

## The Unpaid Child



FAILING TO PAY CHILDREN FOR WORK in New Zealand factories may have seemed wrong to some in the 1870s, but not many. There were two references to the practice in the 1878 Royal Commission's report into the operation of the Employment of Females Act 1873. David Haynes, an employer in Dunedin, New Zealand's main industrial town in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, offered that 'The youngest of the girls come for nothing for a time, to learn the business; afterwards, at first they get from 6s. to 8s. a week, according to what they can do'.<sup>1</sup> The other source, Rosina Jewitt, 'going on for fourteen years of age', also in Dunedin, told the commissioners: 'I am in the mantle-room, sewing. I have been here about four months. I get no wages at present. I am apprenticed as a learner for just a year. I do not know what I shall get when the year is up'.<sup>2</sup> The remarks were incidental to the purpose of the review and the issue of wages found no place in the commissioners' findings. Possibly, the young girl was complaining. If so, her complaint fell on deaf ears.

By the time of the 1890 Sweating Commission attitudes were changing. As part of its investigation into oppressive employment contracting practices leading to long hours and very poor wages, the new commission heard complaints about the non-payment of girls and low payment of boys and recommended legislative change that it expected would resolve these problems. Despite its recommendation, the issues were not settled until the enactment of the Employment of Boys or Girls without Payment Prevention Act in 1899.

The Act, perhaps the first modern statute directly providing workers with the protection of a minimum wage, is a significant part of the early history of working children in New Zealand.<sup>3</sup> Jeanine Graham states that 'little attention has been directed toward Liberal concern for the children of colonial New Zealand'.<sup>4</sup> In seeking to remedy this, she includes some consideration of the Act as one aspect of her general coverage of a range of issues impacting on child labour. The essay below considers the Act more fully and is directed at an improved understanding of the nexus between children, wage exploitation and the work of the Liberals. It chronicles the less than straightforward development of the legislation in three parts: the growth of concern over unpaid and lowly paid children; the failure of the Liberals to pass master and apprentice legislation that included wage controls; and how the matter

was finally dealt with. The essay also touches on issues of ‘class hierarchies’ and ‘gendered ... divisions’ articulated through the clash between classical liberalism and humanist or progressive liberalism. Melanie Nolan discusses the evolution of these hierarchies and divisions in the context of a common conception or misconception of New Zealand as an egalitarian society.<sup>5</sup> Tom Brooking provides a prime example of the interplay of the liberal tendencies in his biography of Richard Seddon. He usefully clarifies that ‘Unlike “classical Liberalism”, popular Liberalism ... emphasised “fairness” ahead of liberty and favoured the moderation of stricter forms of laissez-faire policy through the use of state power and regulation’.<sup>6</sup> The fractures are principally illustrated in this essay through the words of employers and unionists in government reports and the contributions of parliamentarians to legislative processes in the elected House of Representatives and the appointed Legislative Council.

The signs that there was less acceptance of non-payment by the time of the Sweating Commission were apparent in the evidence presented at its hearings in the first part of 1890 and in the commission’s findings, reported in May. The appointment of the commission followed rousing work in Dunedin in the late 1880s against the exploitation of female labour in the depths of the ‘long depression’. This economic malaise had become exceptionally severe in Christchurch and Dunedin by 1887. Rutherford Waddell, a Presbyterian clergyman in Dunedin, was central to the public reaction. In his well-publicized sermon in 1888, entitled ‘The Sin of Cheapness’, he condemned the low piece rates paid to seamstresses and argued that they were the result of overseas competition, deliberate exploitation of the oversupplied labour market by local businesses, and the ‘rage’ of consumers for cheap goods. An investigation by the *Otago Daily Times* confirmed the low rates and the local practice of undercutting. Despite pressure from the Presbyterian Church, as well as from the newly formed Tailoresses’ Union and its office holders, Waddell, Harriet Morison and John Millar (also of the Federated Seamen’s Union), and from the media, a small group of local companies refused to mend their ways. As the issues developed, Waddell and his associates and supporters turned the matter into a national campaign, which included a request for a commission of inquiry that was duly agreed to by the government.<sup>7</sup>

The Sweating Commission was specifically tasked to inquire into ‘the mode and terms in and on which persons are engaged or employed’ relating to the supply and manufacture of goods and into solutions to any issues arising. The government appointed nine members to the commission, including Waddell. In its report, the commission directly acknowledged the contributions of factory inspectors, unions and employers.<sup>8</sup> Of these groups, union officials appeared the most organized and forceful.

The submissions contained three themes of importance relating to the future regulation of youth wages. The first directly addressed the issue of non- and low payment of children. The second referred to the undercutting of adult male labour by children and women. The third covered concerns about the inadequacies of apprenticeship. The latter two were given greater weight by the union witnesses and strongly affected the legislative pathway, which included provision for unremunerated and under-paid children.

Harriet Morison, the first unionist and the only female union official to speak, described the problem for girls in the stocking trade. Ostensibly employed as apprentices, they worked for one year 'for nothing, after that they receive[d] 2s. 6d. to 5s. a week, and then they [were] allowed to leave and others [took] their place'. Morison could not 'say whether they [left as] competent dressmakers'.<sup>9</sup> Subsequent witnesses made it clear that 'allowed to leave' was a euphemism for 'replaced' and the 'apprentices' did not leave as trained workers.<sup>10</sup> Haynes, reprising his interview of 1878, agreed that 'The apprentices get nothing for twelve months, then 5s., ranging up to 8s. and 9s. as improvers'.<sup>11</sup> There were no other admissions of non-payment, but a number of workers commented on low wages. This included 'Mrs. B', a widow undertaking machinist work at home. In addition to her own long hours and poor pay, she referred to keeping 'a little girl to do the hand-sewing on the top of the pants'. She added that this 'was work that would not pay any one who wanted to earn money', but that she nevertheless paid the girl 4s. a week 'and then 5s. a little later on'. The girl, 'about fourteen', lived with her mother, 'who had a family of eight', but 'had to feed herself'.<sup>12</sup> Millar, David Pinkerton (Bootmakers' Union) and Matthew Baxter (Tailors' Union) generalized the concerns to include boys on low pay who were similarly discarded after a few years to avoid the payment of higher wages.<sup>13</sup> Robert Slater (Otago Trades and Labour Council) referred to girls from 'comfortable homes' who did 'not care to apply themselves' and in the process undercut the market for girls needing to work for a living.<sup>14</sup>

The primary concern expressed at the hearings by the unionists in relation to undercutting, however, was that girls and boys undercut adult labour, and that female labour also undercut adult male labour. Millar made the issue the first of his principal questions; it was a 'very serious question indeed'. Citing wide correspondence and specific examples, he stated that 'the majority of businesses and trades are overrun with boys' and that the proportion was much higher than in other Australasian colonies.<sup>15</sup> Harry Farnall (Auckland Trades and Labour Council) told the commission that 'Nearly every trade complains about the boy- and girl-labour taking the place of adult-labour'.<sup>16</sup> Slater commented that the use of boy labour 'had driven the best of our men

out of the colony'.<sup>17</sup> Francis Parker (Canterbury Trades and Labour Council) referred to observing 'the evils – the excessive employment of boy-labour and the employment of females – creeping in'.<sup>18</sup> The Bootmakers' Union excluded women and probably excluded boys, and Frederick Gerard (Typographical Association) complained that the introduction of female compositors into a Christchurch 'establishment' had caused its male workers 'some trouble'.<sup>19</sup> One of the medical practitioner witnesses argued that unions 'should direct all their efforts to keeping back women from labour ... and agitate that question', and that the 'labour market is glutted, and glutted because men have to compete with their sisters'.<sup>20</sup>

The commissioners also came to the investigation with the thought that stricter apprenticeship indentures may be required. One of the requests to their first witness, John Hanson, Inspector of Factories, was for comment on the allegation that 'a great many young persons that are employed are really not operatives, in the sense of learning the trade – apprentices, or something of that sort'. Hanson agreed that training was lacking.<sup>21</sup> Matthew Baxter (Tailors' Union) reported 'a great amount of abuse with reference to apprentices' and that 'the workers complained of the large percentage employed'. He qualified the language later in his evidence referring to 'so-called apprentices' and noted that 'One of the greatest evils of the trade' was the setting adrift of boys and girls before they had learned their trade. His solution was that 'Apprentices should be bound, in order that they might be turned out better workers'.<sup>22</sup> These views were repeated in one form or another by many of the witnesses: union officials, workers and even some employers.<sup>23</sup>

The commission's conclusions and recommendation addressed both generalities and specifics. Directly rejecting the claims of the Otago activists made prior to its appointment, the commission did not accept that 'the system known in London and elsewhere as "sweating"' existed in New Zealand. Waddell and two of the other nine commissioners dissented.<sup>24</sup> The commission nonetheless concluded from the detail of the evidence and its investigations that there were industrial issues that needed to be addressed. This included acceptance that some girls were initially working for nothing and then for low wages before being discharged when they asked for more, and that boys were lowly paid rather than being unpaid when starting but were otherwise similarly treated. Moreover, it found that greater numbers of 'youths and girls' were being employed in trades because 'it was inevitable that those engaged in keen competition should employ the cheapest labour at their command – cheapest not only because the supply was larger than the demand, but also because it required little previous training'. The commission

explained that less training was required because of new technology and the greater opportunity for division of labour. But it also accepted that the system of indentured apprenticeships had fallen into disuse and the early discharge of girls and boys meant they were deprived of valuable training and augmented the pool of semi-skilled labour which also undercut skilled labour. It recognized that 'the chief grievance among artisans' that they were being undercut had validity. This said, the commission was critical of the unions for acting largely in the interest of skilled male workers in trying to impose 'strictly defined' apprentice-to-journeymen ratios rather than considering the interest of youths in employment.<sup>25</sup>

The recommendation arising from these considerations was simple but also vague. The commission stated that 'A system of indenture by which employers should be bound to teach their apprentices their trade, and by which apprentices should remain with their employer long enough to learn it, would remedy many of the evils complained of'. The commission further implied that the system should be incorporated 'with the least possible delay' into 'a new Factory Bill'.<sup>26</sup> Unfortunately, this intimation of a swift remedy was illusory. In fact, subsequent action reflected the reverse priority of the male unionists and involved the Liberal government, which succeeded the Atkinson government, in legislative work of a particularly prolonged and arduous nature.

Both the Atkinson and Liberal governments subsequently failed to implement effective change to protect children from wage exploitation for a period of eight years. The Atkinson government responded by presenting labour bills, including a Factories and Shops Bill, but there was nothing in the legislation relating to the pay of children or indentures. The Liberals, who succeeded in the general election in December 1890 and took office the following year, initially did likewise. It was not until after the middle of 1894 that the first provisions to protect youth pay were presented to Parliament. These were included in a series of Master and Apprentice Bills. Four years later the Liberals were still struggling to pass this legislation. Explicit in the struggle was the clash of labour and employer interests and the assertion within and from the labour camp of the interests of adult male workers over their female and juvenile counterparts.

There are three associated explanations for the Atkinson government's failure to act on children's pay. The commission proposed reform of the apprenticeship system but without any substantive guidance on what this might look like in practical terms. Further, overseas jurisdictions had not addressed the need for similar reform and there was nothing elsewhere to consult and borrow from.<sup>27</sup> The government may have also regarded the

issue as having less significance than the other labour issues identified by the commission. Perhaps most importantly, the government may have seen the futility of trying to progress the legislation. Len Richardson describes the government as nothing more than a 'loosely organised' team.<sup>28</sup> It also included groups of 'free-trade retrenchment-without-taxation' members and social conservatives, both of which were certain to be hostile.<sup>29</sup> Generally, the government's introduction of its labour bills to the House of Representatives, the lower chamber of the bicameral Parliament, seems likely to have been not much more than a gesture.<sup>30</sup>

More was expected of the Liberals. The Sweating Commission's hearings and report had jolted the country, and the electorate voted in a progressive government in the hope of something better.<sup>31</sup> The unions, which had suffered a resounding defeat in the 1890 Maritime Strike, had supported various sympathetic candidates and returned to a greater reliance on political action to obtain their objects.<sup>32</sup> The successful candidates included Pinkerton, William Earnshaw, William Tanner, Lindsay Buick, James Kelly and, most notably, William Pember Reeves, who became the first Minister of Labour. The expectations were also indicated by the outgoing Atkinson government's fear of imminent radical change and its stacking of the upper chamber of the Parliament, the Legislative Council.<sup>33</sup>

From 1891 to 1893, the Liberals, like the Atkinson government, introduced no legislation to redress the non- and low payment of children. They probably had similar reasons. There was still no blueprint to follow. Prioritization was also likely. In the Liberals' case some measures appeared easier to achieve, such as the Truck Act, or were of greater interest, such as Reeves's favoured project of compulsory arbitration. But the main challenge continued to be opposition within Parliament. The Liberals themselves were still developing as a political party, the party's organization was relatively weak and was dominated by country members, and there were many independents in the House. Free-traders and conservatives also remained in the House of Representatives to express their hostility to all labour legislation. But the absolute bottleneck was the Legislative Council. Even after the Liberals managed to secure 12 new appointees at the end of 1892, a substantial majority hostile to their policies remained on the Council.<sup>34</sup> Edward Tregear, Reeves's first Secretary of Labour, referred to the difficulty in his 1893 report: 'the sweating-wage, miserable as it is, sometimes stands between the unfortunate recipient and starvation. If the State prevents this pittance being worked for, the authorities must either regulate wages or pension indigent workers, both of which courses are at present "outside the domain of practical politics."' <sup>35</sup>

Significantly different circumstances applied to the Liberals' failure to resolve the non- and low payment of wages to children from 1894 to 1898. Inaction was replaced by the inclusion of measures that addressed the issue of youth wages, not in a Factories Act as suggested by the Sweating Commission, but within master and apprentice reform legislation.<sup>36</sup> Regardless of Tregear's reservations, the patience of the unions had run out and they openly declared at the beginning of 1894 that they would be seeking a Master and Apprentice Bill.<sup>37</sup> The unions submitted a draft to Reeves which, regarded as too radical, was redrafted and submitted as a government Bill for its first reading in late June.<sup>38</sup> This was quickly discarded because of fundamental errors in the interpretation clause and replaced at the end of the following month by a further Bill.<sup>39</sup> Key features of the second Bill were that, with the exception of unskilled work, children could be employed only under 'indentures of apprenticeship', they would be subject to a probationary period and they would receive wages as proportions of the adult paid rate for their particular handicraft or work relating to 'the manufacture of articles for trade or for sale'.<sup>40</sup> As foreshadowed in the commission hearings, the unions made the protection of adult male labour the principal focus for the reform. The means to this goal were restrictive apprentice provisions and apprentice pay rates. Progress on youth wages was subordinate and hostage to the achievement of these other, higher priority objectives.

The Liberals' inability to pass this and the later master and apprentice Bills reflected the parliamentary opposition's powerful, visceral reaction to the legislation's radicalism and its willingness and ability to harness its institutional strength. The opposition was also able to exploit ambivalence within the loose Liberal coalition with respect to radical departures from economic orthodoxy. The unions may have conceived that Millar joining the labour group had given them an advantage following the Liberals' convincing win at the 1893 elections. The reality was that the relative influence of labour within the House had declined. With increased unemployment, the trade unions had been unable to organize its vote as effectively as it had in the previous election and the Liberals lost ground in the towns and gained more in the country.<sup>41</sup> Jim Holt notes that the farming community did not feel threatened by key labour legislation but at best they remained neutral in 1894.<sup>42</sup> They also became increasingly ambivalent toward labour reform. In addition, Reeves, an exceptional advocate for labour legislation, left the House to become Agent-General in London in early 1896.<sup>43</sup> In seeking to pass the Bills, Reeves and Premier Seddon needed to accommodate those who recognized 'shameless sweating' but also had to protect 'ordinary commerce'.<sup>44</sup> Seddon acknowledged a need to 'creep before you gang'.<sup>45</sup>

The arguments over the Bills were relentless. The drafts commenced with a mere 31 clauses and eventually reduced to only 25 clauses. Yet the minutes of the evidence for the first hearing in the House Labour Bills Committee in 1894 from 31 August to 2 October were the length of a short novel. The *Hansard* record in relation to the legislation that followed comprised more than 150,000 words. Many of the core issues and disagreements were indicated at the outset in media reaction and in the first hearing minutes.

The *Lyttelton Times* described the Bill as proposing 'to introduce a rigid and almost universal apprenticeship system, and to fix the rates of wages' and critically regarded it as too innovative and 'far-reaching'.<sup>46</sup> Legislators, employers and unions all expressed partisan views over the following months. Robert Stout, who resented the elevation of his rival Seddon to the Liberal premiership on the death of John Ballance, thought the Bill 'most cumbersome and unworkable'. Kelly thought 'the main principle of the Bill' was right. Earnshaw agreed with the fixing of 'a distinct ratio between the wages of adult and juvenile workers'.<sup>47</sup> The Employers' Association regarded the possible enactment of the Bill as 'most prejudicial to the manufacturing industries, inasmuch as the effect would be to absolutely prohibit the employment of young persons, except at high rates of premiums'.<sup>48</sup> The Trades Councils urged 'the necessity of the measure becoming law this session'.<sup>49</sup> The Canterbury Typographical Association spoke of compulsory indenturing 'as the vital principle of the measure' in dealing with 'the undue competition of juvenile labour'.<sup>50</sup>

The Labour Bills Committee hearing was chaired by Pinkerton and included Reeves, Kelly, Millar and William Russell, Leader of the Opposition. Alfred Newman and Walter Buchanan also represented the opposition. David Fisher (Typographical Association) reminded the committee that the Sweating Commission had found that 'small wages, or very low wages, were prevalent', 'there was no such thing as teaching trades', and 'there was nothing like a fixed living-wage in any shape or form'. In expanding, however, he not only reversed the order of importance of wages and training but referred at length to the 'cardinal point', which was the need to address the substitution of boys for adult male labour. The Bill, in his view, did not provide 'for the boy after he has served his apprenticeship.' The remedy, he said, had been in the union's earlier Bill: 'Masters should only be allowed to employ a just proportion of apprentices to journeymen.' He also told the committee that without the ratios the Bill would 'do more harm than good'.<sup>51</sup> Four other unionists, all male, provided a similar message.<sup>52</sup> James Mackay, the Chief Clerk of the Department of Labour, also emphasized the concern by commenting that the printing trade was 'overrun with what is called boy-labour'.<sup>53</sup>



Grace Neill, Inspector of Factories, was the sole female voice heard by the committee. Reeves made it clear that she had been called to provide a perspective on ‘the state of female workers’. Her evidence was that the circumstances described to the Sweating Commission had not changed. Girls were still not being paid in their first year and were being discharged early without proper training, and girls in need of pay were being undercut by girls who came from ‘well-to-do’ families where there was no pressure to obtain what Reeves referred to in a leading question as ‘the living wage’. The girls from these more affluent families were resistant to apprenticeships and, Neill thought, better served by access to a ‘continuation school’. ‘Boys have night-schools to go to’, she noted, ‘but parents do not care about girls going to these schools’. She agreed with Reeves that unpaid children were ‘not taken on to learn a trade, but simply to get a certain amount of work out of them’.<sup>54</sup>

Other points raised in support of the legislation included concern that inadequate wages led to moral risk for girls. Challenged, the claim was softened but reasserted later.<sup>55</sup> Poor training also augured badly for the economy and excessive competition led to exploitation and ‘evil’ consequences.<sup>56</sup> In response to criticism, the supporters of the Bill said that work in country areas provided better options for children than work in oversupplied industries and that apprentices did provide employers with economic advantages and would not become unavailable.<sup>57</sup>

The opposition looked for vulnerabilities. Newman, for example, asked if the Bill would cause the employer to shut up shop and contract out all his work to be done in the home.<sup>58</sup> Russell questioned whether boys produced anything of value in their first year.<sup>59</sup> Buchanan suggested that girls were not committed to learning a trade. Neill agreed that some could give up on a whim.<sup>60</sup> The urban retailers and manufacturers who came in relative strength represented the trenchant voice of business. John Kirkcaldie from Wellington spoke of the Bill taking ‘away from the liberty of the individual’, that wages had to be negotiated directly between the master and individual worker, and that the Bill was ‘the very essence of levelling’.<sup>61</sup> John Blair, a bookseller and printer, said the Bill would close him down and asked how employers were ‘to exist’ under such ‘accumulating burdens and restrictions’.<sup>62</sup> At best, another argued, the legislation should be held off because of ‘the depressed state of things’.<sup>63</sup>

The arguments and attacks on the Bill and subsequent versions had several themes. Some of the criticism related to the regulation of minimum wages for children. For example, Russell in the first full parliamentary debate stated that for every position there were three or four waiting to work for nothing

and asked, 'though I deplore it, how is it to be prevented?' Fixing wages 'must be futile, for the ordinary law of supply and demand is so powerful it must override any laws we may pass in Parliament'.<sup>64</sup> Others argued that the minimum wages would lead to the charging of premiums for apprenticeships to the disadvantage of poor families.<sup>65</sup> Some saw little if anything that needed remedy.<sup>66</sup> William Massey, the reactionary future Reform Prime Minister, justified the non-payment of wages on the basis that apprentices wasted as much as they earned for their employers and deprecated the state's 'grandmotherly interest in all and sundry'.<sup>67</sup>

But most of the opposition to the Bills related to other aspects of the proposals to increase apprenticeship regulation. This included the argument that the Bills would stop youths from getting work. The opposition predicted emigration and increased 'larrikinism'.<sup>68</sup> Further, fewer children in work would lead to a skills deficit in the economy and jobs currently undertaken by children would either not be done or would have to be done by adults at low rates of pay.<sup>69</sup> As the debates in Parliament progressed, the opposition emphasized attendance at institutes as a better means of training.<sup>70</sup> Galling for the progressives, the articles of indentures were condemned as unfree, archaic and oppressive.<sup>71</sup> Youths were to be locked into careers that were unsuitable.<sup>72</sup> Employers would also be variously oppressed by decisions of the inspectors and the Arbitration Court and the access of mischievous apprentices to court procedures.<sup>73</sup> In addition, employers would be required to maintain apprenticeships during downturns in economic activity; they did not have the capacity to train apprentices or would find it too difficult; and probationary periods were too short.<sup>74</sup> Another important occasional argument was that the non-payment of children was wrong but that the rest of the apprenticeship provisions were unacceptable.<sup>75</sup>

There was a specific attempt to encourage dissent amongst the Liberals' country members. Significant issues included farmers' daughters deprived of opportunities to learn garment-making skills for the home and their 'after-life' and that areas outside the main centres would be deprived of apprentices.<sup>76</sup> On the latter, concerns were raised that ratios would limit employers to one apprentice for every four journeymen.<sup>77</sup> This would prevent the employment of apprentices in small towns and in the country.<sup>78</sup> Similar fears were raised that the Arbitration Court would make blanket apprenticeship rules over the whole country.<sup>79</sup> Despite the government's reassurance that one apprentice would always be allowed where a journeyman was employed regardless of the standard ratio, Liberal country members remained worried. Charles Hall thought, for example, that the local blacksmith should be able to train more than one son.<sup>80</sup> Seddon responded by appealing to the country members to

take their lead on labour matters from those who had made a 'special study' of the subject and had a 'special duty' to town workers. This would fairly reciprocate the respect shown for the 'special knowledge' of country members on 'the pastoral or agricultural interests of our colony'.<sup>81</sup>

Moreover, the opposition demonized unions as prime movers of legislation against the interest of other workers and to the detriment of the general economy. As they had been by the Sweating Commission, the unions wanting stronger measures were particularly criticized for seeking to advance the interest of adult male workers over 'boy-labour'.<sup>82</sup> The opposition was also well aided by disunity amongst the labour members and their supporters. Some on the left felt the legislation did not go far enough. Arthur Morrison, a Liberal with strong labour sympathies, reflected the sense of disappointment in describing the 1897 Bill as 'only a very feeble attempt to deal with some of the evils which exist at present in our industrial departments'.<sup>83</sup> On the other hand and particularly useful to the opposition were remarks from Earnshaw on the 1896 Bill. He agreed with the opposition that the Bill would cause a heavy loss of jobs for young workers and 'general demoralisation in the labour-market of the colony'; that the Labour Bills Committee had 'very unwisely' set a single apprentice ratio for boy-to-adult labour of one to four; and that apprenticeships were not necessary for the development of a trained workforce.<sup>84</sup> Opposition speakers repeatedly exploited Earnshaw's remarks.<sup>85</sup> As the opposition probed for weakness in commitment among the Liberals and sought to profit from any union unpopularity and to enliven unease over economic consequences, it self-validated the use of its power and capacity to obstruct.

The opposition was entirely successful in halting the legislation. The Bills were introduced again and again, subjected to challenging committee hearings, acrimoniously debated at great length, denied progress, and discharged. Throughout they were subject to amendments.<sup>86</sup> These included shifting, sometimes back and forth, industry coverage, the age of apprenticeship applicability, the length of trial periods at the commencement of apprenticeships, the proportionality of apprentice-to-journeyman wages, the expression of wages as percentages or fixed sums, the division of the duration of the apprenticeship, the use of schedules and the Arbitration Court to fix ratios, and equal and different provisions for girls and boys.<sup>87</sup> The late scheduling of the 1897 and 1898 Bills was also effectively used by the opposition to prevent progress.<sup>88</sup>

The Liberals' failure was prolonged and difficult. Initially, legislation such as the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act had taken precedence. Subsequently, provisions that could have helped were buried in legislation

subject to political trench warfare. The Master and Apprentice Bills reached the Legislative Council in 1897 and 1898, but the vote at the end of 1898 gave no basis for confidence of future enactment. And yet suddenly the following year there was light ahead.

The deadlock was broken by the radical jettisoning of the apprenticeship provisions. The unions could hardly have missed the parliamentary remarks of those who would support minimum wages for children but not the rest of the apprenticeship provisions. The unions let go or were forced to let go. The change also provided a helpful shift in dynamics for the imminent elections. Although argument about training and how apprenticeships would not work continued, the issue became much more clearly the protection of the most vulnerable workers against the unfettered operation of the free market. There was also much more said on pay equality and a living wage. Finally, the Liberals were to at least resolve the issue of the non-payment of children.<sup>89</sup> This was achieved within a single session.

The government was taunted in the Council on 2 August 1899 with a demand for the introduction of a further Master and Apprentice Bill for consideration by its Labour Bills Committee. William Walker, Minister for Immigration and Education, assured the Council that a Bill would be presented and ample time would be given for consideration.<sup>90</sup> Instead the House was informed two days later that the Employment of Boys or Girls without Payment Prevention Bill was to be a substitute measure. The Bill had been read for a first time in the House on 30 June 1899; the second reading, *pro forma*, had occurred on 21 July. The new Bill provided for a minimum wage of 2s. 6d. for all boys and girls in factories and workrooms. There were no references to apprenticeships or to skilled handicrafts. The Labour Bills Committee subsequently reviewed the Bill and raised the rate for boys to 5s.<sup>91</sup> The first substantive debate, on 4 August, was on a motion to move the House into committee to further progress the Bill.

Seddon commenced the debate by stating that all were clear on what the issue was and that he had been 'advised the proper way to deal with it would be by a separate Bill'. The intent was indeed familiar: to deal with the practice of children, particularly girls, working for 12 months without pay on the understanding that if they gave satisfactory service they would be paid and taught the trade, but who were in fact usually replaced by children offered the same conditions. He claimed that legitimate employers were complaining of being undercut and said, disavowing personal responsibility, that 'I see the [Labour Bills] Committee has raised the minimum wage to be paid to boys to 5s. per week'. His view, regardless, was that the rate should not be too high to deter employment but sufficient to deter employers from

‘duping ... juveniles’.<sup>92</sup> Morrison explained the gendered rates as a political move to avoid jeopardizing the Bill.<sup>93</sup> Several other supporters of the Bill said the minimum rates for girls and boys should be closer or the same and that if girls and boys did the same work they should receive the same pay.<sup>94</sup> An argument was made in support of higher rates. Charles Rawlins, the conservative member for Tuapeka, said it was ‘a terrible state of affairs that we live in a country where people should propose such a thing as giving girls half a crown a week. I am going to move to amend it to such a sum as they can nearly live on’.<sup>95</sup> It is unclear if this was genuine sentiment or intended to propose the politically impractical and thus the demise of the Bill. Another opposition member argued that 2s. 6d. was of no use at all and that 10s. was required to enable factory girls to live; rather than a minimum rate, workers needed to be encouraged to go into the country for work.<sup>96</sup> Thomas Taylor, a radical independent, said that it was ‘ridiculous ... to argue that every boy when he goes to work should be paid an amount sufficient to keep him. You cannot do that without crippling industry.’<sup>97</sup>

Opposition remarks on the Master and Apprentices Act were sharpened or readjusted to take aim at the new much more limited Bill. Russell took the safest course he could by realizing ‘most fully’ how it was ‘desirable that a wage should be paid’ but also recounting the difficulties in achieving this. He did ‘not want it thought that I think it is desirable that 2s. 6d. should not be paid, but so long as there is a constant demand for employment in certain classes of work, so long as there are more people applying than there are vacancies to be filled, so long will the employer regulate the rate of wages or demand a premium’. The duty was rather to encourage youth into other work.<sup>98</sup> Seddon finalized the debate by stating, among many other things, his agreement with the principle of equality.<sup>99</sup> The Bill progressed to the committee, and Seddon proposed a single minimum rate of 4s. for boys and girls. The proposal was agreed. The House then read the Bill a third time, and it was referred to the Council for its consideration.<sup>100</sup>

Presenting the government’s Bill for the second reading in the Council with a view to referring the matter to the Council’s Labour Bills Committee, Walker first explained that ‘Trades are not the same mysteries as they used to be. Certain work in certain factories is much more a matter of machinery, and attendance on that machinery, and, therefore, the employer cannot offer to the young person whom he takes into his service the same advantages of training that he used to offer in return for unpaid services.’ Thus, he continued, ‘it is more incumbent on employers nowadays to pay for all the services they get’. He stressed that girls rather than boys were in most need of protection and that the evidence on the matter was clear.<sup>101</sup>

Included among the councillors who supported the Bill in the debate and committee discussions that followed were Francis Fraser, George Jones, John Rigg, Pinkerton and William Jennings, all appointed by the Liberals. Some Liberal appointees opposed the Bill, however. These included John McGregor and William Bolt. Conservative opponents included George McLean, James Bonar and Samuel Shrimski. McLean, leading the opposition, expressed sympathy with the Bill's objective, but also said that it flew 'too high' for many young workers and required a 'great many amendments'. Citing previous evidence to the Labour Bills Committee, he claimed some workers were not worth their pay and the Bill would produce job losses as a result.<sup>102</sup> McGregor recognized and deplored 'the evils' that the Bill intended to address but had 'very grave misgivings as to whether it will achieve its purpose, and I am very much afraid it will produce consequences which such measures so often do, and such as we have little thought of'.<sup>103</sup> Bonar was less restrained. The Bill was unnecessary: boys were already paid fairly and well able to care for themselves and girls would end up being charged premiums, as already happened in Victoria. Thus, girls from poorer families would be excluded from jobs.<sup>104</sup>

The comments produced some forthright responses but also suggestions of amendments. Fraser said that McLean had incorrectly represented the evidence of the committee and invited premiums on the basis that employers would be held more stringently to their obligations to train. He also regarded the non-payment of workers as an inducement to pilfer.<sup>105</sup> Jones asked how it was possible for McLean to 'be in favour of a thing when he opposes it tooth and nail' and proposed an amendment preventing premiums excepting in the case of indentures drawn up under the current Master and Apprentice Act. He wanted employers to 'have some sort of care for the present and future welfare of the young people under their charge, as well as have in view the benefit of themselves'.<sup>106</sup> Rigg, a former political ally of Reeves, attacked the offset of training against wages. Recounting a recent conversation, he noted the distinction being made between boys paid from the outset of employment despite a lack of knowledge of their work and the non-payment of girls in the dressmaking industry because they were 'learning something that will be useful to [them] in after-life, and therefore it is right that [they] should give free service in order to gain that knowledge'. There was also the inconsistency of the payment of girls entering into domestic service.<sup>107</sup> Pinkerton, appointed to the Council in 1897, simply believed that 'it would be better to separate these questions as to the boys and the girls, as the boys stand in a different position altogether from the girls'.<sup>108</sup> The Bill was read a second time and then discussed further in the Council sitting as a committee.

McLean continued to express his reservations in the committee. He saw no reason for boys to be included in the Bill and, for girls, proposed that employers should be required to pay at least 2s. 6d. but only after three months' probation, with another increment after six months.<sup>109</sup> Bolt suggested that a statutory minimum rate of 4s. would encourage employers to lower the current standard commencement rate for apprentices from 5s. to 4s. He thought that the Arbitration Court made 'sweating' impossible and that girls only needed to unionize to ensure a fair rate.<sup>110</sup> Jennings, although in support of the Bill, thought the rate of 4s. for girls too high and would encourage forms of evasion apparent in Victoria.<sup>111</sup> MacGregor restated the standard argument that labour legislation as 'class legislation' tended 'in the direction of discouraging thrift, discouraging co-operation, discouraging self-reliance'. He also maintained that the proposal to prevent the payment of a premium was an attempt to introduce by stealth the object that the government had been seeking to introduce in its Master and Apprentice Bills.<sup>112</sup>

The committee discussion included views from both ends of the spectrum. Opposed, Shrimski thought the Bill interfered 'a little too much with the freedom' of employers and girls themselves. Poorer consumers would bear the brunt of price rises as a result of payment. Parents mainly wanted their children to be taught and kept off the streets, and payment would 'only tend to make [children] independent and impertinent, and given to dictating terms'.<sup>113</sup> Rigg argued that there was a difference between rates that fell 'to the lowest point at which a labourer could work and subsist' and the standard rates where 'necessity does not come' into it. Concerns that the rates in the Bill might affect standard rates could be addressed by a higher rate for boys, not the elimination of a minimum rate for boys. He dismissed Shrimski as confused and misleading. He recited a brief summary from a contemporary description of women's work in America, associated degradation and its long-term consequences. The Bill was a very timid attempt to deal with the same problem in New Zealand. His preference was for 'a graduated scale of wages for all workers up to the adult age, and that the graduated scale should be based, even in its lowest stages, upon a living wage.' Questioned, he accepted that the living wage would vary from place to place but, to provide an indication of the rate, he thought that 'in Wellington a living wage for a girl of sixteen years of age ... is about 15s. a week'.<sup>114</sup> According to MacGregor, 'the whole tone and sentiment' of Rigg's 'learned disquisition' was 'derived from the socialism of Karl Marx'.<sup>115</sup>

Further discussions resulted in various proposals to amend the Bill, including an increase to the youth rate for boys and girls to 5s. This was defeated, and instead an amendment passed that the rate for boys alone would

be 5s.<sup>116</sup> The Council also agreed to Jones's proposal to include a clause to prevent the payment of premiums unless formal terms of indenture were agreed.<sup>117</sup> The amended Bill received its third reading in the Council.

The final legislative hurdle was the harmonizing of the two Bills that had passed the House and the Council. Again, a committee was formed for this purpose. Government supporters in the House continued to argue the merit of equal rates but were prepared to concede the change made in the Council for the sake of enactment.<sup>118</sup> Seddon supported the introduction of the new clause limiting the payment of premiums to formal indentures.<sup>119</sup> Opponents in the House persisted in challenging the Bill. Russell was particularly contrary. He continued to argue that the market alone should determine wage rates but also strongly opposed the introduction of differential rates for girls and boys. It is reasonable from context to conclude that he was pressing the issue in the hope that the House and Council would end up with irreconcilable Bills. He also bridled at Seddon's comment that the amendment made by the Council to prohibit premiums had followed from his own comments. He asserted again that premiums would hurt the poor and not the more affluent and that they would now increase as employers sought to cover the penalty clause attached to the prohibition.<sup>120</sup> Richard Moore, a Canterbury conservative, claimed that the Bill would be inconsistent with awards determined by the Arbitration Court and that the system was 'already costing the colony a considerable amount of money'.<sup>121</sup> Managers appointed by the House and Council met in conference and decided to increase the penalties and cover repeated offences. On further debate the penalties were reduced and the Bill was finally passed.<sup>122</sup>

Gendered exclusion, disparity, inequity and condescension were significant themes throughout the genesis and the development of the legislation. The principle of equality was subsequently acknowledged, however, with the equalization of the minimum rates for boys and girls in the Factories Act 1901, and eventually in the Shops and Offices Act 1904. Viewed from the perspective of the concern raised as a result of the work of pivotal activists such as Waddell and Harriet Morison in the late 1880s in Dunedin, and of the Sweating Commission, over the non-payment of children, the Employment of Boys or Girls without Payment Prevention Act and superseding statutes were a success. The non-payment of girls in dressmaking factories ceased and there were no signs of the adverse consequences predicted by opponents of the measure. Tregear noted the immediate positive impact on the wages of children in his report of 1900.<sup>123</sup> Of the other closely associated matters, the unions' desire to protect adult male labour through the control of an apprenticeship system was progressed through the arbitration system that



developed under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. New master and apprentice legislation was eventually passed in 1908, but this involved only tinkering. A more substantial revision took place in 1923, but even so there was no attempt to repeat the difficult reform proposals of the 1890s.

The Employment of Boys or Girls without Payment Prevention Act, as part of a lineage that included the failed Master and Apprentice Bills, was a significant part of the Liberals' labour legislation work.<sup>124</sup> The genesis and development of the Act illustrates the development of a broad awareness of the incidence of poverty and exploitation and the prioritization of the Liberals' labour agenda. It also exemplifies the tormenting political difficulties, in part self-inflicted, of enacting new and radical solutions to what were old but unaddressed problems in the face of determined political opponents. Further evident is the conflict of two discourses associated with class interests, one rooted in the self-interested view of political economy, the other reflecting social progressive thought. The overall result demonstrated the colonial social and economic elite's ability to exercise power through the parliamentary process. Despite being out of office, they forced the abandonment of the unions' objectives to radically regulate wages across a significant swathe of the labour market and to assert some control over the supply of labour to the advantage of adult male workers. The work of the Liberals did not end here, however, and they continued to test the boundaries of what was politically possible. In relatively short order they made a success of the compelling argument precisely directed against the egregious exploitation of children. On balance, a sense of fairness and the need to ensure payment for work of value triumphed over the strongly advocated need to respond to market conditions and claims relating to the burden of training obligations.<sup>125</sup> While of little help to the individual child, the progressive margin over reaction and resistance resulted in a minimum wage for children that assisted poor working-class families.

The Liberals, led by Seddon, had done what they could. But the progressive future most importantly lay in part of the thread of the repulsed Master and Apprentice Bills. Along with rejecting chauvinism against women, this would mean ensuring equitable access to work and remuneration for adults, and ending child labour.

The first of two, this essay prepares the ground for further comment that relates to Nolan's questioning of New Zealand's self-image as an egalitarian society. The Liberals of the 1890s worked hard to institute a progressive agenda but were clearly and powerfully opposed by interests that espoused free-market capitalism in a society where many participants were socially and economically disadvantaged. The most important theme of the second

essay is that the self-interested advocates of free-market capitalism have been ever present and took the opportunity to visit particular harm on vulnerable workers in the 1980s and 1990s.

JON HENNING

*Independent Researcher, Ōtepoti/Otago*

## NOTES

My thanks to Jen Wilson and Rosemary Mercer for their essential and kind assistance, and to Josie Henning for her inspiring combativeness in support of the rights of women.

- 1 *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives* (AJHR), 1878, H-2, p.10.
- 2 AJHR, 1878, H-2, p.20.
- 3 G. Starr, *Minimum Wage Fixing: An International Review of Practices and Problems*, International Labour Organisation, Geneva, 1993, p.1; [www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minimum\\_wage](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minimum_wage) (accessed 25 December 2018).
- 4 Jeanine Graham, 'Child Employment in New Zealand', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 21, 1, (1986), p.62.
- 5 M. Nolan, 'Constantly on the Move, But Going Nowhere?', in G. Byrnes, ed., *The New Oxford History of New Zealand*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 2009, p.357.
- 6 T. Brooking, *Richard Seddon: King of God's Own*, Penguin, Auckland, 2014, p.23.
- 7 I. Dougherty, *Pulpit Radical*, Saddle Hill Press, Dunedin, 2018, pp.86–115.
- 8 AJHR, 1890, H-5, pp.i, iii. Other groups were medical practitioners and workers. The medical practitioners were generally focused on the physical health of workers. The workers provided personal accounts of actual wages and hours of work and attributed recent improvements to the growth and work of unions.
- 9 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.5.
- 10 The essay generalizes from a very substantial amount of primary material. The references are illustrative, not comprehensive. AJHR, 1890, H-5, pp.60, 62.
- 11 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.27.
- 12 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.6.
- 13 AJHR, 1890, H-5, pp.10, 15, 51.
- 14 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.14.
- 15 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.10.
- 16 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.55.
- 17 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.14.
- 18 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.39.
- 19 AJHR, 1890, H-5, pp.42, 48.
- 20 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.35.
- 21 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.1.
- 22 AJHR, 1890, H-5, pp.50–51.
- 23 AJHR, 1890, H-5, pp.25, 75, 78.
- 24 AJHR, 1890, H-5, pp.iii, vi.
- 25 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.iv.
- 26 AJHR, 1890, H-5, p.vi.
- 27 New Zealand Parliamentary Debates (NZPD), 1897, 100, p.409; 1898, 102, p.455; 1898, 105, p.373.
- 28 L. Richardson, 'Parties and Political Change', in W. Oliver, ed., with B. Williams, *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1981, p.198.
- 29 J. Bassett, *Sir Harry Atkinson*, Oxford University Press, Wellington, 1975, p.140; R. Dalziel, 'The Politics of Settlement', in Oliver with Williams, *Oxford History*, pp.109–11; K. Sinclair, *A History of New Zealand*, Penguin, Auckland, 1969, p.168.
- 30 Atkinson taught Reeves the value of introducing Bills not likely to pass in order to educate public opinion, K. Sinclair, *William Pember Reeves: New Zealand Fabian*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965, p.93.
- 31 M. King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, Penguin, Auckland, 2012, p.237; Jeanine Graham, 'Settler Society', in Oliver with Williams, *Oxford History*, p.138.

- 32 Richardson, 'Parties and Political Change', p.197; e.g. NZPD, 1896, 95, p.570.
- 33 One of the new appointees, James Fulton, a resident magistrate from Otago, chaired the Sweating Commission.
- 34 Brooking, *Richard Seddon*, p.88; K. Sinclair, *History of New Zealand*, pp.170–1.
- 35 AJHR, 1893, H-10, p.3.
- 36 There was some confusion amongst some of the industrial and political actors over the first and the number of the master and apprentice Bills: AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.17; NZPD, 1898, 102, p.447.
- 37 Tregear's Department of Labour reports from 1894 provided considerable support for the rationale for the master and apprentice Bills.
- 38 *Star*, 19 January and 17 July 1894. The 'confidential' union draft does not appear to have survived: AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.4.
- 39 *Lyttelton Times*, 18 July 1894.
- 40 Master and Apprentice (No.2) Bill, 1894.
- 41 Richardson, 'Parties and Political Change', p.202.
- 42 J. Holt, *Compulsory Arbitration in New Zealand*, Auckland University Press, Auckland, 1986, p.25.
- 43 Richardson, 'Parties and Political Change', pp.203–204.
- 44 NZPD, 1897, 100, p.414.
- 45 NZPD, 1896, 95, p.555.
- 46 *Lyttelton Times*, 12 and 13 July 1894.
- 47 *Star*, 14 July 1894.
- 48 *Lyttelton Times*, 19 July 1894. Employers could require payment (premiums) for apprenticeships.
- 49 *New Zealand Times*, 20 July 1894.
- 50 *Lyttelton Times*, 6 August 1894.
- 51 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.17–18. Fisher sat with Waddell on the Sweating Commission and similarly dissented from its final report.
- 52 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.9–11, 18, 24–27.
- 53 AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.1.
- 54 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.7–8. Tregear promoted the living wage 'as "such a wage as will enable the workers to maintain healthy and human homes"'; it is not a starvation or minimum wage unfit to maintain a household'. He noted the economic benefit of the wage and condemned criticism from 'well-to-do preachers of thrift', AJHR, 1895, H-6, pp.6–7.
- 55 AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.6; NZPD, 1896, 95, p.564; 1897, 100, p.399.
- 56 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.2–6, 8, 10–11, 13–14, 24–25.
- 57 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.4–6, 11–12, 26–27.
- 58 AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.5.
- 59 AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.5.
- 60 AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.8.
- 61 AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.30.
- 62 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.12, 14.
- 63 AJHR, 1894, I-13, p.23.
- 64 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.556–7.
- 65 NZPD, 1896, 95, p.583; 1897, 100, p.392.
- 66 NZPD, 1896, 95, p.574; 1898, 102, pp.449–51.
- 67 NZPD, 1898, 104, p.732.
- 68 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.550–1, 557; 1897, 100, p.393.
- 69 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.552, 560, 587.
- 70 NZPD, 1898, 104, p.721; 105, p.366.

- 71 NZPD, 1896, 95, p.572; 1898, 102, p.457.
- 72 NZPD, 1897, 100, p.397; 1898, 102, p.440.
- 73 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.22–23, 28–29; NZPD, 1897, 100, pp.392–3, 409.
- 74 AJHR, 1894, I-13, pp.12–13; NZPD, 1896, 95, pp. 572, 596; 1898, 102, pp.460, 462, 465. Probation periods in the first Bills were capped at one month. This increased to three months in 1896 and was set at six months for boys in the first of the two Bills for 1898.
- 75 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.561–2; 1898, 102, pp.453, 470.
- 76 NZPD, 1896, 95, p.563; 1897, 100, pp.397, 410–11; 1898, 102, pp.460, 469.
- 77 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.552, 563.
- 78 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.566, 583.
- 79 NZPD, 1897, 100, pp.391–2, 408–409.
- 80 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.552–3, 584, 587.
- 81 NZPD, 1898, 102, p.479; also see 1897, 100, p.420.
- 82 NZPD, 1896, 95, p.550; 1898, 102, p.458.
- 83 NZPD, 1897, 100, p. 395.
- 84 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.558–9.
- 85 NZPD, 1896, 95, p.578; 1898, 102, p.455.
- 86 NZPD, 1897, 100, p.391; 1898, 102, p.437. The opposition was also accused of seeking to transform principle and detail ‘into a mass of incongruous matter’, NZPD, 1898, 105, p.738.
- 87 There were nine parliamentary Master and Apprentice Bills, two in 1894, 1896 and 1897 and three in 1898.
- 88 NZPD, 1897, 100, pp.882–5; 1898, 105, p.746.
- 89 Seddon similarly greatly reduced scope two years later to obtain progress on the eight-hour day, J. Henning, ‘Prosaic Realities of the Work Time Dream’, *Journal of New Zealand Studies*, 25, (2017), pp.65–68.
- 90 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.373.
- 91 Employment of Boys or Girls without Payment Prevention Bill, as reported from the Labour Bills Committee, 1 August 1899.
- 92 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.488.
- 93 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.504.
- 94 NZPD, 1899, 107, pp.493–4, 499.
- 95 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.500.
- 96 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.494.
- 97 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.502.
- 98 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.489.
- 99 NZPD, 1899, 107, pp.507–510.
- 100 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.510.
- 101 NZPD, 1899, 107, pp.561–2.
- 102 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.562.
- 103 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.564.
- 104 NZPD, 1899, 107, pp.566–7. The reference to Victoria is much exaggerated. Master and Apprentice Act 1890 [54 Vict. No.1117] required payments for female apprentices but only to the extent of an annual sum of 30s. for each of the last three years of a seven-year apprenticeship.
- 105 NZPD, 1899, 107, pp.562–3.
- 106 NZPD, 1899, 107, pp.565–6.
- 107 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.563.
- 108 NZPD, 1899, 107, p.565.
- 109 NZPD, 1899, 109, p.385.

- 110 NZPD, 1899, 109, p.387.
- 111 NZPD, 1899, 109, p.386.
- 112 NZPD, 1899, 109, pp.426–9.
- 113 NZPD, 1899, 109, p.388.
- 114 NZPD, 1899, 109, pp.422–3.
- 115 NZPD, 1899, 109, pp.428.
- 116 NZPD, 1899, 109, pp.433–4.
- 117 NZPD, 1899, 109, p.470.
- 118 NZPD, 1899, 110, pp.97–100, 113. Also see p.103.
- 119 NZPD, 1899, 110, p.98.
- 120 NZPD, 1899, 110, p.99.
- 121 NZPD, 1899, 110, p.106.
- 122 NZPD, 1899, 110, pp.357–59, 427, 469–80, 729–30.
- 123 AJHR, 1900, H-11, pp.ii, v.
- 124 NZPD, 1896, 95, pp.558, 567; 1898, 102, p.436.
- 125 NZPD, 1898, 102, pp.437, 467.