term private property has become obnoxious to the ears of right-minded men, not because there is any harm in a man living upon land which for his term of life is exclusively his own, but because vast quantities have been amassed by a few, who have made no further use of it than to extort almost the life-blood from thousands, who had they been able to obtain land at reasonable prices, would have lived contentedly in their own cottages, in lieu of huddling together in over-crowded badly ventilated boarding houses,

or when it proclaimed on 15 November 1888 that

> 'The Land "Boom" is over. Self-destroyed. Destroyed by its insubstantiality - its lack of true

---

35. Table Talk, 20 February 1891. John Marshall, Sparks's old partner in the Dominion Bank purchase was reported to be suing the Bank and James for £100,000 each over the 1888 transactions but no such case was reported in the Argus 1891 and Marshall's insolvency dated 10 May 1892 - 90/770 gives no further clues.

36. Argus, 3 May 1890.

37. 11 February 1887.
honesty. Its fictitiousness has discovered its sudden ruin.

This concern was indeed rare among contemporaries for, as its near neighbour, the Northcote Leader 38 asserted a month later with an editorial heading: 'The Land Boom [is] Not Yet Dead', using as evidence the fact that James had recently bought 'Strathallan', 1650 acres near Heidelberg, for £236,000. Further, it argued, since, 'his reputation is without taint and above suspicion' and 'he is one of the best judges in the colony', 'there is still a wide and profitable field for dealing in land around Melbourne'. But to the Northcote Leader and most other papers, the high hopes of 'The Land That Will Boom in the Spring' type 39 had not been realized late in 1888; it was the booming zeal of a new weekly, The Land and Property Record 40 which, as late as February 1889, asserted that land still remains a sound and solid security, and all this over-speculation and fictitious tightness of money cannot in the least degree permanently effect (sic) the value of land and property in this colony. 41

expressed, it seems, the hopes of James and Sparks.

As Reever and Freeman have stated 42 James did not become bankrupt until 1897 43 when he showed the massive deficiency of almost £320,000 and

38. 15 December 1888.
39. Land and Property Record, 1 August 1888 - advertisement for Altona Bay - 'Australis Margate'.
40. 'A Weekly Paper Devoted to the Interests of Investors', published by T.E.H. Bullen in Melbourne from 14 March 1888; it stopped early in 1889. (V.-S.L.) See also editorial 24 October 1888 entitled 'In the spring of 1889 there will be a Greater Boom!'
41. 27 February 1889.
42. Loc. cit. p.123.
43. Insolvency Papers 90/2941 - filed 20 December 1897.
debts totalling £851,842. The delay seems partly due to the complexity of his affairs; but clearly, James had amassed enormous assets which helped sustain his solvency into the 'nineties through mortgages totalling £384,000 from the Commercial and the City of Melbourne Banks. These assets included vast quantities of land in Mordialloc, Moorabbin, Ivanhoe, the 'Rosanna Estate', 'Strathallan', the Empire Buildings which he had built in Collins Street and two New South Wales pastoral properties - 'Kentucky' and 'Romara'. Eventually, according to his liquidator, 44 it was the severe decline in income from these properties, the calling up of the paid up capital of the ill-fated Dominion Bank, in James's case over £170,000 45 and the continued burden of his last boom purchase, 'Strathallan' that eventually forced James to file.

Through a chance survival of papers, it is possible to show how badly James misjudged the times in 1888 when he bought 'Strathallan'. 46 The vendors lived in Scotland and because of the difficulty of communication, Yeo, Brentnall and Merrin, their agents, were lucky to have James's offer of £140 per acre accepted before they were reporting to their clients that 'outlying lands have become simply unsaleable' 48 and shortly afterwards: 'The land market here continues dull, no transactions

44. Ibid. dated 21 September 1896.
45. Argus, 8 December 1896; order made 16 December 1896 — see Insolvency Papers 40/2941. Proof of Debt to Dominion Bank.
46. Yeo, Brentnall and Merrin, Outwards Correspondence 1888-9. Letters concerning the sale of 'Strathallan' cut from letter-books before books were destroyed. Originals now in possession of T.N. Sheehy, Cheltenham. Xerox copies in my possession.
47. Ibid. Letter dated 5 November 1888 to Mr Greenfield.
48. Ibid. 7 December 1888 to Malcolm McLean.
of any consequence having taken place since "Strathallan" was sold. 49
James was slow to accept the title and the last of the surviving letters, in August 1889, 50 shows that he had still not accepted. By this time, James had begun payments and there is probably some significance in the timing related to Sparks's insolvency. Clearly James had miscalculated badly; his plans for a railway 51 to 'Strathallan' and the adjacent 'Rosanna' estate and 'Bundoora Park' and presumably, for a spate of subdivisions, could not be realized in the climate of 1889. He had also paid too much and, in 1891, he unsuccessfully tried to have the contract of purchase cancelled on the grounds of imperfect title. 52 He did succeed in having the price reduced and the time for payment extended by agreement with the vendors but in his insolvency schedule, he still owed more than £190,000. Just before his death, James was actively seeking a release but he died before this could be granted on 2 October 1898. 53

His 'boom' career was a complex one: his admitted use of dummies and his methods of company flotation do qualify him as one of Cannon's 'villains' but on the other hand, he may genuinely have believed what he preached about the housing of the workers, and whilst the 'boom' lasted, his outstanding success in the 'struggle for survival' made him the object of admiration in a community caught up in the excesses of the 'boom'.

49. Ibid. 4 January 1889 to Rev. J. Gibson.
50. Ibid. 9 August 1889.
51. Ibid. Referred to in most letters before the sale.
52. Table Talk, 10 April 1891.
53. Obituaries:
   Table Talk, 7 October 1898.
   Journal of Commerce, 11 October 1898.
   Australasian, 8 October 1898.
   Argus, 3 October 1898.
   Leader, 8 October 1898.
After Sparks was acquitted, he lived at Preston until 1894, the year that his release from insolvency was granted, after paying 1/15 in the £. Preston was a northern suburb in which Sparks had agitated for railways since 1887 and where shortly before he left James, he had stated at a tramways meeting that 'he was so enamoured of it [the district] himself that he intended are long to take up his abode in the locality'.

After his acquittal, Sparks was treated to a 'complimentary dinner' in Preston; he participated in the local council elections, and he supported W.R. Fitzgerald Moore in the 1890 election for the Southern Province of the Legislative Council. James had previously declined to stand because he claimed that he had accepted an undertaking involving contracts between Victoria and other colonies. His withdrawal led to speculation that Sparks had sought and obtained his revenge. This Sparks denied but the suspicion nevertheless remains.

Sparks was a major witness before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Railways early in 1891 when discussions of the route for a northern suburbs railway were held but he was not mentioned in the local paper after the end of that year.

54. Sands' Directories 1891-4 show him in Tyla Street, Preston.
56. Collingwood Mercury, 4 March 1887 – Sparks was president of the North Suburban Railway League.
57. Northcote Leader, 29 June 1889.
58. Preston Leader, 2 August 1890.
59. Ibid. 9 August 1890.
60. Ibid. 30 August 1890.
61. Romsey Examiner, 22 August 1890; Collingwood Mercury 21 August 1890.
62. Northcote Leader, 30 August 1890.
63. V.P.P. 1891 v.2 Parliamentary Standing Committee on Railways. First General Report.
64. He probably moved to Sydney where entries for Harold Sparks appear from 1897 to 1914 in various secretarial and managerial positions in Sands' Sydney Directory.
The demise of James and Sparks, the suicide of Crisp, the failure of the Davies brothers and temporarily, of Bent were part of the depression which had gradually succeeded the boom. Whilst the shire of Moorabbin and especially its old West riding changed under the influence of the 'boom', with its railways extension and the Beaumaris tram, its widespread land sales, its further extensions of water supply and its attempts to make a healthy, fashionable 'watering Place', the 'boomer's' dreams of spectacular population growth in the coastal sections were not realized for almost twenty years.

Nevertheless, the 'eighties did produce new and durable tensions in the community and it is to these and the general development of the community through the boom that we now turn.
CHAPTER 5 : GROWTH, SEVERANCE AND RE-SUBDIVISION

IN THE 1880's

At the end of the 'eighties, there were few Crown portions in
the West riding and south into Mordialloc which had not been subdivided
into small lots; in the parts along the coast which had been cut up in
the 'fifties, there was a new flurry of activity but inland, in Holloway's
old 'Township of Moorabbin', for example, sales were very slow. John
Matthew Smith still retained the two portions around 'Castlefield' in
South Road; 1 Ehden's estate in Portions 29 and 30 remained, the house
hidden within its 112 acres and already surrounded by a considerable
folk-lore about its origins; 2 and David Benjamin's Portion 73 remained
intact apart from a small bite for the railway extension but almost
everywhere else in the West riding had been under the hammer, at least in
part.

In spite of the important new rail connections made to the area
in the 'eighties, it was still necessary to change trains at Brighton
Beach on the Sandringham line and the Mordialloc line had many of the
characteristics of a country service. The emphasis placed on these rail

1. See above p.120 for sales of his other holdings late in the 'boom';
at his death in 1898 (ibid., Southern Cross, 23 April 1898) he
left an estate of £238,100 (Ibid., 9 July 1898) which included
most of the land he had owned in the '80's - See Simmonds Other
Box - Letter dated 3 August 1898 from J.M. Smith and Emmerton.

2. e.n., Southern Cross, 9 December 1893 had its turreted construction
to provide a refuge in case of an attack from the aborigines.
It 'was used as the residence of Governor Latrobe' in the same
account. A less garbled article by M.H. O'Neill appeared in Ibid.,
6 January 1894. It was finally sold and subdivided in 1910 -
Ibid., 19 November 1910.

3. Finally subdivided in 1904 - see Simmonds Book - Plan dated
November 1904.
services as 'excursion lines' is suggestive too of the fact that for the Melbourne masses of the 'eighties, Sandringham and its adjacent portions of coastal Moorabbin remained as places to visit rather than places in which to live. The lack of a water-supply in most parts of the shire and the cost of the rail fares remained as deterrents to permanent residents.
GROWTH:

In spite of the volume of land sales, the shire of Moorabbin grew slowly compared to other suburbs, as Davison has shown\(^4\) with an increase of only 75.2 per cent in the intercensal period, 1881-1891 as against the enormous increases of suburbs like Essendon 400.4 per cent, Malvern 369.4 per cent, Borounda 306.8 per cent or even of neighbouring Brighton 140.8 per cent. In fact, Moorabbin's growth approximated that of 'older' suburbs like Richmond, South Melbourne and St. Kilda. This apparently slow growth can be accounted for partly by the fact that most of Moorabbin was rural in terms of its services throughout the 'eighties and therefore was not so attractive for speculative or private building for residence as suburbs better served; in fact, Moorabbin in the 'eighties was part of Melbourne's outer fringe at a time when the "walking city" was giving way to the more dispersed "trains and tramways city"; investment there was clearly highly speculative and an investment in land carried a much less risk than any capital development.

Taking growth figures for Moorabbin as a whole produces a somewhat misleading picture of slow growth; if one takes the West riding only, then there is a clearer view of the 'boom' suburb.

---

4. Ph.D. thesis v.2 Table 6: 1
### Table 5:1: Moorabbin Population 1881-1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>1881 (Census)</th>
<th>1886 (Council)</th>
<th>1891 (Council)</th>
<th>Aggregate Increase 1881-91</th>
<th>% Increase 1881-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>115.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South 1571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3733</td>
<td>4155</td>
<td>6191</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The West riding was divided in 1888 to form West and South.
2. I have used the Council figures for 1891 in preference to the Census whose breakdown into ridings is clearly in error:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   It seems very likely that all of Cheltenham and Mordialloc have been included in the South riding, hence the very low figure for the East riding – an impossible fall of 427 since 1881.

3. Since there was no Council population count for 1881, I have used the Census figure with the result that the increases in this table are probably lower than the actual ones.

As Table 5:1 shows, growth in the West riding was at least comparable to Brighton's but the point remains that the increase was not as spectacular as those in the newer northern and eastern suburbs. For Sandringham itself, it is difficult to arrive at a reasonably valid
population figure for this period. 6

Regional differentiation shown by analysis of those rated and by
analysis of the size of holdings clearly accelerated as the subdivisions
of the 'eighties took place; (see Table 5 : 2) in 1886, only 141 of 751
occupiers of land in the West riding were gardeners whereas in the North,
207 out of 301, and in the East, 127 out of 407; the West also had 808
rated blocks of less than ten acres and 168 of more whereas the North had
161 of more than 10 and 161 of less. In the West, there was an actual
fall in the number of gardeners from 1881.

By 1891, all ridings had experienced some subdivision giving the
Rate-collector a prolific growth in numbers of entries. 7

6. The Victorian Municipal Directory maintained Sandringham's population
at 183 throughout the period 1883-95 and the Ratebooks only count
by houses for the period 1871-8. The 1891 Census gave a figure of
787 for 'Sandringham and neighbourhood' but it is not clear what
boundaries were used.

7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>3316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 : 2  GARDENERS AND SIZES OF RATED PROPERTIES 1881-1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>1891(^{1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land 10&gt;acres</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 10&lt;&quot;</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occupations of Rated Persons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>1891(^{1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source - Ratebooks: 1881, 1886, 1891

Notes:

1. The West Riding was divided into West and South Ridings in 1888, so that totals given below West and South figures are for the area of the old West Riding.

2. Lots held by companies not included for South Riding.

3. This figure is a minimum one; in the East Riding, many occupations were not entered and some of these were certainly gardeners; there may not have been a fall in gardeners.

In the area of the old West riding, now carved into the West and the South ridings, there were a total of 130 gardeners rated - a fall of 11 since 1886 as against a total of more than 1200 'other' owners, exclusive of companies; in the North, the number of gardeners rated had fallen to 168,
compensated by a substantial expansion in gardening in the East where 214 were rated. By 1891, the land held in lots of more than 10 acres, not held by companies, roughly coincided with the numbers of gardeners rated, suggesting the high subdivision of undeveloped land already noted. The numbers of gardeners and holdings of more than 10 acres remained much the same through the depression of the 'nineties. This Ratebook analysis is roughly borne out by the 1891 Census figures, which show that there were 445 cultivators of whom 329 had between 6 and 30 acres, cultivating 3382 acres out of the 4427 acres cultivated and representing 390 of the 611 holdings in the Shire over one acre. The Census also provides clues as to the regional distribution of gardening in relation to land occupation (Table 5: 3).

**TABLE 5 : 3  LAND OCCUPATION 1891**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>Occupied (acs.)</th>
<th>% of Total Cultivated</th>
<th>Cultivated (acs.)</th>
<th>% Cultivated of total area Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>3703</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10165</td>
<td></td>
<td>4427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Previous censuses did not present comparable figures on land use.

9. The discrepancy could be due to some doubling up in Ratebook entries and to the Census regarding as employees some of those rated as 'gardeners'.

10. The only other Census return related to cultivation, 1871, showed 427 cultivators of 3241 acres. Thus over the period 1871-1891, the average area cultivated per cultivator rose from 7·6 acres in 1871 to 9·9 acres in 1891.
The scope of growth can be fairly accurately traced through house-building (see Table 5 : 4). From a total of 684 houses in 1881 with more in the West than in either of the other two ridings the next five years brought an increase to 823 houses but with over half the new building in the West, 29.2 per cent against an overall increase of 23.2 per cent. This growth was further accentuated before 1891 with a 76.1 per cent increase in the old West riding as against a 54.4 per cent overall increase.

### TABLE 5 : 4 RATED BUILDINGS : 1881-1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase Since 1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>% Increase Since 1886</th>
<th>1886-91</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(After 1888)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source - Ratebooks

11. North - 212 - 37%; East 219 - 32%; West 253 - 37%.

12. This analysis is based on the Ratebooks. There is still considerable disparity between census and rate collector's figures but the proportions of the census figures are approximately those of the ratebook, in comparable cases a.o. in totals, where 1881 - Census 743 Ratebook 684 and 1891 - Census 1416 Ratebook 1260

The obvious error in the riding figures in the 1891 Census limits their usefulness.
Thus the 'eighties, especially the second half, saw a considerable growth in Moorabbin of population and building, with most of it in the area west of Point Nepean Road where there was an increase of 123.7 per cent in housing in 1881-91 compared to an increase of 84.1 per cent in the shire as a whole – comparatively the North had 58 per cent and the East 54.4 per cent. 13

The Census gives a total of 171 unoccupied houses and houses under construction in Moorabbin in 1891; the Ratebook suggests a figure of less than 60 unoccupied. Part of this discrepancy is probably due to houses under construction not being rated and also to the fact that many houses were occupied only in the summer months, often on a yearly lease, so that for the Rate collector, they were 'occupied' and for the Census collector, they were not. The extent of this latter type of occupancy is not known but clearly one needs to use the Census figures on occupancy cautiously for anywhere like Moorabbin with seasonal residence.

Most of the house-building of the 'eighties was in wood but, of brick houses, a disproportionate number were in the old West riding-55 of a total of 85 for the shire in 1886. 14

The ideal of home-ownership was stressed by the subdividers 15 but in the late 'eighties, there was a substantial decline from the high level of owner-occupation (see Table 5: 5); in 1886, there was 78 per cent owner-occupation in the shire with the west at 80.1 per cent and and North at 74.5 per cent providing slight variations. By 1891, the shire figure was down to 62.6 per cent with equivalent drops in all ridings except the new West riding which still had a higher level of

13. For totals see Table 5: 4.
14. Based on Ratebook details of house construction. The Census figures for 'construction' are much higher than this – 1881 – 115 houses and 1891 – 219 houses. This point cannot be taken much further as neither the 1881 nor the 1891 Ratebook give details of house construction.
15. See above p.127
68.6 per cent. This substantial drop in owner-occupation in the shire might suggest that speculative building for rental if not for sale took place in the late 'eighties but the Ratebooks do not show this on a large scale except at Mentone in the South riding where the Mentone Land Company and Henry Arnold & Co had built extensively and where, in 1891, there were 42 occupied houses owned by land and investment companies and a further 39 unoccupied. Elsewhere, there is little sign of building for sale or rental on a large scale - Frederick Aplin owned 7 houses in Gipsy Village and J.M. Jenkins had built 6 at 'Highett Town' but these were exceptional. Very often, the landlord lived locally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Houses Owned</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.5: Owner-Occupation: 1881-1891**

16. Shire Ratebook 1891.

17. This phenomenon has been noted by M.J. Kelly, 'Eight acres: Estate Sub-Division and the Building Process, Paddinton, 1875 to 1890'; *AEH*, 2 September 1970, pp. 155-168.
The decline in the level of owner-occupation seems partly to have been due to the deaths of the first generation of gardeners - frequently their widows were the landlords, or, sometimes if the gardener had retired, there was a family lease; it is also partly due to the acquiring of land by companies who had not subdivided it and who thus leased it pending subdivision. It is also possible that the rise in renting represents a greater mobility of the Moorabbin population in the late 'eighties. 18

The number of small houses in the shire continued to drop in the 'eighties; in 1886, there were 528 houses of 4 rooms or more to 191 with less than 4, 19 and the 1891 Census shows only 67 houses with 1 or 2 rooms. 20 Within the shire, slight differences in house-size are apparent. In 1886, for instance 78.9 per cent of houses in the West riding had 4 rooms or more compared with the East 72.8 per cent, the North 77.5 per cent and the shire as a whole, 76.7 per cent. 21 By 1891, the Census shows an average of 5.39 rooms per house in the shire but the West had 5.52 and the North 4.92 rooms. 22

---

18. Very intensive ratebook analysis could provide an answer on this point.
20. The Census changed its method of classification in 1891, providing figures in categories: 1-2, 3-6, 7-10, 11-15, 16-20, more than 20, so that direct comparison with 1881 is impossible. Moreover, the 1891 Ratebook does not contain details of rooms either. In 1891, 1030 houses had up to 6 rooms and 327 had 7 or more.
21. Actual figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than 4 rooms</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>628</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less &quot; 4 &quot;</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Shire - 7642 rooms in 1418 houses; West-1717 rooms in 311 houses (This figure is for the West riding formed in 1888 and therefore cannot be compared to the West for 1886); North - 1741 rooms in 354 houses.
Disparity between the numbers in the sexes was gradually disappearing in the 'eighties as population increased. Overall, in 1891, the ratio was 89 females to 100 males with the Narrabundah North still strongly male with 77:100 and the new West riding much closer to parity at 95:100. Brighton maintained its partly compensating female preponderance, in spite of rapid growth too. The disparity was most apparent in the adult group notably the 30-35 years group where there were 224 males and 217 females; the ratio between unmarried females over 15 years and unmarried males over 20 years dropped to 91:100. The main factor in the drop was an influx of Chinese into Mooroobin market gardens and to a lesser extent, Scandinavians into fishing at Woddiarloo.

The large increase in Mooroobin's population in the 'eighties very largely maintained the proportions of 1881 - the Australian-born rose to 67 per cent in 1891 from 64 per cent in 1881, whilst there was a corresponding decline in the proportion of British-born to 27.8 per cent. The figures also suggest the high level of overseas migration to Melbourne, for out of a net gain for the decade of 2093 people, there were net arrivals of 1103 including 420 English-born, 102 Scots and a large number whose birthplaces were in other colonies, notably 87 from South Australia, 46 from Tasmania, 65 from New Zealand and 72 from New South Wales. This

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Mooroobin Shire</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>3082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Riding</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Riding</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Town</td>
<td>4611</td>
<td>5247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Ratios calculated from 1891 Census — males females

24. 1891 Census — 748 males over 20 years, 679 females over 15 years (380 females over 20 years).

25. There was also a Convalescent Home for Men at Cheltenham; the only figures for females I have found was 17 in 1897 — Southern Cross, 13 March 1897. I have not found any female institutions.

high inflow lessened the impact of the enormous increase of Victorian-born; in fact, the proportion of Victorian-born fell slightly during the decade from 61.7 per cent in 1881 to 61.4 per cent in 1891.\footnote{1881 - 2305 in 3733 people; 1891 - 4011 in 6542 people.} The number of people born in other colonies almost supports the claim of the old booming advertisement that people were rushing to Moorabbin from all parts of Australia.

There are two other demographic elements of the 'eighties worth noting: one was the steep relative decline of the Irish-born from 9.5 per cent of the shire in 1881 to 5.6 per cent in 1891 with a net gain of only 16 people\footnote{Irish - 1881 - 353; 1891 - 369.} and the other was the appearance of important non-British minority groups. By 1891, there were 135 Chinese-born in Moorabbin - in 1881, there had been one - and there were also other significant minorities: Scandinavians - 48 and Germans - 56. It was in these non-British groups that the great disparities between the sexes occurred; the Chinese population was all male; there were only 6 females in a total of 48 Scandinavians;\footnote{Most at Mordialloc in fishing and boating a.a. Nils Peter Olsson, Axel Svenson, Neil Johnson, William Rydberg who gave evidence before the Select Committee upon the Fishing Industry of Victoria, Final Report 1892 in V.P.P. 1892/3 v.1.} and 16 females in a total of 56 Germans. The preponderance of males over females amongst the English-born remained but it was diminishing but as the Census does not provide a breakdown of the figures into ridings, further comment on the distribution of the English groups cannot be made. Moorabbin had significantly more 'foreign'-born than Brighton - 5.1 per cent against 3.6 per cent in 1891, re-inforcing a picture of social differentiation, already noted, and also understandable in view of the rural nature of most of Moorabbin.
Whilst Bruton mentions Chinese fishermen at Mordialloc probably in the 'sixties, it was not until the 'eighties that numbers became market gardeners in both Brighton and Moorabbin. The Census clearly shows this growth in figures for Chinese-born:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Ratebook, there appear to have been no Chinese gardeners between 1872 and 1881 but from 1882, the Ratebook shows Ah Yet renting 6 acres in Huntley Road and there is a rapid increase especially in the North Riding during the 'eighties. Almost all of their holdings were rented and it is simply not true to say that 'the Chinese owned and worked most of the market gardens within easy reach of Melbourne'; this is to believe the anti-Chinese propagandists.

Local opposition to the Chinese reached a climax in August, 1887 when a packed meeting at Cheltenham with Harold Sparks in the chair passed a series of resolutions calling on the government to protect the local working man from 'unequal competition', to raise the poll tax on immigrants to at least £100, and to introduce a tax on Chinese residents of £10 per annum, thereby raising their costs of living. Further, sanitary regulations should be enforced on Chinese housing and Sunday work prevented. These resolutions were taken to a conference with the Trades Hall but the ensuing planned boycott of Chinese gardeners at the market failed. The fact that most of the Chinese rented land from

31. Shire Ratebook 1882 Entry No. 309.
32. In 1891, a name check of Ratebook shows 25 Chinese, all renting, with 21 in the North Riding.
34. Southern Cross, 27 August, 17 September 1887. See Oddie, M.A. Thesis ch.3 for the wider setting of the anti-Chinese movement of 1887-8 and generally for the Chinese in Victoria 1870-90.
local gardeners suggests that fear of competition did not fully carry through to actual practice although clearly the pressure of the Cheltenham meeting was against selling or letting to the Chinese. More likely it was the emotional tinged with the economic that prompted action. As ‘A Gardener’ wrote in the Southern Cross:

Once the Chinese gain a footing in this district then look at the wickedness that will follow, leprosy, opium smoking, whoredom, theft, gambling and wickedness that no other nation follows but the Chinese, whose cunning and crafty ways does not leave him open to the law.

Later, in the dispute over the issue of ‘night-soil’ permits, Councillor Dally argued that a reason for discontinuing them was that they ‘encouraged an undesirable class – the Chinese – to settle amongst us’.

An Alma has shown, the Chinese were often unequally treated in the enforcement of ‘night-soil’ bye-laws; in Moorabbin, a clear case of this discrimination occurred when See Hing was fined £2/2/- and £2/2/- costs for using night-soil supplied to him by the local dunghill contractor, H. Wilkins. As the chairman of the court commented: ‘it seemed a remarkable thing that an officer of the council could commit a breach of the bye-law whilst a comparatively innocent Chinaman had to suffer’. See Hing unsuccessfully appealed to the council to refund his fine.

35. In 1891, these included J. & T. Marriott, A. Waun, H. & W. Box, J. L. Smith and also Henry Carr, the night-soil contractor.
36. E. Penny urged this and Exley said he had refused £11 per acre for 14 acres.
37. 22 January 1887.
38. Southern Cross, 9 August 1890.
40. Southern Cross, 9 June 1894.
41. Ibid.
The Council periodically passed motions drawing the attention of the police to the fact that Chinamen worked on their gardens on Sundays.\(^{42}\) This was part of the wider question of Sabbath observance, for which there was a general acceptance on the Council,\(^{43}\) but nevertheless the motions were usually discriminatory.

The 1891 Census does not give any breakdown within the shire of religious adherence (Table 5 : 6) but some probable inferences can be drawn from the total figures compared with those for 1881 (See Table 2 : 1) when a pattern of distribution was known. Proportionately, the Anglicans made substantial gains in adherence and whilst the numbers of the other sects rose, their proportions declined. This relative decline is especially noticeable amongst the Church of Christ but also among the Methodists and Baptists; the very low net gain in Irish-born population is mirrored by the proportionate decline in the Catholic population. Since more of the increased population was found in the West Riding than elsewhere, one can assume the greatest increases there in the Anglican population and also among the Presbyterians who maintained their proportion of 10 per cent; thus Moorabbin's patterns of religious adherence and especially those for the West Riding were becoming more like Brighton's in 1891 but nevertheless, the strength of the Methodists and the Church of Christ and the German minority of Lutherans remained as distinctive elements in Moorabbin.

---

\(^{42}\) Council Minutes 10 February, 10 March, 1890; 19 December 1898; 22 January, 3 September, 1 October 1900; Southern Cross 22 January, 17 February 1900; 21 July 1894; Council Minutes 6 February, 21 August 1905.

\(^{43}\) See Southern Cross, 4 August 1894. On the other hand, a year after discriminatory motions against the Chinese, the Council passed: 'That when the engineer deems it necessary, the day men be called out for Sunday work unless they have conscientious scruples' Council Minutes 17 December 1906.
### TABLE 5.6

**RELLIGIOUS ADHERENCE 1891**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Madora Bin</th>
<th></th>
<th>Brighton</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4431</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutherans</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>6542</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9858</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source - Census 1891)
MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATION: 1880-1900

In the period 1880-1900, the councillors themselves provide some insight of the nature of each riding. The North, stable, without much village development, and solidly gardening, had only six councillors over this period: Bent, never opposed after the 1860's; William G. Burgess, 1881-1916, a widely respected gardener; William Ward, 1863-6, 1871-89, 1892-5, long standing champion of northern interests; and Michael Clements, 1895-1910, fiery 'night-soil' advocate; William Leary, 1878-81 and Frederick Hollier, 1889-92, all gardeners. The East riding where there was expansion of gardening in this period and which contained parts of the Villages at Cheltenham and Mordialloc, was mainly represented by gardeners - Robert Keys 1874-87, Henry Comport 1864-9, 1879-89, Donald McSwain 1882-93, Francis Le Page 1889-1902, George Brownfield 1893-1910 and Robert Mills 1887-1915. Richard Alexsidge 1873-82, a Mordialloc publican was the exception. By contrast, the West had much less stability of representation and only six of the fourteen councillors for the period were gardeners. Alfred Harston retired in 188444 but his place was taken by David Abbott who held it almost continuously until 1898. J.G. Reynolds, the South Brighton storeskeeper, 1883-5, Thomas Rennison, a Mordialloc publican, 1887-8, and Alfred Bunn, 1894-9, a retired civil servant living on the Esplanade, all had short periods on the Council; so too did Harold Sparks 1885-7. The other two, Alfred Small, 1899-1914 and de Hanzell Storey, 1899-1905 were both auctioneers. The gardeners - George Stayner, 1886-7,47 Charles

44. He left the district by 1889 and for the period 1892-1905, lived in Surrey Hills, according to Sands' Directories.
45. Sutherland, v.2, p.730
46. First rated 1885 Shire Ratebook Entry No. 844
47. Sutherland, v.2 p.707; Cheltenham Leader, 3 November 1894.
Allen, 1880-3, George Mock 1879-85, E.J. Barnett, 1888-94 and his brother, W.H. Barnett 1894-1909, and J.J. Daly 1888-94 — were all substantial ones whose families had been in the area since the 'fifties. Daly was locally involved in the 'boom' as a subscriber to the Sandringham Property Company, a shareholder in the Brighton, Caulfield and Morell and Property and Investment Company and also of Sandringham House. The most active councillors for the West were all non-gardeners — Harston, Abbott and Sparks — and for a brief period in 1887, there were no gardener representatives for the West. In the South riding, formed in 1888 from the southern parts of the West riding, there was even less stability and only one gardener, Edwin Penny, 1893-1908, amongst the ten councillors for the period 1888-1900. Maurice Benjamin 1894-7, Charles Potts, 1888-90, and E.J. Vail 1888-92 were all solicitors; John McIndoe, 1898-1908 was a law clerk; F.R. Nipps, 1899-9, a civil engineer; James Miller, 1892-4, was a printer at Morwell and William Lamb Smith, 1889-1902, Edward Nicholls 1890-3, and Charles Hearle, 1888-92, were all auctioneers and/or land agents. Potts, Vail, Miller, Nicholls and Hearle all left the district in this period and all but Miller were involved with land companies in the area.

At the height of the boom in 1888 and in the wake of the attempted severance and the subdivision of the West riding, the most spirited elections occurred, with all seats thrown open. The candidates and the results reinforce the picture of representation already given;

48. Sutherland, v.2, p.663; Southern Cross, 28 October 1893.
49. Cheltenham Leader, 27 October 1894.
50. Manager of Fraser & Co., auctioneer.
51. Acquisition in Southern Cross, 28 June 1890 is very strong amongst the syndicators of the South riding.
52. Resigned 14 October 1889, went to Gippsland and was killed by train — see Southern Cross, 21 March 1891 and Cheltenham Leader, 21 March 1891:

'Reverses of fortune had preyed upon his mind and for several days prior to his death he had been seeking solace in the inhospitable bowl.'
in the North, Bent, Burgess and Ward were elected unopposed; in the
East, James Jenkins, the only non-gardener, finished behind Mills,
Comport and McSwain; in the West, Abbott headed the poll with the only
other non-gardener, Walter Mills behind Daly, Barnett and Penny; in the
South, all five candidates were non-gardeners: Hearle, Potts, Vail and
the unsuccessful ones, Lamb Smith and W.T. Carter, whom Sparks supported. 53

During the 'eighties, the presidency of the shire, of some
significance because the president had a further casting vote when voting
was even, was always in the hands of the North and West councillors.
This was partly because of their relative experience. Ward, for
instance, was president 1880-2 and significantly, Bent four times -
1884, 1885, 1887 and 1888 - with Abbott in 1886 so that for five
consecutive years, the leadership was in the hands of forward looking men
whose interests were not narrowly conservative in the spending of money
and the making of improvements. For the rest of the period, the
presidency was mostly in the hands of the gardeners - Burgess 1889, 1895,
1896; Mills 1890, 1891, 1897 and Penny 1898, 1899, the others being
Lamb Smith 1892, Abbott 1893, 1894, and Bent, about to make a triumphant
return to Parliament, in 1900.

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES IN THE 'EIGHTIES:

The annual valuations of the shire (Table 5:7) provide a useful backdrop for a consideration not only of the advance and decline of land values in the period 1890-1900 but also of regional differences. They are also important for any useful analysis of council activities in this period. Based on land prices, they suggest the enormous advance in auction prices for West riding land. A block 100 feet by 300 feet on the corner of Melrose Street and the Esplanade sold in 1881 for 30/- per foot; in James's 1884 sale, the same area, now two smaller blocks 100 feet by 141 feet and 100 feet by 81 feet sold for 50/- and 23/- a foot, an advance of 243 per cent; the smaller block was sold again in April 1886 for 50/- a foot, another 217 per cent whilst in November, the same year, a similar block in Melrose Street made 77/6 a foot; a year later, another Melrose Street block sold for 91/- a foot which, in 1888, Simmonds had listed at £9 per foot.54 These advances in prices and increases in valuations were of course parts of the stock-in-trade of the 'boomer', examined in the previous chapter; these were the paper profits on which they so often proceeded.

For the council, the rise in valuations meant a substantial rise in income from rates which, in turn, attracted larger government endowments, based as these were on the amounts collected locally. From 1884, the council maintained a 1/- in the £ rate55 which accorded with the usual boomer's belief that 'in any district where the rate was high it was noticeable that it retarded its progress'.56

54. This analysis is based on plans with marked prices and the listing book for the 'Sandringham Estate' in the S.P. Simmonds collection. Few areas experienced this extent of selling but the advance of prices for this land seems to have been repeated elsewhere. Tracing of T.O. search notes would demonstrate this further.

55. It had been 1/3 in the £ in 1883 and 1/6 in the £ in 1881/2.

56. Rent at Council in Southern Cross, 28 April 1883.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source - Ratebooks)
With the addition of loans floated in 1885, 1886, 1889 and 1892 the Council had considerable resources with which to carry out capital developments within the shire and thereby contribute to the furtherance of the 'boom'. Because the money was spent relative to the rates collected, the Council works tended to promote the West riding relative to the others.

The primary concern was with roads and by 1890, a total of 121½ miles were under Council control - 25 miles in the North, 39 miles in the East, 27 miles in the South and 30 miles in the West, most of them metalled in the gardening districts. The steep rise in valuations hailed so much by the boomer could cause difficulty for the gardener. As 'Veritas Vincit' wrote to the Southern Cross:

My property is valued this year at within an ace thrice that of last year. I have made no improvements whatever, either on land or building, and can only imagine that the way the valuator came to his figures was by cutting up my ground in imaginary allotments and playing the part of land-syndicate, auctioneer and some counter-jumper eager to secure a "splendid allotment in a rising and healthy locality, close to the train &c." mixed up with a good deal of the "luncheon provided" material.

57. Council Minutes, 17 August for £10,000; V.G.G. 1885 p.198A.
58. Council Minutes, 13 September for £3,000; V.G.G. 1886 p.2376.
59. Council Minutes, 3 September for £18,000; V.G.G. 1889 p.3314
60. For £2,000; 1hid., 1892 p.2734.
61. Southern Cross, 15 March 1890.
62. 19 June 1886.
But the Council’s activities still reflected the gardeners’ interests and the chief purpose of the four loans was for the construction of iron or steel way (or tram) along Point Nepean Road from Brighton to Cheltenham, up Centre, North and South Roads and down Bluff Road. Originally, Comport’s idea, it was Bent who successfully pressed for its construction both at Brighton and Moorabbin, and work proceeded from 1885. Much of the rest of the loan money was used in construction of local roads; in the villages, there was even some kerbing and channelling.

At the end of the ’eighties, the estimate of council spending on maintenance, public works, and day labour had risen to over £10,000, an enormous increase from 1885, and decline was not really precipitous in the ’nineties as the loan moneys were spent (Table 5 : 8). Whilst Council spending increased greatly in the ’eighties, there was very little attempt to build municipally on the grand scale, so characteristic of Melbourne suburbs in the ’boom’; neighbouring Brighton spent £8,000 on its town hall, a comparatively modest affair compared with South Melbourne’s or even Noroondara’s (Camberwell’s), opened in 1891 for £10,000. In Moorabbin, the Council narrowly agreed to build an additional room, 30 feet by 18 feet at £250 on to the existing chambers in 1884 and only then because Ward, the shire president, used his casting vote and Robert Keys abstained. Predictably, Comport opposed it on the same grounds as he had raised in the disputes of the ’sixties, that Cheltenham was more central to the shire.

63. Council Minutes, 9 October, 20 November 1882.
64. Rate Brighton, p.234; Council Minutes, 10 March, 30 June, 3 November, 22 December 1884.
65. Southern Cross, 4, 20 July 1885.
66. Rate, Brighton, pp.200-1.
67. Blainey, Camberwell, p.61
68. Council Minutes, 13 March 1884.
69. A further motion by Comport was rejected – see Southern Cross 31 March 1888.
### TABLE 5:8
ANNUAL ESTIMATES of INCOME and EXPENDITURE
(MAJOR ITEMS ONLY) (in £'s) 1880-1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Source</td>
<td>Salaries, Working Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>7675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>6148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>5216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source - Council Ratebooks and Minutes)

The great expansion in Council activities placed increased demands on its officers. In 1882, Keys was secretary, engineer and treasurer at £200 per annum and Rodley received £175 as clerk of works, rate collector, dog inspector, collector of statistics and inspector of nuisances. For the work carried out with the loan money they received additional payments in 1886 and both received salary rises in 1888; Keys to £300 and Rodley to £200 as clerk of works, having shed his rate-collection portfolio with the advance of the 'boom' to George Keys until the appointment of Ewen McSwain for the West and South ridings and William Ward junior for the North and East ridings in 1888.

Raising the officers' salaries was always contentious; for example, when Keys's salary was raised in 1889, councillors balanced his unquestioned capacity and the danger of losing him against their

---

70. Council Minutes, 7 August 1882.
71. Ibid. 28 October 1886.
72. Ibid. 14 January 1889; Southern Cross, 19 January 1889.
73. Southern Cross, 14 September 1889.
characteristic reluctance to spend money on their officers. This reluctance was supported by ratepayers like a correspondent in the *Southern Cross*, who, when in 1890, the Council baulked at giving Keys and Bodley commission for work on the 1889 loan argued that Keys's claim was not just, pointing to his various positions viz. secretary, engineer and treasurer for both Dandenong and Moorabbin shires, M.L.A. for Dandenong and Berwick and Chairman of the Carrum Irrigation Trust. Keys resigned when the Council refused to pay the commission but in October, he was voted £150 and Bodley £75 and the resignation was withdrawn.

The local health officer, honorary at first, was paid £10 per annum from 1884 but until 1891, there was still only one for the whole shire: Dr H.W.S. Verity of Cheltenham. The increased concern with public health was reflected in the appointments of two health officers - Drs Moore and Scantlebury - in 1891 and, in addition, Dr Joyce in 1893 and also by the appointment of local police as inspectors of nuisances.

---

74. 10 May, 14 June 1890.
75. *Southern Cross*, 17 May 1890.
76. Ibid., 11 October 1890.
77. Council Minutes, 7 April 1884.
78. Appointed 1885 - Ibid. 21 December 1885. Salary raised to £30 in 1889 - *Southern Cross*, 16 March 1889.
79. Council Minutes, 20 October 1891.
80. Ibid. 6 February, 6 March 1893; *Southern Cross* 11 February, 11 March, 25 March 1893.
SEVERANCE and RE-SUBDIVISION 1885 - 1886:

Grounds for separation by the West riding had been present from the first settlement but they became much more clearly visible in the early 'eighties. The provision of water, the duplication of the Brighton Beach line, the building of the Jetty at Picnic Point, the enormous number of sales in the coastal portions, the building activity at Gipsy Village and south on the 'Sandringham Estate' and also at Mentone and Mordialloc, the development of the beach resorts all played a part.

The steep rise in population and in land valuations relative to the rest of the shire led Ment as early as 1884 to propose dividing the West riding but his motion lapsed through want of a seconder. His argument had been simply that the West's funds for the previous year - £1,073 was twice as much as either of the other ridings - North £462, East £480 - and therefore, they were entitled to increased representation. Less than a year later, a large group within the West Riding petitioned for severance from Moorabbin and the formation of a new shire; in doing so, they dwelt on their differences from the other parts of Moorabbin thereby emphasizing and accelerating the growth of separate feeling, clearly dormant for most of the time of local government; there had been disputes but none approached this one in intensity nor in durability. Its links with the real growth of the 'boom' but also with the tactics of the 'boomers' are quite clear too; and the involvement of James and Sparks had importance for the timing and the impact of the movement.

Heralded by strong editorial support from the Southern Cross, which saw the petition as resulting from an amicable desire to separate 'rather than as the outcome of any quibble', a meeting, convened by Harold Sparks was held at the 'Duke of Edinburgh' on 15 January 1885.

81. Ibid. 5 May, 2 June 1884.
82. 10 January 1885.
David Abbott, the leading West riding councillor, was voted to the chair although he 'did not identify himself with the present movement' and Sparks outlined the reasons for the petition. First, the West had sufficient revenue to become a Shire; as has been noted, it had more than the East and North combined. Secondly, he claimed 'the area ... has been much built upon by professional men and others carrying on business in Melbourne and is now advancing by greater strides than formerly and as their properties are heavily rated they naturally seek to have the same advantages as are obtainable in other suburban districts'; this attunes well with 'boom' rhetoric. Thirdly, 'the interests of the ratepayers of the area and the other portion of the shire of Moorabbin are not in harmony and it is believed are antagonistic'; this was not really explained further. Fourthly, he claimed that the fact of considerable street building was sufficient justification for a Shire. Fifthly, 'efforts will be made to make it a suburb of Melbourne'; one has to assume that he was referring to the spread of water, gas, transport, night-soil and refuse disposal services and street-making, kerbing and drainage. Lastly, the area's progress would be impeded if severance was not granted.

In support of these claims, Sparks argued that the shire was too large and that the West riding had been treated unfairly, a point which Harston took up when he claimed that the West was made unduly responsible for the Point Nepean Road which mainly benefited the North and East ridings, and, as a consequence, Bluff Road and Beach Road, the main roads of the West riding were neglected. The opposition at the meeting came from Councillors Ward, Mills and Confort but there was overwhelming support for the severance move. Some fanciful voting for a name for the proposed shire took place at this meeting and 'Abbottsford' - perhaps a piece of calculated flattery - was recommended to other meetings.

---

83. *Southern Cross*, 17 January 1885.  
A further meeting was held the next week at Cheltenham with William Ruse, the ex-councillor, in the chair and Sparks and Harston, the main speakers for severance. Again, the opposition came from councillors including J.C. Reynolds, the South Brighton store keeper and West riding councillor who wanted a poll of ratepayers before further action was taken and who wanted additional membership for the West riding in order to eliminate anything of the unfairness which might exist. Point Nepean Road concerned Reynolds but as Ruse pointed out, its maintenance was vital to so many people that it would not suffer too much. Typical of the claims of the opposing councillors was that the petitioners had been hoodwinked; this was the sort of criticism to which Sparks could respond with florid and flattering pen:

> It will certainly be a matter of congratulation if the new shire has such able councillors and officers as now form the Moorabbin shire council.

As the separatists gathered their signatures, the 'Sandringham extension' sale in Portion 24 and the first of the 'Black Rock' sales in Portion 28 were held and James, the vendor, had plenty more land to subdivide in the southern parts of the West riding e.g. all of Portions 49A and 49B. Whilst a minority of councillors actively opposed the severance movement from the outset - Reynolds, Ward, Mills and Compart - the rest did not come out strongly against the moves until April after these sales. Abbott, for example, had moved in February that the Council offer no opposition to the petition but the motion was not

---

85. Ibid. 24 January 1885.
86. Ibid. 7 February 1885.
87. 14 February 1885.
88. 21 March 1885.
89. Shire Ratebook 1885 Entries Nos. 110A, 110B.
90. Southern Cross, 28 February 1885.
put; the separatists gathered their signatures, held their meetings and sent their petition which was gazetted before the Council decided to ask that the West riding be divided with Tulip Road the boundary between the two new ridings. At that meeting, Abbott claimed that the petition was 'not worth the paper it was printed on' and Bent, who had remained outside the conflict, claimed that the petition was informal.

While it cannot be argued that the Council's moves represented a dramatic volte-face, it has nevertheless to be explained why they had not come out against the petition before this. In February, Ward had thought that the separatists were 'cooling down' and this apparent slowness in acting may be explained by the hope that the movement would die through its own inertia, but the crisis came when the petition was actually presented. Then, concern that the severance would jeopardise the projected loan for the Point Nepean Road tram, the feeling that it was unfair for the West to suffer when its prosperity was rising and perhaps, the feeling that in the new shire, power was going to be very much in the hands of the Montrose promoters and James, for whom Sparks was a very able advocate, caused them to act. This last point is difficult to prove but one has to explain why Abbott was slow to oppose; his interests were all in the area around his house 'Coggeshall'; in the proposed new shire, his interests would be confined to one riding; he may have been genuinely suspicious of the desire for severance as opposed to subdivision of the West riding on these terms; although it does not seem to have been stated in 1885, it is possible that those councillors who had remained neutral like Abbott and Bent, decided that the separatists' demand was being made to serve their own interests rather than those of the community; a compliant council would not interfere with the plans of subdivision, would energetically promote improvements designed to encourage the sales of land but would not be

91. Council Minutes, 20 April 1885.
92. Southern Cross, 25 April 1885.
93. Ibid., 28 February 1885
concerned with the long-term prospects of the area.

The provisions of the 1874 Local Government Act\(^\text{94}\) under which severance was claimed were somewhat vague; Abbott, for example, claimed that the Governor-in-Council had no power to sever a portion of one shire into a separate shire,\(^\text{95}\) and certainly, the sections in the Act were much more explicit about annexation and consolidation than about severance; Rent, usually expert in local government matters, argued that the petition needed over half of those on the roll\(^\text{96}\) but he was clearly wrong. According to Sparks the petition submitted had been declared formally correct by the officials who gazetted it\(^\text{97}\) but after a visit of some councillors, presumably Rent and Abbott, it was discovered that there were some errors in declarations which made the petition informal.\(^\text{98}\) As a result a new petition was drawn up. The separatists' view, if Sparks is representative, was that sub-division would not help the riding because the present council could not work in the interests of the West.\(^\text{99}\)

The Council's action to counter-petition for subdivision brought on a vigorous personal battle between Sparks and Abbott largely conducted by letter in the Southern Cross. On 2 May, Abbott claimed that ratepayers had signed the petition under the misapprehension that the rates collected from the West were not being spent there; this had been his own belief before entering the Council 1884 but the fact that the end of year balances showed the North and the East in debit and the West in credit did not show that the West was being deprived of its due; rather,
there were contracts let which would absorb the credit. Severance would bring no advantage, he argued; rather, there would be an additional cost of building and a council of inexperienced men. These arguments were liberally spliced with acid too: Sparks 'can be president of it [the new council], and sit with eight of his Black Rock purchasers as councillors in his new shire hall on his Blackrock estate' but Abbott 'would have nothing to do with it'.

A letter writer in the same issue was 'inclined to think that the promoters of severance have some personal object to gain' for, as he pointed out, under the proposed divisions, the same disparity of income that had appeared in Moorabbin shire would occur — the North, the area North of Bay Road would be much wealthier than the Centre between Bay and Balcombe Roads and the South, the rest. These letters produced a great flurry in the next Southern Cross, including one from Sparks branding Abbott's attack as 'grossly and impertinently personal'. The Southern Cross itself, now editorialised for subdivision rather than for severance mostly on the grounds that the proposed loan and works to be effected as a result would not take place if severance was proceeded with.

In the next issue, Henry Young of Mentone wrote most eloquently for severance:

here is a beautiful and picturesque piece of country springing up into magnificent villas with syndicates and incorporated companies buying up the land of the market gardeners, turning them into streets and selling it by the foot; this is the age of progress, and if this land is governed and managed by a separate municipality will it not more likely go ahead with its own council to direct its local requirements, see

---
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to the beautifying and protection of its foreshore, to which it has a most noble frontage, will not, I say, this locality more likely push itself into prominence in conformity with the times and its position, than if it was linked to, and formed a part of a back lying country district, principally used for grazing and market gardening purpose? This is what is meant by the words in the petition that the interests of the West and other ridings are not in accord.

Recollecting Abbott's strong protests over the taking of stone from the beach, he wondered 'what sweet allurements this council has used to win over this gentleman's ability at bantry and poor sophistry.' Subdivision would mean, according to Young, that

'It would be a very long time before we [the West] could shake off the old fogyism of the old municipality; where councillors were perpetually re-elected and meetings were held once a month.

At this stage, compromise moves were made with Bent, the shire president and the man really capable of straddling the interests of the coast and country, actively making them. A meeting on 21 May, in which it was argued that the loan would not succeed with severance, suggested, at Bent's instigation, that a conference of six persons of opposite views should work out a settlement. In the meantime, Bent arranged that the new severance petition should not be presented for a fortnight and offered, on the Council's behalf, equal East and West contributions to Point Nepean Road, £5000 from the next loan to be spent on the West, and equal contributions to the tram from both East and West. To clinch the bargain, the Council would not pass the loan if the West severed; they would drop the proposals for re-subdivision.

4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid. 23 May 1885.
7. Council Minutes, 28 May 1885.
if the West remained. At a meeting of the petitioners for severance at Cheltenham on 28 May, the first leaders of the movement, Harston and Sparks, were inclined to accept the compromise but the meeting carried a motion to proceed with severance with Sparks nevertheless arranging that a deputation of nine should meet the Council - Harston, Ruse, Sparks, Charles Allen, Brown, Judd, McGee, Organ and Junner. 8

On 1 June, a special council meeting received the deputation. After a series of exchanges in which Rant's compromise position was strongly put, the deputation left and drew up the following resolution: 'That if the Council proceed with the loan and discountenance steps taken for division of the riding into two, the stops taken for severance will be discontinued' to which the Council agreed. 9 A meeting of West riding ratepayers generally concurred in the actions taken; the tram must not be stopped, the financing of Point Nepean Road was now placed on a more satisfactory basis - compromise had won. 10 The crisis passed, Orford of the Southern Cross presented a short play in verse on the Council's proceedings entitled 'Sear Your Hearts and Not Your Lands, A Domestic Drama Incorporate With the Body Politic' with 'B - T' in the mediating role:

I think it only due to say that we Desire amongst us perfect harmony!

In order to achieve this:

In future, our boundary roads, our share will pay. That the loan shall be well and fairly spent
And no monies from the West to other ridings lent. One thing we must promise not to do
And that is the division of the riding into two.

In the face of this, 'EX-C' [Harston]:

---

8. Southern Cross, 30 May 1885.
9. Council Minutes, 11 June 1885; Southern Cross, 13 June 1885.
10. Southern Cross, 20 June 1885.
we’d got all we asked — if not a little more
And we said that now from Severance we might very well
withdraw.11

'Perfect harmony' was never restored; the whole of Moorabbin went
forward much more conscious of their differences than they had been
before; political antipathies had been created never to die; rural
Moorabbin, the old Moorabbin had been confronted by the newcomers to the
coast; old Moorabbin, which in many ways Bent stood for, survived but
the long-term reasons for strain were still there, unresolved. The
loan could proceed, the trams could be laid but these were transient
issues; the West remained, in contemporary metaphor, the lusty youth
outgrowing its parent: brash and conditioned by this struggle of 1885.
At the next Council meeting, both Abbott and Comport objected to the
minute that the Council was to 'discontinue' the steps taken; rather,
they argued, it was 'discontinue'; already, the terms of compromise
were in dispute.12

One result of the 1885 severance movement was that Harold Sparks
received enormous West riding support to replace Mock who had retired
from the Council. As his requisioners said:

In asking you to take charge of our interests, we would
express our gratitude for your thankless, arduous and
incessant toil on our behalf in bringing about a
reconstitution of the rights of the riding and obtaining
redress for its grievances. We would ask you to accept
our assurances that in you we sedulously guard our
interests, who will use every effort in promoting our
welfare and who will not spare trouble, care or labour
in the discharge of the duties of the office of councillor.13

11. Ibid.
13. Southern Cross, 4 July 1885.
The requisitioners listed in the paper totalled 122, of whom 78 were on the 1886 Voters' Roll representing a total of 161 votes in a possible 928.  

His supporters were distributed throughout the riding and included a fair sample of the community - a number of leading gardeners and ex-riding councillors like Charles Allan Junior, William Ruse and Daniel Magee were active supporters both of severance and Sparks. They were not by any means 'his Blackrock purchasers' as Abbott had written. Sparks's opponent at the election was Alfred Bradshaw, a horse trainer and pioneer of racing at Mentone and Mordialloc, who was in favour of dividing the riding. Against the charm that Sparks was more a representative James and the syndicatoes, Harston argued that he [Sparks] has his own property; but even if he did, I fail to see that we have any fault to find with men who, by their courage in opening out fresh localities cause a considerable increase in the value of our individual properties. I am not aware that the country objects to railways because the money is supplied by bloated British capitalists. It may be urged that syndicatoes have their own annuities in view; admitted. What then? The benefit to the district remains.

This was an argument that attuned well with the 'boom' of the 'eighties. On the one hand, there was admiration for the rugged individuals with the 'courage' to carve up land causing advance in values and improvements

---

14. No voters' roll for 1885 is extant—so that clearly these figures give the minimum of Sparks's support. The 1886 Voters' Roll is part of Public Works Department, Roads and Bridges Inward Correspondence 87/928 (V.-S.A.)

15. See Tom Sheehy, Mordialloc-Chelsea pp.31-34 for stories of his racing exploits.

16. Southern Cross, 29 August 1885.
for which the community was grateful; on the other, there was the feeling that individuals became too rich and powerful and that, say in Moorabbin, the little man on his land did not get the price he should. In 1885, in Moorabbin, it was more the former than the latter.  

Sparks argued for the need to maintain the unity of the west riding, clearly the major issue of the election, 'so that concerted action will be easier' surely suggesting that the compromise was a very temporary one. After his win - 299 to 101 - he denied that he was the 'nominee of C.H.James' whilst Bradshaw declared that he 'had contested the election in the interests of the market gardeners'. That both Bradshaw and Sparks claimed market gardener support and that neither was a gardener suggests the importance of the gardeners' vote as well as the changes that were taking place in the district.

On Council, Sparks was concerned actively with the interests of the West riding. In June 1886, for example, he moved that the Council adjust the balances between ridings i.e. the issue of the severance campaign where the West seemed perpetually in credit and the North and East in debit thereby the argument that the West was really financing works in the other ridings. Eventually, the Point Nepean Road account was adjusted on the basis of actual frontage with the East and West combining against the North with Sparks commenting that 'had it not been so, his resignation would have followed. He would have gone to the ratepayers, and the result would have been the

17. Something of the same ambivalence was current in American attitudes to 'big business' in the same period.
18. Southern Cross, 29 August 1885.
19. Ibid., 5 September 1885.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid., 12 June 1886.
22. Council Minutes, 26 July 1886.
settlement of the severance question. The severance issue was certainly not dead in spite of Abbott's refusing to take part, in August, in a debate on severance against Sparks for the Mutual Improvement Society at Cheltenham, claiming that 'he had come to the conclusion that it would be hardly compatible with the position of President to discuss in a debating club a matter so vitally affecting the shire', adding that both he and Sparks were 'pledged to allow [it] to drop'.

In January 1887, the Southern Cross reprinted an article on Moorabbin which had appeared in the Daily Telegraph which asserted that

the people of the West riding are determined that the place shall go ahead, and if those of the other ridings do not join in the progressive movement, there is every probability of the shire losing its richest portion. For, in that case, application will be made to have a new municipality and severance will be pressed to an early realization. It would be quite in keeping with the spirit of the times to have this 'new suburb' created; and the vast improvements taking place along the coast would form quite sufficient ground for such a step.

The basis for these predictions can be found in the Council's discussions with the Beaumaris Tramway Company over an agreement. James, originally given the right to build by the Council, had transferred that right to the Beaumaris Tramway Company, the prospectus for which had been published in the Southern Cross showing that Sparks was a director.

24. Ibid., 21 August 1886.
25. 15 January 1887.
27. 4 December 1886.
At the Council meeting, Abbott claimed that Sparks was a director and the holder of 300 shares and therefore not entitled to speak; this Sparks denied, claiming that he had regretfully withdrawn from the company. Abbott supported by Ward refused to believe him and the meeting dissolved in some uproar after passing a motion to apply to the Governor-in-Council to allow the tram to be built.\textsuperscript{28} In February, the Council met to consider the Beaumaris Tram proposals; Sparks and Rent moved that the Council sign the agreement\textsuperscript{29} but their fellow councillors expressed misgivings. Comport had thought that they would get the tram free after 30 years and McSwain was concerned that there was no clause for completion date whilst Ward claimed that the route started at the wrong end; the matter was not resolved and at a further meeting on 18 February, Abbott charged 'that the projectors never intended to carry out the scheme', thus implying, according to the \textit{Southern Cross}, 'that a fraud was contemplated upon the credulous and simple Moorabbinites'.\textsuperscript{30}

The Council made a series of amendments designed to guarantee that the company would carry out the project \textit{e.g.}, a deposit of £1500 was asked for, and to increase the Council's equity \textit{e.g.} by making the tram available for 21 years.

Whether there was any justification for Abbott's charges, it is impossible to answer conclusively but it is significant that the tram company's major shareholders all had large land-holdings in the section that was to be served first by the tramway \textit{i.e.} the route from Cheltenham station to the beach not as in the first agreement with James the section from the Sandringham railway station.\textsuperscript{31} Their enormous land-holdings could be served much more cheaply by a tram over a shorter

\textsuperscript{28} Southern Cross, 18 December 1886.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 19 February 1887.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 26 February 1887.
\textsuperscript{31} See above p.100 and Map 5.
route than one from Sandringham station. Abbott's land was already served by the railway almost completed from Brighton Beach; he and Sparks had already clashed during the sewerage movement of 1885 and clearly there were good grounds for his notion that the profits of the line would come from land sales rather than ticket sales; it is even conceivable that Abbott saw in the Beaumaris Tram, a vehicle by which the whole of the coast would come under the control of James and his associates to the detriment of his own and the interests of people who had decided to live there permanently, for the syndicators were mainly 'outsiders'.

By March, the Beaumaris tram issue had brought severance forward with the *Southern Cross* strongly in favour:

> The time has now arrived when it must be apparent that the west riding has no main interest in common with its sister electorates. To a necessarily limited extent there must be ever exist a mutual leaning, but the close association of the past is gone.

The main reason for the change, they argued, was

> the recent keen appreciation by the ever-extending population of the metropolis, of the manifold advantages of its shore line for residential sites

and predicted that in a short time, the west riding must become as much a suburb of Melbourne as is at present Brighton itself, the animating causes being identical — railway extension and the sea board.

To this 'sense of incompatibility of interests' was added the wrong of the way in which the rates were being spent. In the same issue, the petition for severance appeared, its reasons almost identical to those of the 1885 petition. The *Brighton Leader* argued that severance should not be 'used as a battering ram to obtain concessions but some

32. 5 March 1887.
councillors think ought not to be conceded.' Further, they considered that the only reason for Sparks's action was the demands made by the Council for guarantees from the tram company, considering that if the tram company was really 'bona fide' that it was 'strange [that they] should be so dreadfully sensitive when they are asked to prove their "bona fides"'.

Abbott's reaction to the new demand for severance was to circularise the West riding with the claim that Sparks and the severance group had broken the 'solemn agreement' made two years before and cautioning ratepayers against signing the petition. Stormy Council meetings ensued with Sparks claiming that Abbott's statement was 'a tissue of falsehoods' and that there never was any solemn agreement; rather, severance had been called off to enable the loan for the Nepean Road tram to proceed. Further, he argued that the conditions imposed on the tram were 'utterly unreasonable', but Sparks had no supporters for these contentions on the Council. Abbott moved that the Council go ahead and counter-petition for re-subdivision which Sparks claimed would result in the northern end joining Brighton and the southern end being left to fend for itself. In the Council debates, it was McSwain who referred to a previous 'bird of passane' [Macerthy], expressing bluntly what was probably a feeling held generally by the councillors that worthy people were those who 'were prepared to live and die in the shire'.

In the Council, it was again Bell who tried to straddle the issue, arguing strongly for the tram and pushing for further discussions with
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the company, so that the details of the agreement could not 'be used as a lever for severance.'\textsuperscript{40} Abbott suggested that 'the tramways might he laid to Rickett's Point, the company might work it a little, have a sale of land, and having had it, might say, "We don't want the tram any more" and move the rails to another place'; hence, a guarantee was necessary. Sparks maintained that the guarantee of £1500 would cripple the company's operations but Abbott claimed that this was 'a fair deposit' which would compel the company 'to carry out the work, and not merely lay a portion as make-shift and then pull it up and remove it to another part'.\textsuperscript{41}

After a meeting with James, a further agreement was produced: the company should forfeit all rights if the line was not kept in repair; the company should pay a penalty - £1 per day for the first three months and £5 per day for the next three months - if the sections joining Sandringham and Cheltenham stations were not completed within the year.\textsuperscript{42} The tram issue apparently settled, Bent could now mount an attack on the severance movement, arguing that squabbles would occur in the new district between the Mordialloc end and the Picnic end and that the scheme would result in 'decadence'.\textsuperscript{43}

Severance meetings were held with enormous coverage in the Southern Cross - six columns for one of Sparks's meetings\textsuperscript{44} - with support from leading landholders like J.B. Davies, the managing director of the Freehold Investment Company and a leading promoter of Mentone.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{40} Southern Cross, 19 March 1887.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} Brighton Leader, 26 March 1887.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44} 26 March 1887.
\textsuperscript{45} Cannon Land Boomerang pp.160-2.
G.W. Taylor, an enormous land speculator in the suburbs including Moorabbin, and J.M. Smith, Charles Allan and Daniel Macaee specifically denied Abbott's contentions about the nature of the agreement of 1885 and at a particularly rowdy meeting at Cheltenham, a resolution was actually passed late in the night that severance was undesirable with Abbott, secretary John Keys and Rent all arguing strongly against severance.

The severance petition was gazetted on 15 April 1887. Shortly afterwards, a further petition, this time for annexation to Brighton of the area north of Bay Road in the West riding was announced. The area was the same as the northern riding of Sparks's proposal and the chief proponent was Thomas Crisp who claimed that if Brighton controlled the area towards Picnic Point that there would be a substantial increase in land values something which Crisp's ailing 'Linacon Park' could do.

46. Ibid. p.32; he had once lived at 'Mirriment' Wells Road, Beaumaris see Shire Ratebook 1883 Entry No.1147 and was requisitioned to stand for the Council in 1882 - see Southern Cross, 26 August 1882 - but refused. His Moorabbin lands in 1888 when a company called the Australian City & Suburban Investment & Banking Company Limited was formed in 1888 to take over his holdings, totalled 432 acres including extensive blocks at Beaumaris and Mordialloc. See prospectus - Defunct Company Ban 1476; also in Simmonds' papers.
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50. V.C.L. 1887 p.1076. The actual petition has not survived, so the lists of signatories cannot be analysed. Probably some measure of composition can be inferred by taking the signatories of the successful council petition for re-subdivision of 1888 and also the lists of requisitioners for Sparks at the 1885 election; Public Works Department, Roads and Bridges, Register of Correspondence, Inwards Letters 1887/632 show stages of presentation. (V.-S.A.)
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with, but there was little support for the scheme.

In Council, the severance petition was attacked by Bent, who argued that it was not brought up voluntarily and openly by ratepayers but rather by auctioneers, members of land syndicates anxious to effect the sale of land. Sparks objected but the evidence of the meetings where the principal speakers, apart from Sparks, had been Davies and Taylor and the enormous holdings of the Union Property Investment Company, which had taken over the Saratoga Land Company's holdings in March 1887 and in which the principal shareholders - Robert Walker, Robert Kingston and E.O.Dyer - were also major shareholders in the Beaumaris Tramway Company, lend support to Bent's argument. Further, the evidence of the 1887 Ratebook suggests a case of 'roll-stuffing' by the Union company as the land obtained from Saratoga was listed under the names of individual shareholders of the company in 1887. Indeed the 1887 voters' roll for the West riding shows that practically all the Union shareholders had multiple votes - a total of 59 votes in a total of 975 for the West riding. To these votes could be added those of shareholders in the tram company - those with more than 25 shares in the tram had a total of 51 votes and those of Sparks and his family and others closely associated with James as employees like O.F.Watson or speculators like J.O.Davies, to give a total of well over 10 per cent of the voting power in the riding. Bent later strenuously raised this point of 'dummying' on Union land claiming that 'the men who have lived here for years would be outvoted at the election by men who had no interest in the

53. Ibid.
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district'. Storey, the valuer was criticised but no action was taken until 1891, when largely at Abbott's instigation, company nominees were removed from the Ratebooks. 57

Late in May, the hearings of the petition were conducted by J.A. Nimmo, the Minister for Public Works. 58 Sparks, Ruse, Charles Allan, J.G. Newman, Thomas Renison and J. Ferguson all spoke in favour of severance, raising some arguments which had not been canvassed much before. Ruse, for example, argued that the east and the north were peopled by market gardeners, 'one of whose great interests was to get night-soil as manure spread upon their gardens. It meant life and property to them; but destruction and disagreeableness to the west', but it was Ferguson's expressed hope that there would be no dividing of the townships of Mordialloc and Cheltenham that aroused Nimmo's interest, and he decided to visit the area. Sparks attempted to counter Nimmo's view that splitting townships would be detrimental by arguing that Smith Street divided Fitzroy from Collingwood but Nimmo rejected the petition on that ground, claiming also that the west riding was scarcely developed sufficiently and that it was generally undesirable to increase the number of municipalities. Nimmo's decision, 59 the Southern Cross argued, was 'clearly... against the wishes of the sentiments of the majority!' 60 but the way was paved for the Council's plan of re-subdivision, with Sparks, the only Council opponent. 61 The feud between Sparks and Abbott entered a new stage in July after Sparks had reported to the Public Works Department that Abbott had claimed that its officers had shown favoritism to the separatists. The Council censured Sparks who then took two

57. Ibid., 6 June 1891.
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59. Ibid., V.R.S., 1887 p.1454 dated 31 May 1887.
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columns of advertising space in the **Southern Cross** to justify his position by publishing with almost paranoid efficiency a whole series of letters supporting himself against Abbott.62

The re-subdivision issue was the major one at the West election in August. Abbott, having retired, three candidates - Thomas Rennison, the Mordialloc publican; Charles Hearle, a Cheltenham land agent; and Joseph Bell, a South Road gentleman, fought a close election, each polling well in his home area but with Rennison, in favour of severance, the winner by 10 votes.63 When the Council postponed signing the agreement with the Beaumaris Tramway Company yet again on 31 October, Sparks, no longer able to use the severance threat, resigned.64 In the succeeding election, Sparks supported E.J. Vail, a solicitor living in Charman Road, against Abbott, who had reversed his previous decision to retire. The feud was extended further with the major issue, again subdivision, but also the agreement with the tramway company.65 At one meeting, Sparks was forcibly removed after he had tried to move that Abbott was not a fit candidate.66 But Abbott's easy win - 333 votes to Vail's 228 and Hearle's 14167 - suggested not only that he had retained his popular support in spite of Sparks and the **Southern Cross**, but also that a majority of the riding were not in favour of severance.

The Council's petition for re-subdivision was finally gazetted in

---
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March 1888 with 501 signatures out of the 1179 names on the rolls.

Against this formidable petition, Sparks and one of his partners in land business, W.T. Carter were the only vocal opponents. At the ministerial hearing, Abbott argued that at the previous election, voting was 478 for subdivision (Abbott and Hearle) and 228 for severance (Vail). In vain did Carter claim that every locality should be governed in accordance with its special requirements and Sparks that division would assist the movement for the severance of the northern part, for Nimmo recommended the subdivision 'seeing that the present West riding with a revenue of more than the other two, is only represented by three members, that the petition is so numerously signed and that no counter-petition has been presented'.

Clearly the petition for re-subdivision contained a number of defectors from the severance cause and clearly it enjoyed very wide support in the West riding - 266 signatories out of a possible 519 was no mean achievement given the scattered distribution of many who did not sign. The active collection was done by Councillors Mills, McGwain and Abbott, C.J. Hearle, William Ward junior, the rate collector and a number of gardeners from all ridings. Any claim that the interests of the West were being coerced by the North and the East simply could not be made when half of the signatures collected, came from the West. Of this total, 117 were gardeners but there was wide support from all social groups. Most Mordialloc residents did not sign but there were significant turnouts like James Ferguson; many Beaumaris Tramway shareholders signed for re-subdivision; so did Union

---

68. See Map 1 for boundaries; Public Works Department, Roads and Bridges, Inwards Correspondence Letters 1887/926, 1090, 1101, 1102 and 1888/624 and 635 - all extant. V.C.C. 1888, dated 21 March 1888. The petition for re-subdivision is filed as 1888/624 and includes voters' rolls for 1886 and 1887 marked with signatories.
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Property shareholders, most of whose signatures were collected by Hearle. In fact, only those who had been very strong for severance in 1885 like Ruse, Harston, Brown, J.M. Smith, the Davies brothers, Peter Junner, Daniel Organ, Thomas Nannison, Henry Young and Richard Judd did not sign but Charles Allan, one of the severance deputation to Council in 1885, did. There were other notable non-signatories like Rent, who with severance defeated, need not concern himself with re-subdivision and Mair, who had stayed aloof from local affairs since the seventies.

Re-subdivision with the addition of three new councillors brought a widely contested election in 1888. Requisitions to Sparks from Beaumaris and from Kordialloc failed to bring him out. The results in the South and West ridings show diminishing support for severance; none of the five candidates in the West was for severance and Abbott topped the poll, whilst in the South, Carter and Vail, who favoured severance polled a lower total than their opponents.

The enlarged council still had the Beaumaris tram to deal with; work had begun on Section A from Sandringham to Rickett’s Point but it was claimed that it was done badly; further, no guarantee had been paid to the Council, and they unanimously moved in August for payment within seven days. Two months later, the guarantee was still unpaid and the council moved to stop construction if the company failed to pay or covenant to pay within two months. In late November, Sparks attended on behalf of the company offering the guarantee which was meant to cover any liability the Council might incur as a result of accident.

---
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77. Council Minutes 22 October 1888; *Southern Cross*, 27 October 1888; Cheltenham Leader, 27 October 1888.
78. Council Minutes, 19 November 1888; *Southern Cross*, 24 October 1888.
A month later, there was still no guarantee so that the Council resolved that work should stop in seven days if it was not paid, but Sparks claimed that the Council was not liable and that therefore the guarantee was not necessary. 79 A fortnight later, Bent had produced a further compromise between Council and company; claiming that the tram would be 'the making of the district' and criticising the 'croakers' and the 'wretched straw-splitting' and 'lawyer business' which had plagued the whole affair, he successfully moved that the company be allowed to provide a note of guarantee instead of the continuous cash guarantee of £1000. 80 Thus, the round trip by train to Sandringham, by tram to Cheltenham and by train to Princess Bridge for 2/4 1st. class was possible late in the summer.

An subdivision channelled the energies of the old West riding away from severance but it provided more representation for the coastal parts and therefore more opportunities for non-gardeners to direct Moorabbin affairs; the residential/rural tensions still remained and in debates over matters like the entry of 'night-soil', water supply, gas, lighting, baths constructions, preservation of the foreshore, they were often clearly expressed. One other effect of the boundary line between South and West was to reinforce regional differences which had existed previously; Mentone, for example, was not only further from the city than Sandringham on a railway with a much more rural time-table and without a water supply, it was now in a separate riding and any drives for unanimity, strong in the severance movements, were now seriously weakened. In that sense, Sparks was right in thinking that subdivision would weaken the severance cause.

79. Council Minutes, 17 December 1888; Southern Cross, 22 December 1888.
80. Council Minutes, 31 December 1888; Southern Cross 5 January 1889.
81. Southern Cross, 16 March 1889.
CHAPTER 6: LEGACIES OF THE 1880s: 1890-c1900

In spite of all the activity of the 'eighties, Sandringham was still 'an escapist's paradise', as Martin Boyd has termed it, at the end of the century. 1

Apart from a few shops round the railway station, there were only half a dozen scattered houses and his family had the undisturbed use of a mile of golden beach, and red, ti-tree covered cliffs.

Inland from his childhood house in Bay Road was a tract of sandy scrub, covered with pink and white heath, prickly flowering shrubs, and small orchids called "donkey ears" and "spiders" which they resembled. 2

Contrasted with his grandparents' houses in Brighton and St. Kilda Sandringham was arid and exposed. There were no trees but the stunted ti-tree, and few stretches of grass broke the waste of sandy scrub. Roses bloomed with difficulty in our garden, he wrote. 3

1. A Single Flame, London 1939, p.9. His artist-parents, Arthur Merrie and Emma (nee Applethorpe) Boyd had a house in Bay Road, Sandringham, Voters' Roll 1901, West Riding No. 52. Martin Boyd has used the backdrop of his childhood in Sandringham, Brighton and St. Kilda in his 'Longton' series of novels.

2. Ibid, p.9; see also the same statement in his later autobiography, Day of My Delight, Melbourne 1965.

3. A Single Flame, p.11; Day of My Delight, p.5.
PEOPLE:

If Sandringham was an 'escapist's paradise', then the census figures suggest that there were numbers of willing escapers in the period 1891-1901, when the population of the shire rose between 13 and 14 per cent with the West riding population having about 28 per cent increase and the South 19 per cent. While population growth was severely checked by the slump in the 'nineties, the order of increase contrasts with the negligible increase for Melbourne as a whole. The Census also showed substantial increases in the townships within Moorabbin for this period (see Table 5: 1) but these figures should be used cautiously because it is not clear what the boundaries of each township were or even whether the same boundaries were used for each Census; what they probably do confirm is the relative attractions of settlement in the Sandringham area in this period compared to Mentone and Nordialloc. Sandringham's growth in this period is confirmed by the entries in Sands' Directories.

4. The Census and Council figures do not agree, but both show roughly the same order of increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual figures:</th>
<th>Shire:</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. See McCarthy's figures in A.E.H.R., X, 2, p. 130 - an increase of 5000 for the period, 1891-1901. In his estimates for those years, no part of Moorabbin is included in the Melbourne total.

6. In 1888, the first year in which 'Gipsy Village including Hampton and Sandringham' was listed, there were 54 entries.

In 1891, there were 116 entries for a slightly enlarged area.

In 1905, the area bounded by South, Balcombe, Bluff and Beach Roads had 196 entries.

In 1911, there were 330 entries.

The totals themselves should not be taken as precise evidence but the growth between 1891 and 1911 corroborates the Census.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inhabited Dwellings</th>
<th>Population 1891</th>
<th>Population 1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentone</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordialloc</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham and</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source - Census 1891, 1901)

Notes on the Table

The 1891 Census gave a population figure of 2571 in the Parish of Moorabbin within the 10 mile radius of the Melbourne Post Office; that figure includes most of 1700 for the North riding, leaving a minimum total of 871, for the South Brighton area and the area bounded by South, Bluff and Bay Roads and the beach. If the figure of 787 for 'Sandringham and neighbourhood' in the table is for this latter area, this leaves a population of around 100 for the South Brighton area. It should be noted that the figure for 'Sandringham and neighbourhood' in 1901 includes the area south of the station in Parishes 24 and 25 as well as the area within the ten mile radius used in 1891, so that the figures are probably not for comparable areas.
Not only was there an overall rise in population but there was also a high turnover of population with the result that in 1901, in the West and South ridings, only 19.8 per cent of those whose names appeared on the 1887 West riding roll at the time of re-subsidization still appeared.\(^7\) Viewed from 1901, only 12.5 per cent on the South roll and 17.8 per cent on the West roll were included in the 1887 West roll.\(^8\) Over both ridings in 1901, there were 15.1 per cent who had been on the 1887 rolls; of this group of 103, 37 were market gardeners suggesting that they were a more stable occupational group than any others but viewed in relation to the 155 gardeners on the 1887 roll, it cannot be argued that the gardeners were the backbone of the 1901 community. Certainly George Davis, Edwin Penny, George Steynor, Ben Roberts, Michael O'Neil, John Moray, and Henry Wells, for example, were members of old-established gardener families but one might equally well argue that the other 'survivors' like David Abbott, William Mair, Alexander Morrison, Walter Meares, and Angelo Bertotto were as much a part of the backbone as the gardeners.

By 1901, there were only 58 gardeners out of a total of 352 voters in the West, mostly in the area east of Bluff Road and especially near Hightett and the north east corner of the riding; in the South, there were only 20 gardeners amongst the 328 voters, mainly in the old 'Beaumaris' gardening settlement. Of the remaining voters, about 60 in each riding probably were working outside the shire and of the rest,

---

\(^7\) Actual figures: 102 of 519 on 1887 roll. Voters' rolls have survived in the papers filed for the 1888 re-subsidization of the shire P.H.D., (Roads & Bridges)Inward Correspondence RR/535 (V.-S.A.) and for the 1902 petition for severance - Ith 02/1294 (V.-S.A.). I have used these partly because they can demonstrate changes between the two severance attempts and partly because they are easier to handle than the Ratebooks. Voters' rolls do not contain the names of those who have not paid their rates so that a slightly different figure might be obtained from Ratebook analysis.

\(^8\) Actual figures: 41 of 328 on South in 1901, 62 of 352 on West in 1901.
there were 49 in the West and 52 in the South with 'domestic duties'. In fact, in terms of occupations, there was little to distinguish West from South in 1901 except the trainers, jockeys and grooms in the South.

The high turnover of population shown by analysis of the voters' rolls was reflected in the 1901 Census figures where the sex ratio of the shire was 105:100 compared to 89:100 in 1891, with both West and South ridings predominantly female and with wide disparity at all ages between 17 and 45 years. This probably meant that unemployment was not a problem within the confines of the shire because the male population was not there. The Australian-born rose from 67 per cent in 1891 to 78 per cent in 1901 and religious affiliations were substantially unaltered from 1891.

The 1901 Census provided some measure of differentiation between the coastal area served by the Board of Works and the rest of the shire: with 17.2 per cent of the shire's population, 11 it had 23.7 per cent of the shire's larger houses i.e. those with more than 7 rooms; 12 but its overall share of the shire's rooms, houses, and brick houses was proportionate to population. Variations in building within the shire period in the 1891-1901 period are clearly pointed out by ratebook analysis:

---

9. West 115:100; South 120:100 - the 1901 Voters' rolls reflect these ratios in the high number of entries for 'domestic duties'.
10. An exception was Presbyterian adherence which rose from 10 per cent in 1891 to 12.5 per cent of the shire in 1901; possibly it would be worth further investigation.
11. 1278 of 7417 people.
12. 100 of 418 houses.
### TABLE 6 : 2  RATED BUILDINGS, 1891 - 1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1891</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1891-6</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1896-1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>since 1891</td>
<td>1891-6</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>since 1896</td>
<td>1896-1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6 : 3  OWNER OCCUPATION, 1891 - 1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses - Owned</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land - Owned</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses - Owned</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land - Owned</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses - Owned</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land - Owned</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whilst the figures in Table 6:2 clearly show the severe down-turn in building activity for the shire as a whole as the 'nineties progressed, they also show that in the West riding and to a lesser extent in the South, there was a clear reversal of the general trend, thereby emphasizing the differences that already existed between sections in Moorabbin.

Leasing and renting increased (see Table 6:3) especially during the latter part of the decade; by 1901, the shire had only 53 per cent owner occupation of buildings and the West riding no longer differed from the shire as a whole.

The boom and the growth of residential settlement in the shire spawned not only severance movements but also continuing local associations acting as Council watchdogs for their particular districts. At Mentone, for example, a 'Board of Works' was formed under the auspices of the Davies brothers and other leading Mentone investors in May 1887 with an annual subscription of £1. With this revenue, they were able to carry out minor improvements themselves as well as harry the Council on larger projects such as water supply and drains. A similar body, the Sandringham and District Improvement Committee was formed at the 'Duke of Edinburgh' in October 1888; residents had met less formally before - for example, a meeting in May 1888 had appointed a deputation to ask for a better station, improvements to the pier and the Esplanade.

14. Cf. Table 5:5.
15. Southern Cross, 14 May 1887.
16. Ibid., 27 October 1888.
17. Ibid., 17 May 1888.
These extra-council bodies, often moribund in the ensuing years, nevertheless provided a framework in which regional wishes could be expressed and through which devolution from the council could take place. It was through the 'progress associations' of Hampton, Sandringham and Black Rock that later severance movements came; opposition to severance came from similar bodies at Highett, Cheltenham, Mentone and Mordialloc.
The greatly increased expenditure by the Council in the 'eighties, (see Table 5:8) bolstered by the loan monies and government grants, continued into the 'nineties with the range of activities enlarged to include the building and leasing of baths, a pan service in the closely settled parts from 1890, and street lighting and scavenging from 1891. The effects of the depression on these activities were gradually felt; arrears of rates rose steeply and large sums had to be written off at a time when the falling prices in the land market allowed many appeals against valuations to succeed but the high level of government grants, intended once to aid the first struggling years of a shire's existence, were important in enabling Macedon to weather the early years of the 'nineties with little curtailment of activities. When the handouts ended abruptly in 1895, the Council was forced to raise the rate to 1/9 from 1/- in the £. and to cut back expenditure (see Table 5:9) more heavily.

18. C.C. Council Minutes, 17 April 1893 - of 176 appeals heard, 139 were reduced.
The 'boom' which had increased the salaries of the officers by more than 100 per cent had ended earlier when the Council moved for retrenchment in 1893 and took 7½ per cent from all officers' salaries to yield £204/3/-.*20 The officers then comprised Keys, Rodley, two rate collectors - McSwain and Ward, five inspectors and three health officers whilst the 18 day men were reduced sixpence per day. There was further general retrenchment in May 1894 — another 7½ per cent reduction for Keys, Rodley and the rate collectors and some reductions to the inspectors and health officers but a move to reduce the wages of the day men by a further sixpence a day was defeated.*21 In discussion on the reductions, Bent argued that it was 'an attempt to trap votes' and all councillors acknowledged the value of their officers but as Mills argued Keys was 'a capable secretary, a good treasurer with nothing to treasure, and an engineer with no work to do'.*22 These discussions about municipal retrenchment took place at a time when moves were made to set minimum wages for contractors' employees; these moves were supported only by Mills, Daly and Bent, the majority of the Council arguing that it would increase the prices of the contracts and agreeing with Lamb Smith that it was the duty of the Council to get as good a bargain as they could. Union demands got scant hearing, it seems, in spite of the plight of men working on contracts whom the *Southern Cross* described as 'sweated down' to £1 per week or less.*23

There are few other references to the effects of the depression in Moorabbin but they are quite suggestive. The Council commended the 'Determination of the Government in preserving Law and Order' in 1890*24 on Lamb Smith's motion; a local 'Young Victorian Patriotic League' was formed in March 1892 with Abbott and Lamb Smith amongst its

---

20. Council Minutes, 17 April, 1 May 1893; *Southern Cross* 6 March 1893.
23. 24, 31 March 1894.
24. Council Minutes, 5 October 1890.
founders, the former arguing that 'organization must be met by organization' and in May 1899, the Council carried a motion 'that the Secretary of the unemployed be informed that there are no resident unemployed in this Shire'. Perhaps part of the explanation for the last phenomenon lies in a motion six months before which called the 'attention of Constable Mills to the numbers of tramps about Sandringham'.

The cessation of government endowment and the enormous arrears in rates and the drop in valuations led to even harsher Council retrenchment in 1895, when, after nearly four hours' discussion, Keys was reduced to £200, Rodley to £150, the rate collectors to £90 each and 10 per cent of the dog fees collected. The police were appointed inspectors at £10 per annum each but as three of them would not accept appointment at this rate the Council was forced to advertise for a full-time inspector — Butler, appointed from 45 applicants at £70 per annum. Day wages were fixed at 5/6 per day but there was a drastic reduction of men — from 5 to 3 in the North, from 4 to 2 in the East, from 4 to 2 in the West, and from 4 to 3 in the South, and from 2 to 1 extra day man.

Further retrenchment in 1898 reduced Keys's salary to £150 per annum plus £20 as consulting engineer and Rodley's to £130 and dispensed with one rate collector, William Ward junior. Keys, at first resigned, when

25. Southern Cross, 12 March 1892.
26. Council Minutes, 15 May 1899. Storey and McIndoe's motion 'that a register be opened for the unemployed at the Shire Hall' was negatived.
27. Ibid., 17 October 1899. The rise in the proportion of females for the shire as a whole and an actual drop in male numbers in the North riding and the relative stagnation of male population in the South and East ridings mean that there may have been 'no resident unemployed in the shire', as the Council said; the local papers and the Council Minutes did not mention the existence of a local problem.
28. Ibid. 21 July 1895.
29. Ibid. 5 August 1895.
30. Southern Cross, 24 August 1895.
31. Council Minutes, 11 February 1895.
32. Ibid., 4 April, 2 May, 16 July, 5, 10 September, 17 October 1898.
offered £150 as secretary, engineer and treasurer, but he remained until the end of 1901, still holding both Dandenong and Moorabbin municipal posts as well as being chairman of the Carrum Irrigation Trust and secretary of the Dandenong Gas Company. After being defeated in the 1900 Assembly election for Dandenong and Berwick, he was appointed Chairman of the Royal Commission on Local Government, which was sitting in 1901 as a new severance movement criticised the officers for the poor state of the roads in the coastal area. It was in the middle of this criticism that Keys resigned from Moorabbin.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{33}. Council Minutes, 15 July 1901; \textit{Southern Cross}, 20 July 1901; \textit{Obituary Record}, 29 July 1904.
WATER SUPPLY:

The failure of the severance did not prevent the antipathies between gardeners and non-gardeners and between ridings from appearing in the early 'nineties. Nowhere is this clearer than in the protracted discussions over water supply in the period 1891-3. If the land 'boom' had burst, 'boom' methods might still enable land to be sold if services could be extended. As the Mentone and Mordialloc Chronicle editorialised in 1891, most parts of Moorabbin suffered from lack of a water supply:

In the city there are numerous families that would gladly at the conclusion of their day's business turn their back upon it, and take up a more rural place of abode than those found in the immediate vicinity of Melbourne or suburbs, but the periodical scarcity of water to which the inhabitants are subjected is a hindrance, for it can readily be understood that people who have become accustomed to have the Yan Yean at their disposal cannot readily fall in with the fragility that is required when householders are dependent upon the rainfall and the tanks for their daily supply. 34

The need for water in the townships to the south still pressed on the Council, who had the impossible task of finding a scheme which was agreeable to the areas already reticulated from the Yan Yean in coastal Sandringham as well as to the gardeners, most of whom did not want the expense, and to the southern townships who could not bear the whole cost themselves.

In 1891, acting on the assumption that most of the shire would not get Yan Yean water, the Council held a poll of ratepayers in the areas that would form a trust to obtain water from the Moonhull Creek. 35

---

34. 14 March 1891.
35. Council Minutes, 16 March 1891; Southern Cross, 21 March 1891.
When the poll resulted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the *Southern Cross* made the dubious comment that 'the figures ... show that the scheme is considered an urgent necessity for the shire',

but the candidates of the East and West ridings might reasonably have objected that the poll meant nothing of the sort. The Council, apart from Vail and Burgess, considered that the shire should join with Dandenong to form a trust

and they went ahead, at a joint meeting with the Dandenong Council to work out the details, with John Keys as the obvious liaison.

But less than a week later, at the next Moorabbin meeting, the Council voted 9-3 to postpone forwarding the proposal for a water trust until inquiries 'as to the probability of getting the Yan Yean further extended into the shire' were made.

This indecision arose from the question of apportioning of cost and on total cost. If the Yan Yean was brought further into the district, then only the streets reticulated would have to pay but if a Trust was formed, the cost was uncertain and it was not clear who would have to pay. Thus a majority of the Council, those not favourable to any water supply and those with doubts about the Monbulk scheme, could prevent rapid progress in forming the trust. The *Southern Cross* turned around with the Council on this issue, commenting that the scheme was 'rapidly drifting in the direction of the limbo for all crude and ill-devised measures'.

After hearing a report that the Engineer of the Melbourne

---

37. Council Minutes, 25 April 1891; Mentone and Mordialloc Chronicle, 2 May 1891; *Southern Cross*, 2 May 1891.
38. *Dandenong Express*, 29 April 1891.
39. Council Minutes, 4 May 1891; *Dandenong Express*, 6 May 1891; *Southern Cross*, 9 May 1891.
40. 16 May 1891.
Water Supply thought that the Yan Yean should be extended into the thickly populated parts of Moorabbin such as Cheltenham, Mentone and Mordialloc, the Council rescinded its motion to form a trust on 1 June. The M.M.B.W. offered them water delivered to the Shire's boundaries but no reticulation without sewerage but when the offer was formalised in November, the Council had further doubts about cost. The Board was to deliver water if it was available, at 1/- per 1000 gallons to the boundaries of the metropolitan area i.e. the ten mile radius for the city, but the Council was to reticulate and to maintain pipes already there. This jeopardised supplies already being reticulated in East Brighton and Sandringham with the result that the Council turned yet again to the Monbulk scheme. In the circumstances, the dissatisfaction with the Council's performance expressed by J.F. Morgan of East Brighton in the Southern Cross was not surprising; likening the Council to a little poodle who wants to join a mastiff (The Board of Works) 'eating a lump of meat in his own kennel' and on being rebuffed, 'scampers off whining', Morgan argued that 'the muddle of the Council may be laughable but it is very objectionable to the people of the district who have the annoyance'.

41. Council Minutes, Mentone and Mordialloc Chronicle 6 June 1891: Southern Cross, 13 June 1891.
42. Council Minutes 6 July 1891.
43. Southern Cross 19, 26 September 1891. John Keys sought to amend the M.M.B.W. Act to include the area within the ten mile radius for water supply purposes - see J.P.D., 1891, p.1298-9 September but the bill was not debated in December - see Third, p.2840-3 December.
44. Southern Cross 7 November 1891.
45. Third, 21 November 1891.
46. 11 January 1892.
The decision to reconsider the Monbulk scheme brought out the old opposition to schemes because of expense from gardeners like Robert Mills and J.J. Daly and to a consideration of the comparative costs of water if the Board’s proposals were implemented. Meanwhile, as the Southern Cross argued, with considerable point, for residents at Mentone, for example

the want of water for domestic purposes has seriously mitigated against the settlement of the shire for residential purposes and hardship and privation is continually inflicted on those who had already established homes in Moorabbin.

On a solution, unity was difficult to achieve, especially as the same editorial pointed out, Sandringham was already substantially reticulated; on the other hand, the unity of the shire seemed necessary if the water was to be obtained.

Moves from Sandringham, sponsored by Abbott, led to the Council supporting a move to have the area bounded by South Road, Bluff Road and the southern boundary of Portion 27 included in the Board of Works area. Opponents of this proposal included the other two West riding councillors, Daly and F.J. Barnett, who both had gardens in the area affected. Barnett and Daly organized a petition which claimed that the eastern part of the area proposed would not benefit for the next twenty years, but the council rejected 9-2 a resolution to rescind the previous motion. These moves were followed by meetings in the North riding and at South Brighton aimed at joining the Board’s area too.

47. Ibid. 6 February 1892.
48. Council Minutes, 9 February 1892.
49. Southern Cross 25 March 1892.
50. Council Minutes 7 March 1892; Southern Cross 12 March 1892.
51. Council Minutes 21 March 1892; Southern Cross 25 March 1892.
This apparent divisiveness within the shire was deplored by the Southern Cross, who claimed that the council 'must legislate for the whole of the shire and not for any particular portion of it, and that individual opinions should yield to the benefit of the whole district'. As a result of the local meetings, the Council moved to have all the areas of the shire within the ten miles radius brought under the M.M.B.W. and further, to form a trust to serve the needs of the remainder of the shire, perhaps, as Bent suggested, by pipe down the Point Nepean Road and thence to other areas by pipe as required. The non-gardeners all voted for it but the gardener vote was split with Hollier, Barnett and La Paine for and Mills, Daly, McMain and Burrows against. This burst of divisiveness of the Council's was dispersed when the Board stated that any area brought under the Act would be immediately liable to the sewer rate - thus, the Yan Yean might not be a cheaper water supply than the Monbulk. Especially in the North riding where William Ward led a strenuous attack against joining the Board were there doubts; at South Brighton also, a small meeting voted against joining the Board area and in the winter, as rains filled tanks and the elections loomed, further action was deferred.

Almost predictably, at the end of the next summer, renewed moves were made when Councillor Miller, who had taken Vail's place in the South riding, proposed that water be bought from the Board and a 6 per cent recirculation rate charged with meters for individual householders.

52. 2 April 1892.
53. Council Minutes 4 April 1892; Southern Cross 9 April 1892.
54. Council Minutes 20 June 1892; Southern Cross 25 June 1892.
55. Ibid. 2 July 1892.
56. Council Minutes 18 July 1892; Southern Cross 23 July 1892.
57. Southern Cross 16 July 1892.
58. Council Minutes 1 August 1892.
59. Southern Cross 11, 18 March 1893.
This led to reappraisals of both supply by the Board and by the Dandenong Trust and the decision to approach the latter.\(^60\) A price of fourpence per 1000 gallons and half the cost of bringing water to the shire was suggested by the Dandenong Trust and the Council agreed \(^61\) and went ahead with an application for a £20,000 loan with only Daly and Le Page wanting a postponement.\(^62\) Opposition in the shire came from areas not included like South Brighton and Highton and the old doubts that they were helping Dandenong rather than Moorabbin and that Keys was promoting the scheme for the mutual benefit of his two shires, and possibly himself, remained.\(^63\)

As opposition mounted, the Council narrowly agreed to a poll of those liable to be rated, on Bent's motion,\(^64\) his argument being mostly that money must be used carefully. The poll was simply of those against the scheme and it had been agreed that more than one-third would be necessary to stop proceeding with the scheme; only 297 of the necessary 520 voted not to proceed\(^65\) but the voting procedures came under strong criticism from the gardeners, in the south and the east, affected. Their claims were partly sustained, it could be argued, when Donald McSwain, in favour of the scheme, was soundly defeated by George Brownfield, a leading opponent of the scheme, in August 1893.\(^66\) Brownfield almost immediately called for action to rescind\(^67\) on the grounds that people neither wanted water nor could they pay for it, but the scheme was already before the minister, whose engineer reported

\(^{60}\) Council Minutes 5 April 1893.

\(^{61}\) Ibid. 7 July 1893.

\(^{62}\) Ibid. 1, 15 May 1893; Southern Cross 5, 20 May 1893.

\(^{63}\) Ibid. 20 May 1893.

\(^{64}\) Council Minutes 10 June 1893; Southern Cross 24 June 1893.

\(^{65}\) Council Minutes 17 July 1893; Southern Cross 15 July 1893.

\(^{66}\) Brownfield 110; McSwain 91; Bunn 43.

\(^{67}\) Council Minutes 16 October 1893; Southern Cross 9 September, 21 October, 25 November 1893.
that 'an effective and economical supply', sufficient for present requirements could be obtained but that the Council would have to make changes if a trust was to be formed because trusts could not legally construct and control joint works. 68

Any chance of immediate water for the southern parts of the shire was removed as the Council and the Colonial Government felt the financial pressures of 1894 and the Monbulk scheme was pigeon-holed, ready for the return of better times. Clearly, lack of water supply acted as a deterrent to further residential settlement in the southern parts of the shire and, in the depression years of the 'nineties, this was a deterrent which could not easily be removed: on the other hand, the reticulated areas of Sandringham faced no such hindrance and the experience of the 'nineties served to produce grounds for sectional difference over and above the old coast/narden division.

Mentone, Cheltenham and Mordialloc were still without supplies at the end of the century and when renewed moves were made in 1900 69 not only did the old 'rural' opposition re-appear but also a new move for severance, stemming from the reticulated parts of the West riding, in opposition to the proposed water loan 70 and showing the split between Mentone and Sandringham 71 - a split which persisted (See Appendix).

68. Ibid, 2 December 1893.
69. Moorabbin News, 2 June, 7 July, 22 December 1900.
71. See Southern Cross, 20 July 1901 - letter from H.T.C. Kelly and Ibid, 27 July 1901 - a meeting at Mentone unanimously rejected severance.
DRAINAGE and STREET-MAKING:

In the subdivisions of the 'eighties, there were no formed roads or comprehensive drainage systems; these were problems with which the Council was later forced to grapple. Both residents and land-owners were eager to have the Council take on and pay for road building in private streets but the Council's financial resources could not possibly tackle all, so that any private roads that were made by the Council were regarded as 'inside' jobs by critics. This charge was certainly made for Abbott, Waltham and Malrane streets in Sandringham which were made under the 1886 loan before the Council resolved 'that no new roads be taken over... unless the plan of subdivision be previously approved by the Council and unless the roads be at least one chain in width'; 72 Daly charged that roads should be made with major contributions by the owners of property. 73

In the concern over public health, drainage posed considerable problems as more and more land was cleared; the most notorious case was part of 'Bolton Park' which could be reached, according to the Southern Cross only 'by wading through slush and mud along the thoroughfares known as Hoyt Street and Lady Gordon's Drive'. 74 Close to the Brighton border, there was considerable difficulty in getting joint action by Brighton and Moorabbin 75 and in deciding the extent to which ratepayers should contribute.

These early disputes over drainage foreshadowed the later problems of the residential areas. As more blocks were cleared and roads were

72. Council Minutes 23 April 1891.
73. Southern Cross 11 April 1891.
74. 2 September 1893.
formed, the natural drainage pattern, satisfactory in times of sparse settlement, became quite inadequate. The solution, a comprehensive system of drains was an expensive one and no task for an impoverished Council in the 'nineties. Not until 1911 was any real action taken despite insistent 'residential' demand. The action came only after a serious diphtheria outbreak in January and February 1911, when a total of 17 cases, including 7 from the local school, was reported at Sandringham. The outbreak brought unfavourable publicity in 'Oriel's' column in the Arnoz which did not help the promotion of a healthy seaside suburb. As he rhymed:

At Sandringham the waveslets play,
And, if report be true,
Upon the sands, the doctors say,
The waveslets gambol too.
The drains are anyway you like,
And anyhow you please,
Hence little Jim and Bill and Mike
Contract the throat disease.
In every street and every lane
The torn dustboxes stand,
Month in, month out, they wait in vain
The dustremover's hand,
Sing, Hey, Sing Ho! for Sandringham,
Where the streptococci play,
And the bold spirillum (sic)bathes his feet,
Upon a summer day.

According to the coastal residents, it required a diphtheria epidemic to prompt Council action; whilst the demand for drainage appeared after the 'eighties, it reflected the greater concern for public health amongst coast residents, typical of the earlier 'night-soil' disputes.

76. See Southern Cross, 24 June 1911. Loans in 1912 raised £6800 for Sandringham, £9225 for Hampton and £1500 for Black Rock.

77. Ibid, 4 March 1911.

78. Reprinted in Moorabbin News 18 March 1911.
'NIGHT-SOIL' :

The collapse of the 'boom' did not solve the 'night-soil' question. Not only did owners hope to keep their land untainted but at the start of the 'nineties, local cases of diphtheria and typhoid' were making the Council more aware of the need for action on the use of night-soil and more ready to accept an 1889 report of the Central Board of Health when the whole district was proclaimed as infected with diphtheria. On 13 January 1890, a committee of the Council recommended that permits for night-soil deposits be granted for a further six months only; after that, only the disinfected product would be received; further they recommended yet another joint conference to enable enforcement but those recommendations were not effected. In May, Ahlott returned from a trip to England and was reported as having 'had difficulty in convincing many in the Old Country that Melbourne was not a "regular filth bed"' and he proceeded to claim that Moorabbin was receiving 'vile treatment at the hands of the City Corporation and the other suburbs'.

This was the prelude to a sustained campaign in the 'nineties which gathered strength as the loads showed no sign of diminishing. In 1890 a majority of the Council was prepared to allow permits to receive night-soil for a limited period in the hope that the supplying

79. See, for example, reports in Council Minutes 13 January, 10 February 1890 and Southern Cross 15 March 1890. That there was plenty to fear is made clear by Jacqueline Templeton in her account of the disposal of night-soil from the Homoeopathic (later Prince Henry's) Hospital in Prince Henry's: The Evolution of a Melbourne Hospital 1869-1969 Melbourne 1969 pp.87-94. See also Harratt, Collingwood pp.175-179 for action in an inner suburb.

80. Southern Cross 16 February 1889.

81. Council Minutes 13 January 1890; Cheltenham Leader 18 January 1890.

82. Ibid, 10 May 1890.

83. Ibid.
municipalities would solve the problem by building deasicators and incinerators; but a crisis came when Henry Carr, a very large night-soil contractor, applied for a permit to use night-soil on land at the corner of Warrigal and Centre Roads. He used the double pen system in Prahran and Brighton and claimed that his loads were both disinfected and hermetically sealed, so as to cause little nuisance. Feeling on the Council was almost evenly divided and so was the community; the Southern Cross described the system as the best in the circumstances whilst letter writers declaimed about the risks and the depreciating affects that the depot would have on property values. The Council received petitions for, signed by 303, and against, signed by 141 but they rejected Carr's application, 8-3.

Prahran Council took up Carr's case and managed to get Moorabbin to agree to extend the permit system until 30 June 1892, but as Carr did not comply with the Council regulations on hours of carting, the Council decided to prosecute Carr's drivers. The Council's aim was apparently to force the supplying municipalities to find alternative methods of disposal and thus prevent Moorabbin from becoming a dump.

Pressure from municipalities waiting for the underground sewers, like St. Kilda, Prahran and South Melbourne, for an extension of the permit system after 1892 was met by unanimous rejection on the Council.

84. Council Minutes 22 December 1890; Southern Cross 9 August 1890.
85. Ibid. 18 April 1891.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Council Minutes 20 April 1891; Southern Cross 25 April 1891.
89. Council Minutes 16 June 1891; Southern Cross 9 May, 20 June 1891.
90. Ibid. 22 August, 5 September, 7 November 1891.
91. Ibid. 5, 12, 26 March 1892.
Abbott's view that 'the shire would be left in the background if it
[night-soil] was permitted to come in much longer',92 was general. Soon
after, Bent took up Carr's case and moved that he be granted a permit,93
strongly supported by the Southern Cross, who thought that its use should
be prohibited only in the centres of population whereas, it was:

The plain straightforward duty of the Council to
assist . . . the gardening community . . . and not
cripple the main, in fact the only industry of
the shire by frivolous namby-pamby legislation
and farcical squeamishness.94

A letter-writer put the dispute in very simple gardeners versus others
terms when he asked 'Why should this solid source of revenue be cut to
bolster up the tottering land-boomers on the Council?'95 but this was a
gross over-simplification because the gardeners themselves were divided.

In June, with the end of permits imminent, supplying areas looked
desperately for means of disposal; Prahran asked the Public Health
Board to proclaim Carr's site in East Brighton as a depot for trenching
under the Health Act and there was talk of Prahran's retaliating by
prohibiting the carting of horse manure in its streets.96 But
Moorabbin stood firm - as Abbott said 'if they did not show some backbone
they would make themselves appear ridiculous'97 - but the voting was 6-4
with all the non-gardeners against it but the gardeners divided.98 As a
direct result of the Council's stand, the Public Health Board proclaimed
Carr's a temporary depot which meant that night-soil was trenching there

92. Ibid., 26 March 1892.
93. Council Minutes 2 May 1892.
94. 14 May 1892.
95. Southern Cross 21 May 1892.
96. Ibid., 11 June 1892.
97. Ibid., 9 July 1892.
98. Council Minutes 4 July 1892; Southern Cross 9 July 1892;
Cheltenham Leader 9 July 1892.
and never made available to gardeners. This meant according to the Southern Cross\textsuperscript{99} that the value of the finest fertiliser known has been lost to the district, whilst the nuisance — if nuisance there be — is perpetuated\textsuperscript{100}. Moreover, they claimed that Moorabbin would suffer from competition from 'night-soil' shires like Munawadin and Borroondara, adopting a distinctly rural view: 'Too much placation of land-hoovers and syndicators has already taken place and the sooner the idea of making the shire a residential area is dispelled the better it will be for all concerned'.\textsuperscript{100} But Moorabbin had both residential and rural sections and it was impossible to have one just policy for all on matters like water supply and the use of night-soil.

The proclamation of Carr's depot still allowed the Council to prosecute offenders against the traffic bye-laws and also those who still applied it to their land. To many gardeners, the trenching done at Carr's was a waste, especially as the tram roads were still choked with the night-carts. A growing pressure from local gardeners to allow deposit permits again brought Abbott's assertion that 'if the gardeners wanted night-soil, then he would go in for severance and let that part of the shire that used the night-soil be distinct from the other ... that did not want it'.\textsuperscript{1} To safeguard their stand, Moorabbin sought the support of the other outer suburban municipalities calling on them to co-operate 'by adopting stringent measures to prevent the suburban municipalities from imposing on the outside municipalities, and by compelling them to provide destructors within their own boundaries'.\textsuperscript{2} This stand by Moorabbin was seriously weakened by Brighton's decision to issue permits in its sparsely

\textsuperscript{99} 16 July 1892.

\textsuperscript{100} Ibd.

\textsuperscript{1} Council Minutes 18 July 1892; Southern Cross 23 July 1892.

\textsuperscript{2} Cheltenham Leader 20 August 1892.
settled areas;\(^3\) almost immediately, H. Clayton applied for a permit
to use night-soil in Dene Road, arguing that gardeners in Brighton
could use it; the Council unanimously refused, Abbott claiming that
Brighton's was an 'artful move' which would be rescinded as soon as
Moorabbin gave permits.\(^4\) Simultaneously with this refusal, about
thirty offenders were successfully prosecuted.\(^5\) In the same period,
Carr successfully appealed to the Supreme Court against prosecutions
of his men\(^6\) providing some encouragement to those in Moorabbin seeking
to use night-soil but the Council rejected a petition seeking permits,
with only Burgess and Le Page remotely entertaining it by suggesting
a poll of ratepayers.\(^7\) The Council's firm stand can be partly
justified by the defeat of F.J. Bunny, a strong night-soil advocate,
by Le Page in the 1892 East riding election.\(^8\)

The strong stand of the Southern Cross needs to be explained;
partly, they did not have medical insight of the problem but there was
probably a genuine concern to find a rational short-term solution to
the problem of disposal in the metropolis through use on Moorabbin
gardens. In December 1892, they pointed to the anomalous position
that Moorabbin's own night-soil collection was applied to Moorabbin
gardens - 'Is there some special feature in the Moorabbin product by
which it is rendered innocuous or pure?', they queried.\(^9\) Fixing on
an available site for a depot in Moorabbin brought out strong local
objections and it was not until January 1895 that the Council approved

3. Southern Cross 27 August 1892.
4. Council Minutes 5 September 1892; Southern Cross 10 September 1892.
5. Council Minutes 5, 12 September 1892; Southern Cross 24 September
   1892. 22 more were reported in October - Thid. 8 October 1892
   and 16 in November - Thid. 19 November 1892.
6. Thid. 15 October 1892.
7. Council Minutes 7 November 1892; Southern Cross 12 November 1892.
8. Council Minutes August 1892.
9. 24 December 1892.
a new site in Weatherall Road. 10

Abbott's fears that Moorabbin would become a gigantic dump were not altogether unfounded as the experience of the early 'nineties shows; St. Kilda eventually established a depot in Moorabbin after strong resistance, 11 Brighton 12 and Richmond 13 both applied and there was talk of depots for Bentleigh and Fitzroy. 14 There was good reason then for the Council's uncompromising stand; it might be anomalous from the health point of view to apply the home product to local gardens, but the home product did not create the stinking reputation of the 'foreign stuff'. In March 1895, however, the bye-law by which means Moorabbin had been able to prevent many loads entering the shire was quashed by Judge Hodges in the Supreme Court. 15 This led to renewed attempts to have the Council grant permits for its use 16 and now that entry could not be prohibited, support on the Council for issuing permits 17, abolished since 1892, reappeared. A petition signed by 51 wanting night-soil permits was printed in the Southern Cross; 18 most of the signatories were in the north-eastern parts of the shire, closer to supplies, away from centres of population and adjacent to Oakleigh. At a time when Council financing met the crisis caused by the end of the government grant by raising the rate to 1/9 in the £ and when heavy local costs had been incurred in a losing cause on 'night-soil', Michael Clements,

---

10. Council Minutes 6 February, 5 April, 1 May 1893; Southern Cross 9 April, 6, 20 May 1893, 12 January 1895.
11. Council Minutes 5 June, 4 December 1893; Southern Cross 10, 24 June, 9 December 1893; Cheltenham Leader 7 July 1894.
12. Council Minutes 3 July 1893; Southern Cross 8 July 1893.
13. Ibid. 25 August, 8 September 1894.
15. Southern Cross 16 March 1895.
17. Ibid. 3 June 1895.
18. 11 May 1895.
a leading advocate for use, asked in the Southern Cross how the prophecy that 'the growers would get a better price for their vegetables; land would increase in value; villas and mansions would be built all round if night-soil was prohibited; and a 1/- rate would only he needed'- had been kept. On the Council, Ward, Le Pea, Mills, Brownfield, and Bent supported the issue of permits but they were opposed by all the South and West riding councillors and Burgess. This division almost reflected the notion that the gardeners were suffering 'merely to gratify the hypocritical sense of a few Melbourne gentlemen, who happen to have built houses in and reside in Moorabbin', but the fact that Burgess, for example, opposed the permits and that the South and West riding councillors were not all City gentlemen suggest its distortion.

The appointment of Butler as the first full-time inspector of nuisances in Moorabbin coincided with the increasing pressures on the Council to alter its policy on permits; it also coincided with the election of Michael Clements to the Council and very stormy meetings especially when Abbott urged that the night-soil case between Butler, the inspector of nuisances, and William Clements, the new councillor's brother, be re-opened on the ground that prejudice had been committed. The Council also had great difficulty in agreeing to a new depot to replace the one at Cheltenham condemned by the Board of Public Health, for their own collection; the Cheltenham Leader even suggested that the councillors who favoured night-soil permits deliberately voted

19. 16 March 1895.
20. Council Minutes 3 June 1895.
21. Southern Cross 20 July 1895.
22. Ibid. 24 August 1895. North riding - Clements 151, Ward 0.
23. Ibid. 9 November 1895.
24. Ibid. 0; 23 November 1895.
against the sites suggested so that permits to receive Moorabbin's four loads would be granted. Eventually the Council agreed to a site on the corner of George and Fern Streets in the area of the present municipal golf links.

A system of deputes, a ban on permits, and much more rigorous enforcement of the byelaws remained until connection to the underground sewers. Pressure for permits remained, especially from the North riding where Michael Clements still retained his popularity, defeating the ane Ing William Ward, 246 votes to 144 in 1898 despite fines of £10 with £5/- costs and £20 with £5/- costs for night-soil offences in 1897-8. The expansion of the sewers gradually removed the sources of supply.

The attitude of the gardeners in favour of the use of night-soil can be explained largely in terms of their refusal to believe that night-soil could cause real health problems; this attitude was clearly shown in a dispute in 1892 over the carrying of fruit cases on loads of manure, which the Melbourne City Council had regulated against. The argument of Mr. Michel, a South Brighton gardener: 'How is it that gardeners are so healthy a class if the morals are so bad?' was the same question which gardeners who wanted to use night-soil asked through the twenty years of night-soil disputes. Especially in the

25. Cheltenham Leader 7 December 1895; see also Council Minutes 7 October, 4, 18 November, 2 December 1895; Southern Cross 12 October, 9, 23 November, 7 December 1895.


27. They did not reach the Sandringham area until 1910.

28. a.n. Council Minutes 16 May 1898 - Act not have notice of motion that Council re-issue permits, because it was said, night-soil was being used in neighbouring Oakleigh.

29. Southern Cross 27 August 1898.

30. Ibid. 29 May 1897, 25 June 1898.

31. Ibid. 27 February 1897.
North riding, the gardeners tended to cling to the minismatic theory of disease; thus Henry Dale's large boiling-down works and bone mill established in East Brighton in 1896\textsuperscript{32} was opposed because of its stench but Henry Carr's treated night-soil was regarded as 'innocuous' because it was relatively odorless.

\textsuperscript{32} Dale's works were intermittently censured between 1896 and 1901 - see \textit{Ibid.}, 19 June 1896, 15 February 1899, 27 April 1899. For description of works see \textit{Ibid.} 27 April 1899, 18 April 1896. Dale committed suicide in May 1901 - see \textit{Obituary Ibid.}, 25 May 1901.
TRAMS and TRAINS:

The tram connecting Sandringham with Cheltenham had been built in the turmoil of the late 'eighties but Section C, from Beaumaris to Mordialloc was due to be completed in July 1890. At the company's request, the Council agreed to apply for a two years' extension thereby provoking a storm at Mordialloc, where it was argued, with justification, that the company did not really intend to complete the line; they had in fact first asked the Council to excise the third section. When this extension neared expiry, the Council narrowly postponed the question of granting the company an extension whilst a Mordialloc group sought support to enable them to take over the remaining section themselves. In spite of a petition, signed by 118 ratepayers seeking the immediate completion of the tram, the Council narrowly voted for a further two years' extension arguing that to enforce the provisions would lead to the liquidation of the company and the closing of the existing line. In 1894, yet another extension was granted - this time of seven years.

All through the 'nineties then, the horses strained along the track between Cheltenham and Sandringham with occasional mishaps and low profitability. The receipts dwindled sharply from a peak in 1891 so that in 1897, they were barely meeting expenditure from receipts, to say nothing of the capital costs; in 1900, the receipts

33. Ibid., 14 June, 12 July 1890; Council Minutes 7 July 1890.
34. Southern Cross, 14 June, 19 July 1890; Cheltenham Leader 19 July 1890.
35. Council Minutes 16 May 1897.
36. Southern Cross, 28 May 1897.
37. Council Minutes 6 June 1897.
38. Ibid., 21 May 1897.
39. Southern Cross, 23 May 1891; 9 June 1897.
were, in fact, less than the expenditure — £562/1/7 against £575/16/5. In this circumstance, economy was effected by running the tram less with the result that Black Rock and Beaumaris remained remote by comparison with Sandringham, holiday and retirement places rather than 'dormitories' for commuters. The Council could do little except grant further extensions for the completion of the Bordialloc section although the coast 'boosters' on the Council — Smith, Storey and Abbott — had tried as early as 1898 to get an electric tram on the route.

* 

The considerable railway penetration of the 'eighties could provide stimulus for further residential growth if both fares and the time-table were set to catch commuters. But the passenger figures (see Table 6 : 4) suggest very clearly that Brighton Beach, Bordialloc and Sandringham were regarded as places to visit by train users. Clearly the Picnic Point railway passed through very unprofitable country as the Hampton figures show but when one compares the Mentone and Sandringham figures for the period 1891-6, when the Brighton-Sandringham line was making a loss — £4423 in 1893/4 there are striking differences. Sandringham maintained its use of the railways more or less at the 1891 level whilst there was a sharp drop at all other stations. Whilst the daily number of trains to Bordialloc dropped from 18 in 1890 to 13 in 1895, the numbers actually rose on the Sandringham line, in spite of

---

40. See periodic reports in Defunct Company Res 1075 (V. -5.A.)
41. Council Minutes, 1 July, 7 October 1901.
42. Ibid, 7 February 1898; See also 4, 18 September, 20 November 1890; 16 September 1901 for further attempts. The whole history of the tram and attempts to remove, improve, or supersede it in a cameo of the development of the area beyond Sandringham which would repay detailed study. The tram horse actually continued until 1916; the railways opened a tram line to Black Rock in 1919 (closed 1956) and an extension to Beaumaris in 1926 (closed 1931).
43. V.R.R., 1895/6 Report of Victorian Railways Commissioners to 30 June 1895.
the losses, from 22 in 1890 to 26 in 1895; this was temporary
however, for in 1900, the daily number was down to 21 although
outwards passenger journeys had risen to 115,152 in that year. Bradshaw’s
Guides show that the rail extension of the eighteenies brought
Sandringham within forty minutes of the city, the same time that the
trip from Brighton Beach had taken on the single line track before
1882; by contrast, Mordialloc henens as a trip of 1-1/4 hours in 1882
and remained a one hour trip at the end of the century.

Clearly Sandringham was differentiated both by railway use and
by railway policy after the boom. The nature and tempo of later
growth is pointed up clearly by table 6 : 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6 : 4 RAILWAYS PASSENGERS 1882-1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwards Inwards Outwards Inwards Outwards Inwards Outwards Outwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Brighton (Dentleigh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brighton (Heathfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentone (called)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcombe 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordialloc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Reports of V.R. Commissioners in V.R.P.)

* Report does not give figures for inwards passengers.

---

44. Bradshaw's Guide 1 January 1891, 1900, 1900.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outwards</th>
<th>Railways</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Haltom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(After 1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>233020</td>
<td>15220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>238330</td>
<td>15734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>277116</td>
<td>17163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>278904</td>
<td>16379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>291677</td>
<td>94031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>286695</td>
<td>70203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>287039</td>
<td>117779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>305811</td>
<td>150477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>217335</td>
<td>165998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>328933</td>
<td>21419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>349227</td>
<td>311479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>40076</td>
<td>301517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>405385</td>
<td>471665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>444725</td>
<td>551645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>442829</td>
<td>595852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>429320</td>
<td>643926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reports of Victorian Railways Commissioners in V.R.C.
The hooper's hope that the Moorabbin coast would become a series of fashionable watering places was probably shattered by the building of the railway with its relatively cheap excursion fare. Mordialloc with its large hotels was especially popular for day trips after the railway opened and the Melbourne masses could upset the calm of a potential 'fashionable watering place' as on Boxing Day, 1888 when the *Southern Cross* described them as

some hundreds of the most dispicable (sic) Melbourne larrikins and larrikinnesses that was ever congregated together

who had

the respectable portion of the visitors . . .

quite at their mercy.45

---

45. 7 January 1888.
In the 'boma', baths had been built at Sandringham, Mentone and Mordialloc but there were none at Beaumaris, a sore point for two other 'boma' creations, the Beaumaris tram and the Great Southern Hotel, both ailing as the nineties passed. In September 1896, the Council moved to build baths there if £100 was donated and a reasonable tender received; at its next meeting, the Council was offered the 'Hilaria' as a 'bathing-ship' to be fitted up and anchored off Beaumaris, and by a 6-5 vote decided to offer Phillips, her owner, £350. The voting at this point before the disadvantages of the idea were expressed, was almost one of conservative gardeners – La Page, Brownfield, Barnett, Clements and Burgess – against coast 'improvers' Abbott, Brown and the South riding councillors, with Mills joining the latter. Subsequently, doubts appeared among its supporters when it was revealed that the 'Hilaria' had been burnt eighteen months before so that when Phillips accepted the Council's offer, Rent and Abbott were able to use the expediency that an expenditure of more than £100 had to be placed on the annual estimates to delay action. Baths were not built at Beaumaris until 1901 when Charles Knefor tendered successfully. In between 1896 and 1901, the 'Hilaria' project was abandoned; Phillips unsuccessfully sued the Council for the costs of fitting her out, and moves to vote money for the baths were defeated largely by the gardener vote.

The Council's control of the foreshore led them to take action against people living in boatsheds, to charge fees for the sheds and

46. Council Minutes 21 September 1896.
47. Ibid. 19 October 1896; Southern Cross 24 October 1896.
48. Ibid. 31 October 1896.
49. Council Minutes 2 November 1896; Southern Cross 7 November 1896.
50. Council Minutes 17 June, 6 September 1901.
51. The struggle to build the baths can be traced in Ibid. 7, 21 December 1896; 16 January, 15 March, 20 September 1897; 7, 21 February 1898; 3 December 1900 and Southern Cross 12, 26 December 1896; 23 January, 11 September 1897.
bathing boxes and eventually to remove from the beach a number for which no fees had been paid.\textsuperscript{52} Avenues were cut in the ti-tree in the area between Black Rock and Mordialloc under the direction of Henry Byron Moore\textsuperscript{53} and daymen were used occasionally to pick up rubbish in the Beach Park.\textsuperscript{54} Between Christmas and New Year, they decided to send a man to patrol the foreshore to prevent fires;\textsuperscript{55} a continuing concern was expressed about the ti-tree, partly because its destruction would lead to the Beach road being invaded by sand\textsuperscript{56} and discussion also centred on the appointment of a ranger for the whole park\textsuperscript{57} but generally they had difficulty in preventing foreshore destruction. Whilst there was a high degree of unanimity for these actions, campers on the foreshore showed two minds amongst councillors. On the one hand, it was argued that camping was healthful and ought to be encouraged but regulated; on the other, as Lamb Smith stated, it was 'unwise and impolitic to allow any person to camp there.'\textsuperscript{58} Coastal residents usually shared the latter view, protesting, for example, through the Sandringham and District Progress League later in 1900 but the Council resolved that every application be considered on its merits.\textsuperscript{59} Two years later, camping was forbidden in the Beach reserve\textsuperscript{60} but coastal residents continued to ask for regulation of the camping on private land.

\textsuperscript{52} These actions can be traced in Council Minutes 4 March 1905, 20 December 1906, 17 January 1908, 2 October 1909, 4 August 1912.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid. 22 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, 14 November 1899.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid. 21 December 1901.

\textsuperscript{56} o.c. Southern Cross 25 March 1893.

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{58} Council Minutes 19 February 1900; Southern Cross 24 February 1900.

\textsuperscript{59} Council Minutes 3 December 1900; Southern Cross 8, 16 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{60} Council Minutes 13 January 1902.
The beach remained popular for picnics and excursions, partly encouraged by holiday fare reductions on the railway, but the Council was unable to do much except enforce the bathing regulations; new latrines were built for the 1900-1901 season, but public dressing sheds outside the baths were not, so that complaints about undressing on the beach, or indecent exposure, continued. From 1890, bathing for anyone over twelve was forbidden within half a mile of any of the baths and in the areas more than half a mile from the baths, bathing was prohibited for people over twelve between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. 'except such person being a male person he clothed with trunk of close texture' and 'every female person in full bathing costume'. The Council appeared to have been more successful in policing bathing than in preventing destruction on the foreshore but their sensibilities would not agree to a request from Mordialloc residents to fly flags for mixed bathing at the Mordialloc baths. 'Mixed bathing remained immoral in the view of most councillors well into the new century: their concern to ensure due decorum on the beach was clearly shown in the new Bathing Regulations of 1911 which, apart from specifying the 'Canadian Bathing Costume' covering the body from neck to knee, provided that:

no person clothed in a bathing costume shall sit, lie, loiter or run along the beach or sea shore, but shall proceed in a direct line to and from the dressing place..."
As the beach became more popular, the control of the foreshore exercised by the whole Council was challenged by the coastal residents; the reluctance of the Council to relinquish any of their powers was a major issue in later severance attempts.

67. This is especially true for 1910-11 attempt. See Council Minutes 20 June, 17 August 1908; 5 April 1909; 21 February, 4 April 1910; 18 December 1911; Southern Cross 19, 26 February 1910; 23 December 1911. See Appendix below.
LAND SALES:

As money tightened in the early 'nineties, land became virtually unsaleable; most of the sales recorded were made by the local agents, William Fairlam at Cheltenham and de Hanzell Storey at Sandringham; 68 allotments at Sandringham were offered at prices a quarter and less of 'boom' rates; 69 'boom' buildings like the Beaumaris Hall in Tramway Parade were unsaleable; 70 in Mentone, where speculative building was more pronounced, houses were actually removed, including two large right-roomed villas with slate roofs in Como Parade which had cost £950 each and which were sold for £100 each. 71 The liquidation of 'boom' companies like the Colonial Investment and Agency Company 72 simply left creditors with masses of land and houses that sold slowly. Nevertheless the high turnover of population, 1887-1901, noted above was the result of sales as well as from the rise in renting.

In Sandringham, there certainly was a check to building in the early 'nineties but there had been less building speculation than at Mentone and as the population of most Melbourne suburbs stagnated in the 'nineties, Sandringham's rose (see Table 6 : 1) especially in the later 'nineties. Its range of retail services which included a hay and corn store, a butcher's shop, an ironmongery and a timber yard by 1892, 73 its rail connection, water and gas supplies, pan service and school provided the basis for continuing settlement. In fact, the comments of a boosting Southern Cross editorial in 1894 74 still really applied

68. Southern Cross contains occasional reports from 1893.

69. Southern Cross 25 March 1893. Storey offered lots in the Gibson Estate at 6½ per foot.

70. Ibid. 15 December 1894 - advertised for auction by C. T. Ham on 20 December; listed by S. P. Simmonds 28 December 1894 - No. 6234 in Listing Book (AMA).

71. Southern Cross 14 September 1895.

72. Sale advertisement in Ibid. 28 January 1893.

73. Cheltenham Leader 14 January 1894.

74. 13 August.
to Sandringham in 1900

the prosperity of the country or otherwise has
little to do with the monotonous, steady progress
of this district. We increase in number and value
in spite of surrounding cries: our natural
advantages will always insure this much. Beauty
of situation, cheap land and proximity to town make
it the most desirable suburb as a place of residence.
It is within the means of ordinary business men to
possess themselves of sufficient land in this
locality wherein to build, have garden, paddock,
privacy and wholesome air to breathe.

As the new century opened, two elements from the railway boom
re-appeared, symbolizing the rising tempo of development in the coastal
sections of Moorabbin.

Rent, defeated by Mcule for the Brighton seat in the Assembly in
1894, in the aftermath of the boom, had left Brighton, apparently a
figure of approbrium; in November 1900, he defeated Moule in a
comeback that was in some ways as surprising as his defeat in
Moorabbin in 1871. His North riding colleague, W. G. Burgess had
reduced Moule’s majority in 1897 and in 1900, Rent not home by 191 votes,
with widespread support from the gardening communities, clearly behind
Burgess in 1897, but also from Brighton itself. This was a
triumphant return in which his old electorate shared. 75

75. He was Minister for Public Works and Health and then Railways in
the Irvine Ministry, 1902-4 and then Premier, Treasurer and
Minister for Railways, February 1904 - January 1909. He died
in September 1909 - See Obituary Angus 18 September 1909.
### TABLE 6: BRIGHTON ELECTIONS 1894, 1897, 1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polling Place</th>
<th>Moule</th>
<th>Bent</th>
<th>Moule</th>
<th>Burgess</th>
<th>Moule</th>
<th>Bent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Brighton</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brighton</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highett</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsternwick</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardenvale</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total           | 1579  | 925  | 1373  | 1036    | 1257  | 1446 |

| Votes Recorded  | 2504  | 2424 | 2705  |         |       |      |
| Votes on Roll   | 3525  | 3438 | 3808  |         |       |      |

(Source = Southern Cross 22 September 1894, 16 October 1897; )
(Source = Cheltenham Leader 3 November 1900.)
The other element was sales in the old 'Sandringham' estate by David Abbott. On 23 November 1901, 75 'large-sized allotments' were auctioned on 10 per cent deposit with the balance over 3 years at 5 per cent interest. These comprised Abbott's holdings except for 4 acres around 'Connaught'. In addition to the selling points of the 'eighties, Abbott could dwell on some new "proposals" - an electric tram from St Kilda to Mordialloc and a complex comprising skittles alley, croquet lawns, tennis courts and bowling greens in the Beach Park— and some new "facts". One of these was the Royal Melbourne Golf Club; originally formed in 1891 by golfing enthusiasts largely from city clubs like the 'Melbourne' and the 'Australian', it had temporary links and a clubhouse near the Caulfield station.

According to its historian, on 4 July 1891, the opening day, the first captain, J.W. Bruce had commented that 'in the old country, it was found that wherever links were formed houses were built' - a comment which was doubtless sympathetically received by a club whose foundation members included W.R. Davies, J.R. Davies, C.H. James, James Munro, James Nell, C.S. Price and D. Abbott. Thriving in the late 'nineties but without permanent links, the club committee selected land at Sandringham in 1898, the purchase of which Storey was able to organize. After clearing and sowing, the links were opened in 1901.
thus providing a new selling point for Abbott and a host of subdividers who followed. \(^{81}\)

Abbott sold 20 lots at the auction for prices ranging from 16/- to 38/- per foot, \(^{82}\) far below the heady heights of the 'eighties but certainly an encouragement for further sales, with the result that, in the early years of the new century, Boyd's 'escapist's paradise' gave way to R.H. Long's 'The Passing of the Moor'. \(^{83}\)

The moor is no more, but numbered lots with 'Land for Sale' boards, heralding on high the advent of the 'pulldown'. Far and wide the right-of-ways that once the mortised plots Trails with their slime o'er ravaged ti-tree spots.

Hunt's return to Parliament and Abbott's sale almost coincided with a further severance attempt in 1901-2 coming largely from the Sandringham area. \(^{84}\)

Whilst there was no severance movement in the 'nineties themselves, the continued growth especially in the Sandringham area strengthened the underlying conflict between 'rural' and 'residential' Moorabbin noted in the disputes of the 'eighties. Because the Sandringham area had its own water supply and separate railway, it was further distinguished from the coastal areas south of the Beaumaris Moorline around Beaumaris Bay.

---

\(^{81}\) Whether the claim o.p. Thid. 24 February 1917 that the club attracted settlement is valid is hard to determine accurately as lists of early members have not survived but at least two notable early members mentioned by Ellis had houses near the Club House in 1910 - W.F. A. Hancock - Mayville, Fernhill Rd, and James Gatelyhouse, Victoria St. The area around the old club house acquired a social pretence that still remains.

\(^{82}\) Thid. 30 November 1901.


\(^{84}\) The main focus of this movement can be traced in Southern Cross 22 June, 6, 20, 27 July, 24 August 1911, 15 March, 26 Nov 1912, Cheltenham Leader 6 July, 14 August 1911, Council Minutes 7, 22 April, 5 Nov 1912, Moorabbin News 28 May 1912, W.F.A. 1912 p.1015, R.W.O. (Roads and Bridges) Tenders Correspondence 02/1914 (W.F.A.) 02/1635. See Appendix below.
The cut-back in Council expenditure during the 'nineties served to heighten the feeling amongst coastal residents that their roads, drainage and beach lacked municipal attention; for some of them, the solution was local control or severance.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{85} Severance 1901-17 is discussed in Appendix, below.
CONCLUSION:

Martin Boyd’s recollection of Sandringham as ‘an escapist’s paradise’ is a salutary reminder that, in spite of the activity of the ’eighties, settlement was still sparse. Yet, even as an ’escapist’s paradise’ it was clearly marked apart from the inland sections of Moorabbin where the market garden — no escapist’s paradise — dominated.

From the ’fifties, the coast had attracted a few settlers concerned more to live in an area of natural beauty than to extract a living from its soil; it attracted more people as visitors to its beaches and sandy bents. The railway to Brighton Beach and the construction of the Point Nepean Road made this easier but the land subdivisions of the early ’fifties were much too grandiose in intent for an area around ten miles from the city. The coastal areas remained thinly settled and subject, when local government came in 1862, to the control of the much more densely settled farming districts especially of East and South Brighton.

Even when the Roads Board area was divided in 1864, the West riding was still dominantly a gardening one. In the small, scattered, community forceful characters like Thomas Bent could straddle potential differences between the gardening and coastal communities. Community squabbles proceeded from personal and sometimes regional biases rather than from conflict of socio-economic interests, but in the late ’seventies the demands for better railway services and a water supply for the coast from ’boosters’ like Bent and Harston were potential causes of distinctive and disruptive growth within Moorabbin.

The experience of the ’eighties was crucial to this distinctive development. Whilst the boomers’ dreams, as in the ’fifties, were not realized, they left a railway extension to Sandringham, the double line...
to Brighton Beach, the railway to Mordialloc, baths at Sandringham, Mordialloc, and Mentone and Mordialloc, a water supply along the coast from Brighton Beach to Sandringham, even the 'arcadian horsecar-tram' that Boyd recalls. All of these, along with the hotels and coffee-palaces, served to draw an increasing number of people, whether as 'excursionists' or permanent residents to the 'golden beach and red, ti-tree covered cliffs'. Moreover, inland, the iron trams on the gardeners' roads to market, another 'boom' product, served to further concentrate the market gardeners in the areas removed from the coast. Thus, whilst the population was still small and thinly spread over most of the coast, clear differences in occupation and interest between coast and inland had developed.

These differences were heightened not only as numbers increased but also as the demands of late 19th century urban residents, frequently aired in the 'nineties, were made: the need for water and gas supplies; the attack on the entry and use of 'night-soil'; the demands for control over building construction and for comprehensive drainage and the density of buildings increased, for garbage and night-pan services, for street-paving, channeling, kerbing and the making of footpaths; the demand for faster and more frequent transport. These demands were not ones that were necessarily opposed by the market gardeners but frequently he did not see them as requiring urgent action in the way that the coast residents did; in times of financial difficulty, especially in the late 'nineties, the Shire Council was understandably slow to act. West and South riding councillors whose occupations generally mirrored those of their riders, often recognized the Council's difficulties and were, therefore, less insistent in their demands than their constituents; 

---

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. O.R. Small and Storey, both West riding real estate agents, did not support amendments in 1901-2 because the time was 'not ripe'; see Southern Cross 6 July 1901.
also rare at Council meetings.

Outside the Council, the apparent failure to achieve what coast residents regarded as necessary led them to the conclusion that it would be better to control their own affairs. The 1885 and 1887 severance attempts were often categorized as 'selfish'; in terms of their specific origins, this may be true, but they drew support on wider grounds. Whilst the 1888 subdivision weakened the severance movement in the short-term by splitting the 'home' development of Montone, Cheltenham and Mordialloc from that of Sandringham, in the long-term, it was strengthened. Sandringham, on a separate railway line with more services and lower fares and with water reticulation from the M.M.A.W., adjacent to Brighton and acquiring some of its urban characteristic, continued to grow during the 'nineties and was geared for very rapid growth early this century.

One problem for all advocates of the severance of the coastal sections was the selection of boundaries; as Nimmo had argued at the ministerial hearing in 1907, the splitting of townships - Mordialloc and Cheltenham in that case - should be avoided. All the later severance movements in 1902, 1905, 1907, 1910 and finally 1917, avoided Cheltenham and Mordialloc. Montone feared domination by Sandringham and wanted a water supply, so opposed joining in Sandringham's move in 1902. This left the coast between Brighton Beach and Beaumaris and inland to Highett and part of South Brighton but in the severance movements of 1902, 1905 and 1907, it was the inland area that strongly opposed so that from 1910, the boundaries pretty well of the present-day city were caught in an area linked to the Sandringham railway and proposed

---

5. The separatists often claimed that rates collected were being spent elsewhere, that officers were unable to give the area proper attention which were ways of saying this.

6. *n.r.,* by Abbott at a severance meeting in 1901 - see Cheltenham Leader 6 July 1901.

7. See Appendix below for discussion of later severance.

8. Portions 1 and 2 of the Parish of Moorabbin were annexed to Brighton in 1912. See Appendix.
extensions to Black Rock and Beaumaris.

Successful severance depended not only on the will of the people in the area but also on the will (whim?) of the Minister of Public Works. It also depended on the prevailing political climate; after the failure of the 'eighties petitions, the climate was unfavourable. Federation of the colonies was the grand example held up to those anxious to divide local government areas, but closer to home, there was the example of the M.M.B.W. formed in 1890. Although no reasons were given, the refusal of a strongly-signed petition in 1902 can be explained in terms of the political climate. Bent's determined opposition and influence on governmental decisions was also a stumbling-block for those seeking severance.

The quest for local control by Sandringham residents can be seen in the demand that the Council hand over control of the foreshore to a committee and in the continued strength of the 'progress Associations', from which the later severance move emanated and through which the demands for 'residential' amenities and foreshore improvements were made. Thus, while territorially 'old' Moorabbin survived intact after the 'eighties, 'residential' demands which had scarcely existed before became more insistent.

---

9. In rejecting the 1902 petition, W.I. Reillyau suggested that Sandringham should be annexed to Brighton although this had not been argued by either the severance leaders or Brighton, and certainly not by the Shire Council. See Southern Cross 18 February 1911; Moorabbin News 18 February 1911.

10. See Southern Cross 24 May 1902.

11. Ibid. 14, 21 December 1907; Moorabbin News 22 February 1908 provide grounds for arguing that a three-year stay on severances and annexations 'backed' on to the Municipal Reorganization Bill of 1907 which stifled the 1907 severance was Bent's personal response to the severance moves; he was then Premier.
The 'eighties also heightened social antagonisms which made it increasingly difficult for councillors like Bent to straddle both coast and garden. These antagonisms are revealed in statements like McSwain's during the dispute over the Panumaria tram, 12 in the attitude of the Southern Cross during the 'night-soil' dispute in 1892 13 and in the following interchange between George Brownfield and David Abbott during a sewerage meeting in 1901:—

BROWNFIELD: You thought the market gardeners not good enough to sit with.

ABBOTT: Now, sir, that is not fair. We had done more for the market gardeners of the West riding than any other man. They wanted the night soil and we did not.

BROWNFIELD: You've thrown it in our faces often enough. 14

'Old' Moorabbin survived well after the 'eighties in the personnel of its councillors—Bent, Purcell, Bille, Henry, In Pico, Brownfield, Clements and Barnett continued to serve into the 20th Century, conscious of their achievements in the 'eighties and 'nineties but liable to the charge of 'old fagism' from newcomers to the Shire whose primary concern was to gain the normal amenities of suburban living whilst maintaining the natural beauties of their locales. Unable to recognize the past achievements, the newcomers were regarded by the Council as 'molecatchers'.

In the 20th Century, the rapid rise of population, especially at Bentleigh and Sandringham, untramelled by the past but conscious of the

12. See above p.
present and concerned for the future, spawned strong severance movements which finally succeeded in 1917. The attractions of the beach had eventually borne fruit in a bayside suburb.\footnote{The successful Sandringham petition can be traced in P.L.G. (Local Government Branch) Towards Correspondence 16/1705, 17/172. The petition and marked 'voters' rolls are missing (V.S.A.); Southern Cross 3, 24 February 1917; V.L.R. 1917, p.796. Three years later Montane and Northallorne severed from Moorabin to complete the disruption of the 'old' Moorabin of beach and gardens. See ibid., 1920 pp.1500, 1555-6.}
APPENDIX: SEVERANCE 1901-17

It is argued in the thesis that a distinctive coastal community in the Sandringham area had emerged from the 1880's. But the political separation of Sandringham from Moorabbin did not take place until 1917, following the fifth severance movement since 1901.

The 1901-2 attempt arose from the reticulated parts of the West riding i.e. Sandringham and Hampton, in direct response to a specific Council plan for a water loan from the rest of the shire.1 Whilst David Abbott, the movement's leader, claimed that the 1901 attempt bore no relation to the 'selfish' one of 1887,2 and his own leadership and the fact that the other promoters like Walter Toohey and Benjamin Ferdinando had not been in the area in 1887 support his claim, the 'residential' demands for road improvements, drainage and foreshore works suggest similarities that Abbott probably would not have cared to admit. Whilst the catalyst had changed from the Beaumaris Tram to the proposed water loan, promoters of the 1901-2 severance drew on the same arguments that Harold Sparks and the 1887 severance petitioners had used.

Their failure to stop the water loan3 did not stop the severance petitioners from collecting signatures for the proposal that the coastal area between Brighton Beach and Beaumaris and inland to the Mordialloc railway line to include parts of Highton and South Brighton but not Cheltenham and Mentone, should become a borough.4 Initially to oppose the water loan, the movement adopted much wider bases —

2. Cheltenham Leader, 6 July 1901.
3. Council Minutes, 5 August 1901.
4. At first, it was proposed to include Mentone - see Southern Cross, 20 July 1901 - but Mentone opposed - see Ibid.20, 27 July 1901 - and was excluded.
according to the petition presented in April 1902, the grounds for severance were the necessity for drainage, the spending of rates in areas other than where they were collected and the need for better supervision over expenditure, maintenance, drainage and health.

The major opposition to severance came from the councillors, including Small and Storey from the West riding. At the first meeting, Bent, the chairman, was hostile to the severance group; not only did he protect council officers from criticism but he also forced the severance leaders to include parts of the South riding in their motion, thereby weakening their case by scattering it over a larger area and also helping to bring on the conflict between Mentone and Sandringham. The Council prepared its case against severance in a letter claiming that money had been spent fairly in the area and that drainage had been attended to. Moreover, severance would be unjust insofar as Moorabbin would lose most of its coast, as Moorabbin would have to bear practically all the costs of the Point Nepean Road, as loans for £41,700 had been raised on the credit of the whole shire and as water had been extended close to several properties in the proposed severance area. Further, the Council contended: 'unification ... not ... disintegration ... should be the principle observed'.

5. V.G.G. 1902, p.1315. Petition dated 8 April 1902. The petition is filed in Public Works Department (Roads and Bridges), Inwards Correspondence 02/1294 (V.-S.A.).

6. These arguments echo the views expressed at the first public meeting for severance - Southern Cross 6 July 1901.

7. Ibid.

8. Council Minutes 7, 22 April, 5 May 1902; P.W.O. (R & B) Inwards Correspondence 02/1635 dated 7 May 1902.

9. Letter claim was apparently based on fact that some channelling of Sandringham streets had been done with a special rate from owners affected since 1900 - see Council Minutes, 18 December 1899.

10. The Council's letter was prepared by Alex Smith who had been appointed Shire Secretary &c. after Keys resigned - see Ibid. 4 November 1901.
The petition was signed by 337 inhabitant householders, which included 245 of the people out of the 435 people on the voters' rolls within the severance area; given the large number of non-residents on the rolls, the petition was strongly supported. 'Rural' opposition is clear from the fact that only 19 out of the 73 gardener-voters within the severance area signed. Because the signatures of gardeners would have been relatively easy to collect, their non-signing can be taken as calculated opposition; significantly old gardening families, like the Stayners, the Woffs and the Williams did not sign. Despite its widespread support, the petition was refused in May but no reasons were given. 11 As Small had joculatorily predicted, the severance supporters had been 'blown out in one act, when Long Tom [Bent] got to work'. 12

Later severance movements did not spring from particular proposals like the water loan but rather from what the Moorabbin News called 'continual grumbling' from Sandringham 13 - the 'grumbling' was largely in the quest for improved 'residential' facilities and amenities including drainage, 14 gas extensions, 15 a hall, 16 and sports arenas. 17 In August 1905, the 'grumblers' began to prepare another petition with Ferdinando, the driving force. The proposed area remained much the same as that for 1902 but it included Higlett and more of South Brighton as Point Nepean Road was the major eastern boundary. The strongest opposition to severance came predictably from the gardening community

11. P.W.D. (R & B) Inward Correspondence 02/1635 dated 20 May 1902; Southern Cross 24 May 1902; Moorabbin News 28 May 1902 give details of hearing. For Morrissey's refusal, see V.C.G. 1902 p. 1882. A reasonable conjecture is that government policy was for amalgamation.


13. Ibid. 8 April 1905.

14. Ibid. 15 June 1903.

15. Sandringham Rambler 7 May 1904.

16. Ibid. 6, 20 August 1904.

17. Ibid. 5 March 1904; Council Minutes 21 March 1904.
east of Bluff Road\textsuperscript{18} but the petitioners abandoned their attempt in December\textsuperscript{19} at about the same time as a battle over proposed additions to the Shire Hall broke out.\textsuperscript{20} This battle served to strengthen the Sandringham severance movement which re-appeared early in 1907 after the additions to the Shire Hall were under way.\textsuperscript{21}

In April 1907, a new petition taking in the same area as the 1905 attempt was gazetted\textsuperscript{22} but it was withdrawn in May because it did not contain enough signatures of inhabitant householders,\textsuperscript{23} thereby allowing the Council some breathing space in which to organize meetings.\textsuperscript{24} Previously they had asked McCutcheon, the M.L.A. for St.Kilda, 'to use his best endeavours to prevent any interference with the Hon. the Premier's constituency during his absence' (Bent was overseas) but McCutcheon refused.\textsuperscript{25} The general attitude of the Council was probably expressed by Michael Clement when he contended that:

\begin{quote}
he knew the Sandringham people, and the sort of malcontents they had down there. They were not satisfied with anything. .\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

In a sense, Sandringham had upset the stability of 'rural' Moorabbin and this was bitterly, and sometimes personally, resented.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Moorabbin News 21 October 1905.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Southern Cross 16 December 1905.
\item \textsuperscript{20} The battle can be traced in Council Minutes 4 December 1905, 15 January, 19 February, 2 April, 7 May, 5 June, 2, 16 July, 6 August, 1, 15 October 1906; Moorabbin News 25 November, 23 December 1905.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Southern Cross 12, 19 January 1907.
\item \textsuperscript{22} V.C.G. 1907 p.1967. Petition dated 29 April 1907.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Southern Cross 1 June 1907.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Council Minutes 4 June 1907.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid. 6 May 1907, Southern Cross 25 May 1907.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid. 11 May 1907.
\end{itemize}
The petition was re-presented in November 27 after lively discussions in letters to the Southern Cross 28 especially from W.G. Piper, a publisher from Black Rock in favour of severance and from Percival White, the South Brighton blacksmith, his chief antagonist. White argued mainly that unity was desirable because similar development could occur elsewhere 29 whilst Piper dwelt on the development of Sandringham as:

a new community, with interests apart from those of the rest of the Shire, unable to mix with the other parts of the Shire except at much cost of time and travel 30

a community which was both able and willing to manage its own affairs.

The presentation of the petition coincided with parliamentary discussion of a new Municipal Reclassification Bill under which each of the 'rural' ridings of Moorabbin was to receive £300. 31 The Bill was passed but with a crucial amendment preventing severance or annexation until after 30 June 1910. The amendment was introduced by J.E. Mackey, the Minister of Lands and was passed quickly with only one member of the Assembly, John Gray (Swan Hill) asking why it was necessary. Bent's reply was that if classifications were to be fixed for the next three years, then endowments had to be fixed too 32.

---

27. Ibid. 30 November 1907; the actual petition is not extant but P.W.O.(R & B) Register of Inwards Correspondence 97/1166, 1371, 1410, 1482 shows the stages (W-S.A.)


29. Southern Cross 20 July 1907.

30. Ibid. 27 July 1907.

31. V.P.O. 1907 11 December; a previous Bill which would have given Moorabbin £1500 was returned to the classifiers partly because of the favourable treatment given to Moorabbin - see Ibid, 1907 pp.465-9, 490-2.

32. Ibid. 1907, p.3219, 11 December 1907; Southern Cross 14, 21 December 1907.
a reply which did not convince Gray or Moorabbin residents. The latter, depending on their view of severance, either saw Bent's actions as 'high handed treatment' or as another of those many successful and unexpected diplomatic coups, possible only to one of Mr Bent's experience, and one having the proverbial wisdom of the serpent without the harmless of the dove.  

Bent's later statement that he knew nothing about the petition is scarcely credible; his argument that because fixed subsidies were being given for the next three years that boundaries had to be kept was not convincing to his contemporaries, as adjustments in subsidies could easily be made; thus, the amendment may well have been deliberately included for the specific purpose of stopping any dismembering of his own little 'empire'.

Attempts to have the amendment rescinded in 1907–8 were unsuccessful; so too were attempts to create a fifth riding. Nevertheless, the insistent demands of the coastal progress associations were for drainage schemes and for local control of the foreshore, so that as the three-year stay on severance came to an end, discussions for a further severance petition resumed. The coastal areas had continued to grow rapidly; by 1911, the West riding had a population of 4198 against 1829 in the North, 2337 in the East, and 2791 in the South. Thus to many people in Sandringham the old problems,

33. Ibid. 21 December 1907.
34. Moorabbin News 22 February 1908.
35. Ibid. 28 December 1907, 22 February 1908; Southern Cross 15 February 1908.
36. Ibid. 5, 12 June, 3 July 1909; Council Minutes 8 June 1909.
38. 1911 Valuer's Report.
unsolved since the 'eighties, were new problems to be solved as soon as possible; if the Council would not act, then local control was essential.

Opposition to severance came from a majority of the Council and from the Cheltenham, Mentone and Mordialloc progress associations, who favoured a petition for a fifth riding. Drawing boundaries for a new riding was an almost impossible task so that by late November when the severance petition was presented, the opposition had done little but pass resolutions condemning severance. The proposed severance area excluded Highton and Moorabbin in the north-east section of the West riding and was thus a 'coastal suburban borough' - the area of the present city, apart from a small section at Brighton Beach in Portions 1 and 2, for which the Brighton Beach Progress League petitioned for annexation to Brighton.

At the ministerial hearing before W.L. Baillieu, the separatists argued that severance was both needed and desired and that it could be accomplished without injustice to the remainder of the shire. That it was desired was shown by the petition and the history of petitions, they argued; that it was needed was shown by the Council's

41. Lack of progress can be traced in Council Minutes, 5 September 1910; Southern Cross 10 September, 8 October, 12 November 1910.
42. A petition for a larger area bounded by South Road, Hampton Road and the beach had been organized abortively in 1907 - Ibid. 19 October 1907. In 1910, the Sandringham severance group agreed not to oppose them - Ibid. 9, 23 July 1910. Their petition in V.S.G. 1910 p.5372 and P.W.D. (R. & B.) Inward Correspondence 10/4101a (V.-S.A.)
failure to deal with the drainage problem, by their dilatoriness in 
street-making, by their inadequate building regulations and by their 
failure to improve the foreshore and bathing facilities. This last 
point was especially highlighted by Walter Tochey, a solicitor and 
Chairman of the Severance League, when he claimed that the Council had 
deliberately avoided forming a foreshore committee. Tochey, 
Eggleston and de Garis all emphasized the social and economic 
differences between the coastal residents and the inland "producers", 
differences which Tochey argued meant that the representatives of 
other ridings 

were not as peculiarly fitted to grasp the 
pressing necessities and the great wants 
of a populous district, as the people who 
lived on the spot.

and differences which de Garis had neatly categorised in a letter 
to Baillieu before the deputation as the 

"Residential Interest" existing chiefly 
along the foreshore and . . . the 
"Producing Interest" inland.

Whilst this was a gross oversimplification as the opposition to severance 
of "non-producer" councillors like Small, Scudds and White bore 
testimony, de Garis's argument is worth recounting:

The market for the producer is in Melbourne, 
and they have their convenient Railway line; 
none of their business brings them into the 
Residential portion of the Shire.

The interest of the Residential portion, along 
the foreshore, is with the Metropolis, and none 
of their business takes residents into the 
producing areas, and to serve their needs they 
have another Railway line, which is distinct 
from the line serving the producers.

44. J.B.Eggleston was a solicitor, later elected to Council, 1912; 
E.C.de Garis, a merchant, elected to Council in 1909, bought 
Abbott's 'Coggeshall' in 1908.
The opponents of severance, mostly councillors, defended the work of the Council whilst admitting that there were problems like drainage that were difficult to solve; they dwelt at length on the expense of maintaining Point Nepean Road and argued that severance would result in increased rates for both areas and they pressed that unification was the order of the day.

Baillieu deferred his decision and then refused the severance, but stated that he was impressed ... with the fact that portion of the area proposed to be severed is a purely residential one, comparatively thickly populated, and if the petitioners desire it he will recommend an amendment to the law to permit of the ratepayers of such portion petitioning for severance from the Shire and annexation to the Town of Brighton.

Amplifying this statement in an interview, Baillieu claimed that Ferdinando, in particular, gave the impression that union with Brighton was the real objective; the official typescript of the deputation does not give that impression at all and whilst most of the separatists interviewed saw annexation to Brighton as better than staying with Moorabbin, Councillor Kelly's comment in the Moorabbin News aptly summed up Baillieu's actions —

To tell people that they are entitled to severance but to place conditions on that severance not contemplated by the Act is — well, strange.

45. Southern Cross, 18 February 1911; V.G.G. 1911 p.1435.
47. Southern Cross, 18 February 1911.
48. Ibid.
49. 18 February 1911.
Whatever Baillieu’s intention, his decision threw the severance forces into disarray, whilst the executive led by Tochey, Ferdinando, de Garis, Champion and Curtis went ahead and negotiated with the Brighton Council50 for the annexation to Brighton of the proposed severance area except for most of Beaumaris, a section of the old Severance League including King, Callaghan, Biggs and Duff disagreed, and at a public meeting, voting was almost even on the desirability of annexation.51 Whilst the Severance League wound up its affairs and an Annexation League was formed52 the dissidents met and sent a resolution to Baillieu, claiming that he had misapprehended the wishes of the ratepayers53 and also resolved to draw up a counter-petition to annexation.

It was in these confused political manœuvres that the West riding election took place. Small, a strong opponent of severance on the Council, was opposed by J.B.Eggleston, who favoured annexation. Frost, King and Biggs, all separatists opposed to annexation, worked on Small’s committee,54 Small held no election meetings whilst Eggleston attacked him and pushed for annexation.55 Small won convincingly with majorities at all polling places except Hampton, where he was narrowly beaten:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Eggleston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightett</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


51. Southern Cross, 15 April 1911.

52. Ibid., 15 April, 17 June 1911.


54. Southern Cross, 16 September 1911.

55. Ibid., 5 August 1911.

56. Ibid., 26 August 1911.
Small's success was attributable to an odd mixture of factors - he had been an energetic and capable councillor; he had the support of the Highett gardeners; and he had the support of the separatists who opposed annexation, in spite of his own clear opposition to severance. Eggleston's defeat, on the other hand, suggested that annexation to Brighton was not overwhelmingly popular even in Hampton where he scored more votes than Small.

The way of the annexationists was difficult and in February 1912, they gave up their petition. 57 This opened the way for the decision on the Brighton Beach annexation petition which had been deferred in 1911. 58 In March 1912, it was granted and by September 1913, all matters between Brighton and Moorabbin were settled. 59

After the failure of the severance and annexation attempts in 1910-12, some of the separatists' objections were met - for example, comprehensive drainage schemes for Hampton and Sandringham were begun in 1912, financed by new loans 60 but the Council still maintained its control of the foreshore and the feeling of coastal residents that they could manage their own affairs better than the Council could, persisted. The Council's will to resist severance gradually eroded too; by the end of 1916, only Le Page survived from the Councils of the last century; in the West riding, all three councillors - Ferdinando, Eggleston and T.Farrant - favoured severance, whilst in the South, there were two - W.T.C. Kelly and F.W. Hearndon - with a fair chance of F.M. Scudds, the Mentone publican being defeated when he came up for re-election in 1918.

59. The history of the petition can be traced in Ibid., 7/3691, 10/4101a, 10/4178, 11/287, 12/618 (V.-S.A.) and V.C.G., 1910 p.573; 1912 p.1332; the settlement with Brighton in Council Minutes 5 August 1912, 20 January, 3 February, 7, 21 July, 4, 18 August, 1 September 1913.
60. Ibid., 16 January, 17 June 1912.
When the Hampton Progress Association and the Sandringham Progress League began to discuss severance and arranged to collect signatures for a petition in April 1915, they were not responding to any immediate grievance; rather they felt that more rapid improvement of their district would come if power was in their hands; their appeal was on matters which concerned coastal residents: further improvements to the sanitary service, further extension of the Board's area for water, a committee to control the beach reserves, local officers and offices. Leadership was provided by the three West riding councillors, with Ferdinando the dominating force. Their opposition gradually took shape in the areas not included; the Moorabbin-Highton Progress League proposed a fifth riding, the Central riding, with a variety of boundaries; their deputation to Council pointed up the difficulty of selecting boundaries for, whilst the majority of the Council agreed that re-subdivision was necessary, opposed by Kelly and the West riding councillors, there was no agreement on how this should take place.

Late in the year, with five separatists now on the Council after Hearndon's election, the Cheltenham Progress Association proposed a new riding which would place Cheltenham in one riding instead of three, but by this time the separatists were ready to lodge their petition and opponents had to take their chance at the ministerial hearing.

The separatists claimed in their petition that there were 6094 people in their proposed borough and that a 2/- rate would yield £7,703

61. **Southern Cross**, 17 April 1915.
64. **Council Minutes**, 3 April 1916; **Southern Cross**, 8 April 1916.
65. **Southern Cross**, 2 December 1916.
which would be adequate for its maintenance. A total of 1556 out of 2232 voters in the area signed the petition. At the hearing before W.A. Adamson, the Minister for Public Works on 1 February 1917, the arguments advanced by Ferdinando, Eggleston and their supporters differed little from those of 1911. Kelly, then Shire President, struck a new example to demonstrate the identity of the proposed area when he argued that there were serious disadvantages in being in a shire because this meant that the railways department treated the area as "country" instancing the case of the proposed Black Rock railway in 1910 for which the locals were asked to pay not only interest on the construction and purchase price but also to give the land. It also meant that Moorabbin had no representative on the Board of Health. This argument was taken up by Eggleston who urged that 'boroughs' were residential districts where drainage, sanitation, street channels and shop inspection were important whereas 'shires' were producing areas.

Their opponents were less convincing than at previous hearings; Small argued that amalgamation was the thing and that the existing council was doing a good job; Scudds abused the severists and White claimed that the Council was really being charged with mismanagement. For the rest, severance was 'selfish' or 'a mistake'.

Adamson commented favourably on the case for severance, claiming that

67. P.W.O. (Local Government Branch) Inwards Correspondence 16/1705. The actual petition and marked Voters' Rolls are not filed with the other papers - their whereabouts tantalisingly suggested by a 1916 note in Ibid. 16/1664 as 'filed on top on plan desk', are not known.

68. Ibid. 17/172.

69. Reports in Ibid., see also Southern Cross, 3 February 1917.

the 1914 Act which enabled the Department to amalgamate struggling municipalities, in no way barred the Sandringham case, and on 26 February assent to the petition was gazetted\(^71\) and the borough of Sandringham created.

\(^{71}\) V.G.G., 1917 p.796.
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