## Northampton Mercury 6 July 1872 PETTY SESSIONS 28 JUNE

Before the Honble. St Andrew St John, Rev C. C. Beaty Pownall, and Jos Tricker and R Orlebar, Esqs.

[....]

Captain Charles Patrick, of Brigstock, assistant inspector of factories, charged Eliza Savage, of Harrold, lace school mistress, with neglecting to produce a certificate from some school master, or principal teacher, showing that one Clara Chambers, under the age of 13 years, employed by her, had attended school for at least 10 hours during the week preceding 4th June inst., when required by the inspector, in accordance with the provisions of the workshops Act, 1867, which prohibits children from working at any handicraft for profit or gain under the age of eight years; and if employed between the ages of eight and 13, shall attend some school of education for at least 10 hours every week when so employed, and no child shall be employed for more that 6 1/2 hours in one day. A workshop means any place whatsoever, whether at home, or in other people's houses or shops, or in the open air, where goods are made for sale, by a parent or employer, and the penalty for each offence is 20s, of 14 days imprisonment. This being the first case, the inspector asked the Bench to deal with the case as leniently as possible, with the smallest fine (without costs), and the Bench fined her in the mitigated penalty of 3s. Thomas Webb, of Harrold, labourer, was charged by the inspector with allowing two of his children to be employed in a workshop kept by Joseph Valentine, they being under 13 years of age, and not having attended some school as required by the Workshops Act. The charge was withdrawn by the inspector on Webb promising to comply with the Act in future. George Pratt, of Harrold, was charged in a similar manner with allowing two of his children, under 13 years of age, to be employed contrary to the provisions of the Act. This charge was also withdrawn on his promising to comply with the Act. James Chambers, for allowing one of his children, under 13 years, to be employed in a workshop contrary to the requirements of the Act. This was also withdrawn on his promising to comply with the Act. The inspector said in these cases he had no doubt the parents and employers had erred in ignorance, and that being so he would pay the costs in all cases, hoping this would act as a caution; but should they fail, and he should be obliged to summon them again, he would undoubtedly ask for the full penalty to be inflicted.