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ABSTRACT

This study examines the social role of the Church within the Hobart community with particular reference to Holy Trinity Church between 1833 and 1945. There were two Trinity Churches built in Hobart in the nineteenth century: the first, known as ‘Old Trinity’, was the chapel within the penitentiary precinct, built between 1831 and 1833 and the second known as ‘Holy Trinity’, was built nearby on the summit of Potter’s Hill between 1841 and 1849.

Holy Trinity adapted to the needs of the changing demography of Hobart, from penal colony to independent responsible Government, and therefore its social role covers an eclectic number of subject areas. Colonial and imperial records show that ‘Old Trinity’ was an integral part of penal reform being propagated in early nineteenth-century Britain where it was argued that the reformation and rehabilitation of the convict could be achieved through religious education delivered by the colonial chaplains.

The hill-top site chosen for the new Holy Trinity Church ensured that the sight and sound of its bells would play a meaningful religious and civic role in Hobart’s community. Trinity Parish was one of the largest and most densely-populated areas of Hobart. An analysis of the archives of the Church also indicates that it was also one of the poorest. This thesis, through the study of state records, institutional records, private papers, local and national newspapers, parish magazines, synod reports and diocesan newspapers, explores the extensive outreach of the Church to the growing number of destitute in Hobart. Their dire circumstances were compounded by the withdrawal of British Government services after the cessation of transportation and
the reluctance of the newly-formed Tasmanian Government to take responsibility for
the welfare of the poor and vulnerable in the community. The Church was
instrumental in setting up welfare societies, schools for vagrant children, refuges for
women and a home for female servants, thus situating this study within broader
historical studies of convicts, welfare, women and immigration as well as religion in the
nineteenth century.

In the twentieth century, the patriotic role played by the Church in times of war,
transcended the boundaries of the city of Hobart. During the Boer War, and the two
World Wars, the Church readily defended the honour of Britain. Church leaders
believed that the people were fighting ‘a holy war’, a twentieth-century crusade for
the vindication of liberty, justice, humanity and righteousness against the aggressor
nations. Holy Trinity clergy volunteered to be army padres, men and women enlisted,
while those left behind were encouraged to maintain their morale and industry, adopt
the principles of Moral Re-Armament, contribute to patriotic and comfort funds and
support the recreational ‘Hut’ for troops set up in Hobart city.
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Table 1: ENGLISH WEIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Weight</th>
<th>English Weight</th>
<th>Current Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 drachms (dr)</td>
<td>1 ounce (oz)</td>
<td>28.35g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000 grains</td>
<td>1 pound (lb)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 ozs</td>
<td>1 pound (lb)</td>
<td>0.453kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 lbs</td>
<td>1 stone (st)</td>
<td>6.35kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 st</td>
<td>1 quarter (qr) = 28 lbs</td>
<td>12.7kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 qrs</td>
<td>1 hundredweight (cwt) = 112 lbs</td>
<td>50.8kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 cwt</td>
<td>1 ton (tn)</td>
<td>1,016 kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1: Church of England Churches and Mission Churches of Hobart in Nineteenth Century

1 Holy Trinity Church, North Hobart
2 Old Trinity Church (Penitentiary Chapel)
3 St Margaret’s Mission Church, North Hobart
4 St David’s Cathedral, Hobart
5 St David’s Mission Church
6 St David’s Melville Street Mission Hall
7 St George’s Church, Battery Point
8 All Saints Church, South Hobart
9 St John The Baptist, West Hobart

1 Proeschel, Frederick, *Map and Select Directory of Hobart Town* (Hobart, 1858) (Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office).
INTRODUCTION

This thesis focuses on the Church and its social role within the Hobart community. It considers the outreach of the two ‘Trinity’ Churches, ‘Old Trinity’ and the newer Holy Trinity, between 1833 and 1945, from the point of view of meeting the changing needs of the community in those years. Situated in one of the poorest parts of Hobart, much of Holy Trinity’s outreach was directed at those on the lowest rungs of the social ladder. In this regard, this study differs from other studies of Tasmanian Church history which chronicle the tenures of those in authority at a diocesan level.¹

The British historian, K.D.M. Snell, argues that the notion of ‘community’ can have multiple meanings.² The scope of this study embraces three meanings. In the narrowest sense, it pertains to Trinity Parish as designated by the Diocese of Tasmania. In 1845, it was described as the largest parish with 7000 people.³ The boundaries of the parish were constantly being redrawn to accommodate the growing population and the setting up of new parishes on its borders.⁴ Parishioners were expected to use the parish church to consecrate life’s milestones, but even this was a ‘fluid’ situation as Holy Trinity tended to the deaths of the convicts in the Hobart Hospital and the inmates in the Brickfields Asylum, both institutions being outside the ‘official’ boundary of the parish.

¹ For example, Geoffrey Stephens, The Anglican Church in Tasmania: A Diocesan History to mark the Sesquicentenary: 1992 (Hobart, 1991); Peter Boyce, God and the City: A History of St David’s Cathedral Hobart (Hobart, 2012).
³ Letter of Trinity Subscription Committee to the parishes in Britain, 29 January 1845, p. 1, Holy Trinity Church Archives, (hereafter, HTCA).
⁴ St John the Baptist Parish West Hobart was established in 1845, formerly part of Trinity Parish. (Courier, 22 May 1845, p.2.)
Far from being narrowly parochial, Holy Trinity Church also served the wider Hobart community, indeed even the Diocese, with the appointment of the majority of its clergy to positions of Canons or Archdeacons of St David’s Cathedral or Vicar General in the absence of the Bishop. In practical terms, its philanthropic outreach served the city needs as well as its particular parish as the number of destitute needing support were too numerous for any of the city churches to minister alone. In one aspect Holy Trinity did serve the city alone in allowing its peal of bells to be used to announce important civic events.

In a broader context, Holy Trinity showed that its outlook was not insular or introspective on matters concerning the national and international community. This ‘globalised parochialism’ as K.D.M. Snell calls it, kept parishioners informed about events or people in countries on the other side of the world, such as the wars of the twentieth century, albeit through the filter of the editors of the diocesan newspaper and the parish magazine. Nonetheless, the people who read these two publications, gained a better insight into the course of the war and its consequences, and developed a sense of common purpose through the monthly publication of personal letters, accounts of military padres and reports of the many activities being undertaken on the home front.

Of particular importance for this study is the change from a penal colony under full Imperial control to independent responsible government. ‘Old Trinity’ was an integral

---

5 See Appendix D.
part of penal reform being propagated in early nineteenth-century Britain, where it was argued that the reformation and rehabilitation of the convict could be achieved through religious education delivered by the colonial chaplains. The focus on the mind rather than on corporal punishment was a new key element in Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur’s views on reformed penal practice.\(^7\)

Although not a well-endowed church in its early years and therefore unable to provide materially or financially for the poor, the second ‘Trinity’ Church, Holy Trinity’s clergy, their wives and devoted laity gave their full support to the joint Protestant philanthropic organisations set up mid-century within Hobart to support the growing number of destitute. Nineteenth-century philanthropy came with a number of stipulations, not least that only the ‘deserving poor’ should receive any assistance.\(^8\) This immediately precluded the many ex-convicts who lived in large numbers within Trinity Parish.\(^9\)

This study identifies the different vulnerable groups within colonial society needing assistance. The education of the poor was addressed with Holy Trinity’s clergy founding an industrial school for girls\(^10\) and governing a similar one for boys.\(^11\) These schools not only rescued vagrant girls and boys off the streets, but provided them with

---

\(^8\) Bishop Francis Nixon at the Inaugural Meeting of the Hobart Benevolent Society Hobart, held on 28 October 1859, *Daily Mercury*, 31 October 1859, p.3.


\(^10\) Minutes of the Hobart Town Female Refuge Association, 6 June 1862. (G31/1/1 University of Tasmania Archives:Special and Rare Collections, (hereafter UTA).

training that would ensure that they would lead useful lives in the future. The setting up of a refuge for ‘fallen women’, the provision for poor women during their pregnancies, the care of young unmarried mothers and their babies, the protection of female servants waiting for employment and the supervision of the infectious diseases hospital were all undertaken by the clergy’s wives, albeit as ‘silent’ work.

In other contexts, Holy Trinity responded to different social needs of the community. The Church was able to also extend a warm welcome to immigrants, particularly those from Germany by performing church services in their native language. Through its lay workers, the Church encouraged the working classes within the parish, to embrace the notion of ‘self-help’ and see the benefits of penny banking, temperance, hygiene, better sanitation, education for the young and leisure hours spent away from the numerous public houses in North Hobart. What began as a single mission room in the slums grew into a large Mission Hall by the end of the nineteenth century, where working class groups of men, women and the young could gather for education, recreation, worship and lectures—the Mission Hall became a central focus for a hitherto disparate neighbourhood.

The sense of community was also enhanced by the installation of eight bells in Holy Trinity’s belfry in 1847. The sound of the bells gave the wider Hobart community a

---

13 Maternal and Dorcas Minute Books, 9 July 1835- 24 March 1949, RS1/2/1, UTA.
14 Ibid., July 1892, p.694.
15 Colonial Times, 20 October 1856, p.2.
16 Church News, October 1890, p.348.
17 Mercury, 21 November 1870, p. 2 and 3 December 1870, p.3; Launceston Examiner, 24 November 1870, p.5.
sense of identity and linked their past lives in Britain to the new urban settlement of Hobart. The bells were not only used for religious purposes, but for civic events such as the Hobart Regatta, deaths of prominent civic leaders, marriages and birthdays in the royal family and the end of wars.

Again, in the twentieth century, Holy Trinity showed strong support for the war cause through the Boer War and both World Wars, championing the ties with the Mother Country. Holy Trinity, its clergy and parishioners stood out strongly in the Hobart community in showing unswerving loyalty to the sovereign who was the head of their Church. Holy Trinity had its own branch of the Union Jack Society and Home Comforts Fund as well as sending its clergy to be military padres on the front line or in military camps in Tasmania or abroad. Moral Re-Armament was encouraged to give the parishioners a different perspective on the causes of the war. A men’s group from Holy Trinity was responsible for setting up a ‘Hut’ in the city to give some creature comforts to the serving troops.

Significance and Contribution
This thesis will argue that both its location in the early colony and the particular clergy appointed as the church leaders destined Holy Trinity to be ‘different’ from other local

---

20 Courier, 4 December 1847, p.2.
21 Extract from Lady Caroline Denison’s Journal, 1 December 1847, quoted in Richard Davis and Stefan Petrow (eds.), Varieties of Vice-Regal Life (Van Diemen’s Land Section), (Hobart, 2004), pp.71-72.
22 Church News, July 1917, p. 3.
23 Church News. October 1915, p.4; November 1914, p.3; May 1940, p.2.
24 Synodal Address of 1938, p. A; Church News, April 1938, p.1; September 1939, p.10; Mercury, 17 August 1939, p.2; Church News, August 1939, p.2.
churches built at the same time. The first Trinity Church was situated inside the precinct of the Hobart Penitentiary and doubled as both a church and prison with solitary confinement cells for recidivist prisoners in its foundations. As well, the free population used it as a second church in the colony as the first church, St David’s, had become overcrowded. Complaints from both the free population and the convicts led to the building of the second Trinity Church on top of one of the prominent hills of Hobart, Potter’s Hill. Deliberately placed so that all residents might see it and hear its bells, Holy Trinity Church became an integral part of the lives of the wider Hobart community.

Its clergy covered by the years of this study, contributed to the development of colonial society in a number of ways. They not only were rectors of Holy Trinity, but many also held diocesan positions as Canons to the Cathedral, Archdeacons of the Tasmanian Diocese or Administrators of the Diocese in the absence of the Bishop.\(^{26}\)

The first incumbent, Philip Palmer, faced criticism and opposition from Government quarters, other clergy and the press during the building of Holy Trinity and it was largely due to his persistence that the building was finally completed over a period of eight years.\(^ {27}\) The second incumbent, Arthur Davenport was instrumental in providing education for vagrant girls, while George Shoobridge took a similar interest in rescuing boys from the streets of Hobart. Through the example of Donald Blackwood, first as curate and later as rector, Holy Trinity played an active role in the outreach to those serving in World Wars 1 and 2.

\(^{26}\) See Appendix D.

\(^{27}\) Palmer Letter Book, n.p., H TCA.
This thesis will argue that two significant events, the end to Transportation in 1853 and
the granting of responsible Government in 1855, considered as being desirable by the
free population in Tasmania, only exacerbated the problems of the poor. Left with a
void as to just who would be responsible for their existence, Holy Trinity, in concert
with the other Protestant churches in Hobart, stepped into the breach left by the
Imperial Government. Drawing on the example of philanthropic organisations in other
colonies and in Britain, two of the first Tasmanian welfare agencies, the Hobart City
Mission and the Hobart Benevolent Society were set up by ministers of the Church of
England to help the large number of destitute in the city.

This study will also argue that another unexpected by-product of the demand for a free
and independent Tasmania was the parishioners of Holy Trinity following suit in 1853
and demanding the right to choose their own minister, not the Bishop’s nominee. The
three-way dispute between the Crown, the Bishop and the people brought to a head
the issue of Church-State responsibilities in this distant colony. The raising of the
people’s voice challenged nineteenth century notion of unquestioning respect for a
Bishop.

This thesis will demonstrate that two further departures from tradition occurred at
Holy Trinity. In order to attract the working classes to church, a change in perspective
was required. The issue of charging pew rents to raise revenue to maintain the Church
was one tradition which had to be abandoned as the poor could not pay these dues.
This was one reason for the building of a ‘free’ and more modest Mission Hall further
away from the ‘mother church’ in the slums. The idea for a Mission Hall was very likely
copied from St David’s Cathedral which had set up one in the slum area of Wapping ten years earlier. Indeed, if we look further afield to the other early penal colony of New South Wales, we see a Mission Room was being built at the same time in inner Sydney by St Andrew’s Cathedral.\textsuperscript{28}

The second break with tradition was to include the laity with more responsibilities in the work of the parish. A number of men stepped forward to set up the ‘self-help’ groups designed to bring some order and dignity into the lives of the working classes. The initial work of Joseph Smales and Charles Grahame was later replaced with groups such as the Brotherhood of St Andrew and Lay Missioners’ Association taking on philanthropic and missionary work centred round the Mission Hall. The lay women also set up ‘self-help’ sewing groups and became ‘visitors’ to the homes of the poor, giving advice on hygiene and the efficient management of the home.

The role the Church played in times of war transcended the boundaries of Hobart. In the first half of the twentieth-century, Holy Trinity gave unquestioning support to Britain in three wars—the Second Boer War and World Wars 1 and 2. The clergy led by example, some serving as military padres abroad or in military camps; others encouraged their sons to enlist, showing that they were at one with the common people. All men, women and children were urged to do their part for the war effort. Apart from serving on the fronts, men could contribute to war projects such as the Church Huts Scheme; women could volunteer for the numerous Patriotic Funds and

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 22 July 1896, p.5.
gather items for the Comfort Fund, while children could raise funds for the victims of war left homeless and without food in Europe or China.

This thesis is divided into eight chapters, each examining a theme in the community outreach of Holy Trinity Church. Whilst the themes are diverse, ranging from the moral reform of convicts, Church-State responsibilities in appointment of chaplains, the importance of church bells in a nineteenth-century community and the patriotic stand for the Mother Country in three twentieth-century wars, a large part of this thesis concentrates on the provision of welfare for the vulnerable, both within Trinity Parish and in wider Hobart. It is this diverse range of themes which had an impact on the lives of the common man that prompted my decision to choose the time frame of 1833 (convict period) to 1945 (end of World War 2) for this thesis.

The course of this study has uncovered several perspectives of the Church’s involvement in the community that hitherto have not been recorded or examined. Thus, the impact of the peal of Holy Trinity bells on the Hobart community cannot be fully appreciated in the secular milieu of today. However, for the people of nineteenth-century Hobart, to be within sight and earshot of these bells gave a sense of belonging to a community, so important in a distant colony from the Mother Country. On a completely different note, the Church-State crisis of appointing a replacement chaplain for Holy Trinity has not been recorded or assessed in any literature on church history. Again, the extensive work of the laity in providing pragmatic programs of ‘self-help’ for the working classes leading to the establishment of the Mission Hall in the midst of the slums of North Hobart needs to be put on the public record. So too does the ‘silent
work’ of the women of the Church need to be recorded. By not having a ‘public face’ to their philanthropic work for ‘fallen women’ and abandoned children, their contribution has gone un-documented. Finally, the new evidence of plans for Holy Trinity Church to be the cathedral church for the new See of Tasmania is reasoned in Chapter 2, giving a new perspective to the importance of this church in early Hobart.

**Methodology and Sources**

Statistical analysis of data collected from Holy Trinity Church Archives is presented in Chapter 5. Using the data of the Baptismal Registers, a cross section of the population is taken to test the veracity of Philip Palmer’s assertion in 1845 that most of the potential parishioners in the new Holy Trinity Church were ex-convicts, the off-castings of Britain’s penal system. Samples were taken from the Baptismal Records as they were the most complete compared with the Marriage Registers and the Death Registers. To obtain a representative sample, a full year’s data was taken every five years between 1845 and 1875. Occupations of the Parishioners were recorded and divided into groups using the Nicholas-Shergold Skills Classification. This was applied in preference to the Tasmanian Government’s classification, which was used in the annual ‘Blue Books’ statistics sent back to Britain, as it was a closer reflection of nineteenth-century colonial society’s employment range. An additional category had to be added, ‘Private Means’, as the original classification did not make provision for colonists who had private income.

---

29 Letter of Trinity Subscription Committee to the parishes in Britain, 29 January 1845, pp. 1-2, HTCA.
30 See Appendix E.
Another source of data printed regularly in the *Hobart Town Gazette* was the *Valuation Roll for the City of Hobart Town*. The Roll’s property valuation was used for 1858,\(^{32}\) again to test the assertion that Trinity Parish was poverty stricken in the early years of Arthur Davenport’s incumbency. One shortfall in using the *Valuation Rolls* is that they only give the owner and lessee of a property, not the number of families living in cramped conditions in the dwellings. The raw data of both the above analyses were made into graphs which appear in Chapter 5 and confirmed that Trinity Parish was an extremely poor area.

Comparisons are made in this study only where they are valid or shed light on an issue. A transnational perspective is seen in the number of institutions or practices that are adopted from Britain: the City Mission, the House of Mercy, Penny Banking, Industrial Schools for Girls and Boys, the Mission to Seamen and the Moral Re-Armament campaign. The influence of General Synod meetings can be discerned in the adoption of similar measures between states, such as the Mission Halls, the Home for Migrant Women and the Church Hut Schemes. Within Tasmania, similar ideas were shared between Hobart and Launceston such as the Benevolent Society and Hope Cottage for unmarried mothers and their babies. Within Hobart itself, comparisons are made between Protestant Churches only to illustrate a difference or similarity. Thus, only St David’s Cathedral and Holy Trinity Church established a Mission Hall (or Church) —

---

\(^{32}\) *Hobart Town Gazette*, 16 March 1856, pp. 251-327.
other Churches chose to build almshouses for the poor or to provide ‘free’ Churches with no pew rentals.

Evidence for the erection of Old Trinity at imperial expense can be found in the official documents of the Colonial Government including the Colonial Office, the Home Office and the Colonial Secretary’s Office. Governor Arthur had a large input into the location, style and building materials of the early churches in the colony. His instructions to the Government architect at the time, John Lee Archer, for a building which was to be both a prison and a church were unique, but demonstrate his constant concern for saving costs for the Imperial Government.

Holy Trinity’s manuscripts are found in a number of locations— in the Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office (TAHO), at Holy Trinity Church and at a private residence. The documents at the latter two locations were not in any order and had to be audited and listed before commencing this study. These records, by no means complete, include letters, financial statements, vestry meeting minutes and parish council meeting minutes, which reveal the parlous state of the Church’s finances. As well, there are the minutes of a number of major outreach groups (Mothers’ Union, Friendly Societies, CEMS) which detail philanthropic work in the North Hobart area. Baptismal, Marriage and Burial registers indicate that a wide cross section of Hobart’s society looked to the Church for their life’s milestones but were not necessarily engaged in the

---

33 St Georges Church, Battery Point.  
34 St John the Baptist Church, West Hobart and All Saints Church, South Hobart.  
weekly worship at the Church (and the attendant financial commitment), particularly the working class.

As well, documents from the Convict Department, the Governor’s Office and the Public Works Department pertain to the erection of Holy Trinity Church as convict labour was used. The church’s architect, James Blackburn, was a convict, transported for forgery and the first master bellringer, William Champion was a convict, transported for theft.

The private papers of the clergy, Palmer, Davenport, Nixon and Blackwood although incomplete, give additional insight into ecclesiastical issues not necessarily those in the public domain. In like manner, the personal papers of Lieutenant-George Arthur give a frank assessment of the problems facing the early churches in Hobart Town and the dispute between the clergy, Philip Palmer and William Bedford.

Primary sources for the large number of welfare agencies include the minutes of the Girls’ Industrial School, the minutes of the Maternal and Dorcas Society, the minutes of the Hobart City Mission and the Casebooks of the Hobart Benevolent Society. The Tasmanian Parliamentary Papers have the annual reports for the Boys’ Industrial School and fill in the ‘gaps’ of welfare groups whose records are often incomplete.

Newspapers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries give reports, although irregular, on the Church’s activities. These need to be used judiciously as some do have a negative bias against the clergy. As well, there are the two Anglican
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36 For example, the Mercury, Colonial Times, Courier, Hobart Town Advertiser, Tasmanian Times, Clipper, Austral-Asiatic Review and the Illustrated Tasmanian Mail.
newspapers on microfilm at TAHO, the *Tasmanian Church Chronicle*, published only between 1852 and 1856 and the *Church News*, first published in 1862. Both these Anglican resources must be treated with some caution also: the former was deemed to be the mouthpiece of Bishop Francis Nixon; the latter, although valuable in recording events, rarely offers any criticism of the Church.

Early maps of Hobart Town show the changing demography of Hobart, generally and of North Hobart in particular. The rapid settlement north of Holy Trinity forming the working class slum near Brickfields, is one of the reasons given for the building of Holy Trinity’s Mission Hall in 1896.\(^\text{37}\) The early maps also show the close proximity of Old Trinity to the northern tributary of the Hobart Rivulet—consequently another reason given for building the ‘new’ Trinity was the stench from the nearby creek which had become polluted and therefore was offensive for worshippers.\(^\text{38}\)

Synod Reports (both Tasmanian and National) are helpful in detailing the work of the Anglican Church generally, but owing to their publication for public scrutiny, they tend to be heavily edited and free of controversy. What is probably more relevant to this thesis, but unrecorded except perhaps in private correspondence, is the sharing of ideas for outreach among the clergy. This might partly explain the parallel


\(^{38}\) Palmer Letter Book, n.p., HTCA.
development in Sydney and Hobart of Mission Churches and in Sydney, Melbourne and Hobart of ‘Huts’ to provide recreational activities for troops during World War 2.\textsuperscript{39}

A large number of miscellaneous manuscripts, scattered over three sites, include the bills promoting the fund raising concerts for the Church; newspaper cuttings in scrapbooks kept by members of the Holy Trinity congregation and the \textit{Holy Trinity Magazine} which gives a detailed monthly summary of the Church’s activities. Unfortunately, the latter is incomplete due partly to its ephemeral nature and partly to not being envisaged as valuable for future research.

The evidence for the crisis within Holy Trinity between 1853 and 1854 are located in the British Parliamentary Papers for the Colonies\textsuperscript{40} and the Tasmanian Parliamentary Paper devoted solely to the three-way struggle between the Bishop, the Lieutenant-Governor and the parishioners of Holy Trinity.\textsuperscript{41} Commentary on the problem is found in the \textit{Tasmanian Church Chronicle} and the local newspapers of those years.

This thesis’ focus on the social role of the Church situates it in a broad eclectic range of histories, including church, convicts, welfare, philanthropy, women, immigration and war. As church history, it can be placed alongside the study by Renate Howe and Shurlee Swain of the Wesley Central Mission,\textsuperscript{42} Peter Kaldor’s work on the Church’s

\textsuperscript{39} Church Huts were erected by the Anglican cathedrals in Sydney, Melbourne and Hobart during World War 2.


\textsuperscript{41} Legislative Council Sessional Paper, Van Diemen’s Land: Trinity Parish Correspondence, Vol. IV, No. 62, 1854.

\textsuperscript{42} Renate Howe and Shurlee Swain, \textit{The Challenge of the City: The Centenary History of Wesley Central Mission 1893-1993} (Melbourne, 1993).
outreach to the poor\textsuperscript{43} and Richard Broome’s research on the Protestant churches in New South Wales in the early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{44}

Secondary sources on the two Trinity Churches give useful overview, but do not provide much detailed insight into the work of the Churches. They include booklets on the Penitentiary Chapel by Brian Rieusset.\textsuperscript{45} These are directed at tourists who still visit the Old Trinity complex, which was converted to serve as the Law Courts of Tasmania between 1859 and 1983. Two parishioners, Frank Bowden and Max Crawford compiled \textit{The Story of Trinity} \textsuperscript{46} as ‘a keepsake’ for fellow parishioners for the centenary of Trinity Parish in 1833. This booklet borrows heavily from another shorter volume by one of the rectors, George Shoobridge, \textit{Notes on the History of Holy Trinity Parish, Hobart, Tasmania, 1833-1899}.\textsuperscript{47} A sequel, \textit{Supplement to the Story of Trinity} by Max Crawford,\textsuperscript{48} follows the same approach, taking the history up to the end of World War 2.

Another study of Holy Trinity by Peter Freeman and others is a comprehensive two-volume report, entitled \textit{Holy Trinity Church: Conservation Management Plan}, commissioned by the Hobart City Council in 2008 to make a thorough investigation of Holy Trinity’s state of disrepair and its historical significance. While this study is

\textsuperscript{44}Richard Broome, \textit{Treasure in Earthen Vessels: Protestant Christianity in New South Wales Society 1900-1914} (St Lucia, 1980).
\textsuperscript{46}Frank Bowden and Max Crawford, \textit{The Story of Trinity}, (Hobart. 1933).
\textsuperscript{47}G.W. Shoobridge, \textit{Notes on the History of Holy Trinity Parish, Hobart from 1833 to 1899}, (Hobart, 1899).
\textsuperscript{48}Max Crawford, \textit{Supplement to the Story of Trinity}, (Hobart, 1949).
detailed, its focus is on issues of heritage conservation, architectural significance, significant artefacts, costs of restoration, etc. It remains a valuable report in that it draws on the expertise of a number of professionals (architects, engineers, builders, restorers) and is the first and only detailed report of its kind available on the physical state of this historic church.

A diocesan history for Tasmania, *The Anglican Church in Tasmania* by Geoffrey Stephens is useful in the chronological overview of the whole diocese, parallel events which might impinge on Holy Trinity, the achievements (or conflicts) of each Bishop and a list of all clergy who have served in Tasmania. Relying heavily on Dorothea Henslowe’s older work, Stephens lists the churches constructed in each episcopal period. An earlier history of the diocese by the Warden of Christ’s College, W.R. Barrett, was published to mark the centenary of the foundation of the diocese in 1842. These diocesan histories, being written ‘from above’, do not mention the outreach of the Church to the poor. In contrast, the more recent study of the cathedral church of the diocese by Peter Boyce, while still focusing on the clergy, the Bishops and Deans of the day, does acknowledge its work among the disadvantaged in its parish, including Wapping and the Melville Street Mission area.

---

52 One diocesan history, which is the exception, is Brian Porter, *Melbourne Anglicans: the Diocese of Melbourne 1847-1997* (Melbourne, 1997), devotes one of its essays to the church’s outreach to the needy.

More general histories of religion in Australia raise many of the issues explored in this thesis. Ian Breward points to the significant contribution of the laity, largely unrecorded, in the role of the Church within the community. 57 Roger Thompson describes the thwarted attempts of the Church to raise the moral standards of both bond and free in early colonial Australia. 58 John Bollen examines the adjustments which the Church of England had to make with other Protestant churches after it had lost its status as the ‘Established Church’, 59 while Walter Phillips explains in detail the quaint practice of pew renting, a major obstacle to including the poor to worship in nineteenth-century churches throughout Australia. 60 The recent study of Hilary Carey, 61 explores a number of transnational themes including the relationship between religion and colonisation from the perspectives of the different denominations

54 Bruce Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia* (Melbourne, 2002).
56 Brian Fletcher, *The Place of Anglicanism in Australia: Church, Society and Nation* (Melbourne, 2008).
including the Church of England. The proliferation of colonial missionary societies in the mid-1840s was due to the concern of the British people for their fellow countrymen settling in distant colonies and needing adequate funds to establish churches and clergy to provide for their ongoing spiritual needs.

Other recent transnational histories have focused on the impact of imperialism on the Anglican Church in Australia. Rowan Strong and Michael Gladwin both emphasize the impact of the constitutional changes in Britain between 1828 and 1832 and their effects on the colonial church in the Australian colonies up to 1850.62 The passage of the Church Acts, which introduced pluralism into religious practice, on the one hand removed the Church of England from its privileged position of the ‘Established Church’, but on the other, was the stimulus to set up an independent episcopal church more suited to colonial conditions.

Secondary sources which identify some of the components of Lieutenant-Governor Arthur’s penal administration include the older studies of C.M.H. Clarke, M.C.I. Levy and A.G.L. Shaw.63 W.D. Forsyth’s evaluates the merits of these works and adds a further dimension in trying to assess the success of Arthur’s reform program for convicts by examining retrospectively the evidence presented before the Select

---

Committee on Transportation (1837-1838) before the British Parliament. Other more recent sources include legal historian, Alex Castles’ balanced view of Arthur’s administration, pointing out both the harsh and more humanitarian aspects of Arthur’s treatment of the convicts. More contemporary developments in convict historiography have seen revisionist historians scrutinising the activities of the Anti-Transportation League of the mid nineteenth-century.

The historiography of working with the poor or working classes can be found in two other different areas rather than in church history: social history and philanthropy. Both these bodies of study have a large intersection with the Church’s outreach to the poor. The same civic-minded philanthropists assisting the poor can also be found on the parish rolls.

From a social history standpoint, many writers have focused on the reasons why the Church has not been able to reach the working class and encourage them to attend church on Sundays. Reasons given are the secularisation of society in the nineteenth century; the influence of radical free thinkers; the distance of the Australian churches from the mother church in England and the long-established support networks in
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65 Alex Castles, *An Australian Legal History* (Sydney, 1982), pp.252-293.
67 Parish Rolls (Holy Trinity Church Archives) lists names such as Frank Bowden, Henry L. D’Emden and Frederick Stops.
English society.\textsuperscript{70} Pete Kaldor, Allan Grocott, H.R. Jackson and John Barrett claim that the working classes brought their poor attitudes towards the Church with them from Britain.\textsuperscript{71} British historian, Hugh McLeod, points to the working classes’ feelings of inferiority in having to attend church with their ‘social superiors’.\textsuperscript{72} Other British scholars such as Callum Brown, David Martin, Edward Norman and Simon Green\textsuperscript{73} see the very division of society into classes compounds the problem of the middle class reformers expecting the lower orders to embrace their values of clean living and sobriety.

A different perspective on the working classes’ attitude to the Church is presented by Jeffrey Cox, who contends that church attendance alone should not be the only evidence of the workers’ disregard for religion.\textsuperscript{74} Cox argues that the workers were not irreligious nor out of touch with the institutional church but practised ‘diffusive Christianity’.\textsuperscript{75} He cites as evidence the workers’ willingness to attend the sacramental milestones (baptism, marriage and death); to send their children to Sunday School; to accept ecclesiastical philanthropy and to attend the Autumn Harvest Festivals when the churches were decorated with fruit and vegetables and the New Year’s Eve

\textsuperscript{70} S.Piggin, \textit{Evangelical Christianity in Australia: Spirit, Word and World} (Melbourne, 1996), p.34.
\textsuperscript{74} Jeffrey Cox, \textit{The English Churches in a Secular Society, Lambeth, 1870-1930} (Oxford, 1982).
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., p.104.
Watchnight Services which were thought to bring good luck.\textsuperscript{76} The work of Hamish Maxwell-Stewart and Ian Duffield points to the large percentage of convict tattoos portraying religious symbols such as crucifixes and scenes of Christ’s crucifixion as further evidence of personal religious belief among the numerous ex-convicts who would have been living within Trinity Parish.\textsuperscript{77} Alison Vincent and Alan Atkinson identify that evidence of millenarianism, popular in Britain in the early nineteenth century, was practised as an alternative religion among some of the early settlers in the Australian colonies.\textsuperscript{78}

Philanthropic studies are the other major source of reaching out to the poor. Brian Dickey has published numerous studies on the development of social welfare,\textsuperscript{79} while Stephen Garton has looked at the broader backdrop of Australian welfare in his studies on welfare and poverty.\textsuperscript{80} Joan Brown’s early study of the development of social services in nineteenth-century Tasmania draws on her extensive experience as a social worker with public agencies, particularly the problems facing their administration.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., pp. 93, 102-103, 104
Her pioneering work offers a valuable overview for students of both social history and public administration.

Some British studies do not see philanthropy in a positive light: Brian Harrison argues that in order to give time and energy to charitable causes, only the ‘leisured classes’ could hold office in charities,\(^82\) while Alan Kidd makes a case that the motives of the wealthy in donating to charities were self-aggrandisement and status seeking through the publication of subscribers in newspapers.\(^83\) Other studies have concentrated on the motive of ‘social control’ of the working class masses to maintain social order and stability so desired by the middle class. The scholars, F.M.L Thompson, Richard Johnson and K.D.M. Snell\(^84\) argue that inculcating such values of orderliness, punctuality, cleanliness, deference and respect for property in the poor underpinned the establishment of philanthropic institutions such as Sunday Schools, temperance organisations, reading rooms, libraries and working men’s clubs.

Frank Prochaska’s comprehensive study of philanthropic outreach to women in Britain details several aspects of rescue work similar to those taken up by the Church in Hobart.\(^85\) These transnational practices are discussed in Shurlee Swain’s study of colonial and post-colonial philanthropy in Australia.\(^86\) Anne O’Brien’s substantial body

---

of work on philanthropy examines society’s attitude to the poor, particularly women caught up in a relentless cycle of destitution due in part to society’s limits on the availability of work for women.\textsuperscript{87}

Sources for the role played by Holy Trinity Bells are varied. The Hobart Bellringers maintain a website detailing the history of the bells, their uses and the activities of the bellringers,\textsuperscript{88} while Paul Cattermole, an English campanologist examines the history of bellringing in an English context.\textsuperscript{89} French historian, Alain Corbin, argues that the sense of community depends strongly on the ‘auditory space’ of church bells, giving all within earshot a sense of belonging.\textsuperscript{90} This was particularly pertinent for the colonists living in Hobart in the nineteenth-century.

Finally in times of war, the Church’s role extended beyond immediate Hobart, the main sources detailing the directives from the Primate of Australia or the Archbishop of Canterbury are recorded in the \textit{Church News} or the local newspapers. For the local patriotic response, the \textit{Trinity Parish Magazine} is an invaluable primary source. Secondary sources include for the Boer War, John Bufton and Peter Warwick’s detailed accounts.\textsuperscript{91} Michael McKernan’s study of World War 1,\textsuperscript{92} examines the ministry of the

---


\textsuperscript{88} Bell Ringing in Hobart http://members.iinet.net.au/~dnichols/bells/ht_catalog/details/077.html.

\textsuperscript{89} Paul Cattermole, \textit{Church Bells and Bell-Ringing: A Norfolk Profile} (Woodbridge, 1990).


\textsuperscript{91} John Bufton, \textit{Tasmanians in the Transvaal War} (Launceston, 1905); Peter Warwick (ed.), \textit{The South African War: The Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902} (London, 1980).
military padres, while Alan Wilkinson’s work provides the specific detail of the Anglican Church’s contribution to World War 1 in Britain, so often lacking in secular histories.  

Charles Jackson’s claim to have written the official account of the Australian Comforts Fund during World War 2, omits the considerable effort of establishing the Church Hut in Hobart by Holy Trinity’s Church of England Men’s Society.

**Structural Summary**

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the social role of the Church within the Hobart community. In particular, it focuses on the Church’s response to the varying needs of the common people, many of whom were very poor, as Tasmania changed from a penal colony to independent responsible Government. This thesis is divided into eight chapters, with an Introduction and a Conclusion. While following a broad overarching chronological format, each chapter picks up a particular theme of the outreach of the Church between 1833 and 1945.

**Chapter 1: Building the First Trinity Church for Convicts of the Penitentiary, 1831-1833.**

In keeping with the new ideas in penal reform of the early nineteenth-century, the first Trinity was a large chapel built as part of Hobart Town’s Penitentiary precinct between 1831 and 1833. A focus on the moral reform of the convict through religious education was coupled with the benefits of solitary reflection which could be achieved by the sixteen solitary confinement cells built beneath the chapel. This first Trinity Church

---

also doubled as a parish church for the growing free population, but complaints about having to share a common place of worship with convicts led to the chapel being closed to the public in 1845. This showed the obstacles in the way of building a sense of community in the penal era.

Chapter 2: Building the Second Trinity Church for the Free Settlers and Ex-Convicts of Hobart Town, 1841-1849. This chapter examines the many impediments which had to be overcome in order to satisfy the demands of the free colonists for a separate parish church and to provide a place to worship for the ex-convicts who were leading dissolute lives and resorting to spending Sundays in the local public houses. Lieutenant-Governor Arthur believed the free population needed religious instruction as much as the convicts. Both the site and the lack of funding together with the economic depression of the 1840s, were the biggest hurdles for the first incumbent, Philip Palmer, to overcome. In addition, he had to contend with a shortage in the supply of building materials, recalcitrant convict labour, illegal contracts, incompetent builders and changes to the decoration on the Church by the convict architect, James Blackburn. Palmer sought subscriptions from supporters in Britain to finish the building, the whole process taking eight years. The question of whether Holy Trinity was intended to be the new cathedral in the city rather than a parish church is raised with the uncovering of new primary evidence.

Chapter 3: A Divided Community: the Petition of the People to Choose a New Chaplain, 1853-1854. This chapter investigates a crisis within Trinity Parish community. With the death of Philip Palmer in 1853, the people put forward their own nominee, James
Medland, the convict chaplain at the Hobart Penitentiary, approved of by Lieutenant-Governor Denison but refused by Bishop Nixon. This chapter explores the notion of ‘people power’, already evident mid-century with the wider community’s demand to end transportation and the granting of responsible Government to the colony. The appointment of Arthur Davenport as the new incumbent satisfied all parties without any loss of face. The issue brought into focus one of the problems of transplanting a Church into a penal colony, exacerbated by constitutional changes in Britain between 1828 and 1832, and just who was responsible for appointing colonial chaplains.

Chapter 4: A Sense of Community in a Distant Colony: the Bells of Holy Trinity, 1847-1900. The installation of a peal of eight bells into the tower of Holy Trinity in 1847 was seen from the beginning as a service to the whole Hobart Town community. They were used not only for religious services, but for civic occasions such as Regatta Day, the death of a prominent politician, the milestones in the Royal family or the end of a war. The people of Hobart were asked to learn the art of bellringing, to understand the intricacies of change ringing through public lectures, contribute to the bells’ upkeep by donation or supporting fund raising concerts. The bells were the only peal in the city until 1936 and brought a sense of nostalgia for the Old Country as well as a sense of community for the colonists’ new home in the distant colony.

Chapter 5: A Mission Church for the Poor: A Change in Perspective, 1850-1900. An examination of Holy Trinity records reveals that the Church ministered to a poor population made up of the working class, ex-convicts and those still under sentence. Of concern to the clergy was the fact that these people did not attend church except
for baptisms, funerals and the occasional marriage. With the assistance of the laity, a Mission Hall was set up in the slums to encourage the poor to adopt the principles of ‘self-help’ and learn skills to improve their lives, to meet socially and worship in a plain unadorned building, free of the ceremony associated with traditional nineteenth-century churches. The Mission Hall created a sense of meaningful community for a disparate people.

Chapter 6: Church’s Philanthropic Response to Hobart’s Poor, 1850-1900 This chapter examines the Hobart community’s response to the growing number of destitute people in the city, exacerbated by the withdrawal of Imperial support for such people with the cessation of transportation and the granting of responsible Government. With no Poor Law in the colony and the new state Government slow to assume responsibility, it fell to the combined operations of the Protestant Churches in the city to care for the poor and the vulnerable through a number of welfare agencies. The Church leaders called the inaugural meetings to establish the City Mission and the Benevolent Society, while George Shoobridge, Rector of Holy Trinity, assumed the governance of the Kennerley Boys’ Home. Another vulnerable group, the newly-arrived migrants from Germany, were cared for and ministered to in their native tongue.

Chapter 7: Rescue Work of Women and Girls in Hobart by the Women of the Church, 1850-1900. This chapter records the extensive ‘silent’ philanthropic work carried out by the wives of the clergy to rescue abandoned girls and destitute women living on the streets of Hobart between 1850 and 1900. An Industrial School for Girls, the Maternal and Dorcas Society, a Penitents’ Home, a Lock Hospital, a House of Mercy and Hope
Cottage for unmarried mothers and their babies were set up and managed by these women. The mid-nineteenth-century notion of giving aid only to the ‘deserving poor’ was gradually abandoned as more enlightened ideas filtered into the colony from newly-arrived women from Britain such as the Bishop’s wife, Maud Montgomery and the Governor’s wife, Teresa Hamilton.

Chapter 8: For God, King and Country: the Church’s Role in the Boer War, World War 1 and World War 2. This chapter investigates Holy Trinity’s ‘globalised parochialism’, the awareness of the needs of the national and international community. Holy Trinity gave strong support for the war cause through the Boer War and both world wars, championing the ties with the Mother Country and showing unswerving loyalty to the sovereign, the head of the Church of England. Holy Trinity had its own branch of patriotic and comfort funds as well as sending its clergy to be military padres on the front line or in military camps. Church ‘Huts’ were set up in Egypt and France to give serving troops a place for recreation and spiritual counsel. Holy Trinity’s branch of Church of England Men’s Society was responsible for setting up a ‘Hut’ in Hobart for serving troops on leave during World War 2.

A Note on Terminology

The terms used in this thesis reflect the common usage of the nineteenth century and in no way reflect my personal opinion or attitude to the subject matter. ‘Fallen Women’ was commonly used to describe women professed to be engaged in prostitution, while women or girls ‘at risk’ referred to females who were supposedly keeping the company of prostitutes. ‘Rescue Work’ was a term used by the middle
classes as they attempted to remove women and girls from these situations. ‘Inmates’ was used frequently to refer to women under supervision in the refuges or girls at the Industrial Schools. The ‘Lock’ Hospital, referred to the Hospital for Contagious Diseases, set up to treat syphilis in the late 1870s.

Ecclesiastical terms such as ‘rector’ were not used in Tasmania until sanctioned by the Tasmanian Synod in 1896. Up until that time, I have used ‘Chaplain’. The titles of ‘Canon’ and ‘Archdeacon’ have been omitted for the clergy, Shoobridge, Davenport and Blackwood, simply because this study does not follow a strictly chronological structure which would reflect their promotions.

---

95 Church News, 1 May 1896, p.467.
CHAPTER 1

BUILDING THE FIRST TRINITY CHURCH FOR CONVICTS OF THE PENITENTIARY,
1831-1833

...punishment is ineffectual unless a Man is made sensible of his degradation...the Reformation of the convict ... [is] an important feature in a Convict colony...

(Arthur to Huskisson, 14 April 1828, HRA III, vii, pp. 118-119.)

Introduction

So wrote Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur (1784-1854) to the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, William Huskisson (1770-1830) in 1828. Arthur had already been in Van Diemen's Land for four years and had formulated clear ideas as to how he would run this penal colony. Efficiency, consistency and diligence were the hallmarks of his administration. Scholars such as C.M.H. Clarke, M.C.I. Levy, A.G.L. Shaw and W.D. Forsyth have documented the strict regimen of Arthur’s tenure, but more recent scholars such as Alex Castles and Alan Lister have acknowledged that there was a more humane side to the Lieutenant-Governor’s administration. This chapter will

---


concentrate on the measures taken to implement a number of the nineteenth-century reforms in penal practice in the colony during his term of office.

Being a devout Calvinist,4 Arthur held the view that all ‘lost’ souls of the convicts should have the chance of redemption through reformation. This more considerate approach would be achieved through religious education, delivered by the colonial chaplains either on their visits to the gaols, houses of correction (‘factories’), convict outstations or in the churches in this infant colony. To that end, the calibre of the chaplains was vitally important for they had to have both the vitality and the ability to reach out to the felons. In like manner, the free settlers were required to lead godly lives themselves, to be consistent in their ministrations and be examples of high principled living to the convicts.

The building of the first Trinity Church, in the precinct of the Penitentiary in Campbell Street, Hobart Town between 1831 and 1833, was a direct response to Arthur’s axiom that transportation of felons must have a reformatory purpose as well as a punitive one. Moreover, in order to cut costs to the Imperial Government, the establishment of a church such as Trinity would double as a parish church, and give the free population a chance to enjoy some of the familiar institutions associated with the Home Country.

From the start then, the early Trinity Church, although erected in the grounds of a Penitentiary, was built to serve the population at large—both bond and free. The actual timing and site chosen for this second colonial church were the result of three

major factors: first, the overcrowding of the one existing church at the centre of Hobart Town; second, the implementing of new ideas in penology, including the mandatory reform of the convict, being promulgated in Britain at the time; and third, the attempt to further cut costs for the Home Government in building a very utilitarian church which would serve two unique needs: a chapel for worship and solitary confinement cells for recidivist prisoners.

**St David’s Church, Hobart Town**

St David’s Church, in Macquarie Street, Hobart Town, was built with convict labour between 1817 and 1822 (See Figure 2). Although officially consecrated in 1823 by the Reverend Samuel Marsden, the most senior chaplain in the colony of New South Wales (including Van Diemen’s Land) at that time, it had been in use since April 1819,
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incomplete though it was without any windows.\(^6\) Governor Lachlan Macquarie had recommended that a church be built on his first visit to Van Diemen’s Land in 1811, but not as a first priority— a military barracks and a colonial hospital were to be built first.\(^7\)

The new church was ‘a sizeable building; 88ft 8ins in length and 44ft 10ins in width.’\(^8\) It was designed to seat 832 people,\(^9\) of whom 442 would be in the galleries.\(^10\) The Governor, civic leaders and the free settlers had pews in the body of the church, for which they paid pew-rent, while the convicts and the military sat on benches in the galleries which ran down two sides of the church. The population of Hobart Town in 1819 had reached 3,292\(^11\) (See Table 2).

During the 1820s, with the further increase in population of both free settlers and convicts, the capacity of this one church was stretched to its limits. In his diary, the Reverend Robert Knopwood (1761-1838), the first Senior Chaplain, often commented that the new church was already ‘very full’.\(^12\) By 1825, he was commenting that ‘the church was very much crowded ... morn and eve.’\(^13\) The Land Commissioners supported this view in their 1826 Report on Public Buildings in Hobart: ‘There is at present only One Church built which ... probably will soon be found insufficient for the
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\(^9\) Nicholls, *Diary of Knopwood*, p. 347.


\(^12\) Nicholls, *Diary of Knopwood*, p.329.

\(^13\) Ibid, p. 450.
inhabitants.’ Mrs Prinsep, a visitor to Hobart Town, recorded in her journal in 1830 that ‘the members of the Church of England establishment will soon require another building for the accommodation of their increasing population, if one may judge from the overflowing congregation of the present church.’

Table 2 Statistics of Van Diemen’s Land, 1819
(Taken from General Muster October and November 1819)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Derwent</th>
<th>Port Dalrymple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Convict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in South</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td>Total in North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in VDL</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Historical Records of Australia, Series III, Vol. iii, p. 585)

Various changes were implemented to try to address the overcrowding problem. First, the number of services each Sunday was increased to three. The first service, at 9 o’clock, was for the convicts in indentured service and ticket-of-leave convicts. This was followed by a service at 11 o’clock for the free people and the military and a final service at 3 o’clock, which the convicts in the barracks were expected to attend for a
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16 Hobart Town Gazette, 5 July 1823, p.1.
second time in the day. This latter service was changed to 6 o’clock in 1823\textsuperscript{17} and an additional service added in the evening in 1829 to be taken by Reverend James Norman (1789-1868).\textsuperscript{18} These measures were only partly successful because the number of colonists continued to rise and the building of another church became a protracted issue between Lieutenant-Governor Arthur, advised by Archdeacon Thomas Scott (1783-1860), and the Secretary of State. The chief concern was cost to the Home Government. In 1828, Arthur reported that he had overspent his budget by £22,465\textsuperscript{19} and Archdeacon Scott’s estimates for the ecclesiastical needs for Van Diemen’s Land had been rejected by Lord Bathurst as being too expensive.

The second measure to alleviate the overcrowding of St David’s came as some surprise as it was adopted by Arthur, a devout member of the ‘established’ Church of England. He allowed, even encouraged other Protestant denominations, as well as the Roman Catholics to set up their own churches in Hobart Town – Wesleyans, Presbyterians and Congregationalists all held services either in new churches or in makeshift premises. By 1830, a visitor to the colony commented on the ‘three chapels’ belonging to the Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, and Presbyterian denominations.\textsuperscript{20} While these churches went some way towards meeting the needs of the colonists, particularly the Scots and the Irish, the majority of the colonists belonged to the Church of England, at least nominally. Provision for these other denominations was to be an ongoing concern of

\textsuperscript{17} Hobart Town Gazette, 17 October 1823, p.2.
\textsuperscript{18} Hobart Town Courier, 23 May 1829, p.2.
\textsuperscript{19} Arthur to Huskisson, 1 May 1828, HRA III, vii, p.294.
\textsuperscript{20} Prinsep, Journal of a Voyage, p. 62.
Arthur in reaching out to the spiritual needs of all colonists, not just members of the ‘established church’.

A third measure adopted to relieve pressure on St David’s was to examine if more parishioners could be seated in the building by removing pews and reorganising their configuration.  

21 (See Fig. 3) This caused some outcry in the community because the benches for the local Orphan School were some of the seating removed to make way for more convicts. Plans were drawn up by the Government architect, John Lee Archer, to see if the church could be enlarged.  

22 As early as 1820, when the church was still being built, Commissioner Bigge had foreboded trouble with its construction when he

Figure 3: St David’s Church Hobart Town (Plan for Reconfigured Seating)  
(PWD 266/324, TAHO)

---


22 Plan - St David’s Church, Hobart Town. Architect, J. Lee Archer. 1 January 1828 to 31 December 1828. PWD 266/1/316 (Tasmanian Archives and Heritage Office, hereafter TAHO).
commented that its ‘workmanship ... was defective’. Later, the shoddy workmanship of the convict builders became apparent with the misalignment of a wall (up to twelve inches out of alignment), poorly tempered clay bricks and one wall needing to be completely rebuilt. In 1830, a tender was accepted for alterations costing £1,200. This closed the church for some eighteen months, not reopening until 25 December 1831.

The people of Hobart were strident in their complaints. Many claimed they were being forced to absent themselves from Divine Service because there was ‘insufficient accommodation for one third of the church-going population.’ Others said modifications to the existing structure was a waste of time and money and brought little advantage to the public. It was estimated that the additional thirty six seats would end up costing £38 each. The diarist, G.T.W.B. Boyes described the modifications as ‘barbarously’ destructive of the proportions of St David’s. Dr Ross, editor of the Hobart Town Almanack (1832) on the other hand, claimed that the complaints of the colonists like Boyes, were ‘too insignificant’, given only one sixth of the population could attend church at a given time.

These complaints provided the catalyst for Lieutenant-Governor Arthur to instruct the Government architect, John Lee Archer to draw up plans for a second church, to be

---

23 Karl Von Stieglitz, The Story of the Pioneer Church in Van Diemen’s Land (Hobart, 1954), p. 34.
27 Colonial Times, 6 July 1831, p. 2.
28 Colonial Times, 19 October 1831, p. 2.
29 Colonial Times, 28 December 1831, p. 2.
31 Ibid.
built on the vacant block above the convict barracks in Campbell Street. These barracks had been built in 1822\textsuperscript{32} during the tenure of Lieutenant-Governor Sorell, to house one hundred convict men who were either awaiting assignment to settlers or who were employed in public works in chain gangs or in the lumber yard on the water front. In 1827, Arthur had decided against building a new penitentiary because of the ‘burdensome’ expense involved.\textsuperscript{33} Rather, he chose to improve the existing arrangements and structures. Consequently, the Campbell Street barracks slowly evolved during the 1820s to include elements of a penitentiary, with additions to the barracks to hold four hundred men,\textsuperscript{34} the installation of tread wheel in 1828\textsuperscript{35} and the erection of a Superintendent’s house within the walls of the complex.\textsuperscript{36} The building of the second church or chapel on this site would relieve the overcrowding at St David’s in that the convicts would not have to attend divine service there. The inclusion of a chapel within the penitentiary complex also reflected the growing practice in Britain to place chapels inside the new penitentiaries such as Millbank opened in 1816 in London.\textsuperscript{37} In these, the role of the prison chaplains was seen as a vital link in the process of reforming the convict and helping him or her to see the errors of their past lives.\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[32] \textit{Hobart Town Gazette and Van Diemen’s Land Advertiser}, 27 April 1822, p.1.
\item[34] Arthur to Huskisson, 1 May 1828, \textit{HRA III, vii}, p. 300.
\item[35] \textit{Hobart Town Courier}, 16 February 1828, p. 2.
\end{footnotes}
Growth in Free Population

Despite its prison origins, Hobart Town prospered commercially so that by 1827, Arthur was describing it as ‘the Alexandria of these seas.’ The population increased significantly in the 1820s for reasons which are many and complex. Apart from the official statistics given in the annual returns of these years, early maps of Hobart Town show the altered demographic with the more wealthy immigrants establishing homes north of the original Sullivan Cove settlement in New Town and the poorer families settling around the penitentiary. There were several factors responsible for the rise in population, including the publication in Britain of several books favouring emigration; the advertising in the British papers of the advantages of emigration; the publication of Parliamentary reports in Britain and the changed policy of the Home Government towards commerce in the penal colony.

The official Government returns show the huge increase in population in the 1820s for the free population in Van Diemen’s Land and Hobart Town in particular. During this decade, the population of this township had more than trebled to 3,500 (See Table 3). The need for a second church was urgent, given the existing one was designed to seat only 832 persons. Added to this, the same statistics show an increase in the number of convicts whose ranks had swollen by an additional 1,000.


Table 3  
Hobart Town’s Population 1820 and 1830

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Convict</th>
<th>Hobart Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The early maps of Hobart Town also show the changing face of Hobart Town.\textsuperscript{41} (See Figure 4) The population, particularly the working class, was clearly spreading to the north and west of the town’s centre due to two reasons: first, workers were choosing to live within walking distance of their work in the town centre;\textsuperscript{42} and second, many dwellings were built near the new prisoner barracks and penitentiary, where families preferred to be near their relatives ‘serving time’.

The Land Commissioners in their Report of 1826 advocated building a new church in this densely populated area north of Sullivan’s Cove, on a ‘hill between Elizabeth Street and Argyle Street.’\textsuperscript{43} As well, the wealthier and free settlers were beginning to build more substantial homes in elevated positions out at New Town.\textsuperscript{44} The new church, named ‘Trinity’ after the recently-formed parish, would be well-placed to serve this diverse population.

Published accounts of the advantages to be gained by emigrating to Van Diemen’s Land abounded in Britain in the 1820s. For free migrants with some capital and testimonials about their character and prospects, it was in their interests to gain as much information about the distant colony as possible. Their whole desire was to make it an economic success, either as ‘workers or as entrepreneurs’,\textsuperscript{45} which would give them a better standard of living than that which they currently had in Britain. Just

\textsuperscript{41} George Frankland, \textit{Hobart c.1839}, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{42} Patsy Adam-Smith and Joan Woodberry, \textit{Historic Tasmania Sketchbook} (Hong Kong, 1977), p.128.
\textsuperscript{43} McKay, \textit{Journals of the Land Commissioners} p. 102.
\textsuperscript{44} Adam-Smith and Woodberry, \textit{Historic Tasmanian Sketchbook}, p.128.
\textsuperscript{45} Brian Fletcher gives this as the motive of free settlers to eastern Australia in ‘Christianity and free society in New South Wales 1788-1840’, \textit{Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society}, Vol. 86, No. 2, 2000, p.93.
as important, financial success would enhance social status and lead to these upper working class families becoming ‘gentry’. 46

In the 1820s, there were several publications in print which gave varying degrees of accuracy as to the conditions and prospects in Van Diemen’s Land. Edward Curr (1798-1850), a merchant, William Charles Wentworth (1790-1872), an explorer and landowner, George Evans (1780-1852), a surveyor and Henry Widowson (1774-1858), a farmer, gave realistic descriptions of Van Diemen’s Land having the potential of being a profitable ‘Little England’. 47 What was needed were hard working Englishmen, who could improve the inefficient and unproductive agricultural practices of the local inhabitants. A potential fortune lay in wool production and marketing. Tracts of land could be procured on presentation of the new migrant’s credentials to the lieutenant-governor, although Lloyd Robson points out that the description of the land did not necessarily match the reality and the cost of buying farm implements was prohibitive. 48

Ships’ commanders, who had made several trips to Van Diemen’s Land with passengers or supplies, wrote of their observations and prospects of the penal colony. Commander James Dixon (1786-1866), Lieutenant Charles Jeffreys (1782-1826) and

46 Accounts of free settlers’ changed lives can be found in James Boyce, Van Diemen’s Land (Melbourne, 2009), pp.213-215 and Sharon Morgan, Land Settlement in Early Tasmania: Creating an Antipodean England (Cambridge, 1992), pp.44-46.
47 Edward Curr, Account of the Colony of Van Diemen’s Land, principally designed for the use of Emigrants (London 1824), pp.79-84, 144-146, 148; William Charles Wentworth, Statistical, Historical and Political description of new South Wales and it dependent settlements in Van Diemen’s Land (London 1820), p.183; George Evans, Geographical, Historical and Topographical description of Van Diemen’s Land with important hints to Emigrants (London, 1822) pp. 27-32; Henry Widowson, Present State of Van Diemen’s Land; comprising an account of its agricultural capabilities, with observations on the present state of farming etc. pursued in that colony: and other important matters connected with Emigration (London 1829), pp. 141 ff.
Captain T. Betts gave practical advice regarding the type of goods to bring from Britain, how to obtain land grants and the building regulations in Hobart Town.\textsuperscript{49} Van Diemen’s Land was recommended over Sydney because of its more pleasant climate, the fertility of the soil, the beauty of the country and the ‘rustic paradise’ was destined to be one of the most valuable assets of the British Empire, according to Governor Lachlan Macquarie.\textsuperscript{50}

Another source of information for would-be emigrants were articles and letters published in British newspapers between 1820 and 1830 on the prospects of success in Van Diemen’s Land. Some were effusive in their praise of the antipodean colony as offering a new and better life for the intending migrant, particularly those from urban London and Edinburgh and the new industrial cities such as Leeds.\textsuperscript{51} The residents of Leeds were encouraged by a future life being the combination of the ‘climate of Italy, the mountain scenery of Wales, [and] the fertility of England.’\textsuperscript{52} Other newspapers gave pragmatic advice on the equipment needed and what personal effects to bring from Britain.\textsuperscript{53} Information about the most successful crops, even exotic crops such as


\textsuperscript{50} Dixon, \textit{Narrative of a Voyage}, pp. 133-134.

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Caledonian Mercury}, 3 January 1824, p. 4, 9 October 1823, p. 4 and 17 November 1823, p. 4; \textit{Leeds Mercury}, 29 August 1829, p. 4; \textit{Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle}, 29 December 1823, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Leeds Mercury}, 3 January 1824, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Caledonian Mercury}, 19 February 1824, p. 4 and 5 July 1824, p. 4, 13 December 1824, p. 3; \textit{Morning Chronicle}, 20 September 1826, p. 4 and 26 September 1826, p. 1.
tobacco\textsuperscript{54} and grapes,\textsuperscript{55} the best breeds of sheep and cattle and the cost of basic provisions such as meat (mutton and beef), bread, tea and sugar were given.\textsuperscript{56}

Firm advice was given to the poorer class of emigrant, ‘those without sufficient capital,’ to understand that they would not necessarily be successful in the new colony\textsuperscript{57} and they could ‘be doomed to a life of labour, to which servitude in England is comparative happiness.’\textsuperscript{58} On the other hand, there was ample work for artisans and wealthy emigrants were encouraged to ‘bring with them two carpenters, a smith, two brick-layers [and] a stone mason.’\textsuperscript{59}

Magazines of the day, with a circulation among the more well-to-do classes in Britain, also carried articles on Van Diemen’s Land. In July 1919, the \textit{Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal}, a liberal-Whig periodical, printed excerpts from W.C. Wentworth’s guide for emigrants,\textsuperscript{60} while the \textit{Quarterly Review}, a Tory magazine, also published excerpts of Wentworth’s guide as well as relevant passages from Curr’s account of Van Diemen’s Land.\textsuperscript{61} By the early 1830s, for the working classes the \textit{Penny Magazine} ran two articles on Van Diemen’s Land\textsuperscript{62} based on the information gathered by James Ross in his \textit{Almanac of 1831} and concluding that that colonial settlement was a ‘young but advanced and flourishing society.’\textsuperscript{63} Hobart Town was portrayed as a very respectable

\textsuperscript{54} Caledonian Mercury, 1 February 1823, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{55} Morning Chronicle, 6 October 1824, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{56} Caledonian Mercury, 4 April 1822, p. 2 and 19 February 1824, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{57} Morning Chronicle, 26 September 1826, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{58} Caledonian Mercury, 4 April 1822, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{59} Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle, 29 December 1823, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{60} Edinburgh Review, Vol. 139, July 1819, pp.25-48.
\textsuperscript{61} Quarterly Review, Vol. 32, June and October 1825, pp. 311-342.
\textsuperscript{62} Penny Magazine, Vol. 1 March 1832 and Vol. 2 April, 1832.
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid, Vol. 1, March 1832, p.3.
place to live with wide streets, public buildings, parish church, Government schools, banks and libraries. Its industries included a distillery, breweries, timber mills, tanneries, flour mills and soap and candle works.\textsuperscript{64} Again, the \textit{Saturday Magazine}, read by the working classes, began publishing articles on Van Diemen’s Land and the advantages of emigration for the colony in 1832.\textsuperscript{65}

The British newspapers and magazines were not the only sources of information for the intending migrant. He could also read the Parliamentary reports ordered to be printed by the House of Commons. Four reports on Emigration appeared in the 1820s, describing the stark contrast of socio-economic conditions in Britain, in particular the rising population and the degradation of wages on the one hand, and the unoccupied lands to be taken up in the Australian Colonies on the other.\textsuperscript{66} These reports clearly set out how a prospective emigrant could apply for a passage to the colonies through the Board of Emigration, secure financial assistance and the potential wage which might be expected on arriving in the colony.\textsuperscript{67} For the impoverished, displaced agricultural labourer or the desperate city dweller living in squalor as a result of the revolution in manufacturing or the demobilised military from the Napoleonic Wars, a new life in a new land would have sounded appealing.

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Penny Magazine}, Vol. 2, April 1832, p.10.
\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Saturday Magazine} Vol. 1, July 1832, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{67} Report from the Select Committee on Emigration, Vol. IV, No. 404, 1826, HCPP, pp 4-11; Report from the Select Committee on Emigration, Vol. 1, No. 88, 1827, HCPP; Second Report from the Select Committee on Emigration, Vol. 2, No. 237, 1827, HCPP; Third Report from the Select Committee on Emigration, Vol. 223, No. 550, 1827, HCPP.
The other Parliamentary reports which had a great impact in Britain were the publication of Commissioner John Thomas Bigge’s (1780-1843) three reports into the colony of New South Wales, including Van Diemen’s Land, published between 1822 and 1823.\textsuperscript{68} Bigge’s brief had been clearly set out in his Commission, issued by Lord Bathurst in 1819.\textsuperscript{69} He was to investigate every aspect of colonial life — judicial, civil, ecclesiastical, and trade and commerce. In the course of his enquiry, he was to take statements from all colonists— convicts, free settlers, military and civil servants.

Bigge spent three months in Van Diemen’s Land where he took the required evidence. What was interesting for potential emigrants was Bigge’s description of the main towns, Hobart Town and Port Dalrymple and his accounts of farming and commerce. He gave a clear message to intending migrants that a better standard of living could be had in Van Diemen’s Land than in Britain.\textsuperscript{70} He made farming sound attractive by describing large tracts of land having a reliable water supply, needing little clearing of timber, having an absence of disease, regular seasons and no drought—in summary making settling in Van Diemen’s Land ‘a preference in the estimation of settlers over the colony of New South Wales.’\textsuperscript{71} The assignment of convicts to settlers provided


\textsuperscript{69} Bathurst to Bigge, 5 January 1819, \textit{Historical Records of Australia, Series I}, (hereafter, \textit{HRA, I}), \textit{Volume x, Governors’ Despatches to and from England (January 1819 – December 1822)}, Frederick Watson (ed.), (Sydney, 1917), pp.3-4.

\textsuperscript{70} Bigge, \textit{Report on the State of Agriculture and Trade}, pp.24, 25

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid, pp. 26-27.
cheap labour in exchange for the housing, clothing and victualling of the felon.\textsuperscript{72} In return, the settler would help reform the convicts by setting a fine example of good moral living and keeping the felon separated from his fellow prisoners in the towns.\textsuperscript{73}

For intending emigrants interested in trade or commerce, Bigge gave detailed accounts of fledgling industries such as tanning, fine wool, salted meat, produce markets for wheat and potatoes, seal skins and whaling.\textsuperscript{74} Imports of foreign goods from India or China included sugar, spirits, cotton goods, tea and silk came into New South Wales, and ultimately into Van Diemen’s Land through inter-colonial traders.

After 1820, the Home Office changed its free emigration policy by encouraging three different types of people. First, those with some capital to invest or purchase land were encouraged to obtain a letter of introduction from the Secretary for State who checked their claims of wealth. Some carried memorials of their good character or work habits. On arriving in the colony, they presented their credentials to the Lieutenant-Governor who gave them parcels of land or encouraged them to set up business, or both. As there was a shortage of manufactured goods—implements, household goods, farming implements and clothing, these entrepreneurs were encouraged to bring these goods (‘specie’) with them to make ready sales and thereby raising additional capital for their own needs.

The second group of free migrants were those who had served in the military and navy. Inducements for half pay officers to emigrate to Australia and take up land

\textsuperscript{72} Bigge, \textit{Report into the Colony of New South Wales}, pp.18-20.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid, p.157.

\textsuperscript{74} Bigge, \textit{Report on the State of Agriculture and Trade}, pp. 51-56.
settlement were made with the approval of the British monarch.\textsuperscript{75} It was hoped that these men would form a supply of strong and dependable civil servants, including magistrates in the colony.\textsuperscript{76} The diarist, G.T.W.B. Boyes was one veteran of the Peninsula War (1810 to 1815) who took up the responsible position in the civil service in Van Diemen’s Land as Auditor of Civil Accounts in 1826.\textsuperscript{77} He served the colony with ‘zeal, ability and urbanity, gratifying the Government and residents of the Colony.’\textsuperscript{78} Boyes’ diary has numerous references to brother officers who had served on the Peninsula and who were serving in similar positions of trust and responsibility, such as Affleck Moodie (in Hobart Town)\textsuperscript{79} and William Lithgow (in Sydney).\textsuperscript{80}

Another group of soldiers who were encouraged to emigrate were the Chelsea Pensioners, who were formed into the Royal Veteran Company to serve in the colony. The motives of the Home Government really have to be questioned in encouraging these old men and their families to leave England. Was Van Diemen’s Land becoming the sink hole for England’s poor cast offs? They were supposed to help with the supervision of convicts on the voyage to Van Diemen’s Land and on arrival, become overseers or superintendents of the convicts.\textsuperscript{81} More often than not, they indulged in debauchery and imbibed alcohol to excess making them quite useless as productive

\textsuperscript{75} Lloyd Robson, \textit{A History of Tasmania}, p.161.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid. p.162.
\textsuperscript{77} W.A. Townsley, \textit{The Struggle for Self-Government in Tasmania, 1842-56} (Hobart, 1951), p. 46.
\textsuperscript{79} Chapman, \textit{The Diaries and Letters}, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, p. 259.
\textsuperscript{81} Arthur to Huskisson, 1 July 1828, \textit{HRA III, vii}, p. 376.
members of the workforce. Arthur was quite scathing about them, describing them as ‘wretched, decrepit beings.’

The third group of free settlers were the families of the convicts. As this group was without capital, they had their passages paid for them by the Home Government. Apart from the reuniting of families, the Colonial Office considered that the presence of family would induce a convict, serving his sentence, to reform, seek an early ticket of leave and become a useful member of society. In theory, this appeared to be an honourable aim, but in practice it is dubious whether the work ethic and morality of these families improved once they joined the cramped living areas of inner Hobart Town. Before the building of the Convict Barracks in 1822, unassigned convicts were released into the community to find their own accommodation. With limited means, this led to overcrowding in makeshift dwellings in and around the town’s centre. Robbery with violence, house breaking, the sale of wives and drunkenness were common. The colonists openly opposed the arrival of paupers, citing the increase in robberies in Hobart Town in 1828 and their reluctance to take up employment, preferring to be ‘parasites ... [feeding] upon the substance of others more active and vigorous than themselves.’

---

82 Robson, History of Tasmania, p.165.
83 Arthur to Murray, 3 August 1829, HRA III, viii, p. 459.
84 Beattie, Glimpses of the Lives, p. 35.
86 Hobart Town Courier, 27 September 1828, p.2.
In summary, the growing numbers of free settlers in Hobart Town between 1820 and 1830 was due to a large number of factors, not least the proliferation of written accounts which encouraged emigration in Britain. It is interesting to note that these free immigrants’ ideal of a better life would be tempered within twenty years by a desire to rid their new home of the ‘convict taint’, which they would discover, pervaded all aspects of their life. The Anti-Transportation movement took root in the 1840s, led by recently-arrived free immigrants such as the Reverend John West and culminated in the cessation of Transportation in 1853. In the meantime, the one local church of St David’s, in the centre of the township, was not large enough to serve the growing settlement. It seemed to the Lieutenant-Governor of the day, Colonel George Arthur, that if moral reform of the inhabitants (bond and free) were to be achieved, a second church must be built. The site of such a building should be in populous North Hobart near the Penitentiary.

**New Ideas in Penology**

Changes in penology had begun sweeping through Britain, Europe and America in the late eighteenth century, led by reformers such as the English philanthropist, John Howard (1726-1790). By the nineteenth century, many of the current practices of punishment were being questioned by both humanitarian and utilitarian reformers. The former, as Phil Handler contends, condemned the criminal law as ‘a monolithic

87 ‘Convict Taint’ was a term used in the *Courier*, 12 August 1853, p.2.
mass of draconian statutes inherited from a former, less civilized age and demanded change to meet the expectations of a more humane public.Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), a utilitarian, scrutinised the harsh Penal Code (or ‘Bloody Code’ as it was known in penal reform discourse) and questioned its usefulness. Consequently, in the 1820s the British Parliament passed legislation abolishing the death penalty for about one hundred offences.

Penal reform is mostly connected with prison reform and the nineteenth century reformers carried on Howard’s earlier work. They questioned the use of physical cruelty as a punishment, the foul prison environments and the incarceration of all types of prisoners together, regardless of their crime. The nineteenth-century reformers were beginning to advocate radical ideological changes which focused on the mind rather than the body of the prisoner. Changes including isolation of prisoners, silence at all times, spiritual counselling and hard work to rehabilitate them. Prisoners would be encouraged to see the benefits of the dignity of work as opposed to the temptations of laziness and idleness. Several of these new places of penance or penitentiaries began to be built in Britain, the main one being Millbank in

---

93 Harding, Imprisonment in England and Wales, p.148; Ignatieff, A Just Measure of Pain, pp.102-146.
London which, although unfinished, opened to take inmates in 1816\(^95\) and another, Pentonville, completed in 1842.\(^96\)

**Reformation of the Convicts**

The whole idea of transporting convicts to Van Diemen’s Land was twofold: one, to rid Britain of her large number of felons and thereby relieve the overcrowding in her prisons and hulks – this was the deterrent factor;\(^97\) the second, the belief that transportation to another land would offer the convict a chance of reformation—a new start in a new land. ‘This colony must be considered in the light of an extensive gaol to the Empire—the punishment of Crimes and the reformation of criminals, the grand objects, in its penal character, to be attended to,’ Arthur wrote in 1826.\(^98\) His principles of managing the convicts were clearly set out in a despatch a year later to Earl Bathurst in March 1827: ‘Your Lordship will perceive that I proceed upon a principle of moderate indulgence and coercive labour: In fact, upon a system of reform and punishment.’\(^99\) Even recidivists sent to Macquarie Harbour were to be shown ‘humanity without relaxing ... from the steadiness of a calm and resolute discipline.’\(^100\)

Throughout his tenure, Arthur, maintained this stance that punishment was not the sole factor in his management of the convict system, but the reformation of the criminal as well.\(^101\) The Quaker missionaries, James Backhouse (1794-1869) and George

\(^{95}\) Ibid., pp. 135, 151.
\(^{97}\) James Backhouse Walker described Van Diemen’s Land as ‘a dumping ground for home rubbish’ in *Reminiscences of Life in Hobart 1840s-1860s* (Hobart, 1890), no pagination (hereafter, n.p.).
\(^{100}\) Arthur to Wright, 25 June 1824, *HRA III*, v, p.631.
\(^{101}\) Arthur to Goderich, 8 February 1833 CO 280/39; Arthur to Stanley 19 December 1834, Transportation Report, app., 132.
Washington Walker (1800-1859) witnessed his keenness to offer hope to the convicts when he met with a new shipload of convicts. Arthur pointed out to them that it was up to them which course their lives would follow—the life of hard work and wholesome living or a return to a life of crime and further incarceration and punishment. In particular, Arthur warned them about the ‘influence of bad company, and of drunkenness’, but for compliant good behaviour he offered them the reward of indulgences such as a ticket-of-leave, a conditional pardon, a full pardon and perhaps ‘a return to their native land.’ In fact, as Arthur dealt more and more with the convicts, he was ‘drawn to [be] compassionate rather than to resent their criminal habits’. Arthur put in place in Van Diemen’s Land certain humanitarian reforms in

Figure 5: Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur (J.W. Beattie, 1896, TAHO)

---

103 Ibid.
104 Ibid, pp.9-10.
105 Arthur to Hay, 10 July 1834, CO 280/46, f.383.
advance of Britain, one being the separation of juvenile prisoners from adults in the Point Puer experiment at Port Arthur.\textsuperscript{106}

The building of the Penitentiary Chapel (the first Trinity Church) on Crown Land just north of the convict barracks in Campbell Street, was part of the gradual transformation of this double urban block in Hobart Town. Central to the reform of the convict were two tenets: religious teaching and the assignment of convicts to morally upright settlers. At all times, both the free settlers and the Government officials (civil and military) were to live high moral lives and thereby set a good ‘example ... for the improvement of those in bondage.’\textsuperscript{107} If it were found that the free settlers had abandoned their duty, then their free labour would be withdrawn\textsuperscript{108} and they could face other disciplinary procedures through the magistrates’ courts.\textsuperscript{109} For example, the cases of the wealthy and influential settlers, William Bryan, Gilbert Robertson and George Meredith\textsuperscript{110} proved that they were ‘not fit persons to have charge of prisoners of the Crown.’\textsuperscript{111} It was hoped that the withdrawal of their assigned convicts from their service would act as a deterrent to other free settlers who thought they could make their own rules with regards to their convict labourers. Assigned labour was very valuable and demand had outstripped supply.\textsuperscript{112} Just as convicts were rewarded with a


\textsuperscript{107} James Fenton, \textit{A History of Tasmania from its discovery in 1642 to the present time} (Hobart, 1978), p. 64.


\textsuperscript{110} Levy, \textit{Governor George Arthur}, pp. 168-172.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid, p. 170.

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid, p.173.
variety of ‘indulgences’ for good behaviour, so too should settlers perceive the granting of assigned convicts as ‘indulgences’ was to help them prosper in the new colony. Arthur believed that his system of reforming the convict would only succeed if all colonists were consistent and vigilant in their association with the prisoner population at all times.113

Arthur implemented a number of the recommendations of the nineteenth-century prison reformers. The treadmill had been introduced in Britain in 1818 on the recommendation of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline.114 The use of the treadmill was considered an appropriate device for second offenders in that it involved hard labour and was ‘monotonous, irksome and dull’.115 The treadmill in the Penitentiary in Hobart Town took over eighteen months to build and was used to grind corn for the convicts’ consumption.116 Other treadmills in the colony could possibly provide power ‘to spin and manufacture coarse woollen garments’.117

Solitary confinement was another form of secondary punishment favoured by the nineteenth-century reformers. Solitary confinement was seen to have several advantages as far as the gaolers were concerned. First, it forced the felon to face up to his crime; second, it separated prisoners so that they could not ‘contaminate’ each other; third, it would break down the mutual support of the inmate culture; and fourth, it would reduce the prisoner to a more receptive state of mind to accept

Sydney Smith (1771-1845), an English cleric and advocate for prison reform, believed that ‘periods of solitary confinement on bread and water’ should make a prisoner’s time in gaol ‘disagreeable’. ‘The first object should be the discomfort and discontent of the prisoners ... they should feel unhappy ... A Prison must be a place of sorrow.’ The thirty six solitary cells, incorporated into the foundations of the first Trinity Church North Hobart varied, some in height so small that Brian Rieusset claims that a convict could not stand upright in them. The building of solitary cells beneath the chapel was a cost saving measure, but they also brought those prisoners serving time in solitary confinement within earshot of registering that Divine Service was being conducted above them. To give credence to this view, the reverse was certainly true. Members of the congregation could certainly hear the noise emanating from the cells below the church during their services.

The Penitentiary Chapel

The addition of a penitentiary chapel in Hobart Town also reflected current reformatory practice in Britain of placing chapels inside the new prisons being built, such as Millbank Prison. For Arthur, the chapel would be the focus of the moral reform of the convict. The theory underpinning the reformation of convicts was clearly stated by Arthur in a letter to Colonial Secretary Huskisson in 1828. Arthur believed that, based on his long experience of military service, physical punishments were
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ineffectual in reforming a miscreant. He listed the many physical punishments then being used in the colony for secondary offenders: working in chains, lashed to the tread-mill, locked in a solitary cell, reduced rations—all to no avail. The convicts simply reoffended. What was required was for the convict to become ‘sensible of his degradation’ and that his mind must be changed so that he might reflect on his past crimes and his current situation in prison. This focus on psychological rather than on physical punishment again reflected current practice being adopted in prisons in Britain. The key to achieving this change in thinking was the prison chaplain.

Another contemporary practice which Arthur adopted in Van Diemen’s Land was the classification of convicts. This took place at a number of different levels. Within the convict barracks in Hobart Town, the two chain gangs, comprising some of the worst offenders, were housed separately from the artisans who were working on various public works sites. Convicts who had reoffended more than twice were further separated from the other convicts and sent to outlying penal settlements such as Macquarie Harbour or later, Maria Island or Port Arthur. Juvenile boys were sent to Point Puer. By far the greatest prospect of reforming a convict lay in the assignment system. For Arthur, this had a twofold benefit for bond and free. In his *Observations upon Secondary Punishment* (1833), Arthur stated that the convict acquired ‘habits of
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industry and labour’ as well as being separated from his fellow felons.\textsuperscript{129} In return, the private settler would be remunerated by the work of a willing labourer whose welfare was paramount.\textsuperscript{130}

As part of the reward for complying with regulations, a range of indulgences were held out to the reformed convict. The most sought after was the ticket-of-leave which would allow a convict to earn a living.\textsuperscript{131} With further good conduct, he might secure a conditional pardon would give him more freedom to move around the colony and not be subjected to check on his whereabouts or obeying the 8 pm curfew in place at night.\textsuperscript{132} Another enticement taken up by several well-behaved convicts was to bring family out to the colony and assign him or her to the spouse.\textsuperscript{133}

**Role of the Prison Chaplain**

In Britain, the new Gaol Act of 1823 (4 George IV, c.64) provided that the prison chaplains should visit and instruct each convict in religious principles as well as holding Divine Service. Moreover, the chaplains were to play a key role in prison discipline. They sought ‘to legitimise the punishment, persuading the prisoner to admit guilt for the crime and to accept the justice of the sentence.’\textsuperscript{134} Allied to this, the chaplains should try ‘to persuade the prisoner to submit to the prison discipline: such
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\textsuperscript{132} Ibid, p. liii.
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reformation amounted to an acceptance of certain dominant values—work, quiet submission, authority, self-discipline.\textsuperscript{135}

To that end, Arthur repeatedly asked Whitehall for more colonial chaplains for the expanding colony.\textsuperscript{136} As these chaplains were civil servants and therefore in the pay of the Colonial Office, the Home Government was reluctant to appoint more clergymen. Within months of his arrival, Arthur stated firmly to Earl Bathurst that ‘The want of Clergymen ... is most distressingly felt in the Colony’ and ‘that these additional appointments are most important to its welfare.’\textsuperscript{137} With the burgeoning population, more colonial chaplains were needed to teach both the free settlers and the convicts the principles of religion. Arthur put forward four reasons why this would benefit the whole of society: first, a convict’s character could be changed for the better; second, the native-born children could benefit from religious instruction for the first time in their lives; third, free settlers were entitled to enjoy the same institutions which they had in the mother country; and finally, the utterly depraved wretches in places such as Macquarie Harbour were in urgent need of the services of a chaplain for any hope of redemption.\textsuperscript{138} In 1826, Archdeacon Scott had recommended that ten more clergymen were needed in the colony, together with support staff of clerks and sextons.\textsuperscript{139}

Early in his tenure, Arthur realised that the calibre of the clergy of the Church of England in the colony was poor and not suited to the reformation of the convicts and
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settlers. When Arthur arrived in the colony in 1824, there were three clergymen of the Established Church: Reverends Robert Knopwood, William Bedford (1781-1852) and John Youl (1773-1827), the latter stationed at Port Dalrymple in the north. Knopwood’s reputation had been tarnished by his bouts of drinking and his consequent inability to take Sunday services. Governor Lachlan Macquarie thought the chaplain was ‘a man of very loose morals ... and ought to be admonished when guilty of any impropriety of conduct’. He made it clear that Knopwood ought to be ‘removed from the Derwent where he is of no use and not at all respected.’ As well, Knopwood’s relationship with George Arthur was strained. In Knopwood, Arthur could see an ailing ‘old’ gentleman, struggling to keep up with the demands of his ministry. In this regard, he echoed the criticism of Governor Macquarie in 1817, who claimed that Knopwood needed to be replaced. What was more serious, Arthur attributed the laxity of the moral standards in the colony directly to Knopwood and his failure to teach religious principles. The Reverend John Youl, at Port Dalrymple, although sober, highly moral and popular, was too ‘gentle, tender, affable and engaging’, and, according to Arthur, was uneducated, a reference to his missionary background perhaps.

The remaining clergyman, the Reverend William Bedford, appointed as the Senior Chaplain in 1822, was initially supported by Arthur. Bedford impressed Arthur in that

---

141 Macquarie to Goulburn, 31 May 1819 HRA I, x, p. 141.
142 Arthur to Huskinson. 14 April 1828 HRA III, vii, p.117.
143 Macquarie to Goulburn, 31 May 1819 HRA I, x, p. 141.
144 Arthur to Huskinson. 14 April 1828 HRA III, vii, p.117.
145 Philip Charles Blake, John Youl: The Forgotten Chaplain (Launceston, 1999), p.44.
146 Ibid, p.41.
they both took a high moral stand against the low living, dissipated inhabitants. In particular, both men were appalled by the habit of the free men, some leading residents, who were cohabiting with female convicts. By a Government Order, all officers, on pain of dismissal from the public service, were to amend their lives and be united in matrimony with those women with whom they were living in sin.\textsuperscript{147} For this stance Bedford was given the name ‘Holy Willie’.\textsuperscript{148} Bedford came with good credentials of his work as an Ordinary at Newgate Prison with prisoners awaiting their deaths. His work had particularly impressed Mrs Elizabeth Fry. Her association with William Wilberforce led to Bedford’s name being put forward to the Bishop of London
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\caption{Reverend William Bedford: Senior Chaplain of Van Diemen’s Land (Thomas Griffiths Wainwright) (State Library of New South Wales)}
\end{figure}


for consideration as a colonial chaplain. He continued his work with the prisoners on
death row in Van Diemen’s Land\textsuperscript{149} and again, Arthur was impressed with the change
he could bring in the prisoners’ thinking which earned him the name of ‘Weeping
Willie’.\textsuperscript{150}

Unfortunately, Bedford adopted a rather pompous attitude both in his preaching at St
David’s Church and in his manner towards the colonists. The visiting English migrant,
Edward Markham, dismissed him as ‘pompous ass, with well-cased ribs —fasting not
being one of the virtues on which he laid stress, and speaking with a slight lisp as if his
mouth were full of hot pudding’.\textsuperscript{151} William R. Barrett likened his bearing to ‘one of the
old Hebrew prophets’ in his thunderous denunciation of the social and moral evils of
the day.\textsuperscript{152} His pomposity made him fair game for the local newspapers to ridicule.
Two colonists writing under the pseudonyms of ‘Rusticus’ and ‘Viator’, questioned his
honesty in removing church property (candles) for his own home use and his
pomposity which made ‘Thomas à Becket [look like] a poor curate.’\textsuperscript{153} He was also
ridiculed in Alexandre Dumas’ work, \textit{The Journal of Madame Giovanni}, where he was
portrayed as a glutton, more preoccupied with food than his parishioners’ lives, even
cutting short Divine Service in order to get back home for dinner.\textsuperscript{154} He was an
example of one who had escaped ‘the surveillance of their chiefs and are wholly
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unworthy of tasks with which they are entrusted’. Bedford, while zealous in his attempts to improve the morals of the colonists, had become the subject of ridicule in the local press with his pompous manner.

For Arthur’s moral reform to take hold, he needed chaplains who were ‘pious, active and ... firm ... and ... whose zeal for the Church is tempered with a great deal of discretion.’ Other officials such as Archdeacon Scott, on a visit to the island in 1826 from Sydney, echoed Arthur’s concerns about the calibre of the colonial chaplains: ‘many of them, although good and excellent men, have been bred up with those peculiar notions of gloominess and what they call real piety ... but I cannot find with all this, much good has been done.’ He added, that ‘they must be able to endure fatigue, ... be active and zealous, and of a peculiar turn to endeavour to overcome the hardened vices ... of the population here ... [and be] well qualified to instruct the schools on the National System’.

Unimpressed by the lack of calibre in Knopwood, Bedford and Youl, Arthur wrote to the Secretary of State in 1826 requesting more clergymen but of the Wesleyan type not in the bookish and pompous Bedford mould. Although a staunch supporter of the Church of England, unlike some contemporary dignitaries, such as Judge John Pedder (1793-1859), he could see that the Wesleyans’ unaffected manner of preaching had a
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better outcome for the convicts and free settlers in far-flung parishes. In like manner, he encouraged the Roman Catholics to set up their church to serve the large number of convicts from Ireland. This was a significant step for Van Diemen’s Land because it saw an increase in both the number of other Protestant faiths arrive in the colony—Presbyterians, Wesleyans and Congregationalists as well as Irish Roman Catholics. By 1833, Arthur was confidently asserting that his new approaches to managing a penal colony were successful. ‘Reformation and good conduct’ were the products of efficient, consistent discipline, tempered by high Christian ideals. Most convicts were able to return to useful lives:

The moral effect of colonization has ... been underrated ... The greater proportion of [the convicts] instead of being the plagues of their fellow creatures and un blessed and miserable in themselves, are now useful to society, and are daily contributing, by increasing the commercial importance of the colony, to the wealth of the empire... 

The Quakers, Backhouse and Walker, were high in their praise of the lieutenant-governor’s achievements in reforming the morals of the colonists at large, which Arthur had mentioned in his first speech on arriving in Hobart Town nearly a decade earlier. The Quakers attributed the reformation largely to the example of Arthur himself, as well as his influence and policies: ‘An encouraging advancement is now observable, both in the improved standard of morals, and in the increasing spirit of religious enquiry.’
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In summary, Lieutenant-Governor Arthur implemented in Van Diemen’s Land aspects of the new theories in penology which were being put forward by both the humanitarian reformers and the utilitarians of the day. Both their arguments were directed at the prisoners:

reformative theory presented punishment to the offenders as being ‘in their best interests’, while utilitarian theory cast it as an impartial act of social necessity. In rejecting retributive theory, the reformers sought, in effect to take the anger out of punishment. As it was legitimized to the prisoner, punishment was no longer to be ... ‘an act of wrath and vengeance’, but an act of calculation, disciplined by consideration of social good and the offender’s needs.\(^{164}\)

The free population’s religious education must also be catered for through the work of the chaplains appointed by the Imperial Government. The building of more churches or chapels in the colony was imperative to achieve this, but at the same time, the cost had to be kept to a minimum. The use of convict labour would partly go to achieving the latter objective.

**First Trinity Church: A Utilitarian Building**

The first Trinity Church (See Figure 7) was built on the corner of Brisbane and Campbell Streets. It was built on a vacant block north of the Hobart Town Penitentiary, the first part of which had been opened as a Prisoners’ Barracks on 26 April 1822.\(^{165}\) It was to be a receiving depot for male convicts on their arrival from England rather than just allowing the convicts to find their own accommodation.\(^{166}\) Most of the convicts were subsequently assigned to settlers, but some were retained to work on Government


\(^{166}\) Evidence of Humphrey before Bigge, *HRA III*, iii, p.278.
projects, either in road gangs or in the nearby lumber yard. A local builder, W.F. Brown was the successful tender at £1,763/16/- to build the new Penitentiary Chapel to be

Figure 7: First Trinity Church, the Penitentiary Chapel (Miscellaneous Collection of Photographs. 1860 – 1992, (PH30/1/344) TAHO.

made out of brick,\textsuperscript{167} in accordance with Governor Macquarie’s directions that ‘no new paltry common Buildings’ should be erected in the colony.\textsuperscript{168} Commissioner Bigge, on his visit to Van Diemen’s Land in 1820, had earlier advised that the many public buildings which Macquarie had identified as necessary in the penal colony, would require someone with ‘architectural knowledge in designing and constructing buildings.’\textsuperscript{169}

The architect was John Lee Archer who had taken up the position of Civil Engineer and Architect in August 1827.\textsuperscript{170} Arthur believed that the appointment of Archer would
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address a long standing ‘desideratum in [the] colony’ 171 and he was immediately set to
work to draw up plans for a large number of public buildings and offices for both the
convicts and the free population. By 1831, he had already established his reputation in
designing classical buildings. For the military, he had designed a number of substantial
buildings for Anglesea Barracks; for Hobart Town, he had designed bridges, improved
the foreshore of Sullivan’s Cove and realigned the Hobart Rivulet to avoid flooding the
centre of the township. He had already designed other churches, gaols, civic buildings
and schools.172 This was a prodigious list, but the Lieutenant-Governor was known to
complain to the Home Government about how slowly Archer worked.173 Roy Smith,
Archer’s biographer, suggests, that up until 1832, Archer’s work was carried out by
unskilled convict labour.174

Archer had been instructed by Lieutenant-Governor Arthur that the new chapel was to
serve two purposes; first, to provide a place of worship for the convicts
accommodated in the barracks and second, to house solitary confinement cells
beneath it.175 These varied in size, the smallest being only 70cms high called the ‘Dust
Hole.’176 This was to save costs of building separate prison cells as well as to place
recidivist prisoners within earshot of religious teaching.177 Certainly, the Lieutenant-
Governor was keen to comply with Whitehall to keep the costs of running the penal
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colony to a minimum. Arthur supported the practice of the separation of prisoners in order that they might reflect on their misdemeanours and seek redemption and ultimately, reform. Certainly, he sought the approval of Archdeacon Broughton (1788-1853) before proceeding with this unusual building.

**A Church for Convicts and the Free Population**

The first Trinity Church took two years to build and opened for services on 29 September 1833, although not completely finished. In 1834, approval was given to fit out a small vestry and a pulpit at a cost of £170. Dr James Ross reported that the ‘admired orthodox discourses of the Reverend Pastor (the Rural Dean) [attracted] very crowded congregations in this now populous quarter of the town, where an appropriate place of public worship had long been wanting.’ In order to accommodate the free population, a separate entrance through a tower was built at a cost of £304 (See Figure 9). In design, this tower reflected ‘the influence ... [of] ... London’s renaissance churches’ on Archer when he worked in that city with John Rennie, an engineering firm specialising in constructing bridges. The Trinity Church tower was ‘simplified of course, by the limits of local materials and workmanship.’ ‘A fine-toned bell’ was later added. The design (See Figure 8) of the new church was in the ‘Tau’ cruciform style: the body (or nave) of the cross accommodated 500 free settlers and the two transepts or ‘arms’ of the cross could accommodate 1000 convicts.
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and their guards. One of these ‘arms’ was to have a flat roof to accommodate a gibbet for the execution of criminals.\textsuperscript{184}

The erection of this chapel was not without difficulty. According to Smith, ‘Its construction was carried out in several stages during the years 1831 to 1833.’\textsuperscript{185} The cost of roofing and the furnishing of the chapel became an issue. In July 1833, Archer recommended calling a tender for fitting out of pews in the body of the church for free people.\textsuperscript{186} A month later, on 17 August 1833, Archer submitted more plans for a clock and tower, at an estimated cost by contract of about £300; ‘but as I propose to execute it by the Government men and most of the materials being on the spot, I
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\caption{John Lee Archer’s Plans for the Penitentiary Chapel (Old Trinity) (TAHO)\textsuperscript{187}}
\end{figure}
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calculate it at about £150.’

The interior of the church had round-arched windows with clear glass and a large Palladian window set high in the back wall facing the Penitentiary. The interior was open without screens, so that the congregation had an unobstructed view of the pulpit and reading desk. It is interesting to note the marked differences between the two facades of the chapel: the one facing the penitentiary was ‘a rough building’ as required by Whitehall, while the brick facade used by the free population was dominated by a tower, reminiscent in its design of the Renaissance churches of London. (See Figure 9)

Figure 9: Plans for front entrance to the Penitentiary Chapel (Trinity Church) –John Lee Archer (PWD 266/1/336, TAHO)
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Role of Philip Palmer

The first clergyman of this first Trinity Church was the Reverend Philip Palmer (1799-1853) (MA Cambridge) (See Figure 10) who was appointed by the Colonial Office on the recommendation of the Bishop of London in 1833 because of his ‘piety and leadership qualities.’ As well as being the Church’s chaplain, Palmer was to take up several positions: colonial chaplain to St John’s New Town, Inspector of Schools and Rural Dean, a position recommended by Archdeacon Scott, who could see that he could be

Figure 10: Reverend Philip Palmer, Chaplain of Trinity Church and Rural Dean of Van Diemen’s Land (J.W.Beattie)
(Allport Library and Museum of Fine Arts, TAHO)
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absent for up to two years with his responsibilities to both New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land.  

His role as Rural Dean put Palmer on a collision course with Reverend Bedford, Senior Chaplain at St David’s Church, for two reasons: first Palmer now became the senior clergyman in the colony in practical terms, and second, he had ecclesiastical jurisdiction over other colonial chaplains, at least in theory.

His arrival prompted both Arthur and Archdeacon Broughton to put some ‘guidelines’ in place, largely because of Bedford’s reputation for being intransigent. Arthur now decreed that Palmer would serve on the Executive and Legislative Councils, not Bedford, as Palmer was now more senior to Bedford. Bedford continued to retain the title of ‘Senior Chaplain’. As far as ecclesiastical duties were concerned, Hobart Town was to be divided into two, with Palmer concentrating on St John’s New Town, the Penitentiary Chapel and the Hospital, funerals and baptisms at the Penitentiary Chapel, but all marriages were to be performed at St David’s Church. Parish records indicate that Palmer ignored the last directive with the first marriage at the Penitentiary Chapel taking place on 31 October 1833. Bedford for his part was to remain Chaplain of St David’s Church, supported by quite a large staff as well as chaplain to the Hobart Gaol and the Female House of Correction at Cascades.
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Greatly piqued at being overlooked as Rural Dean, Bedford mounted a malicious campaign of vitriol, undermining Palmer.\textsuperscript{197} Arthur found himself caught between Palmer and Bedford, both putting forward their complaints against the other. Arthur tried ‘to stop open warfare between [the two clergymen] whose skirmishes for superiority ... afforded such a display of bitterness as must ... grieve any man who wished well to the cause of religion.’\textsuperscript{198} Both clerics accused the other of acting in an unprofessional way with their respective parishioners: Palmer for adopting Methodist-like practices in his services\textsuperscript{199} and Bedford for being dishonest in financial transactions\textsuperscript{200} and falsifying documents of his visits to the local school. Some colonists summed Bedford up as a ‘liar, mischief maker, a backbiter, a drunkard ... with no delicate perception between meum and teum’.\textsuperscript{201}

Although distracted by the Reverend Bedford debacle, Palmer showed that he had the interests of his congregation at heart and took steps to set up the new Penitentiary Chapel so that both groups from the different social classes would benefit from his religious ministrations. Palmer set before the Lieutenant-Governor, additional expenses for items in the unfinished church, including green baize doors at the entrance in the tower, cedar encasing to the handrail of the staircase and a pair of folding gates at street level. The cost was estimated at £36.\textsuperscript{202} Ever mindful of costs, Arthur reluctantly agreed to this extra cost to the Crown, regretting ‘that everything of
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this description for the fitting up of the Church was not provided for by the Engineer [Archer] when the general arrangements were authorised.\textsuperscript{203}

Attentive to the needs of his free parishioners, at least the female ones, Palmer had a curtain erected in Trinity so that they could be protected from the harsh gaze of their fellow convict worshippers. Mindful of the Lieutenant-Governor’s acidic comments about on-going costs, Palmer paid £15 from the pew rents. This caused Arthur much wrath for two reasons: first, he had not been consulted about the curtains; and second, he claimed that the convicts felt insulted that such a drape impinged on their view in church and that they had complained to the prison commandant.\textsuperscript{204} Arthur considered it ‘a most objectionable measure and cannot imagine under what circumstances I can have approved of an expense for an arrangement which I should have disapproved.’\textsuperscript{205}

This was the first of several complaints made by the free settlers in sharing Trinity with the convicts. Penny Russell’s recent study on colonial society sheds some light on the reasons for this discomfort of the free settlers. There was the constant fear that in the new burgeoning towns like Hobart Town, ‘the mixed social world of the colonies existed in concentrated form ... [where] ... the refinements, niceties and ordered hierarchies of civil society would be thrown into chaos.’\textsuperscript{206} Patricia Clarke and Dale Spender’s collection of letters and diaries of the early colonial years reflect the class consciousness of the free colonists and importance of ‘preserving one’s dignity’ by

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[Ibid.\textsuperscript{203}]
\item Palmer to Montagu, 13 April 1835, CSO1/27/484, TAHO.
\item Ibid.\textsuperscript{204}
\item Penny Russell, \textit{Savage or Civilised? Manners in Colonial Australia} (Sydney, 2010), p. 108.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
maintaining the distinct boundaries between themselves and convicts.\textsuperscript{207} Kirsty Reid further illustrates this point by giving examples of how the petty snobbery, which preoccupied colonial society, was shown even towards successful ex-convicts.\textsuperscript{208} James Boyce gives examples of free settlers obsessed with social status in the emergence of Van Diemen’s Land in the 1820s and 1830s as ‘a Little England’.\textsuperscript{209} They took as their exemplar Lieutenant-Governor Arthur, ‘who always refused to meet convicts and emancipists socially’, unlike previous Lieutenant-Governors.\textsuperscript{210}

Other objections included the stench emanating from the end of Campbell Street, nearest to the outlet of the Hobart Rivulet.\textsuperscript{211} The colonists tipped refuse, human and manufacturing, into this waterway, producing vile odours. The free colonists also objected to the lack of ventilation in the new church,\textsuperscript{212} even though the convicts were meant to wash and have clean clothes for Divine Service. A further objection was having to attend a church so near to the new Hobart Town Gaol.\textsuperscript{213} The old gaol, diagonally opposite St David’s Church, urgently needed replacing because it was crumbling, prisoners could easily escape and it was unsuited, being in the centre of town. The adjacent site to the Penitentiary Chapel had been reserved to build the new gaol for the township.

\textsuperscript{208} Kirsty Reid, \textit{Gender, Crime and Empire: Convict Settlers and the State in Early Colonial Australia} (Manchester, 2007), pp. 53, 57.
\textsuperscript{209} James Boyce, \textit{Van Diemen’s Land}, pp. 157-160.
\textsuperscript{210} Ibid., pp. 158-159
\textsuperscript{211} Adam-Smith and Woodberry, \textit{Historic Tasmania Sketchbook}, p.90.
\textsuperscript{212} Palmer to Montagu, 3 June 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{213} Rieusset, \textit{The Penitentiary Chapel}, p. 19.
Another objection was the noise of the convicts, both in the chapel and coming from below it in the solitary cells. Recidivist prisoners took to banging on the wooden walls and ceiling of these solitary cells during Divine Service, disturbing the proceedings. Those convicts attending services did so without any due respect for the occasion. The American convict, Linus W. Miller, who had been transported to Van Diemen’s Land because of his involvement in a revolt in Canada, described their arrival as follows:

Those who wore no leg irons were first and they came pouring in, pushing, pulling, and crowding each other, horrid blasphemy and abominable obscenity made the building ring. Then came the chain gang, about five hundred in number, and such rattling of chains, such sounds of hell.

The convicts’ behaviour during the service was worse:

I could not discover more than twelve ... who appeared to be taking any notice of the service. Some were spinning yarns, some playing at pitch-and-toss, some gambling with cards. Several were crawling about underneath the benches, selling candy, tobacco, etc, and one fellow carried a bottle of rum which he was serving out in small quantities to those who had an English sixpence to give for a small wine-glass full.

The free population, who were meant to be examples of high-principled colonists to the convicts, and part of Arthur’s reform program, suffered these disturbances between 1833 and 1845. On 25 February 1845, Trinity was closed to the public and was used for convict services only. A new convict chaplain, Reverend Robert Wilson (1820-1897), took over services. The local newspaper, the Courier, warmly recorded on 31 May 1845 that Trinity was reopened to the public, having undergone a thorough

---

215 Linus Miller, Notes of an Exile to Van Diemen’s Land (New York, 1846), p. 276.
216 ibid, p. 277.
217 Courier, 31 May 1845, p. 2.
cleaning and painting. Moreover, the prisoners seemed to enjoy the services, singing and chanting with enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{218} For the free parishioners, a chapel in High Street (now Tasma Street), near the corner of Argyle Street, was rented from the Methodists for Trinity Parish services. This was to be only a temporary arrangement for plans were well under way for the building of the second Trinity Church on Potter’s Hill, on the site originally identified by the Land Commissioners back in 1826.\textsuperscript{219}

Conclusions

In summary, the idea of using the Penitentiary Chapel (the first Trinity Church) for both free and bond colonists in theory was sound. It relieved the pressure on the only other Church of England church, St David’s, which had undergone numerous changes to accommodate the ever increasing population in the 1820s. The new church also was designed by John Lee Archer to be a chapel without adornment, built by convict labour and therefore not at huge cost to the Home Government. The placement of solitary cells beneath the church was both a cost saving and reformatory measure.

In practice, however, the close contact between the convicts and the free parishioners was a distasteful experience owing to the poor ventilation of the building. The erection of curtains and the separate entrance for free settlers did not lessen their angst in having to worship with felons. Moreover, the holding of convicts in the solitary cells beneath the church only served to disrupt any religious teaching which might have been in the process of being undertaken in the chapel above. The reaching out to both

\textsuperscript{218} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{219} McKay, \textit{Journals of the Land Commissioners}, p.102.
the convicts and the free colonists with the building of the first Trinity Church was
noble in spirit but impractical in reality.

In a broader context, the idea that bond and free would happily worship together in a
penal settlement was reasonable from a purely cost-saving point of view, but in the
newly-emerging port of Hobart of the 1830s, together with the enticing propaganda
put out in the British press that Van Diemen’s Land offered great opportunity to invest
in capital and personnel, inevitably ensured that the far-flung colony would not just be
a gaol, but a viable economic asset to Britain. The consequential growing number of
free colonists in Hobart Town would demand a place to worship separate from the
convicts. Chapter 2 will document the building of this second Trinity Church.
CHAPTER 2

BUILDING THE SECOND TRINITY CHURCH FOR FREE SETTLERS AND EX-CONVICTS OF HOBART TOWN, 1841-1849

The moral evils which afflict this penal Colony, and the destitution ... in this most important portion of our Diocese, induce us to implore the kind exertions of our Mother Church at Home, whose outcast Children have been ... thrown upon our hands, in masses which defy our resources ... we still require the sum of £2,000 ... [for] the numerous, and truly destitute population of the District [and their] offspring ... not be suffered to relapse into heathenism ...

Letter of Trinity Subscription Committee to Parishes in Britain, 29 January 1845. (Holy Trinity Church Archives)

Introduction

Although the Government officials and the people of Hobart Town were aware of the urgent need for a second church, the raising of the second Trinity Church (later to be called Holy Trinity) met many impediments. This chapter details the steps that had to be taken, painfully and slowly, in order to raise this edifice. There were questions raised about the site, the competence of the convict builders and their supervisors, its size and the most pressing problem of all, the lack of funds to finish the church. These impediments caused so much delay that many other churches were built and functioning in Hobart Town long before Holy Trinity was finished.¹ It was largely due to the efforts of the incumbent, Philip Palmer, to seek funds in Britain, where he raised over £4000 in subscriptions that the church was finished at all.

¹ For example, St John’s New Town (1835), St George’s Battery Point (1838) and St John the Baptist (1845) cited in Geoffrey Stephens, The Anglican Church in Tasmania: A Diocesan History to mark the Sesquicentenary: 1992 (Hobart 1991), pp. 38, 44, 68.
To compound matters further, the untimely death of Archdeacon William Hutchins in 1841 meant that time was lost while a suitable replacement cleric was found and the Church of England within Van Diemen’s Land underwent restructuring. William Barrett and Geoffrey Stephens\(^2\) both contend that the sudden death of Hutchins was a catalyst to raise a separate See in Tasmania. The appointment of Francis Nixon as Tasmania’s first Bishop in 1842 only further aggravated matters, for Palmer and the Bishop did not agree on most matters.

This chapter examines another issue, long the subject of conjecture of scholars and clerics alike, that the new Trinity Church was intended to be the new cathedral to replace the cramped and inadequate first church in the colony, St David’s. This thesis will argue that new primary evidence, unconventional building ornamentation and the practice of nepotism in clerical appointments leads to the conclusion that Holy Trinity would have been the new cathedral in the See but for its slow completion. If this had been the case, then the social role of the Church within the Hobart community would have been vastly different to the philanthropic role it played to the densely-populated poor part of Hobart.

**The New Trinity Church**

The site for the new church had been chosen by the Land Commissioners as early as 1826. The three Commissioners, Edward Dumaresq, Peter Murdoch and Roderic O’Connor, had been appointed by Lieutenant-Governor Arthur in March 1826 to

---

identify suitable sites for public buildings, including churches. In their report to Arthur, they stated that the site for Holy Trinity was to be ‘on the Hill between Elizabeth and Argyle Streets [nominated as ‘Church C’ in the margin] about 5 Furlongs North Westward from the present Church’ [St David’s]. (See Figure 11) The Commissioners considered that this site would ‘be the most Convenient for the attendance of the Inhabitants at Divine Service.’

Lieutenant-Governor Arthur, however, disagreed with the Commissioners’ suggestion of the possible site. In a letter to the Surveyor-General, George Frankland on 26 May 1832, Arthur voiced his concern that insufficient land had been reserved for the new church on what was to become known as ‘Potter’s Hill’. His main argument was the poor access for carriages and ‘foot passengers’ who would have to climb a steep hill for worship. Another concern was a quarry (See Figure 12) being used on the south eastern side of the same hill.

Accordingly, he directed the Town Surveyor to issue an order for the quarrying to cease and for the local police constable of the district to enforce this order. Not surprisingly, this order produced an immediate protest from Peter McIntyre, who was quarrying stone on this site for a stone building he was erecting in the ‘Quadrant’, in

---

5 Ibid p. 103.
6 This hill was called various names at this time: Langlaw’s Hill, Trinity Hill, Mount Calvary.
7 Arthur to Frankland, 26 May 1832, CSO 1/1/595/13531, TAHO.
8 Ibid.
neighbouring Campbell Street. He claimed that he could not use stone from other nearby quarries because that stone was of a different colour. To use a different

Figure 11: Land Commissioners’ Map of Hobart Town illustrating their Report on Public Buildings, 4 August 1826.⁹

⁹ Mackay (ed.), *Journals of the Land Commissioners*, (between pages 99 and 101); Appendix: Commissioners’ Report on Public Buildings, Hobart, 1826, CSO1/1/850/17974, TAHO.
 coloured stone would completely spoil his half-finished building. In frustration, Arthur deferred to the Government Civil Engineer, John Lee Archer (1791-1852), to give his professional opinion on the claim. Archer took a conciliatory approach and recommended that McIntyre be allowed to remove ‘one hundred loads’ of stone from the quarry to finish his building and then it should be closed. What is more interesting is that Archer took issue with Arthur over the actual site of the proposed

---

10 McIntyre to Archer, 26 June 1832, CSO 1/1/595/13531, TAHO.
11 Archer to Arthur, 27 June 1832 and Archer to Burnett, 9 July 1832, CSO 1/1/595/13531, TAHO.
church, claiming it should sit on the very apex of the rise, not anywhere near the quarry.\(^\text{12}\)

Arthur reluctantly agreed, perhaps because he was under pressure for the newly appointed colonial chaplain, the Reverend Philip Palmer was about to arrive in the colony:

Very well— But I must beg to remark that, although a Church on the summit of the hill may look to greater advantage, it cannot be so acceptable to those who, it may be hoped, will most desire to attend it – the aged and infirm.

To add to his argument, he rejoined; ‘Archdeacon [Broughton] expressed the strongest desire that it might not be on the summit of the hill!’\(^\text{13}\)

As a sequel to the quarrying question, several memoranda passed between the Surveyor-General Frankland and Arthur during July 1833, the main issue being the Chief Police Magistrate pointing out that the local constabulary could not guard the quarry when McIntyre had permission still to take out one hundred loads of stone.\(^\text{14}\)

**Response to Community Demands**

The idea of building a second church had been in the public’s conscience for well over a year. In May 1832, the *Hobart Town Courier* had announced details of the edifice:

It is with infinite pleasure, we learn, that Government has resolved on the immediate erection of an additional Church in Hobart Town, to be placed on the beautiful eminence near the old brick fields on what is usually called Potter’s Hill, where it will form a conspicuous object to the whole of Hobart Town and its vicinity, and be a means of affording the

\(^{12}\) Ibid.

\(^{13}\) Arthur to Archer, 27 June 1832, CSO 1/1/595/13531, TAHO.

\(^{14}\) Franklin to Burnett, 4 July 1832, CSO 1/1/595/13531, TAHO.
long and much wanted opportunity of religious worship to that already populous and rapidly increasing quarter of the town.\textsuperscript{15}

The newspaper went on to describe how funds would be raised to cover costs: ‘one half of the expense shall be contributed by the Government, and the other by such of the inhabitants as come forward with voluntary subscriptions, and who shall in consequence be entitled proportionate accommodation or pews in the church as freehold property.’\textsuperscript{16} The Government’s contribution to raising this church was in keeping with Arthur’s practice of granting subsidies to any denomination which had raised a reasonable amount of capital itself towards new chapels. Government aid applied to Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Wesleyans and Independents, not just to the ‘Established Church’. In Arthur’s opinion, if the ‘Convict taint’\textsuperscript{17} were to be wiped out, then Government assistance should be given to any denomination belonging to the ‘Spiritual Church of Christ’.\textsuperscript{18} Clearly, it produced the desired effect for when Arthur left the colony in 1836, twenty two churches had been built compared to the four which existed at his time of arrival in 1824.\textsuperscript{19}

As to the proposed new Trinity Church, the \textit{Hobart Town Courier} accorded the design of the building to the Civil Engineer and Architect, John Lee Archer because he was known for his ‘architectural knowledge and correct taste’.\textsuperscript{20} The architect was actually

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{15} \textit{Hobart Town Courier}, 26 May 1832, p.2.
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\bibitem{18} Ibid, p. 490.
\bibitem{20} \textit{Hobart Town Courier}, 26 May 1832, p.2.
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James Blackburn, a convict transported for life for forgery.\textsuperscript{21} Being a supporter of Lieutenant-Governor Arthur, the editor of the paper finished with a fervent statement: ‘we hope it will be erected as a monument ... of Colonel Arthur’s administration under which [the colony] has so prospered as of gratitude to divine mercy, and we should propose that a tablet expressive of such a sentiment should form a conspicuous part of the building.’\textsuperscript{22}

The estimated cost was between £12,000 and £15,000. It was expected that the colonial Government would contribute from the colonial revenue as such a building would be deemed as improving the colony in the same way as erecting public buildings, roads and bridges.\textsuperscript{23} Although this sum was enormous compared to the costs of erecting other churches in the district, the Colonial Government did set aside £1,000 in the Estimates for 1833.\textsuperscript{24}

In January 1833, the Reverend William Broughton, in his capacity as Archdeacon of both New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land, arrived in the island for an extended visit. He brought with him his wife, two daughters and two servants. In his ‘Visitation Charge’, delivered at St David’s Church, he announced ‘that provision had been made for the erection of six new churches in the colony’, including the new Trinity Church.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{21} See pages 101-107 of this chapter.
\textsuperscript{22} *Hobart Town Courier*, 26 May 1832, p.2.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} 4 William IV: No.6 —An Act for Applying Certain Sums arising from the Revenue Receivable in Van Diemen’s Land.
\textsuperscript{25} Frank Bowden and Max Crawford, *The Story of Trinity* (Hobart, 1933), p. 13.
In the same year, a Government notice appeared in the *Hobart Town Courier*, setting up a committee to raise funds for the new Trinity Church. The colonists appointed to supervise this were well-known in the community—Joseph Hone (Master of the Supreme Court), John Montagu (Colonial Secretary), William Wilson (Assessor of the Court) and John Bell (a successful merchant). Arthur claimed that this action was in response to ‘a large number of the inhabitants of Hobart Town [who had] expressed an anxious desire for the erection of an additional Church, and that they [were] willing to contribute by subscription to the necessary expense of it.’\(^{26}\) The letting of pew and seats would be made on the following conditions:

1\(^{st}\) – That one third of the entire number of sittings, including those reserved for tickets of leave or assigned convicts be left free.

2\(^{nd}\)– That one third be let at a rent of ten shillings per annum; one sixth at seven shillings and sixpence per annum, and the remaining sixth at five shillings per annum.

3\(^{rd}\) – That each subscriber for one or more seats, shall advance five years rent of the same in the following proportions, viz-One third of the amount, when the foundation stone had been laid-one third when the building is roofed, and the remaining third when possession is given of the seat or seats subscribed for, with an engagement that no further pew rent shall be required for the same until the expiration of five years.

4\(^{th}\) – That such parties as shall then be subscribed for the seats at ten shillings per annum, shall on the first of August next, appoint one of their number to be united with the Committee of the gentlemen above named in superintending the erection of the Church upon an approved plan, and in allotting their seats to all subscribers.\(^{27}\)
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\(^{26}\) *Hobart Town Courier*, 14 June 1833, p.2.

\(^{27}\) Arthur to Burnett, 11 July 1833, CSO1/1/595/13531, TAHO.
It would appear that the four men nominated to form the committee had not been asked and letters were hastily compiled, asking for their services.\(^{28}\)

**A Church for all Inhabitants: Free Settlers and Ex-convicts**

Clearly, Arthur intended the new church to serve the needs of both the free colonists (pew rents) and the ex-convicts (free seats). It was this latter provision that the new chaplain, the Reverend Philip Palmer took up with the Colonial Secretary late in December 1833,\(^ {29}\) enclosing a letter from Joseph Hone, head of the subscription committee, dated a few days earlier. Palmer claimed that he had been under the impression that the new church would be built as soon as he arrived in the colony, some six months previously. He pointed out that the pardoned convicts had nowhere to attend divine worship and so resorted to the many public houses in Hobart instead. The lack of churches encouraged Sabbath breaking, drunkenness and other evil vices and immoralities. For the free settlers, they had to resort to finding alternative places of worship because there was insufficient space in Old Trinity, the Penitentiary Chapel. Palmer pointed out two further consequences of building the church; first, that the Colonial Government would not need so many law enforcement officers if the population at large were to receive religious instruction from well-appointed ministers—sobriety and honesty would abound; second, the Colonial Government should match its grant given to the erection of the Presbyterian Scots Church, Bathurst Street, implying that equal subscriptions should be given to the ‘established’ religion of

\(^{28}\) Ibid.

\(^{29}\) Palmer to Bennett, 28 December 1836, CSO1/1/595/13531, TAHO.
the day. He pointed to the great increase in the population, most of whom gave as their given religion, ‘Church of England’.  

Joseph Hone’s reply to Palmer on 19 December 1833 was a mixture of logic, common sense and personal offence. He assured Palmer that the plan outlined in the Government Order would probably succeed, but he had not been informed as to the amount of money required to be raised. He suggested that if a ‘neat and substantial church divested of all outward and inward pomp or ornament’, 31 was required, costing £4,000, then Hone thought that donations of £2,000 from the public could be achieved, with the Government contributing the other half. Moreover, the government could probably lend mechanics and any other aid available, such as building materials. Hone finished his letter with the pointed remark that he took his position on the Trinity Committee seriously, but did not allow his ‘public duties to suffer’ because of his ‘multifarious acts of gratuitous description’ which he did for the Government nor did he warm to those like Palmer who did not appreciate his ‘well-intentioned efforts’. 32 Upon sighting this exchange of letters between Hone and Palmer, the Lieutenant-Governor reassured both of his support and promised that the Government would match an equal sum raised by the colonists. 33

During 1834, Hone and Palmer solicited subscriptions from the people of Hobart Town, but Palmer had to admit the ‘the attempts to raise a moiety of the sum requisite for

---
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31 Hone to Palmer, 19 December 1833, CSO1/1/595/1531, TAHO.
32 Ibid.
33 Arthur to Bennett, 1 January 1834, CSO 1/1/595/1531, TAHO.
the completion of the undertaking had failed.\textsuperscript{34} Nevertheless, Palmer continued to press for the ‘erection of a Church in Trinity Parish, capable of accommodating a large congregation.’\textsuperscript{35} He was concerned that parishioners were beginning to go to other churches because there was no Established Church in the parish. What particularly galled him was that the ‘Church of Rome’ and the Independent Congregationalists both were able to secure land and build their churches.\textsuperscript{36} Not having enough funds, Palmer proposed that the amount of £1,000 set aside in the 1833 Estimates be increased to £3,000.\textsuperscript{37} This was refused, but in the 1836 Estimates, a further £1,000 was added to the Government’s contribution.\textsuperscript{38}

By the end of 1834, Palmer had devised a complicated plan to raise money on a ‘quid pro quo’ basis, whereby subscribers who paid more, could have more pew seats for a longer period of time.\textsuperscript{39} He urged that this scheme be adopted because ‘the present accommodation of free persons in Trinity Chapel is quite inadequate’ owing to a rise in the population of free immigrants and ticket-of-leave convicts.\textsuperscript{40}

By May 1835, revised plans for the church were presented to the Executive Council for approval with the cost being shared by the parishioners and the Government.\textsuperscript{41} On 24 July 1835, the Executive Council reconsidered the application, this time with additional

\textsuperscript{34} Minute of Palmer on the erection of Churches in Trinity and Queenborough Parishes, CSO 1/1/804/17188, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{38} 6 William IV: No.9—An Act for the General Appropriation of the Revenue for the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty Six.
\textsuperscript{39} Palmer to Montagu, 5 December 1834, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Executive Council Minutes, 20 May 1835, p. 440, EC4/1/3, TAHO.
information. Facing the reality that he would not be able to raise the moiety required by the Government, Palmer, as a member of the Council, put his case strongly to the Government. He argued that as most of the parishioners in the Trinity Parish were paupers and from the lower classes, the Government should bear the whole cost of erecting the building, perhaps recouping their costs through pew rents. This financial proposition would be placed in the hands of three church wardens, elected annually by the people, the Government and the incumbent.\(^\text{42}\) The Executive Council was not convinced.

By 9 February 1836, Palmer again brought the conditions inside Old Trinity to the Government’s attention, this time claiming that trying to conduct Divine Service over the prisoners’ cells was being interrupted by ‘the noise and tumult of the prisoners confined there’.\(^\text{43}\) On one occasion, a baptism had to be put on hold while he went in search for a prison warder who might discipline the noisy prisoners. The prison guard was absent. With ‘painful anxiety’ he returned and performed the service over the din, hoping that he would ‘never again perform services under circumstances so distressing in any Christian Community.’\(^\text{44}\)

Palmer again stated his case that the parish was a poor one with few wealthy parishioners. He used the example of the newly-erected St John’s Church, New Town as an example where the poor could have free access to the church for worship while the wealthy should pay for the privilege. He expressed surprise that so many ex-

\(^{42}\) Executive Council Minutes, 24 July 1835, p. 475, EC4/1/3, TAHO.

\(^{43}\) Palmer to Montagu, 9 February 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO.

\(^{44}\) Ibid.
convicts were not used as labour in the building industry, thereby giving back something positive to the improvement of the colony. He even used Arthur’s dictum that a convict’s future lay in reform not in punishment.\textsuperscript{45} What better way to achieve this than to build a church?

Not only did the ex-convicts not attend church, but the poor free colonists also were affected. He painted a picture of children having to attend Old Trinity and hear ‘the clanking of fetters and chains.’\textsuperscript{46} But as a final resort, he would compromise with ‘the immediate erection of a plain building’ due largely to a generous donation of £500 raised by Archdeacon Hutchins while in England.\textsuperscript{47} Such a church would enable Palmer to perform ‘the services and Sacraments of the Church ... with becoming decency, and without interruption’ for the poor of Trinity Parish.\textsuperscript{48}

Predictably, Arthur’s response was angry and indignant. While he agreed that another church was needed in the Trinity Parish, he did point out that he had erected eight churches in the past year for the Established Church, including the large Penitentiary Chapel.\textsuperscript{49} He was not swayed by Palmer’s arguments, pointing out there were several very wealthy families in Trinity Parish. All that was needed was a ‘spirited appeal to their liberality’ to procure the shortfall in funding for the new church.\textsuperscript{50} With the donation from England and the amount promised by the Legislative Council, ‘ample

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Arthur to Montagu, 21 May 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
funds’ could be raised.\textsuperscript{51} Arthur was most anxious to see the new church commenced. To satisfy himself about the progress, Arthur requested to see Joseph Hone, who was to supply a list of subscribers to date.\textsuperscript{52}

At this point, perhaps Palmer should have backed away with his demands, but still he persisted. In a letter of 3 June 1836 to the Colonial Secretary, Palmer pointed out that his comments in his February letter were not new and were known to the Lieutenant-Governor. He reiterated again that the new Church of St John’s at New Town was an outstanding example of what could be built with convict labour.\textsuperscript{53} Palmer then went to some lengths to point out the shortfall of Old Trinity—first, that it was too small to hold the number of parishioners on Sundays; second, the prisoners in the cells beneath the church made too much noise; and third, the chapel became hot and filled with ‘impure air’, making it very ‘disagreeable and unwholesome’ to worship there. The existing ventilation was not adequate to bring in enough fresh air.\textsuperscript{54} To convince himself of this latter problem, Arthur himself attended the Penitentiary Chapel in July whereupon he immediately directed the Civil Engineer to make adjustments to the ventilation as it was offensive to be in the building.\textsuperscript{55}

As to gaining the support of the wealthy families in the district, Palmer pointed out that most of them had moved away to attend churches of other denominations because there had not been an Established Church in the Trinity Parish for so long. The new Trinity Church would therefore serve ‘the adult poor, their children and the

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{53} Palmer to Montagu, 3 June 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{55} Arthur to Montagu, 23 July 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO.
prisoner population’ and the Government was beholden to provide that, not the other denominations.56

Problems continued to beset Holy Trinity, even as the time approached to lay the foundations in 1840. A champion for its cause was the Archdeacon of Tasmania, the Venerable William Hutchins (1792-1841), appointed in 1836 (See Figure 13). On 5 December 1840, he indicated that he was ready to call tenders for the building, but he first wanted to ascertain just what aid would be forthcoming from the Government. Four years had elapsed since this matter was last broached in official circles and Van Diemen’s Land had a new Lieutenant-Governor in Sir John Franklin. Hutchins enquired about what grants of stone, timber and labour could be expected from the Government.57 He was informed that stone and timber would be supplied at the same cost to private individuals and the ‘usual supply of mechanics and labourers’ would be provided when they were available.58 The foundations would be dug by convict labour and 15 December 1840, Captain Alexander Cheyne, Director of Public Works, was given the instruction: ‘You will cause the foundations of the church to be dug.’59

This indistinct instruction was to have far reaching consequences, not only for Cheyne, but for the progress of building the church. Cheyne took it upon himself to have a contract drawn up between himself and the successful building firm of Cleghorn and

56 Palmer to Montagu, 3 June 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO.
57 Hutchins to Montagu, 5 December 1840, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
58 Forster to Hutchins, 15 December 1840, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
59 Forster to Cheyne, 15 December 1840, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
Anderson, who had submitted a tender to build the walls and roof of Trinity Church. They were to receive the sum of £4,293 to be paid in instalments of 80% the value of the work or materials as certified by Cheyne and the contractors would have to pay £4,000 if they defaulted.\textsuperscript{60} This produced an outcry from the latter because the convicts employed in digging the foundations worked slowly (to the point of doing ‘little or nothing’) and would take another two months to finish and clear away. This would hinder the builders in starting their work.\textsuperscript{61}

Consequently, on 12 May 1841, Cheyne asked the Colonial Secretary to request of the Superintendent of Convicts, Josiah Spode, to provide more men as the current ones

\textsuperscript{60} Bond for Erection of Trinity Hill Church, 1 May 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{61} Cleghorn and Anderson to Montagu, undated, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
were ‘of the worst description’.\textsuperscript{62} This was refused because the Assistant Colonial Secretary, William Mitchell stated that the Colonial Office had no record of Cheyne’s contract for building the church and Lieutenant-Governor Franklin had certainly not approved the tender.\textsuperscript{63} Cheyne had, in drawing up a covenant with the builders Cleghorn and Anderson, together with Archdeacon William Hutchins, bound the Government into this arrangement by signing the papers himself. The contract stated that the building would be completed within eighteen months and that by an additional covenant, the Government would supply eight labourers and two sawyers to be paid at a rate of ten pence per day for the former and a penny three farthings for the latter.\textsuperscript{64}

Cheyne was severely rebuked by John Montagu, the Colonial Secretary, in a number of letters over the next few months. He reminded Cheyne that he had been given authority to dig out the foundations only. There was no undertaking by the Government to supply mechanics or other labour on his request.\textsuperscript{65} Cheyne was informed that the Lieutenant-Governor was displeased and ‘regrets your inattention in this respect and again desires that your services in this and every other work may not be afforded beyond the authority given you.’\textsuperscript{66} Sadly the strain took its toll on Archdeacon Hutchins, who died suddenly on 4 June 1841. This brought Reverend Philip Palmer directly into the fray as the acting archdeacon upon the death of his colleague and brother-in-law. On 1 July 1841, the Colonial Secretary informed Palmer that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} Cheyne to Montagu, 12 May 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Mitchell to Cheyne, 14 May 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Montagu to Hutchins, 26 May 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Montagu to Cheyne, 20 May 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Montagu to Cheyne, 4 June 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\end{itemize}
Cheyne had no authority whatsoever for inserting an additional covenant respecting the payment of labourers and sawyers on the church site and as such, the Lieutenant-Governor would not recognise the contract. Palmer was asked to inform the builders.67

Under the new contract, eventually signed on 7 October 1841, Lieutenant-Governor Franklin approved the assistance of eight convict labourers and two sawyers for the limited time of sixteen months, but they were to be superintended, lodged, clothed and rationed by the building contractors.68 The £2,000 authorised by the Executive Council was to be paid to the builders on Palmer issuing certificates of completed work.69 The new contract clearly would blow out the costs of the new church. In an attempt to defray costs, perhaps this is why the new church’s dimensions were reduced to a more modest size. On 23 July 1841, the Courier newspaper stated:

**The New Church**— This edifice, for which preparations have been some time making upon Mount Calvary, between Elizabeth and Argyle-streets, a name bye the bye, quite in keeping with the ludicrous conglomeration of terms which distinguishes our topography, is not to be of the design originally determined upon, and which were extremely handsome, but of some other which may be erected at a less expense.70

There are no written records which would corroborate this information on the reduction in size of the building, ostensibly to save costs, but the Tasmanian Public Works Department files contain a series of plans for a ‘cathedral’, with the provision

---

67 Montagu to Palmer, 1 July 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
68 Ibid.
69 Montagu to Palmer, 7 July 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
70 Courier, 23 July 1841, p. 2.
for enlarging or reducing its dimensions. The body of the church is identical to Holy Trinity, but the area around the sanctuary is greatly simplified (See Figs. 14 and 15).

Preparations could now be made for laying the foundation stone in October 1841. Yet, even this symbolic event was to be hindered by another setback with vandals or ‘some evil-deposed individual’ breaking and defacing a large amount of prepared sandstone. A reward of a Conditional Pardon was offered to any convict with information as to who might be responsible, together with a £50 reward offered by

![Figure 14: Plan of a Cathedral, possibly Holy Trinity](PD266/1/103, TAHO.)

---

71 Plans, Architectural Drawings, Elevations and Sections of Public Buildings, PWD 266/1/103, TAHO.

72 Hobart Town Gazette, 8 October 1841, p.1414.
Cleghorn and Anderson, the building contractors.\textsuperscript{73} No-one came forward. Eventually, the foundation stone was laid on Wednesday 20 October 1841 at 2 o’clock, with much pomp and ceremony, so favoured by Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Franklin. The Courier reported the event in detail, acknowledging the ‘zeal’ of the late Archdeacon Hutchins in pressing to have this church erected.\textsuperscript{74} It finished its report by commenting on the ‘incongruous’ music, the ‘Halleluiah Chorus’, played by the band of the 51\textsuperscript{st} Regiment for such a solemn occasion.\textsuperscript{75} A later edition of the Courier gave a detailed description of the new church which ‘will form by far the most important and striking object in town’, ‘situated in a very prominent spot’.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{74} Courier, 22 October 1841, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid; G.T.W.B. Boyes, Diary 28 February 1833-1 June 1835(unpublished), University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection, (hereafter, UTA), 1 December 1834, n.p.
\textsuperscript{76} Courier, 29 October 1841, p.2.
Convict Architect, James Blackburn

The architect who designed the new church was James Blackburn, a convict, who had been sentenced to transportation for life to Van Diemen’s Land in 1833. His crime had been the forgery of a cheque for £600 drawn on the Bank of England in the names of his employers, Samuel Mills, R. Carpenter and Francis Wigg, all members of the Board of Commissioners of Sewers in London. Blackburn had been employed as an inspector of sewers for these commissioners for the central London districts of Holborn and Finsbury.  

Blackburn had had no previous convictions and had been driven to his crime by financial distress caused by failed speculation in a building project and the threat that his private possessions would be seized.  

Blackburn was sentenced at the Old Bailey on 18 May 1833, despite writing a petition for clemency to the Secretary of State, Lord Melbourne, professing to be extremely remorseful and sorrowful over his crime. He arrived in Hobart Town in the Isabella on 14 November 1833 and was immediately assigned to the Department of Roads and Bridges under the directorship of Roderic O’Connor as he had stated on the Appropriation List and Indent of the Isabella that his trade was an ‘Engineer’.  

Between 1833 and 1836, he worked for Roderic O’Connor, the Inspector of Roads and
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78 Blackburn to Melbourne, 20 May 1833, CSO1/1/888/188850, TAHO.  
79 Old Bailey Proceedings Online (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 6.0, 01 February 2012), May 1833, trial of JAMES BLACKBURN (t18330516-10).  
80 Blackburn to Melbourne, 20 May 1833, CSO1/1/888/188850, TAHO.  
81 Conduct Registers of Male Convicts arriving in the period of the Assignment System CON 31/1/5, TAHO.  
82 Appropriation List for Isabella, No. 1984, 15 November 1833, CON 27/1/6, TAHO.
Bridges in Van Diemen’s Land. O’Connor was clearly impressed with Blackburn’s industry, diligence and respect shown by a convict towards his employer, stating ‘I never met with one so such exemplary propriety ... attentive and respectful to a degree to undertake the duties assigned to him with cheerfulness and alacrity, devoting his whole time and best energies to the service of the Government.’

Captain Alexander Cheyne, a Royal Engineer (1785-1858) with substantial army engineering experience, took over from O’Connor in 1836, assuming the position of Director of Roads and Bridges. Cheyne too was impressed with Blackburn’s expertise in surveying and engineering, stating that ‘he deserves great credit for what he has accomplished – He has been of very great service to me, being the only person in the Department whom I would willingly entrust with many of its important duties.’

Indeed, while working under Cheyne, Blackburn’s expertise was responsible for the surveying of many of the colony’s roads and building its bridges between 1836 and 1838.

On 1 January 1839, James Blackburn’s position in the colony changed with the promotion of Captain Cheyne to the position of ‘Civil Engineer’, a position that had been held by John Lee Archer since 1827. The reason given for Archer’s dismissal was that the colonial revenue could no longer support a separate department for the colonial architect and engineer, and the new position, Director of Public Works was
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83 Testimonial of R. O’Connor, 1 August 1836, CSO/1/170/4051, TAHO.
84 Testimonial of Alexander Cheyne, 1 August 1836, CSO/1/170/4051, TAHO.
85 See Testimonial of Edward Boyd, Deputy Surveyor-General, 6 August 1836, CSO/1/170/4051, TAHO; Testimonial of John Montagu, Colonial Secretary, 11 August 1836, CSO/1/170/4051, TAHO; Testimonial of William Dawson, Town Surveyor, 16 August 1836, CSO/1/170/4051, TAHO.
86 Hobart Town Gazette, 11 August 1827, p.2.
created. 87 This new position made Cheyne responsible for all ‘civil buildings’, including their repair and building.88 It was the architectural aspect of this position which brought the convict Blackburn to the fore, for Cheyne, on his own admission, said that he did ‘not profess to be an architect’. He hoped that he might ‘not be called upon to furnish Designs for any buildings requiring knowledge of the higher branches of architecture.’89

Blackburn supplied these skills, particularly in drawing up plans for the growing number of churches, of all denominations, which were being built after the passage of the Church Extension Act in 1837.90 This act stipulated that the Colonial Government would match the contributions of a parish to raise revenue for the building of a parish church, not less than £300 and not more than £700 providing there were 80 church members in rural centres and 200 in the two urban centres of Hobart Town or Launceston. Blackburn was kept busy and showed his versatility in designing a number of churches throughout Van Diemen’s Land in 1839. St Mark’s Church of England, Pontville, St Mathew’s Presbyterian Church, Hobart (now Glenorchy) and the Presbyterian Church, Sorell were all in the style of solid Anglo-Norman churches with aspects of Romanesque Revival in their decoration, in particular heavy ornamentation over arched doorways (See Figures 16).

These contrast in style to his Gothic churches, St Mathew’s Church of England (1839) at Clarence Plains (now Rokeby) and the subject of this study, the grand edifice of Holy

87 Montagu to Cheyne, 19 June 1838, CSO8/1/8/C.911, TAHO.
88 Ibid.
89 Cheyne to Montagu, 26 June 1838, CSO8/1/8/C.911, TAHO.
90 1 Victoria: No. 16 passed by the Legislative Council on 27 November 1837.
Figure 16: St Mark’s Church of England, Pontville (TAHO)

Figure 17: Holy Trinity Church, Hobart (Holy Trinity Church Archives)
Trinity Church of England in Hobart Town (1841) (See Fig.17). The Gothic Revival style of this church is very similar to the churches built in England during the 1820s and 1830s called ‘Commissioners’ Churches’.\(^{91}\) As an architect, Blackburn would have witnessed these churches being built and would have had access to their plans. He would have been able to adapt Trinity’s proportions and layout to these and model its ornamentation on the Commissioner designs.\(^{92}\) Likewise, his earlier Anglo-Norman churches would have been inspired by any number of pattern books in print at the time such as P.F. Robinson’s work, *Village Architecture* (1837) and G.E. Hamilton’s *Design for Rural Churches* (1836). Miles Lewis, an architectural historian, states that the Norman church design was suitable for colonial Tasmania for the same reasons it was later adopted in New Zealand in the 1840s: the primitive style suited the convict artisans as it did the Maoris.\(^{93}\) James Broadbent adds another reason for favouring this style—cost. The Anglo-Norman church looked ‘striking’, but was cheaper to build than the more elaborate Gothic style.\(^{94}\)


\(^{94}\) James Broadbent, ‘James Blackburn 1803-1854’, p. 34.
Blackburn’s career took another turn for the better when he gained his pardon on 3 May 1841. Since 1836, Blackburn had petitioned the Van Diemen’s Land Lieutenant-Governors for a pardon and had collected a large number of testimonials from well-respected officials in the colony as well as references to his good character from his former employees. With his pardon, Cheyne assumed that Blackburn would remain with the Department of Public Works, claiming that ‘as I cannot conveniently dispense with his services, because I am not aware there is any person in the colony equally qualified to prepare the various Architectural and other drawings which are constantly required by the Government, I have the honor [sic] to request that I may be authorised to employ him in that branch of this department ... [at] ... £250 to £300 per annum.’

This was refused by the Colonial Secretary, John Montagu. To give Blackburn a salary when he was newly freed from bondage was inappropriate and made a mockery of amalgamating the Engineers’ Department and the position of Director of Roads back in 1838 to save costs to the colony. It was now clear that Cheyne had relied heavily on Blackburn to do most architectural designs and that Cheyne was ‘unqualified to conduct that branch in the manner he undertook to do in 1838.’
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95 Conduct Registers of Male Convicts arriving in the period of the Assignment System CON 31/1/5, TAHO.
96 Blackburn collected testimonials from Josiah Spode (Chief Police Magistrate), Roderic O’Connor (Director of Roads and Bridges), Alexander Cheyne (Director General of Roads and Bridges), Edward Boyd (Surveyor General), John Montagu (Colonial Secretary), Alfred Stephen (Attorney General), M. Forster (Chief Police Magistrate), William Dawson (Town Surveyor), William Moriarty (Commander of Royal Navy), B. Bayley (J.P.), Frederick Miller (Minister of Independent Church), John Nisbet (Minister of Independent Church), and Henry Hopkins (Wool merchant) together with a number of ministers of religion in England.
97 Cheyne to Montagu, 4 June 1841, CSO 8/1/8/C.159, TAHO.
98 Montagu to Cheyne, 8 June 1841, CSO 8/1/8/C.159, TAHO.
99 Memorandum of Montagu, 3 August 1841, CSO 8/1/8/C.159, TAHO.
100 Ibid.
demoted and eventually dismissed.  

Blackburn for his part, entered private practice with James Thomson, another ex-convict and they successfully tendered contracts to build public buildings and bridges.  

Despite having gained his freedom, Blackburn felt that the convict stigma remained with him and affected his family, stating in his petition of 1839 that he had ‘suffered much from physical privation, but intensely more from remorse [and] wounded self-esteem.’  

On 16 April 1849, James Blackburn left the colony for a new life in Victoria, where he became involved in providing a reliable water supply for Melbourne as the City Surveyor.  

With the laying of the foundation stone achieved in October 1841, work on the church proceeded steadily, at least for the next six months. The builders, Messrs Cleghorn and Anderson had won the contract and had recently built the church of St Peter’s at Oatlands. They set out their costs: Erection of Church (£4,293); Erection of pinnacles (£170); Extra work on chancel windows (£15) and Two Crosses (£6) at a total cost of £4,484. Later contracts were granted to George Tame for Plastering (£78); Joseph Smith for Floors and Pews (£255); Joseph Moir for Doors (£41), Gallery and Pulpit

---


103 Petition of Blackburn to Franklin, July 1836, CSO 8/1/8/C.159, TAHO.

(£40); T. Harbottle for Glazing (£104) and Bell Frames in Belfry (£34) at a total cost of £4,845.¹⁰⁵

Palmer, now appointed acting Archdeacon of Tasmania following the sudden death of Archdeacon Hutchins, issued certificates of expenditure for 1842 and 1843, each measuring the progress of raising the walls of the church. On 22 January 1842, Palmer certified that work to the amount of £600 had been completed and requested payment of half be made to the contractors, Cleghorn and Anderson.¹⁰⁶ By 1 March 1842, a further £300 was paid;¹⁰⁷ however, difficulties arose in June 1842. ‘A large bank of earth’ was obstructing the building of the tower.¹⁰⁸ This rubble had been left after the initial levelling of the top of Potter’s Hill for the building site by convict labour. More convict labour was required to remove this rubble, and, although this was granted by the Lieutenant-Governor, workers were not readily procurable.¹⁰⁹ An additional problem was the lack of drainage, which was already affecting the new foundations of the church. Spode, the Superintendent of Convicts, thought that it would take fifty men over six weeks to build the appropriate drains to rectify the problem. He could not provide that number of convicts from the elderly prisoners housed in the Penitentiary.¹¹⁰

Another problem which slowed progress was the ready availability of stone from the Domain quarry. This quarry had been able to supply all the stone required for Trinity

¹⁰⁶ Palmer to Montagu, 22 January 1842, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
¹⁰⁷ Palmer to Montagu, 1 March 1842, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
¹⁰⁸ Cleghorn and Anderson to Palmer, 18 April 1842, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
¹⁰⁹ Spode to Montagu, 7 June 1842, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
¹¹⁰ Spode to Montagu, 1 June 1842, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
Church, until alterations to St George’s Church, Battery Point were commenced. This meant that for six weeks, the contractors made little progress on Trinity Church and were ‘greatly injured by the delay’. The contractors set out their grievances in a letter to Sir John Franklin on 25 May 1842. They claimed that the convicts assigned to them were not able to be fully employed, but as contracted labour, the convicts were still being victualled by them. Another vexation was sourcing their stone from a quarry in New Town, which involved cartage costs. They were also delayed in starting the building by a further two months because the second contract had had to be drawn up and now they were hampered in doing ‘the heaviest part of the building’ with the onset of winter, ‘the worst season.’ Moreover, either through acts of wilfulness or sheer idleness, existing stone was being broken up or defaced by the underemployed men. Given these circumstances, they asked for a remission of the Government’s charges. To substantiate their claims, they listed a number of leading figures in Hobart Town including the Senior Chaplain, the Archdeacon, Cornelius Driscoll (M.L.C.) of the Colonial Bank and John Beaumont, a local magistrate, who would vouch for their claims.

Lieutenant-Governor Franklin was unmoved by these pleas and insisted that the contractors pay out their debts of £280/3/0¾ to the Government before Palmer pay out another £400 for further work. This issue must have been resolved and work

---
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resumed because Palmer announced on 9 July 1842 that £500 had been spent\textsuperscript{117} and a further £200 should be paid to the contractors on 15 October 1842.\textsuperscript{118} Similar payments continued to be made at regular intervals during 1843 on 11 January, 13 April and 13 June.\textsuperscript{119}

**Franklin Coat of Arms**

Blackburn considered it his responsibility as an architect to supervise on site the erection of Trinity Church. In 1842, as a free man, he could now give time to checking the building’s progress and making any minor changes to plans provided that they did not add any additional cost. One liberty he took was to place the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Franklin’s coat of arms, carved in stone over the main tower entrance of the church (See Figure 18). There was some disagreement over just who gave permission for this carving to proceed. Palmer, as acting Archdeacon, claimed he had not sanctioned the decoration,\textsuperscript{120} while Cleghorn the builder, claimed he was acting under the direction of the architect, Blackburn.\textsuperscript{121} Blackburn chose to take the high moral ground and claimed that he had sanctioned the coat of arms of the Lieutenant-Governor to be carved in stone, on two counts: first, on the grounds of aesthetics, stating that ‘part of the Tower ... wanted ornament’;\textsuperscript{122} second, that as the supervising architect he was ‘vested with the discretion possessed by Architects similarly

\textsuperscript{117} Palmer to Boyes, 9 July 1842, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{118} Palmer to Boyes, 15 October 1842, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{119} Palmer to Colonial Secretary (Acting), 31 January 1843, 13 April 1843 and 13 June 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{120} Blackburn to Palmer, 2 August 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{121} Cleghorn to Blackburn, 4 August 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{122} Blackburn to Palmer, 2 August 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
Figure 18: Coat of Arms of Sir John Franklin over the main tower entrance
(P. Graham 2012)

circumstanced in the mother country ... which entitles them, during the progress of
works, to make whatever alterations will in their opinion tend to the improvement of
them, provided of course that no additional expense be incurred.’\textsuperscript{123} Moreover, the
Archdeacon had been well aware of the carving as he had visited the site every day,
but had not made any adverse comment.\textsuperscript{124}

Despite Palmer’s late objections and the builder, Cleghorn threatening to ‘take a pick
and take the whole of the moulding off,’\textsuperscript{125} the coat of arms remained, with Cleghorn

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{124} Blackburn to Palmer, 4 August 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{125} Cleghorn to Blackburn, 4 August 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
stating that having the Lieutenant-Governor’s coat of arms on the church would meet the approval of the subscribers who had raised the funds to build the church.\(^\text{126}\)

On 27 October 1843, Blackburn, sent a report on the finances to the newly-arrived Bishop of Tasmania, Frances Nixon.\(^\text{127}\) Blackburn pointed out that of the £2,000 set aside in the Estimates of 1833 and 1836, £1,750 had been expended.\(^\text{128}\) Any remaining money (£250) would not be granted until the building had been ‘surveyed by a duly authorized public officer’ who would report to the Government.\(^\text{129}\) This was completed by the newly-appointed Director of Public Works, Major James Conway Victor (1792-1864), who sent his report to the Colonial Secretary on 27 December 1843:

The walls of the building are carried up throughout ready to receive the roof.

In the body of the building, the Principal Rafters of the roof are on, but not the common rafters on which the covering will be fixed. 5/7 of the worked or ornamental rafters of this part of the building are also up and the remainder of these appear to be prepared ready for fixing— also 1/7 of the inside lining of the roof of this part is fixed.

In the side aisles nothing but the bare walls done— no timbers of the roof on-nor any to be seen—

In the Tower the wooden flat is fixed, on which the lead of the roof is intended to be laid.\(^\text{130}\)

Government funding for the church was clearly running out by late 1844. Finding the necessary funds to complete the church was a vexed issue for the subscriber

\(^{126}\) Ibid.
\(^{127}\) Bishop Francis Russell Nixon arrived in Tasmania in July 1843 as the first Bishop of Tasmania. As the senior cleric in the colony, all queries about Trinity Church would now be directed to him, not Philip Palmer, who had been acting Archdeacon of Tasmania.
\(^{128}\) Blackburn to Nixon, 27 October 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\(^{129}\) Palmer to Nixon, 35 November 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\(^{130}\) Victor to Bicheno, 27 December 1843, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
committee, originally set up back in 1833. On 18 May 1844, this committee wrote to the new Bishop of Tasmania, Francis Nixon, appraising him of their dire circumstances. First, they had lost Archdeacon Hutchins, their chairman and treasurer, who had worked tirelessly to secure permission to build Holy Trinity; second, the Bishop of Australia (William Broughton) had directed that the design of the proposed church should not be altered and replaced with a less expensive building. To make any alteration ‘would be a disrespect for the late Archdeacon’s memory.’ Third, the committee had devoted ‘much time in visiting Hobart Town from house to house’ and obtaining subscriptions which have realised about £1,000. There are about £150 more nominally subscribed but not yet received. Fourth, owing to the current economic depression, there was little prospect of raising the residual amount. The committee concluded their letter asking Bishop Nixon ‘to advocate the cause before the congregations of our other churches.’

To add to their financial problems, on 2 August 1844, the colonial auditor, G.W.T.B. Boyes stated that of the £2,000 contributed by the Government, £1,900 had been paid. The new Colonial Secretary, James Ebenezer Bicheno informed the Bishop of Tasmania, that a warrant for the final £100 had been made out. This concluded the Government’s financial involvement with the church. On 14 September 1844, the
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Lieutenant-Governor finally approved the digging of drains by convict labour, something that the contractors had requested earlier.\textsuperscript{136}

By 1845, building had come to a standstill through lack of funding. Clearly, the building contractors had not fulfilled their original contract, particularly with regard to the carpentry and plumbing. Moreover, they were twenty months behind schedule in completing the project, originally agreeing to complete everything by 1 January 1843.\textsuperscript{137} The \textit{Courier} newspaper in February 1845 described the church as an ‘empty shell’ and an expensive one at that:

\begin{quote}
We have good reason to know that more than £4,000 had already been expended and that every effort is being made at home towards collecting an additional £2,000, which, in point of ecclesiastical architecture, has not a rival in these colonies. It has been censured as a needlessly expensive building, but those acquainted with the expense of Church building at home appear to concur in the opposite opinion.\textsuperscript{138}
\end{quote}

The newspaper questioned the efficacy of building such an expensive edifice ‘in these times’, presumably a reference to the depression of the early 1840s, and also in a poor parish. Perhaps as a criticism of the building committee, the paper set out two of its own schedules whereby the shortfall in funding could be raised. First, as it was a large parish of 6,000 people, only 1,700 of them need to donate at 1/- per month over a year to raise the necessary funds. Additional funds could be sought from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), a society set up in England which had as

\begin{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{137} Contract to build Trinity Church, signed 3 May 1841, CSO8/1/123/C.130, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{138} Courier, 25 February 1845, p. 3.
\end{flushright}
one of its aims establishing churches in the infant antipodean colony. Alternatively, the paper suggested that one hundred wealthy parishioners could each encourage sixteen other parishioners to contribute 1/- per month over a year to raise the same amount of funds.

In the same month as the Courier’s criticism, Philip Palmer left Hobart Town, having been given leave of absence to visit the home country to appeal for funds. The other reason for taking leave was Palmer’s ongoing ill health. His application for a position back in England had been refused. In his absence, he would go on half pay and Reverend William Dry would act as ‘locum tenens’ in the Trinity Parish. Palmer carried with him commendatory letters from the Subscribers’ Committee144 and Bishop Nixon. The letters put a strong case for Holy Trinity Church to be completed: first, it was a large parish of 7,000 people, and the current makeshift chapel in use in High Street rented from the Wesleyans could only hold 300 parishioners; (See Fig. 19) second, and perhaps more persuasive, the penal colony was afflicted by many moral evils which blighted its inhabitants. This consequent destitution ‘[induces] us to implore the kind exertions of our Mother Church at Home, whose outcast Children
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139 In the eighteenth century, the SPCK had concentrated on producing a wide range of Christian literature.
140 Courier, 25 February 1845, p. 3.
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143 Palmer to Bicheno, 22 January 1845, Palmer Letter Book, Holy Trinity Church Archives, hereafter HTCA.
144 The Subscribers’ Committee comprised of leading figures in the community: Joseph Hone (Master of the Supreme Court), David Lord, John Philip Gell, M.A. (Clerk), and William Dry, B.A. (Clerk).
145 Letter of Trinity Subscription Committee to the parishes in Britain, 29 January 1845, p. 1, HTCA.
have been, by the dispensation of an all-wise Providence, thrown upon our hands in masses which defy our resources.'

The letter pointed that the sum of £4,100 had been raised and spent on building the church but a shortfall of £2,000 remained to finish the project, even after the Colonial Government and the SPCK had contributed £2,000 and £600 respectively. Hoping to evoke the sympathy and understanding of the English people, the committee pointed out that many of the local destitute people in the parish came from the well spring of England’s cast-off felons:

While so much benevolence is expended for the conversion of the perishing heathen by our fellow countrymen, the offspring of the condemned exile from Christian England will not be suffered to relapse into heathenism.

To this appeal, Bishop Nixon added his own emotive appendix:

---
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Whereas the Rev. Philip Palmer, M.A., late Rural Dean and acting Archdeacon of this Diocese (on his return to England on leave of absence) is desirous to obtain if possible among the friends of our Church at Home, assistance towards the completion of Trinity Church in Hobart Town and the erection of a School House and Master’s Residence for the benefit of the Poor in the same Parish—I venture to express my earnest anxiety that his laudable endeavours may meet with that support which they deserve.¹⁴⁸

The appeal for funds in Britain was successful and drew donations from people of all social backgrounds. Religious historian, Hilary Carey, argues that this was due to the growing colonial missionary movement of the 1840s¹⁴⁹ whose aim was ‘to prevent the heathenising of Christians’ who had settled in British colonies such as Australia.¹⁵⁰ A generous donation of £200 was received from Mrs Louisa Jane Oakley; £100 from E.S.; £50 each from Queen Adelaide and the philanthropist, Baroness Burdett Coutts; £25 from each of the Bishops of Canterbury and York as well as the Bishop of London. Donations from clergy and laity from all over England, mostly in £1 and £2 lots, brought the total subscriptions to £1,119/7/-¹⁵¹ But by far the most interesting donation was £3,000, made by ‘Lady Palmer of Farnborough Hill’,¹⁵² to whom Palmer alludes in a letter to one of the English Bishops in 1846. With this donation, Palmer believed it would not ‘be necessary ... to continue [his] endeavours to obtain any

¹⁴⁸ Letter of Bishop Nixon to parishes in Britain, 20 January, 1845, p.2, HTCA.
¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p.180.
¹⁵¹ List of Subscribers in Britain to the Trinity Building Fund, pp.3-4, HTCA.
¹⁵² This ‘Lady Palmer of Farnborough Hill’ is Lady Harriet (Harriot) Palmer (1774-1848). (1841 Census of England, Wales and Scotland on-line data http://www.ukcensusonline.com/?gclid=CNGL1vPbxrUCFQYcpQodwE4Adw). Her wealth was derived from a trust left by Thomas Palmer (1743-1820) who employed slaves to work his lucrative sugar plantations in Jamaica and Surinam. The latter had been sold in 1833, the same year that the British Government abolished slavery.
further help.’ ¹⁵³ In the interim, he had continued to devise other ways of raising funds. One was to ask contractors to become subscribers. In a letter written from Plymouth on 2 July 1846 to the bell foundry firm, Messrs Mears and Stainbank of Whitechapel, London, Palmer agreed to their contract to manufacture eight bells at a cost of £315. This apparently was far below cost, and thus they became ‘subscribers to the object’ and were invited to add their name to the list of subscribers. ¹⁵⁴

Palmer arrived back in Hobart Town in April 1847 and immediately took steps to secure artisans who would finish the interior of the church. On 21 August 1847, he called for tenders for the ‘Fitting up of the Tower of Trinity Church.’ ¹⁵⁵ John Wright won the tender to construct a bell frame and hang the eight bells ordered from England by December 1847. ¹⁵⁶ In addition, interior plastering, glazing of all windows, construction of the floor and pews, installation of the doors and construction of the gallery and pulpit all were finished between October 1847 and January 1848. ¹⁵⁷

Although unconsecrated and unlicensed, Palmer first used the church for public worship in January 1848. This incurred a reprimand from Archdeacon Fitzherbert Marriott, who queried whether any ‘Marriage by Banns’ were indeed lawful, if they were performed in an unlicensed church. ¹⁵⁸ In reply, Palmer mounted a strong defence for his use of Trinity Church for public services. He cited the cramped and inadequate rented chapel in High Street and that it was ‘too small to accommodate my enlarged

¹⁵³ Palmer to Unknown English Bishop, 1846, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
¹⁵⁴ Palmer to Mears and Stainbank, 22 July 1846, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
¹⁵⁵ Courier, 21 August 1847 p. 3 and 25 August 1847, p.1.
¹⁵⁶ Copy of Receipt, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
¹⁵⁷ Copy of Receipts, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
¹⁵⁸ Palmer to Marriott, 11 May 1848 Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
Sunday School and I was glad to have it in my power to commence Divine Service in the Church two months since.\textsuperscript{159}

Clearly irritated by being questioned by the Archdeacon, who was acting as Diocesan Administrator while Bishop Nixon was absent in England, Palmer added pointedly:

I think you may not be aware that for the 15 years that I have held ecclesiastical position in this colony, I have never yet, under the pastoral control of the Bishops of Australia and Tasmania, performed my parochial duties in either a consecrated or licensed building, and I did not consider that anything short of consecration (as soon as convenient after the Bishop’s arrival) would be needful in respect to my bona fide Parish Church, which after eight years’ anxiety and toil is now completed.\textsuperscript{160}

He finished with a barbed reference to John Harrison, the Diocesan Registrar, who might furnish him (Palmer) with ‘any gratuitous information’ about changes to holding services in unlicensed churches in the two years Palmer had been absent in England.\textsuperscript{161}

In a more conciliatory letter, written ten days later, Palmer pointed out to the Archdeacon that he had not meant to ‘convey any unkind reflection on yourself or anyone’, but suggested that the Archdeacon did have the power to set the matter right:

It appears that you have discovered some incongruity in respect to this matter which no one of competent authority has at any time before recognised. It seems to me unquestionably to remain with yourself — acting upon your own judgement of what is right—to issue (according to

\textsuperscript{159} Palmer to Marriott, 1 May 1848, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid.
the prescribed form of our Church of England) such licence as you may
deam requisite.\textsuperscript{162}

With the church now complete and Bishop Nixon back in the colony in early 1848, Palmer presented a petition from the parishioners to the Bishop on 18 May 1848, requesting that Holy Trinity be consecrated without delay. The church alone needed to be consecrated because the Trinity burial ground in Campbell Street had been consecrated by the Bishop of Australia, William Broughton, ten years earlier in 1838.\textsuperscript{163} This raised yet another issue—the question of church land and a further delay in consecrating the church for another eighteen months. Bishop Nixon declared that he was prepared to consecrate the church, but wanted to ascertain that the church and land had been properly transferred to the trustees.\textsuperscript{164} This in fact, had not occurred, largely because the amount of land allotted to Holy Trinity had shrunk from two acres to half an acre. Palmer encouraged the Bishop to have the current Lieutenant-Governor confirm the larger area, as agreed to by his predecessors, Lieutenant-Governors Arthur and Franklin, and as set out in the Church Act.\textsuperscript{165} The larger area for the church grounds was refused, but three quarters of an acre on Patrick Street was granted for the building of a school for poor boys, girls and infants\textsuperscript{166} as long as it was completed within two years.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{162} Palmer to Marriott, 11 May 1848, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
\textsuperscript{163} Palmer to Nixon, 18 July 1848, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid
\textsuperscript{165} Palmer to Nixon, 31 July 1848, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
\textsuperscript{166} Palmer to Bicheno, May 1849, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
\textsuperscript{167} Palmer to Bicheno, 24 May 1849 and confirmed on 9 October 1849, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.
A compromise on the question of land having been reached, in June 1849 Palmer informed the Colonial Secretary that Bishop Nixon:

considered it necessary that the Church of Holy Trinity should be consecrated without delay; and that for this purpose, it is needful that the allotment of half an Acre, assigned for the enclosure of the Edifice, should be made over to the lawfully Constituted Trustees, I respectfully therefore beg, that you will be pleased to take such steps as may be required, to cause the Issue of this grant, so soon as may be practicable.\textsuperscript{168}

Six months later, The \textit{Courier} newspaper reported that the consecration finally took place on 27 December 1849, two years after it had been completed.\textsuperscript{169}

Philip Palmer, first incumbent of Holy Trinity, had succeeded in seeing Holy Trinity Church finished after eight years. His commitment to having this church built had begun as early as 1833, the year he arrived in the colony as the new Rural Dean. Between 1833 and 1849, he had dealt with four different Governors, two colonial secretaries, three archdeacons, all of whom had not experienced the various challenges which Palmer had faced over his long tenure as a colonial chaplain. Government records could not always be found to verify decisions made in a different administration. He could now minister to his parishioners, ‘the destitute population of the District [and their] offspring’ in a purpose-built church after years of ‘making do’ in the Penitentiary Chapel and the small Wesleyan Chapel in High Street. Palmer had faced criticism in the press for allowing the church building to proceed so slowly to the point that it ceased altogether and faced the most serious challenge, a shortfall in

\textsuperscript{168} Palmer to Bicheno, 3 June 1849, Palmer Letter Book, HTCA.  
\textsuperscript{169} \textit{Courier}, 29 December 1849, p. 2.
funds to finish the building. He had personally visited Britain to raise these funds and succeeded.

**Parish Church or Cathedral?**

There is some conjecture as to whether Holy Trinity was intended to be the new cathedral for the Diocese of Tasmania. One of the rectors, George Shoobridge suggested, ‘The fact that the arms of the See, impaled with Bishop Nixon’s, are carved in stone over the porch on the south side of the church may possibly have had something to do with the rumour.’\(^{170}\) (See Fig. 20) Just by its sheer size, ornamentation and peal of bells, it was a much grander building that the more humble-looking St David’s Church in Macquarie Street. It differed markedly in style to other contemporary churches being built in the colony at the time. Significantly, the newspapers of the day often referred to it as the ‘Trinity Cathedral’.\(^{171}\) Another reason is given by William Hutchins’ biographer, Dudley Clarke,\(^{172}\) who contends that Bishop Broughton had put forward William Hutchins as a worthy candidate to be Tasmania’s first Bishop to the Bishop of London for a number of reasons: he was a fellow graduate of Pembroke College, Cambridge and Broughton knew him well;\(^ {173}\) he had risen above the petty squabbles of the colonial clergy under him; he was respected by all and he had a humble but firm manner.\(^ {174}\) Again there is compelling new evidence of the plans

---

\(^{170}\) G.W. Shoobridge, *Notes on the History of Holy Trinity Parish, Hobart, from 1833 to 1899* (Hobart, 1899), p.4

\(^{171}\) *Colonial Times*, 2 November 1841 p. 2 and 18 January 1845, p.3


for a ‘cathedral’ in the Tasmanian Public Works Archive filed with plans of a simpler Holy Trinity. The architect (probably Blackburn) had made provision for the cathedral to be enlarged or reduced as needed. This was most likely the plan that had to be abandoned when insufficient funds could not be raised in the parish. Perhaps

Figure 20: Coats of Arms for the Bishopric of Tasmania and Bishop Francis Nixon over the south door
(Photo: Holy Trinity Church Archives)

there is another reason: did Hutchins intend his brother-in-law, Philip Palmer, the incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, to be the first Dean of Holy Trinity Cathedral? Appointment of family members to important positions was not unknown in Van Diemen’s Land, even in the 1840s—both the Lieutenant-Governors, Arthur and Franklin, had appointed relatives to positions of importance in the colony.

---

175 See Fig 14 and 15.
176 Hutchins had married Rachel Owen on 24 September 1840, the sister of Harriet Palmer, Philip Palmer’s wife.
But when Bishop Francis Nixon was appointed First Bishop of Tasmania on 21 August 1842, the walls of the so-called Trinity ‘cathedral’ were only just being built. In his Letters Patent under the Great Seal of Queen Victoria, the cathedral church in Tasmania was nominated as St David’s Church not Holy Trinity.\textsuperscript{177} It was at St David’s that Nixon was enthroned by the senior chaplain, William Bedford on 27 July 1843.

**Conclusions**

The building of a separate church for the free people and those who has served out their sentence in the colony had come at a cost, financially and personally for Palmer and Hutchins. The eight years of drawn out construction of Holy Trinity Church was the result of a number of factors: primarily, the lack of funds but also delays caused by recalcitrant convict labour, an illegal contract between the builders and Alexander Cheyne, a shortage of dressed sandstone and the premature death of William Hutchins who was keen to see this church functioning within the colony.

The delay meant that Holy Trinity could not be the Cathedral Church for the new See, but in practice, the church’s clergy played a significant role in the affairs of the whole diocese, either as Canons of the Cathedral or as Archdeacons for the Diocese. This meant that they were heavily involved in the church’s governance and ecclesiastical practice, taking leading roles for other clergy, particularly as archdeacons. Chapter 5, 6 and 7 detail the philanthropic outreach of the church to the Hobart community where the Holy Trinity clergy, Arthur Davenport (both a canon and archdeacon) and George Shoobridge (a canon), served not only their parish, but the wider community.

When Philip Palmer died suddenly in 1853, his replacement was considered by Bishop Nixon to have to be a clergyman of high calibre for a church ‘second only to St David’s’ within the diocese. From the people’s perspective, their chaplain needed to be ‘a man of and for the people’. The steps taken for this appointment will be the focus of Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3

A DIVIDED COMMUNITY: THE PETITION OF THE PEOPLE TO CHOOSE A NEW CHAPLAIN, 1853-1854

Notice—Trinity Parish

A General Meeting of the Parishioners and others interested in Trinity Parish, Hobart Town, is requested on the 30th instant, at 7 o’clock in the Campbell-street School-room, [sic] to take into consideration and record an opinion of the treatment of this parish during the last two years by the Bishop of the Diocese, and also to take such steps as may be considered necessary to obtain the appointment of an efficient minister in the spiritual charge of the Parish.

Tasmanian Church Chronicle 4 May 1854, p. 1.

Introduction

The vacant chaplaincy at Holy Trinity in May 1853 brought to a head a number of issues which had plagued the recently-formed Diocese of Tasmania for a decade. Rowan Strong traces many of the problems of the mid-nineteenth century facing the colonial Church to the loss of hegemony of the Church of England in Britain between 1828 and 1832.¹ A series of acts,² the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts (which legally barred Dissenters from Public Office) in 1828; the Catholic Emancipation Act (which lifted all restrictions on Roman Catholics except those relating to succession to the crown) in 1829 and the Reform Acts of 1832, which for the first time enfranchised some of the non-land owning middle classes (where Dissenters were the strongest), greatly weakened the influence of the Church of England in the political, cultural and

² 9 Geo. IV, c. 17 Sacramental Test Act 1828; 10 Geo. IV, c.7 Roman Catholic Relief Act 1829 2 and 3 Wm. IV, c.45 Representation of the People Act 1832; 2 and 3 Wm. IV, c.65 Representation of the People (Scotland) Act 1832; 2 and 3 Wm. IV, c.88 Representation of the People (Ireland) Act 1832.
social life of Britain. In the two penal colonies of New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land, the strong tie between Church and State was broken with the passage of the Church Acts in 1836 and 1837 respectively. This changed paradigm underpinned the problems facing Francis Russell Nixon, Tasmania’s first Bishop whose authority had been made explicit in his Letters Patent, but as he was to discover, was not upheld by colonial law. Working in a penal colony without the trappings of privilege and respect for his office, Nixon was challenged to accommodate the new paradigm where the Church of England was merely another church in the colony. As Patricia Curthoys adds, the decade after the Church Acts was a turbulent time when the Church had to redefine the source and character of its authority in Australia.

In Van Diemen’s Land, the first issue concerned the bitter and protracted debate between two successive Lieutenant-Governors and the Bishop as to who appointed and controlled the convict chaplains—the State or the Church. The second issue involved Tractarianism in the colony, where a seemingly Tractarian Bishop was at odds with an Evangelically-orientated clergy. Compounding this differences between

---

3 Strong, *Protestantism and the British Empire*, p.213.
4 7 Wm IV, No.3 Church Building Act 1836 and 1 Victoria, No.16 Church Extension Act 1837.
6 Tractarianism: a theological movement that developed within the Church of England in the 1830s and 1840s, emanating originally from Oxford University. It took its name from a number of published tracts which argued for a reinstatement of the catholic and apostolic character of the Established Church and the episcopate. The ministry of the sacrament of the Eucharist became central to worship. Peter Boyce, *God and the City: A History of St David’s Cathedral, Hobart* (Hobart, 2012), p. xiii.
the clergy were the ecclesiastical sympathies and understanding of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Secretary of State of the day. Nixon was shown little tolerance from a Whig politician and an Evangelical Archbishop when he complained about his anomalous position in Van Diemen’s Land during the 1840s.

Both these issues impinged on the appointment of a new chaplain at Holy Trinity: on the one hand, the Bishop wanted a cleric who was both learned and identified with Tractarian doctrine and practice favoured by Nixon; on the other hand, the parishioners wanted a more community-orientated chaplain, who was ‘efficient’ and would minister to them in their spiritual and temporal needs, living as they did in the impoverished area of North Hobart. Complicating these views was the pragmatism of a Lieutenant-Governor keen to save the Home Government further expense by not having to pension off redundant clerics no longer required in a penal colony.

This chapter will explore these issues as they impacted on the protracted appointment of the new chaplain over eighteen months. The eventual appointment was a fortunate compromise for it accommodated the needs of both Church and State with the demands of the people also being met in that they secured their desired ‘efficient’ community-orientated minister. The appointment of this chaplain would also be crucial to how Holy Trinity would respond to the poor and disadvantaged residents of North Hobart.

---

8 A series of advertisements for a public meeting appeared in the Hobart Town Advertiser, 22, 23, 24, 27 and 28 March 1853, no pagination (hereafter, n.p.), placed there by the Holy Trinity Church wardens.  
9 Ibid.
Context

Control and Appointment of Convict Chaplains

After his arrival in July 1853, Bishop Frances Russell Nixon, the first Bishop of Tasmania, did not take long to clash with Lieutenant-Governor John Eardley-Wilmot over just who was responsible for the convict chaplains, particularly those who belonged to the Church of England. On the one hand, they were paid by the Imperial Government and had been appointed by the Home Office acting on the recommendation of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG). As such, the convict chaplains were civil servants. The arrival of Nixon, however, brought into relief the problem of the calibre of these chaplains, their training and their ecclesiastical practice. Their official title was ‘religious instructors’ and as such they were ‘not actually ordained but ... had been educated for the Church and were candidates for ordination.’ It was expected that, once they arrived in Van Diemen’s Land, these men would be ordained by Bishop Nixon.

Nixon refused to comply, and most of these men remained ‘religious instructors’ employed as convict chaplains, but under the Bishop’s jurisdiction. For his part, the Lieutenant-Governor refused to recognise Nixon’s claim and, in an attempt to break the impasse, Nixon sent his Archdeacon, Fitzherbert Adams Marriott (1811-1890) to England in May 1844 to ask the Secretary of State to adjudicate on the matter. The

---

10 Although the island was still known in official circles as ‘Van Diemen’s Land’, Nixon’s title was ‘Bishop of Tasmania’, as stated in his Letters Patent, Hobart Town Gazette, 21 July 1843, p.859.
11 Eardley-Wimot to Stanley ‘Private and Confidential’, 4 November 1843, CO280/160 (AJCP 521), TAHO.
15 Ibid.
new Secretary of State, Earl Grey, chose the course of compromise and appointed Marriott as the Superintendent of Convict Chaplains, a position created by Lord Stanley before his retirement.\textsuperscript{16} He would act as an intermediary between the Bishop and the Lieutenant-Governor and ‘exercise a general superintendence over [the convict chaplains’] conduct and ministrations.’\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, Grey surmised that Marriott would be well-suited for the position as he enjoyed the confidence of his Bishop, and was already a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, a fact which would increase his prestige among the convict chaplains. More importantly, Marriott was in close contact with the Bishop on a daily basis as he lived with the Nixons,\textsuperscript{18} and held similar views to the Bishop.\textsuperscript{19}

The compromise of appointing Marriott did not satisfy Nixon, who refused to ordain any of the religious instructors as priests on their arrival in the colony.\textsuperscript{20} In his first ‘Charge’ to the colonial clergy on 23 April 1846 at St David’s Cathedral, Nixon defended his stand, claiming that such clerics, who were civil servants, were beyond the jurisdiction and protection of his episcopal authority.\textsuperscript{21} Moreover, the Lieutenant-Governor had the power to dismiss any of these clerics without deferring to him, thus making their livelihood vulnerable to the whim of a temporal authority.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[Ibid.]
\item[Ibid.]
\item[19] Frances Russell Nixon, \textit{A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania at the primary Visitation in the Cathedral Church of St David, Hobart Town, on Thursday, the 23\textsuperscript{rd} April 1846}, (hereafter, \textit{A Charge (1846)}), (Hobart Town, 1846), p.70.
\item[21] Nixon, \textit{A Charge (1846)}, p. 70.
\item[22] Ibid, p.71.
\end{footnotes}
appointing Archdeacon Marriott to the position of Superintendent of Convict Chaplains, he was opposed to that as well for it gave Marriott semi-episcopal authority to deal with any issues, temporal or spiritual, that might arise between them.\textsuperscript{23} From Nixon’s perspective, it was yet another instance of his episcopal authority being challenged by the State for Marriott was to receive a stipend from the State for his services, thus causing a conflict of interest.

Consequently, Nixon decided to travel to England himself late in 1846, to seek clarification from the Secretary of State and the Archbishop of Canterbury as to his status in the penal colony.\textsuperscript{24} Unfortunately for Nixon, both the positions of Secretary of State and the Archbishop of Canterbury had been taken up by two men, Earl Grey (1802-1894) and John Bird Sumner (1780-1862) respectively who did not sympathise with Nixon’s situation in Van Diemen’s Land. Grey was adamant that the Lieutenant-Governor should ‘maintain control over all persons, whether clergy or laity, employed in the instruction of convicts.’\textsuperscript{25} As far as Nixon was concerned the issue remained unresolved and the control of convict chaplains continued to simmer until 1853 when one of their number was put forward as the favoured chaplain at Holy Trinity.

\textbf{A Tractarian Bishop and Evangelical Clergy}

Another aspect of Nixon’s episcopacy was his belief that he should have absolute authority over church doctrine and churchmanship. In his \textit{A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania} (1846), Nixon clearly set out his aims for the Church.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, p.81.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{25} Grey to Denison, 21 March 1847, Colonial Church Legislation, Part VI, Van Diemen’s Land, Vol. XXXII, No. 355-IV, 1852, HCPP, p. 42.
in Van Diemen’s Land. He pointed out that the colonial chaplains generally were ‘slenderly experienced in the ways, and usages, and discipline of [the] Mother Church’. Moreover, very few of them had ‘kept even pace with the extraordinary energy, that [had] latterly marked the efforts of the Church at home.’ This referred to the large numbers of religious tracts being written and promulgated throughout England, emanating mainly from Oxford University. This early ‘Oxford Movement’, as it had become known, advocated a return to the ancient church of the pre-Reformation era in teaching and churchmanship, particularly reinstatement of the catholic and apostolic character of the Established Church and the episcopate. From 1845, the later Oxford Movement, emphasised the ministry of the sacrament of the Eucharist, central to their worship. This change and others pertaining to vestments and the use of candles became synonymous with ‘high-church’ practice. Nixon advocated adopting these ways pointing out to the assembled clerics that many of them had let slip some of the ‘rubrics’ of the Church of England as set out in the Book of Common Prayer. To many of the colonial chaplains, however, the resumption of these ‘high-church’ rubrics was mistakenly confused with ‘Romanish’ or ‘Popish’ beliefs and

27 Ibid.
29 Oxford Movement: See Tractarianism. The Original Oxford Movement spanned from 1833 to 1845. The later Oxford Movement began in 1845 but was no longer focused on Oxford University but on the parishes. Here the daily services of choral Morning and Evening Prayer were revived, celebration of the Eucharist was increased, stoles and surplices were worn, candles lit on altars and rented pews replaced with free seating. (Hans. J. Hillerbrand (ed.), The Encyclopaedia of Protestantism, Vol. 3: L-R, (New York, 2004), p. 1433.)
30 High-Church: Originally referred in the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries to Churchmen who upheld the Royal Supremacy (1534) and the Protestant Settlement (1701). From 1850, the term referred to those Anglicans influenced by Tractarianism as ‘High-Church’. (Peter Boyce, God and the City: A History of St David’s Cathedral, Hobart (Hobart, 2012), p. xii.)
31 Nixon, A Charge (1846), pp. 40 – 41.
practices. Although Nixon pointed out that he was not a supporter of the Roman Catholic Church, indeed he had made a public declaration to that effect, he was still regarded with suspicion and hostility by the ‘low-church’-practising colonial chaplains.

This matter came to a head with the Gorham Judgement in 1850 where the Privy Council of England (a secular court) quashed a decision of the Arches Court (an ecclesiastical court) with regard to the low-church interpretation of church doctrine by an English priest, George Gorham (1787-1857). At issue was the right of priests to exercise their private judgement in the interpretation of the sacraments, in particular baptismal regeneration. Nixon regarded the Gorham Judgement as a ‘heresy’ putting him at variance with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who accepted the Privy Council’s findings.

In the same year, the question of baptismal regeneration was raised at the first Australasian Bishops’ Conference held in Sydney in October 1850. The minutes of this

---

32 Ibid., p. 48.
33 Francis Russell Nixon, A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania, at visitation, held in the Cathedral Church of At David, Hobart Town, on Thursday, 22 May, 1851, (hereafter A Charge (1851)), (Hobart Town,1851) Appendix D, pp. 92-95.
36 Low-Church: In the early eighteenth-century, the term referred to members of the Church of England who gave low priority to the claims of the episcopate, sacraments and priesthood. From 1850s, it referred to Evangelicals generally (Peter Boyce, God and the City: A History of St David’s Cathedral, Hobart (Hobart, 2012), p. xii.)
37 For the effect in Britain, see Fred D. Schneider, ’The Anglican Quest for Authority: Convocation and Imperial Factor, 1850-60’, Journal of Religious History, Vol. 9, No.2, 1976, pp.145-147.
38 For more on the doctrine of private judgement, see Peter Toon, Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism (London, 1979), pp.135-137.
39 Nixon, A Charge (1851), p. 43.
40 Ibid.
41 These years of turmoil and change in Van Diemen’s Land are well documented in Neil Batt, ‘Bishop Nixon and Conflicts within the Church of England in Tasmania in the 1850s’ Unpublished BA Hons Thesis 1962 UTAS; Neil Batt and Michael Roe, ‘Conflict within the Church of England in Tasmania, 1850-1858’,
conference were made public and revealed that the majority of the assembled Bishops (Sydney, Adelaide, Newcastle, Tasmania and New Zealand) voted in favour of the high-
church interpretation of the meaning of baptism\(^{42}\) with the exception of Bishop Perry of the Melbourne Diocese, the only Evangelical Bishop present.\(^{43}\)

Nixon’s support for this high church principle was attacked in Van Diemen’s Land by Henry Phibbs Fry (1807-1874), the incumbent of St George’s Church, Battery Point. Fry was a curious mix of contradictions as he had started his chaplaincy in the colony as a high-churchman, but after a visit to the mother country between 1849 and 1850, he had become an avid supporter of the Evangelical cause. Fry was Nixon’s most strident critic. In the years 1851 to 1854, he challenged the Bishop on such matters as private judgement, episcopal interpretation of church doctrine, Romanizing tendencies and the education of ordinands at the local college in Hobart.

The newspapers of the day inflamed the rift between the two clergymen and Fry used the press to his advantage. On 22 February 1851, Fry organised for the minutes of a meeting of laity and clergy, held in Adelaide on 28 January 1851,\(^{44}\) to be published in the *Courier* newspaper.\(^{45}\) Fry had been in Adelaide en route to Hobart Town after taking leave in England.\(^{46}\) He had been impressed with how the Adelaide meeting had

---

\(^{42}\) Austin Cooper, ‘The Bishops and Baptism: Colonial Reverberations of a Tractarian Controversy’, *Pacifica*, 18, (February 2005), pp. 76-77.

\(^{43}\) Minutes of Proceedings at a Meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragen Bishops of the Province of Australia, held in Sydney, from October 1\(^{st}\) to November 1\(^{st}\), AD, 1850 (hereafter Bishops’ Conference 1850) quoted in *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 December 1850, Supplement, pp.3-4.

\(^{44}\) The proceedings of this meeting were written in full in the *South Australian Register*, 29 January 1851, pp.2-3.

\(^{45}\) *Courier*, 22 February 1851, pp.2-3.

\(^{46}\) *South Australian Register*, 16 January 1851, p. 2 and 22 January 1851, p. 2.
'calmly discussed ... the greatest good in the Church and in religion.' At the time, he had written two letters to the *South Australian Gazette*, where he raised several points of difference with the Bishops' Conference held in Sydney a few months earlier: a halt to Tractarianism; an increase in lay participation in church affairs; the need for ministers to be free from Episcopal interference, and the right of the clergy to private judgement on matters such as the meaning of baptism. Fry had these two letters reprinted in the Hobart Town press with the aim of creating a catalyst for a similar meeting and discourse in that city.

In a public meeting on 20 March 1851, held ostensibly by Nixon’s supporters to gain clerical sanction of the minutes of the Bishops’ Conference, many of the colonial chaplains lead by Fry, condemned Nixon’s high-church stand, particularly his support for baptismal regeneration and the proposed separation of clerical and laity in future church governance. Fry formed the ‘Protestant Association’, an organisation of clergy and laity committed to maintaining the Principles of the Reformation. Fry also wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, stating that the clergy supported the Gorham Judgement and that they were Evangelically minded, not Romanish.

---

47 Address of the Rev, Fry, respecting the Synod of Sydney, Port Adelaide, 22 January 1851, quoted in *Courier*, 26 February 1851, p.4.
48 *South Australian Gazette*, 22 January 1851 quoted in the *Courier*, 26 February 1851, p.4.
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51 *Courier*, 22 March 1851, p. 2.
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53 Its full title was *A Church of England Association for Maintaining in Van Diemen’s Land the Principles of the Protestant Reformation*.
Encouraged by Fry’s support of the laity in church affairs, on 3 May 1851, 500 colonists petitioned Bishop Nixon to convene a meeting to discuss the decisions and implications of the Bishops’ Conference. Although the Bishop refused to comply, the meeting went ahead, chaired by leading lay figure and lawyer, Thomas J. Knight and supported by Robert Kermode (MLC) and Captain Michael Fenton (MLC). The public was called on to resist the alarming growth of Romanism in the colony, citing as evidence the use of three ‘Romanish’ texts in the local training college, Christ College, for ordinands. The Evangelicals presumed that this was one way Nixon could ‘stack the diocese with Tractarians’.

On 5 September 1851, the Protestant Association adopted *A Solemn Declaration*, a call to arms against Tractarianism. The document listed three demands: first, that theological training must be conducted by Evangelicals; second, that the laity must be allowed to choose their own chaplains; and third, that the clergy must have the right to private judgment on all religious matters, not dictated by the Bishop. Of all the criticism of him, Nixon seemed to feel the brunt of *A Solemn Declaration* most keenly. He retaliated by refusing to ordain or license any clergyman who had signed it, an issue felt at Holy Trinity in 1853. Fry, for his part, threatened to set up a purely
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58 *Solemn Declaration of Ministers of the Church of England in Van Diemen’s Land, on the Present Condition of the Church in that Colony, 1851* (Hobart Town, 1851).
59 *Courier*, 6 September 1851, p. 4.
60 Francis Russell Nixon, *A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania, at visitation, held in the Cathedral Church of At David, Hobart Town, on Thursday, 22 May, 1851* (Hobart Town, 1851), pp.2-3.
Evangelical church in opposition to the Bishop.⁶¹ Although this never happened, concern was voiced at the number of Evangelical clergy leaving the colony and taking up positions in Bishop Perry’s Melbourne diocese.⁶²

Matters were made worse by Nixon’s perceived arrogance and high handedness in the way he treated the clergy. He had a low opinion of the clergy, describing them in terms such as ‘ignoramus’, ‘vain’, ‘headstrong’, ‘indiscreet’, ‘no notion of fostering a congregation’, ‘not a scrap of knowledge of scholastic routine’, ‘utterly unfitted for any post of trust or efficiency’ and ‘deficient in zeal and energy’.⁶³ He became scathing of the Evangelicals’ intelligence and their inability to understand directives. In defending his Tractarianism, he wrote to one chaplain:

Surely it cannot seem strange to any but an illucid mind, that I should prefer the theology of like-minded prelates to that of some of you ill-equipped clergy in this colony?⁶⁴

The rift between the Tractarian Nixon and the Evangelical chaplains became an important issue at Holy Trinity in 1853 on two counts: it caused unnecessary delay in filling the chaplaincy as Bishop Nixon and Lieutenant-Governor Denison could not agree on the appointment; and second, the parishioners made it plain to Nixon that they wanted an Evangelical chaplain not his Tractarian nominee.

**The People’s Voice**

The Bishops at the Sydney Conference had debated the future direction of the
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⁶⁴ Nixon to J. Bishton 14 April 1852, *Correspondence and Associated Papers of Bishop F.R. Nixon*, NS3, TAHO.
jurisdiction of the Church of England in Australia, and acknowledged that any future governance of the Church\textsuperscript{65} should include the laity, but meeting separately to the clergy in conventions at diocesan and provincial levels.\textsuperscript{66} This separation of the levels of church members caused protests from the laity in Van Diemen’s Land.

The Protestant Association’s \textit{Solemn Declaration} of 1851 recognised the importance of the laity in supporting their demand to nominate their own chaplains, not the Bishop. They claimed that this was in keeping with current practice in England, where the local parishioners could choose their own ministers. This was a bold request by the people but buoyed by the support of the articulate Fry who was prepared to confront the Bishop, and lead by their own church wardens, the laity of Trinity Parish made their demands. They petitioned the Bishop to appoint their nominee to the vacant chaplaincy in 1853 and when this failed, they petitioned the Lieutenant-Governor and even threatened to petition the Privy Council.\textsuperscript{67}

In a broader context, this demand for inclusion into the Church can be seen as another facet of the huge changes in society in Van Diemen’s Land in the 1840s and 1850s. As Lloyd Robson observes, ‘There appeared to be creeping in an element of democratic sentiment.’\textsuperscript{68} The voice of the people was already raised against continuing transportation and their desire for self-Government. The people were encouraged by

\textsuperscript{66} Bishops’ Conference 1850, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Courier}, 12 September 1853, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{68} Lloyd Robson, \textit{A History of Tasmania, Vol. 1, Van Diemen’s Land from the Earliest Times to 1855} (Melbourne, 1983), p.457.
their leaders to stand up against those in authority.\textsuperscript{69} The Bishop of Tasmania was but one of these.

Moreover, Batt and Roe argue that these years were a ‘time [when] Tasmanians were avid for excitement, [and they] thrashed every incident livid.’\textsuperscript{70} They resented ‘pretension’ in ‘late-comers who claimed superior status.’\textsuperscript{71} Nixon’s high-church doctrine and practices sat ill with the people. Perhaps it was the feeling of ‘alienation’,\textsuperscript{72} so far from the mother country or living with ‘the confines of an island [that] encouraged early residents to feel proprietorship over its institutions, causing many to act as if the local Church belonged to them rather than they to the Church.’\textsuperscript{73}

In 1853, the Trinity parishioners came into conflict with the Tractarian Bishop over his nominee for their new chaplain. The dispute widened to include the Lieutenant-Governor who did not agree with Nixon’s views of the Church in the diocese, later claiming he was ‘neither ... High Church or Low Church’\textsuperscript{74} and raising alarm over the ‘stumbling-blocks’ being placed in the way of the people. He believed that ‘the laity ...

\textsuperscript{70} Neil Batt and Michael Roe, ‘Conflict within the Church of England in Tasmania, 1850-1858’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{73} Batt and Roe, ‘Conflict within the Church of England’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{74} Low-Churchmen: In the early eighteenth-century, the term referred to members of the Church of England who gave low priority to the claims of the episcopate, sacraments and priesthood. From 1850s, it referred to Evangelicals generally. (Peter Boyce, God and the City: A History of St David’s Cathedral, Hobart (Hobart, 2012), p. xii.)
must take action in all matters connected with the [Church’s] organisation and development.75

**The Vacant Chaplaincy**
The death of the incumbent, Philip Palmer, although sudden, was not unexpected.76 He had been ailing for some years and had asked to be transferred back to a parish in England in 1844,77 but was refused. Instead, he took extended leave for eighteen months in England where he had raised funds to complete the building of the new Trinity Church.78 He returned to Hobart Town in March 1847, still unwell. To enable him to get around his large parish, he purchased a horse, even though he knew as an urban chaplain he was not entitled to one, let alone expecting the Government to bear the cost of its forage.79 His doctor vouched that his patient could not ‘perform his parochial duties without the aid of a horse’ because Palmer suffered from shortness of breath.80

By October 1852, the colonial newspapers, were announcing Palmer’s retirement owing to ill health81 and he had nominated Reverend James Medland, convict chaplain at the nearby Male Penitentiary, as his replacement.82 Joseph Gould Medland (also known as James Medland) (1817-1899), had been an artist in England and had been
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78 See Chapter 2 of this thesis.
79 Palmer Letter Book 16 October 1848, HTCA.
80 Ibid.
81 *Tasmanian Church Chronicle*, 2 October 1852 (no pagination); *Colonial Times*, 15 October 1852, p. 2; *Launceston Examiner*, 20 October 1852, p. 3.
82 *Launceston Examiner*, 20 October 1852, p. 3.
selected by the SPG as a religious instructor in Van Diemen’s Land. After very rudimentary and short instruction in the practices of the Church of England, he had been sent out to the colony, arriving on 20 November 1844 on board the William Jardine. He was immediately given the position of convict chaplain at the convict probation station at Buckland (1844-45), followed by Brown’s River (1845-6) and Hobart Town (1846-47) before being appointed as chaplain to the Male Penitentiary in 1846. In this position he came into contact with and ministered to, the parishioners of Holy Trinity, some of whom preferred to attend the convict chapel instead of the new parish church of Holy Trinity. In 1850, Bishop Nixon ordained Medland a priest, so that he could be more ‘useful at the Penitentiary as a priest, than as a deacon.

Bishop Nixon refused the parishioners’ request to appoint Medland, instead in January 1853, appointing as curate at Holy Trinity, Reverend William Brickwood to assist the ailing Palmer. Brickwood, from the Melbourne Diocese, was not a wise choice for within three months, he had tendered his early resignation, citing ill health and lack of strength as his reasons for not doing the work of the parish. In reality, Brickwood was facing acrimony and criticism from certain outspoken parishioners who had continued to demand the appointment of Medland. This had caused Brickwood great mental distress and, consequently, he had been often absent from performing his duties at
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church services and he had neglected his pastoral care among the parishioners in need.\(^{88}\)

Supported by the Bishop, Brickwood remained curate and endured a year working in the Trinity Parish. When he finally gave notice in February 1854, he was pressed further by the Bishop to give a full account of his experiences as the curate.\(^{89}\) He nominated one of the church wardens, Major Hugh Caveley Cotton (1798-1881) as one of his chief critics and accused James Medland, the penitentiary chaplain, of ‘meddling’ in the affairs of the parish and questioning his authority.\(^{90}\) To make matters worse, the incumbent chaplain, Philip Palmer, although ill, was actively encouraging dissent among the parishioners.\(^{91}\) Nixon informed Medland that he was not to interfere in parish affairs and reminded him that his ‘mission’ in the colony was as a convict chaplain\(^ {92}\) and he was not ‘to step out of that line of duty to which [he had been] appointed.’\(^{93}\)

**Petition of Parishioners**

The event which brought these matters to a head was a deputation on 3 June 1853 to Lieutenant-Governor Denison of twenty parishioners of Holy Trinity, lead by Major Hugh Cotton.\(^ {94}\) This action was unprecedented in the life of the Colonial Church to date but was a strategy, which Howard le Couteur argues, was adopted from the English
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\(^{88}\) Letter of Brickwood to W.H. Gill and Congregation of Holy Trinity Church, 14 February 1854, quoted in *Tasmanian Church Chronicle* 1 April 1854, n.p.
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\(^{91}\) Ibid.

\(^{92}\) Nixon to Medland, 26 May 1853, quoted in *Tasmanian Church Chronicle*, 4 May 1854, n.p.

\(^{93}\) Ibid.

\(^{94}\) *Courier*, 6 June 1853, p. 2.
Dissenters and Radicals when they wished to redress their grievances.\textsuperscript{95} They requested that the Lieutenant-Governor appoint James Medland as the new chaplain because of his exemplary record of ‘attendance on the sick and ... his public ministry on the parish during the long illness of the late incumbent.’\textsuperscript{96} More important, he had earned ‘the respect and good-will of the parishioners, and his appointment would afford general satisfaction to the members of the Church of England in this city.’\textsuperscript{97}

Denison readily agreed to their request, noting that Medland had been attentive to ‘the spiritual wants of the prisoners at the penitentiary [and thereby] instrumental ... in turning many of them from the error of their ways.’\textsuperscript{98} Accordingly, he gladly would recommend Medland’s appointment to the Bishop as the new minister at Holy Trinity Church.\textsuperscript{99} The Bishop refused.

The newspapers of the day seized on the different views of the Bishop and the Lieutenant-Governor, emphasising the power of the latter over the former in matters ecclesiastical. Moreover, the press took up the cause of the parishioners, stating their apostolic right to ‘call’ a new pastor.\textsuperscript{100} Various ulterior motives were put forward as to why the Bishop was ‘disinclined’ to appoint Medland; one was his differing Evangelical views and practices as a prison chaplain; two was that Medland had signed the \textit{Solemn Declaration} back in September 1851 criticising the Bishop’s high-church principles and
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practices;\textsuperscript{101} and third, Medland was considered not ‘learned enough’ to hold the position in such an important parish.\textsuperscript{102} As far as the parishioners were concerned, they had every right to choose their own minister, a practice dating back to the primitive Christian churches.\textsuperscript{103} The press sympathised with the parishioners that they had to demean themselves to ask permission from a third party.\textsuperscript{104}

The Bishop faced strident criticism for his decision, particularly from his vocal critic, Henry Phibbs Fry, now an Evangelical convert.\textsuperscript{105} He took up the Holy Trinity cause with great enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{106} Buoyed by public support, the parishioners sent the Bishop another letter, requesting him to give his reasons for refusing to license Medland.\textsuperscript{107} Nixon, mindful of his absolute authority in the colony, replied that no-one had the ‘right to ask questions of a Bishop of the Church of England’.\textsuperscript{108}

Finally, under continued pressure, Nixon was obliged to give reasons publicly for his denial of Medland through the publication in the press during September 1853 of a series of letters that passed between the main protagonists. Again, the stimulus for this revelation was Fry who began publishing in part some of these letters in his own periodical, the Protestant.\textsuperscript{109} In a letter dated 13 July 1853, Major Cotton, the main supporter of Medland, accused the Bishop of prevaricating over the appointment of
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Medland as chaplain to Holy Trinity. Cotton claimed that initially the Bishop had refused Medland’s appointment because Palmer had not yet resigned; then the Bishop’s excuse changed to his inability to remove Medland from being a chaplain within the Convict Department, a position he implied was for life.

Not deterred, 600 parishioners petitioned Lieutenant-Governor Denison to give his consent for Medland to resign from the Convict Department. This the Lieutenant-Governor readily gave, but still the Bishop remained resolute, even though it was becoming obvious that the convict chaplains would soon no longer be required in the colony with the agitation for the end of transportation mounting.\textsuperscript{110} Major Cotton went on to touch on the question of church-state rights in questioning the legality of the Bishop’s ‘supposed or assumed authority’ over the colonial Government.\textsuperscript{111} He further warned the Bishop that, by his ‘unfair and oppressive’ treatment of Medland, a ‘devoted Christian minister, full of the Spirit, and ... mighty in the Scriptures, ... deeply read in the word of truth and salvation, [and] ... a highly gifted and talented preacher’, he (the Bishop) would bring the Church of England in this colony into ‘disrepute, and [endanger] not only its reputation, but its influence and means of support’.\textsuperscript{112}

Emboldened, Cotton went on to ridicule the Bishop’s choice of chaplain, Reverend Dr Samuel Parsons from Cullenswood\textsuperscript{113} in the north of the diocese, who was not only unknown in the Trinity Parish, but was very young and heavily subsidised by his own

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{113} In 1851, Dr Parsons had been invited to become the chaplain at the chapel built by his uncle, Robert Legge near his property of ‘Cullenswood’ in the Fingal Valley. Such an appointment had not needed to be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor as Parsons was not in the pay of the Imperial Government at that stage.
parish. Cotton further chided the Bishop for even assuming that he could just remove Parsons from his northern parish without consulting the parishioners there.

Cotton concluded his letter by alluding to the other issue plaguing the Church in Van Diemen’s Land—the laity had a ‘legal right to have a voice in the selection of their Parochial Clergy’ and not be subjected to the Bishop’s ‘despotic and irresponsible power’ in selecting a cleric of his choice. It was up to the Bishop to avert the ‘heavy calamity hanging over the Diocese in the disaffection of the laity by granting a licence to Mr Medland.’

Bishop Nixon acknowledged this acrimonious letter but chose not to reply to it. Instead, the Courier published in full an exchange of letters which had passed between Nixon and Medland in August of the previous year, just three months after Palmer had died. It is not clear who supplied these letters to the newspaper, but it would be reasonable to assume that it had been the slighted Medland, who had obliged in an attempt to prove the Bishop’s unreasonable response to a legitimate request.

The Bishop in his letter chastised Medland for allowing the 600 parishioners to petition the Lieutenant-Governor, seemingly going against his episcopal authority to appoint priests. This would invest the Lieutenant-Governor ‘with hyperepiscopal, if not papal power.’ The Bishop listed his objections to Medland taking up office, the chief one being Medland’s signing of the Solemn Declaration and the Principles of the Protestant
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Reformation. The latter document was a strong statement asserting that the Bishop could not force ministers to adhere to his doctrinal interpretation of the sacraments, in particular baptismal regeneration. Another objection was Medland’s lack of classical knowledge, particularly of Greek. This rendered him unsuitable for a post such as Holy Trinity, ‘one of the most important Chaplaincies in the Diocese’ and therefore not a position for a convict chaplain. To emphasise his point, Nixon pointed out that even the SPG, which had recommended Medland for work in the colony as a ‘catechist’, (or at best, a deacon), found his understanding of Greek to be lacking and therefore, with these ‘inferior attainments’, he could not expect to ‘be admitted to the priesthood’ nor could he complain if he remained all his life ‘serving God in the Deacon’s office.

Medland’s immediate reply was to point out that the number of free colonists attending the Penitentiary Chapel was increasing (up to forty three communicants), but because he was not ordained a priest he could not celebrate communion. As to his lack of classical learning, his studies had been interrupted in England when the SPG nominated him for the position of convict chaplain. Since taking up his position at the Male Penitentiary, his duties had become ‘incessant’ with him taking six services per week, visiting the Female Colonial Hospital and ministering to the men in solitary confinement. To make up for his deficiency in Greek, something incidentally he ‘never felt that want of this amongst the people I now am ... connected’, Medland claimed that he was well versed in the teachings of the Bible, which ‘the vast majority of
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persons [in the penitentiary] require to be instructed in the plainest and simplest truths.” Medland finished his defensive letter by reminding the Bishop that, while he carried a heavy load as the chaplain at the Penitentiary for some ‘1000 souls’, a Deacon back in England would not be expected to take on this work alone, but would be assisted by a priest.

The Bishop’s reply was short and to the point: he would not ordain any man who was not educated in the Greek language for to do so would be to drop the standard of the colonial chaplains even further. As to Medland’s need to administer communion to the free colonists in the convict chapel, Nixon pointed out that they should be attending their parish churches which were licensed for the performance of the sacraments, whereas the convict chapel was not.

**Public Meeting**

A day after the publication of the exchange of letters between the Bishop and Medland, a large meeting (about 500 people) was convened in Hobart Town to discuss the issues. Both the Evangelicals and the Tractarians (at least the supporters of the Bishop) attended. The chairman, Captain Michael Fenton (MLC) opened proceedings by asserting that the meeting needed to be called to address ‘the new state of things’ in the colony which were affecting both the clergy and the laity. A number of resolutions had been prepared in advance and would be voted on during the meeting.
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A similar meeting had already been held in Launceston the previous week, where ‘the objection by the Bishop of Tasmania to institute the Rev. Mr Medland in the locum-
tency [sic] of Trinity Parish, Hobart Town, upon the nomination of His Excellency, the
Lieutenant-Governor, a grievance and injury for which there is at present no legal
retire [sic] in this colony’ had been discussed.\textsuperscript{128}

Captain Fenton went on to state that as the Bishop did not abide by the Gorham
Judgment of the Privy Council of 1850, it appeared that Nixon was excluding from
licensing as priests ‘all those men who had views usually called evangelical.’\textsuperscript{129} As the
people’s protests at diocesan level had gone unheeded, they must now appeal to ‘the
highest authority in the land, Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen.’\textsuperscript{130} He then
produced a Petition to the Queen, which requested that the decision of the Privy
Council with regard to the Gorham Judgement be applied to Van Diemen’s Land so as
to redress the suffering of the people and restore the peace to the Church. This
resolution was carried with only two dissenters.

The second resolution involved the right of congregations to elect their own ministers.
The peoples’ nominee for the chaplaincy at Holy Trinity, Joseph Medland, had been
reprimanded by the Bishop for visiting a dying man outside the Penitentiary. The
acting curate, William Brickwood, was ‘too weak and sickly’ to visit his three thousand
parishioners and the clergymen who had been selected by the Bishop to stand in were
‘romish’ and practised a form of worship similar to that of pre-reformation times

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.
‘when idolatry, superstition and wickedness abounded’. 131 This motion was also carried, despite a request for more time to consider the issue.

The third resolution was to thank the Archbishop of Canterbury for his support of the Gorham Judgement and to ask for legislation to be enacted so that this freedom might be permitted in the Tasmanian Diocese. One of Nixon’s supporters, George Anstey (1814-1895), interrupted proceedings and accused the organisers of the meeting of being ‘cunning and deceitful’. 132 He was obliged to withdraw his remarks, but asserted that the public was being led astray ‘in the absence of any explanation. The Bishop was too proud to explain to them.’ 133 Rather, the organisers of the meeting should go to him. Anstey also denied that the Bishop was Catholic in his actions and dogma; on the contrary, he spent much time attacking the Roman Catholic Church. Moreover, the real reason why Medland had been overlooked as the new incumbent at Holy Trinity was because he had signed the Solemn Declaration, which challenged the doctrines of the Church. 134 Anstey concluded his remarks by stating that the other denominations in the colony were enjoying the spectacle of members of the Church of England ‘fighting and struggling’ among themselves, but this appeal to their sense of propriety failed and the motion was carried.

The fourth and final resolution was the introduction into Van Diemen’s Land of fully ordained Evangelical clergy in order to ‘effectively maintain ... Protestant Principles
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and promote the real interests of our Church.\textsuperscript{135} Fry gave evidence of the falling numbers of Evangelical clergy in the colony—`not a dozen of them who had signed the Solemn Declaration were left.' They wanted `men in full orders—men of learning and piety' and thereby they would bypass the Bishop who was refusing to license anyone who had views contrary to his own. This resolution also passed.\textsuperscript{136}

This public meeting was significant for a number of reasons. The large number of people present indicated the interest in the community at large; moreover, the participants were from a wide cross section of the community, including members of the Legislative Council, business leaders and members of all the colonial churches. In addition, the four resolutions summed up the issues which had been simmering since the Bishops’ Conference in 1850, namely the Gorham Judgment, which spearheaded the Tractarian-Evangelical struggle within the state and the right of the people to elect their own chaplains. Criticism had been levelled at the organisers of the meeting that they should have taken their issues to the Metropolitan in Sydney, Bishop Broughton in the first instance, rather than directly to the Queen in Council. As an intermediate step, they would petition the Legislative Council, perhaps on the advice of the Legislative Councillors (Fenton, Chapman and Kermode) who had attended the meeting.

The issue of the people electing their own chaplains was debated in the Legislative Council later in the same month. Not surprising, the same speakers at the public
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meeting also put their views in the Council. Robert Kermode drew on the opinions of ‘learned and ancient writers’ such as Joseph Bingham (*Antiquities of the Christian Church*)\(^{137}\) and Richard Hooker (*Book of Ecclesiastical Polity*),\(^{138}\) who both supported ‘the right of the people to have a consent in the appointment of the clergyman’ and that this was ‘a fundamental principle of the Church of England’.\(^{139}\) Moreover, the people ‘out of their own funds supply the means of paying the clergymen, and therefore ... they have a right to be heard in the selection of the men who are to exercise the function of clergymen among them.’\(^{140}\)

In 1852, at a meeting of Lay Delegates from all the parishes of the Church of England in the Tasmanian Diocese, a resolution was passed (17 to 9) ‘That it is the opinion of this assembly that the nomination of the clergy should be vested in each congregation.’\(^{141}\) As a result, the legislative Councillors had three petitions lying on the table from the parishioners of Pontville, New Norfolk and Trinity, each asking that they might have a voice in the election of their ministers. In the case of Trinity Parish, ‘a considerable number of well-disposed members ... with their families [were] in danger of being driven, surely against their wills, from within her pale.’\(^{142}\) It was up to the Council to crush ‘in the bud’ the ‘unhappy contentions and divisions’ springing up in their midst.\(^{143}\)

\(^{137}\) Joseph Bingham published *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (Oxford) in 10 volumes between 1708 an 1722.  
\(^{138}\) Richard Hooker published *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity* (London) in 8 volumes between 1593 and 1662 (the last 3 volumes posthumously).  
\(^{139}\) *Courier*, 3 October 1853, p. 2.  
\(^{140}\) Ibid.  
\(^{141}\) Ibid.  
\(^{142}\) Ibid.  
\(^{143}\) Ibid.
Legislative Councillor Kermode concluded that a chaplain could minister to a parish for up to fifty years and could therefore influence several generations. How much more important therefore was it that the peoples’ voice should be heard in such a selection? The Bishop should not be the only judge of chaplain placements. Despite being supported by Michael Fenton and Thomas Chapman, both present at the public meeting, the debate was adjourned, Kermode suspecting that his fellow Councillors were evading the issue.  

**Church versus State**

Whilst the issues of Holy Trinity’s chaplaincy were being aired in public through the press and through meetings, Bishop Nixon set about settling the dispute himself by writing several letters to the Secretary of State and the Archbishop of Canterbury. His first letter, dated 19 July 1853, set out his reasons for not appointing Joseph Medland to Holy Trinity’s chaplaincy. He asserted that he had a ‘general principle’ that he wanted ‘the most efficient and best educated Clergyman for ... Town Chaplaincies’. To that end, he nominated the Reverend Samuel Parsons from Cullenswood in the Fingal Valley because he was well-qualified, holding a MA from Trinity College Dublin, as well as having ‘sound theological views, proved usefulness, energy and discretion’. This appointment was in abeyance as Nixon waited for a reply the Lieutenant-Governor’s request for the Secretary of State’s opinion.

Nixon rejected Joseph Medland, an artist by profession, on several counts. Historically, he had only been selected to be a Religious Instructor to the Convicts by the SPG,
which was finding it difficult to select men suitably qualified to go to the colonies. Medland had ‘very inferior attainments’ and was not to ever expect a position any higher than a Deacon (September 1848). Nixon ordained him a priest (May 1850) simply because ‘he would be more useful in the Convict Department as a Priest than a Deacon.’

Nixon’s second objection to Medland was because he had signed the *Solemn Declaration* in 1851, which challenged the Doctrine of the Church of England, in particular Article XX of the *Thirty Nine Articles of Religion*. Medland’s adherence to the *Solemn Declaration* was tantamount to ‘dissent’. This, as well as Nixon’s perception that Medland was not ‘fit’ to be the cure of souls of one of the ‘most important and prominent positions in the whole Diocese’, formed the basis of his decision.

Lieutenant-Governor William Denison had challenged the Bishop’s decision, dismissing both his reasons. Nixon responded by questioning the legal authority of Denison to over-rule his authority to appoint clergy, drawing on his revised Letters Patent and the precedent set by Broughton when he was Archdeacon of Australia.

---
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Nixon also questioned the validity of the petition with 600 signatures requesting the appointment of Medland. Nixon asserted that most of them were not parishioners of Holy Trinity Church, but rather residents living within the vicinity of the church. He pointed out to the Colonial Secretary that such a document hardly represented ‘the wishes of the people’.151

In another letter sent to Newcastle on 28 July 1853, Nixon expressed his concern that the Lieutenant-Governor was encroaching on his role as Bishop by corresponding directly with Medland over the doctrinal implications of his signing the *Solemn Declaration*.152 Nixon asserted that Denison’s interference set a precedent for the State to meddle further in church affairs153 and would encourage resistance among the clergy towards him, their Bishop, claiming that “They [could] now plead that they [had] the Lieutenant-Governor on their side.”154 Medland assured the Lieutenant-Governor that his signing of the *Solemn Declaration* did not contravene Article XX of the *Thirty Nine Articles*, a fact he had made known to Nixon in March 1852.155 Medland also pointed out to Denison that the Archbishop of Canterbury supported the *Solemn Declaration*,156 a point vehemently disputed by Nixon.157

Denison’s biographer, J.M. Bennett, argues that the Lieutenant-Governor was indiscreet and did over-step his authority in investigating for himself matters of Church

---
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152 C.E. Wilmot (Private Secretary) to Medland, 13 July 1853, Ibid., p. 20.
154 Ibid.
155 Medland to Denison 10 July 1853, Ibid., p. 22.
156 Ibid.
157 Nixon to Newcastle, 28 July 1853, Ibid., p. 20.
Doctrine. He would have been familiar with the views of Henry Fry, published in full in the local press as well as being supported by the opinions of the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Bird Sumner, an Evangelical. But Denison prided himself on his moderate position with the Colonial Church, claiming that he was ‘neither High-Church nor Low-Church’. He was mindful that as ‘the Queen’s representative and, no less, a brother of the Bishop of Salisbury, ... [that he was] bound to set a high example to the community.’

A month later, on 23 August 1853, Nixon wrote a third letter to Newcastle, refuting the claims of the 600 memorialists who had signed a petition in October 1852, demanding Medland be named the next chaplain when Philip Palmer would retire. Nixon again reiterated that the signatories were not bona fide parishioners: some lived up to five miles away while others were Dissenters, had left the parish or their given address was in dispute. He explained his refusal to give reasons publicly for overlooking Medland for the Holy Trinity Chaplaincy, claiming that he was only following a directive given to the first Bishop of Calcutta, ‘Be not forward to assign reasons to those who have no right to demand them.’ He asserted again that there were two reasons for Medland being rejected for the chaplain’s position—his unsuitability and his
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theological doctrine (the Gorham Judgement). The memorialists claimed only the latter. On the same note, Nixon denied the claim that he had by-passed any clergyman who adhered to Evangelist principles, claiming that in the last year he had made twenty appointments and none of them had been challenged on doctrinal orthodoxy. Likewise, Nixon disputed the memorialists’ claim that the clergy in the colony had no legal redress through any court. He quoted from his Letters Patent that he had authority to set up an ecclesiastical court along the same lines as those in England. By the same token, any aggrieved clergyman could appeal to the Metropolitan, Bishop Broughton, but Nixon claimed that appeals to such a court and to the Metropolitan had been made in the past and had failed.

Finally, Nixon denied that his nominee, Dr Parsons from Cullenswood, would ‘alienate’ the Trinity parishioners and their numbers had certainly not diminished while under the charge of Brickwood. He closed his letter on a sour note by pointing out that several of the memorialists were ‘in the employ and pay of the Government’, implying they were abusing their positions in colonial society to defy the person and authority of the Bishop of Tasmania.

Relations between the Church and State deteriorated even further when on 5 October 1853, Denison announced the appointment of William Murray to the vacant chaplaincy at Holy Trinity, without consulting the Bishop. Murray was the incumbent of Clarence Plains (Rokeby). Denison had earlier informed Nixon that keeping Trinity

165 Ibid., p. 24.
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167 Ibid., p. 25.
chaplaincy vacant was encouraging ‘agitation from which no good could accrue to the Church’, a reference to Fry and the Protestant Association’s demands through their public meetings. Nixon probably agreed with the Lieutenant-Governor in this, but he still persisted in advancing his nominee, Parsons, as the best candidate because of ‘his talents, zeal, efficiency, sound doctrine, fidelity [and] fitness.’ Denison’s objections to Parsons were that he had ‘no claim upon the government’, that he had ‘been scarcely 2 years in the Diocese’ and had ‘officiated in a scantily populated rural district’ (the Fingal Valley), hardly the place to develop those qualities which would be essential to the management of a large parish in town.

Murray declined the appointment under pressure from Nixon who informed him that he did not have ‘sufficient energy to cope with all the difficulties which ... would surround him in Hobart Town.’ Nixon seized the Lieutenant-Governor’s unilateral decision as evidence that the State was usurping his authority to appoint colonial chaplains. In the most explicit terms, Nixon placed before the Secretary of State, the crux of the Church-State problem:

I respectfully submit, for Your Grace to decide whether the Bishop ... is to exercise the discretion confided in him, and to present to the Lieutenant-Governor the best available Clergyman for a particular post, in order that His Excellency may appoint and confirm him; or whether the Lieutenant-Governor ... is to refuse to acknowledge the Bishop’s discretion, to set aside his recommendation without any valid objection against the individual Clergyman, and to present another of his own choice to the Bishop for a licence.
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Unbeknown to the Bishop, all his correspondence to the Secretary of State was delayed for several months and was not sent until 22 November 1853 when it appears that Lieutenant-Governor Denison had time to mount his own defence. He began by seeking the legal opinions of both the acting Crown Solicitor, Francis Smith (1819-1909) and the Attorney-General, Valentine Fleming (1809-1884), as ‘to the person in whom is vested the power of appointing to vacant chaplaincies of the Church of England in the Colony.’\textsuperscript{174} Denison enclosed a copy of the pertinent clause in the \textit{Regulations for her Majesty’s Colonial Service} which stated:

\begin{quote}
... the Governor has the power of granting licenses for Marriages, Letters of Administration, and Probates of Wills; and has the presentation of Benefices—the person presented being instituted by the Bishop.\textsuperscript{175}
\end{quote}

The Crown Solicitor stated that the position of the Church of England in the colony was ‘anomalous’ because English Ecclesiastical Law could not be applied in the colony because there were no ‘benefices’ in the English sense of the word. Colonial chaplains were little more than ‘Ecclesiastical Officers of the Crown, holding their offices by the appointment and during the pleasure of the Crown, receiving salaries out of the Public Revenue of the Colony during the time they perform their duties.’\textsuperscript{176} Therefore there could be ‘no doubt that the sole right and power of appointing to vacant chaplaincies ... [was] vested in the Lieutenant-Governor.’ This, however, was negated by the fact that the Bishop had the sole right to license a minister before he could officiate in a Church. Without such a licence, any appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor was ‘ineffectual;
and the difficulty [was] without remedy in the present state of things.'  

The Attorney-General, agreed.  

Armed with this legal opinion, Denison wrote to the Secretary of State on 12 November 1853, stating his position. This letter is significant for a number of reasons. First, Denison delayed sending Nixon’s four letters to the Secretary of State because the Bishop’s letters would have given the Secretary of State the Bishop’s reasons for not appointing Medland, something he had refused to do in public. The delay also gave Denison time to present his defence and refute the Bishop’s complaints, paragraph by paragraph.  

A second point of interest is that Denison gave a strong fiscal reason for wanting a convict chaplain appointed to Holy Trinity. With the cessation of transportation imminent, Denison could foresee that those clergy would ‘shortly cease to receive pay from the British treasury’ and therefore he was ‘anxious to provide permanently [for those] who, having been sent out from England or engaged for long periods in the service of the Government, [had] claims, which must be satisfied either by appointments to Colonial Offices or by pensions on the British Treasury.’ This argument concerning costs would have struck a chord with the Colonial Office, eager always to defray costs. The Bishop disagreed, however, claiming that Denison had  
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made the appointment of Murray ‘not upon a thoughtful regard for the best interests of the Church ... but mainly ... upon a consideration of finance’.  

A third notable point was the concern being shown by Denison for the public servants employed in the service of the Government. When Medland was deemed unsuitable, Denison had announced the appointment of Murray, a cleric personally known to Denison’s family. The vacancy created at Clarence Plains could be filled by a Missionary Chaplain, thus reducing further costs to the Imperial Government and Brickwood, the ailing curate at Holy Trinity, could take on the less arduous role of a missionary chaplain.

A fourth point of significance was Denison accusing the Bishop of lying over the proposed appointment of Murray. According to Denison, Murray fully expected to be appointed to Holy Trinity after discussions with the Bishop. The latter claimed Murray had declined the offer because of the arbitrary way he had been appointed by Denison and Parson’s name had already been promulgated. Nixon took great offence to Denison’s accusation of lying, but it is difficult to believe him, given that the correspondence which ensued between him and Murray was to remain private, with only Bishop Broughton having the right to view such documents.
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A final point of interest in Denison’s letter was his desire to maintain the status quo of ecclesiastical appointments in the colony, despite the present ‘anomalous circumstances’. He supported ‘the loosely-defined relation between the Government and the Church’ which sometimes produced ‘inconveniences’, but it would be ‘very unadvisable ... to alter the system by which the Lieutenant-Governor and the Bishop [were] required to concur in the appointment of chaplains’

He would ‘regret the removal of the check which [he and the Bishop] now mutually [exercised] on each other.’ He could see that investing power in one person could generate ‘abuse’ and the Medland controversy was ample evidence that the Bishop’s decision was not conducive to ‘harmony and peace’ within the Church.

Such a comment reveals the stress and strain put on both parties with this appointment. Denison’s opinion was made on two premises. One was his concern over Nixon’s episcopal ‘patronage’ of his nominee, Parsons. Nixon continually maintained that Parsons was ‘the best man’ for the ‘important post’ of Holy Trinity. Towards the end of 1853, Nixon was including an additional reason that he needed ‘men on whose fidelity and cordial co-operation [he could] thoroughly rely.’ This was a clear reference to the ‘unseemly and unscrupulous opposition’ of Fry, ‘aided by a small but active portion of the laity’ who continued to attack him. To Nixon, the clergy within the Diocese now fell into two camps—those who opposed him (the pro-Medland
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Evangelicals) and those who supported him. Clearly, Denison was concerned that any future appointments made by Nixon could be made on the basis of caprice or whim.

The other premise used by Denison was his belief and hope that the church legislation in the colony would be upgraded to address the issues of the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor and the Bishop.\(^{197}\) To that end, long before the Medland debacle had surfaced, he had written to Lord Grey on 15 September 1851\(^ {198}\) suggesting a number of changes. A change in legislation by the Mother Country would demand a realisation that the colonial version of the Church of England was a very different one to that in the mother country.\(^ {199}\)

Further letters from both Nixon (8 February 1854) and Denison (13 March 1854) to the Colonial Office dragged the dispute between Church and State into another year. These later letters degenerated into a series of detailed retaliative points, at times petty, as each tried to assert their authority over the other.\(^ {200}\) Nixon in particular chose to critique the language of Denison’s despatch, while Denison reiterated his certain belief that the Bishop had lied over Murray’s withdrawal from the Holy Trinity chaplaincy. He drew the Secretary of State’s attention to points in his favour—reducing the cost of maintaining the number of colonial chaplains on the public purse\(^ {201}\) and the assurance of the legal opinion that he had at all times acted according to the right conferred by the *Colonial Regulations*.\(^ {202}\)

\(^ {197}\) Denison to Newcastle, 22 November 1853, Ibid., p. 9.
\(^ {198}\) Ibid., p. 11.
\(^ {199}\) Ibid.
\(^ {200}\) Denison to Newcastle, 23 November 1853, Ibid., p. 12.
\(^ {201}\) Ibid., p.14.
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The Bishop, rightly aggrieved, stated he had been misled by the Lieutenant-Governor that the matter of the Holy Trinity chaplaincy had been referred to the Colonial Office and that his letters to England had been not been sent.²⁰³ Most of his last letter reiterated his support for Parsons and his reasons for not supporting Murray.²⁰⁴ He did add that the chaplaincy should be filled all the more urgently with the resignation of Brickwood in January 1854.²⁰⁵

The Colonial Office delayed its response, not sending its despatch on 5 July 1854. This delay was partly due to the initial withholding of the Bishop’s letters in Van Diemen’s Land and partly because the Secretary of State, the Duke of Newcastle, had been replaced by the Secretary for the Colonies, George Grey.²⁰⁶ Not surprisingly, Grey took the ‘via media’, acknowledging the Lieutenant-Governor’s right to nominate clergy to ‘vacant benefices’, but also acknowledging the Bishop’s right to withhold a licence from anyone he deemed unfit for the purpose the ‘Governor’ had assigned. At all times, the Lieutenant-Governor should ‘act as far as possible in concert with the Bishop, but not to have [to make] over the former’s power of appointment to the latter.’²⁰⁷

Grey concluded that both men must acknowledge the ‘mutual rights’ of each other: the Lieutenant-Governor must take care ‘to make none but fit appointments’, while
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the Bishop must ‘equally ‘raise no objections where no valid doubt [existed] as to the qualifications of [the] nominee.’\(^{208}\)

**General Meeting of Parishioners and Supporters of Holy Trinity**

If Denison and Nixon were resigned to not hearing from the Colonial Office before the end of the 1854, the parishioners were not. They became increasingly impatient with the apparent inaction of the authorities to address their needs and took matters into their own hands. Two incidents provided the catalyst for the parishioners to act were the resignation, for the second time, of Brickwood as curate in January 1854\(^ {209}\) and the second was that the pastoral work within the parish had fallen into abeyance with the incumbent’s inability to visit the parishioners and minister to their needs.\(^ {210}\)

Both these issues were discussed at ‘a general meeting for parishioners and others interested in Trinity Parish’ called by Major Cotton on 11 April 1854.\(^ {211}\) The agenda had two items: first ‘to take into consideration and record an opinion of the treatment of the parish during the last two years by the Bishop of the Diocese’ and second, ‘to take such steps as may be considered necessary to obtain the appointment of an efficient Minister in the spiritual charge of the Parish.’\(^ {212}\)

The supporters of Nixon took exception to this meeting being called, predicting that the parishioners would ‘have nothing to do with the meeting’ and they were sceptical that
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it was open ‘to others interested in Trinity Parish’. The latter was simply an attempt by Major Cotton and his associates to hold a meeting designed to ‘assail their Bishop with ribaldry and abuse’ and it would give the organisers ‘more time to beat up recruits.’ Moreover, ‘the resolutions were all ready and the speeches conned’ similar to the last public meeting held by the Protestant Association back in September 1853. In reality, the meeting was probably delayed in deference to Brickwood, who preached his last sermon at Holy Trinity the day after the meeting on 12 March 1854.

_The Church Chronicle_, commonly believed to be the vehicle through which the Bishop made known his views, attacked Cotton as a person of doubtful repute, given the investigation into his work in the Survey Department. The periodical threatened to spread rumours about Cotton’s ‘vagaries’ in England, by publishing ‘extracts from the Report of the Select Committee.’ Given his own short-comings, it was hardly fitting that he should slander the Bishop.

The attempt to intimidate Cotton failed to stop the scheduled meeting for 11 April convening and about sixty people attended at the Campbell Street School, including representatives supporting the Bishop—Archdeacon Davies and Robert Wilson (St David’s Cathedral’s Curate). The local press reported the meeting in detail. Cotton had a list of grievances which he claimed Holy Trinity Parish had sustained since the death of Reverend Palmer. He raised again the issue of appointing Medland and

---

213 Ibid.
214 Ibid.
215 _Tasmanian Church Chronicle_, 1 April 1854, n.p.
216 For example, _Courier_ 12 April 1854, p. 2.
217 Ibid.
218 _Courier_, 12 April 1854, p.2; 13 April 1854, pp.2-3; 21 April 1854, p. 2; 24 April 1854, p. 2; _Colonial Times_ 21 April 1854, p. 2.
Brickwood’s inability to take care of the pastoral needs of the people, implying that the latter had been obliged to give up his tenure against his will. Cotton claimed that the people had been treated poorly by the Bishop on several counts: first, their spiritual needs had not been met; second, they had been ‘cut off from all communication with the Bishop, and consequently it was their duty to seek to obtain some legislative interference which would enable them to have a voice in their minister’; third, the parishioners wanted a ‘settled minister’ to be their chaplain, pointing out that the two ministers from the Cathedral (Davies and Wilson) were too overburdened to deal effectively with both Holy Trinity and St David’s Cathedral; fourth, the peoples’ petition to install Medland as their minister had been treated with ‘contempt’ by the Bishop, with Cotton claiming that he had not acted as a Bishop should, namely with encouragement, guidance or charity. The people felt ‘shamefully ill-treated’—they had a Bishop but not a pastor. ‘The Parish was like a valley of dry bones’. He pointed out that the parishioners were asking no more than what was approved at the Conference of Lay Delegates of the Church of England, held in Hobart Town by the Bishop in June 1852, namely that all Ecclesiastical affairs in the Diocese should be decided in a Convention made up of the Bishop, Clergy and Laity in one assembly, with decisions being made by a majority of votes. A second motion passed by this meeting in 1852 was that ‘nomination of the clergy should be vested in the Members of the Church in each congregation.’
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The business of Cotton’s meeting was interrupted by Archdeacon Davies, who openly professed he was there to defend the Bishop. He believed that such a meeting should not be held in public because there was ‘great evil in appealing to the passions of man.’\textsuperscript{223} Moreover, the voting for the motions at that meeting should only be done by ‘seatholders’ of the church.\textsuperscript{224} He wanted this amendment put to the meeting. Davies had come armed with evidence to support his attack on Cotton. He claimed that the Bishop had stepped in to assist the parish when Brickwood had become unwell. As proof that the spiritual needs of the Church had been met, Davies produced a letter from two of the church wardens, W.H. Gill and Nigel Gedsley, written on 6 April 1854, which claimed that there was no dissatisfaction among the parishioners about the services provided by the Bishop, Archdeacon and Curate. Moreover, in a separate letter signed by a large proportion of the seatholders, the parishioners regretted that ‘any attempt should have been made to disturb the peace and harmony of the parish.’\textsuperscript{225}

Other speakers supported the Archdeacon, defending the character and actions of the Bishop, including Richard Dry, MLC for Launceston. He admitted that he was not a parishioner, but his main concern was the way Cotton was conducting the meeting, pointing out that many of Cotton’s assertions were false and he should desist. When Cotton refused to put the revised motion to the meeting with only the seatholders voting, the majority of the people left the meeting along with Nixon’s supporters. Cotton was left with his own supporters, who naturally voted in favour of the

\textsuperscript{223} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{224} A seatholder was a person who paid pew rent per annum. This gave that person the right to sit in a particular seat—the closer to the front of the church, the more prestigious the person.
\textsuperscript{225} Ibid.
motions—a move denounced by the *Courier* newspaper as an ‘unmitigated and barefaced swindle.’

In the days that followed this meeting, people wrote letters to the editors of the local papers, which decried either Cotton or the Archdeacon’s behaviour. In one issue, two versions of the meeting were printed and readers were asked to choose the authentic one. In an open letter to Archdeacon Davies, published in the *Colonial Times*, Major Cotton reiterated his case for the care of the parishioners: ‘The Parish [needed] the exclusive service of a Clergyman of proved efficiency and service, and [had] a stronger claim for them than any other Parish in the Diocese.’

The present arrangement, where Holy Trinity was ‘a mere curacy of St David’s’, was unsatisfactory. He claimed that, while the church services had been conducted as usual, the real needs of the people, their ‘spiritual interests’ had almost entirely been ‘unprovided for’. He claimed that when Medland had tried to assist by visiting the sick, the Bishop had forbidden this and, with Brickwood’s protracted illness, the peoples’ needs were not met. Cotton finished his letter by accusing Archdeacon Davies of unjustifiably interfering in Trinity Parish affairs by his interruption of the Public Meeting on the previous Tuesday.
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The *Courier* newspaper was Cotton’s harshest critic, claiming that his public meeting was ‘one of the richest and most exquisite fictions which the brain of a “bewildered” chairman ever called into existence.’\(^{234}\) The public deserved better: ‘We will look upon the whole affair as one of the most egregious impositions by which the discerning public [had] ever contented to be hoaxed.’\(^{235}\) With reference to the increasing power of the people in the colony, the editor asked, ‘When will the good people of the rising community make use of the plain English sense with which God [had] endowed them? When will the children of honest John Bull send home for the wits which they seem to have left behind them and cease to be held in leading-strings by such a dry-nurse as Major Cotton?’\(^{236}\)

The public criticism of Cotton did not deter him from presenting a petition to the Legislative Council a week after the public meeting.\(^{237}\) At the same time, a second petition, from Archdeacon Davies, was presented purporting to be concerned about Cotton’s petition and the circumstances under which it had been agreed to be presented to the Government.\(^{238}\)

A heated debate ensued in the Legislative Council, where members aligned themselves either behind Davies and the Bishop or behind Cotton and the needs of the people. Thomas Gregson, the MLC for Richmond, supported Davies and warned that, while the
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people had the right to petition, such a privilege should not be ‘abused’.\(^1\) To that end, Gregson wanted a Select Committee appointed ‘to enquire into the circumstances connected with the petition of Major Cotton, and the correctness of the allegations contained therein.’\(^2\) Robert Kermode, MLC for Campbelltown, challenged this request, claiming that Cotton was being treated unfairly and traduced by his petition only being singled out. It was pointed out that making prejudicial comments about Cotton before a Select Committee Report would not be just and ‘free from bias’.\(^3\) The Parliamentary session degenerated into heated exchanges between MLCs over their ‘unjustifiable, course and scandalous’ language, with Kermode taking particular exception to Gregson describing Cotton at public meetings as ‘spouting with all stupidity ... vile unadulterated trash.’\(^4\)

Fortunately, the Attorney General, Valentine Fleming,\(^5\) brought some calm and logic into the fray by declaring that the Council was not the place for ‘polemical disputes’; rather, they had ‘something else to do in [that] house; [they met] to legislate for the peace and good Government of the colony.’\(^6\) The matter was adjourned for six months. To some in the cynical colonial press, this was ‘the constitutional mode of consigning the documents [petitions] to oblivion.’\(^7\)

\(^{1}\) Colonial Times, 29 April 1854, p. 2.
\(^{2}\) Ibid.
\(^{3}\) Ibid.
\(^{4}\) Ibid.
\(^{6}\) Ibid.
\(^{7}\) Cornwall Chronicle 10 May 1854,p. 3.
In a final attempt to seek justice for his treatment at the hands of Bishop Nixon, Joseph Medland presented his own petition to the Legislative Council on 27 September 1854 for ‘Redress of Injustice and Hardship alleged to have been sustained by the Petitioner.’\textsuperscript{246} The petition was an accurate summary of his service to the Convict Department in the colony and the subsequent rejection of his application to be chaplain at Holy Trinity. His petition concluded that he hoped the Government would ‘adopt such measures as they consider necessary for preserving the rights of the clergy and people of the Church of England in [that] colony.’\textsuperscript{247} This petition was never ordered to be printed\textsuperscript{248} for a Government announcement of the new chaplain had appeared in the \textit{Hobart Gazette} the day before the submission of his petition.\textsuperscript{249}

Fittingly, Medland preached his final sermon on 8 October 1854 in St George’s Church, Battery Point, the church of his Evangelical colleague, friend and supporter, Fry.\textsuperscript{250} He used the opportunity to allude to the vagaries of working in the Tasmanian Diocese. He left Hobart Town on the \textit{City of Hobart} on 13 October 1854\textsuperscript{251} with his wife and three children, bound for Melbourne, where he took up a position at Williamstown with the sanction of the Evangelical Bishop of Melbourne, Charles Perry.

\textbf{The Reverend Arthur Davenport}

The chaplaincy at Holy Trinity was to be taken up by Reverend Arthur Davenport

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{246} Ibid.  
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(1818-1907),252 a convict chaplain about to return to Van Diemen’s Land following the closure of Norfolk Island as a convict station in 1854. He arrived with his family back in Hobart Town on 29 November 1854.253 Davenport had the support of Bishop Nixon, being one of the original clergy selected by Archdeacon Marriott for service in the colony when he had returned to Britain between 1845 and 1846.254 Davenport had served at Windemere on the Tamar River (1846-47) and at Richmond (1847-51) before being sent to Norfolk Island (1851-54).255 In terms of churchmanship, he was closely aligned with Nixon’s high-church doctrine and practice.256 He was scholarly, energetic and loyal. In 1849, he had completed a comprehensive report for the Bishop on the parochial schools in the south of the colony.257

As far as Lieutenant-Governor Denison was concerned, Davenport’s appointment to Holy Trinity meant a saving for the Imperial Government of one less convict chaplain to be pensioned off with the cessation of transportation in 1853. The Colonial Secretary, William Champ, was instructed to reassure Trinity Church wardens that the Lieutenant-Governor had ‘every reason to hope the [proposed new incumbent would] be found to be as productive of benefit to the parishioners as those of Mr Medland.’258 The parishioners were gratified that they at last had a chaplain who would tend to their

253 Reports of Ships’ Arrivals with Lists of Passengers 16 April 1854- March 1855, MB2/39/1/18.
254 Batt and Roe, ‘Conflict within the Church of England’, p. 40.
256 Arthur Davenport, A Sermon preached on the Feast of St Barnabas (Hobart Town, 1851), pp. 8-10, Appendix: Notes A and D; Reverend John Roberts, A Mirror of Religion and Society in Tasmania during the Years 1857 and 1858 (Hobart Town, 1858), p. 9.
257 Arthur Shoobridge, Report upon the Parochial Schools within the Archdeacony of Hobart Town (Hobart Town, 1849); Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 3 January 1852, n.p.
258 W. Champ to S.W. Westbrook, 21 September 1854, quoted in the Courier, 23 September 1854, p.2.
spiritual and temporal needs, suspended during the period of poor health of first Philip Palmer, then of the curate, William Brickwood. Davenport’s incumbency lasted from 1854 to 1880, when he was succeeded by his son-in-law, George Wood Shoobridge.

Conclusions

The delayed appointment of the second incumbent of Holy Trinity gave rise to a number of issues within the colony of Van Diemen’s Land. Encouraged by the impact of the peoples’ voice in demanding the end to transportation and the request of the Home Government to grant the island self-government along similar lines of New South Wales, the parishioners of Trinity Parish were emboldened to request their nominee to be the new incumbent of Holy Trinity, not that of the Bishop of Tasmania. Encouraged by civic leaders, the parishioners petitioned first the Lieutenant-Governor and then threatened to go to the Privy Council to secure what they wanted. Their bold actions raised the issue of Church-State supremacy over the appointment of colonial chaplains, a matter never fully resolved as far as Tasmania’s first Bishop was concerned.

Concomitant with the squabble between the Bishop and Lieutenant-Governor, was the further challenge to the autocracy of the Bishop by his renegade clergy lead by Henry Fry. During the eighteen months of this conflict, the Hobart community was divided. The large attendance at public meetings demonstrated the interest in church affairs. A wide cross section of the population – leading clerics, civil servants, politicians and

---
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parishioners — contributed to the discourse on the rights of the parishioners to choose their own chaplain. In the meantime, ministering to the needy of Hobart Town came to a standstill. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 of this thesis will detail the reaching out of the new chaplain, Arthur Davenport, to the dire needs of his parishioners and the wider Hobart community. Chapter 4 will focus on the service, both civic and religious, to the wider Hobart Town community of Holy Trinity’s peal of bells, installed in 1847.
CHAPTER 4

A SENSE OF COMMUNITY IN A DISTANT COLONY: THE BELLS OF HOLY TRINITY, 1847-1900

Their sound is gone out into the lands, and their words into the ends of the world.

(‘Part of the inscription on the tenor bell of Holy Trinity Church’)

A good peal of bells would be a great addition to either of our churches, as they would sound most musically, reverberating from the hills and pealing over our noble river ... may we suggest a public subscription for the purchase of a set, suitable to the size of the building to be appropriated to them? Many a pleasant reminiscence would this sound recall of gay holidays enjoyed most happily in our father land.

Introduction

The purchase and installation of a peal of eight bells late in 1847 marked the completion of the building of Holy Trinity Church. This peal was regarded from the outset as belonging to the whole community, not just to Trinity Parish. Their impact on the hearing of the citizens was assured by the hill-top prominence of the site, which prescribed what Alain Corbin describes as ‘an auditory space’ that gave a sense of ‘territory’ or ‘community identity’ to the inhabitants. Corbin, a French historian with a

---

1 This quotation is taken directly from the Bible (King James’ Version 1611), the Psalms of David 19:4 and again in Romans 10:18. The words were popularised by George Fridric Handel (1685-1759) in his Messiah, an oratorio written in 1741.

2 Colonial Times, 7 July 1847, p.7.

particular interest in the ‘landscape of sound’ or the sensory experiences of sound, further develops this idea of ‘community identity’ by linking the slower pace of life in the nineteenth century with living and working within earshot of the sound of church bells. This was particularly pertinent to the working classes whose chief ‘mode of locomotion’ was walking. Bells ‘shaped the habitus of a community’, giving a sense of belonging and security. The people’s lives were both punctuated and assured by the different bell sounds.

The first use of the Trinity bells was indeed for the community—for a secular event, the Hobart Regatta of 1847, not a religious gathering. On that occasion, they were described as one of the ‘novelties’ designed to add to the ‘attractions’ of the Regatta.

The people of Hobart Town had been ‘promised “a right merrie peal”... commencing at day break, ... cheering the early riser with the glad anticipation of the approaching festival.’ The sound of the bells ‘called forth emotions, in many a breast, of the joys that had long slumbered of other days.’ This chapter will demonstrate that over the next fifty years, the bells were to be used to celebrate civic receptions, royal birthdays or jubilees of the long-reigning Queen Victoria; to welcome dignitaries (secular and religious) to the city; to acknowledge the grim news of the outbreak of war or the death of an important benefactor to the city, Government leader or monarch. The bells


5 Corbin, Village Bells, p.97.

6 Colonial Times, 3 December 1847, p.3.

7 Ibid.

8 Courier, 4 December 1847, p.2.
were described as being held ‘in trust’ for the people of Hobart. To that end, their upkeep was considered the responsibility of the whole community, not just Trinity Parish.

This chapter will examine the ways in which the Church went about raising funds for the upkeep of its new bells. A number of requests for subscriptions were made through the local press for the bells’ maintenance and repair. Benefit concerts were held for the public by various musical groups, which valued the unique role of the bells in the community for the Trinity bells were the only peal of bells in the colony until the installation of St David’s Cathedral bells in 1936. As the amateur Trinity bellringers improved their skills, the sounds of different peals so familiar in the Old Country, could be heard by the people over their city. The bells cut across the divide of class and wealth and provided all the citizens of Hobart Town within earshot nostalgic moments of the life left behind in a country thousands of miles away on the other side of the world. Bishop Nixon echoed these sentiments, claiming that the sound of bells was one of the most ‘endearing associations’ connected with ‘home’. Other fortuitous events happened in the decades following their installation which aroused and maintained the public’s interest in its bells, namely public lectures, a supportive press and a number of visits from English bellringers, who gave concerts as well as tuition to the local Trinity bellringers on the finer points of campanology.

9 Mercury 6 April 1886, p.3 and 9 July 1887, p.3.
10 For example, Mercury 11 November 1897, p.2; Mercury 6 April 1886, p.3.
11 For example, the Crow Club, 19 October 1887; Orpheus Club, 30 November 1887; Trinity Bell Ringers’ Concert 30 November 1877; Hobart Amateur Bellringers’ Association Concert, 21 August 1888.
12 Peter Boyce, God and the City: A History of St David’s Cathedral Hobart (Hobart, 2012), pp. 125-126.
13 Launceston Examiner, 6 May 1846, p.6.
In the broader context, public interest in peals of bells had increased in England from the 1840s. According to John Camp, an historian with a particular interest in campanology, the refocus of the Church of England in the art of bellringing had its origins in the Cambridge Camden Society, formed in 1839 at Cambridge University\textsuperscript{14} with the express purpose to revive medieval-style church architecture in England. Architects of new churches and those revamping old ones were encouraged to adopt the splendour of the Gothic style prevalent in the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{15}

The bell tower (and bellringing) was part of their focus.\textsuperscript{16} Prior to 1840, a bellringer had acquired the poor reputation of being ‘a layabout and a drunk’.\textsuperscript{17} The clergy of the day had little influence over the churches’ bellringing, neither the occasion nor for whom.\textsuperscript{18} According to Camp, ‘The standard of behaviour in the belfries was appalling. Cursing, swearing and smoking were normal, and in many towers, a barrel of beer was always “on tap” in the ringing chamber.’\textsuperscript{19} The Victorian era brought reform. The Cambridge Camden Society (later the Ecclesiological Society) sent representatives into the English parishes to speak to bellringers about their problems, the main one being the antagonism between them and the clergy and the consequential lack of funds set aside to maintain the bells and their infrastructure. Solutions were suggested, chief among them being the appointment of tower captains who could not only decide what to ring.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}John Camp, Discovering Bells and Bellringing (Princes Risborough, U.K., 1997), pp.25-26.
\item \textsuperscript{15}Cambridge Camden Society, A Few Words to Church Builders (Cambridge, 1841).
\item \textsuperscript{16}Ibid, pp. 8 and 28.
\item \textsuperscript{17}Camp, Discovering Bells, p. 21.
\item \textsuperscript{18}Paul Cattermole, Church Bells and Bell-Ringing: A Norfolk Profile (Woodbridge, 1990), p.40.
\item \textsuperscript{19}Ibid. p. 23.
\end{itemize}
but also be responsible for the attendance and behaviour of the ringers. Rules were drawn up and penalties imposed for poor ringing and behaviour. Despite protests from the older ringers, the ‘new system’ prevailed and a ‘new generation of ringers grew up [and] ringing became respectable and again part of the church.’

**The Bells**

Against this backdrop Philip Palmer visited England in 1845 for leave, ostensibly to restore his health but also to enable him to launch a request to raise funds to finish Holy Trinity Church. His venture was an overwhelming success, so much so, that he decided to order a peal of eight bells from Messrs Mears and Stainbank of Whitechapel London to be placed in the church’s tower. According to nineteenth-century authorities, a peal of seven bells was usually preserved for a cathedral, suggesting perhaps that Palmer still considered Holy Trinity to be the cathedral for the Diocese of Tasmania in 1847. The cost of the bells was £315, a sum which Palmer knew he could not meet, as well as the amount needed to finish the church. Undeterred, he proceeded with the order, even suggesting to the foundry contractors that they might become subscribers to the project themselves thereby bringing distinction to their business as well as giving him a great deal of pleasure.

---

21 Ibid.
22 Ibid. p. 27.
23 *Colonial Times*, 8 February 1845, p.2 reported that Reverend Philip Palmer and his family left Hobart Town on 6 February 1845 on the barque, *Derwent*.
24 Joshua Fawcett (ed.), *The Village Churchman for the Year of our Lord, 1840* (London, 1840), p. 27.
Palmer arrived back in Hobart on the barque, *Elphinstone* on 27 March 1847, some five weeks ahead of the barque, *Navarino*, which was carrying the precious cargo of the eight bells. Palmer immediately made it known that he intended to seek subscriptions from the citizens of Hobart Town, thus making it clear that he believed the bells would be a service to the general public, not just to the parish of Trinity. The people of Hobart Town responded to his appeal, with the *Colonial Times* newspaper publishing a substantial list of 274 subscribers, from all levels of Hobart Town’s society, including the Lieutenant-Governor, civic leaders, merchants, members of the legal profession, clergy and even students from the Hutchins boys’ School. The subscriptions, some as much as £5, and the large number supporters from the general public, indicated the interest the colonists had in securing these bells in their community.

The peal of bells was deemed to be a grand asset for the colony with regard to their size and tone. In reality, they were judged in later years to be quite light and small compared to ‘most of the bells in England.’ Nonetheless, the public were informed that the bells had been made by the ‘eminent’ bell foundry, Messrs Mears and Co. of
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26 *Courier*, 31 March 1847, p.2.
27 *Colonial Times*, 7 May 1847, p.2.
28 *Colonial Times*, 30 March 1847, p.3; *Hobart Town Advertiser*, 30 March 1847, p. 2.
29 *Colonial Times*, 6 August 1847, p.2.
30 Ibid.
31 *Mercury*, 9 January 1890, p. 4.
32 This comment was made by visiting English bell ringers to Hobart in 1934, *Mercury*, 2 November 1934, p. 7.
Whitechapel, a firm that had also manufactured peals of bells for Bow, Coventry, Norwich, Leeds and York, hinting ‘at the celebrity they [had] attained in the trade.’

The largest bell (the tenor) weighed 9cwt, 3 qrs and 1 lb; the total weight of all eight bells was 2 tons, 7cwt, 3 qrs and 20 lbs. (See Fig. 21). The tenor bell had a raised inscription on it taken from the Bible: ‘Their sound has gone out into all the lands and their words unto the ends of the world.’ These words were familiar to people who appreciated sacred music because they had also been used by George Frideric Handel in his oratorio, Messiah, written one hundred years earlier and a popular piece for choral performances at this time. In the 1840s, numerous sacred music concerts had been held in Hobart Town, featuring excerpts from Messiah. By 1847, (the year the bells arrived in the colony), the Colonial Times was advertising an ‘11th Oratorio Concert’, which had been appreciated by ‘a brilliant overflowing audience.’

The bells were hauled from the wharf to the Church on Potter’s Hill by William Smith and his bullock team. Under the supervision of William Champion, the bells were hung by John Wright, following a scaled model sent out by the Whitechapel Bell Foundry (See Fig. 22). As there was no precedent in the colony for installing peals of bells, the model provided local carpenters with a guide to construct the full-sized

33 Courier, 7 August 1847, p.2.
34 Mercury, 11 November 1897, p.2.
35 Psalm 19:4 and Romans 10:18.
36 Courier, 18 March 1842, p.3; 16 January 1845, p.3; 17 April 1845, p.2 and Colonial Times, 5 February 1847, p.2; 16 February 1847, p.2.
37 Colonial Times, 16 February 1847, p.2.
38 Courier, 20 February 1847, p.2.
39 Obituary of Miss Elizabeth Smith, Mercury, 20 November 1933, p.6.
40 Mercury, 1 June 1933, p.10.
41 Mercury, 14 November 1932, p.3.
42 Mercury, 14 November 1932, p.3; Frank Bowden and Max Crawford, The Story of Trinity, (Hobart, 1933), p. 43.
Figure 21: Original Specifications of Holy Trinity Bells

Figure 22: Wooden Model Frame for Holy Trinity Bells

wooden frame.\textsuperscript{45} The model allowed for the internal frame section to be lifted out, to facilitate the bells being lifted into position.\textsuperscript{46} The contractor who built the frame, John Wright, made a contribution to the Subscription Fund of £2/18/\textdollar, being the balance owing by the Church on his contract.\textsuperscript{47}

A shortfall in funds still plagued the completion of the project,\textsuperscript{48} designed to be used to welcome in the 1847 Regatta, a community based event, not a religious one. The \textit{Mercury} confidently asserted that the additional funds would be provided by the ‘liberality of our citizens.’\textsuperscript{49} These were not realised and as late as October 1847, a public meeting was called at the instigation of the subscribers, ‘to adopt such measures as may ... be considered advisable under the circumstances.’\textsuperscript{50}

Due largely to the combined efforts of Champion and Palmer, it was agreed at a public meeting held at the \textit{Jolly Hatter's Inn} on 27 October 1847 that £200 from the public subscriptions would be paid immediately so that a local contractor could hang the bells. In case of an excess in funds, Palmer undertook to reimburse the subscribers: in the event of a shortfall in funds, he personally undertook to pay the shortfall.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{44} (Bell Ringing in Hobart \url{http://members.iinet.net.au/~dnichols/bells/ht_catalog/details/077.html}, accessed 12 January 2013.
\textsuperscript{45} The original timber frame lasted until the 1980s when a new metal frame was built to house the bells which had been sent back to the Whitehall Foundry in England to be restored.
\textsuperscript{47} Bowden and Crawford, \textit{The Story of Trinity}, p.43.
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Courier}, 7 August 1847, p.2.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Courier}, 13 October 1847, p.3.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Courier}, 30 October 1847, p.2.
Fortunately, the bells were ready to sound their first peal for Regatta Day on 1 December 1847. Lady Denison wrote in her diary of the ‘great exertions’ which had gone into getting the bells ‘put up in time’.\footnote{Extract from Lady Caroline Denison’s Journal, 1 December 1847, quoted in Richard Davis and Stefan Petrow (eds.), \textit{Varieties of Vice-Regal Life (Van Diemen’s Land Section)}, (Hobart, 2004), p.72.}

Hobart Town, December 1, 1847.—The day [Regatta Day] was ushered in by the sound of the first peal of bells, I believe, that has ever been heard in the southern hemisphere, or at least in Australia; it has amused me to hear many of the young people who have been born here, say that they have never heard a peal of bells, and express their curiosity to hear these.\footnote{Davis and Petrow, \textit{Varieties of Vice-Regal Life}, pp. 71-72.}

Lady Denison went on to say that she thought the honour of the first peal should have been reserved for Christmas Day, ‘but it seems that this, the birthday,\footnote{Abel Tasman landed on Tasmanian soil on 2 December 1642 although he had sighted the west coast on 24 November 1642.} as one may call it, of the island into the civilised world, is the great day of the year here.’\footnote{Davis and Petrow, \textit{Varieties of Vice-Regal Life}, p. 72.}

Different newspapers reported the event with varying enthusiasm. The \textit{Hobart Town Advertiser} acknowledged the ‘exertions of Mr Champion, who had been indefatigable since their arrival, as well as preparing them as the performers.’\footnote{\textit{Hobart Town Advertiser}, 3 December 1847 (no pagination).} In contrast, the \textit{Courier} newspaper had predicted that the first peal would ‘have an electrifying effect in the bosoms of the population’.\footnote{\textit{Courier}, 7 August 1847, p. 2.} Its report of the actual Regatta Day was more muted:

One circumstance gave especial interest to the anniversary on this occasion—it was the public opening of the first peal of bells in the colony, which, at half-past three in the morning, as the faint streaks of light appeared upon the horizon, sent forth their cheerful sounds. It was
not a ‘peal’, but what is called ‘round ringing’; yet it called forth emotions, which had long slumbered in many a breast, of the joys of other days.\textsuperscript{58}

The newspaper added that the bells were actually rung three times on that Regatta Day—3.30 am, 8.30 am and 4.15 pm, ‘with a marked improvement in the performances.’\textsuperscript{59}

**Bell Ringers**

The reference to the ‘marked improvement in performance’ alludes to the first team of amateur bell ringers, gathered together at short notice by William Champion, a hotelier and brewer of Melville Street. The bell ringers were ‘with two exceptions ... native youths who ... had [had] no experience but by practice with Mr Champion’s [the master bell ringer’s] hand bells, and a very brief period of ringing with the muffled bells.’\textsuperscript{60} The report concluded that ‘much more was achieved than might have been anticipated, giving promise of future excellence.’\textsuperscript{61}

William Champion had placed an advertisement in the local papers very soon after the bells had arrived in Hobart Town,\textsuperscript{62} where he ‘promised [that he would] do all in his power to form a company of ringers for the new bells in Trinity Belfry.’\textsuperscript{63} He requested that people ‘desirous of assisting’ in learning the art of bell ringing should meet at his Inn, 19 Melville Street on 10 August 1847. That the first ringers were all young and three of them were the sons of fellow publicans, could lead to one of two conclusions:

\textsuperscript{58} *Courier*, 4 December 1847, p. 2.  
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{62} *Courier* 7 August 1847, p. 3; *Colonial Times*, 30 July 1847, p.1 and 3 August 1847, p.1.  
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid.
that the general public did not understand the demands and intricacies of bell ringing or Champion had approached the sons of his fellow publicans because they could be relied on. Whatever the reason, the *Courier*\(^{54}\) named the ringers as ‘No 1 [treble] Norton; 2 Champion Junr.; 3 Davis; 4 Crewell, Junr.; 5 Hilton; 6 Basstian; 7 Mitson; and 8 [tenor]W.G. Beaumont.’\(^{65}\) The newspaper marvelled at the native youths’ level of skill.\(^{66}\)

The fact that Champion was able to train this young amateur group in such a short time, was remarkable. Through a number of benefit concerts, he was able to give to the public exposure to the growing talent and confidence of this group by using a set of hand bells imported by Champion from England.\(^{67}\) The *Colonial Times* described their performances as ‘a very striking novelty’ for the colonial audiences and predicted that the hand bells would be ‘a sort of miniature prelude to those [bells] of Trinity Cathedral, whose melodious and sonorous peals we may soon expect to hear from the well-adopted eminence of Trinity Hill’.\(^{68}\) Proficiency in the art was a challenge as Reverend George Shoobridge, the third incumbent of Holy Trinity, was to assert that ‘Few persons know that the old English method of bellringing requires considerable training in order to obtain anything like proficiency in it. Change ringing ... is quite unintelligible to the unitiated.’\(^{69}\)

---

\(^{54}\) *Courier*, 4 December 1847, p. 2.

\(^{55}\) Four of the bell ringers were sons of publicans in Hobart Town: Mitson, Basstian and Beaumont, as well as Champion’s own son.

\(^{56}\) *Courier*, 4 December 1847, p. 2.

\(^{67}\) *Colonial Times*, 31 July 1843 p.3 and 3 September 1847, p.2.

\(^{68}\) *Colonial Times*, 31 August 1847, p.3.

The newly installed ‘English-style’ bells of Holy Trinity swung a full circle every time a rope was pulled as opposed to the style of bells used more commonly in Europe at the time. These latter bells swung ‘through a smaller arc, which [gave] them a different sound and [made] it harder to control when they [rang].’ The English-style bells used numerical patterns rather than music and required some ‘mathematical ability’ as well as intense concentration. The bell ringers used terms such as ‘triple bob majors’, ‘bobs’, ‘dodges’, ‘grandsire triples’ and ‘graveyard bobs’ as well as different ‘peals’ of bells. As Bowden and Crawford noted, ‘A peal upon bells is the greatest number of changes which can be produced upon a given number of bells without their being sounded more than once in the same order.’ Because of the mathematical variations, some commentators refer to English bell ringing as a ‘science’ rather than an art.

A peal of eight bells, such as those at Holy Trinity, ‘[consisted] of 5,040 changes, and [took] between two and three hours to ring.’ By the turn of the century, ‘only two complete peals [had] ever been rung upon Trinity bells, and these were by the members of the Victorian Society of Bellringers in 1890.’ A marble tablet in the belfry commemorates this feat of the Victorian bellringers, of which they were justly proud.
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74 Ibid.
75 Shoobridge, Notes on the History of Holy Trinity, p. 7.
76 Ibid.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid.
for it not only required stamina, but intense concentration to achieve this performance.

Holy Trinity’s first master bell ringer, William Champion (1801-1871), was an ex-convict. He had arrived in Hobart Town on 19 January 1824 on board the *Asia 1*, aged 22.  

Convict records show that he came from Dursley in Gloucestershire, ‘respectably connected’, of ‘good character’ and married with a child. He gave his trade as a ‘hatter’, a profession learnt in his father’s business in Parsonage Street, Dursley. He also learnt the art of bell ringing in the local village church, St James the Great. 

Champion was sentenced to fourteen years’ transportation for receiving stolen goods, namely ‘2 hat blocks and various other articles of great value in the hat-making line.’ On arrival in Hobart Town, he was immediately assigned to Munro, who had established a hat manufacturing business in Bathurst Street and later in Liverpool Street. Convict records show that Champion committed some minor offences (mainly being out after hours) in the early years of his assignment to Munro, but he worked well at his trade, so much so, that within months of being assigned to Munro, the latter
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was advertising for more hat ‘Makers and a Finisher’. Champion soon acquired a reputation for being a skilled hatter and a trustworthy businessman. He prospered so that by 1829, he was opening his own Hat Manufactory in 19 Melville Street, ‘near Mr Thomson’s Academy.’

Champion received his ticket-of-leave on 12 April 1832, having petitioned Lieutenant-Governor Arthur for a conditional pardon in January of that same year. The latter was granted in July 1834 and a free pardon procured on 7 April 1837. In 1833, he was granted a licence to sell wine and spirits and converted his home in Melville Street to an inn and called it the Jolly Hatter’s Inn. He prospered, building a large brewery next door to the inn and listing himself as a ‘Hatter and Licensed Victualler’ in the Van Diemen’s Land Annual, 1834. By the following year, he was being referred to in the press as a ‘licensed victualler’. He purchased several properties and businesses in and around Hobart. Champion became involved in a number of enterprises in the colony, including setting up his inn as a ‘House of Call’ or labour exchange, where out-of-
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work free tradesmen could register their availability for employment.\footnote{See Colonial Times, 6 August 1847, p.2.}

Unemployment became a pressing problem between 1830 and 1850 in the colony with the inundation of cheap (but not necessarily skilled) convict labour. Another activity Champion supported was horse racing where he donated generous prizes in cash and impressive silverware.\footnote{See Michael Quinlan, ‘Trade Unionism and Industrial Action in Tasmania 1830-1850’, Tasmanian Historical Research Association Papers and Proceedings, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1986, pp. 8-31; Michael Quinlan, Hope Amidst Hard Times: Working Class Organisation in Tasmania1830-1850 (Kensington,1986) for an in depth assessment of early labour activity in Hobart Town.}

Because of his ‘spirited and benevolent assistance on many occasions’,\footnote{‘Presentation Cup: The Champion Cup’, http://static.tmag.tas.gov.au/decorativeart/objects/metalware/P2006.26/index.html, accessed 25 January 2013.} it was therefore not surprising that Champion became a supporter of the installation of the peal of bells in Holy Trinity’s belfry in 1847. The official list of subscribers gave him as donating £1 to defray the outstanding debt on the bells in 1847;\footnote{Obituary for William Champion, Mercury, 26 September 1871, p.2.} however, it was not until his obituary, published in 1871, that it became known that he had subscribed £125 towards this cause.\footnote{Colonial Times, 6 August 1847, p.2.} On his death, as a mark of respect, the Trinity Bells sounded a muffled peal for this ‘useful colonist’\footnote{Mercury, 26 September 1871, p. 2.} and his body was buried in the St Andrew’s Cemetery, close by Holy Trinity Church. William Champion was the second ex-convict, after the architect, James Blackburn to contribute to the establishment of this colonial church.

**Appeals to the Hobart Community for Support**

Once the bells were housed in Trinity’s belfry in 1847, appeals to the general public...
to keep the bells operational took two forms: one was the need for skilled bellringers, the other for funds to pay for replacement bell ropes and maintenance of the bells themselves and their working parts. Although the ‘native youth’ had obliged Champion to be the inaugural bellringers in 1847, by 1851 advertisements were appearing in the local press encouraging ‘any person wishing to become a Ringer’ to gather information from the Amateur Bell-Ringers’ Society. 106 The public was advised that practices were on Tuesdays and Fridays. 107

The Hobart Trinity Amateur Ringing Association was formed in 1864 ‘for the pursuit of the grandsires half-pull system of change ringing’. 108 Bell ringing had become popular in the Hobart community with the visit to the colony of a talented English group called the Lancashire Bell Ringers in 1863. They used hand bells in their performances, similar to the ones used by Champion to teach the ‘native youths’. Hobart Town was part of their extensive itinerary which included the eastern colonies and New Zealand. In 1863, they had performed in Sydney and Melbourne before appreciative audiences, who enjoyed their broad repertoire of classical and popular songs. In September 1863, they performed in Hobart at the Mechanics’ Institute and the Theatre Royal to enthusiastic patrons. The local press reported favourably on their performances, 109 the Mercury claiming that ‘nothing at all resembling it has ever been seen in this island’. 110

106 Colonial Times, 21 February 1851, p.3.
107 Ibid.
108 Mercury 11 November 1897, p.2.
109 Mercury, 19 September 1863, p.2; 21 September 1863, p.2; 22 September 1863, p.3; 24 September 1863, p.2; 30 September 1863, p.2.
110 Mercury, 16 September 1863, p.2.
In June 1865, the Lancashire Bell Ringers returned to the colony, performing more popular concerts on their hand bells and delighting the local citizens with their popular pieces, first in Launceston, then in Hobart Town.\textsuperscript{111} In addition, the English visitors gave generous time tutoring the Trinity Amateur Bell Ringers in the ‘intricate system of half-pull ringing.’\textsuperscript{112} These English ringers, from Oldham Lancashire, were ‘delighted ... to teach the art [of half-pull bellringing] which they had gained as amateurs’ in England.\textsuperscript{113} Before they departed Hobart Town, the Trinity Amateurs, under the direction of Charles Hardinge, the master ringer, were able to perform their first successful peal of half-pull ringing.\textsuperscript{114} The English bellringers urged their local counterparts to hone their skills because bellringing brought so many benefits for them personally: amusement, healthy exercise and mental stimulation. Their interest would deepen the more proficient they became.\textsuperscript{115} The other great benefit derived from the bells would be the lasting friendships forged locally, nationally and internationally.\textsuperscript{116}

Another bell-ringing group which performed in Hobart Town at this time was the Lynch family from Geelong.\textsuperscript{117} Formed in 1867, this troupe, calling itself the Australian Bellringers, consisted of Lynch senior and his four sons, the youngest of whom was only nine years old.\textsuperscript{118} They gave their first concert to Hobart Town audiences in

February 1870, performing airs from England, Scotland and Ireland as well as dances such as the polka and waltz. Reading their Tasmanian audiences well, the Lynch family played the ‘well-known heart-stirring “Chimes”’ ... [which reminded] many ... of the festive scenes in which they had taken part long, long ago, in dear happy England, when the bells in the old church tower gave out those same loved tones.\(^\text{120}\)

The significance of the Lancashire Bell Ringers’ visits and the Australian Bellringers’ concerts was to make the citizens of Hobart aware that bell ringing was a remarkable art in skilled hands. A local paper described ‘the extraordinary beauty of the correct modulation of the tuneful bells ... [and they were a] most wonderful achievement of the musical age,’\(^\text{121}\) while the skills of the ‘talented and clever’ Lynch family were to be marvelled at and enjoyed by audiences in Hobart for over fifty years.\(^\text{122}\)

In an effort to place the Holy Trinity amateurs on a more professional footing, in 1876 the Hobart Town Trinity Ringers Guild was formed to take over from the Hobart Trinity Amateur Ringing Association.\(^\text{123}\) With the curate, Reverend George Shoobridge as president,\(^\text{124}\) it was hoped that this body of bellringers would operate on a stricter financial basis\(^\text{125}\) and attend practices more regularly.\(^\text{126}\) This was echoing the changes occurring in England at the time, as argued by John Camp in his detailed study,

\(^{119}\) *Mercury*, 2 February 1870, p. 2.

\(^{120}\) *Cornwall Chronicle*, 22 January 1870, p.11.

\(^{121}\) *Cornwall Chronicle*, 21 June 1865, p.2.

\(^{122}\) *Mercury*, 15 March 1895, p.2.

\(^{123}\) Hobart Town Trinity Ringers Guild Minutes 19 September 1876, HTCA.

\(^{124}\) Ibid. (n.d.)

\(^{125}\) Ibid.

\(^{126}\) Ibid, 8 February 1979.
It was resolved that the Trinity Bellringers’ services to the wider community would include weekly Sunday chiming, peal-ringling at weddings, funerals (muffled) and on holidays. Royal family births and marriages would also be acknowledged by special peals.

Despite the good intentions of the Guild, it too ‘collapsed’, mainly on account of the dangerous state of the framework on which the bells were rung. The bells were silent for almost two years. In 1886, another association, the Hobart Bellringers’ Association was formed to cultivate the art of bellringing. Rules were adopted and a committee formed.

At the same time as the Lancashire Bell Ringers were visiting Hobart Town, a number of lectures were delivered in Hobart Town by well-known solicitor, Thomas Sheehy (1840-1913). Sheehy was not a parishioner of Holy Trinity Church, but rather, came from a well-known Catholic family, his brother being a local Catholic priest. On 16 November 1865, Sheehy delivered a very detailed and informative lecture at the Mechanics’ Institute in Hobart Town entitled ‘Bells: Their History, Uses and Misuses’. His lecture was illustrated by ‘airs and changes’ rung on the hand bells of the Trinity Amateur Ringing Association. A ‘crowded audience’ enjoyed this ‘treat’, reflecting the growing interest in bell ringing in the local community. The Trinity Amateur Bell
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Ringers chose popular pieces such as ‘Blue Bells of Scotland’ and ‘Home Sweet Home’ to appeal to the audience, as well as two pieces especially composed for the occasion by the Master Bell Ringer, Charles Hardinge. The citizens of Hobart Town found ‘the whole entertainment afforded great satisfaction and elicited frequent and hearty applause.’

Thomas Sheehy gave a second lecture on 14 October 1867 at St Peter’s Hall, Collins Street on a similar topic, ‘Notes on Bells’. Again, about 150 members of the public attended, loudly applauding the efforts of the Amateur Bell Ringers, who illustrated Sheehy’s points with examples of change ringing on hand bells, similar to the ‘famed Lancashire Bell-Ringers.’ “Nellie Gray” and “Caller Herrin” were [both] capitally played, and the various peals ...were ... perfectly played.

The Hobart press echoed the support for the Trinity bells within the community. From the earliest days, they encouraged the amateurish efforts of the bell ringers, who were learning the intricacies of the art of bellringing in a distant colony far from the support readily available in England. More particularly, the newspapers reflected the sentimentality and nostalgia for the Old Country where the peals of the village church had been a common feature of everyday life. In a similar way to Thomas Sheehy’s lectures, the Mercury newspaper in 1887, undertook to print ‘an article conveying a little general information on the subject of church and chiming bells which it hoped would do something towards increasing the interest already taken in bellringing by a

---
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few, and thus [would] lead to a more literal appreciation of the efforts of the ringers.'\textsuperscript{137}

For the edification of its readers, the newspaper detailed the different composition and shapes of bells and the early history of campanology, when bells were used to ‘terrify evil spirits and ... dispel storms.’\textsuperscript{138} More particularly, the readers were informed about the details of change ringing as practised on the Trinity bells. A peal of eight bells could ‘admit 40,320 changes which would occupy one day and four hours.’\textsuperscript{139} The citizens of Hobart were encouraged to visit the belfry of Holy Trinity and see for themselves the intense physical and mental fitness that was required to master bellringing. The 	extit{Mercury} pointed out that ‘the thanks of [the] community [was] certainly due to [the] body of men who [undertook] the task of learning to ring the bells, and by diligent practice, attain a proficiency which [rendered] their music joyous, merry and ever welcome to the ears of the citizens.’\textsuperscript{140}

The real point of the article came at the end— the need for more public subscriptions to cover an outstanding debt for repairs to the infrastructure holding the bells. The people of Hobart were reminded that the Trinity bells were ‘the best in the colonies, next to the Ballarat peal.’\textsuperscript{141} A common misconception in the community was that the bells belonged to Trinity Church, when in reality, they were ‘public property’, and are ‘only in the possession of the Trinity wardens as custodians.’\textsuperscript{142} The bell ringers
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deserved ‘the support of every citizen’ as they practised assiduously to ring the chimes ‘on any important occasion in the colony’, as well as ‘filling the air with their sweet sounds one night each week.’

The 1887 request for public subscriptions to cover the cost of maintaining the bells was but one of several since the bells had been installed in 1847. In 1867 the ornamental tufted ropes were renewed and the Trinity Bellringers celebrated with a peal of 120 changes, ‘a feat not yet accomplished by either the amateur or professional ringers in the adjoining colonies.’

Ten years later, the ropes needed replacing again. This time, a more novel method was devised to raise the necessary funds of £12 to purchase the special bell ropes from England. A number of young bellringers, led by Edwin John Rogers (1858-1951), decided to form a small club, the Orpheus Club, and organise some public fund-raising concerts. The first concert was held on 9 November 1877 at New Norfolk, a small village west of Hobart. The ten performers were chosen by the Holy Trinity Choir Master, William Cooper Eltham (1856-1939) from the church’s own choir and others. He formed these men into ‘a Christy Minstrel troupe.’
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Figure 23: Edwin John Rogers, Founder of the Orpheus Club

Figure 24: W.C. Eltham, Choir Master of the Orpheus Choir (NS76/3/5 TAHO)

The concert at New Norfolk was a ‘trial run’ to gauge public support and held at a venue that was small and away from the public eye should the concert be a failure. It was a huge success, partly due to the talent of the men, but largely due to the popularity of the Christy Minstrel shows in the latter part of the nineteenth century among Victorian audiences. The money raised was donated to the local library—the first of many such gestures of the Orpheus Club for charitable causes.
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151 Christy Minstrel groups had their origin in America in mid nineteenth century. Their performances followed a set pattern of 3 acts involving repartee, part-songs and farce. Actors were usually white males wearing burnt cork make-up. Christy Minstrel groups became popular in Tasmania between 1870 and 1880. Unlike the music hall entertainment of the time, the minstrel shows were approved by the Church, despite their obvious lampooning of coloured races. (Aline Waites and Robin Hunter, *The Illustrated Victorian Songbook* (London, 1987), p. 77.


153 The Orpheus Choir raised funds for Church Organs (*Tribune*, 13 June 1878); Artillery Band (*Tribune*, 17 June 1877); Southern Tasmanian Cricket Association (*Tasmanian Mail*, 1 November 1879); Launceston Benevolent Society (*Cornwall Chronicle*, 8 November 1879); Irish Famine relief (*Mercury*, 12 February 1880); New Town Asylum (*Mercury*, 2 April 1880, p.2.) and Fire Relief (*Mercury* 4 December 1890, p.2)
subsequent fund raising concerts benefitted a broad range of recipients—churches, sporting associations (cricket and football), benevolent societies, asylum inmates, public libraries, famine relief and bush fire relief. Significantly, the club assisted those in need in both the north and south of the colony, claiming the members did not understand the north/south divide in the island. They claimed ‘they [were] the servants of the Tasmanian public at large.’

Three weeks later, on 30 November 1877, a second concert was held in the Trinity Hill school room. Admission fee was 1/-. It was both an artistic and financial success, raising £20. The Mercury reported that ‘there was a large and fashionable attendance, and an excellent programme which had been prepared was creditably executed. Some of the most noteworthy items were, “I’m waiting my darling for thee”; “Genevieve” and “Silver Threads among the Gold.”’ (See Fig. 26)

Although this successful concert appears to have been the only benefit concert which the Orpheus Choir per se performed to raise funds for Holy Trinity, the choir did join with many other choral groups, bands, orchestras and soloists to perform choral work in the colony. The club’s concerts were also held in smaller rural villages (Campbelltown, Sorell, Ulverstone, Bothwell, Geeveston) not just in the more populated urban centres of Hobart and Launceston.

The club’s reputation as a fine all-male choir under the direction of William Eltham
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grew. In Hobart, concert halls were ‘crammed’ with many of the ‘elite of the city’ attending. Performances were judged to be of a ‘high class’ and easily compared to similar performances of ‘professionals of the sable fraternity.’ The repertoire of songs was broad and appealed to a variety of tastes in the concert goers. Programmes were changed regularly to bring new pieces to the public’s attention. The fact that many early members were members of Holy Trinity’s choir is significant when
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considering the outreach of the Church into the community.\textsuperscript{160} In 1884, Eltham resigned from being the choir master at Holy Trinity, but he continued to conduct the Orpheus Choir until 1909.

The Orpheus Club augmented its choral presentations with an orchestra in 1888,\textsuperscript{161} but it did not restrict its activities to just musical entertainment. Its outreach to the public included aiding ‘budding artists’,\textsuperscript{162} who needed a public platform on which to demonstrate their talent; contributing to setting up Trinity College London theory and practical music examinations in the colony in 1894\textsuperscript{163} and in 1896, organising the first band concert in Tasmania, using the STCA\textsuperscript{164} Cricket ground in Hobart. Eltham claimed that, ‘Two hundred people paid for admission, and 1,500 persons listened outside the ground.’\textsuperscript{165} In 1897 the club also organised the first Tasmanian Industries Fair to showcase Tasmanian manufactured crafts and a display of model yachts.\textsuperscript{166}

On a lighter note, there were cricket matches held between the club and other rival minstrel clubs, such as the New Town Georgias, where the teams donned colourful fancy dress of various characters such as Macbeth, Robinson Crusoe, Garibaldi and a clown, ‘creating no small sensation amongst the nursemaids’ out walking on the Domain with their young charges.\textsuperscript{167} A later match between the Orpheus and Mohawks


\textsuperscript{161} \textit{Mercury}, 12 June 1888, p. 2 and \textit{Launceston Examiner}, 13 June 1888, p.2.

\textsuperscript{162} \textit{Mercury}, 30 January 1929, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{163} \textit{Mercury}, 21 September 1894, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{164} Southern Tasmanian Cricket Association, later to become the Tasmanian Cricket Association in 1906.

\textsuperscript{165} \textit{Mercury}, 30 January 1929, p.3.

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{Mercury} 8 March 1927, p.8; 22 June 1927, p. 8 and 30 January 1929, p.3.

\textsuperscript{167} \textit{Tribune} 25 March 1878; \textit{Mercury}, 25 March 1878, p.3.
Clubs seemed to be organised more for the ‘pleasant’ social evening of food and song that followed in a local hotel than for the serious playing of cricket.\textsuperscript{168} From the club’s perspective, the main benefit derived from belonging to such an organisation, apart from producing harmonious chorus and part-songs for the male voice, was the spirit of fellowship — ‘the only soil in which the human soul can thrive and bring forth its finest fruit ... [the] personal character [of members] was always deemed ... more important.’\textsuperscript{169}

Indeed, to become a member of this prestigious club of twelve people, a person had to pay an entrance fee of 5/- and thereafter a monthly subscription fee of 1/-; be elected by ballot and risk being excluded should there be a ‘black ball’\textsuperscript{170} against his name.\textsuperscript{171}

Members were not permitted to participate in performances by any other musical club,\textsuperscript{172} the numbers of which had proliferated in Hobart in particular during the late 1870s and 1880s.

This rule did not seem to deter some choir members from joining rival minstrel groups. Frank Bowden, a gifted tenor, began performing with the Mohawk Minstrels in 1880.\textsuperscript{173} Like the Orpheus Club, the Mohawks\textsuperscript{174} practised before audiences in small rural towns,\textsuperscript{175} raising funds for the local football and cricket clubs.\textsuperscript{176} In July 1881, the
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Mohawk Club was formed\(^{177}\) and during that year, gave or assisted at eleven concerts.\(^{178}\) Bowden played a major role in this club, acting and singing solos as well as part-songs.\(^{179}\) Despite Bowden’s involvement in this club, there is no evidence that any concerts were devoted to fund raising for Holy Trinity Church. In 1881, the Mohawk Club gave its first invitation concert in Hobart for members’ friends, ‘and judging from the hearty reception which greeted their debut, it [was] likely they [would] soon occupy a good position in musical circles.’\(^{180}\) By the end of the year, the club was performing a series of concerts for the general public at the Tasmanian Hall, the troupe having honed its singing and acting skills to meet the approval of the theatre critic of the *Mercury* newspaper.\(^{181}\)

Yet another rival minstrel group rallied to raise funds for the maintenance of the Holy Trinity bells, which needed to be rehung in 1887. One of Holy Trinity’s bellringers, Vincent Tregear, was also a member of the Crow Club. This minstrel club\(^{182}\) had given its first public performance in November 1886 at New Norfolk,\(^{183}\) no doubt following the Orpheus Club’s example of trying out its show on a small audience first. By the following year, the club was giving concerts in Hobart and Launceston to large, appreciative audiences.\(^{184}\) In September 1887, the club advertised that it would be

\(^{177}\) *Mercury*, 14 January 1852, p.2.
\(^{178}\) Ibid.
\(^{179}\) *Mercury*, 20 August 1881, p.2 and 22 December 1881, p. 3.
\(^{180}\) *Mercury*, 28 July 1881, p. 2.
\(^{181}\) *Mercury*, 24 December 1881, p. 2.
\(^{182}\) The name, ‘Crow Club’, is derived from American minstrel shows of the same name, popular in the nineteenth century. ‘Jump Jim Crow’ was a popular song which captured the contorted movements of a physically handicapped negro who chattered nonsensically to himself. (Waites and Hunter, *The Illustrated Victorian Songbook*, p. 85.)
\(^{183}\) *Mercury*, 16 November 1886, p.3.
\(^{184}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 30 June 1887, p.2 and 3 September 1887, p.2 and *Mercury*, 30 July 1887, p.3 and 3 September 1887, p.3.
giving a concert ‘in aid of the Bellringers’ Association’ of Holy Trinity.\textsuperscript{185} The proceeds of the concert would ‘be handed to the Hobart Bellringers’ Association for the purpose of liquidating the debt at present existing upon the fine peel of bells at Trinity Church.’\textsuperscript{186} In fact, the Crow Club put on two concerts on 19 and 20 October 1887 for which they were publicly thanked by the Master Bellringer, Edwin Rogers, who advised that the concerts had ‘materially [assisted] them in paying off the debt.’\textsuperscript{187} A debt of £30 had been outstanding,\textsuperscript{188} owed to James Robert Meech (1843-1911), a local engineer, who had rehung the bells at a cost of £60 in 1886.\textsuperscript{189}

The Crow Club continued to give successful concerts for charity over 1887\textsuperscript{190} and 1888, catering specifically for ‘smoking concerts’, (‘men-only’ concerts usually held in a city hotel)\textsuperscript{191} or concerts for rural residents in Geeveston, Sorell, Macquarie Plains or Hamilton.\textsuperscript{192} So generous was the reputation of the club in its charitable donations that in 1889, one reader of the \textit{Mercury} requested that it consider giving a benefit concert to aid ‘Widow Brundle’ and her children.\textsuperscript{193} There is no record of this benefit concert ever having taken place, probably because in that same year, the Crow Club became ‘defunct’.\textsuperscript{194}

After its formation in 1886, the Hobart Bellringers’ Association also sought financial assistance directly from the public in order to free itself from debt. They first asked the
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Hobart people to make ‘a subscription towards meeting the liability incurred’ in having the bells rehung by Meech.\textsuperscript{195} They were in part successful and a list of subscribers was published in the \textit{Mercury} in January 1887.\textsuperscript{196} In the same year, they held a variety of concerts to celebrate Queen Victoria’s Jubilee\textsuperscript{197} and a special concert for children, \textit{Alice in Wonderland}.\textsuperscript{198} Despite these efforts, and the efforts of the Crow Club with their two concerts, there was still a debt of £12 outstanding on the rehanging of the bells.\textsuperscript{199} Again, the Hobart Bellringers appealed directly to the public to support them and ‘free them from debt the only peel of bells in the colony, and the finest in Australasia’.\textsuperscript{200} They also organised another concert of ‘varied items ... to be rendered by some of [the] best amateurs, including Mr Robert Young’,\textsuperscript{201} a popular and obliging actor and singer, who performed in numerous concerts throughout Tasmania in the 1880s and 1890s. There were two curious features about this concert: first, the church bells would ring the clock chimes during the interval, and second, ladies were encouraged to bring their ‘fancy work.’\textsuperscript{202} For their public concerts, the Hobart Bellringers wore black and white striped shirts, made especially for performances (See Figures 27, 28 and 29).

It would appear that these fundraising concerts were successful as the \textit{Mercury} newspaper in 1889 reported that the debt for rehanging the bells, incurred three years
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earlier, had finally been paid. But the Hobart Bellringers were faced with a new challenge: they had been invited by the Victorian Society of Bellringers to be part of a Festival of Bells on the occasion of the opening of the belfry of St Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne on New Year’s Day, 1890. Teams from all the colonies were expected to attend, but the bellringers of Holy Trinity had no funds to cover expenses. Once again, the public responded at short notice, to organise a benefit concert to raise the necessary funds. Diverse musical groups such as the Caledonian Society and the Orpheus Club as well as a number of instrumental and vocal soloists, rallied to this cause, seeing the Trinity bellringers as representing their state on this occasion.

![Figure 27: Hobart Bellringers 1888 (Holy Trinity Church Archives)](image)
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Figure 28: Ringer's Shirt, c.1888.  

Figure 29: Bell Ringer’s Badge on shirt c.1888  

From the proceeds of a concert held on 20 December 1889, together with private subscriptions, five members of the Hobart Bellringers were able to go to Melbourne.\(^{209}\)

The Melbourne Festival of Bells lasted all of New Year’s Day, with the Hobart team being given the honour of ringing out the old year. The Victorians were much more skilful at bell ringing than the Tasmanians, but the latter were deemed to be the best of the visiting colonial teams.\(^{210}\) St Paul’s had more bells (thirteen compared to eight at Holy Trinity) with the tenor bell weighing 31\(\frac{1}{4}\) cwt,\(^{211}\) which was three times larger than the tenor bell at Holy Trinity.\(^{212}\) The Hobart team was warmly welcomed to Melbourne by the Bishop of Melbourne, Field Flowers Goe (1832-1910), and members of Parliament. This was the beginning of an inter-colonial fellowship between bellringers, the Bishop of Melbourne likening the meeting of the different teams to reflecting Australia’s Federation,\(^{213}\) a prospect which was very topical in the 1880s and 1890s.

At a dinner given in honour of the visiting bellringers, the Bishop of Melbourne touched on a number of benefits derived from bells in the community. First, bellringers were important officials of the church and the reputation of a church was judged on their character, sobriety, temper and conduct; second, the ringing of bells was an important aspect of all the important events of life, ‘from the cradle to the grave’; third, bells evoked aspiration in people that was ‘good, true and right’ and man
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\(^{210}\) *Mercury*, 9 January 1890, p.4.
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had written many beautiful literary works about bells; fourth, the gathering in Melbourne in 1890 would be the first of many such meetings, nurturing a fellowship between ringers; and finally, ‘the noble art of bellringing would receive a great impetus from that gathering,’ which in turn would lead to an increase in the number of new peals being installed in churches in Victoria and an increase in the number of ringers attracted to that lofty calling.

In Hobart, the Hobart Bellringers regarded their bellringing as a service to the community and a craft to be honed. They had taken up the suggestion of the Lancashire Bellringers publicly to proclaim their success in performing intricate change ringing, with their ‘feats’ being publicised on peal boards or marble wall plaques placed in prominent places of Holy Trinity (See Fig. 30).

Some of the Melbourne Bellringers came to Hobart at the end of 1890 where they helped the local bellringers to ring their first full peal at Holy Trinity on 29 December (Grandsire Triples) and a different peal two days later. These ringing ‘feats’ were taken very seriously and gave rise to fierce competition between colonial groups. The
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218 Change Ringing is the ringing of a peal of bells in a continuously changing sequence according to a set method. A bell can only change places with the bell next to it and no change can be repeated. (Helen Pettet and Anne Doggett, The Bells are Ringing: A Celebration of Melbourne Life through the Story of her Bells (Melbourne, 2001), p. 81.
219 Pettet and Doggett, The Bells are Ringing! p.20.
visiting bellringers from Melbourne had been expelled from St Paul’s Cathedral because they had assisted the bellringers of St Philip’s Church, Sydney to ring the first peal in the colonies just a few months earlier. As far as their former ringing colleagues were concerned, they were ‘traitors’.

Inter-colonial rivalry aside, the personal benefits for bellringers were numerous for bellringing could be regarded as both an ‘art’ and a ‘science’. The Lancashire Bellringers had advised the Hobart Bellringers that they would derive ‘amusement as well as health, combined with ... mental employment’ as they served and gave enjoyment to the Hobart public.

---

221 Mercury, 11 July 1885, p.2.
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A Service to the Community

The first fifty years since the Trinity Bells had been installed had seen the Hobart community at large respond to their sound, reminding them with nostalgia of ‘that earlier home that we have left thousands of miles beyond the fathomless seas.’ On the whole, the press referred to them in positive terms, usually describing their ‘merry peal’ at significant events, but this was not to say that all residents in Hobart enjoyed their sound. On 27 August 1877, the Hobart City Council received a petition signed by seventeen citizens living near Trinity Hill, ‘complaining of the annoyance they suffered from the ringing of the Trinity bells’, in particular the several practice sessions per week. The matter was referred to the Police Committee, which declined to suppress their ringing, citing that the bells had been in place for many years; they were erected by public subscription, including many of the parishioners; and they revived ‘pleasing recollections of experiences in the old country.’ The Mercury newspaper applauded the actions of the Hobart City Council in standing up to the ‘old fogies’ and ‘barbarians’ living near the church.

The bells were seen to be the property of the community at large, and were only held ‘in trust’ by Holy Trinity Church. This was the main argument usually put forward at the various times in the first fifty years when public subscriptions were sought to pay for the maintenance of the bells’ ropes or infrastructure. Curiously, Philip Palmer had not foreseen the great expense that would be incurred to keep the bells operational.

---

223 Mercury, 11 September 1877, p.2.
224 Mercury, 28 August 1877, p.2.
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227 Mercury, 6 April 1886, pp.2 and 3 and 14 July 1887, p.2.
Church records show that in those first fifty years, the church lacked funds\(^\text{228}\) to the point that the second incumbent, Reverend Arthur Davenport had to give a series of personal loans to the vestry in order for it to pay for expenses such as wages and repairs to the church fabric.\(^\text{229}\) This absolute lack of funds drove members of the church choir and later, the bellringers themselves to hold the number of public concerts in order to raise necessary funds to maintain the bells.

Between 1847 and 1900, the peal of bells was used for a variety of occasions, more for secular occasions than religious ones. Old residents of Hobart fondly recalled their ‘joyous peals at Christmastide and New Year’s Eve’,\(^\text{230}\) the latter peals sometimes lasting for up to an hour followed by a party for the bellringers at a local hotel until three o’clock in the morning.\(^\text{231}\) Secular occasions included acknowledging the significant events of births, deaths and marriages within the royal family. Queen Victoria’s birthday was always a holiday in the colony\(^\text{232}\) and commenced ‘with the old custom of ringing the bells, the sound of which fell on the ears of the aged to recall old memories, and awoke cheerful feelings in the minds of younger people.’\(^\text{233}\) Likewise,

\(^{228}\) Minutes of Vestry Meetings at Holy Trinity Church, 2 January 1857; 23 February 1859; 28 March 1859; 5 January 1860; 10 September 1860; 24 December 1869, HTCA; Minutes of AGM of Trinity Parishioners, 28 December 1860, HTCA.

\(^{229}\) Minutes of Vestry Meetings at Holy Trinity Church, 24 December 1860 (\(£25\)) and 8 January 1862 (\(£30\)), HTCA.

\(^{230}\) Bowden and Crawford, *The Story of Trinity*, p. 47.

\(^{231}\) *Mercury*, 1 January 1889, p.2.

\(^{232}\) *Mercury*, 25 May 1888, p.2.

\(^{233}\) Ibid.
the birthday of the Prince of Wales was observed with a half-day holiday and festivities which included ‘a merry peal’ from the Trinity bells.\footnote{\textit{Mercury}, 15 November 1861, p. 3.}

In 1868, elaborate preparations had been made to welcome the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Alfred, to Hobart. As he was the first member of the royal family to come to Tasmania, the citizens and local dignitaries put on a good show of colourful bunting, closing shops, processions in full ceremonial dress, dinners and speeches. Along with a gun salute, the Trinity bells rang out ‘a merry peal of welcome’ on several occasions, including one and a half hours of peals on the Duke’s second day in the city.\footnote{\textit{Mercury}, 31 January 1868, pp.3-4.} In 1887, the Queen’s Jubilee celebrating fifty years of Victoria’s ascension to the throne, was observed in Hobart with a peal of bells in the morning, followed by street processions, sports and fireworks.\footnote{\textit{Mercury}, 20 June 1887, p.2.} On the Queen Victoria’s death in 1901, the Trinity bells rang a muffled peal as part of the capital’s grand commemoration of the ‘departed Queen’.\footnote{\textit{Mercury}, 25 January 1901, p.5.}

The bells were also rung to acknowledge important state occasions. The end of transportation to the colony was marked on 10 August 1853 by a pealing of the Trinity bells, beginning at six o’clock in the morning,\footnote{\textit{Courier}, 11 August 1853, p.2.} followed by thanksgiving services in a number of different churches and public rejoicing and celebrations.\footnote{\textit{Courier}, 11 August 1853, p.2 and \textit{Colonial Times}, 11 August 1853, p.2. It is against this backdrop of celebration that the prolific writer of historical fiction, Roy Bridges (1885-1952) set his short story, \textit{Bells of Heaven}, serialised in the \textit{Argus}, 1 July 1939, p.4.}

In contrast was the serious occasion of the state funeral of Sir Richard Dry (1815-1869), Premier of Tasmania, on 4 August 1869. The long procession proceeded slowly up
Elizabeth Street and passed just below Trinity Hill where ‘the mournful tones of a peal of muffled bells, rung by the amateurs of Trinity Church’ could be heard.\textsuperscript{240} Dry, a highly respected and popular statesman, was a strong supporter of the anti-transportation movement and he was to be buried at Hagley, in the north of the state. The tolling bell continued until the large cortège crossed the northern boundary of the city.\textsuperscript{241}

Later, in 1900, the bells rang out triumphant peal after peal at 1.20 am on the occasion of hearing of the relief of the imperial forces at Ladysmith,\textsuperscript{242} where Tasmanian troops had joined other Imperial forces in the Second Boer War (1899-1902). The proclamation of peace was celebrated in the capital on 2 June 1902 with canon fire, bands playing ‘Rule Britannia’ and the relieved citizens cheering in the streets, where the mayor claimed that the ‘peoples of the Empire [had] passed through the greatest ordeal ... since the downfall of Napoleon.’\textsuperscript{243} Added to the melée, were the ‘joybells of Holy Trinity Church’.\textsuperscript{244}

Important citizens, both religious and secular, who had been absent from the colony, were welcomed home by the bells. Bishop Nixon was greeted by several peals when he arrived back in Hobart in May 1848\textsuperscript{245} after visiting England to sort out his and the Lieutenant-Governor’s authority with regard to the appointment of convict

\begin{footnotes}
\item[240] \textit{Mercury}, 5 August 1869, p.3.
\item[241] Ibid. p.2.
\item[242] \textit{Mercury}, 1 March 1900, p.2; Hobart Bellringers’ Association Minutes and Dates, 2 March 1902, HTCA.
\item[243] \textit{Mercury}, 3 June 1902, p.3.
\item[244] Ibid.
\item[245] \textit{Courier}, 20 May 1848, p.2; \textit{Colonial Times}, 19 May 1848, p.3.
\end{footnotes}
chaplains. The peal of the bells would have been the first time that the Bishop had heard their sound as they had been hung in the previous year when he was absent. The bells were also rung to welcome back to Hobart noted colonists such as Amy Sherwin (1855-1935), a Tasmanian-born opera diva, who had risen to prominence during the late 1870s and 1880s. Civic dignitaries, preceded by the garrison band, escorted her to the Town Hall, where over 4000 citizens were assembled to welcome their adored ‘Tasmanian Nightingale.’

Prominent local citizens were honoured in various ways. A peal of bells was rung for the 68th birthday of William Champion, Trinity’s first master bellringer in 1869 and for the 84th birthday of William Clarke (1792-1877), one of Trinity’s early bellringers, in 1876. The golden wedding anniversaries of two of the colony’s pioneers and their wives were honoured with peals of bells: David Watson Bush (1787-1866), a successful wine merchant and generous philanthropist in the colony and Henry Joseph Warner (1824-1900), a successful timber merchant and mining entrepreneur. On a more solemn note, the large funeral of well-known businessman and philanthropist, Henry Hopkins (1787-1870) took place in Hobart on 1 October 1870. The mourners included religious leaders from all denominations, members of Parliament and local Government officials. As the funeral procession formed, the Trinity bells sounded ‘a

See Chapter 3 for details.


Mercury, 13 September 1869, p.2.

Mercury, 25 February 1876, p.2.

Mercury, 31 March 1866, p.5.

dumb peal, and the tenor tolled three times three. On this solemn occasion, the *Mercury* alluded to the many acts of kindness shown by Hopkins towards elderly pensioners and widows of clergy.

Finally, but equally as important, the bells were rung to acknowledge significant events in the lives of the Trinity parishioners, particularly the bellringers themselves or those who had given service in the operation of the Church’s activities. In 1880, the marriage of Margaret Lovett, daughter of the Colonial Auditor, William Lovett (1826-1900) and sister of two of the bellringers, Arthur and Edward Lovett, was acknowledged with a ‘merry peal’ of the Trinity bells. Likewise, in 1884, the marriage of Edwin Rogers, at one time the master bellringer and the inspiration behind the formation of the Orpheus Club, was celebrated by a ‘joyous peal,’ even though he was married in St George’s Church, Battery Point. Again, in 1893, the bells rang out after the marriage of Emile Whitbourn, the daughter of one of Trinity’s church wardens, William Whitbourn (1836-1901). Both father and daughter had ‘done good service in many ways’ for the Church and the peal was a fitting tribute to their efforts. Of course, the bellringers would ring the bells if paid a fee. One bridegroom made a donation to the bellringers at the time they needed funds to replace the bell ropes, on the joyous occasion of his marriage even though he and his bride were not members of the parish,

---

253 *Mercury* 3 October 1870, p.2.
254 Ibid.
256 *Mercury*, 10 April 1884, p.2.
257 *Mercury*, 20 July 1893, p.2.
but were married at Brighton.\textsuperscript{258} Sadly, his happiness was not to last for a year later, the \textit{Mercury} was announcing the death of his wife. \textsuperscript{259}

\textbf{Conclusions}

This chapter has shown that the bells of Trinity Church were an integral part of the Hobart community. For all those within earshot or ‘auditory space’ as Alain Corbin describes it, the bells contributed to the community identity, giving a sense of belonging to a people who had migrated to a foreign colony. In their first fifty years of service, the Trinity bells were not only used for religious ceremonies, but the many and varied secular occasions in Hobart. Two older parishioners, Frank Bowden and Max Crawford described them thus:

\begin{quote}
...Trinity bells have played an intimate part in echoing the joys and sorrows of the citizens of Hobart. Joy bells sounded on the cessation of transportation on 10 August 1853, and similar peals have rung out for national victories, coronations and Royals events, as well as on occasions for local rejoicing and the solemn echoes of muffled peals have told of the passing of souls to the higher life beyond the veil. Perhaps, however, the most intimate memories of Hobart citizens, young and old, will gather round the joyous peals at Christmastide and New Year’s Eve, which have rung from the Tower on the Hill.\textsuperscript{260}
\end{quote}

Of course their operation depended on the goodwill of the people of Hobart, who through public subscriptions, public concerts and lectures, provided the funds necessary to maintain them. Their cost was probably not considered by Reverend Philip Palmer when he decided to order them on his fund-raising visit to England in 1846. What coloured his thinking were two factors: first was nostalgia for the sounds of the

\textsuperscript{258} \textit{Mercury}, 17 September 1866, p.1 and 25 September 1866, p.3
\textsuperscript{259} \textit{Mercury}, 8 March 1867, p.1.
\textsuperscript{260} Bowden and Crawford, \textit{The Story of Trinity}, pp. 46-47.
Old Country, where bells were ‘as much part of the everyday scene as the trees, the clouds and the stars’;\textsuperscript{261} and second, that Holy Trinity was still to be the Diocese’s cathedral church and therefore should fittingly have eight bells. The local press always described them as being kept ‘in trust’ for the people and it was only appropriate that they be responsible for their ongoing upkeep.

It was found that here [Hobart Town] there existed a numerous class who were not even represented in the Christian congregation, whom no amount of persuasion could induce to attend the House of God ... Nor was their feeling the mere negative one of passive immobility and indifference, but ... of active and angry hostility. Religion was to them a badge and sign of a class, marking off the so-called ‘respectable’ from their lowlier brethren; an element altogether foreign to their place and habit ... In short, Religion ... gathered up ... all the associations of antipathy which set class against class ...

(Hobart City Mission Report, February 1862, p. 5.)

... what was required was [sic] two additional mission rooms, one in Ware-street, [sic] and another in the vicinity of the Boys’ Home to be centres of work. Of course, the services of the church would go on as usual...

(Mercury, 18 January 1887, p.3.)

Introduction

The years 1850-1900 saw significant changes in the affairs of the Church of England in Tasmania.\(^1\) Governance of the church moved from ‘the full power and authority’\(^2\) of the Bishop to a system of representative government through Synod with the significant inclusion of the laity in the affairs of the Church for the first time.\(^3\) In addition, there was provision for the Church to meet nationally in 1872 through the

\(^1\) After 1856, the island was known as ‘Tasmania’.
\(^2\) Letters Patent (Revised), Hobart Town Gazette, 30 October 1849, p.795.
first General Synod,\(^4\) which allowed for the discussion of matters of mutual concern in each of the colonies. At the same time, a series of National Congresses\(^5\) within the Church of England did away with the formality of Synod’s proceedings, which were at times cumbersome, limited and slow. Delegates at these conferences were exposed to the new ideas of speakers, clerical and lay, from the wider community and were a catalyst for bringing change to the administration of and ideas within the Church of England in the latter half of the nineteenth century.\(^6\) One of the issues discussed at both the Melbourne (1882) and Sydney (1889) Conferences was the outreach to the poor and their meaningful inclusion into the fold of the Church of England communion.\(^7\)

Another factor supporting change in Tasmania from 1862 to the end of the century was the appointment of Bishops who had a background in working with the poor in their respective dioceses in Britain. Bishop Charles Bromby’s (1814-1907) main interests were the poor and education.\(^8\) Prior to coming to Tasmania, he had founded a boys’ orphanage, established a Working Men’s Club and built new schools for the poor,\(^9\) while Bishop Henry Montgomery (1847-1932) had worked in a number of

---

\(^4\) Brian H. Fletcher, *The Place of Anglicanism in Australia: Church, Society and Nation* (Mulgrave, 2008), pp.1-3.
\(^5\) These National Congresses were held in Melbourne 1882, Sydney 1889 and Hobart 1894.
\(^6\) Fletcher, *The Place of Anglicanism in Australia*, pp.3-7.
\(^7\) *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 April 1889, p.4.
central London parishes providing pastoral support for the destitute. Bishop Daniel Sandford (1831-1906) had been impressed with the work of the non-Roman Catholic sisterhoods in Britain in the areas of nursing, education and prison work and set about bringing these women to Tasmania to aid the poor. Trinity Parish was to employ these sisters in establishing a mission school in 1894.

Finally, the other agent of change operating at this time was the dissemination of a number of church newspapers or journals at parochial, national and international levels, where transnational issues within the Church were discussed. Tasmania’s own journals, the *Tasmanian Church Chronicle* (1852-1856) and the *Church News*, which commenced publication in 1862, took on a broader view of church affairs compared to the insular and introspective views that had plagued the Church in the 1840s and early 1850s. In giving reports on other dioceses within Australia, the British Empire and Britain itself, this transnational dialogue enabled the Tasmanian clergy and laity to compare how other dioceses tackled the common issues of poverty and the inclusion of the poor into the Church’s fold.


13 Church newspapers or journals included the *Guardian* (Britain), *Church of England Record*, *Church Sentinel*, *Australian Church Record* (Sydney), *Church Chronicle* (Adelaide), *Church Chronicle* (Brisbane) and *Church of England Messenger* (Melbourne).


15 See Chapter 3 of this thesis.
This chapter sets out to trace the laity’s fuller involvement in the affairs of the Church, in particular Trinity Parish in North Hobart, both in its governance and daily business, particularly in administering to the poor. It will be seen that the initial outreach was confined to a few individuals, who ‘quietly and unobtrusively’ set up organisations such as a penny bank or a women’s sewing group, in a makeshift room in the heart of the most impoverished part of the parish. Gradually, more groups of philanthropically-minded men, such as the Lay Missioners and the Brotherhood of St Andrew, stepped forward to hold simple unostentatious services, set up Sunday Schools and organised clubs as well as visiting the poor in their homes. This change in perspective of working alongside the destitute and bringing outreach to them rather than the reverse, formed the basis of a successful mission in Trinity Parish in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Encouraged by its success, the parish built its own dedicated Mission Hall in 1896, staffed by laity, who remained steadfast in their commitment to helping their struggling fellow parishioners. This was a direct challenge to those scholars, who claimed that the ‘gulf’ between the classes was ‘too deep’ to achieve any meaningful spiritual benefit.

**Challenges facing Arthur Davenport**

When Arthur Davenport (1818-1907) assumed the position of Holy Trinity’s second incumbent in December 1854, he faced two major challenges: the acceptance and trust of his parishioners and a parish in financial difficulties. Church records show

---

16 Peter Kaldor, *A Gulf Too Deep? The Protestant Churches and the Urban Working Class in Australia* (Artarmon, 1983) examines the attempts to reach the urban working classes in Australia since the first settlement. See particularly, pp.54-56.

17 See Chapter 3.
that Davenport quickly got down to the business of running the parish in a calm and purposeful way. His background in mathematics, studied at Cambridge University, was about to stand him in good stead in dealing with the impecunious state of the parish. At his first vestry meeting in January 1855, there was only 14/11d in the church account, but liabilities of £218/6/-.

Davenport ordered these dire financial statements to be posted to the church’s door and measures were to be taken immediately to collect pew rents (£38/5/) and the balance on a promissory note issued at the time of the purchase of the peal of bells back in 1847. He instructed that the large number of outstanding accounts were to be paid, if and when finances became available, beginning with the ones of longest standing first.

Figure 31: Reverend Arthur Davenport, Second Incumbent of Holy Trinity
(Holy Trinity Church Archives)

---

18 Miscellaneous Papers relating to the Davenport family NS144/3/1/4, TAHO.
19 Trinity Parish Vestry Minutes, 3 January 1855, HTCA.
20 Ibid.
Within the first decade of his ministry, it became obvious that there were insufficient funds to pay for the day to day running of the parish. On at least three occasions, Davenport had to resort to giving the new church a loan from his personal purse\textsuperscript{21} to pay debts owed for essential repairs and the payment of services to the steeplejack, cleaner, sexton, bellows operator (for the organ) and the bell ringers for services on Christmas Day.\textsuperscript{22} Davenport was able to do this as his personal papers indicate that he was a colonist of comfortable means, his stipend being augmented by private tuition given to pupils.\textsuperscript{23} Other cutbacks included halving the remuneration for the organist, who subsequently resigned and halving the monthly pension of 10/- given to Widow Griffiths.\textsuperscript{24} Legal action was threatened in some cases where accounts had not been paid.\textsuperscript{25}

Beginning in 1860, Davenport published annually the straitened circumstances in the \textit{Hobart Town Gazette} for the colonists and the Government to see and to compare Holy Trinity’s dire circumstances with other city churches such as St George’s, Battery Point, St John’s, New Town and St David’s Cathedral.\textsuperscript{26} In 1859, Holy Trinity’s pew rents were 14% of those collected by St David’s Cathedral.\textsuperscript{27} Likewise, its offertory collection for the year amounted to £23/7/0½, while the Cathedral’s several collections

\textsuperscript{21} Davenport gave loans on 2 January 1857, 24 December 1860 and 2 January 1862, Trinity Vestry Minutes, HTCA.

\textsuperscript{22} Trinity Parish Vestry Minutes, 30 December 1857, 18 November 1859, 1 January 1861 and 4 April 1861, HTCA.

\textsuperscript{23} Business Diary of Archdeacon Arthur Davenport, 1855-1906 NS144/3/1/1, TAHO.

\textsuperscript{24} Trinity Parish Vestry Minutes, 4 August 1857, 1 January 1861 and 7 October 1861, HTCA.

\textsuperscript{25} Trinity Parish Vestry Minutes, 23 February 1859, HTCA.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Hobart Town Gazette}, 6 March 1860; p. 424; 14 January 1862, p.60; 13 January 1863, p.194 and 12 January 1864, p.159.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Hobart Town Gazette}, 17 January 1860, p. 74 and 6 March 1860, p. 424.
amounted to £759/1/6½. To exacerbate Trinity’s financial shortcomings, both St David’s and St John’s gave substantial donations to the poor. The major cause for the shortfall in funds for Holy Trinity was the lack of well-to do parishioners, who could afford pew rents and donations to the offertory collection, attending church even though the official census records of 1861 indicate that more than 55 per cent of the colonists specified that they belonged to the Church of England. By 1870, the Census figures showed that 54 per cent of the colonists still claimed affiliation but by 1891, the number had dropped to 52 per cent. (See Table 4)

Table 4: Religious Affiliation for the Church of England in Tasmania, 1837-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of People Claiming Affiliation</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>15 228</td>
<td>21 525</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>16 094</td>
<td>23 112</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>32 560</td>
<td>43 704</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>34 861</td>
<td>47 333</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>44 490</td>
<td>63 698</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>45 073</td>
<td>68 153</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>47 714</td>
<td>80 327</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>49 233</td>
<td>89 634</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>53 047</td>
<td>99 092</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>73 169</td>
<td>139 742</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>83 815</td>
<td>167 610</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tasmanian Censuses 1837-1901.

28 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
Trinity Parishioners

The two major factors contributing to the absence of parishioners attending church can be found in the disinterest of the relatively small number of middle classes living in the parish compared to Battery Point and New Town parishes and the low socio-economic conditions of Trinity Parish as a whole. The boundaries of the parish had been redefined in July 1855, but they remained rather ‘fluid’ (See Fig. 32). They included the Hobart Penitentiary in the east and Brickfields Pauper Establishment in the north, but also included the General Hospital in Liverpool St, which technically was within the Parish of St David’s Cathedral. However, Holy Trinity burial records show that paupers and serving convicts were tended by the clergy of Trinity Parish, presumably because the convict burial ground was at the far eastern boundary of the church’s burial ground in Campbell Street, nearest to the Park Street Rivulet. (See Fig.33) The huge Trinity Parish of Philip Palmer’s incumbency had been reduced by the creation of two new parishes from working class areas, St John’s the Baptist, West Hobart (1844), and later All Saints, South Hobart (1858), thus reducing the number of ‘lower classes’ in Trinity Parish.

Nonetheless, when Arthur Davenport took on the incumbency, the parish was still a poor one. The Valuation Roll for 1858 shows the extent of the poverty that 20 of the 21 streets surveyed had more than half of their properties valued at £19 or less. The

---

33 An analysis of Church records show that only between 4 and 5 per cent of the wealthier colonists baptised their children between 1855 and 1860 at Holy Trinity. (See Appendix F.)
34 Courier, 3 July 1855, p.2.
35 Map of Trinity Burial Ground, HTCA.
37 Courier, 3 December 1858, p.2.
38 Ibid.
Figure 32: Trinity Parish Boundary 1856. (Courier, 3 July 1855, p.2.)
one street which had higher valued properties was Elizabeth Street, the main road out of the city, with its many shops and public houses (See Fig. 34). The poorest area of the parish was the streets north of Burnett Street (Colville, George, Ware, Smith, Wellington and King Streets), in the narrow corridor of land between Mt Stuart and the Queen’s Domain Hill. Here blocks were small and makeshift skillings and half-finished dwellings were numerous. Another poor area was the north-west boundary of the

---

40 Valuation Roll, 1858.
parish, (aligned with the new city boundary),\textsuperscript{41} Hill and Arthur Streets, where properties were sparse and of low value.\textsuperscript{42}

The other valuable information which the Valuation Roll reveals is the amount and type of industry within the parish. Most of the industry serviced the immediate city needs: two slaughter houses, a brewery, a bakehouse, a lime kiln and quarry, two timber yards, three blacksmiths, eighteen stables, two factories (one making soap and candles) and a mill (unspecified). By far the greatest number of businesses in the parish were the 117 small shops, attached to ‘dwellings’ and forty-six public houses (See Fig. 43 of Chapter 6).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure34.png}
\caption{Valuation of Property within Trinity Parish, Hobart Town, 1858 (Source: \textit{Valuation Roll, 1858})}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.
The Valuation Roll also lists thirty-four unfinished houses and several dilapidated buildings, thus adding to the low valuation of the parish. One of these was ‘Rat’s Castle’, a ‘rough lodging house’ situated on the southern parish boundary in Brisbane Street (See Fig. 35). This derelict building housed the destitute looking for shelter at night when other lodging houses had turned them away, ‘[crawling] in there like rats, going into their holes.’

![Rat’s Castle, Hobart](image)

**Figure 35: Rat’s Castle, Hobart**
(Watercolour c.1910, Blamire Young, State Library of Victoria)

A cross-section of the parishioners, who presented their children for baptism between 1850 and 1860 and the burial records for the same period, confirm that Trinity Parish was a working class area (See Fig. 36). By far the greatest number of occupations stated in the sample belongs to the unskilled working classes made up of labourers and

---

43 ‘The Captain’, *In Old Days and These and Other Stories* (Hobart, 1930), p.48.

232
gardeners. As the parish boundary in the northwest above Arthur Street abutted onto farmland, farmers and farm labourers swelled this group.

Another large group comprised of semi-skilled and skilled workers in construction such as stone masons, glaziers, plasterers and carpenters. Manufacturing, such as basket making, tailoring, sail making, cabinet making and butchering, also accounted for a large number. The average daily wage for skilled artisans such as carpenters, plasterers, joiners and masons ranged between 10/- and 11/- in 1858 and between 9/6

Figure 36: Samples of Occupations of Holy Trinity Parishioners (1850-1875) Baptismal Records of Holy Trinity Church (NS349/1, TAHO)\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{44} See also Appendix F.
and 10/6 in 1859, most of whom lived within walking distance to their work in rental accommodation.

Typically, their homes were small Georgian cottages of three rooms (living room, bedroom and kitchen), measuring 28 by 12 feet, which was much smaller than the specifications of 36 by 14 feet set down by Governor Macquarie for single storey homes in Hobart Town in 1811. Although wages dropped between 1858 and 1859, the cost of the staple foods did not. Bread, butter, cheese and coffee all rose in price, while there was little change in the price of tea, sugar and meat (mutton and beef). Unfortunately for the temperance advocates in this decade, the cost of alcohol (beer and ale, both imported and local), fell in price by up to 50 per cent.

In the church’s burial records, there is another impoverished section of the population, which recurs frequently—the convicts, listed either as ‘freed by servitude’ or as ‘ticket of leave’ or currently still serving their sentence. The latter are euphemistically entered in the church records as in ‘Government Employment’. Finally, there is another group, which was probably at the bottom of the socio-economic sample, and they are those identified (again euphemistically) as ‘objects of charity’—in

---

45 Statistics for Tasmania, 1859, p.52; Hugo M. Hull, The Experience of Forty Years in Tasmania (Hobart, 1859), p.82.
46 The Valuation Roll 1858 indicates that most of the houses within the Trinity Parish were rented.
47 Solomon, ‘Sprent’s Hobart, circa 1854’, p. 54.
49 Statistics for the Colony of Tasmania, 1859, p.52.
51 Statistics for Tasmania, 1859, p.52.
52 Registers of Burials for Holy Trinity Church, 18 November 1833 to 19 September 1960, NS349/1/29 and 30, TAHO.
other words, the paupers who had no way of earning a living.\textsuperscript{53} It follows that these people did not have the financial means to augment Holy Trinity Church’s coffers either in paying for pew rents or giving to a regular collection. More important was their lack of desire to attend church any way, at least in its current form.

**Reasons for Non-Attendance**

The reasons for the reluctance of the Trinity parishioners to attend and support their church varied. For the small number of middle classes,\textsuperscript{54} disinterest in church affairs was the primary factor, with other more ‘pressing’ temporal activities taking precedence on the ‘day of rest’. Rowan Strong agrees with this statement but in the different context of the colony of Swan River. There the clergy found settlers absenting themselves from church because of ‘distance and harvest’.\textsuperscript{55} Historian, John Barrett points specifically to the colonists’ cultural baggage which they had brought with them from Britain to the colony in the mid-nineteenth century. They neither practised religion nor knew much about it. When they ‘came to Australia, ... they brought their indifference with them, and piled it on the heap of difficulties already made large by isolation and pre-occupation with the business of living, by the breaking of old ties and the early shortage of churches and clergymen.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{53} According to the sample of the Baptismal Records of Holy Trinity, 1850-1875, those who were in ‘Government Employment’ ie Convicts ‘freed by servitude’ or ‘ticket of leave’ and ‘objects of charity’ made up between 9 per cent-18 per cent. (See Appendix F, Urban Unskilled.)

\textsuperscript{54} According to the sample of the Baptismal Records of Holy Trinity, 1850-1875, the proportion of the middle classes in Trinity Parish was between 0 per cent—6 per cent. (See Appendix F.)


Rowan Strong disagrees with the notion of ‘indifference’ among the middle-class settlers, citing two instances: first, clergy often found evidence of religious observance in settlers’ homes in the form of ‘Bible and prayer-book reading, ... hymn-singing and family prayers;’ and second, the Bishop of Australia, William Broughton, in 1840 reported to the SPG, admittedly a major subscriber to colonial churches, that ‘sixteen out of every twenty-three colonists in Van Diemen’s Land belonged to the Church of England’ and marked their ‘religious and moral attachment by erecting churches in various parts of the colony ... [which] ... are no sooner built and opened, than the sittings are engaged and occupied.’

This was not the case with Holy Trinity where the financial records reflected very low receipts for pew rents compared to other established colonial churches such as St David’s Cathedral (See Table 4). There had been no groundswell of middle class support to establish a new parish church as there had been in Battery Point and New Town in the 1830s. The former had the support of leading colonists such as William Kermode, John Montagu, George Frankland and Robert Pitcairn, who were able to raise £1200 towards a new church (St George’s), while a group of well-to-do colonists living in New Town had petitioned Lieutenant-Governor Arthur to build a church in their neighbourhood as they found attending St David’s too distant to travel to on Sundays. St John’s New Town was built quickly with the generous endowment of

---

57 Rowan Strong p. 523
59 Thomas Smith to Philip Palmer, 11 February 1835, CSO1/804/17188, TAHO.
60 William Kermode was a wealthy pastoralist interested in sheep breeding; John Montagu was Colonial Secretary; George Frankland was Surveyor General and Robert Pitcairn was a Supreme Court Barrister.
61 Minute of Lieutenant-Governor Arthur (undated), CSO1/804/17188, TAHO; Hobart Town Courier, 14 October 1836, p.2.
Table 5: Comparison of Pew Rents received by Holy Trinity Church and St David’s Cathedral, 1853-1860.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity</td>
<td>£65/0/0</td>
<td>£80/0/0</td>
<td>£53/17/6</td>
<td>£1/17/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St David’s Cathedral</td>
<td>£251/0/0</td>
<td>£300/0/0</td>
<td>£380/0/0</td>
<td>£265/8/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: *Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 1854-1856; Hobart Town Gazette, 1860-1862.*

wealthy colonists living in that parish and in the wider community of Hobart Town.\(^{62}\)

In contrast, wealthy Trinity parishioners had not supported the building of the parish church. Indeed, in 1836 Philip Palmer had warned Lieutenant-Governor Arthur that obtaining support had taken so long, the would-be parishioners had ‘drifted away’ to other churches, even to non-‘establishment’ churches.\(^{63}\) Arthur had agreed\(^ {64}\) and, despite committing further funds from the Government’s coffers,\(^ {65}\) finalising the plans for and raising the edifice of Holy Trinity all took sixteen years, compared with two years to build St John’s New Town.\(^ {66}\)

Like the middle classes, there is strong evidence to suggest that the working classes in Trinity Parish were never connected to church practice and teaching in the first place.

---

\(^{62}\) Original List of Subscribers to the Fund for the Erection of St John’s New Town, 1830 NS656/1/75, TAHO.

\(^{63}\) Palmer to Montagu, 3 June 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, TAHO. (Palmer’s claim is possible. The *Hobart Town Almanack and Van Diemen’s Land Annual, 1836*, p.19, shows that in 1836, Scots Presbyterian Church in Bathurst Street was open.)

\(^{64}\) Minute of Lieutenant-Governor Arthur (undated), CSO1/804/17188, TAHO.

\(^{65}\) Ibid.

\(^{66}\) *Hobart Town Courier*, 10 January 1834, pp.2-3; *Colonial Times*, 7 January 1834, p.1; *Hobart Town Gazette*, 11 December 1835, p. 1057.
in much the same way as their fellow workers back in Britain.\textsuperscript{67} Commentators such as Friedrich Engels and William Cobbett both independently observed that the British working classes did not attend church in the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{68} Reverend Thomas Gisborne, writing his \textit{Friendly Observations} in 1827, chastised the working classes for spending the Sabbath devoted to their ‘wicked companions, luxurious indulgence and beastly sensuality at ... public [houses].\textsuperscript{69} By 1851, Horace Mann, the reporter for the Religious Census taken that year noted that ‘a sadly formidable proportion of the English people [the working classes] are habitual neglecters of religion.’\textsuperscript{70} Mann pointed to ‘secularism’ as the reason for their non-attendance, where they were too ‘engrossed by the demands, the trials, or the pleasures of the passing hour, and ignorant or careless of the future ... The classes which are most in need of the restraints and consolations of religion are the classes which are most without them.’\textsuperscript{71}

The statistical returns of the Hobart City Mission for 1852 support these views. In Trinity Parish alone there were 900 adults, of which only 100 attended any Protestant church, even though 350 professed to belong to the Church of England. Moreover, 250 adults claimed they did not belong to any denomination.\textsuperscript{72} The ‘religious destitution of a large class of the population’ caused great concern to the City Mission. Many claimed

\textsuperscript{67} Ken Inglis, ‘Churches and the working classes in nineteenth century England’, \textit{Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand,} Vol. 8, No. 29, 1957, p.45.
\textsuperscript{68} Quoted in Allan M. Grocott, \textit{Convicts, Clergymen and Churches: Attitudes to Convicts and Ex-convicts towards the Churches and Clergy in New South Wales from 1788 to 1851} (Sydney, 1980), p.15
\textsuperscript{69} Reverend Thomas Gisborne, \textit{Friendly Observations addressed to the Manufacturing Population of Great Britain now suffering under the difficulties of the times} (London, 1827), p. 18.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{72} First Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission, 6 December 1853, p.12.
that they had not attended church for twenty years, except for a christening or funeral nor had they listened to any sermon since they arrived in the colony.\textsuperscript{73} The missionaries described ‘the spiritual condition of the people as most deplorable’ and ‘the deepest ignorance and irreligion [prevailed]’.\textsuperscript{74} Three years later, the population in the parish had grown to 1,575, (an increase of 75%) but the number of adults ‘induced’ to attend any church was only 91 or 6%.\textsuperscript{75} The clergy for their part, had to take some blame for the spiritual neglect of the masses. Since the 1830s, ministers of the Church of England in Van Diemen’s Land had not been exemplary role models for the people in their treatment of each other nor of other denominations. The open hostility between Reverends Palmer and Bedford had become the source of ridicule in the local press in the 1830s, while Bishop Nixon’s disagreements with two Lieutenant-Governors, Eardley-Wilmot and Denison, over the appointment of convict chaplains had divided colonial society.\textsuperscript{76} Again, in the late 1840s and 1850s, Nixon’s differences over the interpretation of doctrine with Reverend Henry Fry\textsuperscript{77} occupied the press, which tended to side with Fry rather than the head of the English Church in the colony. The squabbles between denominations over the allocation of land\textsuperscript{78} and education\textsuperscript{79} evoked an indifference, at times cynicism in the workers. The nominal church leaders did not practise what they preached and hypocrisy abounded.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., p.7.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{75} Fourth Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission, 11 December 1856, p.12.
\textsuperscript{76} W. R Barrett, History of the Church of England in Tasmania (Hobart, 1842), p.6.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid. p.10.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., p.6.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid. p.9.
The clergy further demonstrated their disconnectedness with the working classes by embracing the trappings of the middle classes. Bishop Nixon drove through Hobart Town in his polished carriage with matching black horses.\textsuperscript{80} He lived in ‘Bishopstowe’, an elegant mansion in the well-to-do area of New Town, out of sight and away from the odours of the crowded inner city (See Figure 37). He spent generous periods away from his episcopal duties in the country, where he spent his days sketching and writing letters home to England. Even the new incumbent of Holy Trinity, Arthur Davenport, attended levees at Government House,\textsuperscript{81} while his daughters took music, dancing and art lessons from private tutors.\textsuperscript{82}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{Figure37.png}
\caption{Sketch of ‘Bishopstowe’, Bishop Francis Nixon (TAHO)}
\end{figure}

These activities had nothing in common with those of the working classes in Hobart and Trinity Parish in particular. The clergy belonged to the middle class, indulged in their pastimes and followed their interests. For their part, the workers would prefer to

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Mercury} 15 June 1872, p.4 and 8 June 1878, Supplement 1.
\textsuperscript{82} Diaries of Fanny Maria Shoobridge n.d. NS144/2/1/4, TAHO and Miscellaneous Papers Relating to the Davenport family, NS144/3/1/4, TAHO.
visit the many public houses that existed in the city in the latter part of the nineteenth century. One visitor to Hobart in 1853 estimated there was ‘one public house for every three or four houses.’\textsuperscript{83} The pub was a common social centre and offered the working classes ‘a sense of belonging to a community of like-minded people ... and ... enabled them to rise above the daily grind, to reflect and recuperate.’\textsuperscript{84}

With the pub culture came drunkenness, gambling and prostitution. The clerics often seized upon these ‘sins’ as the cause for the workers’ squalor and poverty. Their constant cant simply aligned them with the middle classes’ values and morality—industry, thrift and sobriety. Christianity was no friend of idleness and was based on the biblical precept, ‘he becometh poor that dealeth with a slack hand, but the hand of the diligent maketh rich.’\textsuperscript{85}

Another reason for the working classes to absent themselves from church was the formalised services favoured by the Church of England. The Church gave ‘the working man nothing to do. He feels he forms no integral part of her, that he is in no vital connexion [sic] with her, that he is not built into her structure, but is left a loose stone, lying about for anyone to tumble over.’\textsuperscript{86} An additional problem was their lack of literacy to follow and understand the order of services as set down in the \textit{Book of Common Prayer}.\textsuperscript{87} Latin was used to announce the canticles\textsuperscript{88} and there was a sad

\begin{footnotes}
\item[84] McLeod, \textit{Religion and the Working Class}, p. 63.
\end{footnotes}
irony in the elevated language of prayers with which the poor could never identify. Imagery of ‘lost sheep’ losing their way,⁸⁹ ‘[filling] the hungry with good things’ and sending the rich away empty-handed was a far cry from reality.⁹⁰

Moreover, the working classes felt totally marginalised by the system of hierarchical seating, where the wealthy middle classes paid for a seat in their church with an annual pew rent. Callum Brown’s study shows that pew renting was a transnational issue as it was ‘a universal practice in the churches of nineteen-century Britain’, including the Roman Catholic and dissenting Protestant as well as the ‘Established Church.’⁹¹ Holy Trinity had such a system and therefore immediately precluded all those parishioners unable to afford the pew rent. As the historian, Ken Inglis argues in his study of church attendance of the same class in England, ‘if the Church wanted to gain ground among the working classes, she must treat all worshippers alike whatever their social station. In particular, she must abolish the pew system.’⁹²

But there were vested interests at play here, for the newly-emerging middle classes saw the pew renting system as a means of showing their new social status and were therefore more willing to pay higher rents to secure the better pew.⁹³ Coupled with this was their objection to having to attend worship at close quarters with the working

⁸⁸ For example, the Order for Evening Prayer still used the Latin title of the canticles, ‘Nunc Dimittis’, ‘Deus Misereatur’ and ‘Magnificat’.
⁹⁰ Ibid., p.53. See also McLeod, Religion and The Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Britain, p.58.
⁹² Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes, p.49.
classes and the poor on account of their lack of hygiene—as Inglis states bluntly, ‘the poor stank’. Brown contends that it was this hygiene issue which led to the proliferation of separate mission churches for the poor in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Inglis further identifies another issue that affected church attendance: the working classes’ inability to wear ‘Sunday-best’ clothes. He states, that ‘the working-man in shabby fustian ... would not take himself to church alongside respectable broadcloth,’ where his well-worn working clothes would be deemed inferior inside the church. It follows that the working classes in Hobart Town felt the same in a colonial church.

Not all scholars focus on the working classes’ attendance at church as an indication of the latter’s embracing of religion. Jeffrey Cox points to their ‘diffusive Christianity’ in acknowledging the sacramental rites of baptism, marriage and death; in sending their children to Sunday School; in accepting the Church’s philanthropy and attending the popular annual Autumn Harvest Festivals and the Watchnight service on New Year’s Eve, thought to bring good luck. Far from being irreligious, the working classes showed that they were ‘in touch’ with the Church but ‘indifferent to the claims of organised religion.’

---

94 Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes, p.51.
96 Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes, p. 59. See also McLeod, Religion and the Working Class, p.58.
97 Ibid.
99 Ibid., p.104.
This indifference did not help Arthur Davenport in setting up a viable parish church in 1854. Matters were further exacerbated by an economic depression which took hold gradually in Tasmania between 1858 and 1872.\textsuperscript{100} An exodus of young males, potential breadwinners, to the mainland, plus a slump in industry, particularly the construction industry, affected wages, estimated to be 35% lower in 1870 than in 1857.\textsuperscript{101} A labourer now earnt only 4/3d per day and an artisan in the building trade, 7/- per day. The basic food staples such as bread and mutton, on the other hand, only fell 25%, placing greater strain on the working classes.\textsuperscript{102} Still it was calculated that ‘the average married man could bring up a young family on his wages of just over £2 a week and keep them fed and healthy. But he had to exercise thrift and there was little or nothing in the way of savings. If unforeseen misfortune struck, the results were generally quite tragic.’\textsuperscript{103}

A Change in Perspective

Given these many problems thought to be preventing the poor workers from attending church, clearly a change in attitude and practice was needed if the Church of England were to play a meaningful role in the lives of hundreds of disaffected paupers in the Tasmanian Diocese. As early as 1852, the church’s newspaper, the \textit{Tasmanian Chronicle}, began to publish a number of articles that pointed to ways in which the Church could reach out to the poor workers. In July 1852,\textsuperscript{104} two significant articles

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., p.38.
\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Tasmanian Church Chronicle}, 3 July 1852, n.p.
were published by the English cleric, Reverend Edward Monro (1815-1866), who worked extensively with poor English youths in providing them with quality education. Monro asserted that the problems of the poor in society were due to their separation and alienation from the wealthy classes. In medieval times, the two classes were dependant on each other for their well-being; in the 1850s, the poor regarded any ministrations by the wealthy as condescending and therefore seemed to respond with ingratitude, distrust and suspicion.

The clergyman of the day sat midway between the two classes and it behoved him to seek out the poor and minister to them on an individual basis, not en masse. He could then better understand ‘the sorrows, the anxieties and the wants’ of their class and at the same time, appeal to the altruism and philanthropy of the wealthy to ease the burden of the less unfortunate. The best way to do this was through home visitations, something which the Church embraced in employing its own visiting missionary, Joseph Smales, and setting up the Hobart City Mission in 1852. Details of this outreach are explored at length in Chapter 6 of this thesis.

The other article by Munro entitled, ‘Watchman, what of the Night?’ clearly sets out his view that churches should be open in the evenings in competition with the ‘gambling-houses and gin palaces, public houses and taverns’ so favoured by working class men. The clergy could not afford to ‘be absent from their post during the most critical part of the day, and only be found in the circles of social life and intellectual

---


106 *Tasmanian Church Chronicle*, 3 July 1852, n.p.

107 Ibid.
society.’

Holy Trinity Church did open for services at night when Davenport had gas lighting installed on 20 February 1859, but this did not necessarily assure the attendance of the working man as the Church still used the expensive and excluding pew rent system.

In a transnational context, in July 1854 the Convocation of Canterbury met for the first time since 1717 in London to address a perceived third issue, the ‘efficiency of the church’ in meeting the needs of the burgeoning population, particularly in the poor in the cities. The *Tasmanian Church Chronicle* published the Convocation’s report which recommended the shortening of services as laid out in the *Book of Common Prayer*, or at least, the adaptation of services to better meet the level of understanding of the working classes. Children’s services and thanksgiving services should be regularly held.

Finally, from the mid-1850s, there was a noticeable shift in emphasis in the role of the laity in church affairs in Tasmania. This corresponded with the debate in all Australian colonies that the laity should be included in proposed synods and formal meetings of the clergy regarding the management of the Church. The *Tasmanian Church Chronicle* added its support to this movement by advocating that lay missionaries should be employed to help the existing clergy in their work as a way to reach the ‘heathenized population’ who call themselves ‘Christian’ but who never came to church. The type of lay missionary needed must include ‘men of love and zeal and holy wisdom’.

---

108 Ibid.
109 Bowden and Crawford, *Story of Trinity*, p.79; Minutes of Holy Trinity Vestry, 28 March 1859, HTCA.
111 Ibid
112 *Tasmanian Church Chronicle*, 1 January 1852 and 1 December 1854, n.p.
ironically very like the Wesleyans ‘repelled’ by the Church of England one hundred and fifty years earlier.\textsuperscript{113} It was envisaged that these lay missionaries would become ‘open-air preachers’, going into the homes and workplaces of the working classes.\textsuperscript{114} In time, these missionaries could run a series of ‘cottage-lectures and room meetings’ as opposed to formal sermons in a church in a bid to bring Christian principles to the workers.\textsuperscript{115}

The Laity and the Outreach to the Poor

The call to the laity to be included in the ministry to the poor was heeded by Trinity Parish. Underpinning their intentions to help the poor was the notion of ‘self-help’, embraced by the Church of England through the advocacy of Bishop Charles Bromby and by the adoption of the principles of self-betterment. In January 1865, Bromby was invited by the newly-formed Working Men’s Club\textsuperscript{116} in Hobart to deliver the first of a series of winter lectures on self-improvement. Bromby had had experience in working among the poor in Britain, and in particular setting up a Working Men’s Club in Cheltenham\textsuperscript{117} prior to taking up the episcopate of Tasmania in January 1865. His lecture was entitled \textit{Self Help}, which emphasized the importance of self-education,\textsuperscript{118} the need for alternative places for working men to socialize other than the public houses\textsuperscript{119} and the establishment of Penny Banks into which the working classes could

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{115} Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 3 March 1853, n.p.
\textsuperscript{117} Church News, 2 January 1865, p.7.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., pp.10-11.
\end{flushright}
place their wages instead of squandering them on alcohol.\textsuperscript{120}

In this regard, he echoed the sentiments of Samuel Smiles (1812-1904), a Scottish physician, editor of the \textit{Leeds Times}, secretary of the South-Eastern Railway and writer of numerous biographies.\textsuperscript{121} In 1859, he published his self-improvement manual, \textit{Self-Help}, which argued for the importance of character,\textsuperscript{122} thrift\textsuperscript{123} and perseverance\textsuperscript{124} if the working classes were to improve their circumstances. In addition, the qualities of civility,\textsuperscript{125} independence\textsuperscript{126} and individuality\textsuperscript{127} should be adopted by the poorer classes if they wanted to better their chances in society. \textit{Self Help} became the standard by which young men in particular could measure their progress to a better and more satisfying life. His study of \textit{Self Help} was aided by numerous aphorisms,\textsuperscript{128} proverbs and anecdotes of successful men, who had applied the principles Smiles espoused. The work went into multiple editions and was translated into several languages.\textsuperscript{129}

As early as 1860, a number of self-help ‘maternal societies’ were established for the poor in Hobart Town. These groups met up to two times a week to show mothers how

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., p.18.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., p.280-281, 296-298.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., pp.67, 76, 108-110.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., p.407.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., p.285.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., pp.20, 23.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., p.290.
\textsuperscript{128} An Interview with Dr Samuel Smiles, recorded in the \textit{Brisbane Courier}, 2 June 1891, p.7.
to conduct their homes and households in a more ‘orderly’ way.\textsuperscript{130} These maternal meetings spawned sewing groups, one of which began in January 1867 at Holy Trinity. This Mothers’ Society was formed with the purpose of teaching the working class mothers the rudiments of sewing for the home and their families. This self-help group of between seven and twelve mothers met weekly at the Trinity School under the supervision of two ‘managers’ rostered fortnightly from Trinity Parish. One of the managers was Frances Davenport, the wife of the incumbent. The women made children’s clothes, underwear, linen and kitchenware from relatively inexpensive but durable materials such as calico, holland and flannel (See Fig. 38). Each member paid 1/- subscription each week, which went towards purchasing the cloth. When they finished their article, they had the option of purchasing it at cost.\textsuperscript{131} Records show that this group met for seven years, folding in February 1873.

Subsequent sewing groups were set up as part of Holy Trinity’s branch of the Diocesan Church Society, formed in July 1878. Among the aims of the Church Society was ‘to unite together the parishioners in a closer bond of union for their own spiritual benefit [and] for the better organisation of the practical work of the parish.’\textsuperscript{132} In his report for 1880, Reverend Shoobridge noted that the sewing group had ‘done substantial work’ and had sixteen members.\textsuperscript{133} The group appears to have disbanded, but later regrouped and met during the winter of 1893 to make new clothes or refashion

\textsuperscript{131} Trinity Mothers’ Society Accounts, Expenditure for 1872, HTCA.
\textsuperscript{132} Bowden and Crawford, Story of Trinity, p.71.
\textsuperscript{133} Church News, 1 May 1880, p.72.
second-hand clothes for sale to the poor of the parish. The following year, the ladies sewing group met every Thursday afternoon in the Parish Hall. The finished articles made by this group were sold at fairs to raise funds for various projects in the parish such as new choir seats, new pews or to assist with a shortfall in finances in a given year, such as reducing the debt on the new Mission Hall in Colville Street.

For the men in the parish, one lay parishioner, who volunteered considerable time to and care of the poor, was Charles Grahame (1837-1897).

Figure 38: List of Articles made by the Trinity Mother’s Society, 1870.
(Holy Trinity Church Archives)

---

134 Ibid., 1 June 1893, p.875.
135 Bowden and Crawford, Story of Trinity, p. 64.
136 Ibid, 1 July 1892, p.694.
137 Church News, 6 January 1896, p.596; 2 December 1889, p.187.
and the lay representative in Synod between 1895 and 1897.\textsuperscript{139} He was appointed a lay reader in March 1896 after serving twenty five years working in philanthropy in the parish.\textsuperscript{140} He was employed in the Government Printing Office, where his older brother, William Grahame was in charge.\textsuperscript{141} He lived in the northern end of Argyle Street, close by some of the poorest parts of the parish, north of Burnett Street.\textsuperscript{142} In 1876, he rented a room in Ware Street, where he conducted a Sunday School, church services and philanthropic work for the poor.\textsuperscript{143} With the assistance of Frederick Piesse, (1822-1886), the Collector of City Rates, he opened a Penny Bank for the workers, where they were encouraged to bank at least 1d per week every Saturday evening.\textsuperscript{144} This savings bank for paupers quickly became self-supporting and at the end of its first year of operation, it had a balance of £57/0/5 with 81 accounts.\textsuperscript{145} The Trinity Parochial Association held a musical and recitation evening to defray costs.\textsuperscript{146} While most of the depositors were children, the adults saved their money either to buy clothes or to pay the rent.\textsuperscript{147} The real benefit of the Penny Bank was that it encouraged ‘frugality and self-help’ and was ‘an indirect means of promoting temperance.’\textsuperscript{148}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Mercury}, 30 September 1897, p.1.
\textsuperscript{139} Bowden and Crawford, \textit{Story of Trinity}, pp. 34-35.
\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Church News}, 1 April 1196, p.451; \textit{Mercury}, 3 December 1896, p.3.
\textsuperscript{141} \textit{Lanceston Examiner}, 30 September 1897, p.6.
\textsuperscript{142} See Valuation Rolls for the City of Hobart Town, 1869 and 1881.
\textsuperscript{143} \textit{Mercury}, 25 November 1840, p.4.
\textsuperscript{145} \textit{Church News}, 1 June 1878, p.282.
\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Mercury}, 4 September 1877, p.2; 8 September 1877, p.2.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
Several depositors subsequently transferred their funds to the Hobart Town Saving Bank.\textsuperscript{149}

Another measure set up early in 1877 to reach out to the poor was the District Visiting Society. These societies had proliferated in Britain between 1825 and 1850 for a number of the Protestant denominations.\textsuperscript{150} Trinity Parish was divided into nineteen districts so that parishioners could be visited ‘thoroughly and regularly’ by a ‘lady visitor’.\textsuperscript{151} Initially, only twelve ladies volunteered for this work, made all the more difficult in that some of the districts were very large, too large for one lady to cover with the responsibility of home duties as well. These twelve volunteers met with the clergy once a month ‘for prayer and consultation.’\textsuperscript{152} The significance of their work lay in their being ‘the eyes’ of the philanthropic outreach of Holy Trinity ‘for they [found] out cases of sickness and distress, and [induced] parents to send their children to the schools.’\textsuperscript{153}

Allied to the District Visiting Association and arising from its work in the homes of the poor, was the Parochial Library. It housed about 300 volumes, the majority purchased at half price from the SPCK in Britain.\textsuperscript{154} The genre of books ranged from serious religious tracts, bibles and catechisms to fictional short stories with a strong moral

\textsuperscript{149} Church News, 2 June 1879, p.474.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., 1 June 1898, p.282.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{153} Church News, 1 June 1898, p.282.
\textsuperscript{154} The SPCK publications appeared in the Church News, 1 July 1890, p.302; 1 January 1891, p.397; 1 January 1892, p.590 and in the Mercury, 2 April 1884, p.3 and 16 November 1885, p.3.
overtone, known as ‘penny tales’. Books were issued to subscribers at a cost of 2/- per quarter or between 1/2d and 2d per volume. In extreme cases of hardship, they were issued free of charge with the Visitor becoming responsible for the books’ return. The Library was open every Wednesday night and on Saturday between 3 and 4 o’clock. Another role of the District Visitors was ‘to instil habits of cleanliness, sobriety and industry in the housewives of the parish. The Church firmly believed in the adage of

![Figure 39: Visitors of Trinity Parish, 1894](image)

(Holy Trinity Church Archives)
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155 *Petersburg Times*, 5 April 1889, p.4.
156 *Church News*, 1 July 1890, p.302; 1 January 1891, p.397; 1 January 1892, p.590.
157 *Church News*, 1 September 1877, p.130.
‘Cleanliness is next to Godliness’ and ‘the pail and the scrubbing brush [formed] a step —no doubt a very lowly one — in the ladder to Heaven.’\textsuperscript{158} If a Church Visitor could persuade her poorer sister to keep a clean home, she would be teaching the latter ‘self-respect’, a requirement needed to embrace religion.\textsuperscript{159} Moreover, by making a home more comfortable, a poor housewife could dissuade her spouse from visiting the local public houses and keep her children off the streets, where they learnt life’s sordid habits.\textsuperscript{160}

By 1894, there were more than thirty Visitors at work.\textsuperscript{161} The increase in numbers corresponded with a public campaign, between 1891 and 1896, to address the inadequate sanitation needs of Hobart.\textsuperscript{162} The \textit{Church News}\textsuperscript{163} applauded the efforts of Teresa Hamilton, the wife of the Governor and Maud Montgomery, the wife of the Bishop, together with the wives of other civic and Protestant clergy,\textsuperscript{164} in forming the Women’s Sanitation Association (WSA) in 1891.\textsuperscript{165} Apart from successfully petitioning both the state and local Governments to improve drainage and waste removal,\textsuperscript{166} these women took a pragmatic approach in combating outbreaks of infectious diseases such as typhoid fever and diphtheria by printing and distributing 3000 health cards to every household, giving instructions about cleanliness and nursing infectious diseases.
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The Ware Street Sunday School had been closed down when there was an outbreak of Diphtheria in 1892. Shoobridge was only too well aware of the city’s drainage problem when he had to cross the putrid-smelling Park Street Rivulet daily when coming from the Trinity rectory to Holy Trinity Church.

The Church also played a role in trying to redress the problem of drunkenness within the community. It aims were threefold: to promote temperance among all classes, draw public attention to the ‘frightful evils’ arising from excessive indulgence of alcohol and try to cultivate more healthy tastes in those already addicted to ‘this soul destroying sin.’ In October 1877, nearly 300 interested people met to form a diocesan branch of the Church of England Temperance Association. Bishop Bromby believed that the Church could make a bigger impact on the intemperate in their midst if smaller, parochial meetings were held. Charles Grahame was instrumental in setting up the Holy Trinity branch of the Church of England Temperance Society in August 1879. By 1880, the Trinity branch had thirty members. Meetings were held in the Patrick Street School room and the Ware Street Mission Room. These meetings were convened early in the evening to allow both adults and children to attend. Membership was encouraged with a choice of two pledges to be taken: either ‘total
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abstinence’ or ‘temperance’. 176 Meetings took the form of lectures interspersed with musical items (vocal and instrumental) and humorous skits. 177

The Church made its opposition to the number of public houses, 178 trading hours 179 and the detrimental effects on families known through its diocesan monthly newspaper. In his ‘Temperance Sermon’ of November 1877, Bishop Bromby described the ‘terrible scourge’ of alcohol as ‘vast’ and its effects ‘disastrous’ on ‘the social, moral and material prosperity of the land.’ 180 He asserted that the ‘testimony of our judges, police magistrates, coroners and governors of gaols was the same, namely that ‘Intemperance, like gangrene, [was] responsible for the great proportion of pauperism, crime and lunacy, which [afflicted] the Mother Country and her Colonies alike.’ 181 The Church News established a ‘Temperance Column’, where learned opinion was quoted from medical authorities, 182 senior clerics in Australia and England, 183 economists 184 and the Visitors, who went into the homes and saw firsthand the effects of drunkenness on the social and material well-being of families, 185 particularly young children. 186 The witness of the City Missionaries and the visitors of the Hobart Benevolent Society is detailed in Chapter 6 of this thesis.
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In 1879, Trinity Parish also set up a Junior Temperance Guild, which met once a month at a charge of 1d per child.\footnote{Ibid., 1 September 1879, p.520.} This was not the first time a children’s temperance organisation had been set up in this parish. The Band of Hope,\footnote{Minutes of the Church of England Men’s Society, (hereafter CEMS) Holy Trinity Branch, 11 June 1934, p.49, HTCA.} a youth organisation founded in Leeds, Yorkshire in 1847\footnote{Pam Trimmer, ‘Children, the Band of Hope and the Temperance Movement’, Church Heritage, Vol. 16, No. 3, March 2010, p.149.} which quickly spread to the colonies,\footnote{Ibid. p.151.} was set up as early as 1859 to teach children of Trinity Parish the importance and principles of sobriety and teetotalism, as part of their Sunday School lessons. It was hoped that the members would assume ‘the Victorian virtues: honesty, truthfulness and love of God as well as man.’\footnote{Ibid. p.149.} It is not surprising that such an organisation was set up in a parish, which had over forty-six licensed public houses and an unknown number of sly grog shops and illicit backyard distilleries.\footnote{See Figure 43 of Chapter 6, Appendix G.}

By 1885, the Church News commented that ‘Temperance work seems gradually becoming a recognised branch of a parish priest’s duties, especially in England and also in the colonies. In Tasmania our Bishop [Daniel Sandford] is setting an example to his clergy by the great interest he displays in this cause.’\footnote{Church News, 1 July 1885, p.506.} Certainly, Reverend Shoobridge chaired the meetings, but it was the laity, including Charles Grahame, who addressed the meetings on the benefits of temperance.\footnote{Ibid.} The local Temperance Society held in church-owned or rented premises, had a two-fold benefit: for the
working class, it acted as ‘a feeder to the church’ by bringing this class into contact with members of the clergy and laity, whom they otherwise would never have met, and thereby might come to realise that attending church might not be such a distasteful act; from Davenport’s point of view, these meetings brought him into contact with needy people residing within his parish who might benefit from the Church’s wider outreach.195

In August 1892, the mission work being carried out in the Ware Street Mission Room for the poor received a welcome boost. A group of young men had met with Bishop Montgomery and other clergy from the Hobart parishes, including Shoobridge, to form a Lay Helpers’ Association.196 This association would have two orders, ‘Missioners’ and ‘Helpers’. Members would have to be recommended by a clergyman, be a communicant and in the case of a Missioner, be authorised by the Bishop. These young men would take up work in the various Tasmanian parishes where they were needed: in ‘Mission, Children, Outdoor and Cottage Services, House to House Visitation, Night Schools etc.’197 These volunteers would receive instruction through regular classes.198

In October 1892, Shoobridge announced that some of these Lay Missioners would be helping at the Ware Street Mission Room —taking services in the school room, setting up a night school [for boys] and visiting the homes of the poor parishioners.199 Shoobridge believed that ‘by giving secular teaching, first of all an influence will be

195 Church News, 1 July 1885, p.506.
196 Ibid., 1 September 1892, p.717.
197 Ibid.
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gained over big working lads and the way prepared for direct religious teaching and influence.'\(^{200}\) Once the Lay Missioners had settled in, Davenport envisaged that a second room in the Murray Street Free School, which was on the boundary between Trinity and St David’s Parishes, could be used to conduct services and a night school in that area as well.\(^ {201}\) In the meantime, the focus was on Ware Street and after two months, the Lay Missioners were able to report that ‘The district round had been well-visited by members … and the attendance at the services [had], on average, been about 20 adults and the same number of children.’\(^ {202}\)

Other colonies had Lay Helpers or Missioners. Sydney had set up such an association in July 1886,\(^ {203}\) while Brisbane set up its Lay Helpers’ Association in 1895.\(^ {204}\) The idea for such associations was not new\(^ {205}\) and had been copied from a model in London, which had quickly been taken up in many parishes throughout England.\(^ {206}\) The success of the Lay Missioners at Ware Street Mission spread to other parishes within Tasmania with St John’s Parish, Launceston, another very poor parish, taking up missioners’ help in 1893.\(^ {207}\) Bishop Montgomery, in his 1894 Synodal Address, described the Missioners’ work among Launceston’s poor as ‘indispensable’.\(^ {208}\)

\(^{200}\) Ibid.
\(^{201}\) Ibid.
\(^{202}\) Church News, 1 November 1892, p.757.
\(^{203}\) Sydney Morning Herald, 23 July 1886, p.4; Mercury, 30 July 1886, p.3.
\(^{204}\) Brisbane Courier, 8 March 1895, p.7.
\(^{205}\) The Times, 19 October 1871, p.11; 18 November 1872, p. 5.
\(^{206}\) Brisbane Courier, 8 March 1895, p.7.
\(^{207}\) The Lay Missioners assisted the clergy in taking services in Sorell, Forcett, Glenorchy, Bellerive and the Mariners’ Church on Hobart’s docks. They were also available for ‘occasional work’ at ‘outstations’. (Church News, 1 January 1893, p.791.)
\(^{208}\) Launceston Examiner, 11 April 1894, p.6.
The Missioners’ work at Ware Street was taken over in September 1894 by another lay association, the Brotherhood of St Andrew. Church records show that Holy Trinity had formed its own chapter, the Reverend Shoobridge listed among its members. This lay organisation originated in Chicago, USA in 1883 with the express object of advancing Christianity among young men, by encouraging them to participate more fully in church affairs. Each ‘brother’ was bound by two rules; a rule of service and a rule of prayer. The former was manifest in the Brotherhood’s focus on lapsed church members, who were encouraged to return to the Church’s fold. The brothers’ work included visiting house to house, hospitals, reformatories, prisons, lay reading, hospitality committees, Bible study classes and Sunday School teaching. By 1896, the Brotherhood had spread to Britain, Canada, Germany and Ireland, while chapters in the Australian Colonies had been set up in Sydney, Newcastle, Adelaide and Melbourne with a membership of 400. By 1898, two other Hobart parishes, St John the Baptist, West Hobart and All Saints, South Hobart, both with a large percentage of paupers like Trinity Parish, had set up chapters of the Brotherhood. Membership of Holy Trinity’s chapter was never huge with membership dropping to only five by 1899. Nevertheless, records show that this small number of brothers continued to work quietly and steadily in teaching Sunday School, taking evening
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services at the Ware Street Mission and forming a cricket club, which was showing promise.²¹⁸ They welcomed newcomers to Sunday Schools, which were regarded as valuable institutions for instilling in the young elements of moral as well as religious education.²¹⁹

Trinity Parish initially had two Sunday Schools run by a devoted laity — one in Campbell Street and one in Church Street, next door to Holy Trinity. (See Fig. 40) Both these were managed by the Sunday School Association, but there was regular contact with the parish church. Once a month, up to 200 children were mustered and marched to Holy Trinity for a service on Sunday afternoon²²⁰ and the lay Sunday School teachers met once a week on Thursday evening for Bible Study with the incumbent minister.²²¹ Each Sunday, there was two sessions of teaching: 9.30-10.30am and 2.30-4.00pm. A service was held in the Parish Hall (the classroom) between 10.30 and 12-30 pm for those people in the parish who did not want to attend church.²²²

The lay teachers and assistants managed the Sunday Schools efficiently, making them practically self-supporting. Two annual fund raising events in the form of lantern entertainment were held for the ‘annual treat’.²²³ This was a combined picnic held on St Stephen’s Day (26 December) and preparations for this commenced on the

²¹⁸ Ibid., 1 September 1899, p. 1109.
²²⁰ Bowden and Crawford, Story of Trinity, p. 57.
²²¹ Church News, 1 June 1878, p.282.
²²² Bowden and Crawford, Story of Trinity, p.57.
²²³ Ibid., p.59.
afternoon of Christmas Day when the teachers decorated the Church Street Sunday School with greenery collected from the bush. The teachers began preparing the food for the picnic at 5 am the next day. In the morning, all the Sunday Schools attended a service conducted by the incumbent. In the afternoon, other Sunday Schools from other denominations, joined the Trinity Sunday Schools to march with their banners, to the Domain. There, sports and games were held. At 5 pm, tea was served back in to the Domain. There, sports and games were held. At 5 pm, tea was served back in the School room, followed by entertainment.224

‘Treats’ could vary from year to year, some being given by the wealthy members of the community to the poorer.225 In 1882, 150 children and their teachers were taken by

---

224 ibid.
train to *Claremont*, the home of merchant, Henry Bilton (1798-1889), who kindly allowed the usual games and picnic to be held on his large property. On another occasion, 300 children and teachers went to Rosny to the property of barrister, John McIntyre (1842-1930). As well as the usual games, the boys from the Kennerley Boys’ Home entertained with their fife and drum band. In August 1900, all 400 children in the Sunday Schools decided to forego their usual ‘treat’ and give the money (£8) to the Patriotic Fund instead.

With the large numbers of children attending Sunday School in the parish, an appeal was made in 1878 for more young males of the laity to become Sunday School teachers. Arthur Davenport noted that ‘very few young men [seemed] willing to undertake the self-denying work of Sunday School teaching’. He considered it better for the 14-16 year old boys to have the benefit of a male teacher, although he noted that the boys with their female teacher were ‘learning steadily and behaving remarkably well.’ Some social historians such as K. D. M. Snell would interpret these outcomes as evidence of ‘social control’ by the middle-class teachers, for they were ‘values ... associated with the middle orders of society’.

---

226 Henry Bilton had been a successful merchant and importer, and was at one time Warden of Glenorchy and a Magistrate in the Glenorchy Court. (*Mercury*, 6 April 1889, p.30; Francis Beresford Maning, *F.B. Maning’s Tasmanian Directory for 1881-2* (Launceston, 1881); Alison Alexander, *Glenorchy 1804-1964* (Glenorchy, 1986), p.17.


228 John McIntyre was a barrister in the long-established law firm Butler, McIntyre and Butler. He became a Supreme Court Judge in Tasmania and acted as Deputy Governor of Tasmania in 1909 and 1912. (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 September 1930, p.17; *Examiner*, 22 September 1930, p.6.)
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were ‘key agencies in the inculcation of orderliness, punctuality, sobriety, cleanliness’—all ‘virtues governing personal behaviour and social discipline.’

Sunday School enrolments continued to increase, particularly in the 1890s. In 1891, a branch Sunday School was opened in the Ware Street Mission Room. By 1894, enrolments in the two main Sunday Schools had reached 500 and an additional classroom had to be built at the back of the Church Street Sunday School to relieve the ‘inconvenient’ crowding. A year later, the number of children on the rolls had reached 600. The new classroom was used ‘almost daily during the week for various parish meetings’ as well as being filled on Sundays with Sunday classes. Bishop Montgomery described the new class room as a ‘great boon to this, the largest parish in Hobart.’

In 1891, the Juvenile Industrial and Floral Society was set up by the laity at Holy Trinity with the objective of encouraging the youth of the parish to become more involved in the Church. A subscription of 2/6 was charged to enter, with discounts for children of the Sunday Schools (3d). The categories ranged from pot plants, bouquets and a variety of vegetables (fully tended by the child) to needlework (fancy and plain), cookery, carpentry, art work, handwriting and map work (Australia and Africa). As well, there was a variety of competitions, ranging from the best domestic pet, essay

---

233 Ibid., pp.163-164.
234 Ibid., 1 December 1891, p.570.
235 Ibid., 1 August 1894, p.131.
236 Ibid., 1 August 1895, p.325.
237 Ibid.
238 Ibid., 3 May 1895, p.274.
239 Holy Trinity Juvenile Industrial and Floral Society, 1894, p.1, HTCA.
240 Ibid, p.2.
writing, sight reading, darning stockings, spelling and mental arithmetic to poetry recitations,\textsuperscript{241} pianoforte solos and choral presentations.\textsuperscript{242} In 1897, the eighth year of the Festival, Reverend Shoobridge noted that there was a ‘marked improvement in two classes—handwriting and needlework’.\textsuperscript{243} He believed that this was a very ‘useful employment [mental and educational] for the children in [their] vacant hours’ to prepare their exhibits thoroughly.\textsuperscript{244}

Another instance of lay outreach to the poor in Trinity Parish was in the establishment of a mission school for girls and infants on 1 October 1894. This was set up in the newly-built school room\textsuperscript{245} by an Anglican\textsuperscript{246} order of nuns, the Community of the Sisters of the Church (CSC).\textsuperscript{247} This order was one of at least sixty which were established in the last three decades of the nineteenth century in England.\textsuperscript{248} As the Mother House was situated in Kilburn, London, this order had come to be known as the ‘Kilburn Sisters’. They worked among the poor of London, setting up schools and orphanages, sewing rooms to give women employment and soup kitchens and night refuges to give sustenance and shelter to dock workers. In 1887, the nuns had been encouraged to come to Hobart by Dean Dundas to do rescue work, minister to prisoners or set up schools for pauper children.\textsuperscript{249}

\textsuperscript{241} For example, ‘The Arab’s Farewell to his Steed’, ‘The Skylark’ and ‘Soliloquy of Henry IV’, Ibid, p.3.
\textsuperscript{242} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{243} Church News, 3 November 1897, p.755.
\textsuperscript{244} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{245} Ibid.; 1 August 1894, p.131; 1 August 1895, p.325.
\textsuperscript{246} The term ‘Anglican’ was increasingly being used in literature pertaining to the Church of England from the 1880s. This thesis will use that term in dates from that period.
\textsuperscript{247} Church News, 1 October 1894, p. 155.
\textsuperscript{249} Church News, 1 June 1887, p.82.
The sisters arrived in September 1892 to a warm welcome from the Church of England, but contrary to expectations, they set up a fee-paying school for middle class children in St David’s Parish. For this, they were criticised for taking away existing enrolments in similarly-established schools by lowering their school fees. The Clipper newspaper was particularly critical of the sisters, accusing them of being ‘hypocritical’ because they continued their charity work for the poor back in England, while ignoring the many needy pauper children within Hobart in need of similar assistance.

The modest mission school in Trinity Parish, with an enrolment of only six girls and six infants, went some of the way towards ameliorating the suspicion and ill feeling towards the sisters within the Hobart community. The Church News was cautious in its praise of this second venture of the sisters, counselling them to ensure that this school would be for ‘the less well-to-do classes’ not for ‘children of richer parents’ as their first school in St David’s Parish had become. This school was not free and therefore should not be classed as a ‘bun school’, but was obviously aimed at the ‘artisan class’ with the low fees of 1/-, 9d and 6d per week, depending on the age of

---
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the student.\textsuperscript{256} A reduction in fees was made if more than two children from the same family attended. Hours were 9.15 am to 12.15pm and 2-4pm.\textsuperscript{257}

Shoobridge had fully supported of the Sisters since their arrival two years earlier. He had officiated at their first church service in the colony,\textsuperscript{258} conducted bible study with them\textsuperscript{259} and readily agreed to their setting up their elementary church school in his parish school room, absorbing all the costs themselves.\textsuperscript{260} This was a very attractive proposition for Shoobridge because the sisters did not have to be paid and being fully self-sufficient, they would not add to the financial burden of the impecunious parish.

Shoobridge was a strong advocate for ‘religious teaching and training’, believing it to be part of a child’s daily school education.\textsuperscript{261} He was able to report that the parents were pleased with their children’s progress under the sisters and especially for the moderating of their behaviour— they were now ‘gentler and kinder to one another at home.’\textsuperscript{262} Perhaps to counter the earlier vitriol in the press, Shoobridge believed that the children’s change for the better was a strong ‘testimony to the character of the school’. He claimed that the neglect of religious training in the past was manifest all around them because ‘a generation [had] grown up with their religious faculties

\textsuperscript{256} \textit{Church News}, 1 February 1895, p. 233.
\textsuperscript{257} \textit{Holy Trinity Parish Magazine}, January 1904, p.1.
\textsuperscript{258} Sisters of the Church, \textit{A Valiant Victorian, The Life and Times of Mother Emily Ayckbourn 1836-1900 of the Community of the Sisters of the Church} (London, 1964), p. 128.
\textsuperscript{259} Stephens, \textit{Collegiate}, p.18.
\textsuperscript{261} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{262} Ibid.
untrained and undeveloped." This resulted in ‘the irreverence and disregard of needful restraints, which [were] so prevalent’ in the community.

The school succeeded and within a year, had an enrolment of 112 children. It operated until 1918, although it did have to close sometimes for a week to allow for church functions such as the Flower Show in 1895. In his Synodal Address of 1895, Bishop Montgomery acknowledged the helpful work of the Kilburn Sisters, not only in their schools, but in the Sunday Schools as well, stating that they were ‘examples of complete dedication of life to God’s work ... [so needed] ... nowhere more than in the colonies.’

A Mission Hall
In the 1880s and 1890s, the increased philanthropic outreach of the laity in meeting some of the needs of the poor in Trinity Parish made it apparent that a larger building was needed for all their services and programmes other than the rented room in Ware Street. This room had originally been erected to serve as a third Sunday School in the parish in 1859. By 1895, the Sunday School had become overcrowded; the Penny Bank continued to operate (in its nineteenth year) under Charles Grahame’s management and the attendance at Sunday evening mission services had increased, due largely to the efforts of the Lay Missioners and the Brotherhood of St Andrew.

In addition, a Boys’ Club and a night school were ‘doing excellent work, and [were]
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perceptively exerting a most beneficial influence.' In a Parochial Meeting in August 1895, Reverend Shoobridge advised that instead of the rented mission room, the parish needed to build its own mission room ‘somewhere in the neighbourhood, on a site upon which in the future, a church could be erected to become the church of a new parish between New Town and Holy Trinity.’

This was not the first time that a mission hall had been mooted in the parish. Ten years earlier, when the Ware Street Mission Room was sold by the owner and services there ceased for a time in April 1885, a concerned reader of the *Mercury* newspaper, ‘Churchman’, suggested the immediate building of ‘an iron or wooden room’ where ‘a bright mission service’ would attract the large number of adults and children who loitered in the streets on Sundays and had become ‘careless’ about their attendance at church. Moreover, if a mission room was not provided soon, those who had attended Ware Street would be sought out by other denominations, keen to add to their own congregations. Again, in January 1887, at the Holy Trinity Parish Annual General Meeting, Shoobridge pointed out the need for two additional mission rooms in such a large parish—one in Ware Street and another near the Kennerley Boys’ Home where the population had increased markedly in the last few years.

---
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The idea of mission rooms or halls came from Britain. They were used by the Wesleyans in the early nineteenth century as part of their outreach to the poor. They were often makeshift buildings, set up in converted stables or disused public houses or dance halls in poor areas of the larger cities. Later, the Evangelical clergy of the Church of England also set up mission halls or ‘Ragged Churches’ in their parishes to try to overcome the reluctance of the working classes to come to church, seen to be a very middle class institution. In addition, these later Missions provided a range of services for the needy including Sunday Schools, mothers’ groups, food kitchens, nurses’ stations, employment bureaus, free legal advice and a guild for crippled children. One Mission Church in East London was fully supported by the ‘wealthy West End’ with regard to finances and volunteer workers.

In the Diocese of Tasmania, St John’s Launceston was the first parish successfully to establish ‘a mission-house in the midst of its poorer people.’ St David’s Cathedral followed in setting up two mission halls, one (a purpose-built mission church) in Campbell Street in Wapping (1885) and the other, in a makeshift building that once was a carpenter’s shop in Melville Street (1893), in which Shoobridge had taken an
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interest\textsuperscript{285} for it was situated on the south western boundary of Trinity Parish and St David’s Parish. The \textit{Church News} gave regular reports of the activities of these two missions and outreach to the working classes by a very active laity.\textsuperscript{286}

The other Anglican churches in Hobart with a high proportion of their parishioners belonging to the lower socio-economic strata, did not set up mission churches. Both St John the Baptist, West Hobart and All Saints, South Hobart were from the outset, ‘free’ churches with no pew rents.\textsuperscript{287} St George’s Church, Battery Point built a chapel, Bethesda, in the densely-populated suburb of South Hobart before the new Parish of All Saints was set up.\textsuperscript{288} St George’s also built three almshouses on land adjoining its burial ground in Albuera Street in 1843 to accommodate their aged and poor.\textsuperscript{289}

Elsewhere in the other Australian colonies, philanthropic outreach to the poor had been achieved in Sydney with a successful mission rooms being set up by the Anglican churches of St Andrew’s Cathedral,\textsuperscript{290} Christ Church St Laurence and St Mary’s, Balmain, while in Victoria, St Mark’s Collingwood had begun a similar venture but it was plagued by internal dissent.\textsuperscript{291}

Shoobridge’s wish for another separate parish and church was not fulfilled for another twenty years when St James Church, New Town was opened on 4 September 1916

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{285} \textit{Church News}, 1 March 1895, p.244.
\item \textsuperscript{286} Ibid., 1 May 1886, pp.657 and 693; 1 January 1887, pp.9-10; 1 June 1887, p.89; 1 July 1887, pp.104-105; 1 September 1888, p.138; 2 September 1895, p.339; 2 December 1895, pp.387-388.
\item \textsuperscript{287} \textit{Mercury}, 19 June 1906, p.6 and \textit{Courier}, 30 June 1858, p.3.
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with its separate parish created in May 1919.\footnote{Geoffrey Stephens, *The Anglican Church in Tasmania*, (Hobart, 1991), p.162.} In the meantime, a new Mission Hall had to suffice and land in neighbouring Colville Street (now Federal Street) was purchased for £95.\footnote{Church News, 2 December 1895, p.388.} Tenders were called for the erection of a sturdy but simple brick hall, 60ft by 25 ft,\footnote{Mercury, 5 December 1895, p.3; Church News, 1 February 1896, p. 418.} which would hold 300 people for services.\footnote{Church News, 1 April 1896, p.451.} On 11 January 1896, the foundation stone of the new Mission Hall was laid by Alfred Crisp (1843-1917), MHA for North Hobart. The procession of the surpliced choir, church wardens and clergy assembled at the old mission room and then proceeded by local musician, Sydney Ellis, playing his cornet, they moved through the streets to the site of the new Mission Hall, festooned with brightly coloured bunting, singing ‘Onward Christian Soldiers’.\footnote{Ibid., 1 February 1896, p.418.}

Within two months, on 17 March 1896, the new Mission Hall was opened by Bishop Montgomery before a crowd of 200 people. Although there was a shortfall in the funds to pay for this new venture (total cost was £321/3/9), the SPCK had donated £35 to the Building Fund and the building had already been let out as a day school to defray costs.\footnote{Ibid., 1 April 1896, p.451.} In his Synodal Address of 1896, Bishop Montgomery ‘warmly congratulated Mr Shoobridge on his venture of faith in his large and poor Parish.’\footnote{Ibid., 1 May 1896, p.462.} Fund raising events, such as fairs, evening talks accompanied by lime-light slides\footnote{Mercury, 23 April 1894, p.2.} or evening
concerts were held to pay off the debt on the building.\textsuperscript{300}

Parishioners fully supported these occasions in donating goods to sell, volunteering to man the many and varied stalls at fairs\textsuperscript{301} or to perform in the concerts. The choirmaster took over the \textit{Punch and Judy Show}, while the organist provided instrumental solo recitals. Light entertainment was provided by a ladies-only nail-driving contest and for men, a hat-trimming competition.\textsuperscript{302} In opening one fair, Maud Montgomery noted the corporate efforts of the parishioners and praised their efforts

\textsuperscript{300} \textit{Church News}, 6 January 1897, p.596.
\textsuperscript{301} \textit{Mercury}, 5 December 1895, p.3; 2 December 1896, p.2; 17 December 1897, p.3.
\textsuperscript{302} \textit{Church News}, 3 October 1899, p.1129.
in committing to a common cause, while on another occasion, Lady Alice Braddon, the wife of the Premier, commented on the ‘united feeling [that] existed in Trinity Parish.’

In August 1898, the new Mission Hall was lined with pine boards which ‘added greatly to comfort and appearance.’ In August 1900, the new curate, Reverend Fred Taylor (1875-1955), took charge of the Mission Hall, which was now being used for meetings, both parochial and the wider community, social gatherings such as concerts and ‘coffee suppers’ for the parishioners, as well as a night school for boys over fourteen run by two lay women, Miss Hinds and Miss Ayton and the Boys’ Club. As well, a Girls’ Club and night school had been commenced in 1896. In 1898, parishioners were ‘greatly astonished and delighted’ to hear for the first time the sounds of songs and music reproduced by a gramophone. On 28 November 1926, the Mission Hall was dedicated and named St Margaret’s Mission Church, for it gradually took on the administration of the sacraments of baptism, marriage and burials. ‘St Margaret’ was a fitting name for an institution, which tried to reach out to ameliorate the harsh life of the poor through its many ‘self-help’ organisations and activities. Margaret (1045-1093), the English-born consort of Malcolm III of Scotland, became a Scottish
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311 Diary of Significant Events of Holy Trinity Parish, 1926, HTCA.
saint because she championed justice, including reform of the courts and care of the poor and the sick.\textsuperscript{313}

\textbf{Conclusions}

The opening of the Mission Hall towards the end of the nineteenth century marked a significant milestone for Trinity Parish. The clergy acknowledged that the long-held traditional ways of church services, particularly their length, language and ritual, the wearing of vestments and the practice of pew renting, would not persuade the working class poor to darken the Mother Church’s doors and be part of the parish’s activities. Instead, the Mission Hall was an example of bringing the Church to the people on their terms: a simple structure built of brick with little adornment, erected in the midst of one the poorest areas of Hobart, manned principally by the laity, who assisted with many different associations designed to improve the circumstances of men, women and children. This led George Shoobridge to comment in 1899 that, ‘There is much vigorous and healthy life in Trinity Church and its organisations at the present time.’\textsuperscript{314}

From the working classes’ point of view, membership of and participation in these associations built a sense of community: a Penny Bank, Boys and Girls’ Clubs, night schools, temperance associations, sewing groups for women. The laity, who provided these services, did so willingly, thus bridging the ‘gulf’ between the classes for the betterment of Hobart’s society. The Mission Hall provided an alternative to the public

\textsuperscript{313} Ibid.
houses, the drunkenness, the crime and living in destitution on the streets (See Chapters 6 and 7). The Mission’s outreach was underpinned by the notion of ‘self-help’, embraced by the middle classes, who believed in the pragmatic ways of helping their fellow but poorer citizens. Even the poorest of families could learn the habits of thrift to prepare for the unforeseen times of sickness or misadventure and old age. Moral reform would logically come with the adoption of this noble virtue.

Of course, the Mission Hall still operated under the conservative and distant Mother Church, Holy Trinity, not least through the ministrations of the curate when the parish could afford his stipend. Chapter 8 of this thesis will detail the continuing outreach to the community in the first fifty years of the twentieth century, as the parishioners dealt with an epidemic, the Boer War and two World Wars. The parishioners responded positively to the many activities designed to allow them to cope with their changing circumstances. The Mission Hall became both a centre for social activities, a place to worship and a place to be baptised, married or buried, devoid of the traditional, meaningless trappings of the Church of the nineteenth century. Middle class notions of respectability and class had been challenged and found wanting. The new way forward was to bring the Church to the people, for the people in the centre of their community.

315 Pew rents were abolished in 1909, making both St Margaret’s and Holy Trinity ‘free churches’, Diary of Significant Events of Holy Trinity Parish, 1926, HTCA.
CHAPTER 6

THE CHURCH’S PHILANTHROPIC RESPONSE TO HOBART’S POOR, 1850-1900

All present knew that they could scarcely pass the streets without being beset by paupers and it was equally known in most instances that the poverty of which they complained was the result of their own vices, and of their misconduct, and of their want of desire to work, in short their want of social honesty ... [and yet] he could tell many harrowing tales of some poor, real objects of compassion, of those compelled to struggle, to preserve a certain appearance, until they sank lower and lower, pressed down by real grinding poverty ... these were the most deserving ... who needed their assistance.

Bishop Francis Nixon at the Inaugural Meeting of the Hobart Benevolent Society Hobart, held on 28 October 1859. (Mercury, 31 October 1859, p.3.)

Introduction

These pejorative words of Bishop Nixon in 1859 reflect the dilemma facing philanthropists imbued with the Christian dictum to help the poor, the needy and the homeless in Hobart Town and the common belief held by the middle classes in the nineteenth century that ‘poverty was caused by idleness, improvidence ... intemperance [and] defects of character.’¹ Anne O’Brien, in her reassessment of the poor, argues that the negative connotations associated with pauperism being ‘a moral disease corrupting the family and community relationships’ reached a high point after the 1834 Report on the Poor Laws in Britain.² Behind Bishop Nixon’s words was a fear that pauperism was a malady capable of infecting the whole of society. It reminded

colonists of the Britain’s penal system and statutory poor laws— aspects of the Old Country which they hoped had been left behind.\(^3\)

This chapter will show that the charitable organisations set up to deal with the large number of destitute readily adopted the prevailing dichotomy for classifying the poor into the ‘deserving’ and the ‘undeserving’ poor. According to Schaffer and Purtscher, the ‘deserving’ poor in Tasmania included ‘widows, the aged and physically handicapped’, while the ‘undeserving poor’ included ‘ex-convicts, families of prisoners, beggars and scavengers’.\(^4\) However, as O’Brien points out, attempts by reformers to make the distinction between the poor and the paupers simply caste a stigma over the entire body of poor people.\(^5\)

Peter Bolger, in his study of Hobart Town, describes the city as being made up of two disparate classes, with different aspirations and needs: the ex-convicts or ‘inefficients’ as Timothy Coghlan labels them\(^6\) and the middle-class expatriates.\(^7\) The former seemed to suffer from a malaise, an inability to lift themselves out of the mire of their dismal circumstances. Max Hartwell adds that these inefficient were ‘servile by compulsion’.\(^8\) Many were ‘puny, weak specimens of humanity ... in chronically poor health’, avoiding regular employment if they could, unaware that their prospects and situation could be improved if they saved for the future.\(^9\) They cared little for

---

\(^3\) Ibid. p.214.
education and religion and tended to see their children as ‘economic assets rather than the base of a better civilisation.’ Of greater concern was their acceptance that their low-class standard of living was far better than that which they had left behind in Britain. Coghlan adds that these forced exiles showed no inclination to change their outlook or work ethic in their new home. In 1853, there were 1055 families in Hobart Town, comprising 2460 adults and 1347 children identified as living in poverty.

In the 1850s, the problems associated with the urban poor were exacerbated by two significant events, which in themselves were desired and much sought after by the majority of the colonists, but which further challenged the philanthropic agencies’ outreach, particularly the Protestant churches. First, the cessation of Transportation in 1853 certainly halted the hated scourge of having to receive Britain or Ireland’s off-castings or worse, recidivists via India or New South Wales, but as Bolger contends, it presented the new problem of just who would now be responsible for the care of the ex-convicts in their old-age, sickness, unemployment and raise their substandard living conditions.

Second, the granting of responsible Government in 1855 saw the Imperial Government allow its welfare facilities to run down, closing asylums, dismissing public servants and transferring as much responsibility (fiscal and temporal), to the Colonial

10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
14 Bolger, Hobart Town, p.35.
Government for the ex-convicts, who had hitherto been clothed, victualled and housed at the expense of the Mother Country. In 1856, it was suggested in the new Tasmanian Parliament that perhaps Britain might take back any ex-convicts who were likely to become a burden on Tasmanian society but this idea was quashed. With no Poor Law in the colony, the Churches stepped up to fill the void in the years 1850 to 1900 but, out of necessity, this had to be a collective response because each of the Protestant denominations could not afford the expense of having poverty programs.

For Holy Trinity’s part, philanthropic outreach in these years was limited by a number of factors. First, as Chapter 5 has demonstrated, Trinity Parish had a predominance of paupers, many of them the ‘inefficients’ of the convict period. For Reverend Davenport, direct aid to these parishioners from a parish poor fund was out of the question as raising revenue through pew rents and weekly collections barely met the church’s running costs. Second, to add to its financial difficulties, the church was still unfinished even as late as 1867. Outside the front entrance, there were substantial potholes in an unsealed road, the Church had no fence and the vacant land between the church and its school was being used by the local residents as a short cut to their residences in Paternoster Row. Of greater concern was that this latter area

---

20 Hobarton Mercury, 5 February 1855, p.2.
21 Church News, December 1867, p.569.
22 Mercury, 5 February 1870, p.2.
was being used by local citizens for immoral acts.\(^{23}\) Third, was the Tasmanian Church of England’s preoccupation with ensuring that all of its parishes were viable and fiscally strong after the passage of the 1837 Church Act (1 Victoria, No. 16) and later, the 1862 State Aid Distribution Act (26 Victoria, No. 17). In the diocesan press of these years, the overarching concern was not in aiding the substantial numbers of the poor but in organising diocesan affairs.\(^ {24}\) The chief focus was an attempt to set up a Sustentation Fund,\(^ {25}\) which could be used to supplement the meagre stipends of clergy in charge of poor parishes. The Church’s problems were further compounded by the phasing out of Government allowances being paid to convict chaplains once transportation had ceased. In addition, the Ripon Fund,\(^ {26}\) set up to augment the stipends of missionary chaplains and catechists in remote areas, was dwindling rapidly. In other words, from a purely fiscal point of view, the Church of England was undergoing an introspective phase—setting up its own schemes to help the disadvantaged was certainly not part of its outlook in these years.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Church of England as a body and Holy Trinity Church in particular, readily co-operated with other Protestant churches in Hobart Town to address the problem of the poor, their living conditions, dissolute habits and their abandonment of their children. The first part of this chapter will examine three charitable institutions jointly set up by the Protestant denominations, led by the

\(^{23}\) Ibid.

\(^{24}\) Both these acts contributed to the break between Church and State. The Church of England was no longer privileged over other denominations as state funds were now apportioned to all denominations according to the number of their parishioners. Twenty-nine parishes were in financial difficulties once the Government phased out stipends for colonial chaplains.

\(^{25}\) Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 3 July 1855, n.p.; 1 March 1856, n.p.; 1 August 1856, n.p.; 1 September 1856, n.p.; 1 October 1856, n.p.; 1 December 1856, n.p.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., 7 February 1852, n.p.; 4 December 1852, n.p.
Church of England. First to be discussed is the Hobart City Mission (1852), which employed male lay missionaries, whose task was to go into the places of habitation and vice to assess the needs of the urban poor. Predictably, prayer, wise counsel and religious tracts did not alleviate the physical needs of shelter, medical care, food and clothing for these people. The real value of these missionaries’ work, however, was to record for the first time the extent of destitution in Hobart Town. A second institution, the Hobart Benevolent Society (1862) was instituted to address the physical needs of the destitute. An all-male committee of Protestant clergy, public servants and businessmen met weekly to judge all cases presented for philanthropic aid by a male Registrar, who kept a case book on all clients.27 A third institution, a home for vagrant boys, was set up in 1869 by a private benefactor, again under the auspices of the Church of England, as a result of public petitioning, reports in the press and growing public outcry. In addition, the Protestant churches extended their hand of friendship and care to settling free immigrants, who were favoured as new members of Tasmanian society because of their strong work ethic, unlike the ex-convicts in the colony who did not embrace the middle class ideals of perseverance, thrift and independence.

This then, was the Protestant churches’ philanthropic response to Hobart Town’s poor—at least in part. The quite substantial and successful outreach to the women and girls ‘at risk’ or in dire need of ‘rescue’ by the wives of both the clergy and leading

27 The Hobart Benevolent Society differed from its Melbourne counterpart which was run entirely by women. This was probably due to the large number of convicts and ex-convicts resident in Hobart Town and female philanthropists needing male protection. (Shurlee Swain, ‘Women and Philanthropy in Colonial and Post-Colonial Australia’, Voluntas, Vol. 7, No.4, 1996, pp.431-432.)
citizens of Hobart Town, will be the focus of Chapter 7 of this thesis. In this current chapter, it will be seen that members of the clergy served on the committees of the City Mission and the Benevolent Society, with the head of the Church of England in southern Tasmania, Archdeacon Robert Davies, giving leadership in setting up the latter as well as being responsible for organising petitions to the Tasmanian Government to set up Industrial Schools for vagrant children.\textsuperscript{28} Holy Trinity Church supported the outreach of the three charitable organisations with Reverend Shoobridge serving on the Board of the Boys’ Home for fifty years,\textsuperscript{29} thirty of which he was Chairman of the Board of Governors.\textsuperscript{30} Equally important, was the influence of the laity, the Protestant businessmen, on the committees of all the charitable institutions. They were very determined to force all able-bodied men back into the workforce and remove the vagrant children, the ‘street arabs’,\textsuperscript{31} who engaged in petty thieving and unsociable behaviour, from the streets. This would not only improve the moral tone of Hobart Town, but would make their businesses more secure. The annual reports of the charitable institutions, usually published in the newspapers, frequently reminded the public of this fact.

**The Early Missionary, Joseph Holbert Smales**

Philanthropic work commenced in Trinity Parish with a layman, Joseph Holbert Smales (1794-1870). The *Tasmanian Church Chronicle* of 1852 described him as a scripture reader (or catechist) and visitor for Holy Trinity Church. He had undertaken ‘a vast

\begin{footnotesize}
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number of visits’ to ‘sick and dying beds and the abodes of wretchedness’ within the parish.\textsuperscript{32} The idea behind his ‘cottage-readings and lectures’ was to arouse the poor from their careless disregard for religious teaching and to give them an opportunity to experience religion, which was lacking in their lives because they did not attend church.\textsuperscript{33}

Smales had been appointed clerk to Reverend Philip Palmer in 1833\textsuperscript{34} on a salary of £40 per annum.\textsuperscript{35} In 1841, in an attempt to cut costs, the Colonial Government had suggested that Smales could be replaced with a convict ‘pass-holder’—a proposition which was rejected vigorously by Palmer who claimed that such a position should be undertaken ‘with sobriety and propriety’, two traits not associated with convicts.\textsuperscript{36} Smales’ duties included the marking out of the cemetery in Campbell Street for burials, directing the gravediggers as to the correct depth and width of the graves and supervising all the pauper funerals from the prisoners’ barracks, the colonial hospital and the nursery (children’s home).\textsuperscript{37} For a short period he was schoolmaster at Green Ponds, doubling up as a catechist on Sundays.\textsuperscript{38} For the rest of his life, he worked as a missionary, first for Holy Trinity, and then for the broader Church of England between 1861 and 1870.

\textsuperscript{32} Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 7 February 1852, (n.p.)
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Burnett to Palmer, 27 December 1833, CSO 85/1/1, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{35} Frank Bowden and Max Crawford, The Story of Trinity, (Hobart, 1933), p.8.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid. pp.10-11.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid. p.11.
\textsuperscript{38} Petition of J.H. Smales to Sir J. Eardley Wilmot, (n.d.), CSO14/1/100, TAHO.
Smales’ work among the poor was recognised by Bishop Charles Bromby, who made him a deacon in 1866.\(^3^9\) He also worked with the non-denominational Hobart City Mission, particularly with the Ragged Schools movement,\(^4^0\) which had been set up as a philanthropic consequence of the home visits to impoverished families in inner Hobart Town. Smales worked tirelessly among the destitute at the Brickfields Pauper Establishment, the Invalid Asylum, the Hobart Gaol\(^4^1\) and the General Hospital\(^4^2\) —all institutions coming under the ministrations of Holy Trinity Church at this time. He retired from missionary work in 1870 at the age of 75, ‘the oldest clergyman in the colony’,\(^4^3\) without being given a Government pension.\(^4^4\) According to his obituary, he was highly regarded by everyone within the Hobart Town community, living simply and humbly ‘among the sin-stained, the sick, the dying and the desolate.’\(^4^5\)

**Hobart City Mission**

From the mid-1850s, there was a noticeable shift in emphasis in the role of the laity in church affairs in Tasmania. This corresponded with the debate in all Australian colonies that the laity should have a voice and be included in the proposed synods. The *Tasmanian Church Chronicle* added its support to this movement by advocating that the lay missionaries should be employed to help the existing clergy in their work as a way to reach the ‘heathenized population’, who call themselves ‘Christian’ but who


\(^{40}\) *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 14 April 1859, p.3.

\(^{41}\) *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 17 February 1859, p.2.

\(^{42}\) *Mercury*, 21 April 1865, p.3.

\(^{43}\) *Mercury*, 28 January 1865, p.3.

\(^{44}\) *Church News*, 1 August 1870, p. 505.

\(^{45}\) *Church News*, 1 February 1871, p.21.
never came to church.\textsuperscript{46} The type of lay missionary needed must include ‘men of love and zeal and holy wisdom’, very like the Wesleyans which the Church of England had ‘repelled’ one hundred and fifty years earlier.\textsuperscript{47} It was envisaged that these lay missionaries would become ‘open-air preachers’, going into the homes and workplaces of the working classes.\textsuperscript{48} In addition, these missionaries could run a series of ‘cottage-lectures and room meetings’ as opposed to formal sermons in a church in a bid to bring Christian principles to the workers.\textsuperscript{49}

In 1852, the Hobart City Mission was set up, adopting many of the ideas of lay missionary work being propounded in the diocesan newspaper, including holding gatherings in non-church buildings such as the Mechanics Institute\textsuperscript{50} and school rooms.\textsuperscript{51} The idea for such a mission had been mooted in the previous year by two of the clergy of the Church of England. On 19 October 1851, the Hobart Town newspapers had advertised that two sermons would be preached by Dr Henry Fry and Reverend James Medland at Holy Trinity Church, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, to promote the city mission project.\textsuperscript{52} This idea did not gain the public’s support because of the ‘domestic factions’ within the Hobart community.\textsuperscript{53} Such a

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Tasmanian Church Chronicle}, 1 January 1852 and 1 December 1854, n.p.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Tasmanian Church Chronicle}, 3 March 1853, n.p.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Courier}, 6 November 1852, p.2.
\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Colonial Times}, 17 October 1851, p.4; \textit{Courier}, 18 October 1851, p.3.
\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Colonial Times}, 2 December 1851, p.2.
philanthropic organisation would only succeed if the various denominations united in their efforts to enlighten and elevate the ‘labouring classes’ in the city.\textsuperscript{54}

A year later, in the Wesleyan school room, a public meeting of ‘Christian friends’, was called in October 1852 to discuss the ‘religious destitution of a large class of the population ... and the importance of adopting some practical measures to meet [that] evil’.\textsuperscript{55} A month later, a second public meeting was convened at the Mechanics Institute,\textsuperscript{56} to approve the setting up a Hobart City Mission to be run along the same lines as the London City Mission, founded in 1835.\textsuperscript{57} Police Magistrate, Augustus Eardley-Wilmot, presided and the clergy from several Protestant churches in the city attended. The aim of the Mission was to divide Hobart into districts and a missionary would visit each household, regardless of their denomination, read the scriptures, engage in conversation and prayer, distribute religious tracts and encourage people to attend church.\textsuperscript{58}

One of the first three missionaries appointed was H.B. Giles, who had had experience working in the London City Mission.\textsuperscript{59} He resigned after one year leaving the two remaining missionaries responsible for the entire philanthropic outreach to the whole city.\textsuperscript{60} Up until 1860, the work of the City Mission was reported regularly in the \textit{Tasmanian Church Chronicle}. For those years, the Church of England was content to

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{55} Colonial Times 8 December 1853, p.2.
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\textsuperscript{57} Colonial Times, 19 November 1852, p.3. Launceston also set up a City Mission in 1854, see Barbara Valentine, \textit{Launceston City Mission, 1854-2004: caring and sharing in Jesus’ name} (Launceston, 2004).
\textsuperscript{58} Colonial Times, 26 November 1852, p.3; Courier, 27 November 1852, p.3.
\textsuperscript{59} First Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission, 6 December 1853, p.6.
\textsuperscript{60} Second Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission, 5 December 1854, p.9.
regard the mission’s work among the poor as part of its outreach. Although not explicitly stated, Trinity Parish was in the designated ‘District No. 2’ in the early Annual Reports. In the first year alone, some 300 destitute families, 900 adults and 300 children were visited within that district. These reports detailed the number of children sent to Sabbath School, the number of reclaimed drunkards, the number of couples who agreed to be married, and the number of poor who attended public worship (not in churches) for the first time—all evidence that the missionaries were making progress.

The Tasmanian Church Chronicle portrayed the missionaries as ‘heroes’, given the degraded areas that they visited, the abuse which they received and the human misery in the form of disease, hunger and squalor of the homeless whom they encountered on a daily basis. Four specific problems, which alarmed the missionaries most, were the degree of drunkenness, the high incidence of prostitution, child neglect and the ‘migratory habits’ of not having a fixed address for more than a month at a time. Most of the destitute claimed that they had not attended church since they had arrived in the colony, except for baptisms and funerals. Furthermore, some claimed that they did not want to be saved from their current depraved circumstances by the
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61 No. 1 District was the waterfront and No. 3 District was a new and sparsely settled area, probably West Hobart.
63 Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 1 August 1854, n.p.
missionaries ‘if there [were] no drink in heaven’, while others reasoned that as ‘there [was] no grog in the next world, they [would] enjoy themselves here.’

In the City Mission’s Reports, women in particular were singled out as depraved, resorting to prostitution, not out of ‘hopeless necessity’ or a ‘sense of shame’ but by ‘deliberate choice, the hope of gain, the love of idleness or finery.’ Some of the women were referred onto a refuge, the ‘Penitents’ Home’, newly set up by the Governor’s wife, Lady Augusta Young, for care and ‘reform’. Other philanthropic institutions were formed as a direct result of the work of the missionaries: the first two Ragged Schools in Hobart Town were set up to take in the large number of pauper children who did not attend any school. The ‘rising generation’ was ‘left almost entirely to shift for themselves’, which led them to growing up in ‘heathen ignorance’ devoid of ‘morality and religion.’ Holy Trinity’s missionary, Joseph Smales, was at one time responsible for meetings of paupers held in the second Ragged School in Lower Collins Street, established early in 1856.

Other aid was planned for the poor—in the City Mission’s Fourth Report, a Model Lodging House was planned in 1855, supported by the clergy of the Church of England, including Holy Trinity’s incumbent, Arthur Davenport. (See Fig. 42)

---

68 Ibid., pp. 8-9; Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 1 May 1856, n.p.
behind this scheme was to build quality, affordable housing for the working classes, necessary within Trinity Parish as at least three areas of slums could be identified—one in Veterans’ Row (then the northern end of Murray Street), another in Paternoster Row at the side of Holy Trinity Church and the third at the northern end of Argyle Street. \(^7^5\)

In the same report, the City Mission mentioned the setting up of another institution within the parish, the Female Servants’ Home in High Street (now Tasma Street),

---

\(^7^4\) Hobart Housing Association for the Working Classes, 1855 RS1/6: University of Tasmania Archives: Special and Rare Collections, hereafter, UTA.


Figure 42: Model Lodging Houses and Cottages for the Working Classes 1855\(^7^4\)
opened to give better quality and safer accommodation to female domestic servants, who were either between employment postings or were newly-arrived immigrants from Britain, not yet employed in domestic service.

While some clergy of the Church of England, such as Reverend Dr Henry Fry of St George’s Battery Point, were active on the committee of the City Mission from its inception, the majority were slow to respond to the work of the mission within the city. The hesitation of the Church of England in general to give philanthropic aid to the poor, was roundly criticised in the diocesan newspaper. In September 1854, the complacent attitude of the clergy was condemned:

The Church of England ... has been tempted to rely upon her comfortable establishment and wrapped herself up in her worldly respectability, and forgotten the labour of tilling the soil of her Master’s vineyard, and reaping his harvest of souls,—until some Wesley [sic] ... passing by, shamed her into exertion, and compelled her to be up and doing ... 

Not only had the Church avoided ministering to the very poor, she had also ignored the thousands of artisans who ‘lay between the rich and the “needy” ... the tradesman and mechanic ... who [did] not want anybody to condescend to them, and [were] hardly in a position, even if they were inclined, to condescend to others’. They were not part of the Church in its current form, kept aloof and not part of any group—‘too low to
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76 Fourth Annual Report of the Hobart City Mission, 11 December 1856, p.10; Colonial Times, 17 July 1855, p.2; Mercury, 24 June 1876, p.3.
77 Colonial Times, 20 October 1856, p.2; Courier, 21 September 1858, p.3; Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 29 September 1858, p.2.
78 Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 1 September 1854, n.p.
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shake hands with, and too high to be patronised’, so they abandoned the church. The Church of England was the poorer for the loss of their ‘gifts and powers, earnestness and activity.’

The local press also echoed this criticism of the clergy, claiming that they were too aloof from the poorer members of their parishes. The focus of the church’s mission in the colony was now ‘very much confined to the “comfortable”, “the respectable” and the “well-to-do”—anywhere rather than the depraved and unhappy.’ For too long, there had been too much focus on and preoccupation with building churches, where operations were ‘circumscribed by four stone walls.’ As these churches were not now overcrowded with worshippers, and the few who did attend voluntarily were mainly from ‘the middle and higher state of colonial society’, the clergy should go out into their parishes and seek out the marginalised, not wait for them to come to church.

The *Hobarton Mercury* went further and demanded that Government funding of ‘upwards of £14,000 for the Church of England should cease’ as they showed ‘few virtues that adorn the Christian prelate towards that portion of the population whose misfortunes and errors ... would have enlisted their sympathy.’ Compared to the Nonconformist churches, the Church of England had not been as active and as a consequence, had been met with ‘apathy and indifference’ by the working classes.
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85 *Hobarton Mercury*, 21 February 1855, p.2.
another newspaper claimed.\textsuperscript{86} It was time for those clergy to become ‘Christian volunteers’ and begin to work among the ‘ignorant and destitute’, who lived in the ‘haunts of wretchedness, anguish and despair’.\textsuperscript{87}

In its Fifth Annual Report of 1857, even the Hobart City Mission itself implied the hypocrisy of the Church to profess ‘piety for the heathen abroad, [but were] blind to the ignorance and ungodliness that [was] home’.\textsuperscript{88} It emphatically concluded that ‘there was work to be done at home ... under the shadow of cathedral and churches, and from the laneways and lodging houses all over [this city].’\textsuperscript{89} Again, in its Tenth Report, the City Mission acknowledged that ‘Foreign Missions [had] their claim upon us, but do not let us forget the Mission to the poor and the perishing at our very doors.’\textsuperscript{90}

Faced with this onslaught of criticism, the Church of England clergy aroused themselves to play a greater role in tending to the destitute in Hobart Town. Archdeacon Davies provided religious tracts for distribution to the poor,\textsuperscript{91} Reverend Frederick Cox and Joseph Smale were among the clergy who gave talks on Sunday afternoons at the Mechanics Institute on spiritual and pragmatic matters.\textsuperscript{92} Monetary donations from the Church of England were not regular however, unlike other Protestant churches in the city such as the Free Chalmers Church, the Wesleyan Church, St John’s and St Andrew’s Presbyterian Churches and the Independent Church,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Colonial Times, 10 December 1853, p.2.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{88} Fifth Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission, 8 December 1857, p.5.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{90} Tenth Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission, 15 December 1852, p.9.
\item \textsuperscript{91} Seventh Annual Meeting of the Hobart Town City Mission, 26 January 1860, p.9.
\item \textsuperscript{92} Eighth Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission, 17 December 1860, p. 7.
\end{itemize}
which all made generous donations each year.\textsuperscript{93} The Bishop of Tasmania, who expressed his ‘sympathy for the object’ of the organisation, made a singular donation of £5 in 1854\textsuperscript{94} and Reverend Davenport made a similar donation of £1 in 1856,\textsuperscript{95} while Archdeacon Davies made a donation of £25 for the missionaries’ assistance to him when he did not have a curate at St David’s Cathedral in 1855.\textsuperscript{96} Country parishes made modest donations in recognition of the philanthropic benefits to the poor,\textsuperscript{97} while other members of the Church of England clergy made smaller donations each year of between 10/- and £2.\textsuperscript{98} Holy Trinity Church did not make any financial donation to the Hobart City Mission in these early years, probably due to its own impecunious situation that has been discussed in Chapter 5.

**Hobart Benevolent Society**

By the late 1850s, the established charitable organisations, the City Mission and the Maternal and Dorcas Society, were struggling with a shortfall in their finances,\textsuperscript{99} owing to the growing number of poor needing their assistance.\textsuperscript{100} To help the developing desperate situation, the Presbyterian Church in Hobart Town had attempted to set up its own charity, the St Andrew’s Benevolent Society in 1854, ostensibly to attend to the needs of the poor within its own denomination, but it too ran into financial problems a


\textsuperscript{95} *Third Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission*, 7 January 1856, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{97} Ibid, pp. 10-11.

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{99} *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 31 October 1859, p.2.

\textsuperscript{100} *Sixth Annual Report of the Hobart Town City Mission*, 14 December 1858, p.9.
year after its formation. The Hobart City Mission in its Annual Report for 1855, had expressed its gratitude to that organisation and the Dorcas Society’s support for providing ‘clothing, provisions and money’ to the needy; however, the latter’s objectives had never been to tend to every destitute case in Hobart Town. Overstretched and underfunded, a new approach was needed to address the city’s pauperism and allied problems.

Accordingly, a public meeting was called by Archdeacon Davies on 26 October 1859, for all citizens interested in the formation of a benevolent society. Two days later, on 28 October 1859, the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town, a charitable organisation similar to the one operating in Launceston, was set up. Holy Trinity’s incumbent, Arthur Davenport attended along with Bishop Nixon and members of the laity. Davies explained that the proposed Society should be non-denominational and run by laity according to rules set down by a similar organisation in Adelaide. Unlike the South Australian model though, Davies envisaged Hobart Town’s version to be much more modest. It had two main aims: ‘to prevent mendacity and to relieve poverty within the town.’

To support the first aim, Davies claimed that ‘nine out of every ten ... mendicants were imposters’ and asserted that one quarter of the charitable aid currently being given
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101 Colonial Times, 8 August 1856, p.2.
103 Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 31 October 1859, p.2.
104 Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 26 October 1859, p.4.
away indiscriminately would ‘supply all the needs of the very poor of the town.’ The most significant group of perceived paupers needing ‘temporary assistance’ was the deserted wives, particularly those with children. These desperate women had sought aid from the Maternal and Dorcas Society, which really had been set up to give relief specifically to women who were pregnant. The proposed new Society would be able to assume the role of philanthropic benefactor to these deserted wives and also take over the services of the Penitentiary Society, which supplied twenty gallons of soup per week to the poor.

Lay Relieving Officers, whom Davies thought would be the two existing city missionaries, Messrs Coggin and Gray, together with the Church of England City Missionary, Joseph Smales, would visit homes and assess the needs of the poor. They would be assisted by ‘Miss Goodwyn and the Sisters of Charity’ from the Roman Catholic Church to attend ‘cases of females in distress.’ These lay visitors would then report back to the Executive Committee, which would then decide who would receive relief.

Archdeacon Davies was supported by Bishop Nixon, who at this first meeting, distinguished between the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ poor in Hobart Town. He claimed that the latter were so numerous that ‘they could scarcely pass the streets without being beset by paupers’, who, in most cases, were victims of their ‘own vices,

---
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and of their own misconduct.’ Most did not want to work and lacked ‘social honesty’.\footnote{Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 31 October 1859, p.2.} On the other hand, there were the deserving poor, ‘real objects of compassion ... those compelled to struggle, to preserve a certain appearance, until they sank lower and lower, pressed down by real grinding poverty.’\footnote{Ibid.} Often these indigent shrank from seeking help until ‘distress spoke too loudly to be longer concealed.’\footnote{Ibid.} Joan Brown, in her study of the early social services in Tasmania,\footnote{Brown, ‘The Development of Social Services’, p.125.} asserts that statements like Bishop Nixon’s were at the base of all Christians’ dilemma with regard to ministering to the poor: could the circumstances of the homeless living on the streets, in the yards of public houses, the ill, the maimed, the deserted wives, the children scavenging or stealing in the streets all be due to ‘vice’?\footnote{This view was reflected in the press of the day. For example, Mercury, 23 November 1859, p.2.} The Bishop was to further echo Davies’ concern about ‘imposture’, which made the benefactors, (nearly always middle class), reluctant to give relief. This newly-proposed Society, however, would undertake careful scrutiny of all mendicants so that its subscribers could be assured that only those who deserved their philanthropy, would receive it.\footnote{First Annual Report of the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town, 31 December 1860, p.3.}

A committee was formed comprising members of the clergy, members of Parliament and leading businessmen in the city under the patronage of the Governor and the presidency of the Mayor.\footnote{Ibid.} All ministers of the Protestant churches, including Arthur Davenport, were considered \textit{ex officio} members of the committee.\footnote{Ibid.} This first
committee moved quickly to set up the necessary infrastructure for the Society’s outreach: rules were published including Rule 10 which stated that the Society’s great objective was ‘to encourage the poor to assist themselves, [so] relief shall not be given in money, but in food, clothing and other necessaries’ and subscriptions of £1 per annum were sought from the public.\(^{121}\) A depot under the care of a Registrar and Storekeeper was established in the city\(^{122}\) and Hobart Town was divided into eight districts.\(^{123}\) A list of subscribers, published in the local press, indicated support from the Governor (£20), the Lord Mayor (£10), the clergy, including Arthur Davenport (£2) and the Catholic Bishop (£5) and the Vicar General (£5) as well as members of the business community.\(^{124}\) Tenders were called for the immediate delivery of bread and meat from 2 January 1860.\(^{125}\)

The Society commenced its philanthropic work in early January 1860. All the clergy, the city missionaries, honorary visitors who had volunteered to be in charge of one of the districts and any ‘respectable citizen’ had the authority to recommend immediate relief to desperate cases. All other recommendations were carefully scrutinized by the society’s executive committee, which met once a week. These recommendations could be accepted, rejected or passed onto the Registrar, William Witt for further investigation.\(^{126}\)

\(^{121}\) Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 5 December 1859, p.2.
\(^{122}\) Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 17 December 1859, p.1.
\(^{123}\) Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 12 December 1859, p.3.
\(^{125}\) Hobart Town Daily Mercury, 31 December 1859, p.1.
Funds were given a boost by a benefit concert of Handel’s ‘Messiah’, performed by the Glee Club on 7 February 1860.\(^\text{127}\) The ‘handsome sum’ of £108/13/- was raised.\(^\text{128}\) Other performances during this first year by the Tasmanian Minstrels, the Company of Amateur Dramatists and the Amateur Southern Minstrels all raised funds for the Society’s work.\(^\text{129}\) The Government also agreed to donate £800 per annum, provided that the new Society could match that sum with an identical amount from private subscribers.\(^\text{130}\) A more unusual method of fund raising was the donation of prize money for the outcome of a fight between two men, William Higgings and Joseph Horley. Their charge for disturbing the peace was dropped after they made their donation to the new Society.\(^\text{131}\)

The Benevolent Society of Hobart Town’s Annual Reports, tabled in Parliament each year, detailed the extent of its philanthropic outreach to the poor.\(^\text{132}\) The most urgent request recurred each year: families where the husband was out of work,\(^\text{133}\) in prison\(^\text{134}\) or ill;\(^\text{135}\) a number of deserted wives whose husbands had left the colony,


\(^{128}\) *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 18 February 1860, p.2.


\(^{130}\) *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 8 March 1860, p.2.

\(^{131}\) *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 3 April 1860, p.2.


many to try their luck on the New Zealand gold fields; many were waiting to enter the Invalid Asylums because they were widows, aged, infirm or incapacitated due to accidents. The Asylums, more often than not, were overfull and had no vacancies. A number of children were neglected by their parents who pawned their rations to pay for alcohol. These children often roamed the streets, stealing or begging from house to house from kindly, wealthy colonists. The main staples of food distributed from the Benevolent Society Depot were bread, meat, tea, sugar, oatmeal, rice and sago. Gallons of soup and firewood or coal were distributed to poor families. The latter was donated by ‘friends of the poor.’ Registrar Witt thoroughly checked on all applications for relief and was able to ‘weed out’ a number of families not requiring support. Over the next twenty years, Witt was to prove invaluable to the organisation as he came to know the poor very well. Even the Governor deferred to him to establish whether paupers, who solicited money from him (the Governor), were bona fide.

As the Society established itself in the city, it made some changes to its policies, usually to oblige the poor to help themselves rather than just give them handouts. Thus, children were not permitted to come to the soup kitchen for soup during school hours

---


138 These asylums were the Male Invalid Asylum at Brickfields and the Female Invalid establishments at the Hospital and Cascades. (Sixth Annual Report of the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town, 31 December 1865, p.9.)

139 Tasmanian Legislative Council Journal and Papers, No.2, 1864: Benevolent Society Hobart Town Report for 1863, p.3;

because they were supposed to be in school.141 Men, who were out of work, were encouraged to cut firewood at 4d per hour, for two hours which was calculated to be sufficient to feed their families for two days.142 Legislation was passed to address the high incidence of men deserting their wives with reciprocal legislation to be passed in other states and New Zealand.143 Families were encouraged to put aside some of their meagre finances in order to pay for blankets needed in winter.144 For those who were completely bereft, blankets were lent and marked clearly that they were the property of the Benevolent Fund to avoid their being pawned for alcohol.145

In order to cut costs, particularly for the price of food, the Society decided to abandon the distribution of meat to the poor in 1869, and augment the ingredients (‘chiefly bullock’s heads’)146 in the soup available from the Society’s soup kitchen.147 The composition of the soup ‘varied every day ... to avoid it palling from monotony.’148 The cost of supplying bread to the poor was reduced by substituting ‘20 percent bread’,149 a coarser bread described as being similar to home-made bread.150 The more refined ‘white bread’ continued to be given to infants and invalids.151 Both these measures appeared to be successful, and in order to check on the quality of the soup and bread,
members of the Executive Committee and the Registrar conducted checks at ‘irregular intervals’, and found the items to be ‘good and wholesome’.\textsuperscript{152}

Repeatedly in its reports, the Society pointed out that it was better for their organisation and for the poor themselves, to have all aid coming through one agency in Hobart Town than in multiple outlets.\textsuperscript{153} This included kindly citizens giving alms to beggars who came to their doors.\textsuperscript{154} This not only would ensure that a check was being made on perceived paupers asking for help, but also it would enable Registrar Witt to assess genuine beggars’ needs.\textsuperscript{155} The Society was keen to eliminate ‘habitual beggars’ and ‘other imposters’ who practised ‘professional mendacity’.\textsuperscript{156} Giving hand-outs, particularly of cash, simply encouraged dependence. The dignity to be gained for working for welfare was emphasised to the poor. As well as men chopping wood at the Society’s Depot, a Boys’ Wood Brigade was established in 1871, where young ‘destitute’ but ‘deserving’ boys were given the task of splitting kindling and selling it to the citizens of Hobart Town for 1d a bundle.\textsuperscript{157} Later, the frail and elderly were employed in tying up the kindling while the boys were occupied in making boxes and jam.\textsuperscript{158}

Registrar Witt managed the city depot in Melville Street in the mornings and in the afternoons, made personal visits to the poor. He kept detailed case studies showing

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{154} First Annual Report of the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town, 31 December 1860, p.12; Minutes of Executive Meeting of the Hobart Town Benevolent Society, 27 November 1861, NS1637/1/1, TAHO.
\textsuperscript{156} Ninth Annual Report of the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town, 31 December 1868, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{158} Eighteenth Annual Report of the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town, 31 December 1877, p. 4.
that within Trinity Parish, living conditions and the subsequent social problems of females raised the most concern. Drunkenness, having no fixed address and prostitution were recurring problems. The parish had over forty public houses in the latter part of the nineteenth century: some stood ‘cheek by jowl’ to each other, such as the three pubs opposite the Penitentiary Chapel in Brisbane Street (See Fig. 43). Holy Trinity Church itself was surrounded by no less than eight pubs, as well as a brewery. This large number of public houses reflected two aspects of the parish: one was the growing working class population of the area, attracted by the relatively cheap housing and the close proximity to employment in the city;\(^{159}\) and the other, the main road (Elizabeth Street) to the north of the state bisected the parish. A number of terminuses for the coaches which plied to Launceston were situated at the pubs in Elizabeth Street.\(^{160}\) Within the parish boundary, there were eight of these. At the back of these pubs, there were additional rooms and yards,\(^{161}\) where travellers could stay in the long term if need be. The Hobart Benevolent Society’s records show that these same rooms were also used for prostitution.\(^{162}\)

Brothels were associated with the pubs bounded by Brisbane, Harrington and Murray Streets.\(^{163}\) In 1867, the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Hobart Benevolent
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\(^{160}\) Pearce, *North Hobart: Historical Study*, pp. 56 and 95.  
\(^{161}\) *Mercury*, 1 September 1860, p. 1.  
\(^{162}\) Dr E. Swarbreck Hall to Richard Dry, 26 August 1867, CSD 25/1/16, TAHO.  
\(^{163}\) Dennison, *Here’s Cheers*, pp.39-40.
Figure 43: Number of Public Houses in Trinity Parish 1855

See Appendix G for names of the public houses.

Society, Dr Edward Swarbreck Hall, 165 one of the few lay Roman Catholics to take office, claimed that the Society’s monetary relief was being wasted on ‘brothel keepers, prostitutes and drunkards’, who never attended church, never sent their children to school, thereby allowing them to become every year ‘a greater curse to the Community.’ 166 Hall estimated the four fifths of the Society’s charitable money were wasted on such people, so much so, he believed that their children would be better off if their parents were dead. 167 This assertion prompted a request from the Colonial Secretary, asking Dr Hall to supply a list of ‘imposters’, who were receiving aid from both the Government (finance) and the Benevolent Society (mostly food). 168 Hall pointed out that providing an accurate list was difficult because ‘it is usual with many of these paupers to change their names and addresses [and] unless personally seen, it is difficult to remember accurately their previous history.’ 169 In most cases, he recommended that the financial payment be withdrawn from these perceived paupers as they could not be trusted to spend the allowance on essentials. 170

The Benevolent Society’s records detail many women turning to prostitution to make a living. If a woman were a single mother, a deserted wife or a widow, there were not a lot of options available to her to earn a livelihood and support a family: taking in washing or becoming a domestic servant were two of the only options for paid
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165 Dr Hall was well-known in Hobart Town for his philanthropy and concern for improved public health. He was able to give first-hand knowledge of the living conditions of the city and outbreaks of epidemics. See Elsie Frances Haynes, ‘Edward Swarbreck Hall: Medical Scientist and Social Reformer in Colonial Australia’ (Unpublished MA Thesis, 1976, UTAS), pp.296-314.
166 Mercury, 10 July 1867, p. 2.
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employment. As far as the Benevolent Society was concerned, it based its point of view on the prevailing middle class morality of the day, distinguishing between the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ poor. If a woman was found to be cohabiting, she was deemed to be ‘undeserving’ of their philanthropy, and relief was withdrawn. Hall’s ‘list’ of 1867 identified a number of women living ‘duplicitous lives’ within Trinity Parish. Aid was cut off from a number of women so labelled who were operating as prostitutes from behind the Rainbow Inn in North Hobart. Other women tried to dupe the Society’s visitors by giving false information about their family circumstances, such as a husband being bedridden when he was out working or giving a false name in order to obtain more aid. Drunkenness was the most common problem cited, affecting children who were neglected or involving assault.

The case books for 1880 to 1892 are more detailed, reflecting the need for the outreach of the Society within Trinity Parish. Some women had their children removed from their care because they were not looking after them adequately or they had deserted their children or even left the state without their children. Other cases showed women trying to gain financial payments by pretending that they had a

171 See also Kay Daniels, Convict Women ((Sydney, 1998), p. ix.
172 Pearce, North Hobart, p.58
173 Dr E. Swarbreck Hall to Sir Richard Dry, 26 August 1867, CSD 25/1/16, TAHO.
174 Dr E. Swarbreck Hall to Sir Richard Dry, 26 August 1867, Enclosures, Case studies: Ellen Bradley, Mary Cann, CSD 25/1/16, TAHO. Hereafter named ‘Case Studies’.
175 Case Study: Mary Ann Mathews.
176 Case Study: Bridget (AKA Eliza) Rielly [sic].
177 Case Studies: Bridget Rielly, Alice Newling, Mary Connor.
178 Case Studies: Elizabeth Ferguson, Martha Moore.
179 Case Studies: Catherine Staples, Mrs Gifford.
180 Case Studies: Mrs Brooks, Mrs Barclay.
181 Case Study: Jessie Lawson.
deceased child to be buried. Some residents from within the parish were encouraged to report to the Society where they thought duplicity was being practised. Some of the poor, although they had accommodation, had little in the way of basic furniture, and their homes were often described as ‘not fit to live in’. Occasionally, the Society would donate some basic necessities, such as mattresses or carpet in cases of dire distress.

The other group of destitute residents detailed in the case books was the frail and elderly. Unable to work for wages and not wanting to go into the Asylum, these people depended on the philanthropy of the Benevolent Society to ensure that they received the basic necessities to survive. The case of Georgina Gallanghan is worth a closer study. She was an elderly lady waiting to move out of a damp room to a drier room next door, but she had to wait until a horse, which was stabled there, was removed and taken off to the ‘bone mill’.

Finally, although the Society’s case books document the hardship, destitution and extreme poverty of the residents in Trinity Parish, the same books also detail acts of charity, kindness and selflessness from within the community. Friends, neighbours and philanthropic citizens often offered support in goods (blankets, bedsteads, clothes, food) as well as money to their fellow citizens in the time of need. The records also
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187 Case Study: Georgina Gallanghan.
188 Case Studies: Eliza Sparkes, Catherine Ins, Mary Watson, Ellen Harwood.
show that where the poor were able to come off the register for receiving aid, they expressed their gratitude to the Society for stepping into the breach.  

**Boys’ Home and Industrial School**

Chapter 7 of this thesis details the steps taken to successfully set up a Girls’ Industrial School in Hobart Town in 1867 under the management of Arthur Davenport. Of equal pressing need, was a similar institution for the many abandoned homeless boys in the city. Labelled as ‘the idle boys of Hobart Town’, these boys were ‘addicted to slang and obscenity, to rags and dirt, to destruction of property and cruelty to animal life, to a contempt for all authority, and especially to a rebellion against parental discipline.’ They wasted their days in ‘rough gaming, loud quarrelling, stone throwing and pitch and toss’. The newly-formed Hobart Benevolent Society, spearheaded by Archdeacon Davies, took up their case, stating that such children could be reformed by giving them an ‘industrial education’. Despite being described in subsequent reports as ‘a pest’, ‘a scourge’, ‘an incalculable evil’ and ‘a growing dangerous disease’, as well as the focus of repeated petitions to the Tasmanian Government by concerned citizens in 1861, 1862 and 1865, the Tasmanian Government failed to act.
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Finally, in 1869, with the Government prevaricating about establishing a home for such boys, Alfred Kennerley (1811-1887), MLC, ‘moved by a strong desire to give practical shape to the provisions of this [The Industrial Schools] Act, purchased a property of 3 acres, with a dwelling-house, in the western suburbs of Hobart Town, and without delay set about the erection of additional buildings so planned as to provide for the accommodation and proper discipline of a considerable number of boys.’

Extensive additions and modifications to existing structures took place in order to accommodate a school room, laundry, dairy and bathroom. The School was opened on 6 April 1869.

The object of the School was ‘to impart an Industrial, Moral and Religious training to the destitute and neglected children placed under the care of the Governors.’ In particular, the boys were to be employed in various occupations in the home and its grounds—‘cooking, washing, wood-cutting, milking [and] gardening’. (See Fig. 44) In addition, as a result of a generous donation of £100 from local shipping agents, masts and yards were erected in the School grounds to enable boys to obtain training in boat rigging for a sea-faring career. Every afternoon, lessons were given in reading, writing and arithmetic. Saturday afternoons were spent in the outdoors, in ‘a ramble over the neighbouring hills.’ Religious instruction was given in the morning and evening every day.
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198 Hobart Town Gazette, 6 April 1869, p. 513; Mercury, 6 April 1869, p. 3.
In its first year, there were eighteen inmates.\textsuperscript{203} This rose to twenty six in the second year of operation, with the capacity to take thirty boys.\textsuperscript{204} Boys who had criminal records or who were deemed uncontrollable were not accepted and were sent to the Boys’ Reformatory, established at Female Factory, Cascades in South Hobart in 1869.\textsuperscript{205} By the third year of operation, a system of apprenticeships had been devised to allow for boys, who were considered to be ‘of good character, industrious habits and sufficient age and strength’, out into the community to learn a trade.\textsuperscript{206} These boys were sent to country placements—‘Green Ponds, Bagdad, Sorell, the Huon and Prosser’s Plains; it being the desire of the Governors that the boys should not be apprenticed in town, for fear of their again becoming acquainted with former
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\caption{Boys working in the garden, Kennerley Boys’ Home, 1880.\textsuperscript{207}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{203} First Annual Report of the Boys’ Industrial School, 1869-70, p.4.
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\textsuperscript{207} Miscellaneous Collection of Photographs, 1 January 1860-31 December 1992, PH30/1/9326B, TAHO.
associates.\textsuperscript{208} The apprenticeship system worked efficiently with the boys conducting themselves so well that their employers wished to retain them.\textsuperscript{209} Indeed, the ‘applications ... for boys far [exceeded] the supply.’\textsuperscript{210}

The alleged success of the Home in reforming the boys’ characters and habits and providing them with the skills to take up a useful life in the future, spread to the other colonies, indeed overseas. The visitors’ book recorded encouraging remarks from visiting dignitaries such as the Bishop of Adelaide\textsuperscript{211} and the Governors of South Australia\textsuperscript{212} and Victoria\textsuperscript{213}; visiting members of Parliaments from Queensland, Victoria and South Australia \textsuperscript{214} as well as overseas visitors from Oxford\textsuperscript{215} and London.\textsuperscript{216} Referred to as ‘a doubtful experiment’ in its early days, by 1872 the official reports from the home were pronouncing that the success of the institution was no longer an experiment, but a successful and pragmatic way to address the problem of vagrant boys, whose dissolute behaviour had become a problem for Hobart’s society at large.\textsuperscript{217} Thomas Stephens (1830-1913), Chief Inspector of Schools in 1872, in testifying to ‘the successful working of [that] experiment’, pointed to the several benefits for Hobart Town society—‘the marked improvement visible in the appearance and general
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demeanour of the boys’ and ‘the training in habits of industry and usefulness’ of these hitherto neglected street children.\textsuperscript{218}

The founder, Alfred Kennerley, a parishioner of All Saints Church of England in South Hobart, (See Fig. 45) had set up the Boys’ Home as a Protestant institution, ‘in accordance with the doctrine and usages of the Church of England’.\textsuperscript{219} One of the inaugural governors was Frederick Cox, Dean of St David’s Cathedral.\textsuperscript{220} The boys attended Holy Trinity Church for a service on Sundays because the Home was just inside the official Trinity Parish boundary.\textsuperscript{221} Several of the boys were members of Holy Trinity’s Church choir.\textsuperscript{222}
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\caption{Alfred Kennerley, Founder of the Boys’ Industrial School, Hobart (TAHO)}
\end{figure}
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Arthur Davenport was also a visitor to the home, recording an encouraging report on the boys’ ‘remarkable intelligence’ and knowledge of ‘Sacred History’ and good behaviour in 1875.  

In 1890, George Shoobridge, the third rector of Holy Trinity Church, was elected to the Board of Governors.  

He was to hold this position, including being Chairman of Governors from 1893, for the next twenty three years, when he was obliged to resign owing to ill health.  

The Mercury newspaper recorded that ‘a resolution was passed expressive of the great appreciation of his services.’  

Other parishioners of Holy Trinity serving as governors of the Home included Frank Bowden, Henry L. D’Emden and Frederick Stops.  

Although both the boys’ and girls’ Industrial Schools had been set up with similar objectives, their annual reports differed in their candour and description of their respective inmates. The reports for the boy’s home mentioned the background of the boys and the reasons for their admission into the home. Thus in the Second Report 1870, the public is informed of:  

No. 4, G.B. – Father dead, mother not to be found, boy apprehended on the wharf living in boilers, deserted, friendless and destitute ...  

No. 19, J.O. —Father dead, mother drinking and neglecting her children. This poor boy was taken off the streets in a miserable plight, ragged. Starved and covered in sores.  

Again, in the Twenty-first Report 1889, other cases are described:  

---
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This boy was deserted by his parents, who lead a roving life. He is 12 years of age, and had neither been to a school or a place of worship...

This boy’s father is dead. His mother leads a bad life and sadly neglected him.\footnote{Twenty-first Report of the Boys’ Home Industrial School, 1890, p.3.}

The stated reason for publishing this personal information was ‘to substantiate the claim this Institution [had] upon the Government and the public’.\footnote{Second Annual Report of the Boys’ Home Industrial School, 1870-1, p. 6.} This was in line with similar procedures undertaken in similar institutions in Great Britain, where ‘the circumstances of the children at the time of their admission’ were made available to the public.\footnote{Ibid.} There were probably two other reasons that pertain, not so much to the boys, as to the colonists themselves: first, the Governors of the Home were keen to keep reminding the public that the citizens of Hobart Town benefitted from having these vagrants removed from the neighbourhood of their businesses and their own homes; and second, giving the inmates shelter in a home where they could receive nurturing and care and learn to be responsible citizens, was actually saving the Tasmanian Government costs of potential crimes against property and people and years of subsequent imprisonment.

On a more positive note, the annual reports printed some of the boys’ correspondence to the Home, particularly to the Master and Mistress who had cared for them for so many years. The letters were thankful and affectionate in their tone: ‘It was one of the best things that ever happened to me when I was sent to the Home’, claimed one boy. Another boy, showing some insight into his situation, wrote, ‘I hope I have left off a good many of the nasty habits that I was subject [sic] to at the Home, but I can see it
now.’ Finally, in recognition of the fact that most of the inmates could neither read nor write on their admission to the Home, one boy stated quite simply, ‘If you had not taught me how to read and write, what would I have been? Why, just like the beasts of the field.’

Such testimonials have to be scrutinised with some care and assessed against the circumstances in which they were written. They were probably ‘scripted narratives’, admitting no failures, consciously constructed for the public annual report of the Boys’ Home. These positive accounts served two purposes: they demonstrated the success of the nurturing care of the Home and the subsequent gratitude of the boys towards those responsible for their upbringing; and secondly, these testimonials reassured current subscribers and encouraged potential subscribers that their donations were contributing to the making of useful citizens of the boys, who eventually would find employment in the colony. According to Robert van Krieken, producing ‘industrious and self-reliant citizens’ was not motivated so much by benevolence towards the boys as ‘social control’ so desired by the wealthy middle classes.

---

Outreach to Migrants: the Female Servants’ Home

In 1855, Mrs Sarah Crouch, a Quaker convert and wife of the Under-Sheriff of Tasmania, set up a Servants’ Home in High Street, just north of Holy Trinity Church.\textsuperscript{238} The purpose of the home was to provide a safe refuge for newly-arrived female migrants seeking employment in the colony as well as safe accommodation for local female servants who were between placements. The home was to be conducted along similar lines as those already operating in London.\textsuperscript{239} These young women were seen to be vulnerable and often ‘friendless’, they had no-one to advise them and, as a result, they had often resorted to seeking shelter in public houses or disreputable lodging houses. Here they became too often ‘the victims of the designing and depraved and sink into poverty and vice.’\textsuperscript{240}

The \textit{Colonial Times} pointed out that in providing safe lodging for these servants, the benefactors were also aiding themselves and their families for:

\begin{quote}
there are few classes, perhaps in the community, over whose welfare we should watch with more jealous anxiety than over our domestic servants. Our children are often confided wholly, or partially, in their care and attention: they imbibe from them many a right or wrong principle of action for all future years. They minister to our comforts and conveniences, and we are really more dependent upon them than we, at first sight, perhaps would be deposed to believe. It is then for our own interests’ sake ... that we should have considerable respect to their welfare.\textsuperscript{241}
\end{quote}
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After one year of operation, with ‘26 admissions’ of mostly female migrants from Britain,\textsuperscript{242} the home was put on a more business-like footing with the appointment of two committees:\textsuperscript{243} an Executive Committee consisting of Protestant churchmen, including Archdeacon Davies and Reverend Joseph Gellibrand (1826-1887), public servant, Thomas Crouch (1805-1890) and businessman and well-known philanthropist, George W. Walker (1799-1859); and a Ladies Committee, including Mrs Crouch, Mrs Davies and Mrs Davenport. In 1858, a petition from the Executive Committee was presented to the Governor, Sir Henry Young, requesting Government assistance of £500 to set up a more permanent home for these young women.\textsuperscript{244} The Tasmanian Government acquiesced in this request and £500 was set aside in the Estimates for 1859\textsuperscript{245} on condition that an equal amount be raised through public subscription.\textsuperscript{246}

Such a home would be under the charge of a matron, deferring to and assisted by women visitors who would take a personal interest in the girls. It was expected that the home would become self-supporting through public subscriptions, payment of a modest fee for accommodation by the female inmates and the payment of a registry fee by the women in the colony who wanted to engage a female servant.\textsuperscript{247} By June 1860, larger premises were being sought\textsuperscript{248} and an advertisement placed in the local press for a matron who not only had to be competent, morally upright and energetic,
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but also ‘not under forty years of age.’ A year later, new premises had been found in Argyle Street, on the boundary of Trinity Parish, which would cater for twenty two inmates. The Ladies Committee had grown to fourteen members from across all Protestant denominations. It met monthly with one lady visiting the home daily between 3 and 4 o’clock ‘to assist in the direction of affairs, to guard against abuse and promote the welfare of the institution.’ Any lady in the colony could subscribe 10/- per annum and thereby secure ‘a prior claim’ to select servants from those on the registry of the institution. On leaving the home, a female servant would be issued with a certificate verifying her good conduct. If she stayed in a placement for at least twelve months, she would receive ‘a reward for perseverance’ and, if she married, she would receive ‘some useful article towards housekeeping as a token of the esteem in which her character [was] held by the Ladies Committee.’

News of the successful operation of this Servants’ Home spread. In a public meeting in July 1861, the Mayor of Launceston was urged to set up a similar home in that city for the placement of young women in ‘proper homes’, while in March 1862, the Argus newspaper extolled the features of the Hobart Home as an institution which the ‘ladies of Melbourne’ might like to emulate with benefits for both the employer and the employee.

---
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Despite its success, the home in Hobart closed in the late 1860s owing to the ill health of its founder, Mrs Crouch and the easing off of the number of female migrants arriving in the colony.\textsuperscript{257} The home was subsequently let out.\textsuperscript{258} The home was a good example of what could be achieved by non-sectarian co-operation to meet a pressing need in the community. The clergy of the Church of England served as Trustees and members of the Executive Committee, while Mrs Frances Davenport was a visitor and member of the Ladies Committee.\textsuperscript{259}

\textbf{German Migrants}

The mid-1850s saw an increase in the number of free migrants arriving in Tasmania from Europe as well as Britain.\textsuperscript{260} They were encouraged by the Tasmanian Government through its agents, because there was insufficient free labour as a result of the cessation of transportation (1853), the lure of the discovery of gold in Victoria and New South Wales and the imbalance of females to males in the colony.\textsuperscript{261} In particular, the positive and reliable work ethic of the Germans\textsuperscript{262} was seen as being of benefit to Tasmania at this time.\textsuperscript{263} Between July and December 1855, 515 German migrants arrived in Hobart on chartered ships.\textsuperscript{264} Not all were in good condition on
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arrival, some having been poorly-provisioned for their voyage to Tasmania.\(^{265}\) The citizens of Hobart were critical of the selection of migrants, who were not ‘able-bodied men’, but rather ‘deaf and dumb’ with ‘large families of young and helpless children.’\(^{266}\) One of the adults died soon after reaching the city. From the Germans’ perspective, their reasons for uprooting their families and travelling the vast distance to Tasmania varied from wanting to escape the dislocation caused by the Crimean War (1853-1856), rural overpopulation, religious persecution or wanting to try their luck on the goldfields of Victoria and New South Wales.\(^{267}\)

It is to these migrants that the Church of England was urged by Archdeacon Davies to extend a warm welcome and minister to them, even though most of them would end up being scattered some distance from the established churches in the colony.\(^{268}\) Davies pointed out that most of them were Lutherans, a denomination which shared many of the characteristics in belief and practice of the Church of England. In their new home, they would be feeling the privation of not being able to participate in their usual worship. Archdeacon Davies pointed out that the Hobart clergy might form a roster and one of them undertake to visit the German settlements once a month.\(^{269}\) If the Church of England failed to exert itself, these new migrants would lapse into ‘the general apathy of those about them.’\(^{270}\) Records do not indicate whether any of the Hobart churches, including Trinity, did take up the Archdeacon’s suggestion. What is significant was that the local churches were aware of the plight of these newcomers to
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a new land. In an open letter of welcome in July 1855, Bishop Nixon encouraged the Germans to ‘become active and useful colonists’, living ‘soberly’ and ‘righteously’ in their new home by continuing to embrace their faith, attend the nearest church and send their children to Sunday School. 271

In 1870, Holy Trinity Church reached out to the second large group of German migrants, who had newly arrived on the Victoria and Figaro. This group had been deliberately chosen by the Tasmanian Government’s immigration agent, Frederick Buck (1827-1901). On the afternoon of 19 November 1870, Reverend Richard Deodatus Poulett-Harris (1817-1899), (See Fig. 46) an honorary chaplain at Holy Trinity and Headmaster of the Hobart High School, conducted a service entirely in German for them. 272 This was a much more private and meaningful service for the 120 German migrants and their ships’ officers compared to a similar one which had been held at St David’s Cathedral a few weeks earlier. On that occasion, Reverend Poulett-Harris had taken a similar service, again in German 273 for the migrants on the Victoria, and had before the service, married a couple who had met on the voyage out. After the service, he had baptised a child who had been born during the voyage. 274 Unfortunately, the service had attracted the local ‘sight-seers’ and disorder had prevailed with ‘unseemly scrambling for places, the rush when the doors of the Cathedral [had opened and] the continual hum of whispering voices.’ 275 The Mercury criticised the behaviour of the

---
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Hobart people describing them as ‘uncivilized Aborigines and semi-barbarians instead of ... courteous and cultivated inhabitants of the Southern Paradise [Hobart], whose praises had been so eloquently urged by Mr Buck when he succeeded in inducing them to break up their homes and embark for Tasmania.’

What the newspaper did not acknowledge was that it must take some of the responsibility for the ‘mob turnout’ as it had announced the service beforehand some five days earlier.

Holy Trinity’s keenness to make these Germans welcome reflected Tasmania’s society’s positive attitude towards these new members. As most of the men were farmers or agricultural labourers, their admirable qualities had been praised in Government circles by the Government statistician, Edwin Cradock Nowell (1831-1911).

---
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as ‘steady painstaking perseverance, thrift, attachment to the soil, [a] habit of making
the most of small things, and living on little.’\textsuperscript{279} As a result, many had done well and
acquired property and become naturalized subjects of the British Crown. They would
be a positive influence on the colonial labourers.\textsuperscript{280} As far as the Church of England in
the colony was concerned, it was ‘right as well as pleasant to remember sometimes
the points in which we agree with foreign nations rather than those in which we
differ.’\textsuperscript{281}

**Conclusions**

This chapter has detailed the substantial contribution of the Church in addressing the
perplexing and concerning issue of the large number of poor in Tasmania, particularly
in its capital, between 1850 and 1900. The 1850s saw two significant changes in
Tasmania society, the cessation of transportation (1853) and the granting of self-
Government (1855), which potentially held out the possibility of a new beginning for
this former penal colony; however, the people quickly came to realise ‘that Tasmania
[had] to maintain a much larger number of destitute persons in proportion to its size
than any other of the Australian Colonies.’\textsuperscript{282}

The Church of England, alongside other Protestant churches and with the interest and
support of local businessmen, stepped in to fill the void of no Poor Law and a reluctant
Government, which did not accept pauperism as its responsibility. A corporate effort
was required by the churches as none could single-handedly cope with the costs of
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ministering to those in need. A joint effort also eliminated duplication of services. The philanthropic institutions instituted in these years varied in their effectiveness. The Hobart City Mission gave little in the way of material beneficence, but was instrumental in making public the extent of destitution in Hobart Town. The Hobart Benevolent Society, an idea borrowed from the Mother Country via Launceston, was better suited to giving material relief by way of food, clothing, medical care, firewood and short-term employment to the poor, subject to rigorous scrutiny by its Executive Committee. The Boys’ Industrial School provided shelter, kindly supervision and industrial education for vagrant boys, but only a small number in the broader perspective of dealing with children living on the streets of the capital city.

Although the Church of England clergy were active in these institutions, taking the initiative in establishing them, being committee members or being governors of boards, it was the lay members of the Church who took on the mantle of providing philanthropic help to the poor. Joseph Smales, the lay missionary working for the Church of England in the 1850s, the Hobart City Missionaries, the work of William Witt for the Benevolent Society and the generosity of Alfred Kennerley in setting up the Boys’ Home, demonstrated a shift in emphasis on laity in the outreach of the Church in these years.

Indeed, the Church relied increasingly on the lay missionaries to break down the traditional barriers of class and status that existed between the clergy and the poor. Such men had to be ‘men of love and zeal and holy wisdom’ with the skills and determination to reach the ‘heathenized population’ by going into their homes and
workplaces and bypassing the formal structures of church attendance. In Chapter 7, it will be seen that the lay women workers provided philanthropic care through a variety of philanthropic agencies, to the destitute women and girls in the colony.

---
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CHAPTER 7

RESCUE WORK OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN HOBART BY THE WOMEN OF THE CHURCH, 1850-1900

Some may ... think that there is not the ... need here ... for a ‘Home’ or ‘House of Refuge’ for fallen women ... But however it may seem to those who ‘look on life from drawing room windows’, those who have insight into the realities which underlie the surface of our social condition will be able to judge more seriously and more truly. There is too much reason to believe that the number of women in this city who live by the wages of sin is fearfully large ... many would renounce their fearful trade if they could, but how can they flee from it without a Refuge to flee to?

_Tasmanian Church Chronicle, 1 May 1856. (n.p.)_

Introduction

To examine the rescue of women and children left vulnerable through poverty or abandonment in Hobart Town in the second half of the nineteenth century is to chronicle the ‘silent’ work of women in the Protestant churches of that city. Living up to the expectation of the Victorian era that well-to-do, middle class women should not have a public face, the substantial contribution of these women to the philanthropic needs of the poor and destitute was not documented in public records such as the newspapers of the day. Rather, it is the minutes and annual reports of the many charitable organisations which flourished between 1850 and 1900 in Hobart Town, that detail their considerable outreach in providing for refuges (safety, food, clothing), education, moral training, industrial training and fundraising as well as their visitation to the homes or haunts of the desperate and in some cases the depraved. The latter two activities are seen in a harsher light by Brian Harrison, who argues that ‘slumming’
was a ‘remedy for boredom’ and provided some excitement in the lives of middle class women philanthropists.¹ Both Shurlee Swain and Judith Godden assert that the motive behind the setting up of ‘refuges’ was to preserve ‘the distinctions of class’. The training of girls specifically for domestic service ensured that they would be ‘rehabilitated into clean, deferential domestic service’ with the necessary social skills to come ‘in direct contact with families of their employers. For women, the prime attraction of philanthropy was that it confirmed their gentility.’²

Another Victorian expectation was that the ideal life for a woman was to be a faithful wife and loving mother, content to raise a family in comfortable surrounds, managing the home so that it ran smoothly and competently. If she worked at achieving these qualities, she would feel fulfilled and want for nothing else.³ Anne O’Brien argues that women’s work for the Church was ‘a natural extension of their traditional role in the home of nurturer and spiritual guardian’.⁴ This ideal of womanhood had two implications for the church workers and the women and girls to whom they extended their practical assistance. On the one hand, if the middle class matron were busy at home, she should have had little time for philanthropic duties; on the other hand, the degradation of women, particularly into prostitution, offended all notions of the ideal woman, the centrepiece of the happy home. The mantle of silence, which was

---
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expected over any rescue work could be, in fact, due to both these aspects of their outreach.

Of special concern therefore to the women in the colony was the abandonment of young females who were easy prey to be abused or enticed into prostitution. The rescue work undertaken by the Protestant churches in the second half of the nineteenth century was resolute, well-organised and successful, albeit for only a fraction of the vagrant girls in the state. In particular, the work of Frances Davenport, the wife of the second incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, to date undocumented, was significant as she became very active on the Ladies’ Committees of the Maternal and Dorcas Society, the Hobart Industrial School for Girls and the Servants Home, the latter two charitable organisations having been set up very soon after she returned with her husband, Arthur Davenport, from service on Norfolk Island in 1854.

Davenport, himself a renowned scholar, took an active interest in those charitable organisations involved in education. He supported the colonists’ demands for compulsory public schooling to the age of twelve and the setting up of Industrial Schools for the abandoned children in the colony. He served as Governor of the Girls’ Industrial School from 1862 to 1882. Fanny Shoobridge, the daughter of Arthur and Frances Davenport, continued her mother’s work in the Maternal and Dorcas Society after 1880 and became a keen supporter of the House of Mercy, a refuge set up for ‘fallen women’ by Maud Montgomery, the wife of the Bishop of Tasmania, in 1890.

---

5 See Chapter 6 for the Servants’ Home.
Thus the years 1854 to 1900 saw the two incumbents of Holy Trinity Church and their wives, contribute in a major way to the colony’s philanthropic needs, at a time when the new Government of Tasmania believed that it was not its responsibility to care for the sick, the incapacitated or the poor. The second half of the nineteenth century saw the gradual easing of this attitude with the Tasmanian Government beginning to give grants or making available Government buildings to charitable organisations run, in the main, by the lay women of the Protestant churches.

This same period saw a change in attitude to women who had ‘fallen’, from open condemnation to a firm belief that they could and should be saved and ultimately be able to lead useful and fulfilling lives. The catalysts for change were often the newly-arrived wives of the various Governors or the wife of a Bishop, such as Maud Montgomery. These women had witnessed a variety of rescue work being done effectively in Britain and, on arrival in the colony, set about replicating similar philanthropic institutions. By the turn of the century, rescue work was being openly reported in both the daily and church newspapers, in Government reports and in the state-wide synod meetings. This chapter sets out to examine those shifts in public opinion towards rescue work of the Church for the women and girls of the wider Hobart community.
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Early Penitents’ Homes

Rescue work for women, indeed young girls, living on the streets, deserted after being seduced and often pregnant, had been a concern for Hobart Town residents since the 1840s. In 1848, a number colonists and Protestant clergymen, including Bishop Nixon and the Philip Palmer of Holy Trinity Church, set up The Van Diemen’s Land Asylum for the Protection of Destitute and Unfortunate Females. Its aims were threefold: to ‘arrest destitute and unfortunate females’ from complete destruction; to rescue them ‘from vice and misery’; and to encourage them to form better ‘religious and industrious habits’. Although the Asylum began in a promising way—the Lieutenant-Governor’s wife, Lady Caroline Denison, agreed to be patroness, sound finances, a building to house inmates and a willing band of benevolent women in Hobart Town who would be visitors,—the institution foundered through the lack of funds in subsequent years.

Another attempt to establish a Penitents’ Home was made in 1856. The driving force here was the new Governor’s wife, Lady Augusta Young. She was assisted by four women from Protestant churches, including Anna Nixon, wife of the Bishop of Tasmania and Sarah Cox, the wife of the Dean of St David’s Cathedral. Again the aim was to ‘[reclaim] from sin and misery such women as may seek within its walls a place of penitence and safety’. In its first year of operation, the home reported that four or five inmates had been rescued and had ‘[unlearnt] idleness and vice and learnt
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industry and virtue, under such restraints and watchful care, as the kind ladies, who are striving for their good, deem most salutary.’ By its second year, however, despite claiming that nineteen inmates had been admitted, the Home was in financial trouble. An appeal was made to the public for subscriptions, with one newspaper publishing as an incentive, a list of generous subscribers, including Lady Young (£5), Mrs Nixon (£6) and Mrs Davies (£5).

A year later, the Home ‘languished’ when Lady Young was unexpectedly called back to England. On her return to the colony, renewed efforts were made to reinstitute the Home. A fund raising concert was given at the Theatre Royal and ‘a soup kitchen for the poor’ was opened in the Penitents’ Home, where twice a week ‘a comfortable meal’ was given to ‘upwards of thirty poor persons.’ Despite this renewed activity, at the conclusion of Governor Young’s tenure, this Penitents’ Home foundered as well. Attempts to set up similar homes up to 1890 also failed, largely due to insufficient funding from public subscriptions.

It can be deduced from these successive closures that the public at large was not fully supportive of rescuing women already prostitutes or living in such conditions that prostitution was inevitable. Their predicament had certainly been made known through official enquiries of the Tasmanian Government. In evidence given to a Select
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15 *Courier*, 11 November 1857, p.4.
16 *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 14 January 1858, p.3.
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18 *Hobart Town Daily Mercury*, 12 February 1859, p.3.
19 Ibid.
20 *Launceston Examiner*, 20 September 1859, p.2.
21 *Walsh’s Almanac* (Hobart, 1882), p.19, records a Female Refuge at Risdon being set up by Lady Lefroy in 1881 but it too seems to have foundered by 1883.
22 *Mercury*, 19 December 1870, p.3.
Committee convened in 1861, it was estimated that at least twenty brothels were operating in Hobart Town, one hundred prostitutes and girls as young as sixteen were being duped into being prostitutes by older women in the business or even by parents. In 1862, the Hobart Benevolent Society warned that ‘women would be driven into a state of permanent prostitution’ in order to care for their illegitimate children unless some form of rescue work was organised within the community. Twelve years later, with no provision made for these women, the Society reported that its subscribers were reluctant to have their money applied to ‘the lying-in of unmarried women’.

**Maternal and Dorcas Society**

In 1850, the Hobart Town Maternal and Dorcas Society had been in operation for fifteen years, working unobtrusively and without publicity in Hobart Town. It had been founded by a group of philanthropically-minded women under the patronage of Eliza Arthur, the wife of the then Lieutenant-Governor. At the first meeting in July 1835, the two objects of the Society were announced: first, to assist destitute married women during their confinement; and second, to extend relief to the poor, as funds would permit, especially children who might not have enough suitable clothing to attend school. The first committee of twenty-two women was made up of representatives from all denominations, but significantly it included Harriet Palmer, the wife of Holy
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24 Ibid., Evidence of City Missionary, Mr Gray, p.9; Evidence of Church of England City Missionary, Mr J.H. Smales, p.10.
27 Maternal and Dorcas Minute Books, (hereafter, Dorcas Minute Books), 9 July 1835, RS1/2/1, University of Tasmania Archives: Special and Rare Collections, (hereafter UTA).
Trinity’s first incumbent, as well as Eleanor Bedford, the wife of the senior chaplain, incumbent at St David’s Church as it was then known.\textsuperscript{28}

With the arrival of Bishop Nixon in the colony in 1843, Anna Nixon took over the presidency during the term of her husband’s episcopate.\textsuperscript{29} In 1855, Frances Davenport, wife of the second incumbent of Holy Trinity, became active in the Society, serving on the committee for the next twenty-six years, as well as being a visitor to the poor within Trinity Parish and collecting subscriptions from philanthropic citizens.\textsuperscript{30} On her retirement, her daughter, Fanny Shoobridge, then married to the third incumbent of Holy Trinity, George Shoobridge, took over her work on the committee and being a visitor and collector in the parish.\textsuperscript{31}

For efficiency of organisation and sharing the burden of tending to poor women, Hobart Town had been divided into districts, usually by the main street names. This meant that Trinity Parish had a number of visitors/collectors as many of the main streets\textsuperscript{32} cut across the parish boundaries. As the Society’s records do not state the specific address of the recipients of philanthropic care, this thesis will only draw upon the records of Frances Davenport and her daughter as their ‘district’ can be clearly identified as lying within Trinity Parish.\textsuperscript{33} As well as becoming visitors, other women in

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29} W.H. Hudspeth, \textit{The Hobart Maternal and Dorcas Society}, (Hobart, 1942), p.4.
\textsuperscript{30} \textit{The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1855}, p.3; \textit{for 1862}, pp.2-4; \textit{for 1881}, pp. 2-3, UTA.
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1881}, pp.2-3, UTA.
\textsuperscript{32} These streets included Elizabeth, Argyle, Murray, Campbell and Harrington.
\textsuperscript{33} This district included Williamson, Arthur, Colville and Burnett Streets.
Hobart Town were invited to make items of clothing or donate old clothing for poor women and their children.\textsuperscript{34}

Several of the women on the committee, including Frances Davenport and later, Fanny Shoobridge, were put in charge of boxes (later bags) of clothing and bedding for the impoverished mother and new infant, designed to tide them over for a month after the birth.\textsuperscript{35} The mother was also given a bible, 1lb of soap and 2lbs of oatmeal.\textsuperscript{36} If she returned the bag in a clean state and within the specified time, she would receive a ‘suit’ of clothing for her baby.\textsuperscript{37} The bags were certainly in demand as the Society’s report of 1860 shows that forty-five impoverished women had used the items, but not all of them had returned the bags complete to the Society as only thirty-seven suits of infant clothing had been handed out.\textsuperscript{38} Of greater concern were the occasions where the mothers had had to be summonsed because they had pawned some of the ‘lent’ clothing items.\textsuperscript{39} As well as these bags, grocery tickets were distributed as needed and money given towards the cost of a midwife.\textsuperscript{40} The Society would come to question the efficacy of the latter because of their age, cleanliness and competence.\textsuperscript{41}

The Dorcas Minute Books detail the cases of destitution within the parish, as attended to by Frances Davenport and Fanny Shoobridge. Most cases involved women, usually

\textsuperscript{34} Dorcas Minute Books, 9 July 1835, UTA.
\textsuperscript{35} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1862, p.6; for 1855, p.6; Dorcas Minute Books, 9 July 1835, UTA.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., p. 5.
\textsuperscript{38} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1860, p.8, UTA.
\textsuperscript{39} Dorcas Minute Books, 2 August 1899, UTA; Hudspeth, Hobart Maternal and Dorcas Society, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{40} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1860, p.8; for 1862, p.7 and for 1877, p.8.
\textsuperscript{41} Dorcas Minute Books, 1 November 1899, UTA.
with many children,\textsuperscript{42} who did not have any means to support their family because their husbands were either ill, disabled or had deserted their family for Victoria, most probably to seek their fortunes on the gold fields.\textsuperscript{43} Food tickets, clothing and bedding were given out to ‘deserving’ cases, which had been fully investigated by the visitors.\textsuperscript{44} Frances Davenport sought and received aid (10/- each) for two young unmarried mothers in 1861,\textsuperscript{45} although the Society was to show that its benevolence towards such women was not always consistent— similar cases in 1866\textsuperscript{46} and 1872\textsuperscript{47} were refused any form of aid.

Other cases of destitution were not confined to just women’s need. These included the sick, the frail and elderly without sufficient means to purchase food.\textsuperscript{48} Small cash donations, grocery tickets, clothing, flannel to be made into warm undergarments and blankets were dispatched where needed.\textsuperscript{49} Other needy cases involved children, abandoned by their parents\textsuperscript{50} and newly-arrived migrants (from Germany), who needed shelter and food.\textsuperscript{51}

With this increase in demand for assistance, in 1860 the Dorcas Society was forced to state that ‘the operations of the Dorcas Society shall be mainly restricted to affording

\textsuperscript{42} Dorcas Minute Books, 4 April 1855; 7 September 1859; 1 November 1865 and 1 September 1869, UTA.
\textsuperscript{43} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1857, p.8; Dorcas Minute Books, 9 July 1852 and 5 January 1859, UTA.
\textsuperscript{44} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1855, p. 8; and for 1877, p.6.
\textsuperscript{45} Dorcas Minute Books, 2 January 1861, UTA.
\textsuperscript{46} Dorcas Minute Books, 3 January 1866, UTA.
\textsuperscript{47} Dorcas Minute Books, 4 December 1872, UTA
\textsuperscript{49} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Committee for 1855, p.8; for 1862, p.7 and for 1877, p.7; Dorcas Minute Books, 4 August 1881 and 1 September 1869, UTA.
\textsuperscript{50} Dorcas Minute Books, 4 May 1853, UTA.
\textsuperscript{51} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1855, p.8; Dorcas Minute Books, 7 March 1854, UTA.
relief to poor married women in their confinement, all other applications for relief being now remitted to the [newly-formed] Benevolent Society.\textsuperscript{52} Henceforth, cases involving the elderly and abandoned children, referred on by the Dorcas visitors, would be dealt with by the Benevolent Society.

The Society’s finances in the 1850s had become overstretched, due in part to the increase in demand for assistance, including a large fire in the city in 1854\textsuperscript{53} and a drop in subscriptions. In 1855, appeals were made to the various churches to boost the coffers, with little result\textsuperscript{54} and the Government of the day was obliged to liquidate debt for 1856.\textsuperscript{55} Similar shortfalls were to occur in 1858\textsuperscript{56} and 1866\textsuperscript{57} with the Government again coming to the Society’s assistance. Having the Governor’s wife always in the position of patroness provided an opportunistic direct line of communication to the Governor when the Society’s finances became overstretched.

On the other hand, from time to time there were surprising donations from unexpected quarters: legacies from a Miss Anne Watkins (£20) in 1850;\textsuperscript{58} £30 from an old char woman and laundress, Rhoda Duff, who had died in the General Hospital from burns\textsuperscript{59} and £100 from the estates of each of the wealthy, philanthropic Hopkins family (1871) and the Kennerley family (1898).\textsuperscript{60} Other sources included benefit concerts,\textsuperscript{61} ‘a

\textsuperscript{52} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1860, p. 8, UTA.
\textsuperscript{53} Dorcas Minute Books, 1 February 1854, UTA.
\textsuperscript{54} Hudspeth, Hobart Maternal and Dorcas Society, p.5.
\textsuperscript{55} Dorcas Minute Books, 3 September and 3 December 1856, UTA.
\textsuperscript{56} Dorcas Minute Books, 5 January 1859, UTA.
\textsuperscript{57} Dorcas Minute Books, 5 December 1866, UTA.
\textsuperscript{58} Dorcas Minute Books, 5 May 1852, UTA.
\textsuperscript{59} Dorcas Minute Books, 7 October 1891, UTA.
\textsuperscript{60} Dorcas Minute Books, 5 April 1871, UTA.
\textsuperscript{61} The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1867, p.7.; Dorcas Minute Books, 2 April 1873 and 2 October 1895, UTA.
thank offering for special mercies’ of £2/10/- from a grateful but anonymous donor and the sum of a fine of £20 from a young man, James Baker, who had assaulted Henry Lyon, while the latter was prosecuting his duty. With the disestablishment of the Convict Station at Port Arthur in 1877, the proceeds from the sale of its library, £3/17/5, were donated to the Society by Dr Coverdale. As the outreach of the Society cut across the divide of all denominations, a donation of £5 was made by the Hebrew Congregation in 1894 in recognition of the ‘humane work’ of the Society and a regular yearly donation of £1 from the Roman Catholic Sisters of Charity. Even the Duke of Edinburgh, on the occasion of his state visit in 1868, donated £5 to the Society and in 1874, Baroness Rothschild donated £20 through the Governor’s wife, Lady du Cane.

The Hobart Town Maternal and Dorcas Society was entirely run by female lay volunteers, without experience or training in dealing with annual and financial reports. They fastidiously kept the records and ledgers of the Society. Judith Godden identifies such an all-female organisation as one of four possible ways women could participate in philanthropy in the nineteenth century. It was based on ‘the belief in the woman’s sphere which stressed the sexes’ differences’. If women were to look after women (in

62 Dorcas Minute Books, 6 May 1880, UTA.
63 Dorcas Minute Books, 7 November 1855, UTA. Henry Lyon (1798-1873) was the Bailiff in the Sheriff’s Office.
64 The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1877, p.7; Dorcas Minute Books, 7 June 1877, UTA.
65 Hobart Maternal and Dorcas Society Correspondence, 1894-1903. RS1/1/58, UTA; The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1894, p.7; Dorcas Minute Books, 5 September 1894, UTA.
66 Dorcas Minute Books, 6 December 1871; 2 December 1873; 6 September 1876; 3 March 1881; 3 March 1886, UTA.
67 Dorcas Minute Books, 5 February 1868, UTA.
68 Dorcas Minute Books, 5 August 1874, UTA.
this case, their confinement), then it followed ‘that only a woman could understand another woman ... Women, not men, should be in charge of institutions and organisations caring for women, girls,[and] very young children.’

What is interesting about the Maternal and Dorcas Society is that it was set up entirely by women in the colony as early as 1835.

When Anna Nixon left the colony in 1862, the president’s position was taken up by Maria Davies, the wife of Archdeacon Robert Davies, incumbent of St David’s Cathedral. This was a natural consequence given the notion of leadership was expected of an Archdeacon to lead other clergy by example. In like manner, the archdeacon’s wife was expected to take on leadership roles of women’s organisations. Both Davies and his wife were pivotal in the depth and breadth of the work undertaken by charitable organisations in the second half of the nineteenth century in Hobart Town. Mrs Davies held the office of President of the Dorcas Society until 1902, while Archdeacon Davies was the driving force behind the setting up of the Hobart Benevolent Society in 1860, the subject of Chapter 6.

**Girls’ Industrial School**

In the 1860s, the growing number of children living on the streets, known variously as ‘city arabs’ or ‘Bedouins of the capital’, became the focus of concern of the citizens
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of Hobart Town and of a number of the charitable agencies such as the Benevolent Society and the Tasmanian Temperance Alliance. The Benevolent Society in its First Report of 1860, registered its difficulty in how best to ‘afford relief to the numberless, helpless children of vicious, drunken and idle parents ... [without] ... relieving the worthless father and mother ... of their natural responsibility, and ... rendering them more capable of indulging their dissolute habits.’\(^{75}\) Attached to this report was a detailed letter, dated from 19 December 1860, from Archdeacon Davies, where he acknowledged that the Benevolent Society could and did feed the children in their soup kitchen on condition that they attend one of the Ragged Schools in Hobart Town, but these measures did not address the ‘root of the evil, the social position of these poor children, who after they [obtained] their supper, [returned] to their wretched homes\(^{76}\) and the degrading influence of their parents. Davies believed that the solution to this problem was to ‘reform’ the children by giving them an ‘industrial education’\(^{77}\). Drawing on the experience in England and Scotland where two acts had been passed, one punitive in its application, Palmerston’s Reformatory Act,\(^{78}\) which treated young offenders as criminals and the other, more supportive in its application, Dunlop’s Vagrant Act, which treated them as protected children. Davies strongly believed that the Tasmanian Government could quite easily adapt the Dunlop Vagrant Act\(^{79}\) to suit the local conditions.\(^{80}\)

\(^{76}\) Ibid., p. 17.
\(^{77}\) Ibid.
\(^{78}\) 17 and 18 Victoria, Reformatory Schools Act 1854, c.74.
\(^{79}\) 5 George IV, Vagrancy Act 1824, c.83. This act was amended several times during the nineteenth-century.
\(^{80}\) Ibid.
Despite a petition to the Government in the following year from 835 citizens of Hobart Town stating the need to establish ‘an Industrial School’, particularly for the growing number of female children on the streets,\(^\text{81}\) the Government failed to act. The disgust and despair of the Benevolent Society was registered in their Second Annual Report of 1861, which was openly read before the Patron of the Society, the Governor of Tasmania, Colonel Thomas Gore-Browne, and the mayor of the city, Alfred Kennerley, who was also the President of the Society. The Report described ‘the hundreds of neglected children who prowl our streets, learning the rudiments of everything that is vicious and injurious to their ... welfare’ as a ‘terrible pest’, a ‘scourge’ on society, an ‘incalculable evil’ and a growing ‘dangerous disease’.\(^\text{82}\)

In July the following year, members of the Benevolent Society Committee, including Archdeacon Davies, the Mayor, Alfred Kennerley and the Police Magistrate, William Tarleton, presented another petition to the Government where they restated that their solution to the vagrancy problem lay in establishing an Industrial School.\(^\text{83}\) They supported their idea by alluding to the success in Britain and Europe\(^\text{84}\) of a similar system: the boys could learn agricultural trades— gardeners, agriculturalists or mechanics, while the girls could learn the skills of ‘domestic service’.\(^\text{85}\) In this way, society could reclaim these juvenile offenders and vagrant begging children and make them ‘industrious, hardworking men and women’.\(^\text{86}\)
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84 Ibid., p.4.
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The Government again failed to enact the desired legislation, although a similar bill brought on by a private member was passed.\textsuperscript{87} This first Industrial Schools Act (27 Victoria, No. 24) identified the children who could be sent to an Industrial School: those under the age of fourteen found begging or wandering, those without a fixed home and those without the means of subsistence.\textsuperscript{88} Children could be kept in such a school for up to twelve months and could be apprenticed out into a trade, as an agricultural labourer or placed into domestic service as deemed appropriate by the managers of the School.\textsuperscript{89}

In November, 1863, the Hobart Town Female Refuge was set up according to the provisions of this Industrial Schools Act.\textsuperscript{90} This Refuge had really been in operation since June 1862 when a group of philanthropically-minded women, including the wives of three of the local Protestant clergy—Maria Davies, Sarah Cox and Frances Davenport, met under the patronage of the Governor’s wife, Harriet Gore-Browne.\textsuperscript{91} The Roman Catholic Church declined to be connected with this Refuge.\textsuperscript{92}

Initially, the Refuge accommodated only one inmate,\textsuperscript{93} but this increased to four, with a limit of eight.\textsuperscript{94} The girls were supervised by a matron and employed in washing and needlework and making children’s clothing for the Penny Club, a clothing depot

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{87} Fourth Annual Report of the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town, 31 December 1863, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{88} 27 Victoria, No. 24, Section 3.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{90} Launceston Examiner, 5 November 1863, p.2.
\textsuperscript{91} Minutes of the Hobart Town Female Refuge Association, 6 June 1862, G31/1/1, UTA.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 1 July 1862.
\textsuperscript{93} Mercury, 6 September 1869, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{94} Minutes of the Hobart Town Female Refuge Association, 1 July 1862 and 5 September 1862, UTA.
\end{flushright}
connected to the Ragged School in Watchorn Street in the city.

The girls were industrious as can be seen by the substantial list of clothing they made within the first few months of the Refuge being opened (See Table 6).

The Matron reported that ‘on the whole, [the girls’] conduct [had] been good, considering the idle, dissipated life they [had] led, making it so much more difficult for them to settle down into quiet, orderly, industrious habits.’ Some girls did not ‘settle down’ and either absconded or were asked to leave the Refuge. Other girls were able to find employment and, before they left, were given a pair of boots, valued at 7/6, being the amount of money earnt while at the Refuge.

Table 6: Needlework completed within the first three months of operation of the Refuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Shirts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pairs of trousers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pinafores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 chemises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 caps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pairs of drawers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 dozen shirts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the end of 1863, the Refuge’s committee requested the Government to change the Refuge to an Industrial School. In September 1864, the Governor approved of the
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97 Ibid., 15 November 1862; 5 December 1862.
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Female Refuge, in Upper Bathurst Street, to be registered as an Industrial School according to the provisions of the Industrial Schools Act (27 Victoria, No. 24). Among the five managers were Archdeacon Davies, Arthur Davenport and three other leading business men of Hobart Town. Both Maria Davies and Frances Davenport gave their support on the committee, which met once a month to report on the operation of the Industrial School. In July 1866, the School moved to larger premises in Church Street, near Trinity Church and announced that it would be able to take more inmates. While it was heartening to know that some of these girls were being rescued, large numbers still were still on the streets, ‘growing up without education and daily acquiring habits of idleness, mendicancy, theft and other immoralities’ and inundating the Colony with ‘a costly mass of ignorance, pauperism and crime, which [would] press most heavily on the resources of Tasmania.’

A petition, signed by fifty seven citizens, including the Bishop of Tasmania and most of his clergy, the Vicar General of the Roman Catholic Church and most of his priests, members of other denominations, medical practitioners, legal practitioners, bankers, merchants and ‘other influential citizens’, was presented to the Tasmanian Parliament in August 1865. Again, this Reformatory Bill failed to pass, due largely to the ‘apathy
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102 Minutes of the Hobart Town Female Refuge Association, 5 July 1866, UTA.
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and opposition’ of the members of the House of Assembly. The public’s reaction was one of ‘sorrow and apprehension as to the future of large numbers of our youthful population’, particularly the alarming number of girls being apprenticed from the Queen’s Asylum being ‘maltreated and ruined’. The local press singled out ‘the locality of Burnett Street and Upper Elizabeth Street [to be] ... infested with juvenile mendicants who appear cold and starved.’ This area was within Trinity Parish. The newspaper went on to suggest that these youngsters should be consigned to ‘the mercies of a prison, especially for the remaining weeks of winter.’ Still, the Benevolent Society, in its Seventh Report for 1866, claimed that, ‘No public measures have been taken to rescue the vagrant and neglected children on whose behalf we have so earnestly pleaded in every Annual Report. Greatly has this evil increased during the last twelvemonths, [sic] and the idle, vicious and unruly conduct of great masses of children and youths in Hobarton, is a matter of the deepest sorrow and apprehension of every reflecting citizen.’

The public’s criticism of the Government in its failure to take some action against the vagrant children finally resulted in 1867 in the first Industrial Schools Act being repealed and replaced with a second Industrial Schools Act (31 Victoria, No. 37). Under its clauses, the operation of the School in Church Street changed very little — the School was granted a certificate by the Government to receive inmates for ‘reform’.
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Arthur Davenport and two other business men became ‘governors’ and Frances Davenport together with the wives of other clergy and business men made up the committee of twenty four. In 1867, the School had 17 inmates after 4 had absconded, 3 were returned to their parents and 8 were sent into service. The Government paid a subsidy of 5/- per week for each girl and the rest of the School’s operation depended on subscriptions, the sale of needlework and washing taken in by inmates.

This Industrial School on Trinity Hill was not without its critics. In a letter to the Mercury in August 1868, ‘Avocat’ [sic] claimed that there were still ‘no such institutions’ he could describe as a Reformatory or Industrial School in Hobart Town. The Church Street ‘institution is good in its way, but its operation is very limited; the establishment itself is on a small and inefficient scale, and some of the inmates are every now and then absconding.’ The writer conceded that the School was useful ‘for half a dozen girls’ and praised Mrs Davenport and her committee for their dedication; however, there was no Reformatory or Industrial School for boys. These ‘Lilliputian enemies’ of society, this ‘plague of youthful vagabondism [that] must be stayed.’

In its Report for 1868, the Benevolent Society acknowledged the generosity of Alfred Kennerley MLC and other ‘philanthropic individuals’ for initiating the Male and Female
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Industrial Schools in Hobart Town, noting that such institutions would ‘provide for a small proportion indeed of those requiring such care’, but it was to ‘be hoped that the example will spread, and ere long produce incalculable good.’\textsuperscript{119} The Report pressed the urgent need to reform children, who had been convicted of crime. Committing children to gaol only made the circumstances of the child worse. What was needed were Reformatory Institutions like those in England, which would ‘stem the torrent of crime which is causing so much mischief to the rising generation, and threatening to become so grievous a burden on the resources of the colony.’\textsuperscript{120} The Training Schools Act, 1867 (31 Victoria No. 36) opened the way for the setting up of Reformatory Training Schools, but it would be another fourteen years before such an institution was set up in Hobart Town. In the meantime, the Government was petitioned by the executive committee of the Benevolent Society to pass legislation making education compulsory for all children including those living on the streets.\textsuperscript{121} This was achieved in the passage of the Public Schools Act, 1868 (32 Victoria, No. 14). The citizens of Hobart Town hoped that the numbers of vagrant children would be greatly reduced by this legislation.

The Church Street site for the Girls’ Industrial Schools was closed on 26 July 1869 and moved to a larger building in Murray Street, adjoining the Friends’ Meeting House.\textsuperscript{122} These premises lay well within the boundary of Trinity Parish and were once the \textit{Turf Hotel}, which had been purchased and renovated to house the inmates by Robert

\begin{footnotes}
\item[120] Ibid.
\item[121] Ibid. p.15-16.
\item[122] Hobart Town Gazette, 2 November 1869, p. 1231; Cornwall Chronicle, 6 November 1869.
\end{footnotes}
Mather (1814-1884), a Quaker, philanthropist and businessman of Hobart Town. The governors of the School rented the premises, but in time, it was hoped that they would be able to purchase it. The larger premises were required because of the increase in the number of girls being admitted to the home, either as orphans or because they had been committed by magistrates for ‘petty offences’ against the law. With the passage of the Vagrancy Acts and in the absence of a Reformatory (Training) School, magistrates were taking up the option to send the girls to the home for a sentence of between eighteen months and four years, after first making them serve ten days imprisonment in the Cascades House of Correction. The local press was critical of this practice, claiming that it only made the task of settling such girls into the home all the harder if they had been ‘subject ... to the excitement and pernicious results of a residence ... in such a hopeless place of reformation (!) as the Cascades House of Correction.’ Nevertheless, the School could point to the successful long-term placement of girls into domestic service, mainly in the country. A number of the former inmates wrote letters expressing their ‘esteem, affection and gratitude’ to the matron for her care at the home.

Apart from Robert Mather providing bigger premises in Murray Street, other benefactors gave generous donations to the School. In February 1869, a bequest of
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£84/5/- was made from the estate of Captain John Bateman, one of the inaugural managers of the School when it was known as a ‘Refuge’.131 Another generous donation was made in 1870 by William Guesdon, a well-known philanthropist and a former resident of Hobart Town but later a resident in Melbourne. He stipulated that he would give his donation of £100 on condition that the public raised a like sum.132 This was realised with ease133 thanks to the generosity of some of the women on the committee and other wealthy businessmen of Hobart Town, such as Henry Hopkins.134 Other donations were made by the Governor’s wife, Harriet Gore-Browne (£10) and the Duke of Edinburgh (£5) on the occasion of his state visit to the colony.135 Beneficence of a practical kind was given by Dr William Crowther, who gave medical care to the inmates ‘gratis’.136

Frances Davenport was responsible in drawing up a list of rules for the School.137 The girls’ daily routine was highly regimented, with set meal times, cleaning the School and yard and taking turns to serve in the kitchen.138 School lessons were taken between 10am and 12.30pm each day, with reading writing, arithmetic and geography being taught. The lay female visitors helped with this instruction as well as supervising

131 Minutes of the Management Committee of the Girls’ Industrial School Hobart, 5 February 1869, UTA; Mercury, 6 September 1864, p.2.
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needlework in the afternoons.\textsuperscript{139} Both Shurlee Swain and Judith Godden argue that the high regimentation of the girls and the social skills they acquired, prepared them for future employment in domestic service. The female visitors were motivated as much by wanting to confirm their own gentility as helping destitute girls.\textsuperscript{140} In addition, inmates made their own clothes and bed linen as well as items of clothing for the children in the Queen’s Asylum, New Town.\textsuperscript{141} Articles were repaired with Frances Davenport supervising darning sessions with the inmates\textsuperscript{142} or for a ‘reasonable tariff’, the girls could clean items for the general public, such as a horse hair mattress.\textsuperscript{143}

Diligence in School work and good behaviour were rewarded by the ladies on the School Committee. Book prizes were awarded at afternoon tea meetings, which allowed for the Committee members and their charges to meet socially and provide a special ‘treat’ for the girls.\textsuperscript{144} Proficiency in ‘plain’ needlework was encouraged and rewarded with permission to do fancy, ornamental or sampler work.\textsuperscript{145} It was later suggested that these items might be sold as a means of ‘increasing the general [public’s] interest [in] the school, and of enhancing the funds.’\textsuperscript{146} Outings were encouraged as a reward for good behaviour.\textsuperscript{147} Twice a week, half the number of inmates would accompany matron out in public, wearing black cloth jackets and black
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hats with blue ribbons. On Sundays, they would attend Holy Trinity Church in the morning, presenting a ‘neat and orderly appearance’ as they passed in the streets. On Sunday afternoon, two young women conducted a Sunday School on the School’s premises, which included singing as well as ‘biblical and catechistical teaching.’

From time to time, the inmates escaped, and it was left to the Ladies’ Committee to decide whether to accept them back into the School. Members of the public, who were found to assist with absconding, were charged by police. Such was the case of a man who had encouraged five of the girls to come and pick fruit in his garden, but later had allowed them to sleep in a cottage in his garden. Girls who misbehaved within the School were ‘punished mostly by changing the usual food for bread and water, and their being kept apart from the other girls.’

In 1873, the Girls’ Industrial School again moved to new premises, the hospital building inside Anglesea Barracks, Davey Street (See Fig. 47). The barracks had been vacated by the Imperial forces in August 1870 and the Tasmanian Government had offered the Ladies’ Committee the use of hospital for a rental of £25 per annum. This meant that the School was now outside the boundary of Trinity Parish, but both Arthur Davenport and his wife continued to be closely involved in the administration of the School.
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School, the former as a governor and the latter as a committee member and ‘visitor’ to the School.

Now within the boundary of St David’s Parish, the Dean of the Cathedral, Frederick Cox (1821-1906), immediately offered ‘four pews in the cathedral for the girls to attend services, both in the morning and afternoon.’ The Ladies’ Committee decided that the inmates should receive religious instruction on three Sunday afternoons per month with the fourth one being given to attending a second church service in the afternoon. Dean Cox promised to visit the School regularly now that the girls were ‘under his pastoral care.’ Mary Anne Bromby, the wife of the Bishop of Tasmania, acted as President of the Management Committee during these years, with Frances
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Davenport taking over that position in 1886. The wives of the Governors of Tasmania continued to take an active interest in the School, raising funds, donating prizes for proficiency in domestic tasks such as ironing, darning and cooking and attending monthly committee meetings in their role as patroness.

With the added space at the barracks, the School set up a garden for the girls to grow vegetables, it acquired a cow and the matron of the School requested a pig, the latter no doubt a solution to disposing of their food scraps but also, as the records show, a source of meat. Keeping these animals would teach the inmates the rudiments of animal husbandry, another useful skill for girls going into service in the country, the preferred option over a placement in the city. The School continued to receive Government subsidies (5/-) for each inmate, subscriptions from philanthropic colonists and proceeds from the sale of the girls’ needlework and washing.
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The School now employed a certified school mistress, ‘highly recommended by the Board of Education,’ who taught the girls reading writing and arithmetic in the mornings. The girls were regularly tested, at least once a quarter, by a member of the clergy or by two of the ladies on the committee. The Dean of St David’s Cathedral examined the girls in 1874 and gave ‘four special prizes for truthfulness and general improvement.’ Both the Davenports examined the girls. The examiners usually reported that progress was ‘satisfactory’, although the report of 1875 stated that arithmetic was ‘a weak point’. In 1886, Mr W.J.J. Reynolds, a qualified educational examiner, examined the girls for the first time and gave them an unflattering report, although ‘the discipline was excellent.’ The official records of the School do not make any reference to this report, referring instead to how ‘all went off well.’ Prizes (usually books) continued to be given at special afternoon tea meetings, which were followed by entertainment in various forms— ‘magic lantern’ was most popular with the girls but also musical items and recitations were given.

On the whole, the managing Ladies’ Committee treated the inmates with kindness but firmness. The girls regularly received new clothes on the recommendation of the
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matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, matron, attended ‘treats’, usually outings in July or August and at the end of the year, an annual picnic, the providoring of which was generously augmented by the Ladies’ Committee. Additional special outings included a visit to the circus, tea with the Governor’s wife at Government House and a fireworks display. Nonetheless, the committee was firm in deciding who should be admitted to the school and who should be allowed to stay—good behaviour, compliance and a willingness to embrace reform being paramount. In 1883, the Committee decided that girls should stay in the School until they were sixteen before being sent into service. Prior to this, girls had taken up situations as young as thirteen, but it was considered that their training needed to be more ‘efficient’ over the longer term and they also needed ‘to guard against temptations that may beset them.’

The need to provide institutional care for young females at risk continued to be an issue in the late 1870s and into the 1880s. This was complicated by the dismantling of the Queen’s Orphan Asylum in 1879 and the Government asking the Committee of the
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Industrial School to take ten of those inmates who were Protestant. In the same year, probably as a result of the closure of the Orphan Asylum at New Town, the Roman Catholic Church set up the St Joseph’s Orphanage and Industrial School in Hobart Town, specifically for orphan and destitute children, to be run by the Sisters of Charity. In 1881, a Girls’ Reformatory School was established at Anglesea Barracks in the disused military prison building by the Ladies’ Christian Association. During the next decade, the ladies on the Industrial School Committee were keen to place any prospective inmate, who had a dubious character or record, in the Reformatory rather than ‘taint’ their School. Although the two institutions were often confused, owing to their close proximity to each other, ‘they are quite different. One is the home for destitute girls, and the other a school of reclamation.’ They were run along quite different lines: the Reformatory took advantage of the old prison cells to accommodate each inmate separately, to facilitate ‘better control’ and the education was far more basic than the Industrial School as many of the inmates had little or no education on being admitted.

In 1892, the Industrial School again moved to new premises at ‘Kensington House’ in lower Davey Street, the former building at the Barracks having been resumed by the Government for military purposes. ‘Kensington House’ was able to be purchased in
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part by funds accrued in a building fund set up in 1874 after a successful bazaar, sponsored by the Governor’s wife, Lady du Cane. The sale of the inmates’ needlework contributed to the funds.

In these years, the number of inmates had grown to over forty, with the ladies on the Management Committee scrutinising carefully all potential residents. Girls were not admitted if they had a ‘weak intellect’, if they were both deaf and dumb or if their behaviour was deemed to be uncontrollable and a potential bad influence on the other girls in the School. Equally, the ladies carefully checked all applications by families to have their daughters or nieces or granddaughters returned to them. A member of the committee would either inspect the family’s home and circumstances, or in cases interstate, ask the local clergyman to send them a report. In certain circumstances, exceptions were made on the basis of compassion, such as an inmate being allowed home to see her mother for a short stay of five days or another being allowed to go into service to help a disabled person.

The wives of the clergy of the Church of England continued to serve on the Management Committee—Fanny Dundas and Edith Kite, the wives of successive Deans of St David’s Cathedral commenced in 1888 and 1898 respectively and Maud
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Montgomery, the wife of Bishop Montgomery in 1889.\textsuperscript{207} Frances Davenport, now residing in England from 1888, continued to send a yearly subscription of £1, together with letters and gifts,\textsuperscript{208} while the long-serving past president, Sarah Crowther, also residing in England, sent her yearly subscription\textsuperscript{209} and a box of needlework to be sold for the School’s funds.\textsuperscript{210}

The Industrial School’s Committee encouraged the girls in their care to view the School as a ‘home’.\textsuperscript{211} The Annual Report of 1898 stated that ‘officers of the school try to keep in touch with the girls who have left ... Two of the old girls have lately stayed at the School when seeking fresh situations, and good reports have been received from many of those in service.’\textsuperscript{212} The Committee felt that its rescue work had been a success ‘that many young girls are by its home influence, moral training, habits of industry and tidiness, saved from an evil fate.’\textsuperscript{213} Their philanthropic work was publicly acknowledged through the press, stating that the State was ‘a sure gainer.’\textsuperscript{214}

**House of Mercy and Hope Cottage**

In 1874, the *Church News* began urging the Church of England to set up its own ‘home’ or ‘House of Mercy’ for ‘fallen women’.\textsuperscript{215} F. J. Prochaska argues that the interest in prostitution was driven by a belief that it endangered the ‘purity of the family’, broke

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{206} *Hobart Town Industrial School for Girls, Thirtieth Annual Report, 1898*, p.1, UTA.
\textsuperscript{207} *Hobart Town Industrial School for Girls Twenty-First Annual Report, 1889*, p.2, UTA.
\textsuperscript{208} Ibid., p.3.
\textsuperscript{209} *Hobart Town Industrial School for Girls Annual Reports, 1889*, p.2; 1891, p.3 and 1895, p.2 UTA.
\textsuperscript{210} Minutes of the Management Committee of the Girls’ Industrial School Hobart, 5 January 1894.
\textsuperscript{211} *Church News*, June 1875, p. 281, UTA.
\textsuperscript{212} *Hobart Town Industrial School for Girls, Thirtieth Annual Report, 1898*, p.2, UTA.
\textsuperscript{213} *Hobart Town Industrial School for Girls, Twentieth Annual Report, 1888*, p.2, UTA.
\textsuperscript{214} *Mercury*, 6 September 1869, p.3.
\textsuperscript{215} *Church News*, July 1874, p.101.
\end{flushright}
‘marriage and baptismal vows’ and therefore ‘poisoned family relations’.\textsuperscript{216} Such an institution was preferred to a ‘refuge’ or ‘penitentiary’ where prison-like conditions prevailed, management was ‘harsh’ and there was an absence of cheerfulness and home-feeling.\textsuperscript{217} The proposed home would be conducted ‘on distinctly Church principles’. Sisters of Mercy or Deaconesses would manage such a home, without payment, ‘cheerfully [giving] themselves up to the glorious work of saving the lost, for the love of God and for that alone.’\textsuperscript{218} These sisters would be under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Tasmania as Visitor, aided by the local parish clergy as Pastors to the inmates and supported by benevolent-minded lay women, who would assist through ‘constant prayer or by the collection of alms’.\textsuperscript{219} This ideal of a Home of Mercy would be ‘studiously home-like ... ruled by love, and not by fear’ as refuges tended to be.\textsuperscript{220}

Such a home was not set up due to a number of factors converging in the 1870s and 1880s. One limiting factor was the Church of England’s proposal to use Anglican sisters (nuns) for this work, first mooted in 1874.\textsuperscript{221} The Tasmanian Diocese was divided over allowing these nuns into their midst, reflecting similar attitudes to and prejudices against these women in Britain at the time.\textsuperscript{222} Susan Mumm, in her detailed study, \textit{Stolen Daughters, Virgin Mothers: Anglican Sisterhoods in Victorian Britain}, points to
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the rapid growth of sisterhoods there, the first being established in 1845. By 1900, ‘more than ninety sisterhoods had been formed for women wishing to live the monastic life within the Church of England.’ Mumm identifies eight arguments put forward in the nineteenth century to discourage or discredit the sisters’ work, indeed the very existence of these all-female organisations. These included: the death of the family; ‘accusations of Romanism; attacks based on presumed female incapacity for self government; the complaint that sisterhoods gave women a public face; accusations that ladies were doing the work of servants; disapproval of their financial affairs; anger at their refusal to subject themselves to church order; and a fear that sisterhoods were stripping social life of its best women.

In Tasmania, opposition to the sisters was lead by Archdeacon Francis Hales (1821-1900) of Launceston, a low-church Evangelical churchman, who opposed all things that had overtones of Romanism, including high-churchmanship practice within the Church of England, church ornamentation and furnishings. Hales objected to the sisters on two counts. First, that they would bring Romanish practices into the church in Tasmania, such as the use of rosaries, the practice of confession and the use of Roman Catholic books of devotion. Second, it was incongruous to bring ‘women of pure minds, immature in years, or unripe in judgement, to live under the same roof with the
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vicious [the fallen women] in order to tend and teach them.\textsuperscript{230} Despite some ridicule from fellow clerics, the proposal to open a House of Mercy was dropped in 1874.\textsuperscript{231}

Another significant factor in slowing the establishment of a House of Mercy was the intervention of the Tasmanian Government to provide better care for the colony’s prostitutes. This was not driven by any philanthropic outreach but rather by the economic benefits to be derived if Hobart Town’s prostitutes were clean and free of venereal disease. In 1879 and 1882, the Contagious Disease Acts were passed,\textsuperscript{232} drawing the public’s attention to the high incidence of venereal disease amongst the city’s prostitutes. It was the threat of the Royal Navy to withdraw its visits to the port because the British sailors were becoming infected with a virulent strain of syphilis after visits to the city that obliged the Government to act.\textsuperscript{233} An Infectious Diseases Hospital or ‘Lock’ was set up at the former Cascades Female Factory complex, whereby prostitutes, who were known to be infected, were obliged to have treatment. The immediate effect of the act was to reduce the number of prostitutes at both ends of the age spectrum, leaving about thirty operating in 1885.\textsuperscript{234} This thesis notes the significant change in attitude towards prostitution after 1879: some women, particularly the young were seen as ‘fallen’ and the benevolent agencies of the day saw fit to continue to ‘save’ them from their dire situation, while others were seen to be a necessary commodity, serving the needs of men both resident within Hobart
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Town and those visiting such as the Royal Navy, providing always that they were free of disease.235

A final factor in delaying the establishment of a Home of Mercy was the joint effort of the Government and the Hobart Benevolent Society in providing safe lying-in homes for ‘fallen women’ considered ‘deserving’ by the Society. These operated for three decades, following strict guidelines: six respectable homes were chosen to board pregnant girls for six weeks, attended by a nurse. Only girls who were deemed absolutely destitute, not of profligate character and having their first pregnancy qualified for this service.236 In 1888, this boarding out system was abandoned when the Government opened a Lying-in Hospital at Cascades237 and recruited a voluntary women’s visiting committee to assist them.238

In 1889, the Church of England began preparations to open its own Home of Mercy, claiming that it could no longer ‘remain inactive’ to rescue our ‘lost sisters’.239 In a letter from a number of the clergy of Hobart, including George Shoobridge, the guidelines for such a home were set out. Its focus was to be on ‘general Rescue work’ as opposed to being a purely maternity home; it was to operate on a religious basis under the care of a chaplain and to be managed by a Lady Superintendent.240 To that end, the clergy had already asked the incoming Bishop, Henry Montgomery, to select a
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suitable woman before he left Britain. A committee of ladies had already been formed from representatives from each of the six Hobart Parishes, including Fanny Shoobridge from Holy Trinity.\footnote{Ibid.} Subscriptions were sought immediately with Shoobridge collecting £2 from Trinity Parish.\footnote{\textit{Church News}, September 1889, p.142.} By October 1889, news came that the Lady Superintendent had been chosen by Bishop Montgomery.\footnote{\textit{Church News}, October 1889, p.153.} By December, subscriptions of £194/6/6 had been raised\footnote{\textit{Church News}, December 1889, p.186.} of the £200 deemed necessary to set up the House of Mercy.\footnote{\textit{Church News}, October 1889, p.153.} A special request for subscriptions was made from country parishioners as a large percentage of women in need of assistance came from rural districts.\footnote{\textit{Church News}, November 1889, p.161.} This was to be a diocesan project. Donations of furniture, linen, crockery, bedding and kitchen utensils for the home were needed.\footnote{\textit{Church News}, December 1889, p. 187.}

Miss Eccleston, the Lady Superintendent, arrived mid-December. She came with good credentials, having had extensive experience in rescue work at various institutions for fallen women in Britain.\footnote{Ibid.} A suitable house at 11 Garden Crescent, not far from Bishopscourt, had been found for the home.\footnote{\textit{Church News}, January 1890, p.202.} The new Bishop, Henry Montgomery, was to be the first warden, while the Executive Committee was to be made up of his wife, Maud Montgomery and the clergymen’s wives of the Hobart parishes. This committee intended the House of Mercy to be ‘a real home in which discipline and
hard work [were] combined with love and bright surroundings. The inmates were to take in washing and needlework to defray costs.

By August of the first year of operation, a number of strategies had been implemented to rescue women from prostitution with some success. Miss Eccleston made weekly visits to the Lock Hospital and the gaol, while a ‘devoted church worker from St John’s Parish made visits to the haunts of the prostitutes by day and night, thus making the acquaintance of all the members of this class.’ The distribution of cards to prostitutes, inviting them to seek reclamation through the House of Mercy was not taken up even though this initiative was successful in large cities in Britain. The organisers of the Hobart institution concluded that the city’s prostitutes in particular were unwilling ‘to give up money and license, [sic] and the alternate paroxysms of delight and despair, for the monotony of the sober and quiet restraints of a home.’ In that first year, only five women had been received into the home, four of whom had left or been transferred to other colonies. The one remaining inmate was ‘contentedly’ living in the home, ‘preparing for Confirmation.’ It would appear that there had been some public criticism of the rescue work by those who would ‘withhold their prayers, their work and ... their alms’ for the cost of recuing even one woman who had
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‘gone astray.’\textsuperscript{255} The editor of \textit{Church News} made the timely reminder that even ‘The Son of Man, our Divine Master’ was a ‘Friend of harlots.’\textsuperscript{256}

In October 1890, the management of the Contagious Diseases Hospital, the Lock, was handed over to the managers of the House of Mercy. Both were to operate separately, but at the one location, the Cascades.\textsuperscript{257} The Lock Hospital would continue to be fully funded by the Tasmanian Government.\textsuperscript{258} This arrangement was met with some objection by the Roman Catholic members of the public on the grounds that the Lock Hospital was funded from the public’s taxes and should not have any association with the Church of England.\textsuperscript{259} Assurance was given that ministers of any denomination would continue to visit patients in the Lock,\textsuperscript{260} but, once cured of their venereal disease, the inmates would either be persuaded to enter the House of Mercy or be transferred to a Penitents’ Home in another colony if need be.\textsuperscript{261}

By the end of its first year, the management of the House of Mercy was able to report on the successful rescue of three of its inmates: one ‘now living comfortably and happily with her husband’, another ‘in service in the northern part of the island’ and another who was rescued by the sole ministrations of Maud Montgomery and was ‘now living in a respectable part of the city.’\textsuperscript{262} Equally, there were failures: one inmate, who was singled out as a ‘Roman’, returned to prostitution, while another had
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‘gone back to her bad life, ... misconducted herself in the streets and received from the Magistrates a sentence of seven months’ imprisonment.’

In October 1890, George Shoobridge was elected to the Board of Management of the House of Mercy, along with Venerable Charles Dundas, Dean of St David’s Cathedral and Herbert Finnis, Rector of St John the Baptist, West Hobart. All these clergymen were incumbents at inner city churches. Miss Eccleston, the first Lady Superintendent, resigned, citing ‘the circumstances and surroundings ... of “rescue work” in these colonies [was] so totally different from what was expected when in England.’ The *Church News* suggested that she was ‘strict beyond [their] notion of strictness’, and this led to her being replaced by another acquaintance of the Montogomers, Miss Dumsday, who would be arriving in Hobart in February 1891.

Subscriptions continued to be collected by the clergy wives, while Maud Montgomery, the driving force behind this home, appealed for cases of fruit, jam, cast off clothing which could be altered for inmates when they went into service, remnants and scraps for patchwork and books or illustrated papers for the women to read. The Lady Superintendent’s meeting of the released prisoners had achieved ‘more than one rescue’. The *Church News* claimed that on the whole, the rescue work of the
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Church was being done ‘in the most effective way possible, and with no parade and blowing of trumpets and beating of drums.’

This quiet and unobtrusive aspect of the rescue work was emphasised in the 1891 Annual Meeting by Bishop Montgomery. He claimed that the nature of the ‘silent work’ made those engaged in it ‘too deeply intent to look for the praise of man and too quiet to obtain it.’ With the example of his hard-working wife in mind, the Christian virtues of ‘quietness and confidence’ of the committee made up of other clergy wives, had borne fruit and several ‘fallen’ girls had been restored to their families or happily married. Whilst her husband’s rhetoric had its place, Maud Montgomery’s focus was on pragmatic matters. In the same meeting, she requested ‘in a terse address’ the ongoing needs of the home: more washing, gifts of clothing, books and periodicals; more visitors who would take a personal interest in the women; more support from the rural clergy and for mistresses to take greater care of their female servants by not allowing them to stay out late in the evening lest they fall into ‘bad company’.

Maud Montgomery’s ‘self-sacrificing devotion’ to the cause of the House of Mercy came at some cost to her own health. In the 1892 Address to Synod, her husband announced that she would ‘be absent for a few months from the diocese, to get a rest which [had] become absolutely necessary.’ The Bishop made a call for others to ‘fill
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the temporary gap’ and continue the rescue work in his wife’s absence. She departed for Britain immediately. The operation of the home faltered while she was away, and on her return she declared in January 1893 that there were insufficient funds to pay the month’s bills owing to the installation of a new laundry at the House of Mercy at a cost of £50. It was hoped that this new facility would bring more work so that the home would eventually be self-supporting. Her husband contributed towards the fundraising efforts by giving a lantern lecture on his recent visit to Melanesia.

To add to the burden of providing philanthropy to fallen women, the management of Hope Cottage in Launceston, a lying-in home for destitute girls having their first babies, was taken on by Maud Montgomery and her committee in 1892 at the request of its founder, Grace Soltau, the wife of Pastor George Soltau, a Christian Brethren Missionary. In May 1892, it became a ‘Church Maternity Home’, still managed by a Launceston Committee, but under the auspices of the Bishop’s wife. After the birth of their babies, the girls were kept in the home for six months where they were carefully taught and trained, receiving ‘that quiet discipline and Christian training which they so sadly proved themselves to have lacked in the past.’ As girls came
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from all over Tasmania, subscribers were sought from all parishes.\textsuperscript{282} Fanny Shoobridge made collections for Hope Cottage from within Trinity Parish in Hobart.\textsuperscript{283}

Sensing some reluctance on the part of the church women in Launceston, Maud Montgomery urged them ‘to take [a] personal interest in the girls’. She drew a comparison with ladies in Hobart, who had overcome ‘their first shrinking, [and] had found their work of helping to guide their unhappy sisters ... [repaid] their efforts.’\textsuperscript{284} Despite her encouragement, Hope Cottage was transferred to Hobart in 1896 due to a lack of local support, although publicly the reason given was that the expenses would be less in Hobart, where there were more ‘qualified workers’.\textsuperscript{285} The Church of England now had two homes for fallen women in Hobart: the House of Mercy to save and reform prostitutes and Hope Cottage for girls having their first baby.\textsuperscript{286} In addition, the Church of England managed the Lock Hospital for the Government. It should be noted that there were two other rescue homes operating in Hobart at this time: the ‘Anchorage’, which was non-denominational, for first pregnancies and the Magdalene Home in Sandy Bay, a ‘splendid’ complex built for Roman Catholics in 1893 from a bequest left by the Vicar-General, William Dunne, for fallen girls and women, aged twelve to thirty nine.\textsuperscript{287}
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With the growing number of women being accommodated in the Home of Mercy and the original home in Garden Crescent becoming ‘insanitary’, larger premises were found in the Cascades Complex. Extensive renovations were needed, eating into the home’s meagre funds. A call was made to the public to furnish the new chapel. By December 1897, the House of Mercy was in financial difficulties, exacerbated by the absence of Maud Montgomery, who had accompanied her husband to Britain, where he attended the Lambeth Conference. The Committee acknowledged the substantial contribution which Maud Montgomery made to the viability of this rescue home. Her zeal and hard work, together with her many contacts in the community by virtue of her being the Bishop’s wife, were readily put on the public record. On her return, Maud Montgomery set in train a number of initiatives to address the financial problems of the home. She successfully launched a state-wide appeal to pay off the £160 debt by having her ladies’ committee write numerous letters and, on a more pragmatic note, pleaded with the women of the parishes to donate some extra bottles of jam, (a ‘luxury’ for the inmates), when they were making their own supplies.

In February 1899, at the annual meeting of the Church’s various rescue agencies, a review of its functions was published. Financial relief for the House of Mercy had been given in the form of £1,500 from the Guesdon bequest, while the Tasmanian Government now subsidised the home’s work with a grant of £75 on a dollar for dollar cost sharing.
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basis.294 Hope Cottage now had twenty-two inmates, with ten babies in what amounted to ‘a sort of orphanage’.295 The laundry’s income had increased nearly 300 per cent due largely to the ministrations of the new matron, Mrs Gordon.296 The Lock Hospital had received twenty-eight patients.297 The Report reminded the public that, ‘We are always doing preventive work. All our energies are directed to this end, to build up our society on noble lines. But where we have failed, the Christian Church provides a hospital for the sick, whether in mind or soul, and this is her glory.’298 The Report went further in pointing out the ‘there are not many rescue homes belonging to the Church in Australia. We are doing a good work, with unique blessings on it.’299

A year later, the 1900 Annual Reports for the House of Mercy, Hope Cottage and the Lock Hospital gave a summary of the encouraging work being done.300 The one factor holding back further work was the lack of funds. Although the work was diocesan-based, not all parishes contributed to the funds.301 This was possibly due to two factors: first, a lingering reluctance on the part of some clergy to support rescue work, particularly to those engaged in prostitution; and second, as all institutions were now centralised in Hobart, those parishes in far-flung places as the north and west of the diocese were removed from any visible evidence of work being done or of women needing rescue. To compound matters further, Maud Montgomery announced that she would no longer be collecting subscriptions, pointing out the she alone had
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collected £140 out £166 in the previous year. She hoped others would take up the challenge, particularly if each clergyman appointed a collector in his parish.302

The successful establishment of the House of Mercy and Hope Cottage in the last decade of the nineteenth century marked a change in attitude of the Church of England. Although prostitution itself was still regarded as an ‘evil’, the women engaged in its practice and those young girls who had fallen pregnant, were deemed worthy of being saved, reformed and ultimately released back into the community as useful members. Maud Montgomery, supported by her husband, the Bishop, had lead the way to change. Their experience of successful rescue work in Britain had shown that similar institutions could be set up in Tasmania. The few remaining critics were challenged by the Bishop often citing a number of instances in the Bible: first, the parable of the lost sheep and the shepherd leaving his flock to go in search of the missing one;303 second, the similar parable of the lost coins304 and the need to find them; and third, the example of Christ associating with harlots of the day.305

The House of Mercy and Hope Cottage were not the only rescue homes for fallen women and girls. Within Trinity Parish, there were three other similar institutions. The earliest was established in 1870 in Church Street by the Ayton family,306 parishioners of Holy Trinity Church. Its operation was reported in the Tasmanian Mail in 1870,307 but it seems to have been short-lived. A second home was set up in Colville Street in 1887 by
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Miss Alice Sly, ‘an earnest, devoted Christian’.\textsuperscript{308} Again, this refuge closed after only eighteen months, owing to the ill-health of its founder. The third institution was the ‘Anchorage’, set up in Carr Street in 1889 by the Ladies’ Christian Association under the patronage of Lady Teresa Hamilton.\textsuperscript{309} ‘The Anchorage’ operated until 1920, at different locations.\textsuperscript{310} The social role of the Christian founders of all these refuges was threefold: first, they removed these children from the streets, thus benefitting society at large;\textsuperscript{311} second, there was a greater chance to instil reform in young women through supporting them in the care of their children; and third, the children of these women could be brought up in a nurturing environment until they were ‘fit for the Industrial or State Schools.’\textsuperscript{312}

Conclusions
The second half of the nineteenth century saw a change in how the philanthropic needs of the poor and fallen women of Hobart and more broadly, within Tasmania were met and managed. With the new independent Tasmanian Government not taking responsibility for such care, it fell to private organisations, run mainly by lay female members of the Protestant churches, to provide material and emotional support for women facing challenging circumstances. The early Penitents’ Homes of the 1850s and 1860s were temporary refuges and lasted only while the driving force behind their establishment, the wives of the different Governors, were resident within the colony.
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More successful and permanent was the rescue of young girls from the streets of Hobart in placing them in a home where they would be safe, clothed, fed and receive an industrial-based education in the expectation that they could and would be reformed and become useful members of society. Of course, not every young female was accepted into this home—those who showed a propensity for being violent and unrepentant were transferred to the stricter Industrial Training School run more along the lines of a prison than a nurturing home.

The philanthropic work of the long-standing Maternal and Dorcas Society, specifically directed at helping out poor women who were facing a confinement without sufficient support, was particular about just to whom they gave their assistance. Only the ‘deserving’ poor received their ministrations—this meant that those who were cohabiting, living off the earnings of prostitution or who were drunkards, were passed over by the morally-minded ladies’ committee.

This entrenched nineteenth-century attitude was challenged completely at the end of the century by the arrival of Bishop Montgomery and his wife into the Diocese. Even before they had left Britain, they had made it known that they would be establishing a House of Mercy, aimed at rescuing women involved in prostitution. New ideas emanating from the Mother Country\textsuperscript{313} were a challenge to the entrenched views of the colonists. Nonetheless, this home was a success, thanks to the frugal but efficient management of Maud Montgomery and her committee of clergy wives.

The daily management of all the rescue organisations fell to the wives of Protestant clergy or businessmen in the colony. Their records show that they were accurate, detailed and efficient in their management of finances, resources and personnel. Indeed, it was only due to the absence of an accredited female auditor that a male had to be used to audit the financial accounts.\textsuperscript{314} Frances Davenport and her daughter, Fanny Shoobridge, both wives of the second and third incumbents of Holy Trinity Church, served concurrently on several committees, at times, holding executive positions. At the same time, they were official visitors to the homes, visited the poor, dispensed maternal bags for confinements, collected subscriptions, gathered and altered second hand clothing, supervised sewing classes for the inmates and gathered supplies of produce for the homes. The expectation of the day was that this work would be done ‘very quietly and secretly. It would not do to blazon abroad what was being done’, claimed one clergyman in 1895.\textsuperscript{315} It was largely due to this expectation that rescue work must be done ‘silently’ that the enormous contribution of clergy’s wives and other lay Protestant women, has largely gone unrecorded.

By the end of the century, some public recognition was being made of the work being done by clergy’s wives. While their spouses were the public face of the Church, the wives carried the responsibility of providing succour to the poor and fallen, without ‘parade and blowing of trumpets and beating of drums’.\textsuperscript{316} Caught between the expected norms of Victorian times to be the provider for their own families on the one hand, and to reach out to the needy on the other, women such as Frances Davenport
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and Fanny Shoobridge faced an acknowledged ‘divided duty’\textsuperscript{317} to these two competing obligations. Overriding this dilemma, however, was the belief that their ‘preventative work’ was building up colonial society along ‘noble lines’. For them, their philanthropy brought ‘unique blessings’. \textsuperscript{318}

\textsuperscript{318} \textit{Church News}, April 1899, p. 1025.
CHAPTER 8

FOR GOD, KING AND COUNTRY: THE CHURCH’S ROLE IN THE BOER WAR, WORLD WAR 1 AND WORLD WAR 2, 1899-1945

The war we are waging has been rightly called ‘a holy war’, inasmuch as it is a crusade of Right against Might; against an enemy whose revolting crimes have called to Heaven for vengeance. To take part in this crusade for the vindication of liberty, justice, humanity and righteousness should be a coveted honour. Those of military age and fitness who give no heed to the Empire’s rallying cry, nor to the call of their brothers for respite from the strain of the trenches, are courting aspersions upon their courage and future self-reproach, because ‘they came not to the help of the Lord against the Mighty’.

*Church News*, July 1917, p. 3.

Introduction

The role played by the Church in time of war transcended the boundaries of the city of Hobart. On three occasions, Britain asked for assistance from countries within the British Empire to defend her honour. The second Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902). World War 1 (1914-1918) and World War 2 (1939-1945) were all wars ‘of choice’ rather than ‘of need’ as Henry Reynolds and Marilyn Lake point out.¹ The sites of engagement were far away on the other side of the globe, but the Church of England readily gave its support in encouraging young men to take up arms for the Mother Country or for women to join auxiliary services. Not only were there strong ties of kinship, as Reynolds explains, but there was a potential reciprocal obligation on Britain’s part that one day she might be asked to come to the aid of Australia, positioned as she was in a
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remote part on the other side of the world.\textsuperscript{2} For several reasons, it behoved Australia to support Britain in all three wars of the first half of the twentieth-century.

During World War 2, the Church, and Holy Trinity in particular, farewelled young members from their congregations to join troops from other countries of the British Empire. Special services were held prior to their departure and the Church gave each serviceman a pocket-sized copy of the New Testament to carry with him at all times. While abroad, the parishioners went out of their way to hold the servicemen close in their memory. Their names were posted in the front porch of the church while regular intercessions were held every week, where the name of each serviceman was read out.

Far from being narrowly preoccupied with just local issues pertaining to the parish or even the diocese, \textit{Holy Trinity Parish Magazine} and the diocesan \textit{Church News} kept parishioners informed of victories, losses, deaths, those who became POWs and those who won bravery awards. K.D.M. Snell argues that the publication of such international events as evidence of ‘globalised parochialism’.\textsuperscript{3} Michael McKernan believes that readers of the church newspapers had a better understanding of war than those who simply read the daily papers.\textsuperscript{4} During World War 2, one of the most favoured news items was the publication of letters of thanks and appreciation, specifically addressed to members of Trinity Parish who had sent ‘comfort’ parcels to

\textsuperscript{2} Henry Reynolds, ‘Colonial Cassandras: Why weren’t the warnings heeded? In Lake and Reynolds, \textit{What’s Wrong with Anzac?} pp. 48-49.
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the men and women on the Front. The reports of the military padres were published regularly, informing those left behind in Hobart of how much the church Huts and convalescent hospitals, built with parishioners’ subscriptions, were appreciated. With the news of a death, usually by a brief telegram, the Church rallied around the bereaved as well as the military chaplain sending a letter, assuring the relatives that their son had died a noble death defending the honour of Britain and her Empire.5

From the perspective of the Rector of Holy Trinity during World War 2, the most important role played by the Church was to raise and maintain the morale of those left in Hobart. In the first instance, the parishioners were reassured on each occasion, that the war was a righteous one, even a ‘holy war’ and therefore just and necessary. Church leaders spoke in lofty metaphorical language of justice versus evil,6 the latter being the aggressor of either the Dutch Boers or Germany. As justice would always win the day, Britain and her allies would always be victorious.

Parishioners were also urged to maintain their busy contribution to the community, both through their employment and the additional work offered to support the many voluntary organisations supporting the war effort.7 They were encouraged to maintain a cheerful demeanour for to be otherwise would affect the morale of those around them.8 The clergy urged everyone— women, men and children, to become involved in charity work, either fund-raising, collecting clothes, knitting or making up comfort

5 Reverend Donald Blackwood sent over 2000 such letters to next of kin when he was a military chaplain. See Michael McKernan, Padre: Australian Chaplains in Gallipoli and France (Sydney, 1986), p.135; McKernan, Australian Churches at War, p.61.
6 Church News, September 1939, p.10.
8 Ibid.
parcels for the troops, particularly those who were sick or injured. The output of Holy Trinity was extraordinary given that the parish was not wealthy. By example, the clergy associated with Holy Trinity over the two world wars, encouraged their own sons (often at great personal loss) to enlist or themselves volunteered to be military chaplains either at the war front or in the State’s military camps. Once again, the Church’s social role extended far beyond the immediate vicinity of Hobart.

Finally, in the tense years prior to World War 2, Church leaders made a desperate effort to build a better society, a ‘New Order’, based on honesty, justice, love and fairness. The Moral Rearmament Campaign permeated all levels of the Church, international, national and diocesan and pleaded with the individual members of the Church of England to rearm morally and spiritually. Reverend Donald Blackwood, holding the office of both Holy Trinity’s Rector and Archdeacon of Hobart at the outbreak of World War 2, embraced this idea and urged his parishioners to return to the fundamental Christian ideals.

At the end of 1945, the Church of England stood war-weary but proud of her record for service during the three wars, but this was not sufficient to bring about a ‘New Order’ in the post war era. In a Pastoral Letter to all Australian Anglicans in March 1946, the Primate of Australia, Archbishop Henry Le Fanu, despaired over the ‘deep and widespread spiritual malaise’ that had corrupted all aspects of life at a personal, governmental and international level.\textsuperscript{9} In other words, the concerns about the lack of morality and spirituality in pre-war years were still present, indeed magnified, in the

\textsuperscript{9} Church News, March 1946, p.9.
post war years. Trinity Parishioners had had the ideals of Moral Re-Armament put constantly before them by the clergy, accounting for their generous responses to the many wartime requests for aid—material, spiritual and in personnel.

SECOND ANGLO-BOER WAR 1899-1902

Church’s Support for Mother Country

Australia was preoccupied with finalising the federation of her six colonies when the second South African Anglo-Boer War broke out on 11 October 1899. Two colonies, New South Wales and Victoria, had been approached by Britain about supplying contingents, but Queensland first volunteered a militia to assist the Mother Country.\(^\text{10}\) Henry Reynolds suggests that this operation was deliberately stage-managed by British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Joseph Chamberlain, in order to raise an army from the colonies.\(^\text{11}\)

Although Tasmania was the last state to volunteer troops, she quickly made ready her first contingent of eighty-four infantrymen. They left Hobart by train early on 28 October 1899, watched by thousands of enthusiastic citizens who had secured every vantage point around the city’s railway station.\(^\text{12}\) The volunteers included parishioners of Holy Trinity.\(^\text{13}\) The *Church News* commented on ‘the real wave of enthusiasm which the departure of our citizen soldiers aroused.’\(^\text{14}\) Moreover, the rallying of ‘the offshoots of the Anglo-Saxon stock turning from all corners of the earth to knit

\(^{10}\) Ibid., 3 October 1899, p.1121; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 June 1902, p.9; Robert L. Wallace, *The Australians at the Boer War* (Canberra, 1976), p.33.


\(^{14}\) *Church News*, 6 November 1899, p.1137.
themselves by a fresh bond to the Mother of them all’ was truly an ‘annus mirabilis’, the more so because their decision ‘was not the outcome of necessity.’

Australia, New Zealand, India and Canada believed they were going to war to protect British subjects (the Uitlanders) from oppression and injustice at the hands of the Boers. The honour of Britain was at stake and she had to allow her sons of the colonies to stand shoulder to shoulder with her to defend her honour. At this early stage of the war, the Church of England likened the situation in the Transvaal to the ‘barbarism of the Middle Ages rather than the civilization of the nineteenth century.’ The Church pointed to a number of factors which made the war a ‘just one’: the corruption of the Boers, the lack of justice, the blatant disregard for the rule of law and a disregard for their obligations to peoples living and working in their land. At the same time, the Church faced the reality of the horror of war: the loss of life, destruction of property and the many other calamities and miseries which follow a war. She prayed for ‘the hastening of peace’.

Throughout the war, the church newspaper gave regular reports of the progress of the war. It quickly recognised that the reports of victories in the local papers were false or at best exaggerated and consequently unhelpful, particularly when they caused loved ones in Tasmania unnecessary anguish. The Church News preferred to cite the
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English newspapers’ reports as being more accurate. Where opportunity presented, letters from soldiers at the various fronts were published and space was always found to report on those soldiers who had won military awards.

‘War Fever’ consumed the Tasmanian community, which would not tolerate any antagonistic or ‘pro-Boer’ sentiment. In January 1900, a speaker at a pro-Boer rally in Hobart was attacked by a hostile crowd. Likewise, the editor of the left-wing newspaper, the Clipper, was attacked because he had doubts about the real motives behind Britain going to war against the Boers. Specifically, he claimed it was to control the gold mines in the Transvaal, not for any altruistic concern for the treatment of British citizens living there. Although these were isolated exceptions to the usual jingoistically patriotic accounts which predominated in the Tasmanian press, they do indicate that not all Australians were blindly supportive of the engagement in another’s war.
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**Thanksgiving Services**

In its role as the good shepherd, the Church did make timely reminders that sacrifice was not just confined to the men the battle front. It was just as hard for the families waiting ‘with dread for the bad news that may come.’ As contingents returned to Tasmania from their tour of duty, thanksgiving services were held in all the Protestant churches in Hobart. Indeed, the Church of England believed that a religious service for the troops was as equally important as the civic pomp and ceremony of banquets and street processions organised by the civic leaders.

With the return of the First Contingent, Hobart citizens packed St David’s Cathedral to hear a Memorial Prayer, where ‘the names of all Tasmanians, who had laid down their lives in the service of the Empire were specially mentioned.’ The hymns, ‘Onward Christian Soldiers’, ‘O God our Help in Ages Past’ and the ‘Old Hundredth’ were sung heartily. The Archdeacon of Hobart, Reverend Frederick Whittington (1853-1938), informed the assembled veterans that intercessions had been said daily for their safekeeping and that they were expected by the public to live up to their reputations of ‘heroes’ and ‘gentlemen’ garnered on the battle fields of South Africa, now that they would be resuming civilian life.

Holy Trinity, for its part, celebrated news of victories such as the relief of Ladysmith and Kimberley with simple, short services of thanksgiving of just the choir and rector,
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and the singing of the ‘Te Deum’ and the National Anthem around the altar. The news of the relief of Mafeking reached Hobart on 16 May 1900 and Holy Trinity bells rang out across the Hobart to inform its citizens of the good news. Large jubilant crowds dressed in red, white and blue singing the National Anthem, waving flags and letting off makeshift fireworks thronged Macquarie Street near the Town Hall and the *Mercury* office. On the following Sunday, services at Holy Trinity ‘were of a marked thanksgiving character, and again the National Anthem and the ‘Te Deum’ were sung.”

**Patriotic Funds**

On the home front, several Patriotic Funds were set up. The Bishop decreed that all parishes in Tasmania should contribute financially to a central diocesan fund to demonstrate their devout fidelity ‘to the sovereign and the throne’, thereby supporting ‘the good order and sound government all through the Empire.’ Another fund supported by the Church of England was the Tasmanian Soldiers’ National Memorial Fund set up to raise funds for the building of a fitting memorial to the soldiers who fell in the South African War. The Duke of Cornwall and York, who was in Australia for the opening of the first Parliament of Australia, laid the foundation stone for the monument on 4 July 1901 (See Fig. 48).
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Women’s involvement in the war was limited at this time to three spheres of work: nursing, teaching or providing comfort parcels for the troops on the battle front, particularly those who were wounded or had succumbed to disease. The women of the Church of England across the diocese, did rally to form a number of comfort associations between February and May 1890. On 1 February 1900, about 200 women attended a special meeting at Hobart’s Town Hall, chaired by the Governor’s wife, Viscountess Georgina Gormanston, who encouraged them to either contribute financially\(^{47}\) or with goods to the war effort or form groups to sew clothes for the troops, using only new materials and approved patterns.\(^{48}\) Second-hand materials such
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as bed linen and tablecloths would be accepted.  

Maud Montgomery emotionally proposed that the comforts outreach should be called the Union Jack Society, explaining that the Union Jack was made up of the crosses three saints—George, Andrew and Patrick, but more importantly, the symbol of the cross meant ‘suffering and sympathy [and] implied self sacrifice’ on the part of both the soldiers and those left in Tasmania. She was sure that ‘many loving thoughts would be stitched into these garments and that they would be prepared and sent off as promptly as possible.’ She later clarified her statement that the ‘comforts’ being made in Tasmania were to go to any soldier serving under the Union Jack.

Viscountess Gormanston announced that a working group had already been formed at ‘Bishopscourt’, meeting twice a week. Fanny Shoobridge immediately set about establishing Holy Trinity’s Union Jack Society on 5 February 1900, making many garments such as coats, socks, caps, shirts, nightingales and cholera belts. Other comforts included pillows, towels, books, board games (Ludo), walking sticks, tobacco, pipes, writing materials, jam, chocolate and condensed milk. These were made into parcels, packed into twenty wooden cases and shipped to Durban, South Africa, where
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they were distributed to the troops. A letter of thanks was published in the Tasmanian press from Government House, Cape Town.

As the Boer War dragged into 1902, the language in the reports of the Church News changed from imperialistic support of Britain and moral indignation against the Boers, to resignation that ‘yet another contingent’ was about to leave Tasmania for South Africa to fight in what had become a guerrilla war ‘bordering on the criminal’. There was now an urgency to bring ‘peace with honour’ for the Boers and that ‘the waste of life and treasure shall promptly cease.’ Once peace was established, the Church of England must assert herself ‘with alacrity and perseverance’ together with the ‘Dutch Reformed’ Church and root out ‘the weeds of discord and strife’ and bring ‘the blessings of freedom, happiness and prosperity’ to that war-ravaged country. As a final, unintended racist remark, the intermingling of the Boer and British races might bring positive benefits in much the same way that the French émigrés gave a ‘valuable’ infusion into the colonial blood of the backwoodsmen of Canada, for there was ‘good Huguenot and Dutch strains’ in the vanquished Boers.

**WORLD WAR 1**

**A Righteous War**

In contrast to being caught ‘off-guard’ with the Boer War and the hasty call to arms,
the Church of England in Tasmania showed that it was at least aware of the simmering tensions in Europe prior to 1914, the information no doubt still being collected from British newspapers. Since November 1911,\textsuperscript{66} the \textit{Church News} had been carrying articles on the conflict in the Balkans and had kept its readers informed of the new Australian Government’s efforts to organise its militia. Of particular interest was the decision to employ four army chaplains-general— one from each of the Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Church of England and Methodists and one senior chaplain for each state.\textsuperscript{67} The latter was to attend camps and do everything in his power to attend to the spiritual needs of the soldiers including conducting confirmation classes and arranging church services. These could be just for his denomination or could be combined with others.\textsuperscript{68} The military authorities believed the formal organisation of religious personnel would overcome some of the difficulties experienced in the Boer War with the insufficient number of military chaplains being deployed among the Australian troops in that conflict.

When the acknowledgement of support for the Mother Country came from King George V on 6 August 1914 (two days after the official declaration of war), there was no question in the minds of Tasmanian Anglicans of not supporting the head of their church, seen as a calm, restrained and caring figure in the midst of the jingoistic war cant of European heads of state.\textsuperscript{69} From the outset, the war was seen as a ‘righteous’

\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Church News}, 1 November 1911, p.2; 1 November 1912, p.4; 2 December 1912, p.3; August 1913, p.3.
\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Church News}, October 1913, p.4.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid, September 1914, p.3; January 1916, p.3; May 1916, p.3.
conflict— Britain was not fighting because of ‘aggression’ or her ‘own selfish ends, but for the maintenance of vital principles of civilization.’ Throughout the conflict, despite the accounts of the losses and injuries inflicted on the Allies, the Church of England maintained that the war was a ‘holy war’ which would vindicate ‘liberty, justice, humanity and righteousness’. The focus of the Church of England during the war was on the pastoral care of men, both those serving at the battle fronts and those who remained in Tasmania. From the start, the Bishop of Tasmania directed his clergy to give full support of the war from their pulpits. Enlistment was encouraged and included many of their own sons or brothers. Several hundred men from Trinity Parish volunteered in the early days of the war. Bishop Reginald Stephen claimed that, ‘As a nation, we are fighting for our life’ and this should be sufficient reason ‘for every able-bodied man to offer himself for his country’s service.’ Moreover, Australians ‘are fighting for all that makes our national life worth living, for honour, freedom and humanity ... for religion.’ He asserted that the Central powers at war were Christian in name only but not in practice— one had only to look at some of the diabolical actions they were inflicting on the Allies. Paradoxically, the war had brought some better outcomes for the Allies—
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churches were fuller and men were more spiritually aware. For Australia in particular, the war had united her people in working for a common cause.  

![Figure 49: SS Geelong leaving Hobart Wharf, 20 October 1914 (Military Museum, Anglesea Barracks, Hobart)](image)

**Conscription**

A year later, when it became apparent that the Australian Government could not raise enough reinforcements for the allied army, the Bishop came out strongly in support for conscription, citing two reasons: first, that service for the country was an obligation that rested on all citizens; and second, ‘it was the only way by which, as a nation Australia could keep her promise to the Mother Country and deal fairly with those who were now giving their lives for those left behind in Australia.’

In short, a vote against
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78 *Church News*, October 1916, p.4.
conscription was a ‘repudiation of the claim of service and the claim of honour.’ 79 In his synodal address of 1916, the Bishop used even more pointed language, calling those who had not stepped forward to serve their country as ‘slackers and shirkers’, lacking in moral fitness. 80

In the months leading up to the first plebiscite in October 1916, the Church of England redoubled its efforts to win the hearts and minds of the Tasmanian people to embrace patriotism. Patriotic sermons were preached 81 and the official intercessions appointed for each month prayed for ‘a sufficient body of recruits from England and her Dominions to support the forces in the fighting line and especially for success in raising the new Australian army’ 82 and ‘England and her Dominions in dealing with the subject of military conscription’. 83

In July, Holy Trinity began a series of monthly Sunday afternoon meetings in the church for men only in the parish and any others in the wider community who wanted to participate in prayer and intercession for the men overseas. 84 The first meeting took place on 9 July 1916 and the church was crowded. The Rector, Reverend Henry Atkinson, (1874-1960) gave addresses on the growth of an independent England and the consequential development of an imperial ideal followed by how each individual in the audience could contribute to the building of the Empire. 85 Reverend John Bethune (1882-1960), the Anglican military chaplain at the Claremont Training Camp, spoke on
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81 Lake, A Divided Society, p. 77.
82 Church News, January 1916, p.5
83 Ibid., May 1916, p.5.
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the topic of ‘Citizens as Fighting Men’ to an audience that included sixty Scouts and youths from the YMCA.  

Bethune had already written the lead article in the October 1916 issue of *Church News* on the meaning of patriotism, which could find expression in vastly different ways, not just in the military sense. A final talk, given by the Rector, tackled the sensitive area of spirituality, entitled ‘Citizens as Praying Men’. Despite the Churches’ concerted efforts, both the 1916 and 1917 conscription plebiscites were lost, leading the *Church News* to despair that Australia was ‘disgraced before humanity.’ Significantly, the intercessions appointed for November 1916 included a desire for ‘the development of a higher moral and spiritual tone of our Australian people.’

**Mission to Seamen**

Another group of men serving the nation continuously and unobtrusively during the war were the merchant navy. Shortly after Bishop Reginald Stephen (1860-1956) took up office in 1914, he set about giving these men (‘many thousands annually’) better shore facilities at the Port of Hobart. The former Cathedral Mission Church in Campbell Street was offered as a combined Seamen’s Institute and Chapel, to be known as ‘The Flying Angel’, for the sailors. The Archbishop of Canterbury sanctioned the establishment of the facility in Hobart, describing the world-wide Mission to
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Seamen movement as ‘the Church’s effort for her sailor sons ... when we consider what we owe to our merchant seamen, particularly during this time of war ... it is really the Mercantile Marine that is enabling us to carry on the war at all.’\textsuperscript{94} The \textit{Church News} took a moral stand on behalf of the sailors, claiming that there was ‘no class of workers ... more subject to the allurements of harpies\textsuperscript{95} and other undesirables than ... sailors when ashore far from their homes. It is therefore, a plain duty, to try in every port to keep them away from temptation.’\textsuperscript{96}

The Church of England in Hobart took on the role of ‘protector’ of these sailors. A lay missionary, William Cocks, with experience in Sydney and New Zealand, was employed to minister to visiting ships’ crews and encourage them to visit the Mission, situated not far from the Hobart wharves. ‘Wholesome entertainment’ was provided by a number of Anglican ladies from the recently-formed ‘Harbour Lights Guild’ and facilities such as reading, writing, billiards, bagatelle and table games were provided as well as Cocks conducting chapel services for the men.\textsuperscript{97} The Reverends Shoobridge\textsuperscript{98} and Blackwood from Holy Trinity served on the committee\textsuperscript{99} while church warden Arthur Jerrim was to take over the role of the missionary superintendent in 1937.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} A ‘harpv’ is literally a mythical part bird, part woman. Here it has the metaphorical meaning of a grasping, unpleasant woman.
\textsuperscript{96} \textit{Church News}, September 1916, p.4; \textit{Mercury}, 10 September 1920, p.7.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., May 1916, p.6.
\textsuperscript{98} \textit{Mercury}, 10 September 1920, p.7.
\textsuperscript{99} \textit{Mercury}, 7 October 1931, p.9.
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The Mission was considered a huge success, ministering to thousands of sailors each year.\textsuperscript{101}

By way of thanking the navy and the merchant seamen for their service, loyalty and courage during the war, Dean Hay chaired a combined meeting of the Mission to Seamen and the YMCA Naval Service in July 1919.\textsuperscript{102} It was proposed to hold a ‘Jack’s Day’\textsuperscript{103} in Hobart in January 1920 to raise funds to finance ‘Jack ashore’.\textsuperscript{104} Each denomination in Hobart was invited to set up a stall in the city to sell all manner of goods. Similar successful Jack’s Days had been held around the Commonwealth,\textsuperscript{105} indeed throughout the Empire, but on different days.\textsuperscript{106} In Hobart, the Church of England considered it fitting to hold a special day of recognition and gratitude for the service of the seamen who served in the recent war but who, unlike the returned soldiers, largely went unacknowledged on official occasions.

**Military Chaplains**

In another form of service for King and country, the Church encouraged its clergymen to become military chaplains. Early in the war, such positions in training camps were regarded as part-time, unpaid positions,\textsuperscript{107} with the clergy expected to continue to minister to their parishioners. This was reinforced by a directive from the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1914 that all clergy had a primary obligation to guide and administer.
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\item \textsuperscript{102} Mercury, 30 July 1919, p.3.
\item \textsuperscript{103} A shortened term for ‘Jack Tar’, the popular name given to seamen of the Merchant or Royal Navy.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Church News, January 1920, p.6.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Sydney Morning Herald, 19 October 1918, p.12; Australian Worker, 24 October 1918, p.9; Brisbane Courier, 14 December 1918, p.5.
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\item \textsuperscript{107} Church News, October 1915, p.4. The Defence Department only supplied a tent and a bed. Chaplains were expected to pay for their food.
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to their parishioners at this time of national anxiety, particularly to supply ‘spiritual consolation to relatives and friends of those who are suffering, or who have actually fallen, at the front.’ Nonetheless, Tasmania sent ten Anglican military chaplains overseas with the AIF to tend to their social, material and spiritual needs, while another, Reverend John Bethune, volunteered to serve full-time in the large training camp at Claremont just north of Hobart. The number of clergy volunteering to serve abroad left some parishes, such as Holy Trinity, without an assistant curate. Consequently, this placed a strain on the Church’s ability to deliver outreach services to parishioners, particularly those attending St Margaret’s Mission Church. The members of the laity stepped in to fill the void.

One of the military chaplains sent to the western front was Reverend Donald Blackwood, who had been assistant curate at Holy Trinity up to 1913 (See Fig. 50). He was a reliable and regular correspondent and his letters to the senior minister in charge of military chaplains, Archdeacon Frederick Whittington, were published in the Church News. His detailed and realistic descriptions of the training camp in Egypt and the challenging conditions in the trenches on the Western Front, brought home to readers the reality of war. Ever mindful of his pastoral care duties to the soldiers,
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Blackwood set about setting up a ‘Church of England room’ in the Egyptian camp, where he could celebrate Holy Communion, conduct evensong daily and take confirmation classes.\textsuperscript{114} He later thought that he could widen the access to the room to include all men of all denominations and ‘make it an open room to provide writing paper, envelopes, reading material etc for the men, in fact make it a camp home for the men and a rallying point of Church life.’\textsuperscript{115} To that end, he appealed to the Church of England in Tasmania for a donation of between £10 and £20 from the Patriotic

\textsuperscript{114} Church News, February 1916, p.10.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.
Funds to take up this 'spiritual opportunity ... to help these fine fellows.'\textsuperscript{116} His care of the men, particularly in comforting the wounded and dying and boosting the morale of the front line troops earned him a citation in official despatches and the award of the Military Cross.\textsuperscript{117}

\textbf{Church Hut Schemes}

On the home front, the Church of England Men’s Society (CEMS) was active in raising funds to build Recreation Huts on the Western Front. As early as 1915, CEMS had been approached to raise funds to build forty Recreation Huts in France to help the allied soldiers ‘endure the strain which the conditions of present day warfare imposes upon them.’\textsuperscript{118} These Huts provided shelter, warmth, refreshment and amusement for the men when they were taking a break from frontline fighting.\textsuperscript{119} CEMS had been asked to finance the building of another eighty Huts for which they asked the Diocese of Tasmania to contribute. A single hut cost £300 to erect. Records show that Holy Trinity supported the Hut Scheme by making a modest donation in 1918.\textsuperscript{120}

In December 1917, CEMS merged their Hut Scheme Fund into a new organisation, the Church of England Australian Fund for Soldiers Overseas.\textsuperscript{121} By July 1918, the \textit{Church News} was reporting that the ‘Australian huts were well-fulfilling their purpose.’\textsuperscript{122} One Hut, known as the ‘Soldiers’ Cathedral’, was so large it could seat 1500 men, with one
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part at the end ‘shuttered’ off to create a chapel for 150-200 men. This Hut was in constant use by the men for reading, writing and billiards.\textsuperscript{123} Another Hut was built inside the grounds of a military hospital in France. It was used as a chapel not only for the soldiers, but also the nurses and VADs. Choral Evensong was a regular occurrence due to the assistance of the ‘WAACs and Army Pay Corps men.’\textsuperscript{124}

In Egypt, several ‘clubs’ for the troops were set up, financed by the Church of England Australian Fund for Soldiers Overseas. In Cairo, the club had fifty beds to give soldiers more respectable accommodation, home-cooked meals and the wholesome company of Australian nursing sisters.\textsuperscript{125} A medical dispensary was set up to tend to minor medical conditions of the soldiers, thus avoiding the necessity of having to go to hospital.\textsuperscript{126} Another club was set up in Jerusalem to give respite for the Australian soldiers fighting in Palestine. Members of the clergy of all denominations met with the men and took them on sight-seeing tours of the Holy City.\textsuperscript{127} Particular attention was given to soldiers convalescing after being wounded. An AIF Rest Club was set up at Port Said, overlooking the Mediterranean Sea, for convalescents to take in the sea air and be provided with special convalescent food such as Arrowroot and Benger’s food.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., December 1918, p.15.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., p.16.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid. ‘Arrowroot’ is similar to Cornflour, a bland tasting powder that would be easy to digest. ‘Benger’s Food’ was a powder mixed with milk and given to convalescents who were ‘off their food’. It also had a bland, slightly biscuity flavour.
house boat on the River Nile was made free of rent by Messrs Cook and Son for the use of Australian military convalescents.\textsuperscript{129}

By the end of the war, the Church of England Australian Fund for Soldiers Overseas had received £24,633, in donations from the churches including £795 from Tasmania.\textsuperscript{130} Holy Trinity had formed its own branch of this Fund in 1917\textsuperscript{131} and continued to give support with modest donations.\textsuperscript{132} With demobilisation, the Fund's Australian Executive decided to hand over some of the Huts, which had served as chapels near the military hospitals in France, to the English clergy as a gracious act for them to be used as effectively as the Australians had used them.\textsuperscript{133} As late as July 1919, churches were advised that the Fund was still open as the huge demobilisation of troops back to Australia would require special care, especially for transport of the maimed, in body and mind.\textsuperscript{134}

The Church of England Australian Fund for Soldiers Overseas was one Patriotic Fund set up especially by the Anglican Church. Records show that there were thirty-eight other Patriotic Funds instituted in Tasmania during the 1914-1918 war.\textsuperscript{135} They were readily established by altruistic citizens rather than by members of the Church. In terms of financial donations alone, the most profitable were the Red Cross Fund (£114,246), multiple Belgian Relief Funds (£59,229) and the YMCA Field Service
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(£23,686). There are no church records of the service given by Trinity parishioners at this time to these other funds, except a passing reference by the church chroniclers, Frank Bowden and Max Crawford, to the Red Cross Fund and the Belgian Relief Fund. The latter had been set up to relieve the distress of thousands of people in Belgium starving as a result of their homeland being overrun by the Germans in the early days of the war. The Church regarded it as her ‘imperious obligation’ to help ‘this little frontier nation’ which had slowed the advance of the Germans, thus enabling the Allies time to muster their forces. Donations of clothing were also collected with the prospect of the advancing European winter.

**Ministers’ Vigilance Committee**

In the immediate aftermath of the war, Trinity Parish came to the public’s attention because of the outbreak of pneumonic influenza, which was plaguing Australia after the return of the troops from the Western Front. Largely due to strict quarantine measures, its isolation from the mainland states and perhaps its climate, Tasmania in fact, managed to stay disease-free until August 1919, when the first cases of influenza were reported. Once the epidemic took hold, however, many faced hardship, particularly in densely-populated North Hobart. A soup kitchen was set up at the Holy Trinity’s Mission Church in Federal Street, while volunteers from the
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Emergency Clothing Committee visited homes to ascertain the needs of the poor, particularly women and children.¹⁴² These volunteers reported on the widespread destitution of the citizens living in appalling insanitary slums.

A Ministers’ Vigilance Committee, comprising representatives of a number of different denominations, was formed to investigate claims of need. Hobart was divided into 13 districts, each one supervised by a minister of religion, including Holy Trinity’s Rector, Reverend Henry Atkinson (1874-1960).¹⁴³ He was assisted by members of the Church who visited each home in the allocated district.¹⁴⁴ The Vigilance Committee released its report on 19 September 1919 with the committee chairman, Baptist minister, Reverend E. Herbert Hobday drawing attention to the substandard housing in which the poor were forced to live. These slums were in side streets, in close proximity of main thoroughfares along which the citizens of Hobart travelled every day. Dwellings were dilapidated, not weatherproof, overcrowded, pest-ridden and without adequate washing facilities.¹⁴⁵ He particularly singled out landlords, some of whom held civic positions, as being ‘men without ... a soul or conscience, men who were as callous as a camel’s knee’ for whom ‘the most fitting punishment would be ... to compel [them] ... to live in the places they owned, and by which they grew fat.’¹⁴⁶

Rector Atkinson took a Mercury reporter to visit some of the hovels in his allocated ‘district’ which fell within Trinity Parish. In an article entitled, ‘In Darkest Hobart: How the Poor Live’, the substandard dwellings and the number of residents, who were

¹⁴² Mercury, 11 September 1919, p.5.
¹⁴³ Mercury, 22 September 1919, p.2.
¹⁴⁴ Petrow and Alexander, Growing with Strength, p.276.
¹⁴⁵ Mercury, 19 September 1919, pp.5-6.
¹⁴⁶ Mercury, 17 September 1919, p.6.
either afflicted with influenza or who had died, were described.\textsuperscript{147} The adverse publicity prompted the Hobart City Council to launch an official investigation into housing. A municipal housing scheme was set up with the aim of building houses for the needy at low rental. With little evidence of any progress, and despite the passage of the \textit{Homes Act} (10 George V No. 39) in December 1919, a deputation from the Vigilance Committee, now renamed the Citizens’ Social Service Committee, approached the Lord Mayor in March 1920, to again petition the provision of suitable housing for the poor.\textsuperscript{148} After several delays, only eight such houses had been built by 1922, and only one of these let out.\textsuperscript{149} From the Church’s perspective, the epidemic was viewed as an act of ‘Divine Mercy in disguise’ for it forced the public’s attention on the ‘disgraceful condition of some quarters of the city.’\textsuperscript{150} Moreover, the benefit of all denominations acting together ‘for the common weal’ demonstrated that the clergy were a force ‘to be seriously reckoned with in public affairs’ and not ‘a body of tame and harmless individuals mainly engaged in delivering amiable platitudes from pulpits.’\textsuperscript{151}

\textbf{War Memorial Window}

In another development after the war, Holy Trinity set about honouring the fallen within the parish. In 1919, Reverend Donald Blackwood, newly-returned from his service as an army chaplain on the Western Front and recuperating from the effects of
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being gassed,\textsuperscript{152} suggested that the large eastern window of Holy Trinity could be replaced with a war memorial window for the 101 ‘diggers’ from the parish who had died in the 1914-1918 war.\textsuperscript{153} The parish adopted this idea, engaging Lucien Dechaineux, an artist and Principal of Hobart Technical College\textsuperscript{154} to design a window fitting to be a memorial. The window was to be made of stained glass by the Sydney firm, Messrs F. Ashwin and Co.\textsuperscript{155}

The window was unveiled and dedicated by Bishop Hay on 19 February 1922 to a crowded congregation. Guests of honour were the civic leaders and the families of the fallen soldiers.\textsuperscript{156} The window took the form of a triptych, where each panel represented an aspect of a soldier’s life at the front (See Fig. 51). The first was an image of trench warfare with shells exploding in the background; the second panel depicted soldiers being attended by doctors and first aid orderlies at a first aid station; and the third panel showed a family at home receiving the grave news of the loss of life of a loved one. Above all three scenes, were dark foreboding clouds with the outline of the graves of the soldiers juxtaposed against the crosses of Calvary, but above all this was the image of Christ, rising from the dead in a bright, clear light,
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flanked by several angels. At the very top of the central panel is an image of the Dove of Peace.\textsuperscript{157}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{War Memorial Window, commemorating soldiers who had died in World War 1.}
\label{fig:war_memorial_window}
\end{figure}

Inscription: ‘Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends

The window, still in situ, is very striking, particularly in the morning when the rising sun streams through the coloured glass. During the incumbency of Blackwood, the window would be backlit by spotlights during the Anzac Day services held at night.\textsuperscript{158} At the time of its unveiling, the window was considered ‘unusual’ because it differed in its composition of depicting the realities of war, rather than stylised saints. The local
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papers were impressed by its ‘originality’,\textsuperscript{159} which brought to the public’s notice the ninety-three families in the parish who had lost family members—some had lost two. A full list of the fallen was inscribed on a wooden Honour Board fixed at the back of the church (See Fig. 52).

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{honour_board.png}
\caption{World War 1 Honour Board, Holy Trinity Church.}
\end{figure}

Inscription: ‘To the greater glory of God and in memory of the men of this parish who gave their lives in the Great War 1914 – 1919.’

**WORLD WAR 2**

In May 1940, Reverend William Reeve, the military chaplain at the Brighton Army Camp gave a comprehensive overview of the role which the Church of England had played in the lead up to and early months of the Second World War. Asked frequently, ‘What is the Church doing for the War?’ he was able to point out that the Church had been responsible for conducting the Moral and Spiritual Rearmament Campaign in 1939; the immediate appointment of Anglican military chaplains at the time of call-up;

\textsuperscript{159} Church News, 4 March 1902, p.4; Mercury, 18 February 1922, p.6.
the setting up of the Church Recreational Hut in Hobart by CEMS and deployment of the first Tasmanian chaplain overseas with the second AIF. Padre Reeve also pointed out that as the Church of England did not advertise her good works, it was understandable that many members of the public might think that the Church ‘just sat still and did nothing’.  

Moral and Spiritual Rearmament

Prior to war breaking out, Britain had appealed to the Churches within the Empire to focus on morally and spiritually rearming. The stimuli for this movement came from two sources: the ‘Recall to Religion’ campaign and the influence of the Oxford Group. On 28 December 1936, in a BBC broadcast, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Cosmo Lang (1864-1945), had asserted that the world’s ills were the result of a drift away from religion. In his ‘Recall to Religion’ speech, Lang believed that mankind had ‘not so much... denied [God] as crowded [Him] out in the haste, hurry and distraction of modern life’, which had brought a slackening, even a scorning of the old standards of Christian morality. For the British Empire, this meant the ideals of order and freedom were in jeopardy unless they were nurtured by faith. The following year, the Bishop of Tasmania, in his synodal address of 1937, urged the Tasmanian people to accept loyally Archbishop Lang’s exhortation. Set against the backdrop of a failed
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League of Nations with Italy invading Abyssinia, China occupying Manchuria, the Spanish Civil War and the rise of Nazism in Germany,\(^{166}\) Hay drew a comparison with the troubled world being ‘on the edge of a volcano, with wars and rumours of wars’ and the peace enjoyed in Australia. Prosperity had returned after the Depression, but ‘men’s hearts were not yet turned to the source of goodness.’\(^{167}\) In September 1938, Hay sought to inspire the Tasmanian clergy and quicken the conscience of the laity by reviving the practice of religion through his ‘Recall to Religion’ movement.\(^ {168}\)

At the same time, the influence of the Oxford Group,\(^ {169}\) a religious movement initiated by a Lutheran Evangelical minister, Dr Frank Buchman, (1878-1961) was gaining momentum in Europe, America and Britain.\(^ {170}\) This group advocated a return to the basic spiritual ideals of love, honesty, justice and truthfulness, which should be applied in personal and public life.\(^ {171}\) The latter included the way aggressive nations were using expediency rather than principle to dominate other weaker nations. The international crises of the late 1930s were fundamentally moral ones — nations needed to rearm morally not militarily. While some Anglican clergy supported the principles of the Oxford Group,\(^ {172}\) not all churchmen approved of the group, describing it as a ‘cult’\(^ {173}\)

\(^{166}\) *Church News*, November 1935, p.12; January 1936, pp. 1 and 12; *Advocate*, 8 September 1937, p.2.

\(^{167}\) *Advocate*, 8 September 1937, p.2.

\(^{168}\) *Church News*, October 1939, p.1.

\(^{169}\) The Oxford Group derived its name from a group of students meeting in 1928 at Oxford after hearing Buchman speak. The name ‘Oxford’ raised concern at Oxford University (*Church News*, July 1939, p.10) and was changed to Moral Re-Armament (MRA) in May 1938. (*The Times*, 3 June 1939, p.8.)


\(^{172}\) A strong advocate was the Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India, Burma and Ceylon, Right Reverend Foss Westcott (1863-1949), who toured Australia in 1936. (*Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners’ Advocate*, 19 June 1936, p.11.); *Church News*, March 1940, p.6.

and deriding its brash manner of presentation.\textsuperscript{174} In Tasmania, the Church News gave credence to its message and warned critics that such an organisation could be a valuable adjunct to the ‘Recall to Religion’ campaign, given that their purposes were very similar.\textsuperscript{175}

The ‘Recall to Religion’ and the Oxford Group’s teaching merged together in the Moral and Spiritual Rearmament Movement. Whatever its critics within the Anglican Church thought, both groups were preaching the same principles and even using the same descriptive terms but using different methods. By 1939, the Church believed that the aggressive nations – Germany, Italy and Japan, were acting amorally.\textsuperscript{176} They were spurred on by greed and self-aggrandisement, a situation which the Christian nations of Britain, France and America had, upon reflection, allowed to develop throughout the 1930s.\textsuperscript{177} In August 1939 the Hobart Protestant Churches participated in a rally of 800 people, lead by Bishop Hay through the streets of Hobart, which culminated in a meeting at the Town Hall.\textsuperscript{178} A number of different speakers from different denominations urged members of the local churches to find different ways to revitalise spiritually their Christian faith. This could be through a series of sermons, prayer days or special services to rediscover the Christian values of honesty, faith and love.\textsuperscript{179}

Anglicans were instructed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to launch a fresh crusade, ‘Recall to God’, in order to bring about the Moral and Spiritual Rearmament

\textsuperscript{174} Church News, July 1939, pp.10-11; October 1938, p.1.
\textsuperscript{175} Church News, July 1939, p.11.
\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., September 1939, p.10; Synodal Address of 1939, p.A.
\textsuperscript{177} Synodal Address of 1938, p. A; Church News, April 1938, p.1; September 1939, p.10.
\textsuperscript{178} Mercury, 17 August 1939, p.2; Church News, August 1939, p.2.
\textsuperscript{179} Mercury, 17 August 1939, p.2; Church News, June 1939, p.1; July 1939, p.11.
of the nation.\textsuperscript{180} Holy Trinity parishioners were urged to participate in the 1939 public rally\textsuperscript{181} and Reverend Donald Blackwood, now Rector of Holy Trinity, held separate services for all groups—men (Church Wardens, Vestrymen, Sidesmen), women (Mothers’ Union) and children (Sunday School Teachers, Communicant Scholars)—working within Trinity Parish, whereby they could publicly profess their revitalised faith.\textsuperscript{182} Bishop Hay toured the state, holding public meetings and taking smaller groups for spiritual counsel.\textsuperscript{183} Like the Oxford Group, which had been renamed Moral Re-Armament (MRA) in May 1938,\textsuperscript{184} the Bishop believed that societal change for the better, which he called the ‘New Order’, had to come from the individual first.\textsuperscript{185} The benefits for the management of public institutions and governance at all levels would naturally flow from that base.\textsuperscript{186}

**Military Chaplains**

The second contribution of the Church to the war came with the immediate call to mobilise the troops. The Anglican military chaplain, Padre William Reeve, was able to report immediately with the Tasmanian contingent to set up a temporary training camp at the base of Mt Nelson (Fort Nelson), in challenging physical conditions which tested the men’s endurance—cold, wind, snow, rain and mud in abundance.\textsuperscript{187} The local churches rallied and assisted with material comforts not supplied by the army—

\textsuperscript{180} Church News, November 1938, p.1; Mercury, 4 July 1938, p.8; 15 August 1938, p.3; Barrett, History of the Church of England in Tasmania, p.91.
\textsuperscript{181} Holy Trinity Parish Magazine, September 1939, n.p.
\textsuperscript{182} Holy Trinity Parish Magazine, August 1939, n.p.
\textsuperscript{183} Church News, October 1938, p.1; December 1938, p.1; Synodal Address of 1939, p. A.
\textsuperscript{184} Church News, August 1939, p.6.
\textsuperscript{186} Ibid., November 1937, p.11.
\textsuperscript{187} Church News, May 1940, p.2.
books, personal comforts and the provision of hot coffee for the soldiers on ‘ceaseless guard over ... security points.’ Concerts were organised in the local church hall on Saturday nights and the men attended Divine Service on Sundays.

**Church Huts: Synod Hall and Brighton**

A major contribution to the pastoral care of the troops in Hobart in this war was the setting up of a Recreational ‘Hut’ for men of the navy and army who were off duty. The idea for this Hut was conceived by the Trinity branch of CEMS, led by its President, William Michael. The Hut was set up in Synod Hall in Harrington Street through the courtesy of the Dean and Chapter of St David’s Cathedral. St Andrew’s Cathedral in Sydney and St Paul’s Cathedral in Melbourne set up similar Huts in their church grounds early in the war. The Hobart Hut had a canteen which was open every day between 6-9.30pm. Each night, women from the city and suburban parishes, including Holy Trinity, were rostered to supply suppers which were served to the men by members of VAD. By the end of the war, 80 000 free suppers had been supplied to the troops during this time when restrictions on foodstuffs were being implemented. The Hut was particularly welcome to men from rural areas, as a place
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where they could enjoy companionship of fellow servicemen, play games such as billiards or backgammon, listen to music, have sing-a-longs or write letters.  

The Church also played a significant role in the pastoral care of the new recruits. By the time the Second AIF was deployed overseas, a Tasmanian military chaplain, Reverend Charles Mitchell, a veteran of World War 1, had been appointed to travel with the men, leaving Australia on 10 January 1940. Mitchell served with the 2/2nd AIF AGH at El Kantara in Egypt until 1943. Other Anglican clergy, who served as military chaplains, were Reverends Harry Shepherd, James Cloudsdale, Albert Thompson and John May, the latter two being taken as POWs by the Japanese. Holy Trinity’s Rector, Donald Blackwood, offered himself again as a military chaplain for overseas service or in military camp, despite his still suffering from the effects of mustard gas on the Western Front in the Great War. (See Fig. 53) The Anglican army chaplain, Reverend Reeve, the only chaplain of any denomination resident at the Brighton Army Camp, worked under difficult conditions in the early months of the war. There was no building provided for his work: Holy Communion was celebrated in a borrowed hut with a portable altar perched on some boxes. Interviews with the troops were in his own tent and there were no facilities for Bible Study or private devotions.

Mindful of the shortfall in facilities, Bishop Hay launched an appeal to the diocese to
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construct a Church Hut at Brighton Camp in 1940. The cost was estimated at £400 and would serve as a recreation Hut for men to read or write undisturbed as well as having a Chaplain’s room where the men could meet with the Padre and discuss their spiritual problems.\textsuperscript{202} By September 1940, the hut had been erected.\textsuperscript{203} In order to maintain funding for the ‘good work in the interests of our soldiers’, Bishop Hay set up the Church of England Guild of Soldiers’ Friends in July 1940. He hoped that each parish would have its own branch with an annual subscription of 2/6d per person.\textsuperscript{204} Records show that Holy Trinity supported the Guild and contributed and annual subscription of

\textsuperscript{202} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{203} Ibid., September 1940, Synodal Address of 1940, p.C.
\textsuperscript{204} Church News, October 1940, p.1.
Australian Comforts Fund: Holy Trinity Branch

The Anglican Church was also very active on the home front in other areas. Bishop Hay believed that every man, woman and child should be able to contribute to the war effort in some way, ‘to the fullest extent in accordance with our ability and circumstances’, either by monetary donation or voluntary service. The Rector of Holy Trinity used his monthly letter to parishioners to encourage them to join the many voluntary organisations: Red Cross, VAD, St John’s Ambulance or the Australian Comforts Fund (ACF). The latter had many branches in Tasmania and was responsible for supplying ‘comfort’ items not issued by the Commonwealth Government to service men and women. These items included pyjamas, singlets, tobacco, cigarettes, toothpaste, tooth brush, razor blades, reading material (magazines and newspapers) and ‘housewives’ as well as knitted items such as socks, pullovers, balaclavas and sheepskin vests.

A Trinity Parish branch of ACF, which merged with the Mothers’ Union, was set up in August 1940. The ACF supplied wool and collected finished knitted items every two weeks. So industrious was the Trinity branch, they frequently asked for additional
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wool. As the war dragged into its third and fourth year, the women of the Holy Trinity ACF decided to knit additional garments, using wool which they had purchased, specifically for the men serving in the war from Trinity Parish. The motivation for this additional work, ‘a little remembrance and token of gratitude from fellow worshippers of Holy Trinity’, came from the publication of letters of thanks in the monthly *Holy Trinity Parish Magazine* from the parish servicemen serving in Europe and New Guinea. A common thread in these letters was the comfort felt by the men that members of the Parish had remembered them. In the first year of operation, 101 parcels were sent to the troops. At the same time, the Holy Trinity Dramatic Society (HTDS) took on the making of clothes for children evacuated from war zones and refugees fleeing conflict.

**Clergy as Exemplars of Service**

A strong Impetus for war service came from the personal example of the clergy themselves. There was no mistaking Donald Blackwood’s patriotic fervour in an impassioned article he wrote for *Church News* in February 1938 on his return from visiting Britain. Patriotism lifted a person ‘out of the narrow, selfish isolation of our family or parish or city.’ After the declaration of war, Blackwood encouraged his parishioners to support God, King and Country, not just in volunteering for the
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services or making munitions, but in understanding that the safety of the Empire
depended on them building up their moral and spiritual fibre.  

In practical terms, Blackwood showed the way forward by responding to a call up to do
military chaplain’s duties at ‘Mona Vale’, a military camp outside Ross in the north of
Tasmania. On his return, Blackwood was able to reassure parents of the troops that
their sons were well cared-for at the camp. In addition his two sons, Archie and Colin
were among the first to volunteer from the parish for overseas service. At a special
farewell church service, new recruits were given a pocket Testament to have with
them at the battle front. Again, Reverend Francis McCabe (1888-1961), who
succeeded Donald Blackwood as Rector, lost two sons in the war, Angus and Donald
and thought he had lost his third son when two radio operators in Smithton and New
Town independently intercepted a message stating that Graeme McCabe was being
held as a POW in Camp Osaka, Japan. A Roll of Honour was commenced, whereby
every name of a Trinity parishioner serving in the forces was entered and named in
weekly intercessions at the church on Thursday morning and evening. This action
was not only a comfort to parents, especially mothers, but also kept the sacrifice of
war constantly before the people left behind. In addition, Bishop Hay invited all
Christians to make intercessions at St David’s Cathedral, every Wednesday evening at 8
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pm" and King George VI nominated 26 May 1940 as a Day for Prayer for the Empire, the first of what was to become an annual event for the duration of the war.  

**War Loans Schemes**

The Church of England supported the many war loan schemes in Australia between 1939 and 1945. In September 1945, Bishop Geoffrey Cranswick (1894-1978) urged the people in his Tasmanian Diocese to subscribe to the latest Victory Loan (the 4th) as their ‘solemn obligation’ to raise funds to ‘finish the job’ and ‘defend the rights of those who have won ... freedom for us all.’ In July 1941, Trinity Parish’s Mission Church, St Margaret’s, commenced a War Savings Group for its congregation. Voluntary contributions were invited to raise the necessary 16/- to purchase a £1 certificate. After the war, the certificates could be cashed in and 'the money ... go towards some fund which will be used for extension work.' Thus, in contributing to this scheme, the parishioners could feel that they were ‘assisting the nation’s war effort and the church.’

With the entry of Japan into the war in 1941, the Prime Minister of Australia, John Curtin, made an impassioned plea to the Australian people for commitment in defending their native land. The Australian Government needed £200,000,000 to protect Australians. Using horrendous stories of torture and murder of Christian
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religious leaders in Nazi Germany, Curtin urged Australians to contribute to the two Victory Loans launched that year, ‘to make sacrifices for victory ... over an enemy which would stamp out freedom of religious worship here in Australia as [Hitler] has done in the occupied countries of the old world.’

**Contribution of Youth to the War Effort**

The youth in the parish also contributed to the war effort. The Girls’ Friendly Society (GFS) volunteered to do VAD duty,\textsuperscript{239} raised funds for the English Invalid Fund,\textsuperscript{240} Prisoners of War and Hostels for Women’s Services\textsuperscript{241} as well as making patchwork rugs for War Victims’ Relief.\textsuperscript{242} Every Anzac Day, during the war, the Scouts, Cubs, Brownies and Girl Guides, in uniform, attended a church parade at Holy Trinity, which was decorated with several symbols of remembrance: the flags of the British Empire and a bank of white flowers surrounding a red cross displayed in front of the war memorial window which was backlit for the occasion.\textsuperscript{243} A parishioner bugler, in uniform, sounded the ‘Last Post’ and ‘Reveille’, whilst the organist played the funeral anthem, ‘Dead March’.\textsuperscript{244} In 1945, a muffled peal of bells rang out over the city.\textsuperscript{245} From the parish, eleven soldiers were killed in action in World War 2\textsuperscript{246} and over 340 service men and women were in service.\textsuperscript{247}

\textsuperscript{238} Church News, October 1942, pp-6-7.
\textsuperscript{239} Holy Trinity Parish Magazine, September 1940, n.p.
\textsuperscript{240} Ibid., June 1941, n.p.
\textsuperscript{241} Ibid., June 1943, n.p.
\textsuperscript{242} Ibid., July 1945, n.p.
\textsuperscript{243} Ibid., May 1941, n.p.; May 1942, n.p.
\textsuperscript{244} ‘Dead March’ was written by George Frideric Handel, as part of Act 3 of the oratorio, Saul (1738).
\textsuperscript{245} Holy Trinity Parish Magazine, May 1945, n.p.
\textsuperscript{246} Max I. Crawford, Supplement to the Story of Trinity (Hobart, 1949), p.35.
Moral Re-Armament

According to Donald Blackwood and echoing the advice of the Primate of Australia,248 by far the most important contribution to the war was to maintain morale on the home front.249 The war was considered a righteous war against an agent of evil. The parishioners could redouble their resolve by living moral and spiritual lives themselves and applying the principles of justice, honour, freedom and fair play in their interactions with others. In the wider world, these principles applied to their ‘defence of weaker peoples and religious liberty for all.’250 Moral Re-Armament was encouraged by the rector in the early part of the war, even going so far as asserting that Hitler alone was not responsible for the outbreak of war, but every person was collectively responsible for the breakdown in leading personal moral lives.251 As Christians, ‘we could have won Germany after the Great War, by brotherhood and fellowship and helpfulness.’252 Had the Allied victors treated the Axis Powers better in the Treaty of Versailles by not being motivated by revenge on Germany who nursed ‘resentment and grievances’ over the following two decades, then this second world war would probably not have erupted.253

This idea of acting morally was voiced throughout the war254 and found expression in a joint statement at the end of the war with the Anglican, Roman Catholic and other Protestant Church leaders in Tasmania warning the victorious nations not to make the

248 Pastoral Letter from the Primate of Australia, Church News, October 1939, p.4.
250 Ibid., May 1940, n.p.
251 Ibid., December 1939, n.p.
252 Ibid.
253 Church News, April 1938, p.1; September 1938, Synodal Address of 1938, p.A; February 1943, p.3;
same mistakes as in World War 1. They regarded Germany’s brutality, violation of human rights and liberty and self-deification as ‘abnormal’ and therefore it behove all Christian churches to ensure that she be allowed to return to ‘good health’.

**Post War Rehabilitation**

After the war, the pastoral outreach did not cease. The thousands of veterans returning to civilian life needed ‘sympathy ... care and friendship.’ In his monthly letter to parishioners, Rector McCabe highlighted the particular challenges of coping with ‘nervous debilitation, the wounded, the shell-shocked [and] the limbless.’

Many ex-servicemen had left for the Front when they were eighteen or younger and now had ‘to try to fit into some totally new employment.’ The military chaplains were invited to address CEMS meetings to advise on the best way to rehabilitate the veterans. Reverend Bethune, the former Anglican military chaplain at Brighton Army Camp, gave timely advice about employment: there should be no dole system which only demoralised the recipient; shorter working hours would ensure full employment for a larger number of people; new industries, such as social services, health clinics, technical education, nursing and re-afforestation could be instituted; and commercial aviation and the maintenance of a standing army, air force and navy would absorb a large number in the workforce.

Holy Trinity Church arranged the first of its ‘Welcome Home Socials’ in February 1946 where the Rector and church officials
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formally welcomed the ex-service men and women with a dance, concert and a supper.  

**War Victims’ Relief Service**

The Church also reached out to the many millions of people in Europe and China, left destitute by the war. Francis McCabe encouraged the Trinity parishioners to embrace the work of the United Nations, operating since the 1 January 1942. In June 1945, two delegates were sent from the Comforts Club to a meeting of the War Victims’ Relief Service.  

The Trinity branch of ACF made a concentrated drive to collect warm clothing for men, women and children over July 1945. The oncoming winter in the northern hemisphere was forecast to be one of the most severe since the Seven Years’ War (1756-1763). A comprehensive list of items required was published in the parish magazine, including bedding, shoes, soap, remnants of cloth, mending wool, needles, pins, handkerchiefs, sock, stockings and writing materials. Six thousand articles were sorted, mended and pressed before sending them onto a central depot at Coogan’s Buildings in Elizabeth Street.  

In August 1945, the Comforts Club amalgamated with the Trinity Missionary Association to form a branch of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA). A second drive for more clothing was initiated in August 1946, aimed specifically at collecting clothing for 135 million people in China, of whom  
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many were children. Once again, Trinity Parish responded with generous donations of clothing, boots and mending materials. In addition, the Comforts Fund still continued to knit warm garments for the Australian servicemen, injured or unwell, who were returning to Tasmania. Although the ACF officially disbanded nationally in June 1946, Trinity’s Comforts Group continued to knit clothing for three Diocesan institutions—the Mission to Seamen, the House of Mercy and the Clarendon Children’s Home. Richard White, in his study of the effect of the war on Australian society, suggests that the many women involved in voluntary work during World War 2, ‘felt the loss’ of achievement and even power with the cessation of hostilities and therefore transferred their attention to other charities such as these women from Holy Trinity.

**Conclusions**

This chapter has given an account of the social role of the Church of England, and Holy Trinity Church in particular, to the three wars of the first half of the twentieth-century. The Church embraced the work and concern of the community of Hobart but transcended its care to those serving at the different fronts on the other side of the world. During the two world wars, the Church came unfairly under attack for not doing anything or enough. As the Church readily acknowledged, it did not publicise its work in relieving distress or providing comfort to the injured or the bereaved. Much of the beneficial work for service men and women was executed by the clergy, either as military chaplains at the fronts or in the military training camps. The many instances of
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keeping up of morale at home needed to be documented, as Reverend Blackwood claimed in 1942: ‘We must not drop our Church work and service. This is most important to our nation to provide spiritual ammunition and to keep up the morale of our people and our forces, as well as prepare for that New Order that we must help to establish ... now, as well as after the war.’ CEMS provided for recreation ‘Huts’ in Hobart, the military camps or on the battle fronts. The women of the parish contributed to the many Patriotic Funds, either financially or collecting items or making comforts for the service men and women. Prayer and intercessions were offered weekly for loved ones serving in the forces. These regular public meetings sustained the families, many of whom had received no information of the whereabouts or condition of their sons and daughters.

The hope of a ‘New Order’ for society at the end of the World War 2 was not realised, even though the Primate of Australia, Archbishop Henry Le Fanu (1870-1946), still held out hope for such a utopian-like existence, likening the six years of war to passing ‘through a cyclone.’ His list of problems, which must be overcome by post war society, included ongoing rivalry between nations, fear, starvation, industrial strikes, lawlessness, the ‘black market’, broken homes and broken marriages—all had a root cause, ‘a deep and widespread spiritual malaise’. From a moral perspective, society had not changed at all. Archbishop Le Fanu’s call in 1946 was an echo of the Moral Rearmament campaign, which had consumed the Church’s attention before the war in an attempt to avoid another world catastrophe.

\[274\] Church News, March 1946, p.9.
\[275\] Ibid.
Despite this, the Rector of Holy Trinity, Francis McCabe, who had lost two of his three sons in the recent war and the third had been a POW of the Japanese, saw that there was hope for a better and more secure future. He urged his parishioners to be ‘up and doing’, deepening their spiritual lives through attending a range of services, addresses, Bible Study classes and meetings organised by the Church. It was what the individual chose to do along these lines ‘that [would] help us and our fellows towards a better order.’

\footnote{Holy Trinity Parish Magazine, March 1946, n.p.}
CONCLUSION

This thesis has investigated the outreach of Holy Trinity Church to the Hobart community with a focus on the experiences and perspectives of the common people. The British historian, K.D.M. Snell’s recent studies on community have been useful in identifying several different meanings of ‘community’: the parish, the wider city or diocese and the interest in a world view or ‘globalised parochialism’.¹ Within these frameworks, Holy Trinity’s social role adjusted to meet the needs of a changing demographic between 1833 and 1945. The moral reform of the convict, the care of the vulnerable, support of the unemployed, protection of children, guidance to self-sufficiency and reassurance in time of war challenged the thinking and accepted norms of interaction of the Church with the common people. The Church could no longer base its response to those in need on the nineteenth-century premiss of ‘deserving’ or ‘undeserving’ philanthropy. A change in perspective, including the assistance of the laity, men and women, as well as an empathetic understanding of the needs of the people lead to the realisation that all the community would benefit if the vagrant, abandoned and destitute were acknowledged. This thesis has argued that these same people were some of the most disaffected by the Church and its clergy.² This only served to compound the challenge of effective outreach.

Findings and Implications

The pragmatic decision of Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur to build the first Trinity Church as both a chapel inside the penitentiary complex with solitary confinement cells beneath, as well as a second church for the growing number of free colonists, was made on two grounds—one to reform the convicts through religious instruction and two, to save the Imperial Government additional expense. The theory behind the idea seemed plausible at the time, but in practice, it did not take into account the repugnance felt by the free colonists in having to share their place of worship with convicts. The sight, sound and smell of the convicts clearly offended the delicate constitutions of the female worshippers, whose complaints finally lead to the colonists taking up worship temporarily in the small nearby Wesleyan Chapel until the new Trinity Church was finished.³

Philip Palmer made out a strong case for the new Trinity Church to be built because of the large number of ex-convicts not attending church and leading depraved lives. When seeking funds to finish the church in 1846, he appealed to the consciences of the British public to subscribe to the building fund, particularly as most of the inhabitants were the off castings of the British penal system. Moreover, the offspring of these ex-convicts should not grow up not knowing any religious principles.⁴ His appeal was successful, raising over £4,000 from a broad cross-section of British society including Archbishops, royalty, philanthropists as well as parishioners from many parishes throughout Britain.⁵

³ Palmer to Montagu, 3 June 1836, CSO1/1/804/17188, Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office (hereafter, TAHO).
⁴ Letter of Trinity Subscription Committee to Parishes in Britain, 29 January 1845, p.1. Holy Trinity Church Archives, (hereafter, HTCA).
⁵ Ibid.pp.3-4.
The prominent site and grand design of Holy Trinity destined it to be a significant building in the Hobart Community. Plans for a ‘cathedral’, filed with the plans for the church in Public Works Department documents, strongly suggest that this church was meant to have a grander function in the whole diocese. The purchase of a peal of eight bells, usually associated with cathedrals, also suggests the bigger plans of Philip Palmer. From the day of their arrival, Palmer assumed that they would be subsidised by the general population. Comments in the press and in personal diaries suggest that the bells were a welcome sound within the community, communicating important news such as the end of transportation or the death of Queen Victoria. Based on Alain Corbin’s theory of auditory sound in a nineteenth-century context, the bells had two functions: they gave a sense of identity to Hobart community within earshot of their sound and they provided a nostalgic reminder of a former life left behind in Britain.

The length of time taken to build Holy Trinity Church sealed its fate that it would never be the cathedral of the new See of Tasmania, raised in 1843. The many impediments that arose meant that it was eight years in its building. Although it was not a cathedral in name, in practice five out of seven of its clergy were canons of the cathedral and three were Archdeacons of the Diocese of Tasmania. The work of Holy Trinity clergy took them far beyond the demands of being rectors to a city parish. Their wider sphere of work brought with it exposure to initiatives
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of St David’s Cathedral such as the idea of setting up a Mission Hall for the poor, similar to the cathedral’s Mission Church in Wapping.\textsuperscript{11}

The mid-nineteenth century brought a convergence of events which had a significant impact on the church. The successful agitation for the end of transportation and the demand for responsible Government in the space of three years inspired the parishioners of Holy Trinity to agitate and petition first the Lieutenant-Governor, then the Bishop and finally the Privy Council in Britain for their right to choose their own chaplain.\textsuperscript{12} This crisis in the church’s history has not been documented in the only short chronicle of the Church’s history for two reasons: first, the episode was vitriolic and embarrassing for the Church because the problem was widely reported in the press; and second, the printed articles in the public domain were at times insulting for those at the centre of the controversy.\textsuperscript{13}

In a wider context, the episode raised the issue of Church-State powers in a colony in transition from a penal settlement under the authority of the Crown’s representative, to a free, self-governing colony with the separation of the powers of Church and State.\textsuperscript{14} The other outcome of Holy Trinity’s controversy was the realisation that those who derived their authority from the traditional trappings of British society, such as the Bishop and to a lesser extent the Lieutenant-Governor, could no longer demand unquestioning loyalty, respect or deference from the

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Church News}, 1 August 1885, p.521.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Courier}, 6 June 1853, p. 2 and 12 September 1853, p. 2; \textit{Colonial Times}, 15 October 1852, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Colonial Times}, 7 June 1853, p. 2; \textit{Launceston Examiner}, 23 June 1853, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Courier}, 8 September 1853, p. 2
common people.\textsuperscript{15} The people showed that they were prepared to fight for their cause in a very public way through the press and through their petitions.

A convergence of new ideas emanating from Britain, also took hold in the mid- nineteenth century. The idea of ‘self-help’, where thrift, perseverance and the importance of character could be encouraged among the poor, was supported by Bishop Bromby and applied by lay members of Holy Trinity.\textsuperscript{16} Penny banking, temperance, good hygiene and learning to sew were part of the laity’s contribution to better the lives of the parish’s poor. These activities grew to the degree that the single mission room in the slums of North Hobart expanded to become a Mission Hall by the end of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{17} This building became the centre for social activities for the immediate community as well as a place to worship or be baptised, married or buried, devoid of the often elaborate trappings of a traditional church.

Statistical analysis of the church’s Baptismal Registers and the Valuation Rolls for 1858 confirm that Holy Trinity’s immediate community was made up of the poor, either unskilled or semi-skilled labourers or ex-convicts. The empty coffers of the church meant that the indigent could not expect to receive cash or material assistance to ease their suffering. The combined operations of all the Protestant churches of Hobart in setting up a number of welfare agencies are proof that the churches could work together for the common good with none of the sectarianism which surfaced in the 1830s with the passage of the Church Act in 1837. The services rendered by the Hobart City Mission and the Hobart Benevolent Society were harsh, often degrading and insufficient. The significance of their work lay not in solving the problems

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Charles Bromby, \textit{Self Help} (Hobart, 1865).
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Church News}, 1 April 1896, p.451.
of pauperism in Hobart but in documenting the number of destitute people who lived in this city and how they lived from eye witness accounts.\textsuperscript{18}

The rescue work of the Church was more successful. Provision was made for vagrant children under the Industrial Schools Act to place them in homes where they would be cared for and taught a trade or domestic servant duties.\textsuperscript{19} For the free colonists, this had the advantage of training these youths to lead useful lives in the future and removing them from the streets where they caused concern for the local businessmen. Holy Trinity clergy and their wives devoted much time to these organisations for the benefit of the wider community, as well as attending to the business of the parish.

The rescue work of ‘fallen women’ and young girls ‘at risk’ occupied the wives of the Protestant clergy towards the end of the nineteenth century. A marked change in the attitude towards giving aid to prostitutes was evident in Hobart, particularly after the arrival of Maud Montgomery, whose energy and enlightened thinking challenged the conservative thinking of 1890s.\textsuperscript{20} With the aid of the other clergy wives, she was responsible for setting up a refuge for prostitutes in the belief that they could be reformed, while a home for unmarried mothers and their babies was relocated from Launceston to Hobart. The Church believed that these young women could be encouraged to lead more ‘wholesome’ lives by caring for their infants and learning skills for future employment.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Church News}, November 1891, p. 547.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Church News}, July 1892, p.694.
The care of poor women during their confinements was the central focus of the Maternal and Dorcas Society, but only to ‘deserving’ women. In middle class consciousness, this automatically precluded ex-convicts and those women co-habiting.\textsuperscript{22} The wives of clergy were responsible for the organisation of this Society, aided by women from the other Protestant denominations. Likewise, the Servants’ Home demonstrated the Church’s concern for newly-arrived migrant women seeking employment or domestic servants who were between placements.\textsuperscript{23} Because this outreach work was mostly silent, the extent of the rescue work in Hobart went largely unacknowledged, until the arrival of Bishop Montgomery in 1889.

In the twentieth-century, the Church played an active role within the Hobart community, supporting Britain in the Boer War and World Wars 1 and 2. Patriotism and a deep belief that all three wars were righteous, led the clergy to encourage enlistment of young men and women from the community, even conscription, volunteering their own services as military padres and sending their own sons to the front.\textsuperscript{24} Those left on the home front were exhorted to do their part: contributing to the Patriotic Funds, making and packing comfort parcels for the troops or assisting with the running of the Church Hut in Hobart city.\textsuperscript{25} The outbreak of the flu epidemic after World War 1 brought the Protestant clergy together to work co-operatively to address the problem of overcrowding and poor sanitation in the dilapidated housing in the immediate vicinity of Holy Trinity.

\textbf{Possibilities Future Research}

As this thesis has followed a thematic approach, there are a number of other themes which

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{The Report of the Maternal and Dorcas Society for 1855}, p. 8; and for 1877, p.6.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Hobart Town Daily Mercury}, 29 September 1858, p.2.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Church News}, July 1917, p. 3; \textit{Church News}, January 1944, p.9.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Holy Trinity Parish Magazine}, March 1940, n.p.
could be taken up in future research. One is the contribution of Holy Trinity to the cultural life of Hobart. Musical concerts, soirées, dramatic performances both in the church hall and in the Theatre Royal, parochial dinners, organ recitals, choral concerts and fund raising concerts all made the Church a central focus for entertainment in the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries.

Another possible theme could be the outreach to the international community, particularly to the Chinese in the Hobart community up to the end of the twentieth-century. This theme could include the commitment of the Church to missions overseas, sponsoring a number of missionaries from Trinity Parish in Africa, China and the Middle East. Support groups, including children, operated within the wider Church community to give aid (financial and material) to these missionaries. Reports of missionary activities appeared regularly in the *Holy Trinity Parish Magazine* and the *Church News*.

Another focus for research could be further statistical analysis of the church’s Baptismal, Marriage and Burial Records. I have only used the first to gain an insight into the degree of the poverty of the immediate community surrounding Holy Trinity. The records also give information on convicts still serving out their sentences but living within the community and ex-convicts by citing their convict number, their transport ship and date of arrival. Additional information for free colonists, includes occupations, addresses and their marital status.

**Conclusions**

This thesis has investigated a number of themes relating to the social role of the Church between 1833 and 1945. Throughout those hundred years, Holy Trinity has sought to improve
the lives of the people of Hobart: the reformation of the convict, the religious teaching of the ex-convict and the free colonists, the care of the poor, homes for vagrant children, refuges for prostitutes and homes single mothers and their babies. In the times of war, the Church showed unwavering loyalty to the Mother Country and encouraged the community to stand firm in times of adversity by enlisting and defending the honour of Britain or contributing on the home front to many charitable funds.

This study, with its focus on the needs of and responses to the common people, sits alongside institutional histories of the Church. The physical presence of a Church is an obvious attraction to the public, none more so than Holy Trinity’s imposing hill-top structure. However, it is the silent work of a Church’s outreach that goes largely unrecorded mainly because the Church is not in the business of advertising or boasting about its achievements. Holy Trinity’s changing community role has now received due recognition.
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Appendix A

Bishops of Tasmania (1842-1945)

Francis Russell Nixon 1842 —1863
Charles Henry Bromby 1864 —1882
Daniel Fox Sandford 1883—1889
Henry Hutchinson Montgomery 1889 —1901
John Edward Mercer 1902 —1914
Reginald Stephen 1914 —1919
Robert Snowdon Hay 1919 —1943
Geoffrey Franceys Cranswick 1944 —1945

Appendix B

Deans of St David’s Cathedral, Hobart (1872-1945)

Frederick Holdship Cox 1872-1874
Charles Henry Bromby 1874-1876
Henry Bodley Bromby 1876-1884
Charles Leslie Dundas 1885-1895
Joseph Bertram Kite 1898-1916
Robert Snowden Hay 1916-1919
Arthur Richard Rivers 1920-1941
Harold Percy Fewtrell 1942-1945
Appendix C

Rectors of Holy Trinity Church, North Hobart

Rev. Philip Palmer  1833—May 1853
Rev. Canon George Wood Shoobridge  July 1880—Sept. 1911
Rev. Richard Charles Nugent Kelly  Sept. 1911—April 1916
Ven. Archdeacon Henry Brune Atkinson  May 1916—June 1924
Ven. Archdeacon Donald Burns Blackwood  Sept. 1934—June 1942
Rev. Canon Francis Joseph McCabe  July 1942—Jan 1952

Appendix: D

Clergy of Holy Trinity Church who were Canons, Archdeacons or Bishops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>Canon</th>
<th>Archdeacon</th>
<th>Bishop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip Palmer  (1833-1853)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Davenport  (1854-1880)</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>February 1880</td>
<td>Commissary for the Bishop 1880-1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shoobridge  (1880-1911)</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Kelly  (1911-1916)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Atkinson  (1916-1924)</td>
<td>January 1924</td>
<td>• Darwin (1924-28) • Combined Darwin and Launceston 1928</td>
<td>Vicar-General &amp; Administrator of Diocese September 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Blackwood  (1934-1942)</td>
<td>April 1925</td>
<td>December 1929</td>
<td>Gippsland (Victoria) 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis McCabe  (1942-1952)</td>
<td>June 1944</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E

**Range of Occupations of Parents Presenting their Children for Baptism at Holy Trinity Church 1850-1875**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountant</th>
<th>Chemist</th>
<th>Fireman</th>
<th>Messenger</th>
<th>Shipwright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>Stonemason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Manager</td>
<td>Coachmaker</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Overseer</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket maker</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>Stowerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>Painter and Glazier</td>
<td>Superintendent (Convict Dept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Builder</td>
<td>Compositor</td>
<td>Hatter</td>
<td>Plasterer</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatman</td>
<td>Confectioner</td>
<td>Hawker</td>
<td>Post master (Hobart Town)</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Seller</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>Horse Dealer</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootmaker</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Immigration Agent</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Timber Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Ironsmith</td>
<td>Quarryman</td>
<td>Tinman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Sailmaker</td>
<td>Tradesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmaker</td>
<td>Dairyman</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Sailor</td>
<td>Upholsterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Dealer</td>
<td>Licensed Victualler</td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>Waterman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>Lime Burner</td>
<td>School Master</td>
<td>Wheelwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Maker</td>
<td>Domestic Servant</td>
<td>Maltser</td>
<td>Seaman</td>
<td>Wool Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabman</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>Yeoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Drayman</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Master Mariner</td>
<td>Ship Chandler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Shpping Agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Baptismal Records of Holy Trinity Church (NS349/1 TAHO)*
## Appendix F

### Nicholas-Shergold Skill Classification (Raw Scores)

#### Trinity Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1845</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1865</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 (Urban Unskilled)</strong></td>
<td>Hawker, Labourer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 (Rural Unskilled)</strong></td>
<td>Dairyman</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 (Construction, skilled or semi-skilled)</strong></td>
<td>Bricklayer, Brickmaker, Builder, Carpenter, Glazier, Mason, Painter, Plasterer, Sawyer, Stone Mason</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 (Manufacturing or Transport, skilled or unskilled)</strong></td>
<td>Baker, Basket Maker, Blacksmith, Boatbuilder, Boatman, Boatbuilder, Bookbinder, Bootmaker, Brewer, Butcher, Cabinet Maker, Cabman, Carrier, Chemist, Coachmaker, Coachman, Compositor, Confectioner, Drayman, Engineer, Fireman, Fireman, Hatter, Ironsmith, Maltster, Messenger, Miller, Miner, Overseer,</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Occupation(s)</td>
<td>5 (Primary Producers Skilled/Unskilled)</td>
<td>6 (Dealers)</td>
<td>7 (Public Service)</td>
<td>8 (Professional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarryman, Sailmaker, Ship Chandler, Shipwright, Shoemaker, Tailor, Tinman, Upholsterer, Wheelwright</td>
<td>31% 21% 28% 14% 23% 41% 26%</td>
<td>7 4 12 5 4 2 5 14% 9% 13% 10% 11% 6% 11%</td>
<td>4 1 6 3 2 2 ---</td>
<td>5 6 8 3 7 9 4 1 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Primary Producers Skilled/Unskilled)</td>
<td>Farmer, Fisherman, Gardener, Yeoman</td>
<td>7 4 12 5 4 2 5 14% 9% 13% 10% 11% 6% 11%</td>
<td>4 1 6 3 2 2 ---</td>
<td>5 6 8 3 7 9 4 1 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Dealers)</td>
<td>Bookseller, Commission Agent, Contractor, Dealer, Draper, Greengrocer, Grocer, Ironmonger, Licensed Victualler, Livestock Dealer, Shopkeeper, Storeman, Tallow Chandler, Timber Merchant, Tradesman</td>
<td>8% 2% 6% 6% 6% 6% ---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Public Service)</td>
<td>Mariner, Master Mariner, Sailor, Seaman</td>
<td>---- 6 8 5 5 5 6 14% 8% 10% 14% 16% 13%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5 6 8 3 7 9 4 1 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Professional)</td>
<td>Accountant, Artist, Bank Manager, Clergyman, Clerk, Constable, Immigration Agent Merchant, Musician, Post Master,</td>
<td>5 3 7 9 4 1 12</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10% 7% 7% 18% 11% 3% 26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor of Music, School Master, Sexton, Surgeon, Superintendent (Convict Dept.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Domestic Service)</td>
<td>Cook, Servant, Groom,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (Private Means)</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Nicholas-Shergold Skill Classification\(^1\) has been used as it gives a more realistic and detailed reading of urban society in Hobart Town, 1845 to 1875, rather than using the Tasmanian Government’s classification which was used in the annual ‘Blue Books’. As part of Trinity Parish boundary abutted onto rural land, a classification had to include rural workers as well as urban. I have had to add another ‘skill’ (No. 10) to the original classification as there was no provision for a colonist with ‘private means.’ Likewise those who were in ‘Government Employment’ ie Convicts ‘freed by servitude’ or ‘ticket of leave’ and ‘objects of charity’ have been included in No. 1.

## Appendix G

**Public Houses in Trinity Parish 1850-1900 (See Fig. 63)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murray Street</th>
<th>Argyle Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The White Conduit House Inn</td>
<td>23 Duke of York Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Birmingham Arms</td>
<td>24 Ocean Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sir John Franklin Hotel</td>
<td>25 Black Swan Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Holyrood House Hotel</td>
<td>26 Fountain Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Waratah Hotel</td>
<td>27 Calcutta Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Freemason’s Arms</td>
<td>28 Man O’War Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sawyers’ Arms</td>
<td>29 Butchers’ Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sir Thomas Brisbane Inn</td>
<td>30 Good Woman Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Crescent Hotel</td>
<td>31 City of Norwich + brewery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 The Angel Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elizabeth Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>Campbell Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Oddfellow Inn</td>
<td>33 Flemington Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lord Raglan Inn</td>
<td>34 Waggon and Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Caledonian Hotel</td>
<td>35 Golden Fleece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The Lame Horse Inn</td>
<td>36 Royal Exchange Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Empire Hotel</td>
<td>37 Tasmanian Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dallas Arms Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Queen’s Head Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Eagle Hawk Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sir William Don</td>
<td>40 Ye Olde Commodore Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Harvest Home Hotel</td>
<td>41 York Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Crown and Kettle Inn</td>
<td>42 Royal Navy Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 The Canterbury Inn</td>
<td>43 The Lamb Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 The Royal Standard</td>
<td>44 The Jolly Scotchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Marquis of Hastings Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harrington Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Duke of Leinster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Woodpecker Inn</td>
<td>46 Park Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Devonshire Arms*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two public houses had this name.
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CSO1/1/804  General Correspondence Records 1824 to 1836.

CSO1/1/850  General Correspondence Records 1824 to 1836.

CSO1/1/888  General Correspondence Records 1824 to 1836.

CSO5/1/170  General Correspondence Records 1837 to 1841.

CSO8/1/8  Correspondence, ‘Civil Branch’ 1841 to 1845.

CSO8/1/123  Correspondence, ‘Civil Branch’ 1841 to 1845.

CSO14/1/100 Miscellaneous Correspondence 1 January 1842-31 December 1847.

CSO 85/1/1  Letterbook of Correspondence Addressed to Rev. Philip Palmer, Rural Dean of Van Diemen’s Land 27 December 1833-7 March 1838.

Convict Department

CON 22/1  Comprehensive Registers of Convicts January 1804-31 December 1853.

CON 23/1/1  Alphabetical Register of Male Convicts, January 1804-20 June 1840.

CON31/1/5  Conduct Registers of Male Convicts arriving in the period of the Assignment System, 1 July 1832-31 October 1835.

CON31/1/6  Convict Registers of Male Convicts arriving in the Convict Period of the Assignment System, 1 January 1801-31 December 1843.

CON45/1/1  Alphabetical Register of Applications for Indulgences, November 1831-May 1832.

Executive Council

EC4/1/3  Minutes of Proceedings of Executive Council 1833 to 1836.

Governor’s Office

GO 33/1/14  Governor’s Duplicate Despatches received by the Colonial Office July 1833 to September 1833.
GO 33/1/58 Governor’s Duplicate Despatches received by the Colonial Office May 1847 to July 1847.

Marine Board of Hobart

MB2/39/1/18 Reports of Ships’ Arrivals with Lists of Passengers 16 April 1854- March 1855.

Public Works Department


PWD 266/1/316 Plan- St David’s Church, Hobart Town. Architect, J.Lee Archer. 1 January 1828 to 31 December 1828.

PWD 266/1/324 Plan- St David’s Church, Hobart Town-altering and enlarging. Architect, J. Lee Archer. 14 June 1830.

PWD 266/1/336 Plan-Trinity Church (first), Hobart – Proposed entrance. Architect J. Lee Archer. 1 January 1833 to 31 December 1833.

B Private

I) HOLY TRINITY CHURCH ARCHIVES

Brotherhood of St Andrew’s Papers, October-November 1893.


Hobart Bellringers’ Association Minutes and Dates, 1897-1963.

Hobart Town Trinity Ringers Guild Minutes, 1876-1884.


Juvenile Industrial and Floral Society, 1894.

Letter of Bishop Nixon to Parishes in Britain, 20 January 1845.

Letter of Trinity Subscription Committee to Parishes in Britain, 29 January 1845.

List of Subscribers in Britain to the Trinity Building Fund.

Map of Trinity Burial Ground, Campbell Street, Hobart.


Minutes of the Church of England Men’s Society, Holy Trinity Branch, 1932-1944.
Minutes of Vestry Meetings at Holy Trinity Church 1848-1902.

*Mothers’ Union Service Book* (Westminster, n.d.).

Palmer Letter Book, 24 February 1849-3 June 1851.

Parish Roll of Parishioners attending Holy Trinity Church, 1897 and 1898.

Trinity Mothers’ Society Accounts, Expenditure for 1872.

II) MITCHELL LIBRARY, NSW

A2161-A2220/1 George Arthur Papers 1821-1855.

A76 Reverend William Bedford Papers, 1823-1843.

iii) TASMANIAN ARCHIVE AND HERITAGE OFFICE

Non-State Records


NS 3 Correspondence and Associated Papers of Bishop F.R. Nixon.

NS 76 Orpheus Choir: Scrapbooks containing newspaper clippings, concert programs etc, 1 January 1877-31 December 1978.

NS 144/3 Davenport Papers.

NS 144/2 Diaries of Davenport Family.

NS 179/1 Notes on Churches in Southern Tasmania by Linda Monks 1 January 1930-31 December 1960.

NS 349/1/1 Anglican Parish of Holy Trinity, Hobart: Register of Baptisms 31 October 1833-28 October 1885.

NS 349/1/2 Anglican Parish of Holy Trinity, Hobart: Register of Baptisms 28 October 1833-5 January 1900.

NS 349/1/29 Anglican Parish of Holy Trinity, Hobart: Register of Burials 8 November 1833-218 October 1865.

NS 656/1/75 Original List of Subscribers to the Fund for the Erection of St John’s New Town, 1830.

NS 742 Family Papers of Donald Blackwood and Ida Pitt, 1 January 1895-25 June 1967.

NS 1637/1/1 Minutes of Executive Meetings of the Hobart Town Benevolent Society 28 October 1859-28 December 1871.

NS 1637/1/2 Minutes of Executive Meetings of the Hobart Town Benevolent Society 9 January 1872-11 October 1887.

NS 1637/1/3 Minutes of Executive Meetings of the Hobart Town Benevolent Society 5 January 1888-26 March 1903.

IV) UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA ARCHIVES

a) University of Tasmania Special and Rare Materials Collections

Boyes, G.T.W.B., Diary 28 February 1833-1 June 1835 (unpublished).


G3 Girls’ Industrial School of Hobart 1862-1945.

G3/1/1-11 Minutes of Management Committee: June 1862- February 1945.

G3/4 Admission Registers: 1864-1895.

G3/7 Hobart Town Industrial School for Girls, Annual Reports and Regulations, 1865-6—1893.

G3/9 Photograph of Industrial School, Barrack Square (1883).

G31/1 Hobart Town Female Refuge Association, 1862.

G31/1/1 Minutes of the Hobart Town Female Refuge Association, 6 June 1862.

b) Royal Society of Tasmania Library Collection

RS1 Maternal and Dorcas Society of Hobart.

RS1/1 Correspondence: 1848-1928.


RS1/3 List of Cases: 1884-1887.
2 PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

A ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

Britain

58 George III, c.43  Church Building Act 1818.
4 George IV, c. 64  Gaol Act 1823.
5 George IV, c. 83 Vagrancy Act 1824.
5 George IV, c.103 Church Building Act 1824.
9 Geo. IV, c. 17 Sacramental Test Act 1828.
10 Geo. IV, c.7 Roman Catholic Relief Act 1829.
2 and 3 Wm. IV, c.45 Representation of the People Act 1832.
2 and 3 Wm. IV, c.65 Representation of the People (Scotland) Act 1832.
2 and 3 Wm. IV, c.88 Representation of the People (Ireland) Act 1832.
17 and 18 Victoria, c. 74 Reformatory Schools (Scotland) Act 1854.

New South Wales

7 Wm IV, No.3 Church Building Act 1836

Tasmania

4 William IV, No. 6  An Act for Applying Certain Sums arising from the Revenue Receivable in Van Diemen’s Land  1833.

6 William IV, No.9  An Act for the General Appropriation of the Revenue for the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty Six.

1 Victoria, No.16  Church Extension Act 1837.
42 Victoria, No. 36, 43 Victoria, No. 5 and 45 Victoria, No. 23 *Contagious Disease Acts, 1879.*

27 Victoria, No. 24 *The Industrial Schools Act, 1863.*

31 Victoria, No. 36 *The Training Schools Act, 1867.*

31 Victoria, No. 37 *The Industrial Schools Act, 1867.*

32 Victoria, No. 14 *The Public Schools Act, 1868.*

10 George V, No. 39 *The Homes Act, 1919.*

**B GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS**


*Historical Records of Australia Series I, Volume x, Governors’ Despatches to and from England (January 1819 – December 1822),* Frederick Watson (ed.), (Sydney, 1917).

*Historical Records of Australia Series I, Volume xviii, Governors’ Despatches to and from England (July 1835-June 1837),* Frederick Watson (ed.), (Sydney, 1919).


*Historical Records of Australia Series III, Despatches and Papers relating to the Settlement of the State, Vol. iii, Tasmania: January—December 1820,* Frederick Watson (ed.), (Sydney, 1921).


*Historical Records of Australia Series III, Despatches and Papers relating to the Settlement of the State, Vol. v, Tasmania: December, 1825—March, 1827; Northern Territory, 1823—1827; Western Port, Victoria, 1826—1827,* Frederick Watson (ed.), (Sydney, 1922).


Montagu, John, Statistical Returns of Van Diemen’s Land from 1824 to 1835 during the Administration of Colonel Arthur from the Official Records (Hobart, 1836).

Statistics of the Colony of Tasmania for the Year 1859, 1868.

Valuation Roll of Hobart 1858, 1869, 1881.

C  PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS

Britain


Tasmania


House of Assembly Journal, Select Committee on Immigration, No. 150, Vol. VI, 1861.

House of Assembly Journal, Petition No. 1 Reformatories, Vol. VIII, No. 19, 1862.

House of Assembly Journal, Petition from Inhabitants of Hobart Town in favour of Reformatory Bill, Vol. XII, No.37, 1865.

House of Assembly Journal, Contagious Diseases Correspondence, Vol. XXXVII, No.33, 1879.


D NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

Australia

Argus (Victoria)

Australasian

Australasian Sketcher with Pen and Pencil

Austral-Asiatic Review

Australian Church Record

Australian Women’s Weekly
Australian Worker
Church Chronicle
Church of England Record (Adelaide)
Church of England Record (Brisbane)
Church of England Messenger
Church Sentinel
Brisbane Courier
Catholic Freeman’s Journal
Church News
Clipper
Colonial Times
Cornwall Chronicle
Courier
Examiner
Grenfell Record and Lachlan District Advertiser
Hobarton Mercury
Hobart Town Advertiser
Hobart Town Courier
Hobart Town Daily Mercury
Hobart Town Gazette
Hobart Town Gazette and Van Diemen’s Land Advertiser
Illustrated Tasmanian Mail
Launceston Examiner
Mercury
Mercury and Weekly Courier (Victoria)
Newcastle Herald and Miners’ Advocate
Petersburg Times
Tasmanian Church Chronicle
Tasmanian Mail
Tasmanian Times
Tasmanian Tribune
Tribune
South Australian Gazette
South Australian Register
Sydney Morning Herald
Western Argus (WA)
Zeehan and Dundas Herald

Britain
Caledonian Mercury
Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal
3 WORKS OF REFERENCE


*Cable Clerical Index of clergy who served in the Anglican Church of Australia from 26 January 1788 through to those ordained or serving by 31 December 1961.*

*Cyclopaedia of Tasmania, Vols. I and II* (Hobart, 1900).


*Hobart Town Almanack and Van Diemen’s Land Annual, 1836.*

*Hobart Town Directory 1853* (Hobart, 1853).


Melville, Henry (ed.),  *Van Diemen’s Land Annual for the Year 1834* (Hobart, 1834).

Ross, James (complier),  *The Hobart Town Almanack for the Year 1833* (Hobart 1834).

*The Van Diemen’s Land Anniversary and Hobart Town for the Year Almanack 1831* (Hobart, 1831).

*Walch’s Almanac 1882* (Hobart, 1882).

*Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1853* (Hobart, 1853).

4 BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND ANNUAL REPORTS

*Annual Report of the Benevolent Society of Hobart Town (1869-1890).*


Arthur, George, Observations upon Secondary Punishment (Hobart, 1833).

Backhouse, James, A Narrative of a Visit to the Australian Colonies (London, 1833).


Bennett, Allan A., St George’s Battery Point, Hobart (Hobart, 1938).

Betts, Captain T., An Account of the Colony of Van Diemen’s Land, principally intended for the use of persons residing in India (Calcutta, 1830).

Bischoff, J., Sketch of the History of Van Diemen’s Land (London, 1832).

Bingham, Joseph, Antiquities of the Christian Church, 10 Volumes (Oxford, 1708-1722).

Bowden, Frank and Crawford, Max, The Story of Trinity (Hobart, 1933).

Bromby, Charles, Self Help (Hobart, 1865).

Bufton, John, Tasmanians in the Transvaal War (Launceston, 1905).

Cambridge Camden Society, A Few Words to Church Builders (Cambridge, 1841).

Church of England, Province of Australasia, Minutes of proceedings at a meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops of the Province of Australasia: held in Sydney from October 1st to November 1st, A.D. 1850 (Sydney, 1850).

Cockburn, F.J., Letters from the Southern Hemisphere (Calcutta, 1856).


Curr, Edward, Account of the Colony of Van Diemen’s Land, principally designed for the use of Emigrants (London 1824).

Davenport, Arthur, A Sermon preached on the Feast of St Barnabas, 1851 (Hobart Town, 1851).

Davenport, Arthur, Report upon the Parochial Schools within the Archdeaconry of Hobart Town (Hobart Town, 1849).
Dixon, James, *Narrative of A Voyage to New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land in The Ship Skelton during the Year 1820* (Edinburgh, 1822).

Evans, George W., *Geographical, Historical and Topographical description of Van Diemen’s Land with important hints to Emigrants* (London, 1822).

Fawcett, Joshua (ed.), *The Village Churchman for the Year of our Lord, 1840* (London, 1840).

Fenton, James, *A History of Tasmania* (Hobart, 1978). (First published 1884)


Medland, J.G., *A Farewell Sermon preached at St George’s Church Hobart Town by Rev. J.G. Medland on Sunday Evening October 8 1854* (Hobart, 1854).

Miller, Linus, *Notes of an Exile to Van Diemen’s Land* (New York, 1846).

Nixon, Francis Russell, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania at the Primary Visitation in the Cathedral Church of St David, Hobart Town on Thursday the 23rd April 1846* (Hobart Town, 1846).

Nixon, Francis Russell, *A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania, at visitation, held in the Cathedral Church of At David, Hobart Town, on Thursday, 22 May, 1851* (Hobart Town, 1851).


Roberts, Reverend John, *A Mirror of Religion and Society in Tasmania during the Years 1857 and 1858* (Hobart Town, 1858).


Smiles, Samuel, *Thrift* (Chicago, 1890).

Smiles, Samuel, *Self Help with Illustrations of Character and Conduct* (Boston, 1861).

*Solemn Declaration of Ministers of the Church of England in Van Diemen’s Land, on the Present Condition of the Church in that Colony, 1851* (Hobart Town, 1851).


West, John, *The History of Tasmania* (Melbourne, 1981). (First published in Launceston, 1852.)

Widowson, Henry, *Present State of Van Diemen’s Land; comprising an account of its agricultural capabilities, with observations on the present state of farming etc. pursued in that colony: and other important matters connected with Emigration* (London 1829).


5 PERIODICAL ARTICLES


**SECONDARY MATERIALS**

1 **ONLINE BIOGRAPHICAL RESOURCES**

i) **Australian Dictionary of Biography online**


**ii) Design and Art Australia Online**


**iii) Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online**


Scotland, Nigel, ‘Sumner, John Bird (1780–1862)’,
Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,
Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,
Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011

2 WORKS OF REFERENCE

Alexander, Alison (ed.), The Companion to Tasmanian History
http://www.utas.edu.au/library/companion_to_tasmanian_history/

Aplin, Graeme, Foster, S.G. and McKernan, Michael, Australians: a historical dictionary
(Sydney, 1987).


Australians at War https://www.awm.gov.au/atwar/

Australian Studies Resources via SETIS http://setis.library.usyd.edu.au/oztexts/


Borchardt, D.H., Checklist of Royal Commissions, Select committees of Parliament and

Cable Clerical Index of Clergy who served in the Anglican Church of Australia from 26 January 1788
through to those ordained or serving by 31 December 1961, on line


Catalogue of British Papers in the Irish University Press 1000-Volume Series and Area Studies
Series, 1801-1900 (Dublin, 1977).

Checklist of British Parliamentary Papers in the Irish University Press 1000-Volume Series,
1801-1900 (Shannon, 1972).

Davidson, Graeme, Hirst, John and McIntyre, Stuart (eds.), Oxford Companion to Australian
History (South Melbourne, 2001).

Eldershaw, P.R., Guide to the Public Records of Tasmania, Section One: Colonial Secretary’s
Office (Hobart, 1988).
Eldershaw, P.R., *Guide to the Public Records of Tasmania, Section Two: Governor’s Office* (Hobart, 2000).


*Index of British Parliamentary Papers on Australia and New Zealand, 1800-1899* (Dublin, 1974).


3 BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, CHAPTERS AND ANNUAL REPORTS

Adam-Smith, Patsy and Woodberry, Joan, *Historic Tasmania Sketchbook* (Hong Kong, 1977).


Bell Ringing in Hobart


Border, Ross, *Church and State In Australia 1788-1872* (London, 1982).

Boyce, James, *Van Diemen’s Land* (Melbourne, 2009).


Castles, Alex, *An Australian Legal History* (Sydney, 1982).


Corbin, Alain, *Village Bells* (New York, 1994).


Daniels, Kay, *Convict Women* (Sydney, 1998).

Daniels, Kay, ‘Prostitution in Tasmania during the transition from penal settlement to ‘civilized’ society’, in Daniels, Kay (ed.), *So Much Hard Work* (Sydney, 1984), pp. 15-86.


Davis, Richard and Petrow, Stefan (eds.), *Varieties of Vice-Regal Life* (Van Diemen’s Land Section, (Hobart, 2004).


Fletcher, Brian H., *The Place of Anglicanism in Australia: Church, Society and Nation* (Mulgrave, 2008).


Grocott, Allan M., *Convicts, Clergymen and Churches: Attitudes to Convicts and Ex-convicts towards the Churches and Clergy in New South Wales from 1788 to 1851* (Sydney, 1980).


*Holy Bible* (King James’ Version) [London, 1938].


Hutchinson, Mark and Campion, Edmund (eds.), *Re-Visioning Australian Colonial History: New Essays in the Australian Christian Experience 1788-1900* (Sydney, 1994).


Kaye, Bruce (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia* (Melbourne, 2002).


Lake, Marilyn and Reynolds, Henry, *What’s Wrong with Anzac?: The Militarisation of Australian History* (Sydney, 2010).


McKernan, Michael, *Australian Churches at War: Attitudes and Activities of the Major Churches 19114-1918* (Canberra, 1980).


McLeod, Hugh, *Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City* (London 1974).


Meidl, E., *A Donation to the Colony: The epic voyage on the Hannah of German and British free settlers and their contribution to Van Diemen’s Land* (Lindisfarne, 2004).


*Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 6.0, 01 February 2012), May 1833, trial of JAMES BLACKBURN (t18330516-10), accessed 1 January 2012.


Pettet, Helen and Doggett, Anne, *The Bells are Ringing! A Celebration of Melbourne Life through the Story of her Bells* (Melbourne, 2001).


Purtscher, Joyce, *Tasmanian Industrial Schools and Reformatories* (New Town (Tas), 1994).


Reid, Kirsty, *Gender, Crime and Empire: Convict Settlers and the State in Early Colonial Australia* (Manchester, 2007).


Russell, Penny, *Savage or Civilised? Manners in Colonial Australia* (Sydney, 2010).


‘The Captain’, *In Old Days and These and Other Stories* (Hobart, 1930).


Thompson, Roger C., *Religion in Australia* (Melbourne, 2002).


Withycombe, Robert, Montgomery of Tasmania: Henry and Maud Montgomery in Australasia (Brunswick East, 2009).

4 PERIODICAL ARTICLES


Clausen, Christopher, ‘How to Join the Middle Classes’, American Scholar, Vol. 62, No.3.1993, pp.403-419.
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