The New Zealand Journal of History

Vol.42, No.1 April 2008

CONTENTS

Margaret Tennant	Two to Tango: The Partnership Between Charity and the Welfare State in New Zealand 1940–1970	1
Dominic Alessio	Promoting Paradise: Utopianism and National Identity in New Zealand, 1870–1930	22
David Murray	Fitchett's Fallacy and Music at the New Zealand and South Seas Exhibition, Dunedin, 1889–1890	42
Vincent O'Malley	The East Coast Petroleum Wars: Raupatu and the Politics of Oil in 1860s New Zealand	60
Don Kinnell	The Langdale Settlement: Idle Land Transformed	80

Reviews (Books) 101

Ian Pool, Arunachalanm Dharmalingam and Janet Sceats, *The New Zealand Family from 1840: A Demographic History* (Erik Olssen); Barry Gustafson, *Kiwi Keith: A Biography of Keith Holyoake* (Jim McAloon); Lyndon Fraser, *Castles of Gold: A History of New Zealand's West Coast Irish* (Malcolm Campbell); W. David McIntyre, *Dominion of New Zealand: Statesmen and Status 1907–1945* (James Watson); Judith Binney, ed., *Te Kerikeri 1770–1850: The Meeting Pool* (Adrienne Puckey); Antje Kampf, *Mapping Out the Venereal Wilderness: Public Health and STD in New Zealand 1920–1980* (Bronwyn Dalley); Bronwyn Labrum, Fiona McKergow and Stephanie Gibson, eds, *Looking Flash: Clothing in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Angela Lassig); Donald Jackson Kerr, *Amassing Treasures for All Time: Sir George Grey, Colonial Bookman and Collector* (John Laurie); Chris Trotter, *No Left Turn: The Distortion of New Zealand's History by Greed, Bigotry and Right-Wing Politics* (Jim McAloon); Jacqueline Leckie, *Indian Settlers: The Story of a New Zealand South Asian Community* (Geoff Watson); Rosalind McClean, *A Stockman's Gift: Daniel Vickery Bryant and the Bryant Charitable*

New Zealand Journal of History, 42, 1 (2008)

Two to Tango

THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN CHARITY AND THE WELFARE STATE IN NEW ZEALAND 1940–1970[1]

IN 1946 MRS GLADYS MILLER, social worker for Wellington's Smith Family Joyspreaders, seemed exceptionally busy.[2] 'Sometimes we bless the telephone, but mostly it is an instrument of torture, as it seems to ring a hundred times a day!' she reported.[3] Callers were not only 'cases' (who more usually turned up at her office in person — around 1500 of them each year) but other personnel from voluntary agencies, the Hospital Board, the Social Security Department, the Child Welfare Division of the Department of Education, as well as politicians and Cabinet members' secretaries. Asked 'What does the Smith Family do?', Mrs Miller highlighted a variety of interactions and referrals:

> Our work covers so many fields in welfare activities that we cannot say concisely just what we do. In a day's routine calls are many and varied. Perhaps we do not spend one penny and yet have expended hours of our time in directing people to the relief they require. We have arranged for their contacting the right quarters, and personally given them advice and sympathy.
>
> We find that this is the main reason why Members of Parliament and others in authority, realizing that we have so many helpful contacts, send their troublesome cases to the Smith Family. Many cases rush to the Minister's offices when in desperate need. The Secretary who receives these applicants mentions the circumstances to his Minister, who might direct him to phone the Smith Family, saying, 'They can fix this case better than we could, and we will give them any help they deem necessary'. Some of these cases take approximately half an hour of our time, others from days to months, and where necessary we follow up for years.

Individual cases, she noted, involved cooperation with child welfare officers, hospital board almoners, district nurses and general practitioners, some 'going through the whole circle' of agencies, public and private.[4]

The Smith Family was part of a network of government and voluntary organizations that mostly worked together, but sometimes in competition, within a New Zealand version of the 'mixed economy of welfare'. Modelled on an Australian initiative, and prompted by Depression conditions, the Smith Family was introduced to New Zealand by a group of Wellington businessmen in 1932. It continued to find a place within an expanding welfare state, was used by state agencies, and received funding from them. As we shall see, it was significant that it offered a flexible combination of counselling and material aid.

This article examines the interdependence between the state and the voluntary social services during the period of the 'classic welfare state' from the 1940s to the 1970s. For this period welfare historiography is most

neglectful of charity and voluntary welfare, the state's hegemony seeming most securely entrenched. It is argued here that the oppositions commonly drawn between 'the voluntary sector' and 'the state' deny an essential element of the relationship between them in a small society with a centralized political structure and a limited tradition of philanthropic giving. The article first looks at the general niche claimed by established voluntary organizations as the welfare state expanded, and at their mutually dependent relationship with government agencies and administrators. A concept of 'partnership' was articulated not only by organizations seeking state support, but by a new generation of social administrators, some of whom saw voluntary effort as part and parcel of the welfare state. The second part of the article will provide case studies of the arrangements which ensued. A child welfare officer from the period has likened these arrangements to a dance between two partners, circling, briefly touching, sometimes embracing, leading or being led, and sometimes out of step.[5] It is time to bring the voluntary social services into our welfare history, but in a way which acknowledges their symbiotic relationship with state efforts.

Although taken up by historians of welfare largely since 1990, the notion of a mixed economy of welfare, sometimes expressed as welfare pluralism, is not new. It was articulated by Elizabeth Macadam in a 1934 British publication, *The New Philanthropy. A Study of the Relations Between the Statutory and Voluntary Social Services*, which traced the growth of a 'system of combined statutory and voluntary social service' over the previous 40 years.[6] In New Zealand endorsements of the interaction between state and voluntary welfare can be found in the nineteenth century, with further contemporary commentary being provoked by the expansion of the welfare state, and the 1938 Social Security Act in particular. However, welfare historiography was dominated for many years by the state-mandated 'social laboratory' and those moments of political choice which heralded a new statutory measure — the Old Age Pensions Act, the 1938 Social Security Act, Universal Family Allowances in 1946, Accident Compensation and National Superannuation in the 1970s. In the 1990s an important cluster of social service department histories noted state agencies' interactions with the voluntary sector, but their lenses remained firmly upon state effort.[7] The more substantial of the recent histories of voluntary organizations have looked the other way, acknowledging, to varying degrees, the impact of state funding and regulation upon the activities of the society concerned, as well as gaps in state provision which the voluntary sector sought to fill.[8] Indeed, an eye to the state was unavoidable in histories of large national organizations such as Plunket, so heavily dependent were they upon government financial support. Government historically has been New Zealand's most significant philanthropist in terms of voluntary sector funding.

Written at a time when the welfare state was being questioned as unsustainable, excessively interventionist, and contributing to social dependency, and when policies of devolution from the centre were already under way, W.H. Oliver's historical survey for the 1988 Royal Commission on Social Policy mentioned philanthropy and voluntary effort only in passing. However, a short but significant section at the end of his survey noted the growth of voluntary societies over the previous 20 years, and the paradox that

'Many of these groups, from the mainline churches to special interest groups, are directing their demands, not to the charitable impulses of the community, but to the resources of the state'.[9] And the resources of the state were being drawn upon in various ways, and to a degree never before anticipated: a 1986 study conservatively estimated that around $75.4 million was being transferred by government departments to voluntary social service agencies, with a further $6.7 million coming from the lotteries fund. In addition, there were numerous forms of non-financial assistance, most of them discretionary and untransparent.[10]

Interaction between state and voluntary welfare commenced relatively early. There was a tendency for colonial charities to seek and gain government subsidies even during the provincial period of New Zealand's history. The lack of systematic voluntary giving to 'other'-directed charities has been variously attributed to the individualism and materialism of colonial society, to population dispersal and the struggle even of the churches, traditional dispensers of charity, to establish themselves and build up congregations and infrastructure in a settler society. Some of those most heavily represented among recipients of charity elsewhere, such as the elderly, were under-represented among the colonial population, while those who did experience sustained hardship (and, most especially, the able-bodied poor) threatened the ideal of a 'new' society, free of the taints of the Old World.[11] Duncan MacGregor, Inspector of Charitable Institutions, referred in his 1898 report to the weakness of the 'social sanction (*richesse oblige*)' in New Zealand. This had failed, 'in spite of its power in an old country': 'Some of its most potent elements at Home were incapable of transplantation here, while others were slow growing and took too long to mature'.[12] The 1885 Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act was an attempt to regulate and supervise the escalating demands being placed upon government by voluntary societies while allowing the societies concerned to retain their independence, but many of the 'separate institutions' (to use the terminology of the Act) soon became inseparable from the public sector. The 1885 Act was the most significant sign of the voluntary sector's early dependence on government, and of the state's statutory recognition of the situation.[13]

In subsequent years interactions between government and voluntary agencies continued, and in various forms — they did not simply involve state financial transfers, and nor were they one-way. Paid and unpaid workers from churches and more secular voluntary organizations assisted in the supervision and inspection of children and others in public care. They were used as inspectors of institutions and, from the 1920s, as court associates and voluntary child welfare officers. Some were asked to share their expertise with committees and commissions of inquiry on social issues, and members of voluntary organizations sat upon such inquiries. Politicians endorsed the 'moral effect' of voluntary efforts, sometimes giving personnel from bodies such as the Salvation Army powers of supervision and detention through their roles as managers of reformatories for habitual drunkards and others who had fallen foul of the law, and as state-sanctioned probation officers (after 1913).[14] First World War interactions generated very explicit statements about shared

responsibility between the state and the voluntary sector for servicemen and their dependants, and state attempts to regulate the contexts in which money could be solicited for patriotic purposes.[15] During the 1930s Depression, attempts to coordinate relief attempts saw voluntary agencies become part of metropolitan relief associations, cooperating with hospital boards and providing such additional services as shelters for unemployed men and home visiting.[16] There was, in other words, an existing, and accelerating, trajectory of interaction between government and voluntary welfare organizations prior to the election of the first Labour government. Labour and its expansion of state boundaries simply raised these interactions to a new plane.

There were initial fears that under Labour charity would be superseded, prompting a flurry of defensive statements in organizations' annual reports. Despite the restoration of state subsidies on its nurses' salaries in 1936, Plunket sought guarantees in 1937 that the government would not take over its work under the proposed health and superannuation scheme. The threat of a state takeover was said to be hurting its fundraising appeal. Reassurance was readily given by Health Minister Peter Fraser, a long-time supporter of Plunket, though Treasury was soon suggesting that voluntary donations, which ranged from 5% to 13% of branch incomes, should be closer to government grants (at 22%–34% of Plunket branches' income).[17] Members of smaller, less powerful organizations also fretted about the implications of social security. The Onehunga Ladies' Benevolent Society and the Auckland Presbyterian Social Service Association (PSSA) both issued warnings that 'The poor ye have always with you', suggesting scepticism about whether social security could achieve all that was being claimed for it.[18] Sister Esther Charles, a deaconess working with the PSSA, reported that her supporters had sent in their gifts with a proviso that the giving must now end. But, she warned: '... there will always be the need for consecrated lives, for the human touch, for those ever ready to help in time of emergency, to comfort and succour...'.[19]

The 1939 annual report of the Crippled Children Society, then only five years old, showed similar defensiveness, while pointing to the distinctive claims of the voluntary sector within an expanding welfare state:

> ... there are those who protest that the voluntary organisation is out of place in work which it is the duty of the state to undertake. To them the word 'voluntary,' in such a connection suggests a condescending benevolence which is wholly distasteful. The work, they argue, is or should be a national obligation, which ought not to be dependent in any respect upon the charitable impulses of kindly individuals, uncertain, and at best, limited as these must be, but is essentially of a kind to be handled nationally — the State alone being in a position to control and co-ordinate on an adequate scale. Now, those who seek to exclude the voluntary element [altogether], forget that an organisation set up and financed by enthusiasts in the cause, while it may have its weaknesses, will yet possess an elasticity necessarily denied a body whose financial resources are levied by assessment on the general public, and that this elasticity should be of priceless value.
>
> It is the function and privilege of the voluntary organisation to go ahead pioneering the unknown fields, testing and exploring in ways which the State-controlled body hesitates and rightly so, to attempt.[20]

Here, then, were the core claims of voluntary organizations promulgated even today. First, flexibility, the quick emergency response, and capacity to innovate were presented as strengths of the voluntary sector against the supposed rigidities of an impersonal officialdom. Second, religious and secular organizations alike stressed a formulation of need that went beyond financial aid: it was emotional (and, in the case of the churches, spiritual) sustenance which the voluntary agencies positioned themselves to provide. The justification was much the same across a range of reports from church social services, disability and child welfare organizations at the end of the 1930s. The emerging concept of the welfare state was seldom challenged, but there was concern about the impact of social security on the donor base, and a desire for state recognition.

This was not long in coming. Despite the rhetoric of citizenship entitlement surrounding social security, and statements critical of 'condescending benevolence',[21] Labour politicians were not in practice antagonistic to the voluntary sector — rather, politicians became adept at using it. Peter Fraser's endorsement of Plunket was not unexpected, for Plunket had been exceptionally successful in positioning itself as a 'health' rather than a 'welfare' organization, an organization of mothers, for mothers. As Linda Bryder has pointed out, many politicians' wives belonged to Plunket, among them Janet Fraser.[22] Over time, Janet was also a significant force in the Women's Health League, the Society for the Protection of Women and Children, the Women's Borstal Association, the League of Mothers and the Wellington Children's Health Camps Association. The breadth of her activity may have been unusual, but political wives did provide an avenue for voluntary sector influence, and, as the century progressed, the increasing number of women Members of Parliament usually had a strong record of voluntary service.[23] Politicians were patrons of voluntary welfare groups, attended their annual meetings and received deputations from them. Even under an expanding welfare state, voluntary organizations were too useful to be neglected, and, as the experience of Mrs Miller and the Smith Family suggested, there were gaps in the welfare state which they usefully filled.

The Second World War helped underline the need for voluntary effort, as well as generating new possibilities for post-war collaborations between government and the voluntary sector. Voluntary work got off to a slower start than in the First World War, but it, too, generated local patriotic committees while boosting the profile of national organizations such as the Red Cross, YMCA and St John Ambulance Association (and those which involved the wearing of a uniform had a distinct advantage). However, there were changes. National campaigns were more obvious: the Army Huts Appeal, the Sick and Wounded Distress Fund (run by the Red Cross and Order of St John) and the Spitfire Fund, for example.[24] Patriotic activities were more clearly under government control, and the state assumed a more comprehensive welfare role. The 1939 Patriotic Purposes Emergency Regulations established ministerial control over the collection of war funds and associated patriotic activities, mediated by the appointment of provincial patriotic councils to oversee local activity.[25] There was criticism of state control as 'substituting a cold slab of officialdom' for the energy and variety of the First World War effort.[26]

In other ways, too, war encouraged closer and increasingly formal collaboration between government and the voluntary sector. The rehabilitation of returned servicemen into civilian life is one such example. The Rehabilitation Board, the body coordinating job placement, education and access to 'rehab' farms, had equal representation of public servants and others from the community after World War II. Local rehabilitation committees were then used to link a large number of interest groups into the administrative machinery.[27] The Minister in charge of the Rehabilitation portfolio was a returned serviceman, Major C.F. Skinner, and the Director of Rehabilitation, Frederick Baker, had sustained war injuries as a member of the Maori Battalion. Jane Thomson has commented that 'Mateship warmed the cold face of officialdom', and public servants such as Baker openly referred to their dual identity as returned servicemen and state officials.[28] After the war, an existing voluntary organization, the Rehabilitation League, was reconstituted with government funding to aid disabled servicemen (and, from 1954, civilians). It retained this role, despite increasing debate over its efficiency for many decades. The use of Maori tribal executives to facilitate the rehabilitation of Maori servicemen was less successful due to a clash of kaupapa — between more informal tribal ways of operating and a Native Department with an older, paternalist outlook.[29] Nonetheless, wartime arrangements helped cement in the minds of some politicians and bureaucrats the reservoir of community skills and effort which could, with proper nurturing, supplement state endeavours and save government coffers.

A 1948 visit by William Beveridge, widely regarded as architect of the British welfare state, provided a more explicit consideration of the role of voluntary action within a welfare state. The Beveridge Committee's 1942 Report on *Social Insurance and Allied Services* had world-wide influence, but Beveridge also wrote *Voluntary Action*, a report completed shortly before he and his wife, Janet, departed for New Zealand and Australia.[30] Beveridge elaborated on his support of 'the voluntary impulse' in interviews, radio talks and at a public lecture delivered at Otago University. Arguing that some forms of service were more readily given by volunteers with a special interest than by official organizations, Beveridge highlighted the pioneering role of voluntary action, its supplementation of state supports, and its importance in nurturing democratic citizenship (arguments already promulgated by New Zealand organizations over 1938–39). However, he also suggested that the expansion of the state had undermined many of the conditions which enabled voluntary action to flourish in the past. In return, the state should adjust its taxation policies so as to encourage charitable endowments, and it should make direct grants from public funds to approved philanthropic agencies, though, he emphasized, 'in such a way as not to destroy their independence'. What was needed was a middle way through 'the Scylla of Laissez-Faire and the Charybdis of Totalitarianism'.[31] Beveridge spent a month in New Zealand, touring the country, giving interviews, speaking at each of the university colleges, visiting a number of government departments and meeting privately with most of the Labour Cabinet ministers and with the leader of the opposition, Sid Holland.[32]

Significantly, Beveridge's views on voluntary action were later cited

approvingly by the Justice Department's John Robson in an address to the 1955 Convention of the New Zealand Institute of Public Administration. Noting Beveridge's emphasis on the assertion of duty rather than rights, Robson condemned the citizen 'who remains inactive and indifferent when it remains within his capacity to assist'. While religion was no longer the force it had been in Victorian times, Robson urged that 'other means must be found to supplement the religious drive in order to get more voluntary work done in the community[33] ... the case for charity remains as strong as ever, although less apparent because of the facade erected by the social welfare state. Today what is required is the gift of service. It can be justified as one of the primary obligations of a citizen and there is certainly ample scope for it in the conditions of today.'[34] Echoing Beveridge's concern that voluntary associations could no longer anticipate large donations from the wealthy (though this was never significantly the case in New Zealand), Robson endorsed state grants to voluntary associations. These should be accompanied by some level of accountability, but 'carping controls' should be kept to a minimum.[35] As Secretary of Justice, Robson later put government money into prisoners' aid societies and marriage guidance work.

Writing the previous year, Social Security Department administrator Walter Lake presented the voluntary sector almost as part and parcel of the welfare state, claiming that 'the outstanding feature of New Zealand [was a] reliance on the state either directly for services or indirectly for subsidies', since social services either came directly under state control, or under departmental supervision 'following naturally from state subsidies'.[36] An inevitable increase in grants to voluntary organizations from a range of government departments, especially Health, Education, Internal Affairs, Maori Affairs and Justice, suggested even wider recognition that voluntary effort was needed to complement state activity on a number of fronts.

Some public servants were cautious about the voluntary sector, arguing that its activities tended to be thin and unevenly spread, its standards uncertain, and its activities sometimes influenced 'too much by sentiment and too little by reason'.[37] There was a sense that where state money was received, accountability was needed, and that there was a danger of 'building up a system of public welfare outside the co-ordination and accountability required of other public activities through government and parliament'.[38] Representatives of voluntary agencies could also gain the ear of politicians in a way that distinctly undermined hopes for departmental supervision. In the mid-twentieth century, public servants sometimes regretted their political masters' public accessibility, and their willingness to attend to the most minute details brought to their attention by outsiders. As Secretary of Justice in the 1950s, Sam Barnett was not averse to aligning voluntary organizations with his department's social goals. He confirmed that 'The politician is very close to the electorate in New Zealand, his door opens readily to an elector, and his telephone rings whether he likes it or not'. This meant that a 'delegated discretion', to a local branch of a government agency or to a voluntary organization, could become, in Barnett's words, a 'political casus belli' if even something minor went wrong. It also meant that Cabinet ministers and others could get carried away by their

own generosity and make commitments in advance of consultation with their departmental staff.[39]

Many public servants were nonetheless members of voluntary groups themselves — the boundaries between sectors were blurred by daily interactions. There was validity in Leslie Lipson's 1948 assessment that 'The civil servant is a citizen administering public affairs for his fellow-citizens, and in a country containing so many state employees the boundary line between the people and the servants of the people is necessarily imprecise"... . Since in themselves they constitute a large segment of the public, the civil servants play many parts.'[40] A whole range of personal interactions at national and local level constituted, in the words of a former Health Department policy analyst, a 'semi-permeable membrane' between state and voluntary agencies.[41] This could have negative as well as positive consequences in a small country, personal antagonisms and attachments being played out in the public sphere.

The result of these interactions between politicians, public servants and representatives of voluntary organizations was a wide — and widely inconsistent — range of assistance to voluntary welfare groups by the late 1950s. A report to the 1957 Interdepartmental Committee on the Co-ordination of Government Social Welfare Activities revealed small-scale double dipping, as well as a pattern strongly influenced by ministerial preferences, unfathomable historical precedents and increasingly vociferous demands from new organizations such as the Intellectually Handicapped Children's Parents' Association (now IHC). Plunket, as usual, did relatively well, receiving £114,297 from the Department of Health in 1955 (Linda Bryder has shown that 60% of Plunket nurses' salaries and 68% of funding for Plunket's Karitane Hospitals came from government in the late 1950s). At the other end of the scale was Alcoholics Anonymous, which received a small but much-needed grant of £50, also from the Health Department. The Art Union Fund administered by the Department of Internal Affairs was a vital source of income for many societies, giving a total of £14,450 to voluntary church and charitable societies over 1954–55. Ranging from £4000 (Plunket again mounting the most successful bid) to £50 (for the Reefton Miner Pensioners' Committee), these grants were subject to considerable political influence at the time. Financial transfers from government to the voluntary welfare sector were to increase markedly over the 1960s and 1970s but, in the absence of a strong philanthropic sector, they were assuming disproportionate importance in the incomes of favoured bodies, large and small.[42]

Financial aid was not the whole picture. Ever since the nineteenth century some voluntary organizations had negotiated state assistance in the form of free railway passes and combined appointments on public business for some of their employees. In the mid-twentieth century government departments gave help with travel and training, and provided office space, free broadcasting time, access to their libraries and other facilities as well as a general sharing of information.[43] It was in the interests of all parties that this was neither formalized nor quantified (and when, in a later era, this started to happen, the reckoning came as a shock for favoured organizations). There was nonetheless a price to pay, for many local organizations found by the 1960s that government

departments (and private trusts) preferred to deal with one national body. Among the federations which emerged was the New Zealand Prisoners' Aid and Rehabilitation Society, formed largely as a result of Department of Justice pressure in 1959. Tensions still exist in nationally organized bodies where bureaucratic convenience has resulted in infelicitous unions of local associations with very different dynamics and histories.

As has been pointed out, 'the state is a competing ensemble of institutions rather than a monolith',[44] and government departments were influenced in their attitudes to the voluntary sector by their own traditions, past experience of community interaction, and the attitudes of their current leadership. Organizations also varied in their ability to lobby government and in their needs for state support, and our lens now focuses on a number of case studies. The records of small, locally based charities and of large, nationally organized associations show their adaptation to the welfare state, and the responses of its different branches to them. They suggest that the metaphor of an interactive dance, with its varying stages of approach and retreat, distance, proximity and synchronicity is appropriate — though on either side, we are looking more often at mutual convenience than at passionate embrace.

One of New Zealand's earliest charities, the Onehunga Ladies' Benevolent Society, saw its more thankless and longstanding income support functions undermined by social security and, then, by an abundance of war work, followed by post-war prosperity. The Onehunga ladies reported in 1947 that each year demand seemed ever lighter, since social security was relieving most of the poor. Over 1953, it nonetheless provided a total of 535 weekly grocery orders and 3000 daily orders for milk, mostly for old people, who, as we will see, prompted increasing concern in the midst of apparent prosperity. The Onehunga society, like a handful of other general relief agencies dating back to the nineteenth century, was sustained by a small legacy which enabled disbursements to those needing emergency aid, clothing and Christmas treats. Its modest level of activity enabled it to remain financially independent of government, while cooperating with other charities and with service clubs.[45] The society was affected by government actions, but remained at a distance. It exists still, New Zealand's oldest surviving charity. After social security, most others of its kind and era did not long survive as functioning entities.[46]

We have already encountered the Smith Family, a relative newcomer to the charitable spectrum in the 1930s. As an organization so closely associated with the Depression, the Smith Family had to forge a new identity after 1935. That year it amalgamated with the Wellington Mayor's Metropolitan Relief Committee, and responsibility for its core work gradually moved from the businessmen founders to a woman secretary, who functioned as its visitor and social worker. By 1938 Peter Fraser was the Smith Family's titular president, and ready access to his office is apparent from the records. Fraser facilitated access to other ministers and suggested grants from the Art Union Fund. On at least one occasion during a 1946 meeting with Mrs Miller, the social worker, he telephoned the senior solicitor of the Public Trust office seeking special consideration for a grant from the McCarthy Trust towards the Smith Family's 'Mothers' Rest' scheme. This venture involved paying for overworked mothers

to have a holiday with relatives, or in seaside accommodation or a guest house away from family responsibilities, sometimes with alternative child care arranged. As Fraser affirmed, 'Population is sadly needed in N.Z., and the only way to get children of our British stock is to look after the woman who is prepared to have a family. The Mothers' rest service is surely playing a great part in helping to care for the woman. This service should be extended, and it is the Government's duty to support the Smith Family to this end, and see that the funds are made available'. Here we see a voluntary initiative gaining political support because it meshed with the government's pro-natalist goals, but also because it could be carried out discreetly and within a confined sphere, without prompting wider demands. Fraser also noted that first as a Member of Parliament, and subsequently as Prime Minister, he had personally called upon the Smith Family to deal with cases of distress, 'and they have never let me down'.[47] It was a powerful endorsement from a powerful figure, though its downside was an apparent reduction in political support after the National Party electoral victory in 1949. In this case, informal links with government were followed by greater distance.

Apart from the Prime Minister's office, the Smith Family's closest interactions were with the Department of Internal Affairs, which appointed a liaison officer for the Mothers' Rest scheme (and which administered the Art Union Fund), the Housing Department, which referred families with accommodation problems, and the Social Security Department. Child welfare officers frequently sought help with clothing and school uniforms for needy families. During the war, the Smith Family's staff visited soldiers' families recommended by the Defence Department, but the government also found it useful to have a voluntary agency on hand to assist the families of 'enemy aliens': the minutes note on one such occasion that 'Cabinet had recognised the functions of the Smith Family as a private organisation and appreciated the Smith Family activities in asking for this report'.[48] Increasingly, the Smith Family and other voluntary agencies were used in areas where government action could prove unpopular, as well as for short-term aid. Its combination of social work, practical assistance and inter-agency referral made it particularly versatile.

The Department of Justice is not primarily thought of as a social service agency, but it developed two distinctive, and instructive, relationships with voluntary agencies in the post-war years. This was partly because the department's senior members wanted to distance it from areas thought inappropriate for its own personnel.[49] In New Zealand, as in the United Kingdom, the home of the Marriage Guidance movement, government decided that public servants were better to endorse marriage counselling at a distance rather than meddling directly in such an intimate relationship.[50] In the second area of interest, prisoners' aid work was never going to generate popular appeal or large-scale donations, but it needed to draw upon community links if it was to facilitate the reintegration of offenders into society. Rather than being undermined by the welfare state, voluntary work in these two areas was promoted and nurtured by public servants with a wider vision than the original workers in the cause. Particularly influential here were Sam Barnett, permanent

head of the Justice Department from 1949, and John Robson, appointed as Assistant Secretary in 1951 (succeeding Barnett as Secretary in 1960). Both, significantly, were appointed from outside the department and challenged its earlier, more closed and punitive ethos, opening it up to outside collaborations. Each was seen as unorthodox in method and sympathetic to penal reform. In Barnett's case, this reflected a strict Christian upbringing, and in Robson's, a PhD-level education preceded by earlier, and formative, interactions with Workers' Educational Association.[51] These men were to show how, in terms of energy and innovation, in welfare collaborations 'the state could well set the pace'.[52]

Prisoners' aid and rehabilitation was the more stigmatized of the two areas. Although prisoners' aid societies dated back to the 1870s in New Zealand, they struggled for support. In the aftermath of World War II, many were moribund, having lost some of their key workers to the war effort. Local societies already had a relationship with the penal section of Justice, largely because they had to negotiate access to prisoner clientele. However, this relationship was not always happy, and in Auckland, the secretary of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society, George Moreton, was banned from Mt Eden Prison in the 1940s for condemning it as a 'zoo' unfit for human habitation. A Justice Department memorandum on Moreton's retirement in 1952 shows aspirations for control over the society, which need to be set against the later, apparently more comfortable, relationship: 'There are, I suggest, three courses open to you: (a) Let [the Society] perish (b) Run it (c) Control it. For reasons listed above, I would be sorry to see it perish and our apathy might result in this. I do not think it advisable to run it and become identified. The only answer seems to be to control it, which could, I believe, be done.' The issue was whether the department should provide moral support only, or financial aid that would allow the society to appoint 'the right sort of man'.[53] In the long term both moral and financial aid eventuated on a national level, but with certain strings attached. When a national body, the New Zealand Prisoners' Aid and Rehabilitation Society (NZPARS) was formed at the department's urging in 1957, its rules were sent to Barnett and the Director of the Penal Division for approval.[54]

The alliance between the Department of Justice and NZPARS progressed even further in the 1960s, reflecting a productive relationship between John Robson and National's Minister of Justice, Ralph Hanan. Representatives of the department served on national and some local committees and, in the 1960s, the national management committee met monthly with the Secretary of Justice or his deputy. NZPARS leaders seemed comfortable with this close and, in retrospect, deferential relationship. As its president told South Island members in 1963, 'PARS was a lay extension of the Justice Dep[artment]. We had been given a lead and must accept their challenge and be as efficient as possible.'[55] This sentiment was echoed by Robson. Addressing the AGM just before his retirement, he emphasized the strong support he had always given NZPARS in his speeches, publications and reports to Parliament: 'It is very much of a joint effort. Furthermore, you can do so much in explaining policy to the community.... You people can help by becoming fully informed on policy changes and the reasons for them .... You can interpret us to the

community, whereas the community may not listen very intently to me or any of our officers.'[56]

Interpreting Justice Department policy to the community might not have left much space for criticizing it, but oral histories present these as 'halcyon days' for the society.[57] It was, the first national president later noted, a time of enthusiasm and euphoria within the movement 'when everything was new and fresh and we were building, and it was all most exciting and adventurous'.[58] Churches such as the Salvation Army and organizations such as Rotary and Jaycees provided a 'virtually handpicked' leadership for NZPARS, while close alliances were forged with senior probation officers and administrators — some of whom also belonged to service clubs and church groups, and helped facilitate the employment and rehabilitation of discharged prisoners in both capacities.[59] The positive, interactive relationship of the 1960s and early 1970s eventually saw the appointment of a national coordinator, new levels of training for NZPARS workers and cooperation in the management of post-release hostels (thereby removing the department from direct community criticism by opponents). Instead of relying on variable annual allocations from lotteries and charitable trusts, NZPARS gained a direct and on-going grant from the Department of Justice. This stabilized the organization's funding, enabling forward planning and the employment of staff on comparable terms to probation officers (such comparability with government sector terms of employment was another consequence of this interaction with the state). Oral histories of NZPARS are eulogistic about this era, and about the shared vision of Barnett and Robson, the public servants and ministers such as Hanan. Much of the energy survived the Robson–Hanan era, although the relationship was never quite so cosy, and branches of the society beyond the capital showed increasing resentment at Wellington's dominance.[60]

Excitement and energy are also recurring themes in the history of the Marriage Guidance movement during its early association with the Department of Justice. Two streams of influence came together when Marriage Guidance was introduced from Britain in 1949: prominent churchmen's concern about a rising divorce rate in the post-war era, and urban professionals' interest in new counselling therapies. In the 1950s prosperity seemed to be generating its own problems or, at least, to be exposing the fragilities of human relationships beyond the economic realm.

Social security may not have solved all human troubles, but there was an increasing faith that individuals could be educated into the enlightened management of relationships. The Department of Justice already offered a legal conciliation service for those initiating separation or divorce proceedings, but it was unpopular because of its association with the courts and probation service. Barnett believed that a large number of young offenders came from broken homes, and that earlier, preventive action was necessary.[61] The Parker–Hulme murder case in 1954 temporarily damaged the reputation of Marriage Guidance, since Juliet Hulme's mother was counselling secretary of Christchurch Marriage Guidance, and the case revealed the Hulme's own marriage problems to the world. As with prisoners' aid, state endorsement saw a troubled organization revitalized into a 'modern', professional body with a

national presence and organizational coherence. From 1959 Justice funded Rev. Les Clements (already on the payroll as Senior Chaplain to the Prisons) to work as a national advisor and organizer. It then sponsored a major conference on marriage guidance, formed a national advisory committee of state and voluntary workers in 1960, and provided oversight and finance for the organization's counsellor selection, training and accreditation.[62] The Department of Justice library came to have an admirable selection of books on counselling, which was made available to Marriage Guidance, and the movement utilized the centralized training facilities at Mt Crawford Prison (where prisoner 'trustees' were trained to be waiters, in bow ties and cummerbunds).[63] Many public servants — child welfare officers, school doctors, teachers and even judges — became involved in the Marriage Guidance movement, mostly outside their official roles.[64]

In the late 1970s dependence on state funding meant that those involved in Marriage Guidance found themselves maintaining a veneer of marriage conciliation against wider social trends towards family fragmentation.[65] The organization also faced increasing competition from newcomers, including private counsellors. But at the height of its association with the Department of Justice over the 1960s and 1970s, it gained predominant national status as a result of state endorsement. The positioning of this otherwise female-dominated voluntary body,[66] and its success in achieving a mandate within a small, centralized welfare state, was predicated upon official and unofficial conversations between prominent men. A telling anecdote from Wellington businessman and Marriage Guidance supporter John Ilott appears in the official history of the organization: '... when I had lunch with Ralph Hanan or John Robson, every couple of months they would ask us how we were going for cash. I'd say, we need £25,000 ... they'd fix it up, because they knew it would be accountable... . John Robson believed in Marriage Guidance being a community movement rather than a Government Department ... .' [67] Even allowing for exaggeration, we see here the small scale of New Zealand society and the informal ways in which quite consequential decisions could be made: the time would come when such informality was unsustainable, when personal connections were broken through retirement, death and (in the 1980s and 1990s) state sector restructuring, and bodies such as Marriage Guidance lost their favoured position. In these instances, close proximity in the 1960s and 1970s was followed by greater distance in later decades, though state funding continued.

The organizations foregrounded so far were secular agencies, though all drew upon the energies of individual church people. How did church social services fare during the high point of the welfare state? While the mainstream churches were involved in a range of welfare activities, their emphasis shifted profoundly as a result of post-war government policies. Over the twentieth century, the churches were more ideologically wedded than state agencies to institutions, sites of influence as well as care. The first decades of the century had seen a growth in the number of church orphanages; the second part of the century would see the closure of many children's homes and a marked expansion in the number of church homes for the elderly.[68] This expansion

occurred against a background of disclosures about 'the old age problem', most especially the plight of old men and women in dingy boarding houses and other more sorry circumstances. In what has been termed a 'welfare state for the young', geared most especially to the support of young families, the elderly seemed to have lost out. Journalists and others wrote emotive articles about 'Our Forgotten People', whose 'pathetic, sordid lives' were ignored by those who would 'rush to the S.P.C.A if they saw someone beating a dog, or mistreating a horse'.[69] Orphans were replaced as objects of media attention by pathetic old ladies in 'pinnies', the victims of rack-renting landlords, minimal pensions and, sometimes, family neglect.

Labour had already raised the prospect of subsidizing homes for the elderly before its defeat in the 1949 election, but it was the National Party which took action in a way which firmly shifted responsibility on to the voluntary sector and away from hospital boards. A Treasury paper provided the rationale and, significantly, it was an economic one: 'By successfully enlisting the support of voluntary organisations [the problem of aged accommodation] could be solved more economically than by the assumption of direct responsibility by the State. As members of church bodies and welfare organisations throughout the country, many people are willing to support local charitable projects by donations and personal effort. Consequently hostels run by voluntary organisations usually operate without financial loss and certainly without recourse to public funds once the problem of raising capital for the acquisition of building[s] has been surmounted.'[70]

National's Minister of Health, Jack Watt, and his successor, Presbyterian John Marshall, endorsed the introduction of state capital subsidies on aged care institutions built by religious and voluntary organizations, Marshall later noting that it was 'a sound, social, humanitarian and financial policy, providing devoted care for the aged, who needed it most, and saving the State the considerable cost of maintaining the aged poor in public hospitals'.[71] Subsidies rose from 50% of the establishment cost of new homes in 1950, to 100% in 1960, with subsequent assistance for upgrading older developments and the construction of flats and cottages. Between 1950 and 1972 the state provided more than $22 million in subsidies toward the provision of 5429 additional beds in aged care homes run by voluntary and religious agencies.[72]

The use of subsidies encouraged churches into aged care, and hospital boards out of it. But religious organizations' alliance with the state on this particular welfare front came at a price, distorting their internal mix of service provision, requiring them to meet government-defined standards of care, and encouraging the development of separate social service structures beyond church congregations. John Evans has argued partnership with the state muted social critique, resulting in a reluctance to criticize government.[73] Collectively, the churches became 'just one of the many groups involved with the Wellington bureaucracy'.[74]

By the end of the 1960s the Health Department had started to express concern about the unnecessary institutionalization of the elderly, which it attributed to the availability of residential home beds.[75] Despite John Marshall's earlier justification, there were also suggestions that church homes did not necessarily

cater for the aged poor: an influential 1976 report by George Salmond (later Director-General of Health) suggested that 'some religious and welfare homes are accessible only to relatively fit, genteel old ladies'.[76] Funding mechanisms were then used to shift services back into the community for all but the most infirm elderly — the consequences of this are still being played out in the closure and privatization of church rest homes.

As the welfare state expanded, the churches more generally asserted a motif of devoted care, benefiting from relatively high levels of public trust in their welfare work. However, by the 1970s many churches struggled to articulate what was distinctive about their social service activities, especially since they now regarded clients' religious beliefs as a private matter (or were required to do so as a condition of state funding). Increasingly, they employed staff on the basis of expertise rather than religious affiliation. The apparent separation of faith and works may have happened regardless of the state's embrace, but it was encouraged by its requirements.[77]

Further examples can be given of the fortunes of voluntary organizations within an expanding welfare state, and the varying degrees of accommodation and entanglement which resulted. The Maori Women's Welfare League has been examined as an organization embedded within the Department of Maori Affairs, fostered by its officers, but sharing strong community links with these officers.[78] Its early conference records nonetheless suggest early points of tension between the department and the league, and an energetic rejection of government responses to its remits as 'not satisfactory', 'not accepted' or missing the point. Linda Bryder has charted the troubled relationship between Plunket and the Department of Health, suggesting that in the post-war period H.B Turbott, Deputy Director and then Director-General of Health (1959–1965), emerges as the 'arch enemy' of Plunket.[79] In the 1950s and 1960s politicians nonetheless continued their endorsement of the infant welfare body and its 'army' of women volunteers, showing how the administrative and political legs of government did not necessarily dance to the same tune.

A newer organization such as the Intellectually Handicapped Children's Parents' Association (later IHC) illustrates the way in which a small advocacy group critical of the state's failings and bitterly at odds with the Department of Health could metamorphose into a major national service provider heavily underwritten by taxpayer dollars.[80] IHC emerged at the height of the welfare state in 1949. Ahead of government agencies in its advocacy of community care for intellectually disabled persons, it was later used by them to test reactions to community care, its branches bearing the brunt of public opposition to facilities in particular neighbourhoods. The organization's classes for intellectually handicapped children eventually led to a state commitment to their education, as for children without such disabilities. IHC's history confirms one of the claims of the voluntary sector, illustrated by the earlier quotation from the Crippled Children Society: that a key role of the sector was to pioneer in fields where state agencies would hesitate to tread. And yet, as we have seen with Marriage Guidance and Prisoners' Aid and Rehabilitation, it was sometimes state personnel who suggested and nurtured such experimentation.

The voluntary social service sector did not fade after the introduction of

Social Security, and nor was it made redundant by post-war prosperity. Rather, its various forms were elaborated alongside the welfare state. The reports of many social welfare organizations mused upon the existence of poverty amidst plenty in the 1950s and 1960s, and Peter Fraser himself was later quoted as having concluded that 'no matter how socialised or socialistic was legislation introduced, no Government could legislate for human nature'.[81] Organizations continued to claim a space within the welfare spectrum, asserting their traditional claims to the flexible provision of interpersonal supports, but now also pointing out gaps in the welfare state. Some troubled individuals were said to be more willing to approach voluntary agencies, which did not have the authoritarian mantle and statutory powers of state social work agencies.[82] Government departments and their ministers recognized these claims, supplementing ideological support with increasing amounts of subsidization and direct grants.

At the same time, the voluntary social services were characterized by growing complexity in the post-war years. There were the local societies, still dominated by volunteers, but increasingly likely to employ a full- or part-time social worker or organizer — significant figures in their own localities, the Mrs Millers of the welfare world worked in many small ways meeting needs and guiding clients around the intricacies of the state welfare system. Many of these small organizations remained financially independent of government, though the price paid was constant anxiety and a diversion of energies into fundraising and community support. Others made bids for lotteries funding, an intermittent and unreliable source, despite it being (or because it was) for many years a source of ministerial patronage. At the other end of the scale were large national organizations, increasingly reliant on direct, on-going government grants, and able to lobby government to achieve them (and, thereby, their own perpetuation). Some, like Plunket and IHC, had developed their own welfare bureaucracies by the 1970s, becoming 'monopoly providers' with state endorsement. From the late 1960s the voluntary sector was further complicated by the emergence of new organizations, informed more by identity politics and a drive towards self-help and advocacy than their 'other'-directed predecessors: these included anti-violence, health and disability groups. In their early manifestations, at least, some of these organizations had troubled relationships with government agencies, for they were both critical of the state and resentful of their exclusion from the cosy relationships which had emerged around its edges. But, in time, some of them had also to accept the 'bear hug of government funding'.[83]

What stayed constant was the state's role as New Zealand's largest philanthropist to preferred voluntary social services. This role had emerged gradually since the nineteenth century and was elaborated under a rhetoric of 'partnership' during the height of the welfare state. Many organizations found that if they were to survive, and particularly if they wanted to employ staff, they had to embrace government funding. While funding arrangements were later found wanting in terms of accountability, consistency and transparency, prior to the 1980s they were relatively unoppressive for favoured organizations. The symbiotic relationships which resulted went, in many cases, beyond the

45 Information based upon typescript annual reports 1935–1991, in possession of Mrs H. Askew, Auckland. In the late 1980s the society's 'benevolence' once more came into its own, as cases were referred for food parcels by a number of agencies, including the Department of Social Welfare.

46 Some older organizations, such as the Auckland Ladies' Benevolent Society, remained in existence largely to disperse funds from legacies to other more active charities.

47 Report on meeting between Mrs Miller, Mr Fraser and Mr Parry presented to Combined Smith Family and Mayor's Relief Committee, Minutes, 29 May 1946, MS Y 85, ATL.

48 Minutes, Directors of Smith Family, 4 November 1943, MS Y 88, MS Papers 260, ATL.

49 See, for example, John Robson, quoted in Annual Report, National Marriage Guidance Council, 1962, ABWP 7403/2, W4836, ANZ.

50 Jane Lewis, 'Public Institution and Private Relationship. Marriage and Marriage Guidance, 1920–1968', *Twentieth Century British History*, 1, 3 (1990), p.255. For an Australian perspective on Marriage Guidance see Kereen Reiger, 'The Coming of the Counsellors: The Development of Marriage Guidance in Australia', *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 23, 3 (1987), pp.375–87. In neither country was the mantle of a government department as fully extended over the Marriage Guidance movement as in New Zealand, although some state governments in Australia were contributing to training and accommodation costs by the 1950s.

51 J.L. Robson, *Sacred Cows and Rogue Elephants. Policy Developments in the New Zealand Justice Department*, Wellington, 1987, pp.5–11. Barnett came from the Department of Education and Robson had a background in the Public Trust Office and the Public Service Commission.

52 Finlayson, p.317.

53 P.K.Mayhew, Auckland Regional Probation Officer to Secretary for Justice, 11 July 1952, J 1, 29/7/12 Pt.1, National Archives.

54 N.J.Cooper to Director of Penal Division, 16 April 1958, J 1 29/7/12 Pt. 2, Box 382, ANZ.

55 South Island Prisoners' Rehabilitation Association Minutes, 18 July 1963, Acc. 501, no.4, Macmillan Brown Library.

56 Address to AGM, 16 June 1969, J1 29/7/12 Pt.7, ANZ.

57 Ray Hocking, transcript of tape recorded 28 February 1992, NZPARS National Office, Wellington.

58 Jack Davies, transcript of interview recorded 7 October 1991, NZPARS National Office, Wellington.

59 ibid.

60 This section is based upon Margaret Tennant, *Through the Prison Gate. 125 Years of Prisoners' Aid and Rehabilitation*, Wellington, 2002, pp.14–15.

61 The Baptist Barnett also asserted the reformative power of religion upon inmates and supported the appointment of prison chaplains. Robson, pp.59–60, 63.

62 Interview, Merv Hancock, 28 June 2003; Leslie Clements, 'Marriage Guidance in New Zealand. The Story of a Movement', in Stewart Houston (ed.), *Marriage and the Family in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1970, pp.157–73. See also Jackie Renouf, 'Changing Relationships Between the State and the Voluntary Sector — The Changing Face of Partnership', *Social Work Review*, December 1995, pp.9–13. For overseas comments on Marriage Guidance in New Zealand, see A. Joseph Brayshaw, 'Marriage Guidance in New Zealand', in *Marriage Guidance*, 8, 2 (1964), pp.24–26; Gerald Sanctuary, *Marriage Under Stress. Comparative Study of Marriage Conciliation*, London, 1968, especially pp.98–106.

63 Jennifer M. Daly, *MG Reflecting. A Portrait of Marriage Guidance in New Zealand 1949 to 1989*, [1989], p.31; Paper by Wellington Council on Future Finances, New Zealand Marriage Guidance Council Conference October 1964, ABWP 7403/1 Acc W4836, ANZ.

64 Information on Marriage Guidance draws upon the records of Relationship Services (now in ATL, MS group 1217), and on the minutes of the National Marriage Guidance Council, ABWP 7403/2 (Acc W4836) ANZ.

65 Daly, p.45.

66 Around 70% of counsellors were female. Calculated from Daly, pp.57–60.

67 ibid., p.21.

68 On the decline of the churches' role in child welfare services and their increasing emphasis on residential care of the aged, see 'Church Social Services: A Report of An Inquiry into Child Care Services October 1977' [Wellington, 1977].

69 'Cassandra', 'Our Forgotten People', *Mirror*, July 1951, pp.6–7, 77–79. Official reports included surveys carried out by students from the School of Social Science at Victoria University,

NOTES

1 This paper draws upon some material elaborated in disparate sections of Margaret Tennant, *The Fabric of Welfare. Voluntary Organisations, Government and Welfare in New Zealand, 1840–2005*, Wellington, 2007.

2 The name 'Smith Family' was first adopted by a group of Sydney businessmen who wanted to distribute charity anonymously and did so using a shared and common surname.

3 Minutes, Combined Smith Family and Mayors' Relief Committee, 21 August 1946, MS Y 85, Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL).

4 ibid.

5 Merv Hancock, interviewed by Margaret Tennant, 11 March 2004. Hancock's career crossed welfare boundaries, for he was at various times a public servant, a founder and member of voluntary organizations and one of the first New Zealand counsellors to start his own private practice. Coincidentally, Aroha Harris used the metaphor of a dance in her 2007 doctoral thesis: 'Dancing with the State: Māori Creative Energy and Policies of Integration, 1945–1967', PhD thesis, The University of Auckland, 2007.

6 Elizabeth Macadam, *The New Philanthropy. A Study of the Relations Between the Statutory and Voluntary Social Services*, London, 1934. For a recent key survey see Geoffrey Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain 1830–1990*, Oxford, 1994, p.279.

7 See, especially, Derek A. Dow, *Safeguarding the Public Health. A History of the New Zealand Department of Health*, Wellington, 1995; Bronwyn Dalley, *Family Matters*, Auckland, 1998; Margaret McClure, *A Civilised Community. A History of Social Security in New Zealand 1898–1998*, Auckland, 1998; Bronwyn Labrum, 'Family Needs and Family Desires: Discretionary State Welfare in New Zealand, 1920–1970', PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2000.

8 Existing work in two particular areas shows the permeability of boundaries between government and the voluntary sector: in the case of early childhood education, see Helen May, *The Discovery of Early Childhood*, Auckland, 1997 and *Politics in the Playground. The World of Early Childhood in Postwar New Zealand*, Wellington, 2001. Margaret Tennant, *Children's Health, the Nation's Wealth. A History of Children's Health Camps*, Wellington, 1994, focuses on a venture which drew together state and voluntary effort and funding. See also Linda Bryder, *A Voice for Mothers*, Auckland, 2003; Ian Dougherty and Jane Thomson, *Making a Difference: A Centennial History of Presbyterian Support Otago, 1906–2006*, Dunedin, 2006; Julia Millen, *Breaking Barriers. IHC's First 50 Years*, Wellington, 1999; Mary Collie-Holmes, *Where the Heart Is. A History of Barnardo's New Zealand 1866–1991*, Wellington, 1991.

9 W.H. Oliver, 'Social Policy in New Zealand: An Historical Overview', in Royal Commission on Social Policy, *The April Report*, Government Printer, Wellington, 1988, p.42.

10 Sue Driver and David Robinson, *Voluntary Social Services. A Review of Funding. Planning Paper No.28*, Wellington, 1986, pp.10, 18.

11 Margaret Tennant, *Paupers and Providers. Charitable Aid in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1989, ch.1; David Thomson, *A World Without Welfare. New Zealand's Colonial Experiment*, Auckland, 1998, pp.132–9.

12 Annual Report, Department of Hospitals and Charitable Institutions, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, 1898, H-22, p.2.

13 For further on this measure and on past arrangements, see Margaret Tennant, 'Mixed Economy or Moving Frontier?', in Bronwyn Dalley and Margaret Tennant (eds), *Past Judgement. Social Policy in New Zealand History*, Dunedin, 2004, pp.44–45.

14 On the appointment of probation officers, see J1 PD 1920/20/35, Archives New Zealand, Wellington (ANZ). The debate on the 1909 Reformatory Institutions Act shows the rationale behind the state-enforced powers of detention given to voluntary agencies such as the Salvation Army and certain women's homes. See *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates* (NZPD),1909, 147, pp.871–8.

15 See Conference of Patriotic Societies, 17–18 February 1916, SS 11/2/38 ACC W2756, ANZ.

16 See, for example, Statement on Relief of Unemployed, 9 March 1932, H1 54/49/18, ANZ.

17 Correspondence, Daisy Begg and Peter Fraser, 22 May 1937, 8 June 1937; Memo, Departmental Accountant, 16 September 1938, H 1 127 (9251), ANZ. See also Bryder, pp.53–54.

18 Annual Report, Onehunga Ladies' Benevolent Society, March 1939, in possession Mrs H. Askew, Auckland; minutes, Presbyterian Social Service Association, 26 August 1938 (held by Presbyterian Support Northern at time of use).

19 ibid.

20 *New Zealand Crippled Children Society, Annual Report, 1939*, p.6.

21 Walter Nash, quoted by Margaret McClure in 'A Badge of Poverty or a Symbol of Citizenship? Needs, Rights and Social Security, 1935–2000', in Dalley and Tennant (eds), p.144.

22 Linda Bryder, '"Plunket's Secret Army". The Royal New Zealand Plunket Society and the State', in Dalley and Tennant (eds), pp.109–12.

23 Sandra Wallace, 'Powder-Power Politicians. New Zealand Women Parliamentary Candidates', PhD thesis, University of Otago, 1992, pp.132–7.

24 N.M. Taylor, *The Home Front Vol.I*, Wellington, 1986, pp.149–62. For an Australian perspective on the wartime surge of voluntarism, see Melanie Oppenheimer, *All Work No Pay. Australian Civilian Volunteers in War*, Walcha, NSW, 2002.

25 S.J. Piesse, 'Patriotic Welfare in Otago. A History of the Otago Patriotic and General Welfare Association 1914–50 and the Otago Patriotic Council 1939–', MA thesis, University of Otago, 1981, p.172.

26 Taylor, pp.150–1.

27 Jane R. M. Thomson, 'The Rehabilitation of Servicemen of World War II in New Zealand 1940–1954', PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1983, p.340.

28 ibid., pp.85–86, 89, 338.

29 ibid., p.331. For discussion of the Maori War Effort Organisation and the state's attempted co-option of Maori energies, see Richard Hill, *State Authority, Indigenous Autonomy. Crown-Maori Relations in New Zealand/Aotearoa 1900–1950*, 2004, pp.189–209.

30 Janet and William Beveridge, *Antipodes Notebook*, London, 1949, p.6. I would like to thank Melanie Oppenheimer for first drawing my attention to this visit.

31 William and Janet Beveridge, *On and Off the Platform. Under the Southern Cross*, Wellington/Sydney, 1949, pp.69–77; *Auckland Weekly News*, 21 April 1948, p.14. See also Jose Harris, *William Beveridge. A Biography*, Oxford, 1997, pp.453–61.

32 IA 1 152/710, ANZ.

33 John Robson, 'Social Services Administration: Whose Responsibility?', in K.J. Scott (ed.), *Welfare in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1955, pp.22–23.

34 ibid., p.32.

35 ibid., p.31.

36 W.E.A. Lake, 'Social Services in New Zealand. A [NZ Institute of Public Administration] Study Group Report on the 1954 theme "Social Services in New Zealand"', Wellington, 1954.

37 C.A. Oram, *Social Policy and Administration in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1969, p.31. Oram was at this time Deputy Chairman of the Social Security Commission.

38 ibid., p.28.

39 For a 1970s example of the Director-General of Health being left 'speechless' by a Cabinet minister's impromptu promise of a subsidy to a city mission for a new retirement home, see Jane S. Clark, 'Welfare Restructuring in New Zealand: The Changing Relationship Between the State and Auckland's Voluntary Sector', MSc thesis, The University of Auckland, 1997, p.110.

40 Leslie Lipson, *The Politics of Equality. New Zealand's Adventures in Democracy*, Chicago, 1948, p.480. See also Thomas B. Smith, *The New Zealand Bureaucrat*, Wellington, 1974, p.44. Smith's sample of 'executive class' administrators found that 49% belonged to religious or church groups, and 44% to charitable groups or service clubs. However, 56% belonged to sports clubs.

41 The phrase is Warwick Brunton's, in interview, 29 October 2001.

42 For example, around 60% of the Children's Health Camps funding came from the Department of Health in the 1960s (Tennant, *Children's Health*, 1994, p.223). Branch level examples include the Auckland Prisoners' Aid and Rehabilitation Society, which in the late 1950s was receiving 40% of its income from government departments and the Wellington Home and Family Society, which received around 48% of its funding from central government in 1957, mostly via the Lottery Fund, and a further 14% from local bodies. Annual Report, Auckland PARS, 1959, held at NZPARS, Auckland; Annual Report, Home and Family Society, Wellington, 1957, MSX 3294, ATL. Lotteries represented a very fickle source of funding, however, as grants did not remain constant from year to year.

43 For an example of the 'dimensions of interdependence' in one organization over time, see Margaret Tennant, 'A Perilous Partnership: Government and the New Zealand Prisoners' Aid and Rehabilitation Society', *Third Sector Review*, 10, 1 (2004), pp.43–60.

44 Melanie Nolan, *Breadwinning. New Zealand Women and the State*, Christchurch, 2000, p.301. See also Labrum, 'Family Needs'.

the first of which was published as an appendix to the Health Department's Annual Report: 'Old People in Wellington City: A Survey', *AJHR*, 1952, H-31A, pp.82–104. For an excellent outline of the concerns and responses in Auckland, see Russell Stone, *In the Time of Age. Selwyn Village: The First Twenty-Five Years*, Auckland, 1979.

70 B.C. Ashwin, Secretary of Treasury to Prime Minister, 24 March 1950, H 1 104/4 (25575), ANZ.

71 John Marshall, *Memoirs, Vol.I,* Auckland, 1983, p.197.

72 *Official Yearbook*, 1973, p.139.

73 John Evans, 'Church-State Relations in New Zealand 1940–1990, PhD thesis, University of Otago, 1992, pp.197–9.

74 ibid., p.200.

75 See, for example, H1 104 (31674), ANZ.

76 See G.C. Salmond, *Accommodation and Service Needs of the Elderly, Special Report No.46*, Wellington,1976, p.89 and 'Summary', pp.93–100.

77 For a more general discussion of the relationship between religion and social policy, and of the 'wages of entanglement', see Hugh Heclo, 'Religion and Public Policy: An Introduction', *Journal of Policy History*, 13, 1, 2001, pp.1–18. Peter Lineham, 'Government Support of the Churches in the Modern Era', in Rex Adhar and John Stenhouse (eds), *God and Government. The New Zealand Experience*, Dunedin, 2000, pp.41–58, contains an important survey of the churches' relationship with government, which goes beyond the social services.

78 See, for example, Tania Rei, 'Te Rōpū Wāhine Māori Toko I te Ora. Māori Women's Welfare League 1951– ', in Anne Else (ed.), *Women Together. A History of Women's Organisations in New Zealand: Ngā Rōpū Wāhine o te Motu*, Wellington, 1993, pp.34–38; Tania Rei, 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori Women and the State', in Lynne Alice and Rosemary du Plessis (eds), *Feminist Thought in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Auckland, 1998, pp.198–207; 'Historical Background', in Anna Rogers and Miria Simpson (eds), *Te Tīmatanga Tātau Tātau. Early Stories from Founding Members of the Māori Women's Welfare League Te Rōpū Wāhine Māori Toko*, Wellington, 1993; Aroha Harris, 'Maori and "the Maori Affairs"', in Dalley and Tennant (eds), pp.191–205; Harris, 2007, especially ch.4.

79 Bryder, 2003, p.155.

80 See Millen, 1999.

81 C. Meachen to AGM of Wellington Society for the Protection of Home and Family, 27 April 1970, 80/072, ATL. See also, 'Poverty Amidst Plenty', Auckland Presbyterian Social Service Association Report, 1965. Held by Presbyterian Support Northern at time of use.

82 See, for example, the Annual Report of the Wellington Society for the Protection of Home and Family Annual Report for 1973, which claimed that a voluntary agency such as itself was not limited by statute to considering only one aspect of a problem and nor were its clients forced by official dictates into taking a more definite step than they would wish. Annual Report, Society for the Protection of Home and Family, 1973, MSX 3295, ATL.

83 Garth Nowland-Foreman, 'Can Voluntary Organisations Survive the Bear Hug of Government Funding Under a Contracting Regime? — A View From Aotearoa/New Zealand', *Third Sector Review*, 3, 1 (1997), pp.5–39.