

JOHANNA TAYLOR

(*Mexborough*, 1841)

by

Don Bradmore

Johanna Taylor was one of 13,500 (approx.) women who were transported as convicts to Van Diemen's Land (VDL) between 1812 and 1853.¹ All of the women are important and every one of them deserves to be remembered. The stories of their lives are all different. A few are joyous, most are heart-wrenching, some downright tragic. Some of the women will be remembered for new crimes committed in the colony, some because of the way in which they resisted the cruel treatment of the colonial authorities, and some because they did their best to escape the often-harsh manner in which they were treated by the free settlers to whom they were assigned as servants. Others are of women who were pleased to be away from the abject poverty in which they had lived before their convictions and transportation, who made the most of their opportunities, who saw their servitude as a means of changing their condition, who became model citizens and made laudable contributions to the development of their new country. Lamentably, Johanna Taylor was *not* one of the latter group. Just twenty-two years of age when she arrived in VDL on *Mexborough* in December 1841, she had been found guilty of theft in her native Cork, Ireland, earlier that year. It was not her first offence and she had been sentenced to seven years' transportation. Although troublesome at times in VDL, she did nothing that was particularly unusual or bad. In 1846, she had married and, later, had left the colony, probably with her husband, to reside in the neighbouring colony of Victoria. Little is known about the way she lived there but it is thought that her life must have been a difficult one. Described as 'idle and disorderly' and 'a vagrant', and listed as one who had been in-and-out of prison for the previous six years, she passed away at the Melbourne Gaol in 1889. She was sixty-five years old. What adds poignancy to her story - and certainly makes her memorable - is one of several petitions forwarded on her behalf to the authorities in Ireland whilst she was awaiting transportation in 1841. Whereas most petitions for prisoners who had been sentenced to transportation pleaded for clemency, this one, written by the step-mother with whom Johanna had lived at one time in Cork, begged that the powers-that-be show her no mercy whatsoever, that they send her far, far away and that they never allow her to return.

This is Johanna's story:

It is believed that the 'indent' - or 'the ship's muster', as it is more correctly called - of *Mexborough*, the vessel on which Johanna was transported to VDL in 1841, has not been located. As indents usually contained a good deal of personal information about the lives of each convict before their exile, as well as a physical description and details of their crimes, nothing is known about Johanna's early years in Ireland. However, from other convict

¹ Conduct record: CON40-1-10, image 127; description list: CON19-1-3, image 82; police no: 184; FCRC ID: 9249.

documents - and especially from petitions forwarded on her behalf while she was imprisoned in Ireland awaiting embarkation on the ship that was to take her to VDL - important details of her young adult life can be gleaned.²

Petitions such as those presented on Johanna's behalf, are a vital source of information for historians. According to volunteer researchers at the Female Convict Research Centre (FCRC) at Hobart:

After being sentenced to transportation, convicts could petition the Government for a reprieve. These petitions give an insight into the lives of women before conviction, including details of family, employment and offence. Many petitions show the poverty and sad circumstances of the women and their grief at separation from loved ones. Also among the petitions are glimpses of cunning thefts and practised criminal activity. There are others which tell stories of society in appeals against the death penalty, crimes committed because of ignorance, or because of love or betrayal of others. Often, the only time we hear the voice of convict women is in their petitions.³

At least three petitions were presented on Johanna's behalf to Hugh, 2nd Earl Fortescue, a British Whig politician who, as Viscount Ebrington, served as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from 1839 to 1841.⁴

Two were forwarded by clergymen whose aid in this respect Johanna's father had enlisted. They had been co-signed by prominent citizens who, presumably, knew Johanna or knew her family. They were earnest - and urgent - pleas for mitigation of her seven-year sentence of transportation. The third, however, which had been forwarded by her step-mother, begged vehemently that the sentence be carried out – and without delay!⁵

Although the facts presented in the petitions are contradictory in places, when taken together they reveal much about Johanna. To begin with, 'Taylor' was not the name she was born with. It was her surname by marriage. At least two years before her transportation, she had married a man by the name of Michael Taylor, a soldier.⁶ Her maiden name was O'Brien (or Brien). Her mother had died some years earlier and her father, Michael O'Brien, had remarried. The first name of his second wife – and Johanna's aggrieved step-mother – was Margaret.⁷ Neither of these marriages – Johanna to Michael Taylor and Margaret to Michael O'Brien – seems to have been successful.⁸

² [https://www.digitalpanopticon.org/Convict_Indents_\(Ship_and_Arrival_Registers\)_1788-1868](https://www.digitalpanopticon.org/Convict_Indents_(Ship_and_Arrival_Registers)_1788-1868)

³ <https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/pre-transportation/petitions>

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hugh_Fortescue,_2nd_Earl_Fortescue

⁵ https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/petitions/TaylorJoanna_Mexborough_1841.pdf

⁶ https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/petitions/TaylorJoanna_Mexborough_1841.pdf

⁷ Margaret's surname at the time of this marriage is unknown.

⁸ Neither of the marriage certificates has been located.

While Johanna's step-mother, Margaret O'Brien, had referred to Johanna's husband in her vitriolic petition as 'a very honest man' whom Johanna had deserted soon after the marriage and 'from whom she has been living apart since', one of the clergymen had stated that he [Taylor] was 'a man whom [Johanna] did not like' and who had 'treated her with contempt' before deserting her. The same clergyman went on to say, however, that Michael Taylor was now 'an altered man' and that he was 'desirous of taking [Johanna] under his protection' again. If that were to happen, the clergyman asserted, it is likely that she would become 'a useful wife and a source of consolation to her husband'. This view was also held by Robert Bennett, Deputy Recorder, City of Cork, Ireland, the official whose task it was to summarise petitions before sending them on to The Lord Lieutenant.⁹

In his summary of the petitions, Bennett had stated that, although Taylor had not petitioned on his wife's behalf, he himself had thought it wise to speak to him directly and, after doing so, he had thought that he was 'quite a well-disposed man'. Although Bennett had heard from other sources that Johanna had 'been addicted to drink and was very violent when under its influence, Taylor had told him that 'he would wish to have his wife back if she would stay with him' and that he would willingly 'become bound for her good behaviour'. However, Taylor had 'candidly acknowledged' [that] he could not be sure of her but [was] willing to receive her and to try to reclaim her'. He had concluded his remarks to Bennett by saying that he 'had been some months at work in Wales' and, while he believes that he has no child 'here', he 'has heard that [Johanna] has had a child since [their separation.]'¹⁰ (Taylor's use of the word 'here' is interesting. Does it suggest that he knew he had a child, or children, elsewhere? Could this explain why Johanna 'did not like' him and why the couple had parted?)¹¹

The marriage of Johanna's father to Margaret also appears to have been unhappy – at certain times, at least. In her petition, Margaret had stated that she had 'unfortunately' married O'Brien after the death of her first husband and that, even though they had spent a lot of money trying to help Johanna, their good intentions had come to nothing. Rather, Johanna had acted most violently towards them. At one time, she had thrown a parcel of slaked lime at Margaret's eyes, presumably with the intention of blinding her. On another, she had threatened to burn the house down around the family, intimating that she would take the lives of all of them, including those of the two children Margaret had had by her first husband.¹²

The petitions also reveal much about Johanna's behaviour, and the crimes she had committed, prior to her transportation. Margaret had stated she had had to 'defray the expenses' when Johanna had married Taylor. In addition, she had given Johanna 'a feather bed and other property' but, within a short time, Johanna had disposed of them. (Did Margaret bring a charge against Johanna for that act? That seems likely. Among the list of previous crimes which Johanna had on her record when transported was one of 'breach of trust', defined in legal texts

⁹ As for Note 6, above.

¹⁰ Johanna did not have a child with her when she arrived in VDL and no record of a birth to her has been located.

¹¹ As for Note 6, above.

¹² As for Note 6, above.

as occurring ‘when one person who, while entrusted with another person’s property, intentionally converts that property to his or her own benefit.’¹³ For this crime, Johanna had been sent to an Irish prison for seven years. As it happens, however, she had been released after serving only eighteen months.)¹⁴

In her petition, Margaret gave brief details of the several attempts that she and Johanna’s father made in the past to help the young woman. On one occasion, her father had sent Johanna to live with his brother in Limerick, Ireland, but that arrangement had come to an end when she had stolen goods from her uncle’s home. On another occasion, just a short while after Johanna had been released from a Magdalen Asylum at which she had been kept for some time, Margaret had arranged for her to live with some of her [Margaret’s] friends in the country but this attempt to help had also ended badly.¹⁵ One day, while the friends were absent from the house, Johanna had ‘broken open a room door, a cupboard and two large drawers’ and had stolen ‘a parcel of clothes with which she had absconded.’ Later, it was learnt that she had taken the clothes to Middleton, a town about fifteen miles (about 25 kms) from Cork, where she had sold them. At yet another time, her father had had her sent to Bridewell [Prison] in the hope that this would ‘keep the Peace to him and his family.’¹⁶

Margaret was of the opinion that Johanna’s father had made things worse to some extent by hushing up his daughter’s offences on occasions and by recompensing the victims for the items which she had stolen from them. Margaret’s view was that Johanna was ‘incorrigible’ and ‘a pest on society’, and that transporting her to the colonies would be the best way of saving her from ‘a heavier and more ignominious punishment’ at some later time¹⁷

As might be expected, the views of the two clergymen who had forwarded petitions on Johanna’s behalf were much more favourable. One, forwarded by Father Michael O’Sullivan, the Catholic Chaplain of the Cork City Jail, stressed that Johanna was now ‘miserable’ and ‘utterly sorry’ for what she had done. He declared that sending her away would surely bring her father to ‘a premature grave’ and ‘blast the good prospects her husband hopes to reap in the promised confession of her future amendment.’ The other, sent by Father William Nelligan, the curate of St Mary Shandon, Cork, was even more sympathetic. He reminded The Lord Lieutenant of Johanna’s ‘extreme youth’, finding the underlying causes of her rebelliousness to have been that she had been ‘deprived of her mother in her early years’ and that her father had been so ‘preoccupied with his trade’ that Johanna had not received the instruction which

¹³ www.sklawyers.com.au, accessed 20 January 2021.

¹⁴ As for Note 6, above.

¹⁵ The Magdalene Movement, which had originated in Ireland in the mid-18th century, and was supported by both Catholic and Protestant churches, established homes (or asylums of refuge) where ‘fallen women’ could serve short terms with the goal of ‘redeeming themselves’ through lace-making, needlework or doing laundry. These institutions, which had soon spread world-wide, were abandoned in the 1950s amid stories of cruelty and sexual abuse; see <https://www.history.com/news/magdalone-laundry-ireland-asylum-abuse> for additional details.

¹⁶ By this time, the term ‘Bridewell’, originally the name of a prison and hospital established in London in 1553, had become to be used generically to refer to any prison or reform school for petty offenders; see https://www.digitalpanopticon.org/Bridewell_House_of_Correction_Prisoners_1780-1795

¹⁷ As for Note 6, above.

would have led to ‘her salvation’ and ‘made her a dutiful member of society’. He also thought that much of her waywardness could be attributed to the poor treatment she had received from her husband and the ‘bad company’ she had kept after he had deserted her.¹⁸

In regard to these petitions, it is interesting to know where Johanna’s father, Michael O’Brien, stood on the matter of his daughter being sent far across the world, in all probability never to return? Was he aware of his wife Margaret’s unsympathetic and, indeed, vicious, petition? Had he concurred with it? It seems that he had not!

O’Brien’s views on the issue were summarized by Deputy Recorder Bennett in the covering letter he had forwarded to The Lord Lieutenant with the petitions. According to Bennett, when Johanna had been gaoled for a theft two or three years earlier, she herself had written to the presiding judge of the Quarter Sessions Court in which she had been indicted, entreating that she be transported, ‘such was the state of vice and misery into which she had fallen’, and ‘as the only means of withdrawing her from bad company’. At that time, her father had seemed to think that, indeed, transportation might have been the best way of saving his daughter from further misery. Johanna’s letter had been presented to the courts again at the time her father had her sent to Bridewell. On both of those occasions, however, Johanna’s plea for her own transportation had been ignored because dealing with her in that way was impossible for legal reasons. However, by the time Johanna had been convicted of the crime that *did* eventually bring about her seven-year sentence of transportation, her father had had second thoughts. He had gone to Bennett with a ‘memorial’ that he had written in which he pleaded for a reduction of the sentence.¹⁹ Bennett had told him that he ought to have petitioned The Lord Lieutenant directly and that, if her were still to do so, it would be better if his petition were supported by prominent people. O’Brien had then gone to the clergymen, O’Sullivan and Nelligan, seeking their support.²⁰

Ultimately, however, the petitions beseeching clemency for Johanna were of no avail. After reviewing what he had received, The Lord Lieutenant decreed that the sentence of the court be carried out. Johanna was sent to a Dublin prison to await the vessel that would take her to VDL.²¹

Johanna’s convict papers show that, at her trial at Cork on 29 January 1841, the theft for which she had been convicted and sentenced to transportation was of ‘10 yards of pilot cloth’ - a thick,

¹⁸ As for Note 6, above.

¹⁹ Although a memorial is defined as ‘a written statement of facts presented to a sovereign, a legislative body, etc., as the ground of, or expressed in the form of, a petition or remonstrance’ (see www.dictionary.com), Bennett seems to imply that it was not in the form of a petition that he could accept.

²⁰ As for Note 6, above.

²¹ Was Johanna at Grangegorman prison, Dublin? Although there is no record on her convict papers that she was there, it is likely that she was. Grangegorman female penitentiary, Dublin, was the only prison in the British Isles established exclusively for women. The female penitentiary was a part of a complex that held the Lunatic Asylum and Male Prison. In 1839, it housed 660 female prisoners. See <https://www.ourfamilypast.com/article/topic/6770/grangegorman-convict-depot-richmond-female-penitentiary-dublin>

blue woollen cloth, usually used to make seamen's coats.²² The court had also heard of her prior offences, of course.²³

On 13 August 1841, in company with one hundred and forty-four other female prisoners and a small band of free settlers, Johanna sailed from Dublin aboard *Mexborough*. John Bridgman, as Master, had overall control of the ship and was responsible for its safe passage to the antipodes. Prime responsibility for the health and conduct of the convicts was in the hands of Surgeon-Superintendent John Hampton. On 26 December 1841, the vessel reached Hobart.²⁴

According to the medical journal which Hampton furnished to the authorities on arrival, the voyage had been an uncomfortable one. Describing *Mexborough* as 'very old', Hampton had written that 'it was exceedingly difficult, & required the utmost vigilance, to prevent leakage keeping the Prisons damp.' This situation had been made worse by the fact that, after rounding the Cape of Good Hope, the ship had been exposed to 'a continuance of gales ... and very inclement weather up to the date of arrival at Hobart Town'. Hampton had no doubt that the weather had contributed to 'the termination' of two prisoners at sea.' Naming those who died as Mary Holohan, aged fifty-five, and Margaret Reilly, thirty-five, he had added that both were 'unhealthy, debilitated women' who had been very frequently on his sick list. Gladly, Johanna had remained in good health throughout the voyage. Hampton's only comment about her was she had been 'well-behaved'.²⁵

At Hobart, she was described as twenty-two years old and married. She was five feet three-and-three-quarter inches (about 162 cms) tall, with a 'brown' complexion, brown hair and grey eyes. She had a mole on her forehead. Her convict trade was entered on her record as 'servant of all work'.²⁶

Soon after disembarkation, sixty-eight of the *Mexborough* women had been assigned as servants to free settlers in and around Hobart Town, while fifty-seven others had been sent on board the government brig *Isabella* for assignment in the Launceston district.²⁷ Johanna was among the latter group and she remained in the Launceston district for the remainder of her term of servitude.²⁸

Although Johanna was charged with a number of new offences in VDL, her behaviour in the colony was not as bad as might have been expected by any who happened to know her history. On 30 May 1842, just a few months after her arrival in VDL and now assigned as a servant, she was charged with being 'drunk and out after hours' and ordered to spend seven days in solitary confinement at the Launceston Female Factory. Six months later, in September 1842,

²² <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=pilot+cloth>

²³ CON40-1-10, image 127.

²⁴ https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/ships/Mexborough1841_SJ.pdf

²⁵ <http://member.iinet.au/~perthdps/convicts/ships/TAS.html>; for a very detailed account, see 'The Voyage of the *Mexborough*, 1841' by Brian Rieusset at https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/seminars/Voyages_BrianRieusset.pdf

²⁶ CON40-1-10, image 127; CON19-1-3, image 82.

²⁷ Brian Rieusset, 'The Voyage of the *Mexborough*, 1841', see https://www.femaleconvicts.org.au/docs/seminars/Voyages_BrianRieusset.pdf

²⁸ CON40-1-10, image 127.

she was charged with ‘absconding’ from the household of the Stephenson family to whom she had been assigned. When apprehended shortly afterwards, she was punished heavily by being ordered to spend six months’ imprisonment at the Launceston Female Factory. In addition, her existing seven-year term was extended by eighteen months.²⁹

While at the Launceston Female Factory, Johanna had witnessed the stabbing of a government medical officer, Dr. George Maddox, by three of the inmates. The women were named as Mary Sherif, Elizabeth Elmore and Eliza Owens. At their trial in the Supreme Court of Tasmania on 9 January 1843, Johanna was among a number of witnesses whose testimony appeared to diminish any hopes of a reprieve the accused women might have held. She had told the court that she had seen Sherif sharpening a kitchen knife that morning and had heard Elmore say that ‘she would take the old b.....’s life.’ As expected, the jury returned a guilty verdict against all three. A sentence of death was recorded against them but, ultimately, on the strong recommendation of the jury that they be shown mercy, their lives were spared.³⁰

Had Johanna turned over a new leaf in giving evidence in support of the police case? Is this the Johanna who, herself, had had such trouble with the law in Ireland? It is interesting to speculate on what her fellow inmates might have thought of her for this. Fortunately, perhaps, her six-month term of imprisonment at the Factory had been completed by the time of the trial.

However, if Johanna *had* resolved to amend her ways, it was a resolution that was short-lived. In 1843, she absconded from her assigned service again but this time was let off with a reprimand.³¹ In 1844, she was charged with four offences – on 9 January for ‘using obscene language’ (ten days solitary confinement at the Factory), on 14 January for disturbing the peace (fined five shillings), on 14 March for ‘misconduct’ of some kind (reprimanded) and on 25 May for ‘having a man in her bedroom at night (another six months’ imprisonment, this time with hard labour).³²

Nevertheless, the offence of having a man in her room was to be her last in the colony. Although her term of transportation was not completed for another four years, no more charges were brought against her in VDL.³³

Two matters may account for Johanna’s good behaviour in the years between 1844 and 1848. The first is that, by 1844, she may have been able to see that the end of her servitude was in sight. In February 1843, she had been granted a ticket of leave and was then free to find her own accommodation and employment. However, the ticket had been revoked in May 1844 when imprisoned again for having the man in her room. When it was restored to her is unclear

²⁹ Absconding: CON40-1-10, image 127; *Hobart Town Gazette*, 10 February 1843 via FCRC website at www.femaleconvicts.org.au

³⁰ *Launceston Examiner*, 26 October 1842, p.284; *The Cornwall Chronicle* (Launceston), 14 January 1843, p.2.

³¹ Absconding: *Hobart Town Gazette*, 10 February 1843 via FCRC website at www.femaleconvicts.org.au

³² CON40-1-10, image 127.

³³ CON40-1-10, image 127.

but, in any event, on 29 July 1844, she was 'free by servitude'. A certificate of freedom was issued to her a few days later. Her time as a convict was over! She was free again.³⁴

Of even greater importance to Johanna between 1844 and 1848, perhaps, were her thoughts of marrying again? On 19 June 1843, a ticket-of-leave convict by the name of George Joiner, who had been convicted in London of receiving stolen goods and sentenced to transportation for fourteen years, had sought permission for the pair to marry. He had arrived in VDL on *Mangeles* in August 1835. However, approval for the marriage had been denied by the authorities. On 26 February 1843, Joiner had applied again but once more his request had been refused. What had Johanna thought about all of this? Unfortunately, that is not known but, as it turns out, she might have been fortunate that she had not married Joiner. His conduct record shows that, in March 1844, just twelve months after his second application to marry Johanna had been disallowed, he was charged with 'ill-using a female and stating that he was a constable from New Norfolk.' For that offence, he had been sent to gaol for two months, with hard labour. His ticket of leave had been suspended.³⁵

Nevertheless, Johanna did not have long to wait for another suitor. Until the 1850s, there was an overwhelming numerical dominance of males in VDL due to the much bigger number of men who had been transported. It is estimated that there was an average of thirty-nine adult women to every one hundred men - the vast majority of them single - in the colony at that time.³⁶

On 18 March 1846, Johanna married Charles Mouncey (seen also as Mounsey, Mouncy and other variants) at the Baptist Chapel, York Street, Launceston. The ceremony was performed by the Rev. Henry Dowling. Charles, who had not married previously was described on the marriage certificate as a 'farmer' and Johanna as a 'widow'.³⁷

Charles had been in VDL since arriving as a convict per the vessel *Larkins* in 1831. In the previous year, he had been convicted at his native Liverpool, England, of stealing '10 lbs of copper and four brass taps' and had been sentenced to transportation for fourteen years. In the colony, he had been punished for many offences, almost all of them involving 'neglect of duty' and 'insolence'. He had spent long periods in irons and on chain gangs, notably in the Launceston district. Although he did not receive his certificate of freedom until 1847, a year after his marriage to Johanna, he had been granted a conditional pardon in May 1842 and so both were free when the marriage took place.³⁸

Soon after the marriage, the couple left the colony. The discovery of gold on the mainland in 1851 had seen thousands of diggers swarm to New South Wales and Victoria from overseas

³⁴ CON40-1-10, image 127; Certificate of Freedom: *Hobart Town Gazette*, 10 February 1843 via FCRC website at www.femaleconvicts.org.au

³⁵ Joiner: CON31-1-26, image 30; applications for permission to marry: CON52/1/2, pages 89 and 90.

³⁶ https://www.utas.edu.au/library/companion_to_tasmanian_history/G/Gender.htm

³⁷ Marriage: RGD37/425G/1846, Launceston (via TPI Digger). Was Johanna really a widow? Probably not - but as she had declared herself to be married when she had first arrived in VDL, and as had not seen or heard from her husband for years, it was acceptable to the government and church authorities for her to describe herself as a widow now. It is likely that Charles was a 'farm labourer' rather than a 'farmer'..

³⁸ CON 31-1-30, image 66.

seeking to make their fortune. A great many were from Tasmania.³⁹ Records show that Charles arrived in Victoria on the vessel *Colonel Taylor* – an interesting coincidence of names – in 1852. It is probable that Johanna was with him.⁴⁰

Little is known about the way the couple had lived at that time but it is clear that they did not strike it rich. There is some evidence to suggest that the pair might have separated within a few years of their arrival.⁴¹ What is more certain is that their troubles with the law continued.

In 1854, Charles, then thirty-seven years old, was convicted at Kyneton in central Victoria of selling spirituous liquor without a licence and was sent to gaol for four months. His criminal record described him as ‘free’ but the comment ‘Not worthy of belief’ had been added. In 1864, again at Kyneton, he was convicted of larceny and sentenced to a year’s gaol. In September 1884, he died at the ‘Immigrants Home’ in Brunswick, a suburb of Melbourne, in 1853 where he had lived for the previous eight months. The cause of death was ‘general debility’. He was seventy-three.⁴²

Johanna’s first appearance in Victorian records – or, at least, the first that has been verified – was not until 1883, almost forty years after she had left VDL. On 8 November of that year, she was charged with being ‘idle and disorderly’ and committed to the Melbourne Gaol for twelve months. On 10 November of the following year, she was to be convicted of ‘vagrancy’ and ordered to spend another year in prison. From that time onwards she was almost continually in gaol. On four more occasions – 13 November 1885, 15 February 1887, 16 February 1888 and 26 February 1889 – she was convicted again of being ‘idle and disorderly’ and on each occasion, she was given a twelve-month sentence. She appears to have been transferred to the Geelong Gaol for some period on all occasions except the last.⁴³

The prison record shows her name at this time as ‘Ann Mouncey’ but also lists ‘Ann Bruce’ and ‘Annie Bruce’ as names by which she was known. Had she married again? To date, no record of a marriage between ‘Mouncey’, ‘Mouncey’, ‘Mounsey’ (and similar variants) and ‘Bruce’ has been found.⁴⁴

On 31 March 1889, just a month into her final twelve-month sentence, Johanna passed away at the Melbourne Gaol. The cause of death is shown as ‘old age and debility’. She was still only sixty-five.⁴⁵

³⁹ <http://www.maritimetas.org/collection-displays/displays/over-seas-stories-tasmanian-migrants/gold-rush-depression>; Alexander, A. (2014). *Tasmania's Convicts: How Felons Built a Free Society*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

⁴⁰ See ‘Research Notes’ on Johanna’s entry in the FCRC d/base at www.femaleconvicts.org.au.

⁴¹ No record of the two being together in Victoria has yet been found; see also Note 44, below.

⁴² Victorian Central Register of Male Prisoners (VPRS 515/P1, item 4, p.580); see also Immigrants’ Aid Society (1853 - 1902) at <https://www.findandconnect.gov.au/guide/vic/E000351>, death of Charles Mouncey, Vic Reg: 8034/1884.

⁴³ www.vagrantsandmurdereresses.com/record/12870; prisoner no. 5007; VPRS516, volume 9, p.34; VPRS24/PO, unity 1889/471 via www.femaleconvicts.org.au

⁴⁴ www.vagrantsandmurdereresses.com/record/12870; prisoner no. 5007; VPRS516, volume 9, p.34; VPRS24/PO, unity 1889/471 via www.femaleconvicts.org.au See Vic BDM at <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=vic+bdm>

⁴⁵ Johanna, death: Vic. Reg: 8317/1889 at <https://my.rio.bdm.vic.gov.au/efamily-history/5f8e60745ba49023fb9abef0/results?q=efamily>

