

George Hankey, 101, *Hashemy*

Researched by Marcia Watson

Baptism	24 November 1822, Great Budworth, Cheshire
Parents	Thomas Hankey and Mary Dale
Parent's marriage	1 August 1814, Davenham, Cheshire.
Siblings	William (1816), Joseph (1820), Ann (1831), Samuel (1836), Elizabeth (1837), and half-sibling Samuel Jnr (1840)
Wife	
Married	14 September 1842, Davenport
Children	George Hankey (1843-1916)

When George Hankey was baptised, the family lived at Witton.

His mother was buried on 26 February 1837, aged 41. Thomas remarried a widow, Margaret Coombs, on 30 October 1837, and they had a son called Samuel (jun).

In 1841, living at Pump Hill, Budworth, Great, Northwich, Cheshire were:

Thomas Hankey, 50, Rock salt miner; Margaret Hankey, 40; Joseph, 20, rock salt miner; George, 15, Rock salt miner; Anne Hankey, 10; Samuel, 5; Elizabeth, 4; Samuel jun, 1

George Hankey married Amelia (Emilia) Tomkinson on 14 September 1842, at Davenport, by banns.

George was of full age, a rock getter, and his father was Thomas, who was also a rock getter.

Amelia was of full age, and her father was John Tomkinson, who was a joiner.

Both parties were living in Leftwich at the time of their marriage, and both made their mark.¹

At the Cheshire Assizes, Chester, on 16 August 1848:

Thomas Sumner, 31, and **George Hankey**, 26, were indicted for ravishing Jane Proffit, at Leftwich, on 30 July last. Mr Trafford appeared for the prosecution, and Mr Temple for the defence. The prisoners were both found guilty and sentenced to 15 years transportation each.²

Chester Summer Assizes 1848, The Queen v Thomas Sumner and George Hankey

Mr Trafford for the Prosecution; Mr Temple for the Prisoners

Jane Profit. Lives in Yorkshire Buildings, Northwich Leftwich - I am a married woman and have had ten children - On Saturday the 29 July I left my Husbands house to look for him. I went to my Sisters in Whitton St and stopped there from 8 till a little after 12. I then went towards house - my Sisters lodger went part of the way. I saw two men standing with their backs against the Chapel. Passed them and went towards home. Sumner laid hold of me by the Shoulders. I struggled and got round and then knew it was Sumner. I knew him by sight before and I saw Hankey also whom I knew before. I got within six yards of my house. Sumner kicked me because I would not submit, he got hold of my hands and put his legs against mine and threw me down on my back, and he lifted up my cloathes and I struggled as much as I could. He called Hankey to hold my hands and Hankey held my hands I screamed out Murder. Hankey put his hand over my mouth as I was screaming. Sumner had fairly connexion with me, he got up and Hankey got on me but had not anything to do with me. I strove to get up but Hankey would not let me. I screamed murder and Leicester came to me, and I went into my own house and locked the door. I went to my Husband next morning and told him.

Cross Examined. It had been a Club day. I grumbled at my Husband for not coming home. I was once 33 weeks in Gaol about boots and twice before about coals and trowsers - It is ten minutes walk from my Sisters to the Chapel - There is a house within six or eight yards of this place where it happened and two

¹ Parish Church, Davenham, marriages.

² Chester Chronicle, 18 August 1848, p3

other houses - I was sober - I said Sumner please to leave me alone or you'll pay for this another day - he said why damn it Jane hold your noise - When Sumner left me I strove to get up and Hankey would not let me - he got on me - I had my hand on the latch and was getting out the key when Sumner kicked me.

Samuel Leicester. Lives at Leftwich 40 yards off prosecutrix. I was sitting up watching a sick child and heard a woman shriek Murder twice. I went out to where I heard the screaming 40 yards off. I saw two men, and a woman down on her back. One was upon her and the other at her head. His trowsers down and her cloathes up and she was struggling to get up. I saw Sumner get up and Hankey took his trowsers and got upon her. I was within three yards of them. They were in front of her door, and after Hankey got off her I went and said I think this is a nice thing, she is old enough to be your Mother. They said 'Damn you, go and have connexion with her, both of us have'. She took the key out of her pocket to unlock the door and Sumner kicked her. I took Jane and said come go with me to my lodgings and she went part of the way and then said she would rather go home if they were gone. I took her back and she unlocked the door and went in. I knew the men before and their names.

Cross Examined. I looked on. I was afraid to interfere lest they should ill use me. There are several houses nearer than mine. Did not tell anything about this to Winnington. I did not say to him Sumner and Hankey are in the lockups and I can acquit them or transport them whichever I have a mind nor, that I would not for nothing. I did not say I was the man who saw all. Nor did I say that she asked Sumner when he got up whether he was going to be as good as his word and whether he was not going to pay for the half gallon of Ale he had promised her and that Sumner said he would. Winnington did not say if I did that I should acquit them in a minute and I did not say I shall not do it for nothing. Winnington did not say you had better see Sumners father. He did not fetch Sumners father. Sumners father came to me in the forenoon before I went before the Magistrate. I saw Winnington and Sumners father about the street.

Robert Boharra, Policeman. I apprehended Prisoners on 3 August. I took Hankey first and told him the charge. He said he was there but never touched her. Took Sumner, and he said he had connexion with her but he paid her a shilling and some copper.

Mr Temple for the Prisoners

John Mares. I lodge with the Sister of prosecutrix. On Sunday the 30 July at 10a.m. saw Prosecutrix tipsy, and- her husband was there. They were falling out. Went with her at ½ past 12 the night before, and- her Sister asked me to take her home as she was blackguarding and going on so. She was tipsy. I went with her 200 yards. Sumner was at the pumpside and she stopped with Sumner. I asked her to go back and she said she would stop. She had asked to go back several times . I left her with Sumner. On the Sunday she was at her Sisters all day, and she was there on the Monday.

Cross Examined. She got sober towards Sunday night. She drank about 4 or 5 small glasses of Ale between 8 & 12 on Saturday night. She did not say she had come to look for her husband. I did not go before the Magistrates.

John Anlson, a Slater of Leftwich. On Sunday Morning between 12 & 1 of..... was at Wm Hillans door. I saw Sumner, Hankey and Jane Profit going along towards Leftwich. She was in the middle and they were talking together. They were all drunk.

Cross Examined. They were staggering one across the other, Hankey was very drunk. None walked steady. Very few people were about.

Wm Winnington. On Friday morning the 4 August was at Barhin met Leicester returning. he called me back and he said I suppose they are set in Whitton Street. I asked about what, and he said about Sumner and Hankey. He said he knew all about it and could either acquit them or transport them which he thought proper. He said when Sumner got up she got up and she said he was good as your word - you'll pay for that half gallon of Ale - he said he could quit them but would not do it for nothing . I said you had better see Sumners Father and I was going past and would tell him and he told me to be sharp and I fetched Sumners father and they went off together.

Cross Examined. Sumners Father is here. He is a Butcher. It was before they went before the Justices, and I tried to get in before the Magistrates. They kept the door fast.

James Morrell. was with Winnington when Leicester came up. I said it is a bad job about these lads. He said it is a bad job, and he said I shant go for 3/-. He said he wanted 10s and then would go off to Manchester to be out of the way. He said he could either quit them or transport them. He said nothing in my presence about paying for ½ a Gallon of Ale, nor about seeing Sumners Father. I heard all that passed.

Mr Trafford replies. The prisoners were found Guilty with a recommendation to mercy and sentenced to be transported for 15 years each.

Petition:³

Hampton, Middlesex, 18 October 1848

Sir, I send you a copy of my notes of the evidence in the case of Thomas Sumner & George Hankey convicted before me at the last Chester Assizes of a Rape upon Jane Profit & sentenced to Transportation for 15 years.

There was no doubt but that Sumner had had connection with the Prosecutrix, in the presence of Hankey, at the time & place stated by her in her evidence. The only question was, whether it was against her will; & this depended mainly upon the credit which the Jury might give to the testimony of the witness Leicester - who seems undoubtedly to have been present, when the prosecutrix & the prisoners were together, at the time and place stated by both him & the prosecutrix - and if his account of what he saw & heard be true, there can be no question, but that the verdict of the Jury was well warranted by the evidence - Leicester however was contradicted by two witnesses in his denial of having made certain statements to Winnington (one of the two) - These witnesses however differed very materially in the accounts they gave of what Leicester had said; Monde the 2nd of the two witnesses, confirming Leicester's denial in part, & that on most material part - & only supporting the testimony of the other witness /Winnington/ as to the statement by Leicester that he could transport or acquit the prisoners, but would not acquit them for as thing (?) - If Leicester did say that which both the witnesses agree in attributing to him, tho' his false denial might affect his credit generally, the importance he attached to his testimony and the want of any apparent motive for swearing falsely against the prisoners, might induce the Jury to believe that he really did see & hear that which upon the trial he swore he did, tho' /supposing the contradiction to be true / he was willing, for a reward, to suppress the material parts, or the whole of his evidence against the prisoners. With respect to the probabilities of the case, it is to be observed, that the Prosecutrix is an elderly woman the Mother of ten children, returning to he own home after an ineffectual attempt to induce her Husband to return with her, & tho' her character for honesty was impeached, it was not stated at the trial, nor is it now in the petition, that she was of unchaste or profligate habits - & its .. would seem to be hardly probable, that such a person, would voluntarily submit to have connection with one man, in the immediate presence of another, in the public highway, when within a few yards of her own house into which she might have taken any person she chose without observation or difficulty.

The Petition is founded, upon the contradiction of the statement of the prosecutrix that she was sober, & the recommendation of the Jury to because the prosecutrix was drunk - her having been seen in company with the prisoners before the alleged offence - and then had character of & contradiction to the witness Leicester.

It is difficult to appreciate the testimony of witnesses who give their opinion as to sobriety - all that the prosecutrix was proved to have drunk was 4 or 5 small glasses of ale between 8 & 12 on the night in question.

The Jury after two hours deliberation came to the convulsion that the prisoners were guilty, but being probably embarrassed by the contradictions, by way of compromise recommended the prisoners to mercy -

³ HO18/230

when asked on what grounds, they consulted, & replied because the prosecutrix was drunk - which was clearly no ground for mitigation, tho' a material circumstance to consider upon the question of guilt or innocence - and as the Jury nevertheless was of opinion that the story of the Prosecutrix was substantially true, her being intoxicated can hardly be a ground for pardon or mitigation.

As to her having been seen in company with the prisoners before the alleged assault, that is not only consistent with the case for the prosecution but a necessary part for it, & as to her alleged conduct when in their company, that was one of the points for the consideration of the Jury.

I have already remarked upon the evidence of the witness Leicester - It is said his character is bad - it may be so - but there seems to be no doubt, but that he was present, & the only person present, besides the parties, at the time alleged offence was committed - & therefore that he would see & hear all that actually passed on that occasion, & the only question was, whether he reported truly, what he must have seen & heard -

Upon the whole, I cannot say that I am dissatisfied with the Verdict of the Jury- That one of the prisoners had connection with the Prosecutrix in the presence of the other upon the public highway, is not doubted, & the only question being the consent or non consent of the woman, I cannot say that I think the Jury was wrong in concluding upon the evidence before them, that she did not consent.

If the Jury were right in believing the story of the prosecutrix to be substantially true, the case is one of great aggravation and profligacy, & I can see no sufficient ground for a mitigation of the sentence - nothing inclosed, upon the admitted parts, can be more dissolute or profligate than the conduct of the prisoners appears to have been.

The petition however is not for a mitigation of the sentence, but for a free pardon, & I have entered into the of the case in detail in order that you may be able to form your own opinion more satisfactorily upon its

I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant

Wm Wightman

Cover: Report on the Case of George Hankey & Thomas Sumner

Mr Justice Wightman states that altho' the evidence was in some respects conflicting, he was not dissatisfied with the verdict & this he cannot recomd any mitigation of the sentence.

Nil

Ansd 26 August 1848

I John Winstanley of Leftwich in the County of Chester Writing Clerk Do hereby solemnly declare That on Thursday the twenty fourth day of August last I was sitting in my sons Bedroom conversing with my son who then confined to his Bed, where Samuel Leicester (the only corroborating witness on the part of the Crown for the prosecution of Thomas Sumner and George Hankey, charged with the crime of Rape on the person of Jane Profitt, and who were tried at the last Chester Assizes, and sentenced to be transported for fifteen years) then came. That the said Samuel Leicester is of a notorious bad character, and in my sons room showed me a Copy of a Summons which he had been served with since the said Assizes for scandalising a married woman whose husband is a private in her Majesty's fourteenth Regiment of Foot and thereby depriving her of the allowance which she from time to time expected to have received from her said husband.

That the said Samuel Leicester began talking of his being at the said Assizes and said "Mr Temples (Counsel for the prisoners) did not ask me many questions, only that he said Leicester do you know William Winnington, Leicester said "Yes" - did you not meet Winnington on the Town Bridge? "No" - did you not say to Winnington something about some money? "No" - did not Winnington say he could go and see Sumners Father? "No" - did you not say that you was not going to do it for nothing? "No" - did not Sumners father come to you and give you three shillings, so that you would not say more that the truth? "No" - Mr Temple said it is ale "No" - what do you mean by "No" - Leicester said I mean "No" - I then said to Leicester you

knew that you were not speaking the truth when you said "No" - I should have been afraid, because you must know that you were thereby then committing perjury - Leicester replied "I know I was telling lies all the time, and the reason I denied receiving the money from Sumners father was because I was afraid that the prisoners would be quit, and I should be put into the Hole" (meaning the prison)- Jno Winstanley Taken and declared at Witton near Northwich in the County of Chester the 27th day of September 1848 Charles Green, A Master Extraordinary in Chancery

To the Right Honorable Sir George Grey Baronet Her Majestys Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department

The Humble petition of the Gentry, Clergy and Principal Inhabitants Northwich and the Neighbourhood Sheweth

That at the last Assizes for the County of Chester Thomas Sumner and George Hankey were indicted for and found Guilty of the Crime of Rape on the person of Jane Profitt at Leftwich in the said County and were sentenced to be transported beyond the Seas for Fifteen years.

That the said Thomas Sumner and George Hankey positively denied on their said Trial that they were or are guilty of the offence of which they so stand convicted and for which they are sentenced as aforesaid.

And therefore most humbly submit to your favorable consideration the following circumstances relevant to the grounds on which their conviction seems to be founded and that took place at the time of their said Trial. And also to the measure of punishment dealt out to them in reference to the said offence.

That the Prosecutrix was contradicted by two witnesses who swore to her being intoxicated and to her being seen by them in Company with the prisoners previously to the time when she swore her attack was made upon her.

That the only witness that was called to corroborate her was contradicted by the two other witnesses who swore to his having stated that he could either acquit or convict the prisoners and that he would not do it for nothing; (he is of a notoriously bad character, associating with none but the most evil disposed: and altogether in brawls of rioting and drunkenness).

That the Jury after being out for nearly two hours when they returned their verdict of Guilty recommended the prisoners to mercy and upon being asked by the Learned Judge upon what Grounds stated "because the Prosecutrix was Drunk"; which could only be upon the Grounds of the Jury not believing the Prosecutrix and the other witness for the Prosecutrix who having sworn she was sober and believing the Witness for the defence who had sworn she was not sober and who had otherwise contradicted the Prosecutrix and such other Witness.

That the prosecutrix has been previously convicted for felony and suffered a long Imprisonment for the same.

And We the undersigned most humbly represent that we never knew or heard of any Criminal Charge or Offence laid to or proved against the said Thomas Sumner or George Hankey previous to their being charged with and being convicted for the crime aforesaid. We also wish to represent that the said Thomas Sumner was the chief support of his aged parents. And also that the said George Hankey has a wife and two small children entirely dependent on him for support.

Your petitioners therefore most humbly pray that you will be pleased to give their case a favourable consideration so that the foregoing circumstances may be enquired into and that they (solemnly protesting their entire Innocence of the Offence) may be recommended to receive Her Majestys Most Gracious free Pardon.

And your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever Pray &c,

Signed by over 60 people, including the committing Magistrate.

George Hankey, 26, married, labourer; and Thomas Sumner, 31, single, butcher were received at Millbank Prison on 9 October 1848 from Chester. It was the first offence for both prisoners.

George was transferred to Pentonville Prison on 3 May 1849.⁴ Pentonville Register says George's occupation is a salt miner. He was removed to Portland Prison on 4 March 1850, where the register mentions he is married with one child.⁵ George boarded the *Hashemy* on 19 July 1850 for the voyage to Western Australia.⁶

His description on arrival at Fremantle in October 1850:

101. George Hankey, 28, 5'10", brown hair, blue eyes, oval face, fair complexion, stout, scar on forehead, a miner and married with one child.⁷

General Register:

101. George Hankey, 29, married, salt rock miner, Church of England and went to the National school. He could read and write a little but was indifferent with accounts. George said his father was Thomas Hankey, a rock salt mine, who lived in Witton St, Northwich, Cheshire.

Attended Divine Service?	Not regularly
Received Sacrament?	Never before getting into prison
Habits?	Used to get drunk occasionally
Intellect?	Sound
State of Mind?	Very hopeful
Knowledge, Secular?	Limited
Knowledge, Religious?	Rather limited, understands the Gospel Plan of Salvation
Alleged Cause of Crime?	Drunkenness

Name of Person referred to for Character, &c. Mr James Hickson, Mining Agent, Northwich.⁸

George Hankey appears on the casual sick list, at Fremantle on 16 December 1850, with diarrhoea. He was treated with Powder Cal. I Jalap – chalk mixture. It must have worked as he never appeared again on the list.⁹

He received a Ticket of Leave on 18 December 1851

George applied for a free passage for his wife Amelia and son George to come up WA. Her address was, care of Mrs Bonds, 6 Charlotte St, Rock Salt Dock, Liverpool. Four referees from Witton, including a T Hankey, recommended the free passage. The letter was returned.¹⁰

18 August 1852, Fremantle: G Hankey, ticket-of-leave holder, drunk. Fined 5s and 2s 6d expenses.¹¹

A Conditional Pardon was granted on 24 February 1856.¹²

George possibly went to South Australia, arriving on 11 January 1855 per *Madras*.¹³ The ship sailed from Singapore, via Albany, to Adelaide. There are other people called Hankey in South Australia, so it may not be George on the ship.

No further information has been found.

Notes

Jane Johnson married Allen Prophet in 1821 at Great Budworth. In 1851 they were living in Yorkshire Buildings, Leftwich. Allen was a waterman, although he had been a shoemaker journeyman. In 1841 they had three children living with them – Ann 15, James 10, Allan(Allen) 5.

⁴ HO24/4

⁵ HO24/16

⁶ PCOM2/383, p173

⁷ SROWA Acc 128/1-32

⁸ SROWA Acc 1156 R21A

⁹ SROWA Acc 1156 CS1

¹⁰ Register of applications for passages to the colonies for convicts' families. CO386/154, p110

¹¹ Inquirer (Perth, WA : 1840 – 1855), 25 August 1852, p3

¹² SROWA Acc 1156 R21B

¹³ Adelaide Times (SA : 1848 - 1858), 12 January 1855, p2

George's co-accused, Thomas Sumner, was sent to Bermuda on 8 February 1849. He had been on the *Thames* hulk but died on the *Tenedos* hulk at Bermuda on 1 October 1853. HO8/118

Emilia (Amelia) Tomkinson, wife of George Hankey, convict 101

Born	23 December 1822, Salford, Lancashire
Parents	John Tomkinson (1760-1832) and Martha Platt (1770-1849)
Parent's marriage	11 September 1815, Great Budworth, Cheshire
Siblings	Mary Ann (~1816)
Husband	George Hankey
Marriage	14 September 1842, Davenport
Children	George Hankey (1843-1916)

John Tomkinson was a widower when he married Martha Platt in 1815 at Great Budworth in Cheshire. Daughter Emilia was baptised on 6 January 1823, two weeks after her birth, at Christ Church, King Street, Salford in Lancashire, a Bible Christian Non-conformist church.

Britain experienced a widespread cholera outbreak in 1832. John Tomkinson, a joiner, died on 3 August 1832, aged 72, of cholera asphyxia and was buried the same day at Witton, Cheshire.

On the 1841 census, living in Witton, in the parish of Great Budworth, Cheshire were:

Martha Tomkinson, 69, a draper

Mary Ann, 25, washerwoman

Emma, 19, not born in the county [Emilia]

Martha, 4, was Mary Ann's daughter

Mary Ann Tomkinson married John Mills at Davenham, Cheshire, in September 1841. Emilia was a witness and made her mark.

The following year, Amelia (Emilia) Tomkinson married George Hankey, by banns, on 14 September 1842 at Davenport. George was of full age, a rock getter, and as was his father, Thomas. Both parties were living in Leftwich at the time of their marriage, and both made their mark.

In 1843, Amelia gave birth to a son George Hankey at Northwich, Cheshire.

At the Cheshire Assizes, in Chester, on 16 August 1848:

Thomas Sumner, 31, and George Hankey, 26, were indicted for ravishing Jane Proffit, at Leftwich, on 30 July last. Mr Trafford appeared for the prosecution and Mr Temple for the defence. The prisoners were both found guilty. The jury recommended the prisoners to mercy because Jane Proffit was drunk. The Judge sentenced them both to be transported for fifteen years.

George and Thomas petitioned for a free pardon. The petition said George had a wife and two small children entirely dependent on him for support. A second child for George and Emilia has not been found. The Judge was asked to review the evidence and concluded that although the evidence was in some respects conflicting, he was not dissatisfied with the verdict. He could not recommend any mitigation of the sentence. George was sent to Millbank Prison from Chester Gaol on 9 October 1848.

On the 1851 census, Emilia was living with her sister in London Rd, Leftwich:

John Mills 35, his wife Mary Ann 35, and their four children, *Emilia Ankey* 28, and *George Ankey* 8.

Amelia Hankey died on 6 August 1851 and was buried three days later at Davenham, Cheshire.

No.	When Died.	Name and Surname.	Sex.	Age.	Rank or Profession.	Cause of Death.	Signature, Description, and Residence of Informant.
399	6th August 1851 Leptwich	Amelia Hankey	Female	29 Years	wife of George Hankey Bookminer	Disease of the Kidneys and Anasarca Certified	X The Mark of Margaret Lamb present at the Death Leptwich

Her husband George Hankey applied for free passage to Western Australia for his wife, Amelia and son George in 1851. Amelia's address was: c/- Mrs Bonds, 6 Charlotte St, Salt House Dock, Liverpool. Four referees from Witton, including a T Hankey, recommended the free passage. The letter was returned.

Child

In 1861, George Hankey was still living with the Mills family at 8 Court, 6, Clive Street Dickinson Terrace, West Derby, Lancashire:

John Mills, 46, flatman, born Winsford, Cheshire; Mary Mills, 45, his wife; Elizabeth Mills, 19, daughter, house servant; David Mills, 14, son, assistant flatman; Louisa Mills, 11, daughter, scholar; Mary A Mills, 1, daughter; and George Hankey, 18, boarder, flatman, born Liverpool.

A flatman is a boatman on a flat bottom boat (a flat) used in shallow waters (mainly rivers and canals) for transport. The term also came to refer to shallow-draft coastal sailing vessels.

George married on 18 May 1868, at St Thomas Church, Liverpool, by banns.

George Hankey, full age, mariner of Liverpool, father George Hankey, a labourer

Isabella Humphreys, 19, spinster of Liverpool, father Vincent Humphreys, a shoemaker.

Both made their marks.

On the 1871 Census, George, Isabella and son Vincent lived at Toxteth Park, West Derby, Lancashire.

George was now a labourer at the Iron Works. The family still lived in Toxteth Park in 1881, and George was working as a flatman again.

Over the years, their family grew to 13 children:

Vincent 1869, George 1871-1874, Mary Amelia 1873, John James 1875, Ann Jane 1877, George 1879, Georgina 1880, David Humphreys 1883, Robert William 1885, Isabella 1887, Elizabeth 1889, George Thomas 1892, Roberta Alice Helena 1894.

By 1911, George worked as a watchman on a barge. He died in 1916, and his wife Isabella in 1933.