

# Introduction

'The alienation of land', wrote R. M. Hartwell in 1954, 'is the first stage of exploitation'.<sup>1</sup> In Van Diemen's Land, the alienation of land and the consequent use which was made of that land, are vital aspects of the island's history. In colonial Tasmania land settlement influenced, and was influenced by, almost every other aspect of its history. Most spectacularly, we see this in looking at the conflict between the European settlers and the Aborigines, and at environmental destruction. It can also be seen in the colony's social history. The amount of land a settler was granted, and the use he made of that land, affected his relationships with fellow settlers.

It is surprising, then, that this problem has received little attention in the past. Certainly, land settlement has been discussed in general histories of the colony,<sup>2</sup> and there have been short accounts of the problem,<sup>3</sup> but no detailed, specialised study has hitherto been published. As in any pioneering study, a number of problems have been encountered in investigating and writing this report. Some, but by no means all, have been overcome.

The study covers the period from first settlement until 1830, but only grants made up to and including 1823 have been examined. The main reason for this is that the actual deeds for grants made after 1823 could not be found.<sup>4</sup> Finding the original locations and dates of grants after this time would therefore have been prohibitively time-consuming. Nevertheless it was thought appropriate to continue the study as a whole up to the year 1830, for it was largely in the late 1820s that many of the problems associated with land settlement — conflict with the Aboriginal population being the most significant — became clear. Farming practices and problems of the late 1820s are therefore discussed in some detail.

In the first chapter, the regulations imposed by the British government for the disposal of their newly acquired land, and the gradual spread of settlement, are discussed. An attempt is made to chart the movement of Europeans throughout the colony as accurately as possible. This discussion is supported by a series of maps and tables. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that it is impossible to be exact. There are two main

reasons for this. Firstly, the date given in the actual grant deed — which in most cases is our only clue to the period of settlement — and the time at which the settler actually moved onto his land often do not coincide. In many cases the official alienation of land came months or even years after the settler had actually begun farming his land. In a few cases the land was granted before the settler had even set foot in the colony. Furthermore, land was often occupied illegally or unofficially. Settlers grazed their sheep and cattle in the interior with or without the knowledge of the administration.

Only private settlers have been examined; the pastoral companies — the Van Diemen's Land Company and the Cressy Company — have been omitted. These companies came to the colony only in the late 1820s and, as stated above, only grants made before 1824 have been examined. Moreover, a venture such as the Van Diemen's Land Company deserves a detailed study in its own right. The importance of such companies in rural settlement as a whole is not great enough to warrant the research and discussion which would be required to do them justice in a study such as this. It is to be hoped that their history will be tackled in the future.

It should be noted here that the use of the male gender in referring to the settlers is intentional. The people granted land in colonial Australia were overwhelmingly male, a fact which should be emphasised. Regulations were drawn up specifically with men in mind: women were discriminated against in this as in so many other areas.

After giving consideration to the way in which grants were made by the Crown, and the origin of the differences in time between actual occupation of the land and the formalities of granting it, what may be termed the social history of settling Tasmania is considered. An examination is made of the sort of people who became settlers in Van Diemen's Land. Again the picture presented can be no more than impressionistic. Most settlers left few records, many not even appearing in civil registers. Naturally enough, more is known about those who were successful than about the many who failed. In general, those who succeeded were young or middle-aged family men, free settlers from good families in England and Scotland. We should not be surprised that they were the most successful: the odds of patronage were stacked in their favour. We must admire the determination of convict settlers who overcame prejudice and economic hardship to join the upper echelons of colonial society.

The relationships between these settlers and the leisure activities they pursued are then discussed. It will be seen that these pursuits were imported from Britain; they were followed not only to alleviate boredom, but also to remind the settlers of the homes they had left to travel to the antipodes. Almost everything the settler did was a re-creation of the world which had been left behind. This is not to say that settlers spent their whole lives deliberately creating an antipodean England, but everything they did was shaped by their past experiences and beliefs. Not surprisingly, many considered England the yardstick of civilisation and beauty. Consequently — and also because they knew little else — British or European sports, such as horse-racing and boxing, were taken up in the colony. In the same spirit, the administrative districts and villages of Van Diemen's Land were given English and Scottish names. Travellers were at times amused to see how little the colonial Richmonds and Cambridges resembled the originals. Nevertheless, with the implementation of European farming practices and the planting of imported trees and shrubs, the colonial landscape gradually came to look more like that of England than did any other part of Australia.

Farming practices are considered in three chapters, dealing with pastoralism, agriculture and horticulture. Sheep were the most important animals in the colony's early history, largely because they were so easily maintained and there was a good market for their produce. The propagation of grains and vegetables entailed far more work than did the raising of animals. As a result, agriculture was initially carried on for subsistence more than for marketing. Nevertheless, between 1803 and 1830 great improvements were made in the extent of land under cultivation and the quality and variety of crops produced. Again, horticultural activity was initially carried on for subsistence, but gradually changed. The first attempts at gardening were concerned with the production of greatly needed fruit and vegetables, but flowers and shrubs were later added, so that colonial gardens performed the dual function of supplying fresh food and adding 'beauty' to the landscape.

The effects of European farming and grazing on the environment are then discussed. It is not true to say that the environment which the colonists found in Van Diemen's Land was completely pristine: the Aborigines had already changed it to some extent. Nevertheless, the Natives had been sympathetic in their use of the land. The newcomers sought to change it completely; ecological destruction was inevitable with the introduction of pastoralism and agriculture.

Two chapters are then devoted to the problems experienced in beginning to farm in a natural countryside; that is, one which had not previously been farmed with European methods and one where the choice between pastoralism and agriculture depended on the nature of the wild environment. All farmers, including those who remained in Britain, faced a myriad of difficulties. Yet colonial farmers, many of whom had little or no previous agricultural experience, faced additional problems. As well as having to come to terms with an unfamiliar climate, they faced threats which an English farmer would never know. Bushfires regularly threatened their lives and property. Other natural phenomena also presented problems, but perhaps the greatest troubles came in human form. Bushrangers were a problem almost from the foundation of the colony until the late 1820s. They drove a number of settlers from their land and into the towns. With the owners gone, stock rustlers — in particular sheep stealers — moved in. There were problems, too, with the convict labour force.

European bandits and refractory workers were not, however, the only human 'enemies' of the white settlers of Van Diemen's Land. From 1824 there was increasing conflict with the Aborigines. The gradual alienation of the land, and the way in which that land was used, was central to the conflict. The two systems of land use — rural and nomadic — could not coexist. The Aborigines seem to have been prepared in the first years of European settlement to share their land with the newcomers, but the British were determined at all costs to have the land for their own exclusive use. As settlement spread and the Natives were pushed further and further from their traditional hunting grounds, conflict soared.

It could be argued that the existence of a native people on the island precludes the use of the word 'settlement': that invasion is the correct term. Discussing the arrival of Europeans in north America, Francis Jennings argued:

The implications of this use of the word *settlement* are worth notice. First, it vaguely implies that preexisting populations did not classify as humanity, for it is not used to apply to Indians; only Europeans 'settle.' It also dismisses the Indians' ability to wrest a generally satisfactory living from

the 'wilderness' and to travel over established trails to known destinations. Most inaccurate is the word's bland misdirection about the Europeans' intentions, for their common purpose was to exploit rather than to settle.<sup>5</sup>

This argument could just as easily apply to Australia. It is important, however, that all history be written within the context of its period. Although it should be plain to anyone in the late twentieth century that the men and women who came to Van Diemen's Land in the early nineteenth century were mercenary, racist and exploitative, their society's view of them was far more kind. They called themselves settlers and believed they had a holy mission to tame the land and render it productive. On the very rare occasion that a more enlightened contemporary pointed out that they were indeed invaders, they were aghast.

This is not to excuse the actions of Europeans in Van Diemen's Land. Nevertheless, the word 'settlement' has been used throughout most of this book. Invasion it was, but once here the newcomers attempted to settle the land, and settle they did. The discussion of farming in the island requires the use of a word such as settlement. Whatever its shortcomings, whatever its cultural implications, it is the best we have.

## 1



## THE ALIENATION OF LAND AND SPREAD OF SETTLEMENT

The settlement of Van Diemen's Land took place in a number of distinct phases.<sup>1</sup> The first Europeans to undertake permanent settlement on the island were the convicts, military and free settlers who arrived under the supervision of Lieutenant John Bowen in September 1803. They set up camp on the eastern shore of the Derwent River at Risdon Cove, a site recommended by George Bass in 1798.<sup>2</sup> This settlement, however, was shortlived, being superseded by the arrival of the *Calcutta* expedition early in the following year.

On 27 April 1803 the *Calcutta*, with its supply ship *Ocean*, left England for the southern coast of Australia. The newly appointed Lieutenant-Governor David Collins was directed to settle at Port Phillip if it was found to be suitable or, if necessary, to go to another part of the southern coastline or one of the Bass Strait islands.<sup>3</sup> The ships arrived on the eastern shore of Port Phillip in October 1803, but they were unable to locate a constant supply of fresh water and were concerned about the climate and particularly about the difficulty of entering the heads of the bay.<sup>4</sup> The attempt to populate the area with Europeans was consequently abandoned, and Collins looked to Van Diemen's Land for a more suitable base. Governor King recommended the Derwent, stressing its fine port and its suitability as a base for trade and enterprise.<sup>5</sup> Collins was left to decide between the Derwent, already settled by Bowen, and the Tamar.

Having been apprised by a reconnaissance party that the northern port possessed good land but was disadvantaged by the presence of hostile Aborigines and a difficult entrance, Collins decided to sail for the Derwent, where his small establishment would have the support of the members of the New South Wales Corps already there. Accordingly Collins' party left Port Phillip, arriving at Risdon Cove on 15 February 1804. They did not like what they saw. As at Port Phillip, the supply of fresh water was unreliable, the camp was exposed to fierce winds, the soil was poor, and the available anchorage for visiting ships left much to be desired.<sup>6</sup>

Collins determined to find a more suitable site for his base. He despatched his surveyor, George Prideaux Harris, who recommended relocation on the opposite bank of the river, at what became known as Sullivan's Cove. Having taken command of the establishment at Risdon Cove, Collins set about its closure. He moved most of the stores to Sullivan's Cove, but transferred only a handful of the convicts to the new base. He would, he claimed, have retained a greater number at the Derwent, but found that they were useless, refractory characters; they were therefore sent back to Sydney. Thus almost all of the first settlers of Van Diemen's Land, including Bowen's military establishment, which Collins had anticipated would boost his own, left the nascent colony, leaving a group drawn almost entirely from Britain, with no experience of life in the Australian colonies and little experience of a native people.<sup>7</sup>

Meanwhile Governor King was taking steps to establish a settlement in the north of the island as well. His second-in-command, Lieutenant-Colonel William Paterson, was sent to Port Dalrymple to select a suitable site on the Tamar. Orders had been received from England that Norfolk Island be abandoned, and the inhabitants moved to Port Dalrymple. In October 1804 King decided that Van Diemen's Land should be divided into two distinct administrative areas, the counties of Buckingham in the south and Cornwall in the north; the two to be divided by the 42nd parallel. On 5 November 1804, the small party celebrated with a religious service their invasion of the northern section of the island.<sup>8</sup>

Bowen, Collins and Paterson each arrived in Van Diemen's Land armed with regulations concerning the way in which the new land was to be taken under control and tamed. This process entailed the settlement of individuals on farms. The regulations followed closely the lines of regulations in force in New South Wales from 1788.<sup>9</sup>

Lieutenant Bowen had taken with him to Van Diemen's Land five free settlers who, he was instructed, were to be granted areas of 100 acres each, 'when circumstances will allow'. These grants were to be subject to the same quitrents as applied in New South Wales. In addition to the grants, they were to be allowed town leases at Risdon Cove, were to be victualled from the government stores for their first year in the colony, and were to be allowed the labour of two convicts each, who were to be victualled from the stores for twelve months. After this time, it was believed, the settlers would be well established and they 'and their Families to be of no further Expence to Government'.<sup>10</sup>

The government might well have argued that they did more than enough to assist the five free settlers and their families to establish themselves at Risdon Cove. In addition to land, labour, food and clothing, they were also to be provided with two ewes each, six bushels of seed wheat, tools, nails and garden seeds when they could be spared. If the first harvest was a failure or the infant settlement was struck by some unforeseen catastrophe, the settlers could be offered greater assistance, but not without good reason being shown to the Governor in Sydney. In return for these favours, the free settlers were to help to erect shelter for the other people and the supplies brought from Port Jackson.<sup>11</sup>

Yet the assistance offered was not sufficient to entice the settlers to remain in Van Diemen's Land. When Bowen left Risdon Cove after the arrival of Lieutenant-Governor Collins, only two of the five free settlers stayed, and one of those later returned to Sydney.<sup>12</sup> Thus the first grants made in 1805 were to settlers who had accompanied the *Calcutta* expedition. Collins' instructions in relation to the alienation of land were similar

to those of Bowen. Neither had the power to grant land in their own right, but could recommend prospective grantees to the governor and could advise settlers to locate land pending a final decision from Sydney.<sup>13</sup>

Free settlers were not the only people eligible for grants in Van Diemen's Land. Governor Phillip's instructions of 1787 included provision for making small grants to male convicts whose sentences had been completed. There was no mention of grants for female convicts, who apparently were expected to become wives of farmers, but not farmers in their own right. Married convicts were allowed an extra 20 acres in addition to the 30 acres allowed single ex-convicts, plus an additional 10 acres for each of their children in the colony at the time the grant was made. The grants would be free of all fees, taxes, quitrents 'or other acknowledgements whatsoever' for ten years,<sup>14</sup> after which they would be subject to a quitrent of sixpence for every 30 acres. The grant could be forfeited if the grantee did not live upon and cultivate the land during that time. The Crown retained the prerogative of using any timber which might be required for naval purposes:<sup>15</sup> the search for timber suitable for ship-building was vital for Britain which, by 1788, had been largely denuded of woodland.<sup>16</sup> The British government realised that it would take some time before convict farmers could become self-sufficient, so they, like free settlers, were to be supplied with provisions for the first year. Tools, utensils, seed grain and livestock were also to be provided if they could be spared.<sup>17</sup>

In the period under review there were no specific regulations concerning the granting of land to persons born in the colonies. They tended to be looked upon as being of the same class as their predominantly ex-convict parents, and were treated accordingly. Children of the well-to-do were, like their parents, given special treatment.<sup>18</sup>

Grants of land were also to be made to the marines who had served in Van Diemen's Land, provided they had behaved well during their minimum three years of service. A non-commissioned officer would receive 130 acres, or 150 if he were married, plus 10 acres for each child. A private soldier could look forward to a grant of 80 acres if he were single, 100 if he were married, and more if he had children. Such grants, again, were to be free of all fees, taxes and quitrents for five years, after which they were liable to an annual quitrent of one shilling for each 50 acres. These people also were to be supplied with clothing and one year's provisions, plus seed grain and tools. Labour would also be supplied, but only if the soldier cum settler could maintain the convicts. King informed Collins in January 1805 that military officers could also receive grants of land not exceeding 100 acres. This was a reversal of policy: it had earlier been directed that serving officers were not to undertake any agricultural or other businesses that might keep them from their military duties, but the Duke of York, as their commander in chief, had acquiesced to their being allowed to cultivate land for the maintenance of their families. No problems were foreseen in allowing them 'by the Sale of their overplus produce to procure a part of such Articles as may arrive at the Derwent for their Domestic Use and Comfort'.<sup>19</sup>

Although the payment of quitrent<sup>20</sup> was an essential condition of every grant issued in Van Diemen's Land, its collection was never properly enforced, and it seems doubtful that the settlers ever took the charge seriously. In the 1820s a list was drawn up nominating the Tasmanian settlers who owed the government quitrent. Rent from as far back as 1811 remained unpaid, and it was still owing on a total of more than 500 properties. Regulations concerning the amount of quitrent payable, and the time after which it became due, changed at various periods in the first thirty years of Tasmanian settlement;

but however elaborate the instructions may have become, they were meaningless so long as nobody bothered to act on them. In 1820 G. W. Evans told Commissioner Bigge that no-one had yet been appointed to receive quitrents. It was hardly surprising, then, that no money had been thus far collected. By the late 1820s there was considerable vocal opposition to the idea of actually paying quitrent: petitions against it were numerous. Finally, in 1835, the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, Glenelg, decided not to continue pressing for payment. In 1847 Lieutenant-Governor Denison admitted that 'scarcely a single grantee has ever, after his grant has been issued, paid the quit rent reserved in his deed'.<sup>21</sup>

These deeds were not delivered to the settlers immediately;<sup>22</sup> rather, as one immigrant complained to his father, new settlers were issued with location orders, and only after the expiration of five years were the grants forwarded. Young Hamilton Wallace was unhappy about this situation because it prevented him packing up and returning to Ireland.<sup>23</sup> He was one of several settlers who wished to evade the occupation clause in the grants.

Other clauses were also disregarded. In fact Henry Widowson claimed that 'not one-half of them are strictly acted upon'.<sup>24</sup> By the terms of the grants it was forbidden to alienate the land for a period of five years. Yet the transfer of land in early Tasmania was very common, particularly in the 1820s, and grantees did not always bother to wait for the expiration of the stipulated period before selling, leasing or exchanging their farms. It was claimed that by 1834 land was being exchanged 'very currently, in general, without being actually located by the settler'.<sup>25</sup> Sometimes a blind eye was turned, sometimes not. Donald Campbell, granted 500 acres in 1823, was able to exchange his land in the following year, apparently without undergoing disciplinary action. Eliza Ogilvie, on the other hand, was refused an additional grant because her late husband James had sold his land too early. By 1829 the government was far less forgiving. Widowson thought it 'but fair that Government should have some security from settlers, numerous instances having occurred of land having been obtained, and sold the very next week, or perhaps the following day; a much stricter system is consequently now adopted than formerly'.<sup>26</sup>

In fact, the withholding of additional grants seems to have been the only effective means of control which the colonial government was able to exercise over settlers. Land once granted was considered 'freehold . . . in the fullest legal sense, conferring the same right to bequeath or sell it, as if it were an estate in England'.<sup>27</sup> Applications for additional grants were assessed in terms of what improvements had been made by the colonists. Those who had lived on or cultivated their land were more likely to receive extra grants than those who had ignored their duty as landowners, although it was alleged that corruption and patronage played a part in such decisions. Patronage was admitted (privately, at least) by some of its beneficiaries. John Leake doubted that his additional 2000-acre grant of 1825 would have been so large had he not been under Arthur's 'frequent notice'.<sup>28</sup> Other factors were also considered: help in capturing bushrangers, especial endeavour in particular areas of farming, the plight of large families; all influenced officials.<sup>29</sup> Applications were many. Governor Brisbane complained in 1823 that 'Not a Cow calves in the colony but her owner applies for an additional grant in consequence of the encrease of his stock'.<sup>30</sup> Applications were forwarded at all times of the year, and their outcome was doubtless to some degree influenced by the mood of the governor on the day he considered them.<sup>31</sup>



There was also, despite the rules laid down in the governors' instructions, much diversity in the size of primary grants. This was particularly so in the case of free settlers who arrived in the 1820s. The governors of New South Wales became steadily more willing to rely on their own discretion in judging how many acres an individual should receive. From the beginning of settlement in Van Diemen's Land there was provision for making larger grants to the more 'peculiarly meritorious' ex-convicts and free settlers, and by the beginning of Sorell's administration land was being granted in proportion to the amount of capital the new settler brought to the island.<sup>32</sup> George Frankland, the surveyor-general, wrote in 1837 that the economic means of the settler had always been viewed 'as the standard by which such claims should be weighed', although he claimed that the Survey Department had become stricter after the administrative separation of the colony from New South Wales.<sup>33</sup> As wealthier colonists arrived the grants became larger so as to accommodate their grandiose schemes. Furthermore, immigrants who were men of means and had powerful friends in England, arrived with orders for grants far in excess of those designated by the original instructions. Few governors were as confident as Bligh, who refused to honour these letters, saying he needed more proof than was offered by their bearers.<sup>34</sup>

The wiser immigrant proceeded without delay to the Survey Department, to ascertain in what areas good land could be found. Since rents in Hobart Town were outrageously expensive and its inhabitants were 'the most mercenary . . . in their incessant contributions upon the stranger's pocket', it was also advisable that he should proceed to his new location as quickly as possible.<sup>35</sup>

For the first twenty years of European settlement in Van Diemen's Land no major changes in the regulations concerning the granting of land were introduced. The regulations were designed not only to ensure that convicts were enticed to remain in the colony upon the expiration of their sentences, but that the colony would become self-sufficient, in terms of food at least, as soon as possible. Thus the regulations were made as generous as the British government thought necessary.

Settlers were rewarded with more than land alone. Van Diemen's Land, being essentially a huge prison, had a good supply of cheap labour in the form of convicts. Newcomers were allowed the use of these labourers, although the terms under which they were assigned varied throughout the period. In 1819 Macquarie noted that it had always been the custom to allow grantees one assigned servant, even if their grants were only of 30 acres. By 1823 one convict was being assigned for every 100 acres granted. This was the decision of Governor Brisbane who, horrified at the number and tenor of grant applications he found on arrival in New South Wales, instructed that grantees should in future employ, at their own expense, one convict per 100 acres.<sup>36</sup>

The Tasmanian lieutenant-governors were enthusiastic in their support of land settlement — sometimes, indeed, too much so. In 1816 Lachlan Macquarie found it necessary to warn the newly appointed lieutenant-governor William Sorell that 'MUCH irregularity' in the granting of land had prevailed in Van Diemen's Land in the past, 'either through inadvertency or wilfully'. The governor reminded Sorell that no lieutenant-governor had ever been empowered to grant land. Such illicit assumption of the gubernatorial prerogative would not be allowed to continue. Furthermore, all grants and leases made by former lieutenant-governors or by Sorell were deemed null and void.<sup>37</sup>

Having ensured that only he would make grants to settlers in Van Diemen's Land,

Macquarie found little else to criticise in Sorell's administration of the colony, at least so far as land settlement was concerned. In October 1820 he congratulated the lieutenant-governor on the latter's refusal to allow settlers to have their large grants divided. Such an indulgence would, they agreed, 'prove very productive of inconvenience and unnecessary trouble'. It was feared that such people would take all the best land, thus creating an unfair advantage over the smaller settlers and leaving no good land for those who would come after them. Macquarie, recalling his Scottish youth, tended to favour the settlement of small farmers on the land — an early example in a succession of misguided leaders who envisaged an Australian yeomanry.<sup>38</sup>

So long as the right of granting land belonged to the governor of New South Wales, the people of Van Diemen's Land were inconvenienced by the distance between Hobart and Sydney, and the inevitable delays which occurred in having their registered grant deeds returned to them. In 1820 Lord Bathurst took steps to remedy this situation. Henceforth all 'Letters for Grants' issued by the Colonial Office to approved settlers would be addressed to the lieutenant-governor, who would instruct the deputy surveyor to measure the grant. Thus the local representative of the Crown was allowed to locate land for settlers, with the governor legally confirming the grants at a later date. In some respects the Colonial Office was merely catching up with established practice, as the deputy surveyor-general informed Commissioner Bigge in March 1820 that it was already the habit of the lieutenant-governor to allow new settlers 'of good character' to select land and cultivate up to 50 acres before the grant was officially approved by Macquarie.<sup>39</sup>

The first land grants for Van Diemen's Land were signed by Governor King on 15 August 1804. Four grants, each of 100 acres, were made to Edward Miller, Leonard Fosbrook, Matthew Bowden and Lieutenant James Johnson. The grants were all along Humphreys Rivulet, extending from Miller's farm on the Derwent River.<sup>40</sup> Although more grants were issued in the following years, the rate of land alienation remained slow until it was decided to remove the settlers of Norfolk Island to Van Diemen's Land.

In 1805 thirteen grants were issued: these again were 100-acre allotments, except for two smaller grants of 40 and 50 acres respectively to Mary Peters and Martha Hayes. The farms extended along the Derwent River.

In 1806 thirteen grants were made. These varied in size from Leonard Fosbrook's 14-acre parcel of land north of Sullivan's Cove, to the 195-acre grant to Richard Clark, the settler who had remained behind when Bowen's establishment left Risdon Cove. Robert Knopwood's famous 'Cottage Green' was granted in this year.

In 1807 no grants were made, whilst in 1808 only one tract of land, the 2000 acres allowed Elizabeth Paterson, as the wife of Lieutenant-Governor William Paterson, was granted. This was on the South Esk River and was the first piece of land officially granted in the north of the island, although apparently not the first area occupied.<sup>41</sup> At this time William Bligh was governor of New South Wales, and his reluctance to grant land in Van Diemen's Land echoed his policy in New South Wales.

During the next two years the grants made to settlers in Van Diemen's Land were again quite few in number. Fourteen were made in 1809, amounting to 2690 acres in all. These grants were given during the Rum Rebellion by military officers not officially appointed from England. Consequently they were considered illegal and void, though most of them were regranted by Macquarie when he became governor in 1810. Nine of the grants were at the northern settlement, fronting the South Esk River. Jacob Mountgarret, who had