

CHAPTER X.

Early Elwood—Place Name Elwood—Suggested Quaker Origin—Point Ormond—Francis Ormond—The Doughartys—Louis Huon Romance—Elwood Government Land Sales—First Purchasers from Crown—Allotments and Prices—The Rev. Joseph Docker—First Residents of Elwood —Peter Snodgrass—Trustees of Elwood—They Disagree—Minister of Lands as Peacemaker—Samuel Griffiths—Agitation for Annexation by Brighton Council—Thomas Bent and the Would-be Seceders—An Abortive Attempt—The Abattoirs—Agitation for Closure—A Prolonged Fight—The Abattoirs Closed.

IN the Plan Room of the Lands' Department of Victoria is the original plan of a survey marked "North and South Elwood." The land was surveyed by Robert Hoddle in 1850, assisted by Henry Boom Foot. We have not been able to find the information of how Elwood came by its name. Having said that much, lest a reader should unwittingly accept a conjecture, for a fact, we say that to trace the probable source of the place named "Elwood" we had to find a record of Ellwood in Louisiana, which again took us back as far as the Pilgrim Fathers, leaving Plymouth in the "Mayflower" in 1620. The reader, who already knows the part the men of Devon played in the first days of St. Kilda, may observe how the thread of records is interwoven with Plymouth men, and St. Kilda place names. "The Lady of St. Kilda" started from Plymouth, her former owner, Thomas Dyke Acland, was a Devonshire man, and her captain named the street, beside the first allotment sold in St. Kilda, purchased by him, after his friend and employer, Acland Street. The Pilgrim Fathers named Ellwood in Louisiana after the Quaker, Thomas Ellwood, who was a friend of the poet Milton, who, at Ellwood's suggestion, wrote "Paradise Regained." When the part that Lieut.-Governor Latrobe is supposed to have taken in the naming of the projected village is remembered, and when his well-known friendship towards Quakers is recalled, it is not difficult to assume that he may have suggested the place name Elwood in memory of the great Quaker, Ellwood. In early

St. Kilda there was a family of Quakers named Sayce, but their descendants were unable to say how Elwood came by its Quaker name, nor could the late Ellwood Mead. He told us that until he came to Melbourne to be the chairman of the Victorian Water Commission, he only knew of one place name Ellwood in the world, and that was the town in Louisiana wherein he was born, and after which his parents named him Ellwood. He supposed, when he found, to his surprise, an Elwood at St. Kilda, that Quakers had settled there, and it was they who had given the name of Ellwood to the district.

Latrobe arrived in Melbourne on October 1, 1839, two years after James Backhouse, the Quaker Missionary came on a visit to Melbourne, in the company of George Washington Walker. Latrobe must have been aware of the Quaker's visit, since Latrobe was a friend of John Gardiner, whom Backhouse went to see at Gardiner's homestead built on Gardiner's Creek. Backhouse rowed up the Yarra Yarra to do so. In some of the early maps of the St. Kilda district, Elwood is spelt with two "l's," in the same way as the Quaker's name was spelt, "Ellwood."

The place name of Point Ormond was named after Captain Ormond, who visited Port Phillip in 1839. He was so pleased with the country's prospects that he determined to settle in the new land. To carry out his purpose, he returned to England, and bought a small ship in which he brought out his family, including his son Francis Ormond, the Victorian philanthropist, a statue of whom stands in front of the Melbourne Working Men's College.

Francis Ormond was twice married. His first wife was the daughter of Dr. Augustus Frederick Adolphus Greeves. Greeves, from March 11 to April 29, 1857, was the Hon. the Minister of Trade, and Customs, in the O'Shanassy Ministry, and from September 24 to November 26, 1860, President of the Board of Land and Works, and Commissioner of Crown Lands, and Survey in the Nicholson Government. He was one of a syndicate of land speculators who bought ten acres of land in Barkly Street. When they divided the land into allotments, for sub-division sale, they named one street, Greeves Street. Another parliamentarian of some note, who was an early resident of Elwood, was the Hon. John George Dougharty. He was a member of the Legislative Council of Victoria from the

year 1880 to the year 1888. He came to Victoria from Sydney. Dougherty had acted as Dr. Daniel King's assistant in looking after a company of Highlanders, who had boarded an emigrant ship at Glasgow. They reached Sydney in the beginning of the year 1842. Dougherty, when he arrived in Melbourne, commenced business as a stock and station agent.

One of Dougharty's daughters, who was born in the Gothic house on the Elwood Esplanade, married Louis Huon, who was a direct descendant of the proscribed aristocrat, Louis Huon de Querilleau, who, with his wife, fled from Brittany during the French Revolution. Almost stranger than fiction is it to find the widow of a descendant of the refugee Huon, residing in Elwood House, and to look at the yellow parchment Breton title deeds of the de Querilleaux. The story of Louis Huon de Querilleau's life, after he left France, and joined the British Army, and later the 102nd Regiment, in New South Wales, and then disappeared mysteriously, as related in the "Sydney Monitor," under the date of February 3, 1829, is a moving romance.

In Mrs. Huon's girlhood days, Elwood was covered with wattle trees. She remembers how hundreds of magpies frequented the creek, and how too, her brothers caught fish in the creek's waters. Aborigines came to the Red Bluff, the sands thereabouts containing large beds of cockles. After storms, in the bay, dozens of nautilus shells lay stranded on the shore. Her father, when driving home at night, in winter time, often had the waters from the Elwood swamp wash over the floor of his buggy. The swamp was the home of fenland and sea shore fowl.

Elwood House is a composite structure of two houses that were built to form a terrace, by the Rev. Joseph Docker, who bought land from Joseph G. Vautier, one of the purchasers of Crown lands on September 18, 1851, when six blocks of the Elwood land were first sold. The upset price at the Crown Land sales at Elwood, was two pounds ten shillings per acre. The sale, which took place in Melbourne, realised:—

	a.	r.	p.				
Section 14	8	0	0	@	£45	0	0 per acre J. Murphy
	13	8	0	@	37	10	0 „ J. G. Vautier
	12	8	0	@	35	0	0 „ J. G. Vautier

a. r. p.

Section 11 8 0 0 @ £22 10 0 per acre W. W. Blow
 " 1 0 8 0 0 @ 22 0 0 " J. Payne
 " 9 14 1 11 @ 13 10 0 " W. B. Wilmot

These blocks have frontages to the Esplanade at Elwood, extending back to Ormond Road. Wilmot's, Section 9, has a frontage south-east to St. Kilda Street in addition to its west frontage to the Esplanade. On May 29, 1853, Vautier offered for sale by auction on the ground, Hore's Saxhorn band in attendance, Sections 12 and 13. It was at that sale Docker bought his land. Those lands, in addition to the following, sold in Melbourne on October 10, 1851, form the kernel of Elwood :-

Section 17 8 acres £42 per acre J. Murphy
 " 16 8 " £48 " S. Griffiths
 " 15 8 " £44 " S. Griffiths

A line about where Ormond Street is, forms the north-west frontage of Murphy's Section 17. All the houses built on the west side of these sections look over what were designated as "the Public Gardens, 54 acres, permanently reserved, south of Point Ormond," extending as far as St. Kilda Street.

James Murphy, and also J. R. Murphy, bought Elwood lands for speculation purposes. On February 24, 1857, the auctioneers, William Easey & Co., were offering for sale, on behalf of the Murphys, land "at North Elwood fronting Ormond Beach, one mile south of St. Kilda." The land "consisted of eight seaside allotments, adjoining the buildings of Joseph Docker. Lot 1 had a frontage of 102 feet 6 inches to Ormond Beach, by a depth of 396 feet. Lot 5, having a frontage to Beach Road of 132 feet by a depth of 308 feet, had a six-roomed wooden cottage on it." Lots facing Glenhantly Road had frontages of 198 feet, with depths varying from 286 feet, to 700 feet. Land for sale, at South Elwood Section 5, containing 4 acres 3 roods and 22 perches, all fenced, with a frontage to the Bay, was also offered at the same auction sale.

The Rev. Joseph Docker's name remains on the map of Elwood in Docker Street. After Docker built the two houses, he lived in one for a short time, and rented the other to J. G. Dougharty. After a while Dougharty moved to the Gothic house wherein the future Mrs. Huon was born. Left empty, Docker's houses fell into great disrepair, being used by passing swagmen,

and frequented by the flocks of goats that browsed about Elwood. Docker had left Melbourne and taken up pastoral holdings. Elwood being such an out of the way place, house and land agents found a difficulty in taking care of the property. Docker put the houses up for sale. Dougharty then bought them, and made the buildings into one house. Mrs. Dougharty called the reconstructed dwelling "Bleak House." She was a great admirer of Dickens, and she thought that the name was appropriate to the locality, and to the southerly gales, that swept over Elwood. The late Mrs. Dougharty, when seen by us, was a fine old lady of 84 years of age, bright with intelligence. She told us how she grew tired of the name of "Bleak House" sounding as it did to her, at the last, as inhospitable, and so she changed the name of her house to "Elwood House." Since Mrs. Dougharty's death, her daughter, Mrs. Huon, has informed us that her mother often told the story, as we have related it, but it was a *ben trovato* story. The building was called, according to Mrs. Huon, from the first, Elwood House. Mrs. Huon says there was a dwelling in Elwood named "Bleak House," but it is now renamed "Wiltonia." It was occupied by a family named Osborn in the early days of Elwood.

Only a handful of residents lived at Elwood in the year 1868. Their names were :—T. W. Binney, evidently of the Binney Brothers, one of whom lived in Cochrane Street, Brighton; and the other brother, Richard H., had his home in Tennyson Street, St. Kilda. Richard was a member of the firm of J. A. Irvine & Co., wine merchants of Flinders Street, Melbourne. Thomas Boxshall was a gardener, and was one of the family of the Boxshalls of Brighton that came to Victoria in Henry Dendy's batch of emigrants. Their name survives in Boxshall Street, Brighton. John Broadbent, there were two others of the name of Broadbent in St. Kilda, one of whom was a carrier. Broadbent claimed to be the first resident of Elwood. He lived in a tent there, when, as he said, nobody else had tent, or house, in Elwood, in the year 1852. Broadbent at that date was engaged in cutting down timber on Point Ormond. Thomas Dickson, an accountant and public auditor, lived at Elwood. And then we come to J. G. Dougharty, who in his zeal to protect the lands of Elwood from wood cutters had himself appointed one of the Government's honorary rangers. Robert Eddington was

the lessee of the abattoirs. Others at Elwood were G. P. Evans, a contractor ; J. K. Fry, an accountant ; Hastings, a gardener ; Mrs. Hunter; A. A. Le Souef, usher to the Legislative Council; C. Le Souef ; J. C. McCausland ; Mrs. McGregor ; Samuel Griffiths ; W. R. Merry, contractor; John Montague, gardener; James Osborn, senr.; John Owston ; William Owston, of W. Owston & Co., merchants, 108 Bourke Street, West; Sherbourne Sheppard, of J. B. Were & Son.; and Joseph Thompson.

A very early resident of Elwood was Peter Snodgrass. His daughter, Janet, married Sir W. J. Clarke, Bart. Another early resident, who lived at North Elwood, next to the property of J. G. Dougharty, left Elwood for England in January, 1861. His household effects were submitted to auction by G. Walstab. The little-known place of Elwood *was* described to intending purchasers 'as "on the Beach, between St. Kilda and Brighton."' Apart from first-class furniture, a cottage piano, by Addinson, cow, poultry, and a small assortment of superior colonial wines, there were also for sale "a superior American four-wheeled *buggy*, and a splendid English dog-cart, built to order by Wyburn of Long Acre," necessities of a pre-motor age to any "gentleman with business in the city," if he lived at Elwood. Old Londoners will remember Long Acre with its coach-builders' shops. Of the chattels sold that day at Elwood there was one lot that it were a pity not to record in full, since the lot seems to have been a worthy one. The lot was, to quote the description in the advertisement, "the favorite grey horse, 'Tattle,' formerly the property of the late F. M. Selwyn, is too well known to require much comment. He is equally good in single, or double harness, or in saddle, and is in first-rate condition."

The St. Kilda Council has in its possession an original plan of Elwood, dated January 26, 1869, and signed by Clement Hodgkinson, Assistant Commissioner of Lands and Survey. The special purpose of the plan is to show some proposed beach reserves. The map has written upon it three notes, copies of which read :-

"Proposed that the allotments indicated on the plan be surveyed with a view to early sale, subject to the same conditions as the sale of allotments on the Brighton Road, and to the further conditions that the allotments be enclosed within a period of three months from the date of the sale."

"Proposed that the blocks indicated by letters A. B. C. D. be vested in the Borough of the Council of St. Kilda with a view to their enclosure, and planting thereof with trees and shrubs."

"A" on the plan indicates the Blessington Street gardens, and "B," an extension of the land to the south, across Blessington Street. "C" and "D" are foreshore strips of land extending from the west end of Blessington Street south to a line west of about where Shelley Street is now, the St. Kilda abattoirs being shown on the plan, allotments No. 1 and 2, resting on the creek as a south boundary. "E" is the crown of Point Ormond extending west as far as Barkly Street, and sweeping round along what is now Elwood Esplanade. Practically "E" was what now constitutes Elwood Park.

The third note reads :-

"Proposed that the strip of land indicated by the letter "E," and comprising the bluff at Point Ormond, be placed under the control of a Committee of Management to consist of four owners of land in Elwood, and the Mayor of St. Kilda, for the time being, subject to the condition, that this land will be enclosed by private subscription of landholders, at Elwood, with a view to being subsequently converted into an ornamental plantation, and recreation ground."

So far as the Assistant Commissioner's suggestions went, the "Committee of Management" came into existence, but the Mayor of St. Kilda does not appear to have been one of them, at least there is no reference to him in any of the Committee's proceedings, so far as we have seen them.

The residents, and the land-holders of Elwood, were, in the years of the sixties, in a unique position, since they paid no municipal rates, because the Elwood lands were not within the jurisdiction of a Road Board, nor had the Council of St. Kilda, nor the Brighton Borough authorities any control over Elwood. The residents managed their own public affairs by means of the aforesaid "Committee of Management." The members of the first locally-appointed committee were the Hon. J. G. Dougharty, James Osborn, Samuel Griffiths, H. V. Duigan, and R. E. Jacomb. For what length of time the committee, and the residents, expected to remain in the enjoyment of non-rated land the Government had surveyed, and they had bought, is

conjectural, but that they believed that they were an admirable anomalous committee, exercising a sort of imperium in imperio, there is no doubt. The residents of this little seashore kingdom, by the Red Bluff, were given to chuckling when they regarded their rateless condition. Unfortunately for them, the members of the committee had in their composition the seeds of discord. There were too many kings wanting to rule the kingdom of Elwood, and rifts crept in to disturb the harmony. They were so isolated, and so much of a family, that one would have supposed that the friendship of the early settlers' Elwood Brotherhood would have prevailed over jealousies. May be it did at first, but the change came when the Government created a trust, the first shire trust in St. Kilda! and settlers, other than the majority of the first committee, were created by the Minister of Lands, trustees of Elwood lands. These trustees absolutely could not agree in their non-rateable nest. They sought the aid of the Minister of Lands, the Hon. J. G. Casey, in order that he might exercise his power and eject the disturbing spirit.

On October 28, 1873, two of the trustees, James Osborn and —. Houston, waited as a deputation on the Minister of Lands to ask him to remove their co-trustee, Samuel Griffiths, from the trust. John Steavenson, the remaining trustee, was not present, but Osborn informed the Minister that Steavenson was favorable to the application. The listening Minister heard the story of the Elwood quarrels. The trustees had been quarrelling for quite a long time among themselves on general affairs, but the specific complaints they laid before the Minister against Griffiths were:—

"No. 1. Mr. Griffiths had ceased to attend the meetings of the trustees.

"No. 2. Mr. Griffiths had declined to *sign* a cheque for money to the credit of the trust without assigning any reason for such refusal.

"No. 3. Mr. Griffiths had declined to give up seventeen posts and rails, the property of the trustees.

"No. 4. Mr. Griffiths had declined to pay a promised subscription of £10; and finally his conduct towards his co-trustees was offensive."

Griffiths was present at the interview. He listened to the statements made by Osborn, and Houston, regarding his numerous alleged shortcomings, and his alleged illegal detention of posts, required for fencing the reserve. In his defence, Griffiths said, relative to his subscription of £10, his answer was that the other trustees had said they would not act with him. In such circumstances, was it to be expected that he would pay to them £10? As to £10, he had spent more money than that sum in repairing the reserve. As to his own offensiveness to his co-trustees, he answered they were offensive to him. The Minister declined to have any part in their disagreements. He advised them to try to work harmoniously together.

According to dates, Elwood was at this time under the jurisdiction of the St. Kilda Council, though that body had not actually taken over the district. Elwood was in the situation of a "private street not yet taken over by the Council." The Council's jurisdiction, established by a description of the boundaries, which appeared under the heading of "DISTRICT ANNEXED TO THE BOROUGH OF ST. KILDA," described in the Victorian Government Gazette, September 1, 1870, and authorised, at an Executive Council meeting, held on August 29, 1870. The district was described as :-

"Commencing at the southernmost point of the boundary of the Borough of St. Kilda, on the shores of Port Phillip Bay, thence northwards along the centre line of Barkly Street, to its intersection with the Glen Huntly Road, thence eastwards along the centre line of the Glen Huntly Road, to its intersection with a street, or road dividing North Elwood from the village reserve of Elsternwick, and known as St. Kilda Street, thence southwards along the centre line of said street to its intersection with Park Street, thence along the centre line of said Park Street westwards to the shores of Port Phillip Bay, thence north-westerly, along the shores of the said Bay, home to the commencing point at St. Kilda boundary aforesaid."

The St. Kilda Council received a letter from Samuel Griffiths at its meeting held on June 25, 1877, in which he informed the Council that at a meeting held at the Elsternwick Hotel on June 14, Thomas Bent, M.L.A., in the chair, it was

moved by Mr. Briggs, and seconded by Mr. Broadbent:—"That the Chief Secretary be urged at once to gazette Elwood as severed from the Borough of St. Kilda, and joined to the Borough of Brighton." An amendment was moved by Mr. Griffiths, senior, and seconded by Mr. Clarke, to the effect, "that the connexion between Elwood and St. Kilda be continued." The original motion was carried by a majority of one. It was then urged by Griffiths senior that it was unwise to act in haste, and before steps were taken Mr. Bent should be requested to ask definitively, what the Brighton Council was prepared to do, and when? Bent agreed to make inquiries of the Brighton Council, and to suspend further action for a week, as to removal. Bent said that, if the St. Kilda contract for the Elwood Road was put in hand, it would be hopeless to expect the Chief Secretary, or any future Secretary, to sever Elwood from St. Kilda. Griffiths informed the Council that he understood from that remark of Bent's that the blow for severance should be struck at once. Indeed, he added, that when Bent was with the Chief Secretary, Mr. Odgers, on the previous day, Odgers asked if he should gazette Elwood for transference without further delay? Bent replied, "Wait till after Thursday's meeting." Griffiths begged the Council "to put the road in hand, if possible without a day's delay. If not, the Council would be defeated, for Elwood would slip through their hands." The St. Kilda Council replied to Griffiths reminding him of the Council's willingness to form the road to Elwood, for which tenders were called, provided the requisition for severance was withdrawn.

Griffiths wrote once more to the St. Kilda Council. His letter was read at the Council meeting held on October 1, 1877. He told the Council that strenuous efforts were being made by a minority of the Elwood ratepayers to remove Elwood from St. Kilda, and to annex the lands to Brighton. He thought it could be shown that a clear majority of four persons at Elwood were in favor of Elwood remaining a part of St. Kilda. In these circumstances, he thought that the Chief Secretary should be asked, by the St. Kilda Council, to reconsider the proposal. Commenting on the letter, Councillor Tullett said the Council had already lost a large part of the eastern portion of the borough, and the Council ought to make every effort to

prevent Elwood being annexed to Brighton. Mr. Bent, it appeared, was anxious that Elwood should be separated from St. Kilda, but it was to the interests of the residents that it should remain part of the borough of St. Kilda. Mr. Griffiths himself was the cause of the present movement. When Elwood first joined St. Kilda, the agreement was that the St. Kilda Council should not be called upon to spend money on that locality for some years. However, the Council had agreed to expend £350 on the road, near the beach, between the abattoirs and Brighton, and had determined to go on with the work upon the petition for severance being withdrawn. In his opinion, the Council should wait upon the Chief Secretary, make explanations, and ask, on what grounds the separation was asked for? This action was decided upon. Incidentally, it was stated, by Councillor Balderson, that Griffiths was entirely to blame, as he had caused the movement for separation to be initiated. Councillor Dixon did not think that Griffiths should bear the whole blame.

The St. Kilda Council, residents from Elwood, and the Brighton Council waited on the Chief Secretary on October 10, with regard to complaints made by some of the Elwood residents that their wants were not attended to by the St. Kilda Borough Council, and the residents asked that the district of Elwood might be incorporated with the municipal district of Brighton. The Chief Secretary decided that the dissatisfied residents of Elwood should petition the Governor-in-Council, and show what were the numbers for, and against the severance. Upon the majority vote the decision would be based. Thomas Bent, M.L.A., was present, and spoke for the Brighton Council, and E. J. Dixon and G. D. Carter, M's.L.A., for St. Kilda.

The Chief Secretary informed the St. Kilda Council, on November 26, that no petition had been received from rate-payers, resident at Elwood, relative to severance from St. Kilda. The Council then decided to go on with its road making to Elwood. Mr. Broadbent had told Mr. Balderson that the residents he represented had decided not to separate from St. Kilda. The history of the establishment of the abattoirs at Elwood began when in March, 1858, the Government gave the St. Kilda Council a piece of land, in Barkly Street, for the purpose of using it as a place where butchers could kill sheep and cattle. To aid the butchers, and stockmen, in their work, the Council

decided to place a bridge over the creek. We reproduce a copy of the advertisement calling for tenders to erect the bridge:—

MUNICIPALITY OF ST. KILDA.

"Tenders will be received until half past 4 o'clock on Tuesday next, the 22nd inst., for building a wooden bridge over the creek in Barkly Street at the Slaughter Yards.

"Plans and specifications to be seen at the office of Mr. Sydney W. Smith, Town Surveyor.

"E. BRADSHAW,

"Town Clerk.

"Town Clerk's Office, St. Kilda, February 17, 1859."

In the year 1861, the Council decided to erect the abattoirs. Instructions were given to the town surveyor to prepare plans, and these plans were submitted to a meeting of St. Kilda butchers, called for the purpose of asking them if they had any suggestions to make, whereby the plans might be improved. The butchers generally approved of the plans, whereupon the Council called for tenders to build the slaughter house. The successful tender was one amounting to £1,229. By the end of the year the building was completed, and it was leased for the year 1862 to a man named Rodwell. In 1869 alterations were made in the brick building to allow of cattle being slaughtered there as well as sheep. The yards for herding the cattle were floored with stone pitchers. It will be seen that the abattoirs dated seven years or more before the Elwood residents began to agitate for its abolition.

It was in November, 1868, that the residents of Elwood, 28 in number, in an attempt to prevent what they considered to be overt acts of encroachment by the St. Kilda Council, appealed to James Macpherson Grant, Commissioner of Crown Lands and Survey, in the McCulloch Ministry. They sent to him a memorial containing complaints reflecting on the doings of the St. Kilda Council, and they asked the Commissioner to put up for sale land at Elwood that had shore frontages. The memorial was forwarded by the Minister to the Council for its consideration.

Elwood residents and the St. Kilda borough councillors appeared to the Commissioner to be at cross purposes. He essayed to play the difficult part of peace-maker. On January 15, 1869, at his request, he was waited on by the residents of

Elwood, and by representatives from the St. Kilda Council. The Elwood residents opened the proceedings with a list of their complaints. They complained that nuisances to them arose from the abattoirs at Elwood; from the manure and nightsoil depot at Elwood to which the market gardeners of Brighton came to load their waggons ; from the undrained swamp, near the beach. The swamp was the least objectionable of the nuisances, but they thought the swamp should be drained, and the reclaimed land sold for building allotments.

One of the speakers was Thomas Dickson, who stated that if the St. Kilda or Brighton Councils had had the power to annex the lands of Elwood, the councillors would have seized them. He objected to the rifle butts at Elwood, as a source of public danger. With regard to the sale of bay frontages, he foresaw that they would yield a large revenue to the St. Kilda Council. The beach front, which was then a "gigantic nuisance," would be converted into one of the "most magnificent" drives in the world. A plan submitted to the Commissioner showed a road along the Elwood beach of thirty-one chains in length by two chains in width.

Samuel Griffiths, the purchaser of Crown Sections 15 and 16, at the Crown Land Sales held in 1851, for which he paid at the rate of £44 and £48 per acre, told the Commissioner, that he was a pioneer resident of Elwood. He said that some of the land sold at Elwood, in 1851, brought as much as £1,000 per acre. Not half of that sum, he asserted, would now (1869) be obtained for the land. When the abattoirs were placed at Elwood, there was in existence the Elster Creek, the course of which ran close to the slaughter house. The streams of water, used by the slaughtermen, enabled the shambles to be kept clean, but it was otherwise, since only a dry ditch remained in the place where the creek was. No lessee of the slaughter house could keep the yards in a sanitary condition without *he* had command of an ample supply of water. Prevailing winds at Elwood came from the sou'-west, and these winds, sweeping over the southern part of St. Kilda, carried with them the smells arising from a dirty slaughter yard.

The Commissioner was curious to know why Griffiths did not oppose the establishment of the abattoirs at Elwood in the year 1861 when the site was proclaimed a slaughter yard.

Griffiths said he had been told, at that time, that the slaughter house would only be a small one, and the building would be rather an ornament than otherwise to the Elwood beach. Great stress was always laid by the St. Kilda Council upon the circumstance that the residents of Elwood were not ratepayers of St. Kilda, but he, Griffiths, could not see why, because of that, they were to be stifled. "Was human life," he asked, "of no value at Elwood?"

Griffiths condemned the manure depot. The Commissioner answered that plaint by saying that in 1859, authority was given to "deposit rubbish not of an offensive character," in a spot near Carlisle Street east.

The Commissioner was referring* to the land upon which the city hall of the city of St. Kilda now stands. Formerly the site was swamp land, and it extended to where the Brighton Road State School has been built. The land was reclaimed by the St. Kilda Council. The main drain runs through it, passing under the Town Hall. The Commissioner made a mistake when he referred to the land, granted as a rubbish tip in 1859, as the one complained of by the Elwood residents. His mistake was corrected by the mayor of St. Kilda, Councillor Tullett.

In the year 1857, the land at Elwood was granted for the express purpose of being used as a manure depot. Ninety pounds a year were paid to the Council for the right of grazing cattle on the Elwood Recreation Reserve, known as "The Common." According to the pioneer Griffiths, the fence enclosing the reserve was so bad that "cattle were always getting out and sticking up people. Sometimes the trouble was caused by stockmen driving bullocks, and sometimes the bullocks drove the stockmen."

Another resident of Elwood, one Owston, said that not only was there a slaughter house, but the lessee had a boiling-down plant. He, Owston, had seen six or eight loads of nightsoil openly exposed for days together at the manure depot. And yet the tally of complaints was not finished, for Owston declared that the St. Kilda Borough Council by its neglect of the beaches allowed the tea trees to be destroyed. Elwood, he said, had not had sixpence spent on it by the Government.

The mayor of St. Kilda, Councillor Tullett, replied to the complainants' case by informing the Commissioner that the

abattoirs were not the real source of complaint. The head, and front, of the Council's offending was the making of the road the residents were pleased to call Punt Road, that united Elwood to St. Kilda.

This was the road that made the peaceful penetration, and crossed the "boundaries" of the comical, dreaming, autonomous kingdom of Elwood, this the highway that caused the financial pulses of the residents to flutter with the well-grounded fear that their lands would become a part of municipal St. Kilda, and that they, rate-free seashiders, would be so no more, and that they would no longer enjoy immunity from a Council's rate-collector's visit. Before the road was made, the ooze and sluggish flow, at times, of the swamp towards the beach, prevented the Elwood residents from reaching the beach except when the creek, and the marshlands, about it were dry, and they had to pass to the east, the Elsternwick side of the swamp.

The mayor explained that the Government had authorised the establishment of the abattoirs, and the Council itself had made regulations restricting the slaughtering of sheep in St. Kilda to that place. At first the Elwood residents did not object to the abattoirs, because they knew that a road would have to be made to the slaughter house. They anticipated being able to travel on that road to Melbourne. The road's construction cost the Council the sum of £2,000, and the rent the Council received from the lessee of the abattoirs was £200 per annum. The Council's rates were deducted out of that amount, and the expenses of all necessary repairs to the yards were paid by the Council. The unpleasantness of passing the manure depot could not be overcome so long as the road remained where it was. As to a statement that the Council received £90 per annum for rights of grazing on The Common, the Council had only received that rent during the previous three or four years. Improvements along the beach in the form of tree planting, and the construction of a coast promenade, were on the Council's estimates, but owing to the uncertainty about the sale of land, which Elwood residents desired, the Council paused before going on with the work. On drainage the Council had spent £8,000 beyond the Government Grant. If the Government consented to assist the Council, the Elwood swamp would be drained. As to the proposal to have a marine parade from Sandridge to

Brighton, the councillors would be delighted to see it, but the work would cost £70,000 or £80,000. Such improvements the mayor regarded as coming under the description of national works. Its cost was far beyond the Council's means. If the Elwood land was sold, it would not realise the prices expected, and instead of having good buildings upon it, shanties would disfigure the beach line.

Land, according to the Commissioner, had realised ten, or fifteen, per cent more than it had done ten years previously. He regretted that the residents of Elwood had not conferred in a friendly way with the St. Kilda Borough Council. The Council on its part should not have called a passage in the memorial "an impertinence." The abattoirs could not be interfered with ; the nightsoil might be stored in a large covered shed, surrounded by high walls. He suggested that the councillors and residents should confer together. He intended to ascertain the cost of draining the swamp with a view to selling the land. His intention was to carry out a comprehensive scheme for a grand parade along the coast. He would ask his colleague, Mr. McCulloch, to obtain the consent of the military authorities to have all rifle butts in the locality removed.

Following this interview, an inspection of the "nuisances" at Elwood was made. The abattoirs were found to be in such a good sanitary condition that the Elwood complainants said they had not ever seen the place so clean ! Mr. Hodgkinson, from the Commissioner's Department, consented to make the reserve known as "The Herdsman's Run" into a "botanical plantation" on the condition that it was fenced, towards the cost of which fence the Elwood people were expected to contribute. It was calculated it would cost £400 to lay on a service of Yen Yean water to the abattoirs. The policy of the Government was to abolish suburban slaughter yards, and to have, eventually a central Melbourne abattoirs. In view of such a policy, the expense of *laying* on a water service, to the Elwood abattoirs, could not be entertained. Such was the outcome of the memorial of the Elwood residents.

In March, 1884, the Superintendent Inspector for the Central Board of Health, Mr. Le Capetain, inspected the St. Kilda abattoirs. At that period a well-known character of St. Kilda South was in charge of the abattoirs. His name was

Matthias Lyons, and he was a stalwart, shaggy-haired individual, with a gruff voice, often heard when he was restraining the three savage dogs he owned. Lyons lived in a little farm-like cottage, and he grew maize crops alongside his dwelling. When we visited the place, in March, 1884, Lyons had sixty pigs grouting about the unfenced land. According to Lyons, the then agitation to close the abattoirs was due to a land syndicate, the members of which had bought the "bullock paddock." They purposed to hold a subdivisational sale, and to attract buyers to the sale with the promise of a plentiful free supply of cheap champagne. The fat boiling activities, at the abattoirs, Lyons said, had ceased. If there were any smells, they arose from the scum on the half-stagnant waters of the Elwood canal.

The superintendent inspector's report to the Board of Health was sent on to the St. Kilda Council for consideration. According to the report, there was no serious fault to be found with the way the St. Kilda abattoirs were kept, but the report added "without doubt it had been, and would be as long as it was allowed to remain there, a source of occasional air pollution, and annoyance to the neighbourhood, which was fast increasing (1884) in buildings and population. The Central Board of Health wrote also, and told the St. Kilda Council that the Board's intention was to abolish all such abattoirs, unless they were carried out under official supervision. At the same meeting the Council had a report before them on the "noxious vapours," caused by the drain, from the southern part of Brighton, which ran across the swamp to the bay. The continuance of the St. Kilda abattoirs was plainly nearing its end. The trend of official thought in Government and municipal circles was towards the establishment of a central metropolitan slaughtering house, under the safeguards of modern health laws.

A less persistent group of residents might have been disheartened after having been rebuffed for a period covering about twenty years over the abolition of the slaughter yards, but it is a fact that in some cases, the living sons took up the fight that their dead fathers had begun, and so the fight was continued. Circumstances, brought by the passage of time, worked more powerfully in favor of the protesting petitioners than the old-time arguments, threadbare with use, could accomplish. In May, 1899, there was every indication that the long fight was

nearing a close. A deputation to the Council, headed by Dr. McAdam and F. C. Loader, was told that the Council had already decided to close the abattoirs. Steps were being taken to remove the old building. Sheep only had been slaughtered there for some time, but even that must have been very offensive to the residents, if what Dr. McAdam alleged was true, that the offal from the slaughter yards was thrown into the Elwood lagoon.