

Curating the record of free speech in Parliament¹

Cecilia Edwards

1 Introduction

The exercise of freedom of speech in Parliament occurs as a brief moment in time. Georgina Stylianou asks: "... if a political speech is made and nobody witnesses it, does it make a sound?"² And Anthony Marinac said in 2006: "Simply allowing any member to express themselves freely in the parliament is of limited utility if their words are only ever heard by those few people able to attend the parliamentary sittings."³ Traditional and social media communicate just a tiny fraction of parliamentary discourse. Hansard, on the other hand, records and communicates the lot and endures across time.

Hansard serves a very wide range of research purposes, but it is not well researched itself. Histories of specific Hansard services have generally been written by Hansard or parliamentary staff. Although the origins of Hansard in Britain have been quite well covered, there is a very slim literature on the history of New Zealand's Hansard.⁴ Engagement with Hansard's editorial policies has been in the domain of historical linguistics, mostly based on the Hansards for the House of Commons and House of Lords.⁵ Legal scholarship on the use of parliamentary materials in statutory interpretation reveals an underlying sense of unease about the reliability of historic Hansards, but this goes more to issues around the political environment in which speeches are made, rather than the reporting and editing applied to those speeches.⁶

Hansard's hallmarks are impartiality, accuracy, timeliness, readability, and accessibility and it has been described as one of four 'democratic parliamentary pillars' because it enables transparency and accountability.⁷ The principles of Hansard reporting that we associate with it today are the result of sometimes bruising encounters. And they are not fixed in meaning or time. For example, what did "accuracy of reporting" mean in an era without sound amplification and recording? And what are the trade-offs between readability and accuracy? Do we want to read every single word spoken by MPs if they stumble and bumble their way through a speech?

Overview

Hansard is often referred to as an edited report. For the period I've been studying, I prefer to think of it as a curated report. Because establishing Hansard as an in-house service was an attempt by politicians to control the narrative rather than leave it to the whims of the press. And far from it being a simple process of words in, report out, with some editorial tweaks, Hansard reports reflected the complexity of rendering a spoken language in written form, juggling limited resources to report lengthy debates, reliance on the human ear and hand to capture sound until the mid-20th century, and balancing the need to provide a readable, accurate report with getting it published and distributed in a timely manner. And all this in a political environment.

This paper touches on four topics: the importance of impartiality; constraints on achieving accuracy; attempts to retract unfortunate utterances using the members' correction process; and the curious

anomaly of, historically, not reporting certain debates where, arguably, the most free and frank expression took place.

2 Impartiality

Today we take for granted that Hansard is an impartial record of what is said in the House. Hansard doesn't report just the hot-button topics; it reports almost everything that happens in the House. That's why our Hansard was established in 1867. And Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales had a similar experience in the nineteenth century. Unhappy with selective and biased newspaper reporting that couldn't possibly cover everything, members were willing to vote money to rectify the imbalance.

But it wasn't all plain sailing. Members regularly complained about the quality of Hansard reports and sometimes accused Hansard staff of not reporting impartially. Until the early twentieth century, all the Hansard reporters were former newspaper reporters or editors. They retained their press contacts and sometimes wrote articles themselves, usually under a pseudonym. And even after they were replaced by professional shorthand reporters, some members still accused them of bias. But there were two safeguards against Hansard reporters going rogue: the members' corrections process and oversight of Hansard by Parliament, whether by a select committee or the Speaker. In New Zealand, an important outcome of a very public stoush in 1900 between Hansard's Chief Reporter and the Premier was this idea: impartiality was not just about what is reported in Hansard but also how the reporters conducted themselves outside of their time working for Hansard.

Chief Reporter Grattan Grey versus Premier Richard Seddon

Premier Richard Seddon led a Liberal Government that introduced women's suffrage and elements of the modern welfare state. He loomed large in the popular imagination, partly because he was Premier for 13 years and died in office, but also because he was a renowned orator, an astute politician, and a charismatic personality. To this day he is memorialised through countless statues, including one on Parliament's front lawn, a small town named Seddon, another settlement called Seddonville, and lots of Seddon Streets scattered around New Zealand.

The Chief Reporter was one James Grattan Grey. Originally from Ireland, he was a very experienced journalist who came to work in Hansard in the late 1870s. Grattan Grey, like other Hansard reporters at that time, worked only during the session. The rest of the time he worked as a freelance journalist. But in late 1899 he strayed into criticising the Liberal Government's legislation in two stories that he sold to the *New York Times* under his own name. As luck would have it, the Times turned up in New Zealand a month or so later, and one eagle-eyed newspaper editor republished extracts from it.⁸ Grey was called to the Reporting Debates and Printing select committee. The committee resolved that Grey and all Hansard reporters were not to "actively participate in New Zealand politics, by writing articles for publication or otherwise."⁹ This was widely reported in the newspapers.¹⁰

A week later the war in South Africa broke out. Grey strongly disagreed with New Zealand's intentions to support British forces alongside other countries in the Empire—Canada, India, and Australia. Also, his request for a substantial pay increase to compensate for loss of earnings was turned down.¹¹ Just four days later he wrote another article for the *New York Times* criticising the Government's decision to send troops to the Transvaal.¹² He had a further article published, critiquing the British handover of

Samoa to Germany.¹³ Once again, he was sprung when the *New York Times* reached New Zealand shores in late January 1900.¹⁴

Seddon wrote a short 'please explain' letter to Grey.¹⁵ Was Grey penitent? Not a bit of it. "I adhere to the opinions therein expressed regardless of the consequences.", he replied.¹⁶ For the Premier's benefit, he outlined his case against Britain's and New Zealand's involvement in South Africa.¹⁷ Seddon played the long game. There would be no response, he told one newspaper, until the session was convened in late June and it would be up to the Speaker and the Parliament.¹⁸ But he did release the correspondence, which was widely reported in many newspapers.¹⁹ Over the next three months there was a feeding frenzy in the press—mostly against Grey but Seddon's political opponents backed Grey as did those who saw him as a champion for the freedom of the press. Grey was by now a minor celebrity and in April he published an 80-page booklet entitled *A serious menace to Liberty: Mr Seddon, Premier, Mr J Grattan Grey Journalist—an interesting correspondence*.²⁰ He followed that up in May with another lengthy publication: *The Story of the Boers, Things Worth Knowing and Facts Hitherto Suppressed*.

In late June, the House voted unanimously for a select committee inquiry into Grey's actions.²¹ Before Grey was examined, he took the opportunity to insert into the Hansard a letter written by Seddon's Agent-General in London.²² The letter had been referred to by a member during the course of a debate but not read out. It criticised the British campaign in South Africa and New Zealand's involvement. Premier Seddon was all for Grey being called to the bar of the House to be questioned, but the Speaker wasn't keen on dealing with an officer of Parliament in this way. So the House decided to wait for the select committee inquiry into the original complaint.²³

Appearing before the committee, Grey defended his actions on technical grounds.²⁴ Yes, he was familiar with the committee's instruction that reporters refrain from writing political articles, but it was never communicated directly to him, nor had the House debated the select committee's report. As such, he claimed, a committee's recommendation could not trump the terms of his contract which allowed him to earn a living outside the session. For the committee, the key point that counted against him was "his refusal to recognise the authority of the committee" even when asked several times whether he would recognise its authority.²⁵ They therefore recommended his services be dispensed with.

Their report was read out and tabled in the House that afternoon, and debated two days later.²⁶ Grattan Grey was present in the gallery for the entire debate taken in committee of the whole House, which lasted several hours.²⁷ By a majority of 44 to 12, the committee resolved to accept the recommendation and the House adopted the committee's report at 2 a.m.²⁸ Shortly afterwards, the Speaker, by letter, advised Grey he was removed from his job with immediate effect.²⁹ The letter appointing his successor spelt out clearly that while he was free to undertake reporting work during the recess, he was "not to take part in New Zealand politics".³⁰

After months of another feeding frenzy by the press, Grey left New Zealand, eventually settling in Perth, where he pursued various journalistic campaigns. He railed against Australia's involvement in the First World War and advocated for Home Rule in Ireland.³¹ But he did so as a journalist not as Editor of Hansard.

Legacy issues

In so many ways, the past and the present collide and the passage of time produces its own ironies. In its prominent position on Parliament's front lawn, Seddon's statue symbolises the idea of Parliament as a place of free and frank debate. It is enmeshed in every protest staged there. Sometimes it has become part of the protest. In 2004, protestors against legislation that assumed Crown ownership of the foreshore and seabed popped the Māori tino rangatiratanga flag into Seddon's hand—so that he was holding aloft the banner for Māori sovereignty. In 2019, Extinction Rebellion Aotearoa attached a ball and chain to his ankle and put up a sign at the base of the statue proclaiming "Colonisation = exploitation = climate change". In 2020, a petition was got up to remove the Seddon statue—the '#DitchDick' campaign—accusing him of being a "notorious autocrat, imperialist and racist". And in 2022 the statue found itself right at the heart of the month-long occupation of Parliament grounds and surrounding streets that ended in rioting and fires.

Grey's reputation has fared better. In a 2014 biography of Seddon and a 2021 history of New Zealand's involvement in the war in South Africa, Seddon is said to have hounded Grey for criticism of New Zealand's position, the Speaker's dismissal of Grey is cast as a most serious injustice, and Grey emerges as the brave journalist who refused to be intimidated by Premier Seddon—a martyr to the cause of the defence of free speech.³² But for Hansard, Grey's legacy is quite different. He served as a reminder to staff until at least the mid-1970s that as servants of Parliament they should not engage actively in politics.³³ And while Grey has retreated from the institutional memory, the important principle has not.

Editor of Debates Eileen Edwards' attempts to bypass Clerks of the House of Parliament

Not every bruising encounter involved the Hansard chief and the Prime Minister, the Parliament, a select committee or even the Speaker. In the mid-1980s, New Zealand's first woman Editor of Debates, Eileen Edwards, set out to win independence for Hansard from the confines of the various institutions within which she, as manager, operated. She wanted Hansard to be responsible solely to Parliament via the Speaker; that is, to bypass the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Charles Littlejohn. Although she firmly believed that Hansard's reputation for impartiality was at stake, in reality her many clashes with senior staff were mainly over staffing and operational matters, not editorial independence. After the Clerk of the House was established under its own statute in 1988, with its own vote, she advocated to have the same standing as the Clerk of the House—for Hansard to have its own statute and vote. Lacking any support whatsoever, she failed. In 1992 editorship of Hansard transferred to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, at that time, David McGee.

3 Constraints on accuracy

Before we had the ability to amplify and record sound, accuracy depended on the reporter's ability to hear and understand what was said, to take it down in shorthand, and transform those notes into a readable report. Unsurprisingly, the reporting style placed an emphasis on readability. All of the characteristics of spoken language were trimmed from the report—the false starts, the stumbles, the repetitions, the excess verbiage, the broken syntax, and the slips of the tongue. But the combination of poor acoustics and considerable editorial licence opened the door to misinterpretation. Hence the convention of allowing members to check the draft of their speeches prior to publication, which sometimes raised questions about the integrity of Hansard as a true record of spoken proceedings.

Chief Reporter Charles Robinson versus Speaker Henry Willis

There is perhaps no better example of a bruising encounter than what occurred in 1911 in the New South Wales Parliament. This case involved their first Principal Reporter, Charles Robinson, standing on a point of principle against alterations that the Speaker was making to the Hansard. Henry Willis's short stint as a Speaker was marked by controversy partly because of the iron hand he wielded as Speaker.³⁴ But also because he was elected Speaker in a hung Parliament.³⁵ Willis had taken it upon himself to delete parts of the Hansard that he considered objectionable, after the Principal Reporter refused to do so.³⁶ These were alterations to speeches given by other members. In December 1911, an acrimonious exchange of correspondence between them was tabled in the Legislative Council and reported on by the newspapers.

A debate in the Legislative Assembly on the following day quickly descended into chaos with the Opposition taunting Speaker Willis about whether he intended to sack Charles Robinson.³⁷ Willis responded: "Any officer of this House who is disrespectful to the chair will be dismissed immediately.", but he anticipated that Robinson would apologise. Such was the uproar that Willis had to eventually be escorted from the Chamber. In the lobby, it was reported that "one or two members had their coats off and others were talking fight."³⁸ Inevitably, Willis suspended Robinson, because he had not apologised.³⁹ Once suspended, Robinson apparently felt able to defend himself publicly. He disputed Willis' version of the events.⁴⁰ The Government ordered an inquiry.⁴¹

Willis detailed a long list of Robinson's offences: "disobedience, wilful insubordination, disrespect, petulance, flouting authority, offensive language, disparaging and belittling remarks, presumptions, superabundant correspondence, disloyalty, treachery, wastefulness, ill temper and giving vent to unbridled opinions upon Mr Speaker."⁴² Robinson emphatically denied the charges and quoted various testimonials from Premiers and Speakers over 30 years. On the facts, Willis argued that he had issued instructions to cut down speeches "because members of the Hansard staff did not use their literary faculties in making speeches readable, but recorded every word of a long rambling oration". Robinson countered that the parts Willis had excised were those that reflected "disrespectfully on the House and the Chair."⁴³ The judge who presided over the Royal Commission inquiry found that the Speaker had "rightly exercised his power in suspending Mr Robinson, who was guilty of insubordination."⁴⁴ The Cabinet decided to compulsorily retire Robinson, but in light of his faithful and lengthy service they granted him a pension.⁴⁵

This case shows how Hansard staff navigated a difficult course between accurately reporting without any technological aids and the editorial role assumed by a difficult presiding officer.

4 Members' corrections process

In 1908, Hansard reporting staff in Perth went on strike for better pay. A local reporter thought the strikers would enjoy the "hearty support of the public" because they would not have to "[wade] through the garbage ... which frequently represents not what a member has said; but what, after revision, he thinks will please his constituents."⁴⁶ From time to time, similar sentiments were expressed about New Zealand's Hansard, usually after members raised complaints in the House. Although such gibes were usually aimed at denigrating members, they reflected poorly on the

reputation of Hansard. Contrary to what members may have believed, they did not have freedom to amend their draft Hansards however they pleased. Since 1896 the first port of call in New Zealand was a Hansard Supervisor, who sent drafts out to members and dealt with any requests for change. Decisions were usually straightforward—simple corrections from mishears or misunderstandings. The Speaker would only intervene when the Hansard Supervisor did not agree with a request.

Only a few requests have survived, including one from 1928 where the Speaker allowed a 223-word exchange to be excised from the Hansard. In this exchange, an Opposition member had accused Prime Minister Gordon Coates of “justly earning the title of the Mussolini of New Zealand” after his Government bypassed the Railways Board to directly appoint a general manager.⁴⁷ Even though Coates could not have anticipated the disastrous consequences of Mussolini’s fascist rule for the next 17 years, he clearly did not wish to go down on the official permanent record as “the Mussolini of New Zealand”. The newspapers had a field day and reported it widely. With the advent of digitisation, the newspaper reports of that exchange have foiled Coates’ attempt to wipe it from the Hansard historical record.

5 Debates not reported

Until 1995, New Zealand did not report debates of the committee of the whole House. For the first 128 years Hansard provided a summary of important contributions to debates on supply (financial estimates) and recorded any votes that took place in committee. But for any of the content and flavour of what was discussed, researchers have to fall back on the newspaper coverage—the very source that contemporary politicians found to be selective, partial, inaccurate and generally unreliable! There were practical reasons for not reporting these debates. There simply weren’t enough staff, and the cost for printing all those extra volumes was another factor. For historians, this is a shame, because committee discussion was generally very free and frank—to such an extent that the debates often went well into the early hours and sometimes continued over a matter of days if a stonewall was in progress.

But these weren’t the only debates not reported. In May 1940, the Parliamentary (Secret Session) Emergency Regulations were approved. They enabled the exclusion of strangers from the Galleries and Hansard staff from the floor of the House. The measure was to prevent “the possibility of information of value to the enemy being disclosed” and it was used on at least 24 sitting days, particularly between 1940 and 1942. In place of a Hansard report, a brief description was inserted into the Hansard, based on the Clerk’s notes, listing broadly the topics. For example, a 21-hour debate on the outbreak of the war in the Pacific was described in just 126 words.⁴⁸ In Hansard terms, the missing content over 24 sitting days is estimated at about 1,900 pages between 1940 and 1944.⁴⁹ So it’s a significant gap.

In rare cases, Hansard reported a debate that was not published. In 1888, Hansard reported the debate on the Contagious Diseases Bill, but the House then resolved to suppress its publication because the talk about sexually transmitted diseases was deemed too risqué and offensive to women readers.⁵⁰ The newspapers were similarly unable to publish the discussion, but referred coyly to “the social evil” and “interesting subjects”.⁵¹ Another paper simply noted that the Ladies Gallery had been cleared for the debate because “Language and arguments [were] indelicate.”⁵² There are few topics considered too sensitive for publication in the 21st century, but there was an interesting decision in 2006 by the Legislative Council in the South Australian Parliament to excise from the online Hansard

parts of a speech that detailed methods of self-administered euthanasia.⁵³ The historic record remained intact, to a certain extent, however, because they allowed its publication in the printed volume.

Another feature is when speeches were not reported in the language delivered. This was a particular challenge for New Zealand from 1868 when the first Māori members were elected to the House of Representatives. Speeches delivered in their own language were interpreted in the House, the Hansard reporters took down shorthand notes of the interpretation, and wrote their report based on that.⁵⁴ By the 1920s there were no interpreters and Māori members were expected to deliver their speeches in English. Not all did, and especially after the Second World War some members chose to address the House in their own language. They were then expected to provide the text for Hansard.

There were clearly some practical barriers to reporting their speeches in the Māori language, but the consequence of that is a massive gap in the historic record of Māori oratory at a time when significant legislation was passed that resulted in land loss, dispossession, and confiscations following the wars of the 1860s/1870s. From 1881 until 1906 there was a Māori version of Hansard published, but this contained translations from English into Māori. Interpretation given on the fly would have summarised just some of the speech content and the Hansard reporter would have tidied that up into a concise report.⁵⁵ So the Māori Hansard can only be a pale reflection of the original speech. It was only in the 1990s, and with technological advances, that Hansard was able to include not just any speeches in Māori but also a translation into English. In the twenty-first century, the challenge involved in providing a comprehensive report of speeches delivered in indigenous languages is not to be underestimated, particularly where there are several, and we have much to learn from our Pacific neighbours who cater not just for dual languages but multiple languages within the debating Chamber or in the Hansard report itself.

6 Conclusion

This paper ranged widely across aspects of curating a report of the parliamentary debates from the nineteenth century to today. The stories of how Chief Reporter Grattan Grey and Principal Reporter Charles Robinson took on the Premier and Speaker respectively, both on a point of principle, and lost are instructive. In Grey's case, it is a reminder that impartiality remains an important principle for Hansard's reputation as a trusted and reliable source of information. In contrast, Robinson entered the public arena to defend the integrity of Hansard but the integrity of the office of Speaker carried more weight. And in the way that past defeats sometimes become today's victories, Chief Reporter Grey's reputation has been recovered and Premier Seddon's is somewhat tarnished.

Accuracy of the published debates was very much helped by the advent of new technologies in the twentieth century to not just amplify but also record sound. Since then computer technology has sped up production times and allowed greater accessibility via the web. The availability of videoed debates has greatly reduced the potential for clashes between members and Hansard staff or the presiding officer over corrections to the draft Hansard. And newer technologies have made it possible to provide comprehensive coverage of all debates. While there remain challenges still with providing a bi-lingual or multilingual Hansard service, there is now a greater understanding of why that is important for contemporary and future readers.

Today, we are the future readership of Hansard debates published in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In New Zealand the Papers Past digitised newspaper collection is a fabulous archive of many of our newspapers—as is Trove in Australia. These articles represent the highlights or the controversies that took place in the debating chamber, just as they did when they were first published. But they are no substitute for the record of the entire debate in Hansard. When both are read together, however, present-day researchers are better able to understand the good, the bad, and the ugly of decisions made by Parliaments of the past that have consequences for the world we now inhabit, despite any flaws and omissions in the way that Hansard reports were historically assembled or curated and the newspaper articles were written. In that sense, the enduring legacy of the privilege accorded to the exercise of free speech in Parliament is twofold: the freedom of the press and a Hansard reporting service based on the principles of impartiality, accuracy, timeliness, readability, and accessibility, however they were defined over time.

¹ This paper draws on research for my PhD topic, the ‘Making of New Zealand’s Hansard from 1867 to 1992’. Although it is a study of New Zealand’s Hansard, I have looked across the Tasman and a bit further afield to Britain and some of the other Parliaments in the Commonwealth. I acknowledge my PhD supervisors, Professor Jim McAloon and Dr Valerie Wallace, as well as the senior leadership team of the Clerk of the House and Hansard manager Erin Grace for generous study assistance, and Hansard colleagues who have shared my delight in researching Hansard ancestry.

² Georgina Stylianou, ‘To engage voters, politicians have to be authentic’, *The Post*, 10 July 2023.

³ Anthony Marinac, ‘Shaking the foundations of parliamentary privilege’, *ON LINE opinion – Australia’s e-journal of social and political debate*, 18 September 2006.

⁴ William Law, *Our Hansard or The True Mirror of Parliament, A Full Account of the official reporting of the debates in the House of Commons* (London: Pitman, 1950); John Vice and Stephen Farrell, *The History of Hansard* (London: House of Lords and House of Commons Hansard, 2017).

⁵ Stef Slembrouck, ‘The parliamentary Hansard ‘verbatim’ report; the written construction of spoken discourse’, *Language and Literature*, Vol. 1, no. 2, 1992, pp.101-119; Sandra Mollin, ‘The Hansard hazard; gauging the accuracy of British parliamentary transcripts’, *Corpora*, Vol. 2, no. 2, 2007, pp.187-210; V. Michael Cribb and Shivani Rochford, ‘The Transcription and Representation of Spoken Political Discourse in the UK House of Commons’, *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 8, no. 2, 2018, pp.1-14. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n2p1>

⁶ Gordon Bale, ‘Parliamentary Debates and Statutory Interpretation: Switching on the Light or Rummaging in the Ashcans of the Legislative Process’, *The Canadian Bar Review*, Vol. 74, no. 1, 1995, pp.1-28; Stéphane Beaulac, ‘Parliamentary Debates in Statutory Interpretation: A Question of Admissibility or of Weight?’, *McGill Law Review*, Vol. 43, 1998, pp.287-324; John James Magyar, ‘The Evolution of Hansard Use at the Supreme Court of Canada: A Comparative Study in Statutory Interpretation’, *Statute Law Review*, Vol. 33, no. 3, 2012, pp.363-389.

⁷ June Verrier, Benchmarking Parliamentary Administration: The United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, *Australasian Parliamentary Review*, Autumn 2007, Vol. 22(1), p.44.

⁸ ‘Parliamentary Echoes’, *Hastings Standard*, 4 September 1899, p.3.

⁹ Minutes of 14 September 1899, Reporting Debates and Printing Committee 1899, R17688143, Le1 box 362 1899/9, Archives New Zealand (ANZ).

¹⁰ For example: ‘Stray Notes’, *Lyttelton Times*, 16 September 1899, p.8; ‘The Hansard Staff and Politics’, *Evening Post*, 14 September 1899, p.6; ‘The Hansard Staff’, *Auckland Star*, 15 September 1899, p.2; ‘Political Notes—The Hansard Staff’, *Press*, 15 September 1899, p.5; ‘Political Gossip’, *Evening Star*, 15 September 1899, p.4; ‘Public Servants as Critics of Politics’, *Mount Ida Chronicle*, 15 September 1899, p.7; ‘Summary of Business’, *Nelson Evening Mail*, 15 September 1899, p.2; ‘Sessional Notes’, *New Zealand Herald*, 15 September 1899, p.5; ‘The Hansard Staff’, *New Zealand Times*, 15 September 1899, p.3; ‘The Hansard Chief as a Political Writer’, *Oamaru Mail*, 15 September 1899, p.4; and similar accounts appeared on 15, 16, and 21 September 1899 in the *Otago Daily Times*, the *Christchurch Star*, the *Wanganui Herald*, the *North Otago Times*, and the *Otago Witness*.

¹¹ *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates* (NZPD), Vol. 110, 23 October 1899, p.882.

-
- ¹² Extract of letter from J. Grattan Grey to the *New York Times*, 27 October 1899, appearing in the *New York Times*, 26 November 1899, reprinted in *Dunedin Evening Star*, 29 January 1900, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives* (AJHR) 1900, H-29, pp.1-2.
- ¹³ J. Grattan Grey to Premier Seddon, 21 February 1900, and extract from the *New York Times* article, 24 December 1899, AJHR 1900, H-29, p.4.
- ¹⁴ 'A Pro-Boer's Opinions', *Evening Star*, 29 January 1900, p.1.
- ¹⁵ Premier Seddon to J. Grattan Grey, 6 February 1900, AJHR 1900, H-29, p.4.
- ¹⁶ J. Grattan Grey to Premier Seddon, 15 February 1900, AJHR 1900, H-29, p.2.
- ¹⁷ Letters from J. Grattan Grey to Premier Seddon, 12 and 15 February 1900, AJHR 1900, H-29, pp.1, 2-3.
- ¹⁸ 'The Chief of Hansard avows himself a pro-Boer and glories in his rank republicanism', *Evening Star*, 23 March 1900, p.4
- ¹⁹ According to the *New Zealand Herald* correspondent, "the Premier made public certain correspondence which had passed between Mr Grey and himself.", "An Extraordinary Correspondence", *New Zealand Herald*, 28 March 1900, p.5.
- ²⁰ J. Grattan Grey, *A Serious Menace to Liberty, Mr Seddon, Premier, Mr J. Grattan Grey, Journalist, An Interesting correspondence*, No. 1, City Printing Co. (Wright & Genside), Wellington, 2 April 1900.
<https://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Stout76-t12.html>
- ²¹ NZPD, Vol. 111, 29 June 1900, p.159.
- ²² NZPD, Vol. 111, 11 July 1900, pp.433-34.
- ²³ NZPD, Vol. 111, 13 July 1900, pp.536-39.
- ²⁴ Examination of J Grattan Grey, 17 July 1900, pp.1-3, Reporting Debates and Printing Committee 1900, R17688255, Le1 box 371 1900/11, ANZ.
- ²⁵ Report of the Reporting Debates and Printing Committee, 17 July 1900, Reporting Debates and Printing Committee 1900, R17688255, Le1 box 371 1900/11, ANZ.
- ²⁶ NZPD, Vol. 111, 17 July 1900, p.596; 19 July 1900, p.12.
- ²⁷ Something noted by gallery journalists, which was circulated amongst several newspapers, including even the *Mataura Ensign*, 31 July 1900, p.2.
- ²⁸ NZPD, Vol. 112, 19 July, p.50.
- ²⁹ NZPD, Vol. 112, 19 July, p.53.
- ³⁰ Premier Seddon to Silas Spragg, 2 August 1900, R24861456, ACGO 8333 IA1 803 [11] 1900/2689, ANZ.
- ³¹ J. Gratten Grey, 'Driven from New Zealand—Correspondent of the New York Times a Victim of Jingoism', *New York Times*, 2 September 1900, p.15; Trove reveals a substantial legacy of newspaper and journal articles and several books in Australia.
- ³² Tom Brooking, *Richard Seddon, King of God's Own*, Penguin Books, 2014, pp.331-32; Nigel Robson, *Our First Foreign war, The Impact of the South African War 1899-1902 on New Zealand*, Massey University Press, Auckland, 2021, pp.84-86, 338.
- ³³ Allan Conway, Editor of Debates, 'The New Zealand Hansard Staff', 30 January 1974, paper presented to first conference of the Australasia and Pacific Hansard Editors Association, Melbourne, OCB00656, 5/3/5, 01/01/1963 to 01/01/1967, Office of the Clerk.
- ³⁴ See *Decision and Deliberation: The Parliament of New South Wales, 1856-2003*, p.219.
- ³⁵ "To resolve this deadlock, the Labor government convinced a Liberal, Henry Willis, to be Speaker.", Anne Twomey, 'How to Succeed in a Hung Parliament', *Quadrant* Online, 1 November 2010.
<https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2010/11/how-to-succeed-in-a-hung-parliament/>
- ³⁶ *Braidwood Dispatch and Mining Journal* (NSW), 23 December 1911, p.2.
- ³⁷ *Argus* (Melbourne), 18 December 1911, p.13.
- ³⁸ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 December 1911, p.8.
- ³⁹ *Sun* (Sydney), 20 December 1911, p.7.
- ⁴⁰ *Singleton Argus* (NSW) 6 January 1912, p.4.
- ⁴¹ *Leader* (NSW), 11 January 1912, p.2.
- ⁴² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 January 1912, p.15.
- ⁴³ *Muswellbrook Chronicle* (NSW), 17 January 1912, p.4.
- ⁴⁴ *Age* (Melbourne), 31 January 1912, p.10.
- ⁴⁵ *Sun* (Sydney), 19 February 1912, p.8.
- ⁴⁶ Reprinted in *Waikato Argus*, 1 August 1908, p.2.
- ⁴⁷ *Auckland Star*, 23 August 1928, p.10; *Evening Post*, 23 August 1928, p.12; *Evening Star*, 23 August 1928, p.10; *Hawera Star*, 23 August 1928, p.9; *Poverty Bay Herald*, 23 August 1928, p.7; *Sun* (Auckland), 23 August 1928, p.11.

⁴⁸ NZPD, Vol. 261, 11 December 1941, pp.26-27.

⁴⁹ Calculated using the average number of Hansard pages generated per sitting day.

⁵⁰ NZPD, Vol. 60, 1 June 1888, p.416.

⁵¹ 'Parliamentary Notes', *Auckland Star*, 9 July 1888, p.8; 'Parliamentary Notes', *Bruce Herald*, 5 June 1888, p.3.

⁵² 'Notes on Change', *Wanganui Herald*, 2 June 1888, p.2.

⁵³ Anthony Marinac, 'Shaking the foundations of parliamentary privilege', *ON LINE opinion – Australia's e-journal of social and political debate*, 18 September 2006.

⁵⁴ Evidence given to the Legislature Expenditure Committee, AJHR 1886, I-10, pp.3, 7, 14.

⁵⁵ 'Nga Korero Paramete 1881 – 1906' (Wellington: New Zealand Electronic Text Centre, 2009). This is an online version of *Niu Tireni: nga korero Paremete: nga whai korero a nga mema Maori*, (Wellington: Government Printer, 1881-1906).