1. 51-53-55-57 Cardigan St., Carlton.  
   An imposing Italianate terrace.

2. 17-19-21 Cardigan St., Carlton.  
   Small terrace houses of cheap construction. Illustrations 1  
   and 2 show the close proximity of substantial residences with  
   a much poorer type of housing.

3. Palmerston Place, Carlton.  
   An example of a right-of-way built on as a second-class street  
   frontage.

4. Orwell Cottage, Lennox St., Richmond.  
   Built 1848, of very sound construction. Ground floor with 2 attic  
   rooms above.

5. 2 Princes St., Abbotsford.  
   Small weatherboard, one room wide and passage, with pretentious  
   iron-work ornamentation to distract from the plainness of the facade.

6. Cnr. Keppel St. & Cardigan St., Carlton.  
   An unusual 2 storey wooden structure sandwiched between 2 terrace  
   houses.

7. 15 Lytton St., Carlton.  
   Simplest type of weatherboard cottage, built c.1860, demolished  
   in 1968. For details of Lytton St. houses see K. Harvey, G. Martin  
   and M. Martin, "A Block of Dwellings in Carlton. Lytton-Lygon-Cross-  
   Cardigan Streets". (Thesis in School of Architecture, University of  
   Melbourne).

8. 21-23 Lytton St., Carlton 1874. Illustrations 7, 8 & 9.  
   Large Gothic dwelling. A further example of the mixture of cheap  
   and substantial dwellings within a short distance of each other.

9. Terrace Housing, Lygon St., Carlton.  
   Situated around the corner from 15 Lytton St.

    One of the oldest weatherboard houses still standing in Melbourne.  
    The original head station building of the Richmond run, built in  
    late 1830's by McCrae family before they moved down on to the  
    Mornington Peninsula. It was moved to its present position from  
    its original site a mile away in 1950's.

11. 235 Burnley St., Richmond.  
    Robert Russell's house, in which he was living in 1889 at the age  
    of 81. Table Talk 13 September, 1889 gave a detailed account of  
    his residence. In rooms at the back of his house, he had a collection  
    of art treasures, including hundreds of rare etchings and engravings,  
    as well as rare books and his own paintings done in water colours  
    and oils.
    An interesting construction detail is to be seen here. Although  
    the houses are theoretically semi-detached terrace houses, the space  
    between the pairs is no more than 12" and does not allow physical  
    access to the back of the dwellings.
12. 4-6-8-10 Verity St., Richmond.
Depth of blocks is 50' and frontages are as follows: No. 4 12'7½", No. 6 17'7", No. 8 16'10½", No. 10 12'11".
An extremely rare example of two-storey weatherboard semi-detached dwellings with wooden party walls. Either they were built before the 1848 Melbourne Building Act stipulated brick or stone party walls in two-storey dwellings or (more likely) were built in contravention of the building regulations.

13. 149-151 Gore St., Fitzroy.
Examples of small frontages and blocks. No. 149 12'7" x 72'9", No. 151 12' x 83'.

14. 40 Moor St., Fitzroy.
One of the few iron houses still standing in Melbourne. Their erection was forbidden by the Melbourne City Council after 1850's.

15. 46 Moor St., Fitzroy.
Very old vertical weatherboard. Note the unusual roof of flat sheets of iron joined with French seaming and a large garden to the side of the house.

16. 57 Richmond Terrace.
An example of a disproportioned building on a tiny allotment.

17. Hoddle St., Abbotsford.
Squire's Curiosity Corner, a very old wooden shop, evidence that many older structures escaped demolition.

18. 46 Richmond Terrace.
A typical example of a minimal cheap wooden cottage on 12' frontage.

19. 41-49 Cnr. Miles and Rotherwood Sts., Richmond.
Uncommon example of single-storey weatherboard terrace with wooden party walls.

20. 17 Brighton St., Richmond.
One of the oldest houses remaining in Richmond, built 1859. Bluestone with later stucco and brick front additions.

21. 13-15 James St., Richmond.
Handsome 2-storey bluestone pair.
& 17 James St., Richmond.
An unusual 2 storey weatherboard house, built 1878, 12-roomed with interesting sawn gable trim.
One could put forward a case for the speculative streak in profit-making business ventures as being an important feature of colonial growth. From its frequent recurrences it appears to have been endemic in the business and economic life of the colony. The very nature of gold digging with the digger's luck of paramount importance in the earlier stages, followed by the speculative mining company ventures of 1869-61 all contributed to its existence. The Argus on 7 April 1860 thought the mining industry in Victoria had suffered lately at "the hands of sharpeners and tricksters, land-jobbers and venal directors." One of the major criticisms of the land laws c.1860-62 was the claim that they fostered speculation in rural land. Widespread speculation in the import trade and wholesaling, and the chance of making vast profits were characteristic of Melbourne commerce until c.1861. The speculative streak later manifested itself in the dealings in Silver Mining shares, Melbourne Uranium Company shares, and in the Land Banks of the 1860's. Francis Adams commented on the alternations of value and the fluctuations occurring in the Australian markets, thereby echoing an earlier assessment by W.H. Archer. Similarly, William Westgarth thought the spirit of speculation among Victorians was not confined to land but extended to all colonial property, including livestock. In an analytical mood at the onset of the great depression of the 1890's, Table Talk regarded the habit of speculation as one of the national failings of Australians, not only confined to land but apparent in mining, manufactures and trade.

9. Table Talk, 4 September 1891.
The expectation of unduly high returns or profits from investments was named as a characteristic feature of Australia. Thus the land was expected to yield 5% per annum in ground rents whereas *The Age* thought 3% or less per annum would have been a reasonable expectation by world standards.\(^6\) When J. W. Marsden's large estate at Somerton Junction proved to have an immense seam of high quality granite, he intended to float the estate on the London market where investors thought 5% a good return on freehold property while Melbourne investors growled at anything less than 10%.\(^7\)

Speculation in building is also noteworthy during our period. Much domestic building in Melbourne throughout the three decades appears to have been speculative in type, although to what degree of the total number of dwellings built it is impossible to estimate. Twopeny thought the majority of Melbourne houses to be speculatively built, but here he may have been largely intuitive.\(^8\) The piecing together of isolated fragments of information is possible, based on comments relating to the very small number of architect-designed dwellings, on the disregard for sound and sanitary building practices, on the quantity of "jerry-building" and the actual organization of the operation of the building trades — all of these factors add up to a reasonably convincing picture of substantial numbers of speculatively built houses in Greater Melbourne.

After the gold decade, speculation in town lands continued apace. Twopeny could write in 1885 that "Australia is before everything a money making place" and he thought the profitability of speculation in land and housing was assured.\(^9\) Money was dear but the chances of turning it over rapidly were frequent and remunerative. The smallness of the gardens attached to many middle and working class houses was evidence of speculation. The common practice was to buy a house with a large area of land and in a few years' time, to cut it up into building allotments.\(^10\)

\(^8\) Twopeny, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
\(^9\) Twopeny, *op. cit.*, p. 32; *Economist*, 1 June 1861.
\(^10\) Twopeny, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
The smaller the portions it was cut up into, the greater the profit. Land was the safest investment, with the prospect of making 50-100% profit in a good year. "This land speculation is quite a feature of Australian life and at certain periods it is difficult to lose money by it." This observation was reinforced by Francis Adams who saw in the prototype town and suburban Australian landlord and in the great fortunes made by urban land speculators, a type of trading on the forced congestion of the city. "Nowhere in the world has the urban and suburban land-grabber been more of a curse than in Australia. Englishmen can have no conception of it."

All this points to the fact that the land speculation of the 1880's was not a new phenomenon but an intensification of tendencies evident from 1837 onwards. Speculation had always been characteristic of the sale of Melbourne town land, and can be tied into the land-buying colonist's expectation of high profits from resale, a manifestation of the unearned increment in land values benefiting the speculator. Land, then, was viewed as a highly profitable investment. Land speculation was also indicative of the buyers' recognition of land as yielding a calculated rent, another form of remunerative investment accentuated in Melbourne by the tendency to subdivide and re-subdivide original acre allotments into tiny parcels of land which were either sold at a handsome profit or built on to yield a "harvest of rentals", especially in working class areas.

11. Ibid., p. 38.
12. Ibid., p. 38.
F. Lancelott, Australia As It Is (London, 1852), vol. II, pp. 72, 93.
Kelly, op. cit., p. 318.
Twopeny, on. cit., p. 31.
illustrations numbers 12 and 13. Other narrow frontages c.12'6" are to be seen in illustrations numbers 2, 6, 7, 9, 14, 16 and 18.

From the first sale of Crown land held in Melbourne on 1 June 1837 it had been obvious that speculation in land was a lucrative undertaking. The following account is based substantially on the information given by D. Syme, W.H. Archer and the Melbourne Guide Book [1894]. The average price of half acre town lots was then £35. At this sale 100 allotments were put up and 99 sold at prices ranging from £18 to £97 per lot. After the second sale on 1st November 1837 at which 78 allotments sold at an average price of £42, subsequent sales of Melbourne land were held in Sydney as an acknowledgment of the fact that large amounts of Sydney capital were being invested in Melbourne town land as a speculative proposition. Significantly the average price of lots of the third Sydney-based sale on 13 September 1838 had risen to £118, and the demand was keen. Between 14 February 1839 and 4 April 1874 20 different sales of Melbourne Crown land were held, earlier in Sydney and later in Melbourne. The amount realised on the area south of Latrobe street 1837-74 was £114,370 and north of Latrobe Street, 1849-72 was £159,338, making a total of £273,708 at ex-government prices. In 1879, David Syme estimated valuation of this same land (exclusive of buildings thereon) was £6,286,280.

The following examples serve to show the increase in the value of particular lots. The original Allotment 16 of Section 4[17] (in Collins Street through to Little Flinders Street between Elizabeth and Queen Streets), which first sold for £19 brought £32,000 in 1878, or an increase of 173.54% in 41 years. July and August 1888, saw "fabulous" city land prices. In December 1888, land in Collins Street had advanced

17. For details see Plan of Town of Melbourne 1837A.D. (compiled at a later date) in possession of Melbourne City Council.
18. The Builder and Contractor's News, 15 December 1888, p. 33B.
in price during the past 10 months from £900 to £1,500 per foot and in
Elizabeth Street from £7-500 to £1,300 per foot. Suburban land also
shared in the soaring land prices. In September 1888, building sites
five miles from the city sold at £40-50 per foot and in the closer suburbs
£200 per foot was paid. In the principal streets of some of the
suburbs of Melbourne, land which 2½ years previously could have been
bought for £5 per foot sold at £100-200 per foot.
20

A few sober warnings were sounded. Mr. J. Smith, a managing
director and valuer, thought the current great rise in city property
exceptional and impossible to maintain. If a reaction took place or
money became scarce, the fall in prices would be considerable and prices
would not reach their then inflated values again for many years to come.
The builder thought there was "a day of reckoning in store for the specula-
tors running up streets of wooden houses in Malvern and Amadea".
22

In relation to the land opened up by the new railways, *Table
Talk* was aprehensive of the possibilities thereby presented for renewed
speculation by owners realising on the 'unearned increment'. "The
temptation to speculate in the purchase of land is very strong. While
this is so, few are willing to settle down to the hard work of till-
ing the land. Land-owners' ... speculation ... has always existed, and
unfortunately, still exists to so marke a degree among Victorians." 23

The seductive appeals of the land-sales advertisements at this
time were aimed largely at small-scale speculators. Here was a chance
for any man to share in the lucravativeness of land speculation. Thus
Glen Iris Park offered bargain hunters "really good and improving land
at a low price." 24 Doncaster Heights stressed the "great prospective
value of the land ... the class of buyers will be most of our influential
and wealthy citizens". 25 Barwood Township Estate allowed great
opportunity for lucrative investment and certain profit. 26

23. *Table Talk*, 9 January 1891. See also *ibid.*, 4 Sept. 1891, 18 July 1890.
Station Estate promised to double its value in 6 months\textsuperscript{27} and the Brunswick Estate of 43 acres advertised that

"This property ... is rapidly increasing in value and is fast becoming one of the best suburbs ... it is bound to be a good speculation to invest in a block for subdivision purposes ... there is no more popular way of investing ... savings than attending the Saturday afternoon sales, and buying one or two allotments in this favourite locality."\textsuperscript{28}

By the late 1880's, there was a growing conflict between on the one hand, speculation in urban land and the piecemeal unco-ordinated development of suburban lands and housing so characteristic of Melbourne from 1860, which resulted in the vast suburban sprawl and on the other hand, concern with the aesthetics of the environment, rational planning, economic land use, the imposition of controls in the best interests of the public weal, an ultimate regard for the community as a whole, and an increasing sense of social responsibility and the formulation of social welfare concepts noted above.

Hence by 1890, when much of the land area of greater Melbourne had been appropriated to settlement, worked over and to some degree exploited, the attention of thinking men was focussed on the abuses which had by then become apparent in the total landscape of the city. This overall view and critique is on the credit balance side of Melbourne's growth in the decade of the 'eighties. Its formulation is highly significant as a growing awareness of what is a penetration to the heart of the urban dilemma: the fundamental conflict between speculative activity and aesthetics and the consequent need to effect some type of reconciliation between on the one hand profit-making and the liberty of individuals and on the other, protection of the community's long-term interests and the fullest development of the urban milieu.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 12 October, 1888. 
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 19 October 1888.
CHAPTER 18

SOME EFFECTS OF SPECULATION

In the growing debate over the essential character of Melbourne as an urban centre, the divergent views were condensed in the simple question, "Do we want a beautiful city or only a convenient centre for speculation and pushing our wares?" The rapid growth of Melbourne as a commercial and industrial city (see Table IX) by 1891 gave a special urgency to the plea. As seen previously Melbourne land had always been substantially dealt in for speculative purposes but by 1891, some degree of urban planning had become inescapable with sheer size of the suburbs and the growth of population. In 1886, "from all points of the compass people flocked into Melbourne, as many as 11,000 coming during the first quarter of the year, and bringing with them increased trade. Scarcely an empty house was to be seen in any suburb. Rents doubled, in some cases trebled, while land values quadrupled and quintupled themselves." The decade of the 1880's served, among other things, to throw these urban problems up in more starkly defined outlines and the evidence of uncontrolled development was there for all to see in the rows of spec. built cottages and villas with their ornamentation applied to distract attention from the monotonous facades.

Speculation resulted in high prices for land. Compared with land in London or New York, Melbourne land was considered relatively expensive overall. Table Talk in the 1880's frequently supported the contention that metropolitan land was dear. Even allowing for the distorted high prices of the 1850's and 1880's, 'bargains' were to be had only in poorly situated subdivisions or lower class areas (the two frequently coincided) or a considerable distance out from the centre.

1. Table Talk, 18 April 1889.
W. Westgarth, Australia Felix (Edinburgh, 1848), pp. 174-175.
E. Carlton Booth, Another England (London, 1869), pp. 73-74.
We can identify four consequences of this expensive quality of
land - subdivision into tiny allotments; high rents both commercial and
domestic, poor-quality building and the impetus given to peripheral
growth. None of these effects is, of course, an overall trend but all
are mentioned frequently enough to have been obviously important at the
time.

As mentioned in chapter 17, the comparative dearness of urban
land in Melbourne was always a factor of considerable importance in the
building operation. Expensive land and the re-subdivision of, for
example, ½ acre lots into tiny allotments of 16' frontages were the result
of speculative trafficking in land which had been operating since the
first land sales of city land on 1st June and 1st November 1837.3

Early exponents of the theories of land use claimed that many buildings
were unsuitable in size for the plot of land they occupied. Either
they showed an extravagant use of land in leaving too much space around
them, or with others too little space had been allowed and this meant
they were a poor rental proposition.4

Not only cottages or terraces were crammed on to their blocks,
but large mansions or villas, suitable for a country setting were built
on small town allotments which were intended for much smaller cottage
residences. Such were the "ungraily, disproportioned edifices" to be
found along the Richmond Road, for example.5 The existence of large
homes on small blocks probably exemplified several factors in conjunction,
namely the outcome of speculation in town land represented in the size of
the block, the desire to impress reflected in the social value of an
imposing dwelling, or simply an attempt to emulate the English model of
a large better-class dwelling as found in provincial towns and cities
in Britain.

   Kelly, op. cit., p. 518.
4. Australian Builder, 23 February 1861.
5. Ibid., 6 September 1855. An example of disproportion is seen in
   illustration number 16.
Concern over the smallness of many blocks was becoming evident among the early 'town-planners', persons perturbed over the mode of development of urban land in Melbourne, much of which sprang from speculation. In 1856, Mr. Knight, the first President of the Royal Victorian Institute of Architects answered the charge of ugliness in Melbourne's building by issuing a criticism for not distinguishing between what the architect would wish to do and what he was forced to do by his client's wishes. Furthermore, he said, "The architect has nothing to do with the subdivision of original ½ acre allotments into patches not much larger than a billiard table."

Similarly, it was suggested that a ½ acre size block was desirable for suburban residences, the present overcrowding occurring in certain suburbs, such as St. Kilda, Collingwood and Richmond where "speculators continue to build rows of houses in their back gardens" was seen as an undesirable mode of development, one which could only lead eventually to an unattractive urban environment.

"If we persist in building our houses in a heap ... if we string a dozen together on an area about sufficient for one - if we persist in building on flats not leave high ground for pasturage - if we still prefer a 4-inch rotten brick to an 18-inch stone wall - the price, in many localities, being equal - if we are ... too migratory to feel an interest in the place we temporarily reside in - we must not blame the colony, nor howl about its privations."

Marked variation and contrast in the size of allotments, the size of the houses intended to be built thereon and the extent of one man's real property ownership are contained in an Announcement Extraordinary in the Argus, 1860. It lists the real estate holdings for sale of

7. The Australian Builder, 16 October 1856, p. 276. See also Builder and Contractor's News, 2 February 1889.
8. Australian Builder, 10 July 1896.
10. Argus, 17 March 1860.
H.J. Hartimer, shown as residing in Bridge Road, Richmond in the 1860 Directory; he planned to visit England after 35 years in Australia.

Offered for sale were a clutch of small-size allotments in the Richmond Road, 22' x 90', 23' x 80'; 33' x 87'; 30' x 87'; 40' x 87' and two 32' x 87'; also a 7-roomed brick cottage with a large garden and outbuildings on land 87' x 184' and another 8-roomed cottage residence standing in 2 acres of gardens, which in addition to the house, comprised a wash-house, smoke, storeroom, 4-stall stable, a double coach-house with lots above, newly slated roofs and lead gutters and a gardener's house, cowhouse, toolhouse and a large tank, to make it a small estate 'replete with comfort for the most fastidious family'.

In addition, Hartimer's holdings comprised 50 half-acre allotments in Boronandra on the northern boundary, 5 miles from Melbourne, 2 acres also at Boronandra, 2 allotments at Brighton, each 99' x 264' and close to the beach, 2 large houses in Bourke Street West, one 10-roomed one at 60 100 at £500 p.a., and 2 large bluestone stores in Swanston Lane, the larger known as Zander's Bonded Store and let at £600 p.a.

High rents were the secondological result of high land prices. The question of alleged high rents in Melbourne is a complex one, but deserves some attention as it is a recurring criticism which is repeated intermittently over the whole period of the thesis. There were two schools of opinion concerning Melbourne rent levels, the detractors and those who maintained that rents and cost of living

P. Lancelott, Australia As It Is (London, 1852), vol. II, p. 80.
Generally were reasonable in relation to colonial wages. However, high rents were one argument used by the advocates of home ownership in Melbourne, so there must have been some substance to the charge. One must also, of course, allow for fluctuations in levels of rental related to the state of the economy at any given time. Naturally reductions occurred when times were slack, thus we read in 1856

"There is a decided improvement in the letting of cottage property, in consequence of the reduction in rent, and in Collingwood, for instance, which some months ago was half deserted, there are very few houses to let."\(^{13}\)

Melbourne household rents were claimed excessively high in 1860,\(^{14}\) with both tenant and landlord suffering as a result. The demands of many landlords were "extortionate", who thought themselves badly done by if they could not satisfy them. Higher rentals however meant a higher degree of vacancy of premises and it was argued that a rent 50\% lower would ensure permanent tenancy. Thus

"A proprietor of household property here is not content with a good tenant and fair interest for his outlay. He is not content unless he can obtain a rent which will pay him interest and principal as well.... A large part of the population are striving and struggling for the exclusive profit of their landlords; and often times, to pay their rents, they are sacrificing both themselves and their families."\(^{15}\)

Rents for business premises were said as high as London rents - yet there was a severe commercial depression in Melbourne in 1860-1. Whatever slight reduction in rents had taken place in the previous ten years had borne no relationship to the general reduction in prices.

One letter writer\(^{16}\) supported the argument that Melbourne was

14. N. Fergus, Melbourne Illustrated and Victoria Described (Melbourne, A.S. 1866), pp. 36-37.
rents had always been out of proportion to the profits. As a shopkeeper himself and the tenant of a building which cost £300 3 years previously, he estimated he had already paid £1800 in rent. Another letter was published from one who had recently attended meetings of creditors in five different estates of bankrupt and insolvent shopkeepers. In each case he thought high rents had caused their ruin. "The present state of business in Melbourne will not pay half the present rents" and he estimated that 7/8ths of the shopkeepers in Melbourne were living on their stock at that time.

Immigrants accustomed to lower British rentals thought colonial rents high, but British working men's wages were lower, half to one-third of the Australian equivalent, building labour costs lower and the question of the quality of the type of dwelling entered into the picture. In addition the houses when built as a capital investment would not bring in one half the interest which could be got for money on loan. The comparison of wage rates and building costs in Britain and Victoria and their effects on rentals is an interesting one. The cost of building in Victoria was estimated in 1860 to be four times that of England where skilled building labour received an average of 5/- hour compared with 1/8 in Victoria and unskilled rates 2/- compared with 10/- colonial. Trollope in 1873 thought the Melbourne working man paid more for his house and lodgings than he would in London but that the colonial housing was of a higher standard and for his house rent he got more for his money. Thus the Melbourne artisan on £3 week, and even common labourers receiving 36/- week, could live quite well. Twopeny concurred a decade later and regarded the 4-5 roomed cottage of the Melbourne working man renting at 12-15/- a week rental to be more within his reach than a 5/- a week rental was to the English worker. A

A carpenter in good employment would be paying around 12/- week rent; a
worker earning 8/- a day could pay the same amount in weekly rental
which would then amount to about 20% of his wages. Furnishings were
cheap. A working man could furnish a four-roomed cottage comfortably
for £27 and he thought the Australian working man's parlour embodied
a degree of comfort that his English counterpart could not aspire to.
Rentals, of course, varied with the level of employment and the state
of the economy in Melbourne, and also from district to district in
terms of status and social class groupings.

Alleged high rents for dwellings in 1860 were in part a
heritage of the scarcity and dearness of housing accommodation in the
first half of the 1850's. The high price of labour 1852-54 meant that
prices of all commodities rose and especially those of colonially
made goods. "House property being almost exclusively a product of
colonial labour in particular continued to rise in value, even after
most other articles had continued to fall." All who bought houses at
this time were able to sell at a profit immediately after. When commodity
prices began to decline c. 1858, "properties that were considered great
bargains when purchased, were found to be all too dear in the course of
a few months. It may be sometime yet before property recovers from
its state of extreme depression."

Hayes thought that the high labour costs involved and the
opportunities for profit making in other fields of investment meant that
housing was not a very safe or attractive investment proposition "[the
high price of labour] has been the chief cause of the enormous rents
demanded by the proprietors of household property, who have naturally
demanded a rental of from five to ten years' purchase, simply because
they could generally dispose of their capital to equal advantage in other
pursuits."

23. Ibid., pp. 44-45.
24. Economist, 1 June 1861
25. Ibid.
The *Australian Builder* similarly thought that high wages, high rents and immense mercantile profits had not done much to benefit the Colony permanently. It maintained that prior to 1851 the rate of artisans' wages and the general cost of building materials in Victoria averaged much the same as in England. "That change in the value of labour which so significantly marked the condition of this colony in the early days of the fabulously rich Ballarat" had left its imprint on colonial society in a dual manner. Although great changes had taken place over the past five years, the high costs of building meant that the majority of persons who had invested their savings in house property had not realised their investment cost nor had they received a fair rate of interest on their outlay.

The fixed 'official' building labour rates were still high in 1861. One of the supports buttressing this high wage structure was claimed to be the Government-sponsored public works programme involving buildings and railways. These were operating as a kind of disguised public relief programme which prevented large numbers of men from being thrown on to an already crowded labour market. In 1860 the problem of wage rates was particularly acute in Victoria with a residual price structure from the peak of 1852-3 still operating. The relatively high 'official' price of labour was constantly remarked on by contemporary economic analysts.

By 1891 some Trade Unions had a standard rate of pay, the maintenance of which was made the keystone of the society's constitution. Nevertheless many union members worked for less. This anomalous situation of official and unofficial rates of pay appears to have existed throughout the entire period although the unions as such were not continuously in existence nor a highly organised pressure group. Tradesmen often overvalued a good commercial location and plenty were willing to pay dearly for it. Ground owners demanded such enormous

27. *Australian Builder*, 2 February 1861.
28. Ibid.
rents or men in each if they sold that the building owner had to pass
this on in the form of higher prices. The necessities of life were
lower because of the high rents paid by shopkeepers as a result of
inflated land values in the city and suburbs. Thus, land speculators
"let in" for sites at fictitious values 'boomed up' by rigging the
land market in every detestable manner", built high buildings for
which they demanded exorbitant rents. The Builder thought that "the
greed, selfishness and utter disregard for the public health and
wealth so often shown by Australian landlords" needed to be curbed by
legislation. This forcing up of the commercial rents of tenants
was an immediate consequence of the land boom. Landlords and building
owners had to pay high rates of interest on the extremely high prices
paid for their land. Table Talk thought that mushroom millionaires,
like C.A. James, who, a few years previously had owned practically
no assets themselves, had "enslaved the working classes with quarterly
bills and high rents." Francis Adams saw the Australian landlord
as characteristically urban or suburban, and wrote that "Great fortunes
are being made by the urban and suburban landgrabbers, trading on the
forced congestion of the towns."

High rents were certainly closely related to speculation
in colonial real estate, high land prices and high profit expectations.
It was maintained that the rental returns from working class housing
were more profitable proportionately than those from better-quality
housing. This was the low cost housing of the working classes,
usually minimal 2-roomed weatherboard cottages which spread across the
cheaper land of Fitzroy, Collingwood Plat, Richmond and Emerald Hill.
We have seen that in the early 1850's a speculative housing industry
grew up within a very short space of time, geared to the hasty erection

30. Table Talk, 14 August 1891. See also, ibid., 5 September 1890.
32. Ibid.
33. Table Talk, 19 July 1889.
34. Ibid., 5 September 1890.
36. R.T. Tracy "The Importance of Sanitary Works for Towns, 1856",
Papers and Reports read before the Philosophical Institute and
the Royal Society of Victoria (Melbourne, 1856), P. 14.
of low-cost housing. There is sufficient evidence in the writings and reports of the 1870's and early 1880's, for the contention that this early financially speculative dealings in Melbourne land and housing set a trend which persisted in the following decades.

The third effect of high land prices was poor quality building. Land speculation was in this way a contributory factor in a process which is treated in more detail in chapters 8 and 22. With enormous sums paid for building sites, owners wanted a quick return on the capital invested and therefore asked the architect to put up the building in the shortest possible time. In his presidential address to the MLA, Mr. Lloyd Taylor quoted a speaker at the recent Edinburgh Congress of 1:50 on the operation of the profit motive. Street architecture was greatly affected by the badly-designed hastily-constructed buildings whose main purpose was the "gathering in of the harvest of rentals" at the earliest possible time. The retiring president of the Medical Society of Victoria stressed the dangers of unhealthy houses which the health of the Community was subjected to by the speculative cutting up of the land into small building allotments without provision for adequate drainage. The Central Board of Health said it had frequently urged the Government to take action on this but most of the mischief was already done as far as Melbourne suburbs were concerned. Sir George Vernon, retiring President, spoke at the MLA annual meeting of the dangers in the land and building boom.

"One of the most important results of the increased value of suburban land has been the erection of great numbers of houses, so small and so closely packed that it is impossible to provide for their drainage or proper ventilation". He saw the advantages of detached houses being lost in "ill-constructed, undrained and crowded dwellings.

The fourth effect of expensive land, the outward thrust of settlement into lower-price suburban areas has been dealt with in chapter 7, "The Genesis of the Suburbs".

38. Ibid., 1 February 1890.
39. Ibid., 12 January 1889.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., 2 February 1889.
PART IV

THE LATER NINETEENTH CENTURY

URBAN ENVIRONMENT
CHAPTER 10
THE MELBOURNE ANXIETY

Francis Adams noted that "Melbourne is, after all, the Melburnians. A restlessness and determination to get things done characterised the Melburnians, traits which were most obvious in their financial dealings and business transactions. These intangible qualities no doubt provide some explanation of the facts of physical expansion contained in the data tables. Observers saw in this vigour of the city and its inhabitants a key to the essential character of Melbourne.

"The lively, business-like character of the place and people pleases me ... Melbourne itself is splendid. Fine wide streets, finer and wider than almost any in London, stretch away, sometimes for miles, in every direction ... Thousands of persons may be seen straggling (sic) along the leading thoroughfares, with true Cheapside bustle and eagerness. Hundreds of cabs and jaunting-cars rattle through the streets; trains come shrieking in from Geelong and the suburbs every ten or twelve minutes; all the classic cries of London, from hot potatoes to iced ginger-beer, echo through the streets."  

The city was praised as one of the marvels of modern progress. The citizens of Melbourne were always out and about, never dull. Adams identified the 'metropolitan tone' and remarked on the pace of town living in the late 'eighties and Bannow concurred in this a few years later, noting "There is in short nothing provincial at all about Melbourne, but everything is carried on wholesale and in grand style."  

The fact that forty-odd years previously had also seen the bustle on the streets and 'the living scene ... full of picturesque effects' is proof of the continuity of this quality of city life in Melbourne throughout the period. Midway in time Carlton Booth could remark on the fact that people of substance were building their homes in out-of-the-way places in an attempt to escape from 'the rapid town-life.

5. J. Sherer (ed.) The Gold Framer of Australia (London N.D.) [1853].
of Victoria in 1860. He also detected a nostalgia for the relative quiet and spaciousness of the pre-gold era among the older settlers, when the country began at Russell, Queen and Lonsdale Streets, and both Dr. Howitt's house at the east end of Flinders Lane and Justice Redmond Barry's House opposite the Carlton Gardens were in the bush. But even with this expansiveness of the pre-gold town and its leisurely pace of living, the Melbourne streets had always seemed busy and crowded with the huge bullock drays carting the wool to port and supplies up-country.

Although the Melburnians enjoyed their recreations, picnics and outings on fine weekends and holidays, and colonial workers were not thought hard worked by European standards, nonetheless a curiously distinctive time-factor could be observed. By this standard, one year in the colony was reckoned as equal to at least five or six in the Old World: "It must be conceded that we live in a racing pace in this colony; that the flow of thought and action, and the hurry of events, are wonderfully rapid; so that five years in Victoria are equivalent to fifty years in Europe." This compression of time in Melbourne living emerges as an important aspect of its dynamic urban growth.

There was always, then, an inherent vitality to Melbourne town life and a 'go-ahead' feel to the city during the period. Ambition to succeed drove many men of business to amass large fortunes whose tenure was, however, often precarious. Many displayed remarkable

7. See Reminiscences of one of Melbourne's oldest citizens in Table Talk, 2 November 1886, and Ibid, 21 February 1890. See also K. Edmund Ashley's reminiscences in Ibid, 2 January 1891 and Mr. George Croll's corroboration in Ibid, 27 February 1891. Other reminiscences in Builder and Contractor's News 11 January 1890.
individual energy and this they combined with business acumen and foresight, (which at times was little more than pure speculation) to attain many of the notable business successes among those representatives of the British commercial world who had migrated to the colonial city with the avowed aim of making their fortunes. Many realized their hopes beyond reasonable expectation; many fortunes so quickly won were frequently later squandered or lost in further extravagant speculation. This "precarious duration of large fortunes" is another significant aspect of Melbourne life. It can be traced back as far as the speculative tendency, clearly evident in Melbourne land dealings from the initial years in 1837, and which we have noted was characteristic of Melbourne importing, merchandising, real property and financial transactions in the 'fifties. This speculative streak was to have important ramifications in the later metropolitan development of the 'eighties. In this context, "the Melburnians... have shown themselves from the beginning of their brief history, a most mercurial race - the maddest speculators in the world... They disdain every thing but the most lunatic prices and profits." In the early urban phase of the 1850's, then, the 'colonial qualities' were most clearly evident in the inhabitants of Melbourne who in their recklessness in spending, in their living only for the day, in their refusal to plan ahead and allowing 'the uncertain future to shift for itself', exhibited self-interest and a blatant disregard


for the future welfare of the colony. This was the substance of the social criticism levelled against the prevailing tenor of Melbourne society in the period of gold. Sharpest censure was reserved for the alleged lack of altruism and of public-spiritedness, so ubiquitous that "no-one dreams of rendering a present or future benefit to the colony, otherwise than for his personal gain." Lancelott commented on the avarice apparent among all classes in this 'city of sharp traders', where nothing was thought disgraceful but the want of money and even the most influential citizens have little moral rectitude. Both Claran Aspinall and William Kerr attested that wealth gave social standing and noted the existence of a certain aristocracy of wealth in lieu of one of rank. It often happened that financial and social positions were reversed on coming to the colony. The fact that social status could often be gained by industry and fortunate speculation was to be seen in the "palatial residences of successful speculators". Kerr remarked cynically that acceptance beyond the barriers of polite society was not always immediate but the possession of substantial wealth gradually softened any glaring social disqualifications. In this manner, one can detect some continuity with the gold decade, when riches were the test of a man's position. "Plebeianism of the rankest kind dwells in Australia".

There are many ramifications to this question of social status. At the height of the gold rushes, Sherer thought Melbourne society to be in a state of flux with daily transitions in economic and social
status. This was probably exaggerated, but the fact remains that, the
gold era apart, opportunities to rise in society and improve one's
material condition were consistently and repeatedly advanced as a valid
reason for emigrating.\textsuperscript{21} Another advantage existing in Melbourne
society was that it was reputedly not openly divided into obvious
classes, at least in the earlier phase; all could share in the
affluence and Melbourne was noticeably free from the rivalry between
old hands and new chums which characterized Sydney.\textsuperscript{22} This alleged
egalitarianism in part of the myth-making process. Nonetheless we
must be careful here to distinguish between the ideal, the notion
that a man of humble beginnings could rise and acquire status through
wealth and the fact that social class divisions based on economic
criteria were in fact clearly evident in Melbourne suburbs by 1855.
Recognizable class distinctions did exist between different areas as
seen in the congregation of the poorer classes in Collingwood and the
distinctions made between the better and poorer parts of Fitzroy.\textsuperscript{23}
Miserable housing accommodation characterized lower class areas
throughout our period,\textsuperscript{24} so that "cottages in the pleasanter suburbs,
to which access may be had by tram or train, are for the aristocracy
of labor (sic): the feeble and unskilled must accept the shelter ... which is to be had for the fewest shillings" namely the weatherboard

\textsuperscript{21} Hartimer Franklyn, \textit{op.cit.} "Introduction" p.xix and p.12.
\textit{G.C. Levey, Essays on the Colony of Victoria} (Melbourne N.D.)
(1863) p.12, p.16.
\textit{J. Bellantyne, Homes and Homesteads in the Land of Plenty}
(Melbourne 1872 2nd ed.) pp.17-22, pp.156-164.
\textit{H. Perkins, Melbourne Illustrated and Victoria Described}
(Melbourne N.D.) [1896] pp.36-37.
\textit{Carlton-Booth, op.cit.} pp.311-312.
\textit{P. Just, Australia} (Jandee 1899) p.245.

\textsuperscript{22} Lancelott, \textit{op.cit.} Vol. II. p.71, p.75.
Pawley, \textit{op.cit.} p.15.

See also pp.44-45 of thesis.

\textsuperscript{24} R.T. Tracy, "The Importance of Sanitary Works for Towns",
\textit{Papers and Reports read before the Philosophical Institute and the
hovels in Collingwood which rented at six shillings a week. 25

These differences were visible to the eye in the standard of housing which characterised the various districts. What more incontrovertible evidence exists of a man's economic status and social position than his housing accommodation? Among the majority of immigrants their striving for self-advancement showed in the desire for a comfortable cottage or home, the tangible evidence of success. 26 This was the sentiment skilfully and consistently exploited by property agents throughout the period to reach its climax in the mid-1860's.

All adverse contemporary comments and criticisms notwithstanding, there existed in the colony and in Greater Melbourne an expansiveness and lack of restraint almost unknown in older societies. Many immigrants were able to experience 'the unshackled freedom of their own wills' 27 for the first time in their lives. The bulk of them were 'very independent, and very uncomromising. They seem to think when they get out here they may do just as they please, and in that they are not far wrong.' 28 It was from this attitude, no doubt, that the easy-going, independent air seen on the faces of the citizens of Melbourne derived. 29

At this juncture one must ask how far the fortune seekers and the speculative mania of the gold years influenced the later attitudes of Melbourne residents; and how far their pursuit of profit transmitted itself to land and real estate dealings once the gold had passed. On the surface gold gave an opportunity for every man to participate in the colonial lottery. Many of course were to be disillusioned but the speculative notion dies hard and one could argue that dealings in land and property did provide a surrogate.

25. Age 26 November 1861. Age 2 March 1891.
26. Age 2 February 1861, 26 April 1861.
CHAPTER 20

BIRTHPLACES

Visitors to Melbourne often remarked on an "English" quality to the city which was particularly evident in its earlier phase to 1881. Not only was this discernable in the physical appearance of the city but the habits, manners and mores of Melbourne society gave substance to this view. In the late 'fifties, Westgarth saw Melbourne as a thoroughly British society with some modifications. ¹ Lancelott though Melbourne's appearance akin to that of an English country town ² and Howitt ³ noted an "English stamp" on the settlements, while in 1889 Francis Adams could remark that Victoria was still in essence, an "English" colony. ⁴

One result of this English aspect to life in Victoria was that its close modelling on features of English society led to a harking after the necessarily superior English prototype, a harking back to the old country which showed itself clearly in the lack of total identification in the new environment on the part of the colonists. ⁵ Only in the 1890's do we see a re-orientation in thinking gaining widespread acceptance, a nascent "nationalism", as it were, by which colonial standards became acceptable criteria for colonial living.

This so-called "English" quality of Greater Melbourne is explained partly in terms of the birthplaces of the inhabitants, as the following data based on Tables VII and VIII demonstrate.


In 1861, approximately one-third of the population of the 16 municipalities was Australian-born, of whom 10–12% were born in other Australian colonies and the remaining 90% were Victorian. The remaining two-thirds were of British origin with a very small percentage, varying from 1.1 (Brighton, Hotham, Kew and Williamstown) to 5.1 (Melbourne) born in Europe and all other countries. This extremely low percentage of foreign-born was to have important social implications and ramifications during our period.

By 1871 a near-equalisation or slightly predominant number of Australian-born to British-born had taken place in all municipalities except Fitzroy, Hotham, Melbourne and St. Kilda, where a difference of 4–5% in favour of British-born still obtained, with Melbourne reaching 13%.

By 1881, the trend towards the two-thirds native-born of 1891, was well-established. Ranked in order of the highest Australian-born component were Brunswick 65%, Brighton, Portsea and Hawthorn all 63%, Collingwood and Williamstown 62%. Emerald Hill, Fitzroy, Hotham, Prahran, Sandridge and St. Kilda all showed around 60% Australian-born by 1881, with Richmond 56%, Melbourne 55% and Kew 53% significantly lower.

In 1891 approximately two-thirds of the Greater Melbourne population was Australian-born. Of those municipalities with the highest percentage, Brunswick and Fitzroy led with 70%. Of those still below two-thirds, we find Emerald Hill and Fitzroy 65%, St. Kilda 64%, Kew 62% and Melbourne still lowest with 59%. The last three retained the highest number of British-born, 33–35%.

The following general observations are aimed at identifying broad population composition trends during the whole period. Marked variations in the relative numbers of English, Scottish and Irish of both sexes exist between suburbs but certain conclusions are possible.

There were considerably more Irish females than Irish males throughout every municipality at each date, frequently in an approximate ratio 4:3. One of the highest in this regard was Prahran 2:1. St. Kilda was also high.

6. Table VII.
7. Table VII.
There was marked fluctuation in the numbers of Scottish females to Scottish males, even within a single municipality, at the four dates, for example in Brunswick and Collingwood. But by 1891 most municipalities showed a marked drop in the number of Scottish females proportionate to males, i.e. Brighton, Brunswick, Emerald Hill, Fitzroy, Footscray, Richmond, Sandridge, St. Kilda and with Collingwood, Hotham and Melbourne, showing both a proportionate and absolute decrease from the Scottish female figures for 1881.

In all of these municipalities, the number of Scottish females were less than the number of Scottish males by 1891. Williamstown also contained fewer Scottish females in 1871, 1881 and 1891 but the proportion of Scottish F:M remained practically unchanged.

The exceptions of this general trend in 1891 were those municipalities in which the number of Scottish females had always exceeded Scottish males (except in 1861) and which continued to do so in 1891, namely Hawthorn, Kew, Prahran and St. Kilda.

Within the total group of European-born, German comprised by far the largest single group, except in Sandridge, and the numbers of German-born also show a steady growth proportionate to that of the total population over the three decades. They are spread evenly throughout the sixteen suburbs and there is no evidence of any large German community in any one municipality. In the majority of instances the German M:F ratio was roughly 3:2 or 2:1 with some exceptions, Melbourne and Sandridge throughout and Hotham and Williamstown in 1861 and 1871.

In relation to other European countries, German-born outnumbered the others until 1891, when a marked increase in the other-European is apparent in all municipalities, especially Emerald Hill, Fitzroy, Footscray, Hotham, Melbourne, Sandridge (since 1861) and Williamstown. By this the balance is tipped against the German group.

8. Table VIII.
9. Table VIII.
Of the remaining category, "All other Countries", only the U.S.A. and China were of any importance up to 1881. In suburbs where a handful of Chinese is listed, they were probably working as market gardeners. There were almost no Chinese females. In Footscray, Hotham, Prahran, Sandridge, St. Kilda and Williamstown, the numbers of Chinese were negligible throughout. The Chinese community in Emerald Hill remained fairly steady, but despite the Chinese temple situated there, was not a large population group. Richmond had a much larger Chinese community than Emerald Hill. However, Brunswick in 1891 shows 130 Chinese of whom 125 were males.

The 1891 Census figures show the offspring of intermarriage, but it is more probable that they were engaged in some particular occupation. The large group of Chinese in Melbourne are explained in terms of trading and a residential community. However, in relation to the Melbourne population at large, the Chinese were a very small group indeed.

The same statement holds good for the American-born component, whose numbers were surprisingly low at any stage.

We have in these figures and trends of Tables VII and VIII an explanation of the "English" quality to Melbourne and Melbourne living. No other ethnic group left any marked impression on the social mores and standards of the life of the metropolis and by 1891 we have a homogeneous society almost wholly of British derivation. It is interesting to note that Hortimer Franklyn attributed a large measure of Melbourne's commercial and financial achievements to the successful "careers of hundreds of prosperous Scotsmen in the Australian colonies". At the same time he surmised that the best of the English merchant class was also represented in Melbourne trade.

10. Table VIII.
11. Table VIII.
13. Ibid. p.258.
"English" to read "British" is probably necessary in certain contexts, as the Scottish and Irish-born usually made up one third or more of the British-born category in all municipalities at each decade, and in Kotham at all dates, and Melbourne in 1861 and 1871 the English group was in a minority.14

14. Table VII.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861 P</th>
<th>1871 P</th>
<th>1881 P</th>
<th>1891 P</th>
<th>1861 M</th>
<th>1871 M</th>
<th>1881 M</th>
<th>1891 M</th>
<th>1861 F</th>
<th>1871 F</th>
<th>1881 F</th>
<th>1891 F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2501</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>3059</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>4755</td>
<td>2183</td>
<td>2572</td>
<td>9858</td>
<td>4611</td>
<td>5247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>826</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>5755</td>
<td>2573</td>
<td>3182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust.</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cols. &amp; N.Z.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>997</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>344</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit.</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cols. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ.</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. A.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRIGHTON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861 P</th>
<th>1871 P</th>
<th>1881 P</th>
<th>1891 P</th>
<th>1861 M</th>
<th>1871 M</th>
<th>1881 M</th>
<th>1891 M</th>
<th>1861 F</th>
<th>1871 F</th>
<th>1881 F</th>
<th>1891 F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3014</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>4388</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>6222</td>
<td>3133</td>
<td>3089</td>
<td>21961</td>
<td>11568</td>
<td>1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>983</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>12984</td>
<td>6339</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust.</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cols. &amp; N.Z.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>3598</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>397</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit.</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cols. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ.</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. A.</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Figures for Chinese are much larger in 1891 Census. This includes half-castes.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th></th>
<th>1881</th>
<th></th>
<th>1891</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12653</td>
<td>6240</td>
<td>6413</td>
<td>18598</td>
<td>9006</td>
<td>9592</td>
<td>23829</td>
<td>13350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>3544</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>8008</td>
<td>3875</td>
<td>4133</td>
<td>13550</td>
<td>6430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust.,Cols., &amp; N.Z.</strong></td>
<td>439</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>5344</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>5534</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>2668</td>
<td>5107</td>
<td>2651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ. Countries</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. A.</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERALD HILL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8822</td>
<td>4464</td>
<td>4358</td>
<td>17101</td>
<td>8447</td>
<td>8654</td>
<td>25574</td>
<td>12435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>7186</td>
<td>3588</td>
<td>3598</td>
<td>13410</td>
<td>6474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust.,Cols., &amp; N.Z.</strong></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>3043</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>4209</td>
<td>2191</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4943</td>
<td>2613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ. Countries</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. A.</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Birthplaces

### Fitzroy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11807</td>
<td>5752</td>
<td>6055</td>
<td>15547</td>
<td>7557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>3089</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>6165</td>
<td>2997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust. Col. &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>4870</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>4769</td>
<td>2425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europ. Countries</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspec.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footscray

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>2473</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust. Col. &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europ. Countries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspec.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table VII

#### Birthplaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861 P</th>
<th>1871 M</th>
<th>1871 F</th>
<th>1881 P</th>
<th>1881 M</th>
<th>1881 F</th>
<th>1891 P</th>
<th>1891 M</th>
<th>1891 F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>6019</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>19868</td>
<td>9195</td>
<td>10330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust. Cols. &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europ. Countries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspec.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hotham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861 P</th>
<th>1871 M</th>
<th>1871 F</th>
<th>1881 P</th>
<th>1881 M</th>
<th>1881 F</th>
<th>1891 P</th>
<th>1891 M</th>
<th>1891 F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7053</td>
<td>3616</td>
<td>3437</td>
<td>13491</td>
<td>6783</td>
<td>6708</td>
<td>18789</td>
<td>8909</td>
<td>8930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>5629</td>
<td>2801</td>
<td>2828</td>
<td>9694</td>
<td>4814</td>
<td>4860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust. Cols. &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>2957</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>2545</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europ. Countries</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. A.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspec.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BIRTHPLACES

### Table VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>2430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust. Cols. &amp; New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>641</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ. Countries</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. A.</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Melbourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5928</td>
<td>20106</td>
<td>21762</td>
<td>5493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>8191</td>
<td>4105</td>
<td>4086</td>
<td>19502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust. Cols. &amp; New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>11671</td>
<td>7006</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td>14111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>2428</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>4453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>8549</td>
<td>3786</td>
<td>4763</td>
<td>10657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit. Col. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>804</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ. Countries</strong></td>
<td>394</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. A.</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>345</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BIRTHPLACES

#### PRAHAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9866</td>
<td>4725</td>
<td>5161</td>
<td>14096</td>
<td>6679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>6127</td>
<td>3046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust.</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>4260</td>
<td>2121</td>
<td>2139</td>
<td>4352</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Brit.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. &amp; Poss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europ.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspec.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RICHMOND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11355</td>
<td>5590</td>
<td>5765</td>
<td>16899</td>
<td>8383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>7463</td>
<td>3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust.</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>4758</td>
<td>2435</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>2468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Brit.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. &amp; Poss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europ.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspec.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table VII

#### BIRTHPLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3351</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>6398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>785</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust., Cols. &amp; N.Z.</strong></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>452</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit. Cols. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ. Countries</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S.A.</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### St. Kilda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6408</td>
<td>2946</td>
<td>3462</td>
<td>9085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aust., Cols. &amp; N.Z.</strong></td>
<td>299</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>2354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>656</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Brit. Cols. &amp; Poss.</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europ. Countries</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S.A.</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Sea</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unspec.</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861 F</td>
<td>1861 M</td>
<td>1871 F</td>
<td>1871 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4492</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>7126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>3518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aust., Cole., &amp; N.Z.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Brit., Col. &amp; Poss.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europ. Countries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. A.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspec.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>2501</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4755</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3014</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4598</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6222</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12653</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18965</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23632</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36070</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2993</td>
<td>62,5</td>
<td>6935</td>
<td>66,3</td>
<td>10795</td>
<td>32,5</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>50,8</td>
<td>4012</td>
<td>64,5</td>
<td>12289</td>
<td>69,3</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>31,5</td>
<td>9931</td>
<td>48,1</td>
<td>14754</td>
<td>61,9</td>
<td>23579</td>
<td>67,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>48,3</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>30,5</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>61,9</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>47,2</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>33,8</td>
<td>6172</td>
<td>28,1</td>
<td>9351</td>
<td>65,8</td>
<td>9190</td>
<td>49,4</td>
<td>8564</td>
<td>35,9</td>
<td>10028</td>
<td>30,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

1. "$\%$ Inc." refers to the horizontal column above the line and shows the internal population increase for each municipality in 1861, 1861 & 1861 expressed as a percentage.

2. The vertical column below the line gives the distribution in numbers between the different categories of birthplace of the total population figure which is given under "No." at the head of the column above the line.

3. This next vertical column is a representation of the $\%$ of birthplace groups in relation to total population and which add up to the 100 (approx.) at the base.
CHAPTER 21

SEX RATIO

In every municipality with the two exceptions of Essendon where the boundary change accompanying the formation of the borough of Flemington and Kensington in 1882 disturbed the pattern, and of Kew, in every one of the sixteen municipalities the highest proportion of female to male population within the municipality was reached in 1881.¹

Similarly, this peak of 1881 was followed by a significant drop by 1891 whereas the decrease for Victoria as a whole was only .5.

A consistent pattern is discernible in the distribution of the sex-ratio within the majority of suburbs over the three decades as it either remained relatively high or low. The suburbs which maintained a continuously low ratio of females:males were Brunswick, Footscray, Melbourne and Sandridge while those remaining high overall were Brighton, Collingwood, Hawthorn, Kew, Prahran and St. Kilda. Three, Fitzroy, Richmond and Williamstown, while remaining high overall, did show a marked drop, 1881-1891, from the high to the lower group, i.e. below 100. Two others, Emerald Hill and Kooyong reached their peak in 1871 and 1881 then declined while one, Essendon shows a steady upward trend throughout.

Of the high female sex-ratio group, St. Kilda always had an outstandingly high proportion of females, the highest at any date of the entire metropole. It was followed in order of approximate ranking by Brighton, Prahran, Hawthorn, Kew, Collingwood and Fitzroy. We have seen from the number of rooms per dwelling that the first five suburbs were higher class residential areas. The lack of detailed statistics for 1881 and 1891 occupations for each suburb inhibits tight generalisations as to the causes of these high female ratios, but from 1861 and 1871 occupations² we can assume a high proportion of wives and widows, female students or general domestic servants. For example, in 1861 we have the following table:

1. Table II.

2. Census of Victoria 1861 and 1871, "Occupations of the People".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Kilda</th>
<th>Brighton</th>
<th>Brunswick</th>
<th>Footscray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wives and Widows</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Scholars</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Servants</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the high number of female scholars in Brighton (although Footscray was also high) and the greater proportion of female servants in Brighton and St. Kilda compared to the other two mainly working class areas help explain the differing sex ratios at that date. Of the other two, Fitzroy and Collingwood, both show an extremely high proportion of dressmakers and milliners, 277 in Fitzroy and 258 in Collingwood.

In the low-ranking group, Melbourne and Sandridge as ports would have naturally had a greater number of transient and highly mobile males than the residential suburbs above. Although Williamstown was also a port it contained a higher percentage of government employees and professional persons in non-government employment than did Sandridge. (See Occupations of the People, 1861, Table IX (2) Classes I - III and 1871, Table IX (3) Orders I and II.) Melbourne, as usual, occupied a special position with large numbers of males in government offices and trading occupations.

The markedly overall low proportion of females to males in Footscray and to a lesser extent in Brunswick requires some analysis. Some explanation may lie in the occupational structure and nature of industrial undertakings shown in detail in the 1871 Census. The following table condenses some of the relevant data:

3. Ibid.

4. Table II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Sub-Order</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONS 1871</th>
<th>Brunswick</th>
<th>Footscray</th>
<th>Brighton</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Male Population</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males of Working Age 15-60 years</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Butchers, Hostlers and Curers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>*107</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quarryowners and Workers</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brickmakers and Dealers</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tin and Quicksilver Workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Labourers</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drovers, Carriers, Carters</td>
<td>*117</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commercial Clerks</td>
<td>*117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Farmors, Market Gardners</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brunswick had 43 brickyards and potteries in 1871 and the total number of hands employed was 299, which averaged out at 7 employees per brickyard or pottery. An examination of the Brunswick ratebooks revealed a considerable number of dwellings closely associated with the brickyards and quarries, either on adjoining land or close nearby. If owned by the quarry or brickworks, there was usually a cluster of 4 or 5 small dwellings, typical working-class housing accommodation. This provision of workers' housing by the quarrymaster or employer was paralleled in the Hawthorn brickyards, as seen in the ratebooks.

Was there perhaps a traditional responsibility of the employer to provide some housing in these industries? Was the offer of reasonably priced rental an inducement to men to work in these ten to work in these hazardous and arduous occupations? Most pertinently just who were the inhabitants of these dwellings? Were they families or were they several male quarry or yard employees living in the one company dwelling? The later Brunswick ratebooks show a large number of small


6. *At Brunswick Town Hall. Ratebooks examined for 1851, 1871, 1881, 1891.*

quarries worked by 3-5 men, perhaps co-operatively, whereas in 1890 there were 19 brickyards employing 646 hands so by then the scale of operation had grown much larger. 8

Answers to those questions cannot be definitive in the absence of detailed locality studies. We can only formulate hypotheses. Of the 2266 male inhabitants of Brunswick in 1871, 1298 or 55.5% were within the working ages 15-65 years and constitute the statistical workforce for our purposes. 9 Of these workers, 785 were employed in the occupations listed in the Table on page 170 so we have this basis, a restricted and dominant occupational structure and industrial composition. Again it is highly feasible that the relatively large numbers of commercial clerks and carriers were connected with the quarrying and brickmaking operations. The other suburbs registering large numbers of carters at this date were Collingwood 171, Emerald Hill 81, Fitzroy 105, Rotham 215, Melbourne 357 and Richmond 170. All had at least 4 times the male population of Brunswick, were densely-settled, and were older, more-established localities with more manufactories, of which Brunswick had 7, Collingwood 36, Emerald Hill 28, Fitzroy 36, Rotham 34, Melbourne 232 and Richmond 22. Consequently, they would support a large cartage trade whereas in Brunswick it must obviously have been for the cartage of stone and bricks.

Quarrying, brickmaking, meatworking and the processing of animal products are unattractive trades, their physical exactions almost on a par with that of goldmining but without the "freedom" of the fields and the chance to make a fortune. In 1871, a transformation of "the quiet little hamlet of Footscray" was in progress, making it a home of the noxious trades. 10 The price of land had increased tenfold since April 1870 - what sold then for £10 an acre was now bringing £100. A new 11-acre animal manure factory of James MacKeikan

8. Statistical Register of Victoria 1870 - Production.

9. "Age Structure Tables" in author's possession derived from Censuses of Victoria, 1851, 1871, 1881, 1891.

10. Age, 6 January 1871.
and Company producing tallow and guano and another of Robert Smith and Company manufacturing sulphuric and muriatic acid were the cause of the cluster of settlement, the "pretty little cottages" being built by workmen around the factories. Bone mills and soap and candle manufactories were under negotiation. 11

With the smallness of the total populations of Brunswick and Footscray and the relative importance of the above industries in the area, plus the unpleasant and exacting nature of the trades, it would be possible for the high male sex ratio to be explained on the basis of a few more casual, single or itinerant workers employed in these heavy occupations. In this way, a partial explanation of the varying sex ratio is to some extent explicable on an occupational and class basis. The Censuses of Victoria, if used in conjunction with the Statistical Registers and Municipal Ratebooks could provide such valuable information relating to the different localities, and could illuminate local history. More detailed observations along the above lines are, however, beyond the scope of this thesis. 11 

11. Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>228561</td>
<td>21267</td>
<td>442250</td>
<td>21671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourke C.</td>
<td>88522</td>
<td>75474</td>
<td>163996</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G'wood</td>
<td>6240</td>
<td>6413</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hill</td>
<td>4464</td>
<td>4358</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/V/Flem</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flem/Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy</td>
<td>5752</td>
<td>6095</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botham</td>
<td>3616</td>
<td>3437</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>20106</td>
<td>16762</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahran</td>
<td>4725</td>
<td>5161</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>5590</td>
<td>5765</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandridge</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kilda</td>
<td>2946</td>
<td>3462</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendouree</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 22

PROBLEMS OF THE CITY'S GROWTH IN THE LATER NINETEENTH CENTURY URBAN ENVIRONMENT

Radical theories of land use were but one facet of a nascent social philosophy of the need to establish proper controls over the urban physical and social environment. The controls sought took two forms, physical and aesthetic. The first concerned material standards of the buildings, streets and environs and involved concrete measurables and was not concerned with design as such. The second type of control envisaged was over design, appearance and total environment and was largely immeasurable. It would involve acknowledged experts on architectural aesthetics acting as "a sort of custodian of the public taste". The phrase has an ominous ring to it but it was aimed mainly at the prevention of "jerry built shanties... fit only for dogs to live in" and ugly street front development.

By 1891 it had become obvious that an overall design or master plan was necessary for the attractive development of a whole street or group of buildings. "Harmony can never exist so long as buildings are erected without regard to their surroundings... buildings ranged alongside each other should not be regarded as isolated units, but as integral parts of a design represented by the whole street or the whole town, also... such design, being public property, ought not to be at the mercy of greed, ignorance or tasteless fancy." 1

Recognition of this "public property" aspect of building and design 2 was a decisive step towards formulating the quasi-social philosophy aimed at some control over urban development. Although still in an embryonic phase in the early 1890's the implications of these ideas were quite clear to the advocates. Their philosophy of social responsibility was partly bound up with the theories of the land reformers and the public health champions - in fact in the case of some of the early town planners it is sometimes hard to distinguish between one aspect or the other. In practice they often

2. Ibid. 18 April 1891.
3. Ibid. 22 August 1891.
merged. These were men such as the architects G. Vorden, J. Sulman, L. Taylor, T. Sinley, T. Joseland, A. Hieusset, E. Wilson Dobbs, Newton Jennings and Max Hirsch, together with Dr. J. Jamieson, City Health Officer, Dr. Strong and Mr. Topp of the Board of Health. The columns of the *Builders and Contractor's News* and daily newspapers gave voice to these ideas editorially, in articles and in the reports of addresses or papers delivered at meetings of the various professional bodies and associations. Criticism mounted from 1890 onwards when the full import of the building boom was becoming evident.

The reformers strongly criticised the prevailing assumption that a man could do what he liked when building on his own land, providing he did not contravene certain minimum standards. Freedom in building was actually a misuse of the physical environment of the city, and the cause of much undesirable development. So few controls did in fact operate that men could build virtually as they pleased and this was the secondary stage of the speculative venture in real estate, the first or primary one having been the speculation in land. Hence, Mr. John Sulman FHRHA noted in a paper read at the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science, 1890 - "The typical mode of subdivision...is very useful from the 'pay your money, take-your-choice' and 'do-as-you-like' point of view. Blind chance in such a case determines the future of each Street or Block, and the game of 'beggar my neighbour' is too often played by adjoining neighbours with opposing views or interests in the buildings they erect. It is a case of individualism run mad."^5

The reformers argued that possession of a building site did not confer an immunity on the owner who held a responsibility to his fellow men in the type of building he put on his land. Although every building in effect became public property, in appearances


"we permit men to disfigure and defile what might and ought to be our beautiful young towns and cities." It was thought high time that a proper and efficient power were called into existence to control "such an abomination of desecration as we too frequently see around us." Likewise it was argued that "a man possesses no moral right and therefore should enjoy no legal privilege to erect a hideous building upon even his own property". However, when the Prahran Municipal Council attempted to introduce some control and uniformity into "the perfect recklessness of design" in Chapel Street and Toorak Road in 1890, the property owners complained of oppression and refused to co-operate. The Prahran Council was forced to seek legal opinion on the prosecution of the owners.

In discussions on Melbourne architecture, reference was frequently made to the striking aspect and pleasant appearance of many European and American cities, which was due largely to a conformity or uniformity of design. This was stressed as quite different from monotony of appearance. It was attributed to careful planning provisions for future development at any given time; the example was cited of quite stringent controls operating on architecture in France both on a State and municipal level. This type of control was not, however, thought to be operative in many English towns and here lies what is perhaps an important fundamental planning difference. European and American-born persons were at no time a significant proportion of Melbourne population, nor of the colony. Therefore the British Tradition of building would have been predominant in the shaping, unconscious or otherwise, of Melbourne, particularly in the disregard for overall external appearance of the streets of the city and suburbs.

6. Ibid. 6 August 1891.
7. Ibid. 22 August 1891.
8. Ibid. 26 July 1890.
9. Ibid. 18 October 1890.
10. Ibid. 18 April 1891, 16 May 1891.
11. Table VII.
question thus raised as to whether lack of overall or future planning was a characteristic of nineteenth century English urban growth, in contrast to European contemporary developments, is one which would require detailed comparative research. However, the references merely to building controls in European cities ignored other important contributory factors. In Europe, the existence of very strong local and regional traditions concerning the use of certain building materials (e.g. tile roofs), the effective functioning and strength of craft and trade guilds and societies coupled with a widespread apprenticeship system, the power of local government authorities to exercise control within town limits, the relatively low (i.e. 3-storey) height of buildings tied to the state of building technology and materials - all of these factors tended to inhibit diversity in building structures and imposed minimum standards of construction. None except the latter applied extensively to Melbourne at any stage of the period covered in this thesis.

In 1890 the need for city street replanning was thought overdue; rebuilding had been on a gigantic scale but redesigning and remodelling had not; the original plan had not envisaged the needs of 50 years later. The rectangle grid plan of the typical Australian town and the one adopted for the city of Melbourne was based on simplicity of design and ease of survey. In his evidence to the Royal Commission on Land Titles and Surveys in 1897, Robert Russell the first surveyor, then living in Richmond, described the method used by Hoddle, his successor. In answer to the question "Who laid out the city of Melbourne, who designed it?" Russell replied "I fancy there was a plan, for those towns, cut and dried, and they just made it fit Melbourne, or any other place - simply a matter of blocks being cut out."

The Melbourne method had been a very rough survey of town and suburban land for the purpose of speeding up the survey and getting

13. Ibid. 25 January 1890. See also, Table Talk 4 July 1890.
the land on to the market as quickly as possible. So easy did Hoddle
find the task that on the first day, accompanied by Russell, he had
chained the distance from the corner of Flinders and Spencer Streets
up to Spring Street 1 mile, then north 3 blocks, again West to Spencer
Street and then south to the starting point. This took Hoddle 2
hours, after which he went and lunched with the Governor. The old
antipathy between the 2 men was obvious in Russell’s remarks in answer
to questions. He thought Hoddle not very precise or accurate but
quick and he got the land on to the market which was what the
government wanted. In contrast to this rectangular approach,
Sultan suggested a spider-web plan of subdivision surrounding the
administrative heart of the town. This would give variety, especially
of architecture. Merely plotting streets of a certain width at
right angles did not constitute planning and to let each individual
property owner or municipality lay out their land according to their
own ideas resulted in a maximum of inconvenience. In both Melbourne
and Sydney it was noted that there was an unwillingness “to grapple
firmly with the . . . evils of irresponsible and ‘promiscuous-like’
building.”

Sultan also thought that State intervention on a planning level
was justified by 1890 - “When it is beginning to be understood that
the land is the heritage of the whole people and its absolute ownership
is permitted to individuals only as a matter of convenience, the
right of the community to enforce provisions against misuse is, I
think, undoubted and when this misuse is glaring. . . . it is the absolute
duty of the State to interfere.” He noted wisely that the merits
and advantages of town planning were coming to be appreciated in

15. Ibid. pp. 48-49.
16. Ibid. p. 49. See also Table Talk 13 September 1889.
17. Builder and Contractor’s News 25 January 1890. See also
Table Talk 4 July 1890.
18. Builder and Contractor’s News 18 October 1890.
19. Ibid. 25 January 1890.
quarters outside the architects and engineering surveyors, particularly among "those shrewd businessmen, the auctioneers and land-agents of Melbourne" who saw hard cash increments in planning as against the evils of the old happy-go-lucky system. 20

All these defects in the situation, and others besides, culminated in demands for a new Building Act which would place all building operations under a strict control, the enforcement of the regulations to rest with District Surveyors. The 1890 Building Act in operation in Melbourne (to which amendments were proposed later that same year) was mainly founded on the London Metropolitan Building Act of 1844. The 1890 version consolidated a multitude of Acts and amendments, but was thought still unsatisfactory and constant requests continued to be made for a new Building Act.

When the incoming President of the Institute of Architects, Mr. Inskip, called for a new Building Act in 1891 21 he mentioned the movement of more and more people from country districts to Melbourne. In advocating control over streets and dwellings, especially of the working classes, he too expounded a social philosophy - "the housing of the working classes is a matter of great importance. At present they are compelled, in many instances, to dwell in the shoddy houses erected by greedy speculators, without proper drainage or ventilation. The rent of these death-traps being also excessive, I would suggest to our capitalists the formation of a Company for the erection of artisans' dwellings on strictly sanitary principles." 22

Gresswell noted that some councils were concerned that they could not prevent the building of houses on unsuitable sites. 23 The present regulations did not require a certificate to be given by the Surveyor prior to occupancy, consequently building regulations were contravened. The Building Laws themselves were in a chaotic state.

20. Ibid.
21. Ibid. 11 July 1891.
Some acts applied only to specific localities e.g. Brunswick. In some other areas, no building regulations at all had been adopted e.g. St. Kilda, Williamstown, Flemington and Kensington. He observed it was commonly said that regulations had not been adopted lest they interfere with development in those areas. In certain shires, such as Malvern and Coburg it appeared there were no statutory powers authorising the making of building regulations. Greaswell recommended that the building byelaws should be brought under the Health Act, and that their enforcement should be mandatory in all districts.

This was especially necessary to stop the building of shoddy artisan's dwellings and working class houses generally. As it was excessive rents were paid for these "death traps".\textsuperscript{23} The conflict of jurisdiction between the Health Acts and the Building Acts\textsuperscript{24} needed to be resolved so that weaknesses and deficiencies in the present system of control could be overcome. A central authority was required in the enforcement of health provisions for residences.\textsuperscript{25} The Health Act was not properly applied in that the Board of Health only acted when called to do so in default of action by the delegated authority i.e. municipal councils. A central authority above all local considerations was thought preferable. The Central Board of Health had no powers of enforcement over municipal authorities;\textsuperscript{26} Local Boards of Health were not conscientious in forcing property owners to observe the regulations in existence. Certain parts of the municipality were exempted from any form of local government control.\textsuperscript{27} An example of this latter was seen in February 1890 when a Prahran physician denounced the drainage, lighting and sanitary conditions at State Schools in Prahran and Armadale.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{23} Builder and Contractor's News 11 July 1891.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid. 29 August 1891.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid. 23 September 1893.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid. 7 April 1888.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. 2 February 1889.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid. 8 February 1890.
There was no dearth of suggestions aimed at improving the physical environment of Melbourne. The main suggestions covered a range of problems. The streets should be compulsorily formed and drained during land subdivision.29 If government approval were necessary for plans of subdivision then fewer credible folk would fall prey to an auctioneer's sales talk.30 With the lack of uniformity in the building regulations, each municipality made its own byo-laws.31 Thus anomalies frequently occurred even to the extent that 2 different sets of regulations and types of construction could apply to the opposite sides of the street.32 No local Boards of Control over building existed and no municipal supervision of building operations was necessary.33 Thus a Richmond surveyor was merely fined £1 each for 5 cottages he had erected in Mary Street without giving the proper notices to build. Some sanitary building inspectors received only £5-10 p.a. for their services which were often characterised by a neglect of duty.34 Section 234 of the 1890 Health Act (of which an amending bill was shortly to be introduced) did not empower the sanitary inspector to prevent the occupation of houses with imperfect drainage or none at all. In this one regard through the want of adequate authority dozens of jerry built cottages had been erected.35 The duties of a Sanitary Inspector were listed in a Paper given in November 1891.36 They covered food, diseases, noxious or offensive trades, dairies, the district generally and dwelling houses. On the latter, 3 conditions were examinable; firstly houses in disrepair or condemned; secondly overcrowding and thirdly, building on unhealthy sites. The amount of criticism of the latter from many quarters indicates the

29. Ibid. 25 October 1890.
30. Ibid. 1 February 1890.
32. Builder and Contractor's News 1 August 1891, 23 May 1891.
34. Ibid. pp.28-29.
35. Ibid. 21 November 1891.
ineffectiveness of the provisions of the Act. On the food section, the Greenswell report gives an indication of the degree of evasion of the regulations. Not one out of 43 dairies visited was considered satisfactory and milk and cream were kept in places where they were likely to become contaminated e.g. in bathrooms, bedrooms, wooden stables, cowsheds, fowlhouses. "Many of the small establishments presented a picture of filth and poverty." A similar inspection of dairies at Northcote and Preston showed only one with a proper dairy for keeping milk.\(^7\) Dr. Charles Strong commented vehemently on the discovery of a milkman's filthy premises at Footscray and a resultant fever outbreak.

"We are at the mercy of unscrupulous landlords, tenants, builders, milkmen and others; and what can the poor people do to have their wrongs righted? They may appeal to the governing shepherds, but the shepherds possibly have some governing interest in the wolves or do not care to interfere...to make health one of the chief planks in the future political and municipal programme. Let those returned to Parliament and Town Council be pledged to protect health of the people, no matter at what cost and what "vested interests" may stand in the way."\(^8\)

Greenswell pointed out the accumulating evidence linking Melbourne's milk supply with tuberculosis, typhoid fever, scarlet fever, diphtheria and other diseases. He also criticised conditions in butchers' shops and the handling of fruit and vegetables.

Greenswell's report also showed the supervision carried out by Health Officers to be a hit-or-miss affair. There was much latitude and no overall supervision. In several cases, the Health Officers were not even supplied with a copy of the statutes they were supposed to be administering. They did not attend Council meetings regularly and were liable to dismissal for outspokenness. They also had other

\(^{37}\) Ibid. 13 October 1888.

\(^{38}\) Table Talk 6 February 1891.
duties to perform. In Bassendean 90% of the Officer’s time was spent looking after stray cattle and collecting dog taxes. In Brunswick he was also the rate collector. Greaswell recommended placing the Health Officer under direct control of a central Health Office.

The Public Health aspect of Melbourne’s growth shows the impact of environment on mortality and on the vital rates of population. Physical housing conditions, standards of sanitation, density of dwellings per acre and the number of inhabitants per room are all relevant factors. An awareness of the existence of serious public health problems is evident as early as the middle 1860’s.

After the delivery of the 1858 Report of the Melbourne Board of Health to the town clerk the comment was made that with the increasing dirtiness of the city, a system of underground drainage was imperative or the health and comfort of the city’s inhabitants would be seriously affected. The surrounding suburbs also shared in this problem and “the undrained state of Collingwood Flat cannot but injure materially the general health of this thickly populated locality.” Graphic descriptions of the unsanitary condition of the city and suburbs abound, of which the following will serve as an example: “There are hundreds of streets in East Collingwood and Fitzroy that are a disgrace to civilisation. There are gutters which are never cleansed, puddles whose green impurities are unchanged from month to month, horrid little streams of black pitchy-looking filth perpetually trickling down the side and banks and welling up beneath the foundations of rotten wooden tenements.” In short the whole situation was thought disastrous and death-dealing.

This recognition of the seriousness co-existed with a reluctance or inability on the part of local and State government authorities to tackle the question which by the 1880’s had assumed vast proportions.

39. Table IV.


41. Australian Builder 24 July 1856.

42. The Victorian 26 July 1862, p.49.
The health of the inhabitants of Melbourne suffered accordingly. Although "the Season" marked the beginning of the Melbourne and other spring events, the phrase also had an ominous note to it—typhoid. The warmer weather brought annual outbreaks of typhoid, diphtheria and infectious diseases with a consequent rise in the death rate. In the second week of February 1889, it was reported that "King Typhoid is holding high in Melbourne... (which) will soon be a nice place to live out of". 276 cases had been reported in the previous week, of which 9 were fatal but it was estimated that probably 25% more had occurred. It was worst in Melbourne and Abbotsford but Mansergh’s reports commented on the difficulty of explaining the varying incidence of typhoid in different suburbs. The week ending 23 March 1889 saw 231 cases, 11 of which were fatal, and 4 May, 799 cases over the previous 3 weeks, 100 proving fatal and in the same period 97 cases of diphtheria of which 24 cases were fatal. The death rate in Melbourne was 28.68, an excessively high figure compared with 9.54 for the colony as a whole. Both the infant and adult mortality rates were higher in Melbourne but some distortion was caused by deaths in benevolent institutions.

Dr. Jamiesson commented at the Royal Society that there had been no improvement in the Melbourne death rate for many years, especially for typhoid. He blamed bad drainage and soil saturated with impurities and advocated deep sewers. Toorak mansions were just as susceptible to typhoid as Collingwood cottages, epidemic diseases spread through being kept secret and not notified to authorities.

Servants and employees from a home where there was infection would go to work and conceal the fact from their employers. Epidemic diseases such as typhoid, diphtheria and croup, measles and whooping cough prevailed. Yet typhoid was an eminently preventable disease.

45. Builder and Contractor's News 23 March 1889. See also, Ibid.
46. Table Talk 5 April 1889.
The early notification and isolation of infectious diseases was vital. Efficient means should be provided for the destruction or disinfection of infected articles. There was a need for Councils to make arrangements with deputy registrars to notify deaths weekly. Obtaining admission to a hospital was usually difficult for sick persons, and once admitted, there was severe overcrowding. In the hospitals 50-60% of available medical beds were given over to typhoid patients in the season, which meant that many other sufferers were unable to gain admission.

Dr. J. Jamieson delivering a paper to a meeting of the Australian Health Society in 1892 declared contagion had been everywhere in the past and it was often difficult to trace its source when the food eaten, the water drunk and the air breathed were all likely to be contaminated.48

An example of this was the Moonee Ponds Creek where hundreds of dairy cattle grazed on the unfenced lands to the west of Brunswick.49 The Health Officer reported sewage flowed through this land into the Moonee Ponds Creek and the cattle drank either the sewage or the creek water. In the last 2 years there had been 11 deaths from diphtheria and 26 from typhoid in Brunswick.50

Insanitary conditions were no novelty to the inhabitants of Melbourne. Measures to combat or mitigate the risks to their health involving water supply, drainage, sewerage, ventilation of dwellings and pure air generally were under constant discussion throughout the period, and intensified with the pressure of increased building and density in the 1880's.

Mansorgh stressed that Melbourne's physical location provided drainage problems which were intensified by density of population.51

49. Ibid. 4 March 1893.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid. 26 July 1890.
70% of the population occupied 16% of the whole area of Greater Melbourne in 1889. The existence of open street channels and gutters was universally condemned. In one instance, a firm of fell-mongers was fined for pumping polluted water used in their business into the streets of Melbourne. The Yarra and its tributaries, especially the Saltwater, Merri and Moonee Ponds Creeks were virtual open drains by 1890, carrying the pollution from abattoirs, bone mills, manure works and fell-mongers. In dry weather they were little more than gigantic stagnant cesspools. “Almost every water-course or lagoon within the metropolitan area is thus used as a receptacle for sewage.”

In 1890 Captain Fullarton, Harbour Master, submitted a report on drains emptying into the Harbour. The Yarra and Saltwater Rivers were within the Trust’s boundaries. In the Upper Yarra there were 71 drains, none properly trapped or cleaned out. In the Lower Yarra and Saltwater Rivers were 202 drains which discharged into the two rivers. From nearly all the shambles, fell-mongeries and tanneries above the Hopkins Street Bridge, all kinds of offal, blood and filth ran into the Saltwater River. One example of the state of existing insanitary conditions was the No. 7 drain, a deep gully 7-800 yards back to Nicholson Street. Three Collingwood Corporation drains flowed into it, being the sewage of Victoria, Well, Vere, Langridge, Slipp, Islington and Nicholson Streets. The gully had also been a Corporation tip and the silt had formed a bank at the mouth of the drain nearly two-thirds across the river. The Collingwood Council was advised to erect a silt trap.

The filling of streets and building sites was a common practice and one which involved grave health hazards. They were used as virtual for offensive material and improperly covered during the operation.

56. Builder and Contractor’s News 8 November 1890
57. Ibid. 11 February 1893.
Despite complaints from residents, St. Kilda Council persisted in using smelly, offensive material (bones, boots, tins) as fill to bind street metal. After the St. Kilda Council refused to heed the complaint, the residents called in the Government analyst who confirmed their suspicions.  

In road-making operations in South Melbourne decayed vegetable and animal matter was used to build up land between Hannah Street and St. Kilda Road to a height of 4'. It was, in effect, operating as a tip for the whole city. "Yet there are some people who wonder why typhoid never leaves Melbourne!" The State School on the north side of the Edinburgh Gardens in North Fitzroy had to be closed because of the "disgusting effluvia" from the tip in the Gardens. Many parents were withholding their children from school and Mr. Don asked for a report.  

In addition to poor drainage and saturated soil, a generally polluted water supply was a major cause of outbreaks of disease, especially typhoid and dysentery. Dr. Astley Cresswell was a tireless exponent of this fact. Because all the watercourses in the metropolitan area were polluted, water was brought in from the Plenty Ranges and the Yan Yean reservoir. Collected rainwater was also used.  

There was a strong possibility of pollution occurring through leaks in pipes and more particularly through the fire plugs. Dr. Cresswell continually asserted that Melbourne's water supply was dangerously fouled by sewerage usually from fire plugs. "No wonder fevers rampage in Melbourne." Contamination occurred especially during bursts or tapping, as the ball plugs then in use, acting as a valve, dropped down whenever the mains were empty or the water pressure was reduced below a certain level, thus allowing foul water to enter. In 1893 the Melbourne Board of Works decided to substitute 4000 pillar

58. Ibid. 29 March 1890.
59. Ibid. 2 February 1899.
60. Ibid. 27 October 1898.
hydrants at £6 each for 13,000 ball valve fire plugs.

Provision of adequate reticulated water supplies was placing a
great strain upon Melbourne's water supply in the later 1880's with
the continued suburban development. In January 1889 a Port Melbourne
deputation asked the Minister of Public Works for a reticulated supply.63
By June of that year supplementary mains were laid to South Melbourne,
Port Melbourne and Williamstown and gave a much better supply.64
Within a few months pipes were laid in 11 miles of Brunswick streets,
7 miles of Coburg's and other districts but the resources of the
Department were taxed to the limit.65

Municipal attitudes to the health and welfare of local residents
partly explain the appalling situation by the late 'eighties. For
instance, many local councils showed an apathetic attitude on the issue
of replacement of the dangerous fire plugs. When it was proposed
to instal new plugs, some suburban councils even bitterly opposed the
measure. One councillor described Gesswell as "an alarmist" and
charged that the Board of Health were always finding fault. The
Builder and Contractor's News commented, "The Melburnite...seems to be
of the opinion that amidst all the things that go to make up
'Marvellous Melbourne' none are...more worthy to be paraded as unique,
even in the colonies, than the pride of the Metropolis in its native
dirt, and the love of its citizens for insanitary
filth."66 Local control of health matters had worked well enough
when the suburbs were at an early stage of development in the 1860's and
1870's but with the suburban expansion of the 1880's, weaknesses and
deficiencies in local control were exposed and it became increasingly
obvious that questions of a more general nature could not be
satisfactorily dealt with.

63. Ibid. 2 February 1889.
64. Ibid. 22 June 1889.
65. Ibid. 22 July 1889.
66. Ibid. 11 February 1893.
By 1861 the need had arisen for a controlling body with wider powers. Previously municipal councils of city and suburbs had made arrangements within their boundaries independently of one another but now united action for all local councils was necessary, for example to preserve the Yarra River as the lungs of the city and a source of pleasure and health instead of a disease-ridden concourse.

Criticism had always been levelled at local government bodies. An early as 1862 a letter writer claimed the Melbourne Corporation was idle in fields it should be most active in, such as making right-of-ways habitable and the homes of the poorest men presentable. Melbourne would be sewered at some time in the future but in the interim there was no reason why its narrow streets should continue in a filthy condition.

In 1861, the work of the municipalities in Greater Melbourne had centred around the improvement of the physical condition of the municipality, the provision of amenities and the regulation of certain operations within the boundaries. Municipalities concerned themselves with the construction of roads, footpaths and rights-of-way; with drainage, postal delivery and rubbish collection (scavenging), with the building of river and railway bridges and jetties, and of public municipal buildings, Court Houses and Gaols; with the lighting of the streets, water supply and fireplugs; with the provision of gardens, recreation areas and commons; with regulating abattoirs and the passage of cabs, vehicles and animals through the streets; they could also become involved in boundary disputes.

A typical half-yearly report was that of Fitzroy 31 March 1861. The Council was carrying out the following operations—street

67. The Victorian Review 1 December 1862, Vol. V.

68. The Victorian 26 July 1862.

69. The following information is based on the Victorian Government Gazette 1861: Brighton p.1205, p.277; Brunswick p.2258; East Collingwood p.2406; Emerald Hill p. 226, p.1456; Fitzroy p.2206; Hawthorn p.1793.

70. Ibid. pp.969-971.
construction; painting and numbering of lamp-posts; the attachment of water services to 6 lamp-posts in prominent places for public use; the insertion of brass balls in fire plugs; Nicholson Street had been kept in repair by a man constantly filling in the ruts caused by the heavy traffic from the quarries to the north; 500 loads of metal and 800 loads of gravel had been distributed over the district; the scavenging of the main thoroughfares; 84 street lights were lit nightly at a monthly cost of £119; the Health Officer, Dr. Tracy reporting on the incidence of measles and scarlatina stressed the need for a proper sewerage system and underground drainage; a problem had arisen with the disposal of night soil, which had previously been dumped at North Melbourne and was not being temporarily dumped on farms in the neighbourhood; it was intended to regulate the nuisance of slaughtering which had grown in the densely inhabited portion of the municipality; a Court House and the Reilly Street drain were under construction; and the Benevolent Committee had experienced a great increase in the number of applications for relief during the past few months and had reached its spending limit. A special appropriation of £10 was noted to the funds of the Industrial Home. Fitzroy also provides an example of a boundary dispute. At the close of 1859 an attempt was made to include the Quarry District in Smith Ward East of Nicholson Street within the proposed limits of Carlton. The Melbourne City Council caused the introduction of a Bill into the Legislative Assembly purporting to define the limits of the City of Melbourne which excluded the Quarry District. However, the Government declined to elevate Carlton into a separate municipality and on 3 August 1860 a proclamation in the Government Gazette annexed the Quarry District of 480 acres, estimated value £200,000 to Fitzroy.


72. The area under dispute comprised Nicholson Street to the Brunswick boundary, then east to the Merri Creek, south-east to the High Street bridge in Northcote, south-west to Heidelberg Road, thence to Smith Street and Reilly Street.
Trollope described a noisy and lusty quality which he thought characterized the manipulation of powers of local government in Victorian cities in the 1870's.\textsuperscript{73} Despite certain short-sighted policies and minor political jobbery and log-rolling together with a degree of localism and parochialism, he thought that the provision of civic amenities by local municipal bodies to be a commendable achievement.

Many of the defalcations were quite minor. In March 1860\textsuperscript{74} the Collingwood Council passed an account for refreshments of attendants at the municipal election held in January. Two returning officers' poll clerks and 3 policemen conducted the election and a bill for refreshments was submitted comprising 42 bottles of ale and porter at 1/6 each, 15 bottles of sherry at 6/- each, £1 worth of lemonade and ginger beer and £1 sandwiches. It was commented cynically that this bill probably also accounted for the 25\% of informal votes cast through bad management. The \textit{Argus} generally thought Collingwood the prototype of a working class "democracy" in action - a rowdy municipality would have rowdy councillors and for this the ratepayers were to blame.\textsuperscript{75}

Serious criticisms of the role and mode of operation of suburban municipalities in Melbourne had developed by the 1880's. The framework of purely local government was no longer adequate for the needs of urban expansion and in too many instances, local councils were responsible for some of the worst features of suburban development. It was claimed some councils had greatly assisted speculative and jerry building by shutting their eyes to substandard construction and shameless scampering of work.\textsuperscript{76} In other cases they pretended ignorance of the real state of affairs within the municipality and when suggestions for improvement were made, ignored or deferred them.\textsuperscript{77}

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{73} A. Trollope, \textit{Australia and New Zealand} (Melbourne 1873) pp.264-266.
    \item \textsuperscript{74} \textit{Argus} 16 March 1860.
    \item \textsuperscript{75} \textit{Ibid.} 5 January 1860, 7 January 1860.
    \item \textsuperscript{76} \textit{Builder and Contractor's News} 31 October 1891, 6 December 1890.
    \item \textsuperscript{77} \textit{Ibid.} 8 November 1890, 7 February 1891. See also \textit{Table Talk 11 September 1891}.
\end{itemize}
In 1891, Dr. Strong gave evidence before the Victorian Charities’ Commission on the "ill-ventilated, cramped and often damp houses" many poor families had to live in in Collingwood, in narrow back streets.78 Some dwellings were even without a back door, as appears to be the case with the Plan D1 appended. The reaction of Collingwood Councillors was that they would have to see the official report before commenting and that they defied Dr. Strong to take them to such places.

When steps to remedy the Melbourne health situation were discussed, they invariably raised the need for an overall control authority.79 The formation of a Melbourne Board of Works had been suggested in 1881, firstly, to make a complete and detailed survey of Melbourne and its suburbs, secondly, to prepare a proper scheme for an efficient drainage system and thirdly, to levy a rate to provide for current expenses. Melbourne was thought sufficiently wealthy by then to carry out these proposals.

It was not, however, until May that the post of an engineer for Melbourne Sanitation was advertised in England, and the appointment of Mr. Mansergh was announced shortly after.80 Any system proposed had to take into account Melbourne’s peculiar design needs, as well as satisfactorily solving the question of final disposal and allowing for the city’s future growth. In the progress report on Mansergh’s planning,81 it was stressed that as Melbourne was not favourably situated for drainage and sewerage purposes, any plan would necessarily be expensive, £3-4,000,000 being the sum anticipated. When the details of the final scheme were released in September 1890 the estimated cost was £5,500,000.82

79. The Victorian Review 1 December 1881. Vol. V.
80. Builder and Contractor’s News 4 May 1889, 6 July 1889.
81. Ibid. 26 July 1890.
82. Ibid. 27 September 1890.
The first Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works meeting was held in the Lands Office on 18 March 1891. Mr. William Fitzgibbon, a former Town Clerk of the City of Melbourne was elected Chairman. 33 Thirty years previously he had formulated a scheme for the deep drainage of Melbourne which had envisaged a body such as the Board of Works in control. The Report of a Committee of the Melbourne Board of Public Health on the M.M.B.W. bill recommended full executive powers over the sewerage and water supply of the whole metropolitan area, to include 24 municipal districts comprising 164,000 acres with a population of 438,000, nearly half that of the entire colony. The boundaries of M.M.B.W. Greater Melbourne are indicated on the map included at the back of the thesis.

Serious criticisms were made in 1890 of the proposed composition and function of the Melbourne Board of Works. The composition of its members aroused complaints on the basis of the Government's decision to exclude the Professional Institutes of Architects, Engineers and Surveyors from the Board. 34 Exception was taken to "the honourable councillors and mayors, the successful auctioneers and merchants, the shrewd businessmen of all callings who compose the Board." There was nothing at all in the proposed Constitution of the Board to ensure that even one of the 39 members should be an expert. Experience generally in municipalities had shown that architects and engineers were very rarely town councillors. This, "scientific and sanitary experts are very rarely found sitting at the boards of municipal or borough councils." In addition, as Captain Fullarton's Report on Drainage had pointed out, 35 many local councils had shown themselves delinquent in vital health matters affecting their constituencies. Examples of offending Councils, together with the number of recommendations accorded to them were: Collingwood (10),

33. Table Talk 1 May 1891.
34. Builder and Contractor's News 18 October 1890.
35. Ibid. 8 November 1890. See also, Ibid. 6 December 1890, 7 February 1891.
Richmond (9), City of Melbourne (8), Hawthorn (3), Kew (1), Prahran (1), Port Melbourne, Footscray and South Melbourne. It was a piece of magnificent irony that representatives of neglectful and derelict municipal councils should constitute the new Board. A second criticism was made of the effective jurisdiction of the Melbourne Board of Works. It was felt that the Board should have very wide powers of control but as it was proposed to constitute it, it was really a Water and Sewerage Body only. Its powers should be extended to the regulation of all building operations, under provisions of a stringent Building Act enforced by District Surveyors.

It is possible to trace, in the mounting volume of criticism of Melbourne's insanitary condition, an emerging social philosophy in which a sense of community responsibility was in process of formation. Thus, "The housing of the working classes is a matter of vast importance. At present they are compelled, in many instances, to dwell in the shoddy houses erected by greedy speculators, without proper drainage or ventilation. The rest of these death-traps...[is] also excessive." Poverty was examined. Some writers distinguished between the deserving and the undeserving poor but poverty generally was condemned as punishing the innocent and guilty alike." The infringement of human laws is visited on the individual, the disregard of natural ones scourges the community again and again."

Poverty and an unhealthy environment were seen as having a demoralising influence on the poor who often became clean and tidy in improved tenements. The dignity innate in every individual was commented on. "The poor man has feelings and sensations like his more wealthy superiors; blunt them and the man is degraded to the level of the brute." Recognising the importance of a decent environment

86. Ibid. 18 and 25 October 1890.
87. Ibid. 11 July 1891.
88. The Victorian Review 1 April 1882. See also Builder and Contractor's News 11 July 1891.
the reformers tackled the problem of how to implement their ideas and actually provide better living conditions for the poorer classes. There was need for government assistance in providing healthy homes at moderate rentals for poorer classes of workers. They could not help themselves in building houses as their wages were too low. Consequently, they suffered from "rapacious and unscrupulous landlords." The poor person should not be penalised thus for his inability to provide reasonable housing for his family. Co-operation among the people themselves was also mooted as a way out of the dilemma as municipal authorities were unwilling to act in slum clearances.

Another problem which presented itself was how to arouse the people affected from their ignorance and apathy on health matters and how to persuade them to practise simple rites of health. Education avenues were discussed — simple measures such as the distribution of leaflets and the nailing of printed calico posters to the walls of every street and alley. *Table Talk* thought the filthy and disorderly state of the city and suburbs in 1889 could be remedied by the action of all householders. But more education was needed to achieve this awareness and a desire to act.

Sanitation was a related problem. The Australian Health Society, with headquarters at 41 Collins Street E., put on a display at the Centennial Exhibition showing poor and good drainage and ventilation of premises, which it was hoped would have an educative influence. The "Sanitary Institute of Victoria" was founded mid-1891. Dr. Grosswell was a member and on the Council. As a public education measure it was proposed to build a Museum of Hygiene on vacant land at the rear of the "Builders Exchange."

89. *Builder and Contractor's News* 25 April 1891
90. *Table Talk* 5 April 1889.
Dr. Strong argued for the more hygienic handling of food, and suggested even the establishment of municipal stores and dairies to prevent adulterated food being sold. His suggestion was based on the idea of co-operative socialism. "This would be said to be interference with individual liberty... but it would simply be society protecting itself against the tyranny under which many of us have to live — tyranny of every unprincipled rascal who sells our children poisoned milk or raises a fever bed next to us or forces us to use bad stuff of any kind. It would be taking the law into our own hands. Abstract theories of government and political economy go out at the back when the undertaker knocks at the front door."\(^\text{93}\)

The markedly speculative nature of much of Melbourne land subdivision and of many of the houses built on this land meant that public health problems inevitably arose in the course of development. Ill-drained, poorly situated and often improperly filled sites and unsupervised building practices posed very grave health hazards.\(^\text{94}\) European visitors found it hard to reconcile the civic pride of Melbourne citizens in their fine buildings, parks and gardens and wide streets with their tolerance of extremely primitive sanitary conditions in the city and suburbs.

The increasing awareness of the need and the reiterated pleas for reform were counterbalanced by general public apathy and ignorance of the issues involved coupled with official municipal and government disinclination to pursue the matter. "The terribly unhealthy condition of Melbourne... the apathy of the inhabitants and... the disgraceful and constant squabbles among the municipalities as to who is to pay... have brought matters to a deadlock and allowed typhoid and diphtheria to have unchecked sway... these dragons [are] begotten [in] the dreadful 'sanitary' arrangements thought quite good enough by the majority of the inhabitants of 'marvellous Melbourne'."\(^\text{95}\)

\(^{93}\) *Table Talk* 6 February 1891.

\(^{94}\) *The Victorian Review* 1 December 1881, Vol. V.

\(^{95}\) *Builder and Contractor's News* 2 February 1889. See also ibid. 25 July 1891, 18 October 1890.
The pleas of early health reformers such as Dr. Tracy of Collingwood went largely unheeded. Thirty odd years were to elapse before Mansergh drew up his scheme for the deep drainage and sewerage of Greater Melbourne and in the face of mounting criticism and highly vocal objections to the insanitary state of Melbourne in the intervening period, one can reasonably ask just why it took so long to provide reasonable controls and more sanitary living conditions. The answer lies in municipal governments' reluctance to act, in a largely ineffective Central Board of Health and part-time local Health inspectors, in unsupervised building procedures, in the greed for profit from the sale or rental of houses regardless of the inhabitants' health, and in a disorganised body of regulations covering aspects of building and health with ease of circumvention written into their provisions.
CHAPTER 23
FACTORS IN URBANISATION

Within 25 years of the founding of Melbourne in 1835, the extent of the contemporary achievement and the magnitude of the changes which had occurred were thought "marvellous" by observers. The brevity of the city's existence tended to be pushed into the background by the vast expansion of the 1850's and the sense of urgency in the colonising process. This is clearly seen in attempts to impose a human rationale on the physical environment in the provision of amenities and material comforts as well as in the desire to establish more permanent domestic dwellings after the flimsy and primitive structures of the 1840's and 1850's.

Judged in purely physical terms, the growth of municipal institutions in Victoria would seem to bear out the substance of these claims. By 31 December 1862, 53 municipalities covering 200,000 people were in existence under the terms of Clarke's Act of 1854. Of these, 17 were in the County of Bourke with a population of 125,000 or over half the total number of persons under municipal government in the colony. Municipal income for local improvements in the 53 Victorian municipalities was only £100,000, less than the total of the 237 cities and boroughs of England and Wales (excluding London). The Victorian amount was 4 times greater than that of the 94 cities and boroughs of Ireland. The income thus appeared for every 100 municipal inhabitants as: Ireland £6, England and Wales £18 and Victoria £103.

By 1860, then, it was apparent that metropolitan Melbourne had acquired a permanence which removed it past the small-town or frontier stage to give it a solidity based on its commercial, retailing, financial and growing industrial concerns. How far fiscal and

1. "The Municipal Institutions of Victoria" The Victorian, 13 June 1863. See also, Age, 12 October 1860. For the dates for the gazetted of Greater Melbourne Municipalities, see Table X overleaf.

2. See Sands & Kenny's commercial and general Melbourne directory for 1860 (Melbourne 1860) p.359 ff. For a list of societies and institutions c.100 in number. See also Age, 24 October 1860 on the need to create manufacturing employment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities in 1891</th>
<th>Municipal District</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Melbourne (Emerald Hill)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood (Newtown (East Collingwood))</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahran</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kilda</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Towns in 1891 | Municipal District | | Town | City |
|---------------|-------------------| |      |      |
| North Melbourne (Hotham) | 1859 | | 1874 | |
| Williamstown  | 1856              | 1886    | 1919 |
| Brunswick     | 1857              | 1888    | 1908 |
| Brighton      | 1859              | 1887    | 1919 |
| Essendon      | 1861              | 1890    | 1909 |
| Northcote     | 1883              | 1890    | 1914 |

| Boroughs in 1891 | Municipal District | | Town | City |
|------------------|-------------------| |      |      |
| Port Melbourne (Sandridge) | 1860 | 1893 | 1919 |
| Kew              | 1860              | 1893    | 1910 | 1921 |
| Flemington & Kensington | 1882 | |      |      |
banking policies pursued by Victorian governments, leading Melbourne banks and financial institutions and overseas investment, particularly in the 1860's, shaped Melbourne's growth is beyond the scope of this thesis. Likewise, a study of technological change and the growth of industry in greater Melbourne would illuminate the process of urbanisation. The primitive technology of the iron foundries of the 1840's and the early food processing and clothing manufactures prior to 1860, gave way after this date to a growing number of industrial establishments, especially after the 1866 Protection Act. "The various manufactories, including distilleries, foundries, tanneries, sugar refineries and breweries, are in out-of-the-way places but are prosperous and valuable institutions." 3

Here a detailed study of industries in particular localities, for example, Hotham, Collingwood or Richmond, would provide additional data on Melbourne's development. There is evidence that significant differences in local industries, for example brick-making in Brunswick and Preston, the clothing trades in Collingwood, food industries in Richmond and chemical and animal products in Footscray, greatly influenced the character of particular localities and would have affected their demographic composition and class structure. Towards the end of our period, W. Bannow identified distinct differences between Collingwood's 110 factories, the large bluestone quarries in Richmond and Brunswick and the widely diversified industries in Footscray. 4

In this way, we find growing centralisation of trading and financial operations over the three decades. This trend is partly explained in terms of Melbourne's geographical position and its increasing pre-eminence stemming from this. The question of the interrelationship of Melbourne and the colony is dealt with in Chapter 5.


In the 'fifties, the gold mining districts and Melbourne trade were closely linked. In this context it is significant to note the numbers of young men of some status and capital arriving in the colony in the early 1850's who ventured on to the diggings as soon as they disembarked but whose brush with goldfields life was relatively brief. A great many of them spent only a few months on the fields before returning to Melbourne to utilise their capital and connections to set themselves up in businesses in which they later prospered. Many of the prosperous merchants and politicians in the 1880's shared this background, such as William Fuller, Mayor of Prahran, A.E. Moore, a land agent and broker from 1870, Edward Fitzgibbon, Town Clerk of Melbourne 1856 and later first Chairman of the M.M.B.W., J.B. Patterson M.L.A. Other arrivals in the 1850's, equally if not more astute, chose to remain in Melbourne as a start to their colonial careers. Such of these were G. Langridge, estate agent and M.L.A., R. Ross, James Balfour, a banker and politician, G.D. Carter, Matthew Lang, Graham Berry and Robert Harper, a food wholesaler and importer. Gold had an undeniable influence in shaping the form of colonial society by 1860 and "the history of the goldfields illustrates in a remarkable manner the gradual growth and increasing complexity of the ties which bind men together in a civilised state in society".  

A clear illustration of the tie-up between goldfields profits and Melbourne real estate is seen in the case of John Boyd Watson, the Sandhurst mining millionaire, 1824-1889, whose estate exceeded £2,000,000 and included 130 tenements in Melbourne alone, bringing in a rental of many thousands of £'s a year. With his enormous profits from mining, especially from the Kellitch Mine at Sandhurst, 1871-1880, he invested in freehold properties in the cities of Sandhurst, Melbourne and Sydney. He owned many properties in the heart of Melbourne, of which the Leviathan corner was one. Many of these properties were purchased.

5. Victorian Review, 20 April 1861. See also Age, 2 July 1860.
6. Table Talk 7 June 1889, 21 June 1889.
during the "Berry Bight" when property values were low and they subsequently quadrupled in value.

There were, however, other factors in existence which favoured and conditioned the growth of Melbourne.

One of these was the existence of an excellent and cheap public transport system of railways in existence in Melbourne by 1861. After the opening of the Melbourne-Sandridge line in 1854, between 1857 and 1861, private railway companies built lines to Williamstown, St. Kilda, Prahran, Brighton and Essendon. In 1861 the Hawthorn spur line was completed, and cottages were advertised to let within 2 minutes' walk from Footscray railway station. These suburban lines were important in carrying heavy passenger traffic, and the already profitable St. Kilda line showed a considerable increase in profitability from the Richmond and Brighton extensions. Only the original railway to the port carried much goods traffic. The relative popularity of these early railways due in part to their cheapness, together with the large numbers of horse-drawn and foot travellers in and out of Melbourne daily appear to have established an early pattern of daily mobility among Melbourne's population, at least from the lower middle class upwards, which would have pre-disposed Melburnians to outer suburban living. At the terminal date of this thesis, it was maintained that railways added more to land values than roads by more than doubling the value of Melbourne city land.

The tramway building programme of the later 1880's gave Melbourne a second form of speedy, cheap and punctual public transportation which served the suburban districts well. By February 1889, 45 miles of tramways had been completed at an expenditure of £1,550,000. These lines, together with their dates of opening were:

8. *Age* 3 May 1860.
Richmond (November 1885), Fitzroy (October 1886), Collingwood, Clifton Hill and Nicholson Street (August 1887), Brunswick (October 1887), Lygon Street and Kew (December 1887), St. Kilda (October 1888) and Toorak and Prahran (October 1888). The following page, a reprint from Bradshaw's Guide to Victoria, gives an idea of the extent of cheap tramway, omnibus and cab transport operating in Melbourne in 1890. 10

One large and complex aspect of Melbourne's phenomenal growth is the extent to which government land policies promoted urban development rather than agricultural settlement.

The practical exclusion in the fifties and early sixties of many immigrants from rural landholding and the failure to settle small men, a yeoman proprietary, on the land resulted in a diversion to "useless town allotments. "11 W. Howitt similarly saw the population penned up in Melbourne because of the restrictive government land policies12 and Butler Stoney remarked on the accumulation of people in towns, unable to go on the land.13 Here surely we have an important force in Melbourne urbanisation which cuts at the base of the dream of landholding allegedly realisable in Australia.14

Those immigrants who did obtain small farms were often inexperienced in farm management or unaccustomed to colonial conditions and frequently did not succeed; furthermore substantial capital backing was frequently required for clearing and making full economic use of the land, so that usually the small settler could not fully exploit the potential of his holding: the criticism was commonly made that Melbourne banks and pastoral finance companies would make advances to the squatters but not to the "despised" townies.
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that smallholders often found it impossible to obtain financial accommodation. In this way, smallholders were often forced off their holdings to find other work, usually in the towns.

Moreover, many immigrants were reluctant to go up-country and leave the comforts of the city for an unknown venue. We have noted earlier that the Argus in 1860 commented on the immigrants' fondness for town living and three decades later the picture had not changed substantially, for "Immigrants...prefer to compete in the town labour market to roughing it in the bush....The preference for town life and the eagerness displayed to obtain government employment are amongst the worst features of modern colonial life."15

By 1891, it was felt that Melbourne's development had so far outrun that of the country districts that an unbalanced situation existed.16 Large numbers of people were drifting to the metropolis from rural areas so that the population of the capital reached nearly half a million by 1891.17 When the reaction set in in 1892-3, Melbourne's population remained almost stationary for the remainder of the decade.

Nineteenth century speculation in town lands represents "the product of market forces neither fully recorded nor fully understood". To gauge the full implications of dealings in Melbourne land, a comparison with other Australian cities would be extremely valuable.

We have noted that government policies prevailing by 1860 fostered speculation in land, a clear instance of political power decisions affecting land use. This is seen in the Sydney government's decision in 1837 to release only small amounts of Melbourne land for sale at auction, thus intensifying competition for a relatively scarce commodity.

15. Arg 17 February 1891.
17. Ibid. 11 July 1891. See Table I.
So great was the interest of Sydney investors and speculators that subsequent sales of Melbourne town land were transferred to Sydney to facilitate investment, and only under pressure were the sales returned to Melbourne. Boldrewood thought the land speculations saw great wealth lying in town and suburban allotments.

"The invariable increase in prices after the first sales led naturally to a species of South Sea stock bubble, and men of all classes shared in the powerful excitement — was so certain of an advance of 25, 50 or cent per cent, (sic) that everyone who could command the wherewithal hastened to the land lottery, where every ticket was a prize. Speculative eagles in flocks were gathered around the carcass." 19

Howitt also noted that the entrepreneurs and speculators were in action at Melbourne land sales from the outset, whereby "the fiercest gambling in town allotments is created. Thus speculation in such lots is a trade, — one of the greatest in the colony." 20

In addition, in certain Melbourne town lands, Collingwood for example, it had been government policy to sell Crown land originally in very large blocks, which were bought up by capitalist investors to be re-subdivided for small owners at great middleman profit. This is a factor in the small terrace frontages of so much land subdivision in the inner suburbs of Emerald Hill, Richmond, Collingwood, Fitzroy and Footscray.

An example of the vast profits to be made by one man in his lifetime by astute property speculation are seen in the case of Thomas Maclean of St. Kilda who, when he died in May 1889, left an estate of £2,000,000 sterling. 21 Born in Dublin in 1812, he came to Melbourne in 1841 having worked previously as a hospital attendant. He acquired the Queen's Arms Hotel in Swanston Street, a large block nearby and several other city blocks as well as properties in Emerald Hill, St. Kilda, Sandridge and other suburbs. 22


21. Table Talk 31 May 1899.

22. For continuity in speculation by Victorians see Table Talk 8 January 1891, 4 September 1891.
Speculation in Melbourne real estate was not a creation of the 1880's but rather an underlying aspect of Victorian society since its inception. It was still in evidence even at the onset of the depression of the early 1890's when

"[the] craze to acquire land while it is still cheap is all pervading. The profitableness of land-jobbing has done more to retard the progress of the country than is dreamt of. Land-hoarding millionaires are of little value to the community if by hoarding their wealth, they choke the growth of population." 23

A persistent patterning is apparent when we attempt an evaluation of the significance of the 1880's viewed as a study in urbanisation. Melbourne's character by the early 'nineties displays clearly two vital aspects of the city's growth during the preceding decade.

In the first instance, the change was one of degree, an intensification of settlement and occupational patterns inherited from the 'fifties and 'sixties. The 1880's represent an acceleration of the earlier trends in city growth, suburban lands and housing and an extension of population trends. A new third dimension, that of height, came into play for the first time in the city's buildings and this altered the aspect of the streets considerably. In the earlier building phase of the 1850's this third spatial dimension was virtually excluded because city buildings rarely went above 2 or 3 storeys, basements always being uncommon; even in the later period, it is unusual to find a full 3-storey dwelling. Occasionally, site problems pre-disposed the builder to the erection of double-storey buildings with semi-underground basement rooms, and dormers and attics are seen more commonly from the 1870's on. But the new height factor was almost completely confined to the city streets.

With the growth in Melbourne population came an increased demand for houses, preferably for single-storey detached dwellings on 50' frontages.

23. Ibid. 18 July 1890.

24. Ibid. 7 December 1889. Builder and Contractor's News 27 February 1892.
This was said to be the ideal of nearly every young married couple, and led to a marked increase in the value of suburban land within 20 miles of Melbourne by 1891. Suburban housing development in the middle-outer suburbs consisted typically of single-storey detached dwellings and in the inner suburbs of mainly semi-detached or terrace houses, either single or double storey. Here it is interesting to note an almost complete absence of tenement buildings of several storeys so characteristic of nineteenth century industrial cities in Britain and Europe. The highest buildings in the suburbs were probably the large residential coffee palaces and private hotels, still to be seen at St. Kilda, Hawthorn, Auburn and Canterbury. Over most of the Melbourne suburbs, as A. Sutherland remarked, nearly every house exhibited a claim to stand on its own piece of ground, even if it were only a minimal backyard and a token front garden, as seen in Flemington and the back streets of Collingwood and Richmond. In this way, the habit of parceling out suburban land into plots for individual family dwellings shows an unbroken continuity from the earliest days of Melbourne land subdivision. This was identified as an "English" tradition in which Englishmen prized highly the comforts of a home.25

Housing was also commonly viewed as an indicator of wealth or status. At the height of the boom in December 1888 Table Talk remarked on the extravagant tastes of people who had been building big houses and furnishing them lavishly and ostentatiously.26 A year later when the property market was beginning its long recession long rows of empty houses were to be seen in all the eastern suburbs. The majority of tenants were going to the western suburbs, where rents were at least one-third less. "A six-roomed house at Coburg, Essendon


26. Table Talk 7 December 1888.
or Upper Footscray can be had for 12 shillings a week of the same class that the Balaclava, Hawthorn or South Melbourne landlord demands from 21 to 25 shillings per week. The eastern suburbs, as the more fashionable, will always be higher rented, but times are getting too hard even for 'society' people to pay such a price for such a privilege."

In the second instance, the 1880's magnify the problems inherent in laissez-faire urban growth. One of these is concern for the total environment in the town which was evident by 1861 in the early stage of Melbourne's expansion. One example must suffice. In 1861 it was proposed to establish a factory in Studley Park, Collingwood for the manufacture of woollen cloth, to cost £15,000 and utilise water power. A spokesman for the Board of Land and Works commented that the parks were being encroached on in so many ways that it was a clear duty of the Lands Department to resist any further appropriation of public parkland in Melbourne. However, 2 years later it was reported that the first hat manufactory had been established on the south side of the Yarra near the Falls and a woollen factory was about to be. Presumably this was near fighting Falls and the area is shown as parkland on the Collingwood side on the 1864 map so that the encroachment had occurred. This early concern shown over the form of "development" as part of the city's expansion was to become increasingly evident by the late 1880's.

By c.1890, then, it was time to analyse and consider the direction the city's growth was taking. This involved concepts of the organisation of society, social welfare and the issue of social responsibility and a philosophy of town planning. Although imperfectly expounded even by the early 'nineties, the fact of existence of a social philosophy is highly significant. It is evidence of a need felt to create some degree of social order in an expanding environment, an attempt to impose a rationale on the urban complex.

27. Ibid. 17 January 1890.
As noted above, the speed and scale of growth in the 1880's served to precipitate the problems of urban living. For instance, awareness of public health problems had clearly existed even by 1860 but the subsequent decades saw no serious large-scale attempt to ameliorate them, so that by the late 'eighties, the situation in Greater Melbourne had become intolerable. By the 'nineties, the deficiencies and abuses were manifest. Maximum development and profit-taking from the sale of land, and the sale or rental of inferior dwellings too often meant the relegation of lower-income families to a disease-ridden environment of unhealthy streets and insanitary housing. All of this was reflected in a high incidence of illness and death.

This disregard for human life was viewed with increasing concern by medical doctors and social reformers, so that by the closing decade of the nineteenth century, progressive thinkers, radical political theorists, trained doctors, architects and the early town planners whose work involved them with the abuses stemming from uncontrolled urban growth, were vocal in their denunciations. Such matters as an unpolluted water supply, a deep drainage and sewerage system, implementation of a minimum building code, and the need to provide for leisure and recreation within the metropolitan environs, all these matters and many others came to the forefront in contemporary thinking. We find at this later date a perception of the sheer magnitude of urban problems and, at the same time, a penetration to the essence of the urban dilemma which is the paradox that the freedom of choice and enterprise which stimulate maximum growth of the city may not ultimately be in the best interests of the inhabitants of the city nor have, in the last resort, much regard for their welfare in the broadest sense. For this latter point it is sufficient to observe the high mortality rate for the metropolis compared with country districts, and the extremely high incidence of infant mortality in the densely-populated closely built-up working class suburbs of Collingwood and Richmond.
Melbourne's growth had, by c.1892, bred a new awareness of the social consequences and implications of the rapid growth of the city-complex. It is here that much of the real significance of Melbourne's growth in the 1880's lies. Investigation beyond the facade of physical expansion discloses the incipient concept that in growing, the city produces its own set of problems *sui generis*. That the problems thus raised were not amenable to easy solutions is clearly evident in their persistence into the twentieth century.
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