

The Women who had Children on the *Margaret*

1842-1843

Jan Westerink, 2019

## The Women who had Children on the *Margaret*: Background

The women who were sent as convicts to the Australian colonies were a mixed lot. Some were very young, others old; some single, others married or widowed, with or without children. Though all had been found guilty of a crime, many brought trades and other skills to the country. I believe their stories should be told and not simply as a mass movement of people from England to the new frontiers, but also as individual life memoirs, bringing to life their successes and failures. After all, many became the wives and mothers of the future generations that helped build the nation.

Plutarch (46AD-120AD) argued in his salutary tales that it wasn't mass troop deployments, sieges or kings that were important in deciding character, it was small things like a saying or a joke. The ordinary day to day acts often give the measure of the person. So, that is what we can look for in convict women and their children. They were survivors and if they drank too much occasionally, I wonder how much life circumstances and fear of miasma in the water created the habit.

Though the sea journey was hazardous, the conditions in the gaols and hulks were probably worse. Bateson writes that both ships surgeons and convicts were under pressure to ensure they went.

At the medical examination the prisoners were made to appear at their best. They were washed and dressed in new clothes and warned to appear smart and cheerful before the doctor. As most of the convicts, sickened by their imprisonment in the crowded and unhealthy gaols and hulks were only too eager to get away they concealed their disabilities and cheerfully lied about the state of their health.<sup>1</sup>

The women in this study were all on board the *Margaret* from late 1842 and had children with them on that voyage. It is unclear whether the children were also given a medical check.

The *Margaret* was a ship, built at Chepstow in 1829 and was rated by the Admiralty as class A1. That rating was given to vessels which had not passed a prescribed age, had complied with the standard laid down for this class, and been kept in the highest state of repair and equipment.<sup>2</sup> However, the records of surgeons McAvoy and Mould on the journey in 1843 show that the standards must have been low. This was her third journey to the colonies: others were in 1837 and 1839.

The convicts on this transport came from all over England, some from Ireland and others from Scotland. Many had prior convictions, but often for stealing something that we would regard as small items today, such as shoes, spoons, shirts. In Victorian times, clothes were often stolen and then traded. Chesney writes that genteel folk did not wait for their clothes to wear out before discarding, and some items brought a fair price second hand. Even very old clothes were traded: old shirts and waist coats could fetch three-halfpence to fourpence apiece; old boots and shoes, though badly worn could realise a copper or two.<sup>3</sup>

Although a few took infants with them, many of the women left children behind. Some had older children who may have already been working given the use of child labour, especially among the poorer classes, in Victorian times. Poverty was rife and having children help must have been necessary for many families. Dickens and others have described those conditions and Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote a poem, *The Cry of the Children*, about this. One stanza reads:

"For oh," say the children, "we are weary,  
And we cannot run or leap —  
If we cared for any meadows, it were merely  
To drop down in them and sleep.  
Our knees tremble sorely in the stooping —  
We fall upon our faces, trying to go;  
And, underneath our heavy eyelids drooping,  
The reddest flower would look as pale as snow.  
For, all day, we drag our burden tiring,  
Through the coal-dark, underground —  
Or, all day, we drive the wheels of iron  
In the factories, round and round.

Some of the women may have little choice about taking the child/children, as they appear from the records to have been pretty much alone. One said her husband had gone and she didn't know where he was; others were widowed; while still others were young and their family was not close by. In any case, given that poverty was rife, it would be a generous family member or neighbour who would take on extra children.

The sea voyage must have made it a challenge to manage infants and toddlers. Some idea of the life on board can be gained from the journal of Mackie, a Quaker missionary, who travelled to Australasia in 1852. For example:

Since last night it has been blowing half a gale of wind. The sea is a grand sight, its vast rolling billows coming towards us as if ready to overwhelm us, but when just upon us they gradually sink and we rise buoyant above them, occasionally a sea strikes us, dashing over the main deck.... It is not an easy matter to walk on the deck and we cannot take the exercise we otherwise should. Two of our company this morning, involuntarily slid down the leeward side and appeared as if they would pitch over. .... One sea dashed up the main mast about 20 ft. above the deck and the striking of a sea makes the vessel tremble from end to end. ... During the night the mizzen and the main royal sails were split and giving way, the wind being high, the vessel rolling from side to side so much that our sleep is greatly disturbed ...<sup>4</sup>

Dr MacAvoy, surgeon for the first part of the *Margaret's* journey complained about the conditions on board: 'The passage to the Cape of Good Hope was long & protracted the wind unfavourable added to the wet & leaky state of the Ship made it anything but comfortable.' As well as the weather, there was much illness on board: four women died and at least two, possibly three or more, infants. The women were Jane Agnew, Mary Biggerstaff, Mary Lynch and Grace Schofield.<sup>5</sup> What was interesting was that the records of the number on board only included the female convicts, not their children (see Bateson). Also, although the hospitalisation and death of one baby was recorded at length by Surgeon Mould, it was not

recorded as a ‘death on board’ in his summary when landed in Hobart. Babies and child deaths were not noted. Was that because child death was so common? Or was it because colonial authorities were, in the main, only interested in the convicts?

More research is needed to discover how many on the *Margaret* were recidivists. However, Oxley gives some clues. She found in a study on female convicts sent to Australia between 1788 and 1850 that 123,155 were transported.<sup>6</sup> Of nearly seven thousand valid cases she studied she found that 59.1% had no offences prior to the one that led to transportation, that is, most were first offenders.<sup>7</sup> Other studies have found similar results.

In addition, there were some that made an outstanding success of their later lives. Of those on the *Margaret*, the one that stands above all others is Louisa la Grange. She was a French woman arrested for stealing around £200 from a wealthy gentleman in London. She was elegant and talented, speaking French and stated she could teach embroidery. On board ship she helped in the hospital, and the surgeon noted that in his comments when they docked in Hobart. It wasn’t long before she was associating with the gentle folk in Hobart and is said to have been invited to the Governor’s residence. She married and, once free, travelled with her husband to the mainland and then on to the Americas. Eventually she made her way back to Paris and re-joined salon society. She kept a journal of her travels and Alexandre Dumas edited it – publishing it under his own name. In her journal Louisa omitted the fact that she had free passage to Van Diemen’s Land as a convict (see Wilkie and Dumas). Louisa writes of her surprise that the porter at the hotel was a prisoner, the maid who waited on her was a prisoner and even a police agent was also a prisoner. Also, about the convicts:

What is remarkable in the organization of these colonial penitentiaries is that the scum of European society is purified by the classification<sup>8</sup>, several thousand miles from the mother country, of aptitudes ostracized in Europe because of vice and crime.

And

the lost woman [becomes] the children’s governess ... the forger becomes a cashier ... The earth’s span separates the past from the present life of these poor people.<sup>9</sup>

About Cascades she describes the dormitories as immaculately clean. Daily routine was, ‘each morning everything is washed and scrubbed, stone by stone’. The food she described as good and consisting of broth called gruel in the morning; at two o’clock, a thick soup, beef, and potatoes; in the evening bread and tea.<sup>10</sup> Gold was discovered in Victoria and Louisa and her husband travelled to Port Philip. From there they went on to Sydney. There is a fascinating hint that someone she met several times and names ‘Sir George’, was attracted to her. Some people have guessed that she refers to someone who later became a governor in one of the colonies.

∞

So much for the journey and the women on board – what was it like to land in Hobart? A description of elements of the town is given by Louisa, ‘the hotel ... was charming; the two adjoining streets, Macquarie and Murray, were far superior to what I had seen anywhere else;

there were horses everywhere. Glimpses into the houses disclosed an air of affluence, ownership, and wealth that rejoiced the eye and the heart.<sup>11</sup> Whereas, Mackie in his journal noted when taking a walk, 'my admiration was unbounded at the splendid appearance of the cottage gardens and the view of the town and river from the elevated ground'. But he also observed 'several children running about without shoes and stockings, probably on account of the great price of shoes.' He described the streets as wide and straight, the roads well built but the paving as bad and irregular being done by individuals just for the front of their own houses.<sup>12</sup>

But, in July 1843, the women looking towards town from the deck of the ship would not have known this. They were familiar with the ship and the relative isolation and quiet of the ship (apart from the wash of the waves, the slap of the sails and the noises in the rigging). They had been together for around eight months and were familiar with each other and the on-board routines. What lay ahead? Prison, work, a strange town, a new master, guards who may be cruel or kind? They would have been understandably anxious. And the mothers with children must have been asking: what would happen, would they be separated, who might take care of the young ones? So much to be afraid of.

Convicts' children who had been weaned were generally sent to the orphanage once they were allowed to disembark. And several of those on the *Margaret* are known to have arrived there on 27 July 1843. This leaves us wondering what happened to those who, having survived the trip, were still young and possibly being breast fed.

Hyland has a vivid description of the women from the *New Grove* travelling from the docks around 1835:

They walked for an hour or more along the well-worn bush track passing the cottages and gardens of the free, between violet hills clad in strange trees and shrubs, up the valley of the gurgling Hobart Rivulet. .... Carrying their meagre belongings, they approached the Cascades Female Factory settled deep in this valley. Two-storey-high sandstone walls encompassed the large complex of buildings. This walled village was packed with over 400 people.<sup>13</sup>

It would have been much the same, perhaps with a few more houses and citizens, by 1843. Were the children straggling along with their mothers, uphill and into the sandstone prison? Or perhaps the older ones had already been taken to the orphanage and the only children left with the trudging women were those who had breast fed babies strapped to their chests. Records show that Eliza and William Atkins; Alfred Baker; Edward and James Newman; James, John and Thomas Partington were all admitted on 27 July 1843. Others were admitted some months or more later. But there are several where there is no record of an admission. Does that mean they stayed with their mother? Did they die on board, or soon after arrival and before being weaned? Or are the records simply missing?

The stories of these women and their children follow.

### References and relevant readings

- Bateson, C (1988) *The Convict Ships 1787-1868*. Sydney: Library of Australian History
- Chesney, K. (1970) *The Victorian Underworld*. Temple Smith: Great Britain
- Duff, TE (1999) *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Dumas, A (1945) *The Journal of Madame Giovanni*. (trans. ME Wilbur). New York: International Collectors Library
- Fry, EG (1847) *Memoir of the Life of Elizabeth Fry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Digitally printed version
- Hyland, JE (2007) *Maids, Masters and Magistrates*. Tasmania: Clan Hogarth
- McAvoy, B Surgeon, *Margaret*, 5 November 1842 – May 1843, Journal
- Mackie, F. *The Quaker Journals of Frederick Mackie on his Tour of the Australasian Colonies 1852-1855*. (1973) Ed. M. Nicholls. UTAS Library
- Mayhew, H (1999) *London Characters and Crooks*. (ed. C Hibbert). London: The Folio Society
- Mould, J Surgeon, *Margaret*, 14 May 1843 – 1 August 1843, Journal
- Oxley, D. (1996) *Convict Maids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Proceedings of the Old Bailey*, <https://www.oldbaileyonline.org/Old Bailey records>
- Wilkie, D (2015) 'The Journal of Madame Callegari', *Historia incognita*
- Wilkie, D (2012) 'Take the Times as they go and the men as they are': *The Stories of John Perez de Castanos, Pedro Caligani and Louis La Grange*. 'Papers and Proceedings: Tasmanian Historical Research Association, vol.59, no.1, pp.38-49
- Wilkie, D (2013) 'Marie Callegari in Australia: The Identity of Alexandre Dumas's Narrator in *Le Journal de Madame Giovanni*'. *Explorations*, 54
- Wilkie D (2013) *The Journal of Madame Callegari. Historia Incognita*

Summary of children on board the *Margaret* 1842-1843

<i>Family</i>	<i>Children</i>	<i>Orphanage and Outcome</i>
ANGUS	James born 1840 (80) <sup>14</sup>	Admitted 3 February 1844; Died 15 February 1844 at Orphan School
ATKINS	Eliza born 1836 (137)	Admitted 27 July 1843; Discharged to mother 14 December 1847
	William born 1839 (139)	Admitted 27 July 1843; Discharged to mother 13 April 1849
	Thomas born 1842	No record; No record but an infant 'Thomas Atkins' died 12 February 1844, 'son of a convict'
BAKER	Alfred born 1842	Admitted 27 July 1843; Died 21 December 1843
CLARKE	Thomas born 1842	Admitted 31 January 1845; Discharged to mother 4 November 1847
FARRELL	Margaret born 1841	No records; Query whether she was on board the <i>Margaret</i>
	James born 1842 (1781)	Admitted 31 January 1845; Discharged to mother 4 September 1848
HENRY	Margaret born 1841	No records; Query whether she was on board the <i>Margaret</i>
	George born 1842 (2499)	Admitted 22 March 1845; Discharged to mother 1 April 1850
LYNCH	Unnamed born 1843	Died on board ; Neonatal death
McBIRNIE	William born 1842	No records; Suffered <i>pertussis</i> and possibly died on board
McDONALD	Michael born 1842	Died on board; Suffered <i>pertussis</i> died 22 May 1843
NEWMAN	Edward born 1831 (4113)	Admitted 27 July 1843; Discharged to mother 16 January 1846
	James born 1833 (4118)	Admitted 27 July 1843; Discharged to mother 16 January 1846
PARTINGTON	James born 1830 (4282)	Admitted 27 July 1843; Discharged to James Lord 3 October 1846
	John born 1833 (4283)	Admitted 27 July 1843; Discharged to John Lambe 19 December 1846
	Thomas born 1835 (4284)	Admitted 27 July 1843; Discharged to William Bennett 31 October 1849
PITFIELD	Hannah born 1832 (4378)	Admitted 23 September 1843; Discharged to Mr Knight

## Margaret ANGUS

Convict ID 8017

(On board James, born 1840)

Margaret Angus was a native of Ruthven in Dundee Scotland, but on 24 October 1842 she appeared at the Old Bailey Court in London, charged with stealing from a dwelling place. It was a lodging house in Arundel Street London, run by sisters Christina and Ravina Sheppard. Margaret was 26 years old when she appeared at court but had been in trouble before. She had hazel eyes, brown hair and her face was freckled.<sup>15</sup>

According to evidence given by her employer, Ravina Sheppard, Margaret had arrived at her house around mid-morning on Saturday 1 August.<sup>16</sup> She said she had walked from Manchester, a distance of around two hundred miles, was distressed, penniless and her feet were blistered.<sup>17</sup> Ravina, also a Scotswoman, felt sympathy and took her in, offering her work as a servant. Margaret's story was that she had two companions on her walk, young men named Johnson and Steel, and on the next Sunday she asked leave to meet with these two men at Waterloo Bridge. From an upstairs window, Ravina watched her leave and noticed that she met with the young men at the corner of Arundal Street, returning some time later.<sup>18</sup> Serious questions arise: what was she doing walking two hundred miles and where was baby James Angus.

Margaret was a long way from her native place. In Ruthven Scotland she had left behind her mother, Agnes MacIntosh, a brother and three sisters. In addition, court records show that she was married to William Angus, a brass founder, in Derby and she had a son, James Angus, who was one year eleven months old.<sup>19</sup> The 1841 England census shows a William Angus aged 30, born 1811, living in St Peter Derbyshire so this man was probably her husband. The whereabouts of baby James are not mentioned in the court hearing in 1842.

This offence was serious. She was accused of larceny in a dwelling house – stealing £40, the property of Captain Thomas Fairweather, a guest at the home of Christina Sheppard, the sister of Ravina Sheppard. Captain Fairweather had visited Gosling and Sharp's banking house on 17 August and received ten £5 notes and other money. Fairweather left the notes in a portmanteau in his room at Mrs Sheppard's lodging house. The notes were such that a clerk from Goslings was later able to recognise them during Margaret's trial. Her co-accused was Alexander Johnson and he was charged with receiving, harbouring and maintaining her well knowing that she had committed a felony.

During the weeks in August 1842 following the theft, Margaret had an interesting time shopping. She was financed by eight of the £5 notes. The shopping expeditions began on Saturday 20 August when she asked permission to go and buy a collar – she did not return.

- (1) At around 6 o'clock in the evening she went to Thomas Hudson's coffee shop in Limehouse and asked for Johnson and Steel, and while they were sent for she asked Mrs. Hudson to go with her to buy a cap. At Mrs Mills, a milliner in Colt Street, she



bought a cap and bonnet, costing nine shillings. She paid for them with a £5 note. She asked for those to be sent to the coffee shop. Afterwards the two women went to a store where she bought six shifts, which she paid for with another £5 note. Mrs Mills asked her to sign the note but Margaret replied that she couldn't write, and gave her name as Mrs Johnson from Edinburgh. Mrs Mills wrote that on the note.

- (2) Sometime between eight and ten o'clock that same evening Margaret, Johnson and Steel went into Mr Turner's drapery store in High Street, Shadwell. There they were served by William White. Margaret examined some black silk handkerchiefs and purchased three. She also bought three pairs of stockings; altogether her bill came to sixteen shillings. She paid with another £5 note. She was given four sovereigns and four shillings in change, whereupon Johnson insisted on having the sovereigns weighed as he had been cheated before. Margaret gave her name as Mrs Johnson and said she would be sailing on the Edinburgh steamer the next morning.
- (3) Sometime on that same Saturday evening, Margaret found time to visit a shop belonging to Mr Morrison on Ludgate Hill. There she purchased a silver watch and paid for it with two £5 notes.
- (4) She then went back to the coffee house, had tea and met with Johnson and Steel.

Steel left the Limehouse lodgings a week later, but Johnson stayed on and was questioned there on 17 September by police constable William Pocock. This was a lucky arrest because Johnson was able to tell Pocock that Steel had returned to Scotland and Margaret to Derby, possibly to her husband and son. Police Sergeant George Westow pursued them both and arrested Steel on 3 October and Margaret on 11 October<sup>20</sup>. The sergeant had done his homework and traced the various notes she stole and knew where she had changed them and he charged her with stealing the eight five pound notes. However, while she was at the local police court she argued that she didn't take eight, but only seven and offered to show him where she changed them all.

On his part, Johnson had in his possession two silver watches but said the old watch was one his father gave him in Scotland and the new one was one he bought in London. Johnson denied having any female visit him at his lodgings.

Margaret Angus pleaded guilty, Johnson not guilty. The court also heard that she had a prior offence, namely stealing a table cloth, for which she was goaled for six months. The court ordered Margaret be transported for ten years but Johnson was found to be not guilty.

By Christmas 1842, Margaret and baby James were on board the *Margaret* in Deptford. Once on board her life seems to have been fairly quiet. The ship surgeon's report when they landed in Hobart was 'generally fair'. They arrived in Hobart in July 1843.

Margaret was employed soon after landing by someone named Darling, but on 27 November 1843 she was charged with being absent without leave and sent to Brickfield, with a comment that she was 'not to be disposed of for two months'. James may have been sent to the orphanage soon after arrival but there is no record of that admission. However, he was

admitted to the orphanage on 3 February 1844. This would have been soon after Margaret's release from Brickfields. Once admitted, his health must have deteriorated because on 15 February 1844 he died in the hospital at the Orphan School. Given her record, questions arise: was Margaret often drunk and unable to care for her child; was he just another victim of cross infection and other problems at the Orphan School?

Around the time of his death Margaret would have been eligible for re-allocation to an employer. Her record shows that by 20 March 1844 she was a second class convict and employed by (or at) Windsor where she was charged with drinking and for punishment was sent to work at the washtub. Was she grieving James' death? During the rest of 1844, Margaret committed several offences: drinking, being out after hours, making a disturbance in the street, being insolent and refusing to wash. In April 1845 she was charged with absconding and got 4 month hard labour.

However, on 6 August 1845 she gave birth to an illegitimate child, she named Donald Angus. He was baptised at the Cascades Female Factory on 14 August 1845. In early 1847 Margaret had more charges for drinking and neglect of duty. Even so, James remained with his mother until 18 September 1847 when he was admitted to the orphanage aged two years one month. He stayed there until he was discharged 'to his parents' on 8 December 1848.<sup>21</sup> It is not clear whether he was discharged to Margaret alone or to Margaret and her future husband Peter Bushell (see below). I could find no further records for Donald Angus.

In 1849 on 17 September Margaret married Peter Henry Bushell, an ex-convict from Mt Stewart Elphinstone. Then on 8 September 1851 Margaret gave birth to Joseph Bushell.<sup>22</sup> Joseph Bushell also seems to have had an unhappy life. The Female Convict Research records for Margaret Angus show that Joseph Bushell was made a ward of the State in Victoria in 1853. This would be soon after his mother's death. Then in 1866 he was charged with being a neglected child, and in 1867 he absconded from a Naval Training Ship and was believed to be heading for Hobart. Why?

Margaret's misdemeanors did not end with marriage: there were several fines for being drunk and being out after hours. She died on 14 February 1852 and the cause of death was found to be 'cholera aggravated by excessive drinking'. Her funeral was held at Holy Trinity church in Hobart on 20 February 1852.

Elizabeth ATKINS<sup>23</sup>

Convict ID 8021

(On board Eliza, born 1836; William, born 1839; Thomas, born 1842)

Elizabeth was born in Jersey in the Channel Islands (circa 1817) and married William Atkins who lived in Hartford Cheshire. She and William had three children. At the time of her trial, her father was living and she had two brothers and four sisters, at least one of whom lived in London.<sup>24</sup> Her children were Eliza, born 1836; William born 1839 and Thomas born 1842.<sup>25</sup> At her trial she said that she had always been in service, so she may have moved to London for work. Her convict indent states that she was a cook.<sup>26</sup> She was 26 years old, had dark brown hair, dark hazel eyes and a scar on her left cheek plus a scar on her arm.

The Old Bailey court reports of her trials say it all: Trial 2775 Elizabeth Atkins was indicted for stealing on 10 September, 1 shirt value 6*d.*; 1 shift value 6*d.*; 2 pinafores value 9*d.*; 1 table-cloth value 6*d.*; 1 handkerchief value 3*d.* the goods of Ruth Lunn. Trial 2776: she was *again* indicted for stealing, on 10 August, 3 sheets value 6*s.*; 2 shirts value 3*s.*; 2 bed-gowns value 2*s.* 6 *d.*; 2 curtains value 1*s.*; 3 aprons value 2*s.*; 1 pinafore value 1*s.*; the goods of Thomas Reynolds.<sup>27</sup> These items were taken from laundresses (Mary Cosham and Matilda Behde) who were described in court as ‘keeping a mangle’.

The first of the thefts was on Wednesday 10 August 1842. Mary Cosham claimed that a little girl (later named as Christiana Clark) brought a bundle of clothes to mangle.<sup>28</sup> About an hour afterwards Elizabeth came in and asked if her bundle of clothes was done. She replied that her daughter, Lizzy, had brought them in, that she had two children in the Cripple Gate school<sup>29</sup> and there were school aprons in the bundle. At the time of the robbery Elizabeth said that she was very ill and in labour, insisting that she take the items, handing over 2*d.* to pay for the work done. The laundry she took was the property of Mary Reynolds, the wife of Thomas Reynolds, an undertaker of Redcross Street.

Unfortunately, Elizabeth attempted similar robberies late at night on Saturday 10 September 1842. Around nine o’clock she went to another laundress, Matilda Behde and asked if her mangling was done. Elizabeth described some items and paid 1*d.* for a bundle, promising to return on Monday with more mangling for Matilda. Then, still carrying the bundle from Matilda Behde’s laundry, she went to Eliza Watson, of Rosecourt Fore Street London. Here Elizabeth gave an address which Eliza knew to be false and she accused her of being the person who had taken the bundle from Mary Cosham. Eliza insisted that Elizabeth accompany her to Mrs Cosham’s even though Elizabeth argued that Eliza was mistaken. Eliza Cosham recognised her, as did her son-in-law, Charles Wells, who had been at the laundry when Elizabeth called for the bundle. Constable Dennis Hude arrested her and gave evidence she had a basket of laundry at her feet. She was sentenced to transportation for seven years.

The *Margaret* had its full complement of convicts by Christmas 1842, so it mustn’t have been long before Elizabeth was on board. At that time she had ‘three children on board’ so her

youngest, Thomas, was newly born – sometime between August when she committed the first robbery and December 1842. Her children were listed as Eliza, William and Thomas.

None of the children appear in the hospital sick lists,<sup>30</sup> kept by the ship's surgeons. Elizabeth was on Mould's sick list from 20 January to 26 January 1843, suffering '*debility*'. He described Elizabeth as 'quarrelsome and insolent'.<sup>31</sup> Soon after landing in Hobart at least two of the children were taken into the orphanage at New Town. Eliza was aged five years six months, William was aged four years and Thomas was an infant.

Eliza Atkins entered the orphanage on 27 July 1843 but was discharged to her mother on 14 December 1847. She said that her mother was married to Mr Brown, but permission to marry records state 'Murray'. It is probable that Eliza got her new stepfather's name wrong as official documents show permission was given for Elizabeth, aged 29 and a widow, to marry George Murray, aged 27, a sailmaker on 31 July 1846.

Eliza survived and on 13 April 1853, aged 18 years, she married William Hull at St Georges Hobart. Eliza signed with her mark and William, a labourer aged 23, also signed with his mark.<sup>32</sup> Eliza gave birth to a son she named William, on 21 October 1875. That infant died 20 January 1876 of *marasmus*.<sup>33</sup> As for Eliza, there is a record of the death of Eliza Ann Hull in Hobart Hospital. She was admitted on 13 February 1873 and died 25 April 1873. Her date of birth was given as 1835, so the age seems about right to be our Eliza Hull

William Atkins was also taken into the orphanage on 27 July 1843, the same day as his sister Eliza, when he was listed as four years old. He stayed longer than Eliza, and I wonder if that was because Eliza could help her mother around the home. He was discharged to his mother on 13 April 1849. He was ten years old. There are many records for various William Atkins in the Tasmanian archives, but I could not be sure which refer to him.

Thomas Atkins is recorded on CON40.1.29 but doesn't seem to have been admitted to the orphanage. There is no record of him being ill on board the *Margaret* possibly because Surgeon McAvoy kept poor records. However, there is a death of a Thomas Atkins, male child eighteen months old, son of a female convict, who died of *diarrhoea* in 9 February 1844 in Hobart.<sup>34</sup> It is likely that this was the newborn infant that Elizabeth took on board the *Margaret*.

Elizabeth had several misdemeanours in the early days: on 8 May 1844 she was charged with being drunk and having a man in her bedroom and was given six months hard labour at the Factory in Hobart. This was just a few months after the death of the child I believe was probably her son, Thomas. In February 1845 she was charged with larceny but the amount was small and was given just six months hard labour with a notation on her file that 'this woman has two children in the orphan school'.

Luckily, a settled life and marriage was to follow for Elizabeth. She married George Murray and gave birth to his son in Hobart on 24 September 1846<sup>35</sup>. Other children from the marriage were: Margaret Nicholas born 18 February 1848<sup>36</sup>; James born 9 August 1850<sup>37</sup> (died 4

November 1850, cause of death *marasmus* – severe malnutrition). She was given a ticket of leave in March 1848.

Elizabeth's life seems to have been uneventful in later life. She worked as a sailmaker until 1857 when she fell downstairs, broke her spine and died on 2 October 1857. The *Tasmanian Daily News* of 5 October reported the inquest – Eliza Murray, an elderly woman and sailmaker's wife, met her death by falling backwards down a flight of stairs at the residence of her daughter, two days previously. Dr Bright testified that the deceased had fractured the cervical vertebra. The Jury returned a verdict of accidental death. Her death certificate lists her as living with her daughter (presumably Margaret) and others. The Coroner's report read:

An Inquisition indented taken for our Sovereign Lady the Queen at the House of Thomas Robinson known by the sign of the Prince Napoleon Hotel at Hobart Town in the County of Buckingham within the Island of Tasmania this Third day of October in the Twenty First year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen Defender of the Faith before me Algernon Burdett Jones Esquire, one of the Coroners of our said Lady the Queen for the said Island and its Dependencies on View of the Body of Elizabeth Murray then and there lying dead upon the Oaths of William Burgess, John Smart, James Thompson, Joseph Edward Risby, Edmund Thomas Shepperd, Andrew Hunter Finlayson, Charles Henry Miller good and lawful men of the said Island and duly chosen and who being then and there duly sworn and charged to enquire for our said Lady the Queen when where how and after what manner the said Elizabeth Murray came to her death do upon their Oath say THAT the said Elizabeth Murray on the Thirtieth day of September in the year aforesaid at Hobart Town aforesaid in the Island aforesaid being upstairs in a certain house occupied by her daughter and others there situate it so happened that accidentally casually and by misfortune the said Elizabeth Murray then and there fell backwards down the said stairs by means whereof the said Elizabeth Murray then and there received one mortal injury of the Spinal Column of which said mortal injury the said Elizabeth Murray from the said Thirtieth day of September in the year aforesaid until the Second day of October in the same year at Hobart Town aforesaid in the Island aforesaid did languish and languishing did live, and on the said Second day of October in the year aforesaid, at Hobart Town aforesaid in the Island aforesaid the said Elizabeth Murray of the mortal injury to the Spinal Column aforesaid did die, and so the Jurors aforesaid upon their Oath aforesaid do say that the said Elizabeth Murray in manner and by the means aforesaid accidentally, casually, and by misfortune came to her death and not otherwise. In Witness whereof as well the said Coroner as the Jurors aforesaid have to this Inquisition set their Hands and Seals the day and year and place above mentioned.<sup>38</sup>

It is interesting to wonder if Elizabeth and her second family kept in contact with her first family. Eliza's marriage and birth of her child was in Hobart, so it is possible Elizabeth remained close to both Eliza and William. After all her earlier problems I hope so.

## Ann BAKER

Convict ID 8024

(On board Alfred, born 1842)

On the face of things, Ann Baker may have been relatively settled in England. She was married to William Henry Baker, a glove cutter, of the city of Worcester. By the end of 1842 she was the mother of four children: a newborn and others aged between two and nine years. Her father was living in Cheltenham and she had two brothers, Henry and John, the latter enlisted in the 87<sup>th</sup> regiment. She was in her mid-thirties,<sup>39</sup> of medium height with black hair and hazel eyes. She could read and write and her convict record gives her various trades as: laundress, plain cook and glove cutter.

She was first before the Worcester City Sessions on 3 January 1842, charged with stealing a shoulder of mutton from Ann Corbett's butcher shop in Tything Worcester on 9 December 1841. She had gone to Corbett's shop to buy some steaks and shortly after she left, Mrs Corbett realised the mutton was missing. A policeman found the mutton at Ann's house two days later. Ann denied the theft and argued that she had purchased the meat at Mr Lee's butcher shop in Shambles, another area close to the centre of Worcester. However, Ann's claim was denied by Mr Lee's foreman and the court found her guilty. She was sentenced to three months<sup>40</sup> hard labour with the first and last three weeks to be served in solitary confinement.<sup>41</sup>

She was again under arrest in May 1842. It was another charge of stealing meat – bacon from Henry Harris on 23 May and this offence must have happened shortly after her release from her previous sentence. That first prison term might have been uncomfortable for Ann as she was probably pregnant during that term because she gave birth to a fourth child, a son, at Millbank Penitentiary London sometime in September 1842.

The court heard of her prior conviction and this time the sentence was severe: seven years transportation. It seems likely that these two offences were not unique. The gaol report was 'a common thief of drunken habits, convicted before and three times charged with a felony but forgiven'.<sup>42</sup>

This was not the end of the matter, as William Baker appealed for leniency on behalf of his now four children and other locals also requested leniency:

To Sir James Graham Secretary of State for the Home Department.

The humble Petition of Ann Baker wife of William Henry Baker of the City of Worcester – glove cutter who was convicted at the last Sessions of the Peace for the said City of Worcester of stealing a quantity of bacon of the value of 2/- and who was convicted of a former offence and sentenced to six weeks imprisonment before John Buckle Esq. Recorder.

The humble Petition of William Henry Baker

Sheweth: That your Petitioner is quite sensible of the disgrace she has cast upon herself and an honest and industrious husband in committing the offence for which she had been convicted

and is suffering much both mentally and bodily from the sting and remorse of conscience which is naturally experienced by a truly sorrowful and repentant mind.

That your petitioner has caused thru' her misconduct 4 small children to be deprived and bereft of the natural and necessary services of their mother who is also now far advanced in a state of pregnancy which greatly adds to her affliction and the punishment which she is now undergoing.

That your Petitioner will ever hereafter endeavour by walking in the path of honesty and rectitude to regain that character which she had now unfortunately forfeited.

Your Petitioner therefore most humbly and penitently pray as well on her own behalf as on the behalf of her hapless infant children a commutation of her sentence and particularly that she may not be sent out of this country. That you may be pleased to take her case into your consideration and exercise such share of clemency and mercy towards her as to you may appear proper and the end of Justice satisfied.

That your Petitioner William Henry Baker is an honest and industrious man and worked hard for his bread. That he had been in his present employers service Mr John Redgrave of the City of Worcester a Glove manufacturer upwards of 8 years. That your Petitioner having lost the services of his wife, and 4 small children the duties of their mother has rendered your Petitioner less able to support them by reason of extra expense being incurred in paying other persons to take care of them, the eldest being 9 and the youngest only 2 years of age, but which duties cannot and are not performed like that of a mother.

Your Petitioner therefore do hope and most humbly and earnestly prays that you will be pleased to consider and as far as to you may seem just to grant the prayer of the Petition of his unfortunate wife and commute the sentence passed upon her to such a period of imprisonment as to you in your wisdom may seem meet and proper.

And your Petitioner will ever pray.

That petition was supported by another signed by several men, including Henry Harris (the butcher and prosecutor in her case), clergymen and others.

We whose names are here unto subscribed the Clergy, Gentry and inhabitants of the City of Worcester do believe that the above named Petitioner William Henry Baker to be an honest and industrious man. That we pity the situation in which himself and small family are now placed that under such circumstances. We do consider the above Petition worthy the attention of the State.

B Davies – Minister of the Church

Henry Harris – Prosecutor

Thomas Barnsley

John Davies – Rector of St Clements Church Worcester

And 10 other signatures.

Finally, there was a third petition, which included the signature of a visiting magistrate:

15th September 1842

To the Right Honourable Sir James Graham

Sir

We beg to request a commutation of the sentence passed on Ann Baker at our last Midsummer Sessions of transportation for seven years to confinement in the Millbank Penitentiary at the time of her conviction she was the mother of four children and she has given birth to another

this month. The Governor reports favourably of her conduct in the Gaol and she appears to have felt deeply the enormity of her offence and the anguish of mind she has brought upon her indignant husband, who is evidently sinking under the prospect of separation, and therefore humbly implores the clemency of the Crown may be extended to his wretched wife by permitting her to remain in this country, the poor man feels he cannot long survive her removal from it, and the orphanage of his unoffending children consequent thereon completely overpowers him, he hopes and believes the discipline of the Penitentiary will work an effectual reformation in his unhappy wife, and that she will thereby have an opportunity of retrieving in some measure her forfeited character and be enabled to perform a mothers duty to her offspring.

After careful inquiry we can bear testimony to the excellent character of the husband for honesty, sobriety and industry; and we are of opinion that if the sentence of transportation is carried out he will inevitably sink under the pressure of his feelings for these reason and believing his hopes of the convicts reformation are not entirely groundless we venture to recommend the case to your favourable consideration, a recommendation in which we believe the Recorder will readily acquiesce.

We have the honour to remain

Sir

Your most obedient servants

Edward Evans

M Pierpoint

Visiting magistrates of the County City and Borough Gaol

The appeals for leniency fell on deaf ears and Ann Baker was on board the *Margaret* before Christmas 1842. On board with her was her new born son, whom she named Alfred. The petitions included suggestions that Ann was capable of reform but, sadly, that doesn't seem have happened – the ship's surgeon was 'dissatisfied'.

The sea journey seems to have been uneventful for baby Alfred, indicating that his mother must have taken great care of him, or kept him from playing with other infants, because two babies came down with whooping cough in the middle of May – one of those children died. Ann was hospitalised on 9 July for '*phlogosis*' (a localised inflammation), she was discharged 25 July. As the *Margaret* arrived in Hobart 19 July<sup>43</sup> she may have been discharged prior to full recovery in order to allow her to disembark.

As the ship approached Hobart, she would have known that she would be put to work and I wonder if she worried about Alfred's future or who would take care of him. A child would be an added cost few masters would welcome.

Ann's record mostly shows that she was at the Cascades Female Factory and Alfred was probably admitted to the orphanage soon after arrival. He died 21 December 1843; the cause of his death was not given. The information was given by S. Hopkins of the infirmary at St Mary's Hospital Campbell Street, who described him as 'a house servant's child'. Such a description seems sadly anonymous. I can imagine Ann's despair at losing this child, the only one she was able to bring with her.



Ann has no record of misdemeanours between arriving in Hobart until shortly after Alfred's death. Her behaviour went downhill from then. As early as 20 February 1844 she was absent without leave and given one month at the washtub; 15 April she was drunk and given ten days punishment in solitary confinement; 3 October she was insolent and once more given 10 days solitary confinement. By January 1845 her offences included insolence and drinking.

On 3 November 1845 she was delivered of an illegitimate child whom she named James. He was baptised at the Cascades Female Factory on 9 November 1845. In August 1846 Ann was found guilty of stealing fat and potatoes – this was her first theft recorded in Hobart. Was she trying to feed herself and her child? Were convict rations sufficient for a breast feeding mother? Or was she referring to type?

Sadly, James died just before he was one year old on 2 November 1846 of '*dysentaria*'.<sup>44</sup>

Ann's three eldest children had been left behind in England, then Alfred died soon after arrival and now James too was dead. She had not applied to be married so must have felt very alone. She received her ticket of leave 27 June 1848. Her convictions after that date continued: she was charged with burglary but that was dismissed. Another charge was laid but was not proceeded with.

On 28 December 1848 she applied to marry John Rodgers (a convict who arrived on the *Equestrian*).<sup>45</sup> He was not yet halfway through his sentence and permission was refused but they applied again 19 February 1849, but were again refused.<sup>46</sup>

John Rodgers was aged 30 and his convict record prior to transportation shows him as being married with two children. He was tried on 25 March 1845, together with his father (Richard) and brother (Joseph). All three were found guilty and were transported for ten years for sheep stealing. They arrived in Hobart 15 October 1845. The ship's surgeon described each of them as 'very well behaved'. Sadly, the family had further tragedy when Richard Rodgers, the father, newly emerged from a chain gang in 1847 was accidentally killed on 31 May 'by the falling of a tree in the district of Hobart Town'.

There is no record to indicate whether Ann maintained contact with John Rodgers after the marriage refusals. She could read and write so it is also possible that she somehow managed to correspond with her former husband and children in England, but there is no record of that.

The last official record for Ann is for 'not proceeding to Brighton according to her Pass' on 29 May 1849. After that she disappears. However, there was a death registered for an Ann Baker aged 72, living in Macquarie Street, on 15 January 1870. She was recorded as being born in England, dying of 'disease of the heart' and was a tinsmith's wife<sup>47</sup>, therefore married and unlikely to be our Ann. Baker is not an uncommon name and it is more than possible that this was another Ann Baker.

I did find a death notice for an Ann Rodgers aged 50 years, who was a widow and died of a disease of the heart. Her death was on 22 March 1855 and was reported by James Mofs of Patterson Street, a friend.<sup>48</sup> The age is about right, but this may or may not have been our Ann. Rodgers is a common name.

Margaret CLARKE

Convict ID 8038

(On board Thomas, born c1842)

Margaret Clark's convict record is relatively short. She was born in Drogheda Ireland in 1811 and was charged, together with her husband, Patrick, with coining and having a mould for coining at Lancaster Assizes on 30 July 1842. She was a house servant, 31 years old, of medium height and was illiterate. She had a fair complexion, blue eyes and brown hair. She was the mother three children, the youngest being only a few months old. The only other family listed on her record is for a brother, Thomas, living in Manchester.

Her husband was found guilty and sentenced to transportation, but I couldn't find his record. Margaret was also found guilty and sentenced to ten years – she was sent to the *Margaret* and bound for Van Diemen's Land. She chose to take the youngest child, Thomas, with her. As both parents were sentenced, the two children left behind may have gone to her brother or left on the parish.

There was no record of illness for either Margaret or Thomas on the journey to Van Diemen's Land. However, the ship's surgeon described her as 'very dirty and lazy'.<sup>49</sup> The next significant date for the family was Thomas entering the orphanage in New Town on 31 January 1845. He was recorded as being three years old. It seems baby Thomas must have spent some time together with his mother from when they landed until he entered the orphanage.

While Thomas was at the orphanage Margaret was put out to work and on 9 July 1845 her master, Mr Smith, charged her with being drunk. For that offence she was sentenced to 14 days solitary confinement at Cascades Female Factory. It wasn't until nearly a year later, on 4 April 1846, that she re-offended – this time a Mr Williams accused her of being absent without leave. For that offence she received three months hard labour, again to be served at Cascades.

By 1847 things were looking up for Margaret. On 22 July that year she was granted her Ticket of Leave; on 3 September 1847, Margaret applied for permission to marry Thomas Mason, a convict who arrived in Hobart on the *Augusta Jessie*.<sup>50</sup> He was a labourer aged 33 years. Permission was given and they married on 20 September that year at the Church of England Bethesda chapel in St Georges Parish which is close to Battery Point. Now that she was a respectable married woman with a ticket of leave, her son Thomas was discharged to her care on 4 November 1847. He was soon to have siblings – on 19 May 1848, Margaret gave birth to twin girls, Mary Ann Mason and Sarah Mason.<sup>51</sup>

Two years later on 16 April 1850, she gave birth to a son named John Mason or Mayson in Hobart.<sup>52</sup>

I could find no further records for Thomas Clark or Clarke. The name is a common one as also is Mason. Checking records, I did find one marriage for a Mary Ann Mason who would

have been about the right age to be Margaret's daughter. That Mary Ann was a spinster and drayman's daughter aged 31. She married David Wylie, aged 30, a waggoner and widower, on 26 February 1876 in Hobart Town. I couldn't find any records that I could link to her youngest son, John Mason.

After 1846, Margaret had no more offences or charges against her. Presumably she led a quiet family life with husband, Thomas, and the children.

In 1874 she died aged 65, a labourer's wife at Murray Street Hobart, cause of death was registered as heart disease.

Ellen FARRELL

Convict ID 8055<sup>53</sup>

(On board Margaret, born c1841 (?); James, born 1842)

Ellen Farrell's maiden name was Eleanor Cummings. She married Thomas Farrell, a carpenter. She was caught stealing ear rings from a shop and brought to justice in at the New Sarum Boro<sup>54</sup> Wiltshire Quarter Sessions on 27 June 1842. She had a prior conviction for stealing a shawl and had been given six months for that offence. This time the sentence was more severe – she was sentenced to seven years transportation.

She was of medium height, had hazel eyes and light brown hair. She was a Roman Catholic and could neither read nor write. Unlike many other convicts, Ellen reported few relations: her sister had gone to America nine years earlier; her husband was named Thomas and was a carpenter and the couple had children. Her native place was Bristol in Gloucestershire but there is no mention of parents or other siblings living there. There is some discrepancy in the recordings regarding her children. It is unclear whether she was the mother of two or three children:

- (1) the Female Convict Research website records *three* children;
- (2) CON151/2 (pp150-151): '*2 children, 1 on board*';
- (3) CON40/1/4 (p.152): '*1 girl Margaret 2 years and 8 months, 1 boy James 1 year*'.

This notation appears to indicate that Margaret was not on board. Was this a colonial clerical error? Did Ellen intend to take her but changed her mind?

Also, have these citations created the notion that there were three children ( i.e. 2 + 1)? There are no records for Margaret Farrell in Van Diemens Land, only records for James in Hobart.

Which leads to the question, did Ellen leave Margaret behind? Did Margaret die on the journey to Hobart?<sup>55</sup> There is no mention of her death on board, but the ship's surgeon for the first part of the voyage did not keep complete records, due to his own illness.<sup>56</sup> Only one child death is recorded during that voyage, whereas it seems likely there was at least one more child death at sea (See McBirnie and McDonald). The new surgeon took over in May 1843 and recorded children's illness, but no deaths in his summary. Margaret does not appear anywhere.

At the time of Ellen's arrival in Hobart on 19 July 1843, she was 29 years old and gave her occupation as housemaid. She travelled on the *Margaret*, leaving London in February 1843. She suffered from *phlogosis* (inflammation of the skin) on the voyage and was on the sick list from 28 June to 3 July 1843. But that wasn't her only contact with the ship's surgeon: he had reason to record her behaviour and he wrote that she was 'generally troublesome' and that she had stolen a piece of pork from the ship's harness cask.

As early as 2 December 1843, not many months after landing, Ellen was in trouble – being reprimanded for drinking. She was of good behaviour until November 1844 when she was

chided for 'misconduct' and given 14 days solitary; not long after on 8 December she was drinking and was again given 14 days solitary confinement.

Soon after these charges were laid, on 31 January 1845, James Farrell was sent to the orphanage. He was two years old. The next record shows that he was removed to the male school on 14 May 1846, by then he would have been nearly five years old.

Meanwhile, on 22 September 1845, Ellen applied for and was granted permission to marry Thomas Scott a convict from the *Coromandel*.<sup>57</sup> Thomas was tried at Warwick Assizes on 22 March 1838 for housebreaking. His gaol report was bad, but the hulk report stated that he was 'good, single'. The *Coromandel* arrived in Hobart on 25 October 1838. They were married on 15 October 1845 at St Georges, Hobart. Thomas was a brass founder. This occupation means he was skilled in working with metals and his trade would have made him an attractive servant in Hobart at that time. It is interesting that James was not discharged to his parents upon their marriage.

Even after the marriage, Ellen got into further trouble. In June 1846 she was charged with gross insolence and was sentenced to six months hard labour. Then in December 1847 there were two charges: one for burglary and one for drinking but both were dismissed.

James remained at the orphanage until 4 September 1848, when he was discharged from the Queens Orphan School with a notation: 'mother now married, ticket of leave'. He would have been around six years old.

The last few records for Ellen are 1 March 1850 for fighting for which she was given fourteen days hard labour at Cascades. However, in spite of these charges she became free by servitude and left Launceston for Melbourne on 11 January 1852.<sup>58</sup> This would have been about the time of the gold rush in Victoria. I can dream that Ellen and Thomas Scott made their fortune there.

It was difficult to discover what happened to James in the long term. There is a record of a James Farrell, aged 34, a pauper who died from gangrene of the lungs in New Norfolk Hospital on 3 December 1883. The dates don't match if he was born in 1842 and Farrell is a relatively common name, so it is unlikely that he was Ellen's son.

Mary HENRY<sup>59</sup>

Convict ID 8072

(On board Margaret, born 1841; George, born 1842)

Mary was a housemaid. She was married to George Henry, they had four children, and the family lived at Blackburn, a town in Lancashire, when she was arrested. The area was probably quite busy in 1842 as it had been a mill town and was known for weaving and spinning.<sup>60</sup> Mary's native place was Drogheda Ireland. She had a mother and brother, Catherine and Michael Kearns. The family must have dispersed as Michael was living at Wigan when she was arrested. Mary had a dark sallow complexion, black hair and grey eyes. She stood just a little over five feet.

The 1841 census of the Blackburn Lancashire area has George Henry age 30 occupation waterman or labourer, could read, born Ireland; Mary Henry born in Ireland, age 30, (the court records two years later have her age as 37).<sup>61</sup> The children were Michael Henry age 6, born Lancashire; Mary Henry age 3, born Lancashire; Margaret Henry age 4 months, born Lancashire.<sup>62</sup>

Mary was tried at Lancaster Preston Quarter Sessions on 19 October 1842, charged with receiving stolen handkerchiefs, was found guilty and sentenced to 7 years transportation. She may have taken two of her children with her on board the *Margaret*. She claimed that she had never been in prison before. Mary could read and she gave her trade as 'house servant, house maid'. On her indent she is described as 37 years old.<sup>63</sup>

The ship left London on 5 February 1842 and arrived in Hobart on 19 July 1843. On the voyage to Van Diemen's Land, Mary fell ill. She suffered from *diarrhoea* towards the end of the journey and was hospitalised on 14 May and discharged fifteen days later on 19 May 1843. The surgeon was not well pleased with her and in his opinion she was 'a bad mother, dirty, lazy, quarrelsome'.

The children she took with her were Margaret and George and the official record reads: 'one girl Margaret – one boy George 2 years and 3 months'.<sup>64</sup> These ages could be interpreted in different ways – was it that Margaret's age was left out and that George was two and a quarter years old? Or was it that Margaret was one year old and George just three months? The latter explanation best fits the 1841 census records and George being in the orphanage in 1845 and described as aged three.

There were no events on record for Margaret as a child so there are several possibilities: did she die when Surgeon McAvoy was in charge and he did not record the death?<sup>65</sup> Or did she die soon after arrival? Did she remain with her mother, never going into the orphanage, meaning there are no records of her being there? However, I did find a marriage record from 1893 for Margaret Henry, aged 51, domestic and spinster who married William Claridge, aged 66, a farmer at Westbury.<sup>66</sup> The age is just about right (1841-1893) so maybe she did survive and married late in life. But there were several Henry families in Van Diemen's Land, so it could be a coincidence.

George was sent to the orphanage on 22 March 1845 and soon after, on 14 June that same year, Mary was in trouble for being out after hours; she was given two months hard labour. She must have behaved well for nearly a year until 24 April 1846, when she was absent without leave and drinking. For that offence she received four months hard labour. A little over a year later she applied, on 17 September 1847, to be married to William Upton.

Permission was denied and they were required to wait until he received his ticket of leave. William was a convict who was tried at Warwick on 24 March 1841. He could read and write and was a cabinet and chair-maker, aged 34, at the time of his trial. He had dark hair and whiskers and was relatively tall at just over 5'8". He was found guilty of having a mould for coining and he confessed that he had been in trouble before for deserting his family.

Permission to marry was approved on 12 Jun 1849 and the couple were married at St Georges Church Hobart on 9 July 1849. The couple must have been co-habiting because Mary gave birth to a daughter, Eliza, on 13 December 1849 at Molle Street Hobart. The father was registered as William Upton, carpenter.<sup>67</sup> Now Mary and William could settle down as a family and early the next year, George was discharged from the orphan school to his mother on 1 April 1850. I could find no further records for George Henry.

Sadly, the family soon had another tragedy when their first born, Eliza Upton, fell ill in early 1855. She died of the *croup* on 8 March 1855 in Hobart.<sup>68</sup> Did this mean that Mary had now lost all of her children? The two that she left in England were so far away that she may have had little or no news of their welfare; Margaret Henry is not recorded on Mary's convict records other than being on board; George seems to have disappeared soon after he turned five and now Eliza has died.

Soon after Eliza's death Mary began to get into trouble again. Was she grieving? On 22 April 1855 she was charged with misconduct in being disorderly and given two months hard labour; on 14 June being drunk, three months hard labour; 15 December drinking, three months hard labour; then on 27 June 1856 drinking, seven days hard labour; 8 October 1856 disturbing the peace, seven days hard labour; 22 October disturbing the peace, seven days hard labour; 1 November 1856 drinking, two months hard labour.

The records are quiet from 1857. Perhaps she settled down. The *Launceston Examiner* on 28th March 1868 reported that Mary Upton, wife of a cabinet maker, was a witness in an inquest into a death in the street when she gave a dying man a glass of water. Clearly she showed compassion and empathy for another.

Mary Upton, nee Henry/Keans died on 9 August 1894 at Barrack Street Hobart. The cause of death was given as 'senile decay' – she was aged 98<sup>69</sup> and a widow. She was buried in the Roman Catholic cemetery at Cornelian Bay.

Mary LYNCH<sup>70</sup>

Convict ID 8089

(On board one unnamed, born 1843)

Mary Lynch's story is perhaps the saddest among those women on the *Margaret*. She was a young woman who appears to have been very ill at the time of her arrest and conviction. She is just one of four women who died on the journey from England to Van Diemen's Land.

Bateson (1988) argues that it was 'the desire of the gaol and hulk authorities to get rid of as many prisoners as possible ... [this] was aided by the general wish of the convicts to be transported'.<sup>71</sup> Ship surgeons' journals also recorded instances of both male and female convicts concealing illness or injury for fear they would be left to rot in prisons or on hulks<sup>72</sup>. Mary may have concealed the state of her health (she was probably around four months pregnant when arrested) but also it may have been that the authorities wished to get rid of her.

Her past has been researched by Kath Graham, who writes:

Although Mary Lynch is a very common name I tried to trace her through her previous employer in 1841, named Henry Palmer Philips. He was living at 24 Long Acres St Martin in the Fields Westminster age 40 employed as an engineer living with his wife 6 children a nurse and a female servant. There was no sign of Mary Lynch however. Henry had a rather chequered past being incarcerated at the Marshalsea (debtors prison) twice in 1831 and committed to Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum in 1849. I found no sign of him in any other census up to his death at Barnet in 1868. Mary Lynch, although claiming to have been married, does not appear to have been living with her husband and she was obviously living in the household of Henry Palmer Philips in August 1842 as a servant when she was tried for stealing from him.... At her trial in November 1842 Mary is living at 34 Monmouth Street - this is in the Seven Dials Area of London.<sup>73</sup>

On 28 November 1842, Mary Lynch, aged 22, was at the Old Bailey in London.<sup>74</sup> We have no record of what she looked like, but I imagine her standing nervously in the dock and can see her as young, pale and of slight build. It is likely that she was around five-foot-tall and probably she had dark or brown hair and maybe blue eyes. Her clothes would have been rumpled and perhaps a bit grubby. Because she had stolen shoes and a petticoat, I wonder if she was barefoot and wearing prison garb. Or did she steal simply to sell on? Perhaps she cried as she was charged, maybe hanging her head to avoid the stares of those in the court room. Or maybe, as a formerly convicted felon, she stood head up and stared down the court.

She was indicted for stealing from Sarah Chandler, a laundress who lived in Steven Street, London. Steven Street runs off Tottenham Court Road and is just two blocks away from Oxford Street. This was not her first offence, but the court did not record her earlier offence other than to note that it was for a 'felony'.

When giving evidence, Sarah Chandler told the court that on the afternoon of 25 November, Mary had come to her door seeking lodging and that she said that she was a servant and was 'out of place'. When Sarah asked for a reference, Mary was able, or bold enough, to name



many trades people from the area, so Sarah let her stay. Mary was there from the evening of Friday 25 until Monday morning 28 November.<sup>75</sup> The Old Bailey records appear to be incorrect with the Monday dated 25 November and Friday 28 November. Those dates do not fit with the weekdays mentioned as 25 November 1842 was a Friday and 28 November a Monday.<sup>76</sup> Mary gave evidence and argued that she would return the goods on Monday (28?); also the constable's evidence that he took Mary to the police station on Saturday (29?).

Sarah said that 'Mary slept with me'. It seems that they shared a room, because Sarah's evidence clearly shows that the accused 'got up first and was about the room for half an hour', before going out with a bundle under her cloak. It must have been some bundle because the items stolen were: 2 shawls, value 24 shillings; 1 scarf, 1 shilling; 1 pair of stays, 2 shillings; 1 petticoat, 5 shillings; 1 pair of boots, 4 shillings; 1/2 lb. weight of tea, 2 shillings and sixpence; 1 shilling, 12 pence, 24 halfpence, and 12 farthings. The last items were taken from a 'child's money box'. That morning, as Mary left, Sarah called out, 'Where are you going?' Mary replied that she would be back. However, when Sarah looked around the room she discovered that her black scarf, which had been hanging over a chair, was missing. She then went looking for Mary but couldn't find her. When she returned home she discovered that other items were also missing. Sarah called the police.

A constable, George John Restieaux, went to Monmouth Street<sup>77</sup> where he saw Mary going into a public house and he arrested her. Mary protested that she had pawned the items, but that Sarah would have them back again on the Monday. She also insisted that the shawl and boots were at her lodging at 34 Monmouth Street (so much for her earlier claim that she needed lodgings in Steven Street!) and that she had pawned other items in Frith Street, Soho. Constable Restieaux told the court that he went to Frith Street, but there was no pawnbroker. He found the items in Greek Street (also in Soho). He then went to Mary's lodging and found some black tea, a handkerchief, a plaid shawl and a pair of boots. Mary must have walked a lot in those few hours. This would have been a challenge given Mary must have been in a poor state of health: she left Steven Street, possibly went to Frith Street (or Wardour Street) and then on to Greek Street, then back to a public house in Monmouth Street.

While at the Police Station, Mary was subjected to a search by Honora Connell, a widow, who found 14 shillings and sixpence; a flannel petticoat (Mary argued that the petticoat was hers), boots and a pawn ticket for a pair of stays. Sarah confronted Mary at the Police Station and, as she told the court, Mary 'begged me not to appear against her, and she would give up my things.'

Mary's appeal fell on deaf ears as Sarah did not withdraw the charge. When the pawnbrokers gave evidence, Mary was shown to be a liar and thief: John Ewell, a pawnbroker in Wardour Street told the court that Mary had pawned a scarf and shawl using the name 'Ann Chandler'; then William Whittaker, a pawnbroker in Greek Street, stated that Mary had pledged a pair of stays in the name of 'Ann Thorp'. I wondered if the watchers in the court gallery felt sorry for Sarah who had been generous and let Mary stay with her?

The court found Mary guilty and sentenced her to transportation for seven years. Soon after that hearing Mary must have been hustled off to the docks and put on board the *Margaret*.

The next mention of Mary is in the journal of the surgeon Dr McAvoy. She became ill and was admitted to the ship's hospital on 10 April 1843. At that time, the surgeon noted that she was aged 26, rather than 22 as listed at the Old Bailey. His records show that she was suffering from *Phthisis* (pulmonary tuberculosis or a similar progressive wasting disease). This was the first time that she was reported as being ill. Not only was she suffering from a 'consumptive' disease, but she also gave birth to a 'poor underated thing unable to suck.' He does not record whether it was a boy or girl.

If the infant was full term, Mary must have been pregnant when arrested. There is no record of a spouse, so I wondered if she had 'been on the town'. Or, perhaps, as she said she was an 'upper house servant', she may have been the victim of the male householder's advances and then thrown out when she became pregnant.

The *Margaret's* hospital records show how much Mary suffered – she complained of cough and pain in the chest, was spitting up purulent matter, her bowels were 'confined'. McAvoy wrote:

Consumptive diagnosis [and] was confined ten days ago. Her infant is a poor underated thing not able to suck. Complains of cough & pain in the chest. Expecturant purulent matter, want of rest [10 April]; Severe cough with purulent discharge. Pain in the chest & emaciation. Pulse quick & feeble, her infant is dying [13 April]; she is not able to come to my cabin, her infant died last night [14 April]; the nurse reports that she is weak. Coughs all night & refuses food [16 April]; Report this day that she is no better. Cough severe with copious expectoration. Debility [17 April]; Died during the night [18 April].<sup>78</sup>

I could find no record of the burial of either Mary or her child – presumably it was at sea and done with some ceremony.

The surgeon rated Mary's behaviour as 'bad'. He reported that he was ill on this journey and limited in the way he could perform his duties. Poor Mary was admitted showing signs of severe illness on the 10 April and died just eight days later, five days after her child. The surgeon's report noted that Mary died on 18 April, but the baby's death is not mentioned in his summary of deaths on board. Child death was common in Victorian England, perhaps almost commonplace. Which left me wondering how many of the children the convict mothers took on board survived the journey, how many died, and would they have been recorded in Surgeons McAvoy's or Mould's journals.

## Mary McBIRNIE

Convict ID 8091

(On board William, born 1842)

There are a few mysteries around Mary McBirnie because so little information is available about her husband, family, co-conspirators and the child she took to Hobart. She was born in Paisley in Scotland circa 1810. At the time of her arrest Mary was married to John McBirnie. The couple had three children and the family lived in Manchester. There is no occupation given for John<sup>79</sup>, nor the names of her two older children. Convict records show that she was illiterate, 5'4" tall, with brown to grey hair and grey eyes.<sup>80</sup> She worked as a dress and bonnet maker.<sup>81</sup>

Mary was charged with receiving stolen plate and other items at Great Lever, which was a small township on the road between Manchester and Bolton.<sup>82</sup> She was tried at the Lancaster Assizes on 30 July 1842. The stolen items were the goods of a local squire and the cache included: a number of silver forks, some knives, and various other articles of wearing apparel.<sup>83</sup> The prosecutor argued Mary knew the goods were stolen. She was found guilty and sentenced to ten years transportation.

She was sent to the *Margaret* and took her youngest child, William, with her. There is some confusion about William's age: in May 1843 the ship's surgeon recorded his age as seven months, yet Mary was arrested before the end of July 1842; August to May is just ten months. William must have been born after she was arrested, but the date is uncertain.

There is more confusion around the co-offender story she told on landing in Hobart, which was 'Josh Holden and Jane Beattie<sup>84</sup> got 22 years each, stole it they are out here'. Was Mary lying or perhaps deluded? I have searched Tasmanian convict records and couldn't find either of these names. Also, a sentence of twenty two years is unlikely.

The journey to Van Diemen's Land must have been distressing for Mary because she was hospitalised for *catarrhus* (increased inflammation of the mucous membrane) on 17 May and was not discharged until 23 May 1843. Who was caring for baby William while she was in hospital? The day before her discharge on 22 May, her son William was admitted with *pertussis*. The surgeon noted that he was seven months old. Cross infection would have been a problem on board the *Margaret* and the hospital records show that Elizabeth McDonald also suffered from *catarrhus* in late May and was hospitalised around the same time as her baby, Michael McDonald, who died from *pertussis*.<sup>85</sup>

Surgeon McAvoy diagnosed ten women as suffering from *catarrhus*, beginning as early as 27 November 1842 (prior to sailing) and the last case was 10 April 1843, shortly before he left the ship<sup>86</sup>. Surgeon Mould also hospitalised twelve cases of *catarrhus*. Symptoms of this disease include: feeling the throat is blocked, stuffy nose, persistent cough, feeling of mucus running down the back of the throat. Given medical knowledge in those days, I wondered if the infants' *pertussis* and the mothers' *catarrhus* were similar diseases. Hospitalisations varied from one or two days to twenty one.

The two cases of *pertussis* were during Surgeon Mould's tenure. The first case was baby McDonald on 15 May; two days later Mary McBirnie was hospitalised for *catarrhus*. She stayed in hospital for five days. So, who was caring for baby William?

Baby Michael McDonald died on 22 May, which was the same day that baby William McBirnie was admitted to the hospital.

There is no discharge date for William. So did he die on board? There are only four other cases in Mould's diary for which there is no discharge date and all of these are in July: two just before landfall in Hobart and another two which would have been after the ship had docked. It could be that these cases were transferred to hospital in Hobart. Surgeon Mould was thorough in documenting his cases, which increases the likelihood that William McBirnie died on board the *Margaret* sometime in May 1843.

However, William may have arrived as there is no death at sea recorded for him, but neither was there a death recorded for Mary Lynch's baby. Equally there is no record of him entering the orphanage. So, if he landed, he may have stayed with his mother, which would have been unusual. He disappears from records after entering the hospital ward on the *Margaret*.

The tossing of the ship, combined with the severe illnesses of the children and mothers must have made the hospital quarters difficult to manage and a distressing place to be. Mary McBirnie was again hospitalised on 1 June with *psora* and *impetigo* (skin diseases) but discharged by 16 June 1843 – one month before the ship made port in Hobart.

After landing the surgeon described Mary as slovenly and dirty. Once put to work, Mary had two offences – (1) she was absent without leave on 26 February 1844 and was given three months hard labour at Cascades Female Factory; (2) she was insolent and given 14 days hard labour on 14 April 1845. Apart from those, her record was clean. Mary applied to marry Thomas Wilson Steel, a convict, who had arrived on *Eden*(2).<sup>87</sup> Permission was granted on 8 September 1846 and they were married on 28 September that same year at St Andrews Church of Scotland.<sup>88</sup>

Thomas was a native of Glasgow, aged 27 when convicted on 5 May 1840. He was charged with stealing a shawl, but reported he had been gaoled for three months for a prior similar offence. His trade was a cooper; he was a Protestant and could read and write; he was 5'3 ½" tall but he carried several scars. Were these a result of his trade? He had one on the bridge of his nose, another over his left eye and five large scars on his breast. His hulk report was 'good'; the ship's surgeon's was 'orderly', his work in Hobart was regularly described as 'good cooper'.

A census of the citizens of Van Diemen's Land was taken on 1 January 1848 and there was a Thomas Steel living in Collins Street Hobart in a house made of wood. There were two people in the house and of those, only one was free. That was probably Thomas, whereas Mary was still a convict, though married. There were no children recorded.

Mary died on 10 March 1848 at the Colonial Hospital Hobart. She was aged 37 and the records note that she died under sentence.

Elizabeth McDONALD

Convict ID8102

(On board Michael, born 1842)

Elizabeth McDonald was a young woman living in London. She was small, less than five feet tall; had red hair and blue eyes and was much freckled on her face and arms. She worked as a nurse maid and house maid. Her family were also in London – she described them as: Bernard, her father, and three brothers – Thomas, James and Barnard. The 1841 England census has a McDonald family living at Westminster London. They had a daughter, Elizabeth, aged fifteen and a servant. However, the names of others in the family are not identical with the names Elizabeth gave as her relatives. McDonald was a relatively common name – even among convicts in Van Diemen’s Land. It may or may not be her family

Elizabeth was charged with stealing a waistcoat and was tried at Surrey Newington Quarter Sessions on 4 July 1842. She was found guilty and sentenced to seven years transportation. Her gaol report was that she had been convicted before and she was single.<sup>89</sup> She was probably only seventeen years old when arrested and pregnant as the surgeon recorded her baby, Michael, as seven months old in May 1843. Michael’s birth was possibly registered in 1842 at the Strand London.

Elizabeth and her newborn son were sent to the *Margaret* sometime before Christmas 1842. The ship’s surgeon for the first part of the journey was Surgeon McAvoy who was ill and his journal is limited in information, but neither Elizabeth or Michael were sent to the hospital between London and the Cape of Good Hope. Surgeon Mould’s records show that both Elizabeth and Michael were admitted to the ship’s hospital in May. The baby was admitted on 15 May with *pertussis* (whooping cough) and *impetigo*, then Elizabeth had an attack of *cattarh* and *fever* on 18 May.<sup>90</sup> After that date the baby’s condition worsened.

The surgeon’s journal describing Michael’s illness is graphic and shows his care; diligent observations tell how much the child suffered. On admission, Michael a *cough* and *impetigo* on his scalp – the latter was treated with a mixture every three or four hours. Michael’s condition was favourable until 18 May when his mother also became ill. Two days later on 20 May his bowels were loose and his breathing strained; the surgeon ordered warm baths and powders (calomel and antimonial). His condition continued to deteriorate and during that night he convulsed. By the morning of 21 May his cough was worse, his bowels were loose and his head hot. He became faint by evening and by nine o’clock he was ‘lying rigid, his hands grasping convulsively; ... hot and breathing laborious...’<sup>91</sup>

Michael died at about one am on 22 May. He would have been buried at sea, but there is no record of that, nor is his death mentioned in the summary of the journey when they landed. Such a young infant was probably being breastfed so now, on top of her grief, Elizabeth would have had to deal with lactation problems and leaking breasts.

The surgeon’s report on Elizabeth was that she was ‘generally quiet’.<sup>92</sup>

Once in Hobart Elizabeth had a few misdemeanors: 31 December 1844 she was charged with larceny under £5 and given three months hard labour at the Female Factory; 20 May 1845 charged with absconding and was given six months hard labour; 15 December 1845 again absconding and received eight months hard labour. There was a break of just over a year before the next charge on 5 January 1847 when she was out after hours and given ten days hard labour. Then on 29 March 1847 she was drunk and using indecent language and was given three months hard labour. On 21 December 1847 she was granted her ticket of leave. Then by 23 July 1849 she was noted as being free by servitude.

After 1849, Elizabeth disappears from all records. I could find no record of a request to marry, a marriage, birth of further children nor a death certificate.

Ann NEWMAN

Convict ID8115

(On board Edward, born c1831; James, born c1833)

There were many men and women named Newman who turn up as attending the Old Bailey in the 1840's: charged as felons before the court, witnesses, and even one Mrs Newman whose job it was to search the accused. Among all of these was Ann Newman aged 46 (other records show a variation in her age),<sup>93</sup> who on 24 October 1842, was charged with stealing a pair of boots valued at seven shillings and sixpence. You have to feel sorry for Ann – she came from Louth in Ireland, was married to James Newman and she had five children. She explained, 'James left me. I don't know where he is.' At that stage, according to the information she gave officials, her children were:

Mary Ann – deported three years previously

Martha – at native place, presumably Louth in Ireland

Eliza – aged around 16 or 17, at native place though she did move to London later<sup>94</sup>

Edward – aged 11, probably with Ann in London

James – aged 9, also probably with Ann

There are no records of when or why Ann and the boys moved to London.

She was apprehended for stealing shoes on 23 September 1842 when she went to Thomas Searle's shop in Whitechapel at around half-past nine o'clock at night. She had Edward with her and asked to buy shoes for the boy. At some stage the lad serving her turned away and when he came back he saw Ann with a pair of boots hanging on her arm. When he challenged her she replied, 'They are his father's bought at another shop.' The lad took hold of the boots and saw the special mark of Searle's shop. At this stage the foreman, Charles Parrett, became involved and tried to stop her but, as he told the court, 'she would not be stopped. She pressed by me, saying, "They are his father's, bought at another shop". Then she went out of the shop, leaving the boots in my hand. I went after her, and asked her to come back. She refused. I insisted on her coming back. She then returned, and I called in an officer and gave her in charge. These boots are my master's.'<sup>95</sup>

Ann countered, saying, 'A little boy gave me these boots to fit on. I said they were too large, they would fit his father.' Parrett responded that he didn't hear anything of the sort.

Then, the serving lad told the court, 'I took these boots from the prisoner. She said, "They are his father's bought at another shop". I gave them to the foreman.'

Ann tried once more to explain away having the boots, saying, 'A young woman came out of the parlour, and said, "What do you want with the boots?" I said, "They are the boots the lad gave me, they are too large;" she took them out of my hand as though I wanted to steal them.'

Unfortunately for Ann, Thomas Brown a policeman then came forward and gave evidence of her prior conviction: stealing a roll of silk for which she received a sentence of two months. The court decided she was guilty of attempting to steal the boots and ordered transportation for ten years.

It can't have been long before Ann, Edward and James were on board the *Margaret* waiting for transport to Hobart. All convicts were on board before Christmas 1842, even though the ship didn't sail until 5 February 1843. It wasn't long before she was in the ship's hospital, on 7 January, when the surgeon noted she was suffering from *debilitas*<sup>96</sup>. She remained in hospital until 20 January.<sup>97</sup> She was ill again on 10 July suffering from *bronchitis* but doesn't seem to have been admitted to hospital.<sup>98</sup> Neither Edward nor James were on the sick list during the voyage.

The *Margaret* arrived in Hobart on 19 July 1843 and the surgeon described Ann as 'very quarrelsome and she tore a shawl off Sarah Peck's shoulders and rent it.' She had been a dairy maid and country servant in Ireland and England, and would now be looking for work, so this reference would not have helped. Ann could neither read nor write; she was of medium height with hazel eyes and brown hair. Her face was pock pitted and she had a scar on her leg.<sup>99</sup> As she was middle aged, I can imagine that her former *debilitas* on the *Margaret* might indicate that she was less than fit and healthy – not an attractive servant.

By 27 July both Edward and James were at the Orphanage. Their time there seems to have been uneventful and the only entry for them was that they were discharged to their mother on 16 January 1846. Meanwhile, Ann was reported on 14 February 1844 for disorderly conduct and using abusive language, for which sins she was given six months hard labour. This was her only misdemeanour during her early years of imprisonment.

In April 1844 more Newman children were accepted into the orphanage: Elizabeth 12 years, Ellen 9 years, Thomas 7 years, George 5 years<sup>100</sup>. Their mother, Ann Newman (police number 124), had been tried in Wiltshire and was transported on the *Emma Eugenia*. That ship left London on 30 November 1843 and arrived in Hobart on 2 April 1844. It is unlikely that these Newman children were related to Edward and James.

A check of the female convicts with the surname Newman shows that six others arrived in the 1840s. They are Mary (police no.145) from the *Tory*; Maria (police no.100) *Royal Admiral*; Margaret (police no.146) *Tory*; Honor (police no.105) *Waverley*; Ann (police no. 99) *Royal Admiral*; Ann (police no. 124) *Emma Eugenia*. Also, there were five female Newman convicts in the 1830s and one in 1851.<sup>101</sup> There were also several male convicts named Newman who were transported.

Our Ann Newman caught the eye of John Smithson, a labourer, who was a free widower and older man. On 3 November 1845, they applied to be married and permission was granted.<sup>102</sup> Smithson was born around 1780 and must have been about 65 years at this stage – Ann's age is anybody's guess given the different ages on various records (court, surgeon's journals), but it is likely she was around mid-fifties. They married at St Matthews Church New Norfolk on



9 December 1845.<sup>103</sup> Probably this marriage led to the boys release from the orphanage in January the following year. They would then have been around thirteen and fifteen years old.

Ann's misdemeanours increased after her marriage, so what can we read into that? The first was on 11 February 1846 when she was absent without leave and given 10 days solitary confinement at Cascades Female Factory. The next offence on her file gives some insight into her marital relationship when, on 24 March 1846, she was charged by her husband with being drunk and destroying his property. For this offence she was given three months hard labour but the sentence was remitted. Did John feel remorse or did he need a housekeeper back home to care for him and the boys?

There followed two offences in 1846: May and then in October for being insubordinate and disobeying orders, leading to her term of transportation being extended for three months and to one month hard labour. Then in April and November 1847 she was again in trouble: misconduct and more disobedience of orders. Each time she received further terms of hard labour. Finally in April and May 1848 she disobeyed orders, used indecent language and behaved in a disorderly manner – all of which led to more hard labour. Given Ann's offences and sentences I wonder if she and John were still together.

It was hard to discover what happened to Edward and James. A check through the Tasmanian Names Index for the names Edward Newman and James Newman threw up their arrival on the *Margaret*, but also a number of convicts with similar names who arrived in the eighteen thirties. So many Newmans made it hard to identify these boys or to discover their future.

Ann, a female pauper, died on 30 June 1857 aged 65 years of a 'disease of the brain. The records show 'Died at Lunatic Asylum New Norfolk' and the information came from the officer in charge of the asylum; John, a widower and labourer died 24 October 1868 at Longford Tasmania, aged 88.<sup>104</sup> It would seem that Ann and John may have separated or that poverty and infirmity forced him to place her in the asylum.

Discovering what happened to the rest of Ann's family is challenging as there are so many Newmans recorded in Tasmania, including thirteen female convicts with that surname.<sup>105</sup> Mary Ann has been difficult to pin down; Martha was said to have stayed in her Native Place; Eliza was charged with stealing at the Old Bailey in April 1843 and her convict and transportation records are readily available.

Mary Ann Newman has been difficult to positively identify. One possible fit is 'Ann Newman' (convict ID 10820, police no. 99) who was transported on the *Royal Admiral* after being tried at Lancaster Q.S. for stealing money. She had prior convictions and this time was given ten years transportation. She left England on 5 May 1842 and arrived in Hobart 24 September 1842 and was aged 22 years on arrival. The surgeon's report was 'good'. However, she gives her relatives as: mother, Jane White in Ireland; two brothers, Alexander and Edward; two sisters, Eliza and Jane. The only names common to the Ann Newman of the *Margaret* are Jane and Edward. She could read so she was semi-literate and it seems unlikely that she would then make a mistake in identifying her closest family members. She was

employed in Launceston and Longford. She sought permission marry Amos Cole and that was granted on 4 October 1843. The couple had six children: George (1844); Edward (1846); William (1849); George (1851); Sarah (1853); Amos (1855); John (1860). Her death was 28 February 1906 at Barrys Reef Victoria. Details were given by her grandson, David Cummings, a mill hand. She was 88 years old and had been in Victoria for 56 years. That would mean the family moved to Victoria around 1850 – possibly because of the gold rush.

Ann's other daughter, Eliza Newman (Convict ID 13160, police number 247), gave her family name as Johnson when she was arrested but the list of relations on her indent matches those of Ann Newman's family. She said her native place was Dublin and that she was single. The puzzle is why was she 'Johnson'? She was tried at the Old Bailey on 3 April 1843 for stealing a piece of print at Shoreditch. She had prior convictions for stealing a gown (6 months and again for stealing a gown (2 months). This time it was transportation for seven years. She was only eighteen years old when she arrived in Hobart and she explained that she 'lived by thieving once my mother was transported'. That, combined with the alias, implies that she was drifting around London, living as best she could to keep body and soul together. She seems to have been in a pitiful state.

She was able to read and said she was a house maid and needlewoman. Her relations were listed as Mary Ann Newman transported on the *Margaret*, a sister at her native place. But she doesn't mention the brothers who were transported with Ann. She was transported on the *Woodbridge* arrived in Hobart on 23 December 1843 – just a few months after her mother. The surgeon stated that she was 'good' and she only had two misdemeanours after landing – in May and June 1845, for insolence and refusing to work. Her penalties were 14 days hard labour and for the second one, three months hard labour.

She married Thomas Marshall, a convict who arrived on the *Elphinstone* in 1836. He was born in 1811 and they sought approval to be married in July 1846: he was 35 and she would have been in her early twenties. The ceremony was held on 22 August 1846 at St Matthews Church of England in New Norfolk.<sup>106</sup> The couple went on to have many children: Thomas (1848); David (1849); Eliza (1851); Edward (1852); James (1855); Margaret Martha (1857); Ann (1859); John Andrew (1860); Robert Warren (1862); Susan May (1865); Mark (1866). Checking births through the Names Data Index revealed that most of those children also had large families – so many more members of the Newman family in Tasmania.

Some of those children achieved wealth and fame: a note in the *Mercury* 18 November 1941 reports on the death of Robert Warren Marshall, aged 79 years:

He was the last of the Marshall brothers who had formerly engaged in agricultural pursuits in the Macquarie Plains district. He was manager of the Kentdale Estate, one of the most productive and largest hop growing estates in Tasmania until the active management was taken over by his son, Mr P. Marshall. He then left to reside at New Town. His judgement on all matters connected with agricultural affairs was sound.

And Edward and James Newman may also have married and added to the numbers in the clan.

## Ellen PARTINGTON

Convict ID8120

(On board James, born c1830; John born, c1833; Thomas, born c1835)

There are many recordings of events relating to Ellen Partington's life creating an overabundance of riches regarding Ellen and her family. However, little is known of the fate of the three children she took to Hobart. But, to begin at the beginning – she had a large family. Her native place was Walter le Dale Lanarkshire. Her father, David Appleby, was born 25 December 1777 and was buried in February 1853, ten years after Ellen was transported.<sup>107</sup> He was a tailor at Walton-Le-Dale, a village that lies close to Preston and is on the banks of the river Ribble.<sup>108</sup>

Her mother, Margaret (Peggy), died and her father married Elizabeth (Betty) Fisher on 13 February 1809 at St Mary the Virgin, Blackburn. Ellen had many siblings – those from her mother were: John baptised 30 March 1800; Ellen baptised 30 May 1802 (buried November 1804); James baptised 22 January 1804; William baptised 21 April 1805 (buried January 1806); Ann buried 15 March 1807; Mary Ann baptised 6 March 1808, (buried April 1808).

Her half-siblings were Mary Ann and Margaret (twins) baptised June 1810; Nancy baptised July 1812; Grace baptised September 1816; Sara baptised November 1818; David baptised January 1821 (buried November 1821); Elizabeth baptised September 1823; Harriet baptised November 1826.

Ellen's family also included her first-born, a son, David Appleby. He was baptised on 27 November 1827 at St John Preston Lancashire. The records state his father was unknown and that he was the child of Ellen Appleby, spinster of Fishwick. This was a small township on the river Ribble in Lancashire.<sup>109</sup> A few years later, on 16 February 1830, Ellen married James Partington,<sup>110</sup> but by 1842 she described herself as a widow with four children. They were David Appleby (1827); James (1830), John (1833), and Thomas (1835) Partington.

Ellen had a dark and sallow complexion, blue eyes and black hair. She had lost several front teeth from her upper jaw. She was tried at Lancaster Assizes on 30 July 1842 for coining half crowns and shillings. Two men were tried with her and transported.<sup>111</sup> The men are not named on her records and, sadly, the trial is not reported in the rich details that we have from the Old Bailey. Ellen had prior offences for assault and was sentenced to fifteen years transportation. She was sent to London to be put on board the *Margaret* and would have been on board, with her three sons, before Christmas 1842. She left behind David Appleby who, given his age (15 years), may have been working and living independently.

Ellen's journey must have been difficult with three children to manage: I can imagine a small berth area with three active boys who probably played and fought together. Also, they were growing and probably wanted extra rations. Did that create tension with the cooks and the captain? Just washing their clothes and keeping them clean would have been a challenge.

Other than those issues, the journey seems to have been uneventful until just before they reached Hobart. Ellen was admitted to hospital suffering from *diarrhoea* on 8 July 1843. She must have been rather ill as she was there for nearly a week and was discharged on 14 July, the day before the ship berthed.

Prisoners did not leave the *Margaret* immediately, there were reports and inspections to be completed. The ship's surgeon, John Mould, described Ellen as 'noisy, disobedient'.<sup>112</sup> Ellen probably went to Brickfields and the three boys were in the orphanage around the same time.

Records show: James Partington, aged 13 years, admitted to the orphanage 27 July 1843 and discharged 3 October 1846, aged 16 years, to James Lord. The Lord family had been in Van Diemen's Land for many years, were wealthy and had extensive business interests. The names David, John, Edward, Simon and James Lord appeared frequently in Hobart newspapers. A John Lord had a business located at 'Wharf' from as early as 1828 and frequently advertised imported goods for sale at his premises and his range was extensive, including gunpowder, china, paper, books, blinds, cloth, shawls, etc. In June 1826 the papers reported that Master James Lord, son of David Lord, Esq arrived in Hobart on the brig *Fairfield*.<sup>113</sup> David was wealthy with many irons in the fire. He was: a magistrate and coroner in New Norfolk; prominent in agricultural circles; a donor to St David's church; a breeder of racing horses and sheep. The family had a large home in Elizabeth Street Hobart.<sup>114</sup>

The other Partington boys had similar fates. John was admitted to the orphanage aged ten years six months on 27 July 1843, discharged 19 December 1846, aged nearly fourteen, to John Lambe of Oatlands. A John Lambe arrived in Hobart 24 August 1830 on the *Science*.<sup>115</sup> The name is unusual in being spelt with an 'e' and the only other citation I found was the birth of a son, James John Lambe, on 7 July 1853 which was registered in Launceston.<sup>116</sup> It could be the same family but there was no indication of Lambe's business.

As for Thomas, he was admitted to the orphanage aged eight years, three months 27 July 1843, discharged 31 October 1849, aged 14 years, to William Bennett of Hobart. The 1841 census records a William Bennett living in a house in Watchorn Street Hobart with three other people, all of whom were free. Watchorn Street is central to Hobart and is short, connecting Liverpool and Bathurst – just a few blocks up from Salamanca Place. Could this be our man? Unfortunately, there is no trade provided on that year's census. Another possibility is a William Bennett aged 35 who married Mary Smith, aged 20, on 30 July 1849. His trade was 'ferryman'.<sup>117</sup> This Bennett is old enough and newly married; could he have been setting up house and getting a yard boy, for example, to help around the house?

It seems that the boys were discharged in early teenage years and sent out as apprentices or labourers. James is likely to be the longest surviving of the boys as he died in 1912 in Kensington Victoria and was aged 82.<sup>118</sup> Thomas died 2 November 1860 at Richmond and was only 22 years old.<sup>119</sup> I could find no record for John's death, but a John Partington (free) was charged with assault at Emu Bay on 18 July 1853. There are no further details of that case on record. Often children in the orphanage were discharged to the mother when she married. That did not happen with Ellen's sons. She made three applications for permission to

marry and all were after the boys had been discharged. The first application was 6 November 1849 (three weeks after Thomas was sent to William Bennett) when she applied to marry Thomas King and that application was approved.<sup>120</sup> Thomas King was free, but somehow that wedding didn't go ahead and she applied soon after on 18 December 1849 to marry Stephen Cockayne (also free).<sup>121</sup> Did Ellen desert King when she got a better offer? Did King back out? For whatever reason, the marriage to Cockayne also did not go ahead. I wonder why because marriage would have given her more freedom than remaining a convict to be consigned out for work.

Finally on 29 April 1851 Ellen applied to marry Stephen Nessling (or Nesling) and they were married on 19 May 1851.<sup>122</sup> The register shows that they married at St Lukes Church of England in Richmond and Stephen was 52 years old and a shoemaker. Ellen is registered as aged 38 and a widow.<sup>123</sup> There must have been some inaccuracy in the ages recorded at the wedding because only thirteen years later, on 14 December 1864 in Richmond, Stephen died and his age was registered as 72 years. The cause of death was 'general decay'.<sup>124</sup>

Ellen Nessling, now widowed, married again not quite a year after Stephen's death. The ceremony was once more at St Lukes in Richmond where, on 8 April 1865 she married William Medler – both are described as adult and widowed.<sup>125</sup> There were no children from either of her last two marriages.

Ellen died a few years before William. On 21 May 1884 she was at the New Town Pauper Establishment in New Town Hobart, where she died aged 75. The cause of death is listed as '*paralysis*'.<sup>126</sup> William appears to have continued to live in New Town because that is where he died on 23 March 1889, aged 86.<sup>127</sup>

---

Mary PITFIELD<sup>128</sup> or PILFIELD

Convict ID 8124

(On board Hannah/Hanah, born 1832)

Mary Pitfield's maiden name was Cousins and she came from Farrington in Dorset, where she had a mother, one brother and four sisters. By 18 October 1842 Mary was a widow with seven children<sup>129</sup> and she was charged with receiving stolen goods (a pair of trousers) at Dorchester Quarter Sessions. She'd been in trouble before; the records are 'once 14, once for sticks'.<sup>130</sup> Does that mean that, when only fourteen years old, she was charged with stealing sticks? Her life seems to have been one of hard work and poverty and now she had a sentence of seven years transportation.

Mary was married to Samuel Pitfield and was his second wife. In 1808 he married Elizabeth Begg on 23 January at St George Fordington. Elizabeth died and was buried at Fordington 1 December 1813. They had three children who then became Mary's step-children. They were: John, baptised 25 September 1808 (buried 27 March 1818); Charles, baptised 6 May 1811; Hannah baptised 13 November 1813 (buried 3 February 1814).

She must have become pregnant and produced babies fairly quickly as there are six other children listed on her indent. They are Stephen, James, Emma, Mary Ann, Samuel and Hannah.<sup>131</sup> The only child with a birth date is Hannah, born in 1832 – making her eleven years old when on the *Margaret*. Presumably the other children were old enough to be left behind and some were probably working by 1842. There is no mention of the step-children on her convict indent. At the time of her conviction she told officials that her husband had been dead for three years. Life can't have been much fun for Mary.

Mary had other challenges as her description list states that she had a 'defect in utterance'.<sup>132</sup> Her eyes were hazel and her hair was 'inclined to grey'. She also had a scar on her arm, received from a burn. But she was fortunate in being able read, though not write.<sup>133</sup> On board ship she was admitted to the hospital on 19 February (not long after sailing) and discharged eleven days later on 30 February. The surgeon recorded her as aged 52 and the illness as *debilitas* – a weakness of the body.<sup>134</sup> She was ill again in June under Surgeon Mould; he hospitalised her for *catarrhus* from 8 June to 24 June and he recorded her age as 58.<sup>135</sup> It seems she aged six years in six months – or perhaps the records are unreliable. There was no record of Hannah being ill during the journey.

Soon after arrival in Hobart Hannah was sent to the Queens Orphan School and was there from 23 September 1843 until 16 June 1846. She was discharged to be apprenticed to Mr Knight in Launceston. I could find no clear record of where he lived or what Mr Knight did. However, Hannah seems to have stayed in the Launceston area because at some time she married William Amer, a labourer. On 14 November 1864 the couple had a daughter they named Mary Jane.<sup>136</sup> That was the last record I found for Hannah.

Mary told convict officials that she had been a country servant.<sup>137</sup> However, the ship's surgeon's report would not help her get employment as he described her as 'dirty,

troublesome'.<sup>138</sup> The *Margaret* only arrived in Hobart in July 1843 and the convicts did not disembark immediately, yet as early as 16 August she was 'severely reprimanded' for misconduct. Not long after that she was charged with disorderly conduct and given ten days hard labour. After these prompt punishments she was well behaved until September 1846 when she was charged with disobedience of orders and insolence – punishment was one month hard labour. By 1 May 1846 Mary was in Launceston and under supervision at the Female Factory there. Was it a coincidence or intentional that Hannah should be apprenticed to Launceston just a month after Mary was known to be there? Perhaps it was an attempt at a form of family reunion. Mary was still there on 27 July 1847 and in November she was absent and served two month hard labour. She was granted her ticket of leave on 30 November 1847.

Mary applied to marry John Constable, a free man, and permission was given 21 August 1848.<sup>139</sup> The dates are confusing because the records show that she was charged, on 21 August 1848 (the same date), with being found with a 'man in bed with her for an improper purpose'. For that misdemeanour she received one month hard labour.<sup>140</sup> Was she co-habiting and the permission came through too slowly? I could find no record of a wedding with Constable. To have the permission come through on that date indicates that Mary and John probably applied for permission weeks prior to that date. Alternatively, perhaps Mary was in bed with another man and John opted out of marriage.

I could find no record of Mary's death but it was interesting to discover her daughter was married and living in Launceston with a daughter. Mary came from a large family, married and produced her own large family, so it is comforting to think that she may have enjoyed the warmth of family life in Northern Tasmania with her daughter, son in law and granddaughter.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Bateson, pp.59-60
- <sup>2</sup> Bateson, p.89
- <sup>3</sup> Chesney, K. (1970) *The Victorian Underworld*. Temple Smith: Great Britain. p.197
- <sup>4</sup> Mackie, F. *The Quaker Journals of Frederick Mackie on his Tour of the Australasian Colonies 1852-1855*. (1973) Ed. M. Nicholls. UTAS Library, pp25-26
- <sup>5</sup> See Westerink, J. *The Women who died on the Margaret*. Female Convict Research web site.
- <sup>6</sup> Oxley, D. (1996) *Convict Maids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.253-254
- <sup>7</sup> Oxley, D p.262
- <sup>8</sup> I have double checked the correct wording and wonder if this is a mis-translation from the original French
- <sup>9</sup> Dumas, pp.16-17
- <sup>10</sup> Dumas, p.47
- <sup>11</sup> Dumas, p.16
- <sup>12</sup> Mackie, pp.37-38
- <sup>13</sup> Hyland, JE (2007) *Maids, Masters and Magistrates*. Clan Hogarth: Tasmania. p.24
- <sup>14</sup> The numbers in brackets after the name are those used by the 'Friends of the Orphan School' website to identify the children. See [https://www.orphanschool.org.au/showorphan.php?orphan\\_ID=4378](https://www.orphanschool.org.au/showorphan.php?orphan_ID=4378)
- <sup>15</sup> CON15, CON19
- <sup>16</sup> The court records are transcribed as '2 August' but if Saturday it would have to be 6 August. That fits with later evidence 'Saturday 20 August'.
- <sup>17</sup> Margaret returned to Derby, so saying she came from Manchester may not be true. The distance between Derby and London is around 155 miles; Edinburgh (where Steel went) is approximately 403 miles
- <sup>18</sup> Old Bailey records 24 October 1842, ref. t18421024-2806, available online.
- <sup>19</sup> CON 147
- <sup>20</sup> Old Bailey court records 24 October 1842
- <sup>21</sup> There were no more entries for James Angus in the Tasmania Library Name Index site that would fit this child given his birth date
- <sup>22</sup> The birth was registered on 16 September by a Henry Bushell, painter and glazier, of 74 Davey Street Hobart, Rgd33/1/4, no.680.
- <sup>23</sup> Additional extensive notes and references are on the Female Convict Research Centre Inc site under convict ID8021 for Elizabeth Atkins. These notes were researched by (1) Jan and Jill, Woodend, 4/3/2018 and (2) Mary Halliwell, Liverpool South West Lancashire Family History Society (Leigh Branch)
- <sup>24</sup> CON15; CON19; CON40
- <sup>25</sup> Evidence at her trial was that she was pregnant and claimed in August that she was about to go into labour, so this youngest child was possibly born in prison
- <sup>26</sup> CON15,CON19
- <sup>27</sup> Old Bailey records for 24 October 1842
- <sup>28</sup> Old Bailey records show that the child was not Elizabeth Atkins daughter, but Christiana Clark, the daughter of Mary and Thomas Reynolds
- <sup>29</sup> This school was established in 1698 for boys and for girls in 1711, and is a Christian school. See [https://aim25.com/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll\\_id=16529&inst\\_id=118](https://aim25.com/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll_id=16529&inst_id=118) This is a Christian School Foundation that opened a school for boys in 1698 and for girls
- <sup>30</sup> This was fortunate because by May two other infants came down with pertussis (whooping cough)
- <sup>31</sup> Mould, surgeon's journal *Margaret* May 1843 to July 1843
- <sup>32</sup> Rgd.37/1 112 no. 337
- <sup>33</sup> <https://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/marasmic>. ma-raz'mus) [Gr. **marasmos**, a wasting away] A generalized wasting and absence of subcutaneous fat caused by malnutrition; emaciation. It results from caloric deficiency secondary to acute diseases, esp. diarrheal diseases of infancy, deficiency in nutritional composition, inadequate food intake, malabsorption, child abuse, failure-to-thrive syndrome, deficiency of vitamin D, or scurvy
- <sup>34</sup> Death records for 1844 at <https://stors.tas.gov.au/RGD35-1-2p5j2k>. The entry has hard to read but it appears that the notice was given by someone who was the matron at [ ] nursery
- <sup>35</sup> Rgd.33/1/2 1847 Hobart
- <sup>36</sup> Rgd. Hobart 33/1/3 1848/572
- <sup>37</sup> Rgd. 33/1/3 1850/2678



- 
- <sup>38</sup> Rgd.35/1/5, no. 543
- <sup>39</sup> She was aged 35 on arrival
- <sup>40</sup> See the appeal to the sentence of transportation where William Baker refers to six weeks sentence
- <sup>41</sup> Research notes by Mary Halliwell on the Female Convicts Research Centre Inc. web site. Cited source *Berrows Worcester Journal* [Worcester England] - Thursday 6th January 1842
- <sup>42</sup> Female Convict Research Inc site and research done by K. Searson HO 18/85; FMP
- <sup>43</sup> Bateson, C. 1988, *Convict Ships 1787-1868*. Sydney: Library of Australian History.
- <sup>44</sup> Severe inflammation of the intestines leading to diarrhoea
- <sup>45</sup> See CON52/1/3, p.376
- <sup>46</sup> CON52/1/3 p.376
- <sup>47</sup> [https://librariestas.ent.sirsidynix.net.au/client/en\\_AU/names/search/results?qu=Ann&qu=Baker&isd=true](https://librariestas.ent.sirsidynix.net.au/client/en_AU/names/search/results?qu=Ann&qu=Baker&isd=true)
- <sup>48</sup> Rgd 35/1/24, no.1717
- <sup>49</sup> Ship's surgeon journal *Margaret*
- <sup>50</sup> See CON52/1/2 p.413
- <sup>51</sup> Registered in Hobart RGD33/1/3 1848 – 709 and RGD33/1/3 1848/710
- <sup>52</sup> Birth Rgd 33/1/ 1850/2324
- <sup>53</sup> This ID number can be used to locate this convict on the Female Convicts Research Centre Inc. web site
- <sup>54</sup> This is now known as Salisbury, a city famous for its cathedral. See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sarum>
- <sup>55</sup> Two infants were will with pertussis (whooping cough) in May 1843 and one of them died on 22 May
- <sup>56</sup> Ship's surgeon journal *Margaret* surgeon McAvoy
- <sup>57</sup> Thomas Scott's police number is 2601. See 52/1/2, p.432
- <sup>58</sup> POL220/1/1 p516
- <sup>59</sup> The Female Convict Research Inc. has extensive notes about Mary Henry provided by K. Graham
- <sup>60</sup> See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blackburn>
- <sup>61</sup> The census has Mary's age as 30. Many census records of ages were rounded to a near five, ie 34 = 30 on the census. Mary's seems to be an approximation unless the indent recording 37 was incorrect
- <sup>62</sup> This is based on notes from K Graham. There are notes also about what may have been the fate of the family Mary Henry left behind in England. See Female Convict Research Inc web site
- <sup>63</sup> CON15-1-2 p.154
- <sup>64</sup> CON40-1-6, p.83
- <sup>65</sup> When he left the ship Surgeon McAvoy reported that he was too ill to complete his journal. Two children were recorded as suffering from pertussis (whooping cough) soon after McAvoy left the ship and were cared for by Surgeon Mould
- <sup>66</sup> Rgd. 37/1/52, no. 389
- <sup>67</sup> Rgd. 33/1/3 1850/ 2030
- <sup>68</sup> Rgd 35 1812/1855 Hobart
- <sup>69</sup> Her age was 37 when arrested, meaning she was born circa 1806, so the age seems to be incorrect
- <sup>70</sup> Thanks to Kath Graham who has added extra information about Mary Lynch to the Female Convict Research site
- <sup>71</sup> Bateson, C. *The Convict Ships 1787-1868*. Sydney: Library of Australian History, p.61
- <sup>72</sup> Bateson, 1988 pp.61-62
- <sup>73</sup> See Female Convict Research site for Mary Lynch
- <sup>74</sup> The records can be seen at <https://www.oldbaileyonline.org/> (28 November 1842).
- <sup>75</sup> This evidence is what is reported in the Old Bailey records, but the dates do not fit with the weekdays mentioned. See <https://www.timeanddate.com/calendar/?year=1842&country=9> as 25 November 1842 was a Friday and 28 November, a Monday. Perhaps the court reporter's shorthand was not up to scratch.
- <sup>76</sup> <https://www.timeanddate.com/calendar/?year=1842&country=9>
- <sup>77</sup> Monmouth Street is some 6 or 7 blocks from Tottenham Court Road and number 34 appears to be close to Covent Garden, although the street may have been re-numbered since 1842
- <sup>78</sup> McAvoy, B. Surgeon, *Margaret*, 5 November 1842 – May 1843, Journal
- <sup>79</sup> Industries near Manchester at the time were related to textiles and mills
- <sup>80</sup> CON19; CON15
- <sup>81</sup> CON15, CON19
- <sup>82</sup> <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/lancs/vol5/pp182-187>
- <sup>83</sup> Bolton Chronicle 06 August 1842. Contributed by R Thomas – Ancestry.com UK

- 
- <sup>84</sup> I could find no Jane Beattie at the list of female convicts sent to Van Diemens Land. See <https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/lists/ConvictsInDatabase.pdf>
- <sup>85</sup> See Female Convict Research Inc. web site for Elizabeth McDonald, convict ID8102. See also surgeon's records for the hospitalisation of Michael McDonald, which give details of the severity of the illness and the child's suffering
- <sup>86</sup> See Surgeon McAvoy's journal
- <sup>87</sup> CON52/1/2 p.436. Police No. 5388
- <sup>88</sup> Rgd.37/1/5 1846/191
- <sup>89</sup> CON15, CON19
- <sup>90</sup> The transcript of Mould's surgeon's journal lists the 18 May Han<sup>h</sup> as admitted with catarrhus, discharged 22 May. However, additional surgeon's notes on Michael state his mother was attacked by catarrh.
- <sup>91</sup> Surgeon's John Mould's journal entry
- <sup>92</sup> CON40/1/4 p.468
- <sup>93</sup> Records show this may be incorrect as she is listed as age 56 on arrival in Hobart, CON19; McAvoy, ship's surgeon on the *Margaret* voyage until the Cape of Good Hope writes her age in January as 50; Surgeon Mould for the next part of the trip notes her age as 56.
- <sup>94</sup> These details are listed on CON15-1-2 pp.166-167, for other information see CON40-1-8 p.167
- <sup>95</sup> Old Bailey records on line 24 October 1842, ref. t18421024-2884
- <sup>96</sup> Weakness or infirmity
- <sup>97</sup> Ship's surgeon's journal of B. McAvoy.
- <sup>98</sup> Surgeon Mould's journal
- <sup>99</sup> CON15
- <sup>100</sup> <https://www.orphanschool.org.au/showorphan.php?orphan> Numbers 4114; 4115; 4119; 4116
- <sup>101</sup> See list of female convicts data base <https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/lists/ConvictsInDatabase.pdf>
- <sup>102</sup> Marriage permission 3 November 1845, PM15988
- <sup>103</sup> Marriage RGD37/1/4 1845/1582 Hobart; G&K 3362
- <sup>104</sup> Rgd. 35 318/1868. CON52; RGD37
- <sup>105</sup> The data base <https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/lists/ConvictsInDatabase.pdf> lists thirteen female convicts with the surname Newman. None of these seems to tie in with Ann's eldest daughter, her family and being deported three years before Ann. See pages 236/237
- <sup>106</sup> Marriage Rgd.37/1/5 1846/136
- <sup>107</sup> Many thanks to K.Thomas of Lancashire for her research and notes on the Female Convict Research Inc web site. She is the one who provided information about Ellen's English family.
- <sup>108</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walton-le-Dale>
- <sup>109</sup> <http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/place/22492>
- <sup>110</sup> CON40/1/8
- <sup>111</sup> CON40-1-8 p.167
- <sup>112</sup> Surgeon's Journal of Her Majesty's Female Convict Ship *Margaret*, Mr John Arnold Mould.
- <sup>113</sup> *Colonial Times and Tasmanian Advertiser* Hobart 30 June 1826
- <sup>114</sup> *Colonial Times* Hobart 27 April 1849
- <sup>115</sup> Tasmanian Names Indexes 446352
- <sup>116</sup> Tasmanian Names Indexes 995087
- <sup>117</sup> Rgd.37/1/8, no.322
- <sup>118</sup> Rgd.1912/10622
- <sup>119</sup> Rgd.1860/954
- <sup>120</sup> PM19663, CON52/1/3 p.261
- <sup>121</sup> PM19817, CON52/1/3 p.74
- <sup>122</sup> PM19818, CON52/1/3 p.331
- <sup>123</sup> Rgd.37/1/10 1851/952
- <sup>124</sup> Rgd.135 493/1864 Richmond
- <sup>125</sup> Rgd. 37/37/1/24 1865/556
- <sup>126</sup> Rgd. 35/1/10 no. 1641
- <sup>127</sup> Rgd. 35 493/1889
- <sup>128</sup> Thanks to R.Thomas who provided extra research notes on the FFCR web site

---

<sup>129</sup> The convict records state '7 children' but only the names of six are shown on the web site – was this a case of counting the youngest one (on board) twice; six and one on board? Alternatively, Mary may have counted a living step-child when she claimed to have seven children.

<sup>130</sup> CON40-1-8 p.167

<sup>131</sup> CON40-1-8 p.167

<sup>132</sup> CON19-1-2

<sup>133</sup> CON19-1-2p.126

<sup>134</sup> Surgeon McAvoy's Journal for the *Margaret*

<sup>135</sup> Surgeon J Mould's journal for the *Margaret*

<sup>136</sup> Birth Rgd. 33/1/42, no. 453

<sup>137</sup> CON19-1-2

<sup>138</sup> CON40-1-8 p.167

<sup>139</sup> CON52/1/3 p.67

<sup>140</sup> CON40-1-8 p.167