Early Legal Institutions in Victoria
by Patrick Street

This study describes the legal institution which existed in Melbourne from 1835-1838, i.e. the period from the beginnings of the Settlement at Port Phillip until the introduction of Courts of Petty Sessions in 1838. This short period of 3 years saw the appearance of two distinct types of legal institutions: First, an informal, democratic type of authority “where the functions of law and order fell to the lot of the civilians” and the second, an autocratic legal authority dispensed by Captain William Lonsdale, Police Magistrate for the district of Port Phillip. It is proposed to examine and compare various aspects of these two periods so as to determine the actual extent of the judicial institutions, their jurisdictional powers and the development of the system itself. A short historical outline of the main events will suffice to establish a perspective.

When John Batman signed his famous treaty with the Natives, there was no official legal authority in the Settlement. The nearest Police would have been at George Town at the mouth of the Tamar, so naturally, it was every man for himself. Threats of attacks from the Aborigines did not deter those adventurous souls “infected with the Port Phillip mania” from selling up their holdings in Van Diemen’s Land and sailing to Port Phillip.

When John Pascoe Fawkner arrived at the Settlement in August 1835, he found a “thriving village boasting the unauthorised incursions into the southern lands would be treated as trespassers. Despite this “thunderbolt” from Sydney, the new settlers still continued to arrive, and by February 1836 there were 50 whites in the Settlement, 100 head of cattle, 1400 sheep, six horses and a stock of poultry. In March 1836, Dr A Thomson, “the soi-disant catechist of the Batman regime”, James Simpson and John Aitken — men who were to provide the first outward sign of democratic law and order — arrived at the Settlement to add materially to the sense of substantial prosperity which was just beginning to develop. November of that year saw Dr Thomson with 4 acres of barley, oats and potatoes sown, 1750 sheep, 50 cattle and 8 horses, and both Simpson and Aitken both had large flocks and land holding: so it is to be expected that any disputes they arbitrated upon would be disposed of in a businessman-like manner.

Meanwhile, as the Colony was steadily progressing, a “flagrant outrage was committed on the natives”. As a result, Gov. Bourke sent George Stewart, Police Magistrate for the District of Goulburn to investigate this “outrage”, to look at the treatment of the Natives generally, and to distribute the Proclamation of 26th August 1835 warning off trespassers. Stewart arrived at Port Phillip on 25th May 1836 and began his duties which included the apprehension and committal for trial at Sydney of the offenders responsible for the “outrage”. Thus, Stewart was probably the first governmentally constituted legal authority in Victoria.

Whilst Stewart was in the Colony, the inhabitants held a public meeting on 1st June 1836 whereat various resolutions were passed, inter alia, that “James Simpson be appointed to arbitrate between individuals disputing of all questions excepting those relating to land, with power to him to name two assistants when he may deem fit”. It is curious that despite this clear legal mandate to Simpson, research has failed to locate any dispute upon which he adjudicated. It is granted that he was absent from the Colony for a while during 1836, but it was to be expected that Simpson would have decided a few small disputes at least.

As a result of Stewart’s report and the Petition of the 1st June 1836, Gov. Bourke appointed Capt. William Lonsdale to be resident magistrate of the Settlement, and he duly arrived on the 29th September 1836. With this arrival, the “democratic interlude” ended and a new official legal institution took its place. This was the autocratic style of government where the regulation and maintenance of law and order rested upon the shoulders of one man.
Evidence of Law and Order during the ‘Democratic’ period.

As stated previously, the preservation of law and order in the Colony resided in the hands of the settlers themselves. It was a country where “every man was a law unto himself”\textsuperscript{14}. But, in the early days of the Settlement, the members of the Port Phillip Association had made a definite attempt to put the responsible arbitration of disputes on a solid basis. In July 1835 they executed a deed between themselves that, “in case of any dispute, the community stood pledged to “accept the arbitration of three persons, one appointed by “each of the aggrieved parties and the third by the arbitrators”.\textsuperscript{15} The same three persons, one appointed by “each of the aggrieved community stood pledged to “accept the arbitration of disputes between themselves that, “in case of any dispute, the responsible arbitration of disputes on a solid basis. In July 1835 they executed a deed between themselves that, “in case of any dispute, the community stood pledged to “accept the arbitration of three persons, one appointed by “each of the aggrieved parties and the third by the arbitrators”.\textsuperscript{15} The same three persons, one appointed by “each of the aggrieved

“A law-abiding people could not rest satisfied without some organisation for the preservation of order and the redress of grievances. Disputes would continually arise.”

And as Forde said\textsuperscript{18},

“British people have an instinctive love of law and order. Where 70 or 80 persons are settled in a British community, the policeman is sure to appear and there will never be difficulty in obtaining the services of a local tradesman or local orator as a Justice of the Peace.”

By March 1836, Dr A Thomson was able to say that he was the arbitrator at Melbourne:

“I did so by common consent, my tent being the police office. Many felt a pride in showing an example in upholding order, which was done without much trouble”.\textsuperscript{19}

Thus it is not unexpected to find Dr Thomson as one of three arbitrators deciding a dispute on the 2nd May 1836 between Henry Batman and John Pascoe Fawkner. Described as the first legal decision given in the district\textsuperscript{20} the ‘award’ is first quoted in GW Rusden’s pamphlet\textsuperscript{21} wherein he states:

“We award in the disputes between Mr Henry Batman and Mr John Pascoe Fawkner — on the first claim, Thirty Shillings, on the second claim, nothing, although a “strong presumption is in our minds that some hasty expressions of Mr Batman’s may have led Bullett to destroy the rabbits. On the third claim, damages Five Shillings, and a fine of Twenty Shillings, in consideration of it being an act of unauthorised aggression, and in the fourth claim, nothing, as it does not appear that Mr Batman set the dogs on the calf. We cannot omit remarking that there has been a degree of forbearance on the part of Mr Fawker highly gratifying to us, and if generally practised very conducive to the general good. (Signed) A. Thomson, John Aitken James Simpson.

Mem. — The fines to be appropriated to some general purpose.”

Dr Thomson, in company with George Robson and eight others acted as arbitrator in a case of assault by one Jemott and another on Capt. Hunter. The case was heard in the Yarra Yarra Inn on 20th September 1836 before these “city fathers” and as the prisoners apologised to the complainant, the Bench decided:

“We ... express ourselves in the strongest terms against such conduct, but think it so far a redeeming quality on their part that they acknowledge their fault that the prisoners may be allowed to leave.”\textsuperscript{22}

Despite the fact that Whitfield\textsuperscript{23} says that the informal arrangement of appointing James Simpson as arbitrator worked, “and some arbitrations were carried out”, no case wherein Simpson arbitrated as a result of the power given him on 1st June 1836 can be located.

In addition to those institutions which were clothed with an air of consensus legality, there were other more informal agencies operating in the community ensuring that “everyone did not do as he liked.”\textsuperscript{24}

As an instance of this ad hoc justice, Buckley\textsuperscript{25} describes that when one of the shepherds tied up a native woman, Mr. Gellibrand\textsuperscript{26} immediately sent for the man accused, but he denied all knowledge of the woman or of the circumstances to which she had referred. Mr. Gellibrand\textsuperscript{26} had, however, good proof of his guilt; and therefore after severely reprimanding him for his brutality, dismissed him from the Company’s service and ordered his return immediately to Van Diemen’s Land.

A similar type of case is briefly referred to by Geo. Stewart in his letter to Gov. Bourke\textsuperscript{27} where he says at paragraph 4,

“The only aggression known to have been attempted by an European at Port Phillip upon any of the blacks was committed by a stockman, who some time ago attempted forcibly to violate the person of one of their females, and who, on that account, was sent back to Van Diemen’s Land by Messrs. Wedge and Batman, with which punishment the friends of the female were quite satisfied.”

Another type of ‘justice’ which existed in those primitive days\textsuperscript{28} is that referred to by GA Thomson in his Reminiscences\textsuperscript{29}. He states:

“On our arrival in June 1836 we heard that a murder had been perpetrated some mile or two out of Melbourne by the natives. The victims were a Mr Smith and his herdsman. A party of seventeen went out after the murderers all armed with guns and seventeen of the natives were killed.”\textsuperscript{30}
When we add this ‘outrage’ to the fact that both Batman and Fawkner’s men were armed so as to repel attacks by Aborigines and Dr Thomson with a “formidable brace of pistols in his belt” it is a simple matter to state that every man was a ‘legal institution’ in his own right. A system of “natural justice”, As Garryowen observed “it was a somewhat anomalous state of society.” At least we can be sure that the affairs of the little settlement on the banks of the Yarra had become sufficiently important to require the attention of a resident representative of the Government. That representative was Captain William Lonsdale, Police Magistrate.

Legal Institutions during the Autocratic Period

Lonsdale arrived at the settlement on 29th September 1836 with a detachment of his Regiment, one District constable and 2 ordinary constables. For the next two years, Lonsdale with the assistance of two Justices of the Peace, Ensign King, Lieut. Hawkins and James Simpson, went about his duties administering justice “free from prejudice” holding his Court in the most convenient place, “sometimes under the vault of heaven, blue or otherwise.” When Lonsdale was appointed Police Magistrate he received two sets of instructions — one military and one civil. At this stage, it might be appropriate to consider the nature of his jurisdictional powers.

Capt Lonsdale’s Jurisdictional Powers

Without describing the long history of Justices of the Peace and the reception of English Law into Australia, it is stated that as a Justice of the Peace, Lonsdale had power to keep the Peace, arrest, take bail, bind to good behaviour, suppress and punish riots and do all other matters and things with respect to the inhabitants residing in the Settlement as Justices of the Peace had within the part of the Realm called England. As to civil matters, Justices in England had power to hear and determine matters of petty debt such as small debts of forty shillings or less and disputes between masters and servants where the amount involved did not exceed £8. The only case which appears in the Court Register of 1836-8, might have been in the civil jurisdiction was a dispute between one Bolger and Fletcher wherein a contract had been made to make and burn 25,000 bricks in return for a free passage from Launceston and two months’ rations. When the contract was breached, it came on for hearing on 26th September 1837 before Lonsdale and Hawkins, but the matter was settled out of Court. It would seem that the civil jurisdiction of Justices was restricted to the matters relating to master and servant and that no other civil matters could be litigated until a Court of Petty Sessions was established in 1838. If the dispute just mentioned was not within the ambit of Act 9 Geo. IV. No. 9, then Lonsdale and Hawkins had no lawful jurisdiction to deal with the matter.

As a Justice of the Peace, Lonsdale possessed considerable powers which he could exercise sitting alone. Under the English Act 9 Geo. IV, c83 of 25th July 1828, certain English Acts which were in force in New South Wales came within the jurisdiction of one Justice, e.g. 1 Chas.1.c.1 which dealt with Sunday observance; Act 3 Wm IV. No.8 of 13th June 1833 was the Licensing Act which gave power to one Justice to punish licensees who failed to provide accommodation for travellers, etc.

As to Lonsdale’s appointment as Police Magistrate, the position is far from clear. Such an office was created by Act 4 WmIV No. 7 which came into force on the 30th September 1833. This Act dealt with the appointment of Police Magistrates and for removing and preventing nuisances in the Town and Port of Sydney, but no similar provision existed outside Sydney until Act 2 Vict No. 2 — An Act for Regulating the Police in the Towns of Parramatta etc., and it was extended to Melbourne on 5th November 1838 and came into force on 1st January 1839. Thus it would seem that Lonsdale’s appointment as a Police Magistrate had no legislative authority for over two years.

Nevertheless, there was a certainty about Lonsdale’s administration. He was a man of unblemished character and impartial in the conduct of affairs. And there was plenty of work to be done in the community. When Lonsdale met Batman, Thomson and Wedge on 2nd October 1836 they complained that “they were in a most lawless state, and always in dread of being assaulted”. The Establishment which Gov. Bourke had set up “had become absolutely anomalous state of society.” At least we can be sure that “the affairs of the little settlement on the banks of the Yarra had become sufficiently important to require the attention of a resident representative of the Government.” That representative was Captain William Lonsdale, Police Magistrate.

“180 persons have come over from Van Diemen’s Land since the census was taken, but scarcely any of them are persons of respectability, and further that many of the servants are troublesome, ill-disposed men.”
The earliest record of proceedings at the Police Office was on 17th October 1836. “Wm. Lonsdale J.P. Police Magistrate Thomas Brown – a runaway from Van Diemen’s Land ordered to be returned to that place. Proved by letter to be the Resident Magistrate at George Town to be Thomas McMenomy.” The decisions of the Justices at the Police Office are all recorded in the Court Register and there are many convictions of convicts for drunkenness and being absent from their masters’ premises without leave. They were punished by a number of lashes, usually 25 for drunkenness and 50 for more serious offences. These penalties were usually imposed by one Justice, usually Capt. Lonsdale, but for the more serious matters, the two Justices, i.e. Lonsdale and King or Hawkins sat together. Such cases include smuggling, assault, larceny of growing vegetables, drinking on unlicensed premises etc. and occasionally a committal for trial to the Court of Quarter Sessions at Sydney is recorded.

Naturally, with the influx of this type of settler, the work at the Police Office increased and some details of the cases dealt with will confirm this fact.

The earliest record of proceedings at the Police Office was on 17th October 1836. “Wm. Lonsdale J.P. Police Magistrate Thomas Brown – a runaway from Van Diemen’s Land ordered to be returned to that place. Proved by letter to be the Resident Magistrate at George Town to be Thomas McMenomy.” The decisions of the Justices at the Police Office are all recorded in the Court Register and there are many convictions of convicts for drunkenness and being absent from their masters’ premises without leave. They were punished by a number of lashes, usually 25 for drunkenness and 50 for more serious offences. These penalties were usually imposed by one Justice, usually Capt. Lonsdale, but for the more serious matters, the two Justices, i.e. Lonsdale and King or Hawkins sat together. Such cases include smuggling, assault, larceny of growing vegetables, drinking on unlicensed premises etc. and occasionally a committal for trial to the Court of Quarter Sessions at Sydney is recorded.

Before mentioning the number of cases actually dealt with at the Police Office, it should be observed that there is a distinct dualistic approach taken by the Court in dealing with free citizens in contrast to those who were convicts. On 3rd November 1836, Will Davis, a free man, was fined five shillings for drunkenness whereas on 1st December 1836 Benjamin Taylor, a convict serving 7 years, received 25 lashes for the same offence.49

From 17th October to 31st December 1836, Lonsdale and King dealt with 14 cases relating to offences of drunkenness, irregularity50, being a runaway from Van Diemen’s Land, insolent and disorderly and refusing to work. During 1837, 283 cases were disposed of, wherein 145 were complaints against convicts and 138 were complaints against Free Persons. For the month of December 1837, the Police Office dealt with 61 cases, thus in the short space of one year the work had increased by 400%. And yet the figures increased by 100% the next year, when the December, 1838 return of cases showed that 112 persons had passed through the Police Office, 69 Free persons, 39 convicts and 4 released on Bonds. Thus, it would be safe to say that “Captain Lonsdale had his hands full of business”.51

On 17th July 1838, Melbourne was gazetted as a place at which a Court of Petty Sessions was established,52 and on 31st August 1839 Courts of Quarter Sessions and Requests were appointed to be held. The legal institutions in Victoria had finally matured after years of growing pains, through times of stress and turbulence.

Conclusion

In the three short years of the Settlement, the legal institutions had undergone major changes. There were still many disputes which required the intervention of some legal authority, but by 1839 the Sydney Government had provided an efficient administration to cope with the steadily increasing business. When the first settlers arrived at Port Phillip, it was a struggle for survival. “Cost of living was high from the outset”53 and the settlers were obliged to unite for their mutual protection. It was a case of every man a law unto himself. When Lonsdale arrived at Port Phillip in 1836, he brought some degree of legal stability to the community thereby marking the end of an era of summary justice and lex populi.
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