

**Oliver, Bobbie “The Locomotive Engine Drivers’, Firemen’s and Cleaners’ Union: A British transplant or home-grown product?” in *Labour History in the New Century*, edited by Bobbie Oliver, 19-29. Perth, WA: Black Swan Press, 2009.**

Discourse on the origins of Australian ‘craft’, trades, or skilled unions (among which locomotive footplate unions may be counted) in the 19<sup>th</sup> century has often involved discussion about whether Australian unions were derivative of British unions; whether the union movements in each country developed more or less simultaneously,<sup>1</sup> or whether the Australian movement was shaped more by local circumstances than by background.<sup>2</sup> At least two unions, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners and the Amalgamated Society of Engineers [ASE] – later the Amalgamated Engineering Union – Australian section, each originated as the Australian branch of a parent union. Sheridan comments that ‘in every essential, the colonial society [the ASE] was closely comparable to its parent union’.<sup>3</sup> Other studies – for example, Gollan and Bongiorno – have discussed the impact of skilled British craftsmen emigrating to Australia, bringing with them ideologies (such as Chartism) and traditions that influenced the growth of a trade union culture.<sup>4</sup>

There are undoubtedly parallels between the British union, the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen [ASLEF] and its Australian counterparts, the locomotive enginemens’ unions or associations. These unions were all founded in adverse circumstances and struggled to achieve recognition in their early decades. They also bore similarities in the roles of the office bearers, and structures of governance. To what extent do these parallels indicate a common heritage or a continuing relationship in which circumstances of one union influenced those of another?

Using material from British and Australian archives, this paper compares the Western Australian Locomotive Engine Drivers’, Firemen’s and Cleaners’ Union [WALEDF&CU] and ASLEF – both ‘craft’ unions that maintained an individual existence despite attempts to amalgamate them with larger railway workers’ unions. The paper asks: To what extent were British railway unionists who had immigrated to Australia influential in the foundation and development of the locomotive enginemens’ unions in the Australian colonies – and particularly in Western Australia – in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? Conversely, is it possible to argue that the Australian unions had any influence on their British counterpart?

In Britain, ASLEF's predecessor, the Amalgamated Railway Servants Association [ASRS] formed in 1872, a year after the passage of Gladstone's *Trade Union Act 1871*, which clarified the legal status of trade unions and provided for their funds to be protected under the *Friendly Societies Act* of 1855. The ASRS was a timid, conservative union that eschewed strikes as 'an evil to masters and men',<sup>5</sup> despite representing workers in one of the nation's most dangerous industries<sup>6</sup>. In 1876, the ASRS reported the deaths of 696 railway workers, and 3,872 injuries. According to the Board of Trade, 630 deaths and 2,216 injuries were caused 'from their own misconduct or want of caution, and only 43 fatalities and 384 accidents arose from circumstances beyond the workers' control',<sup>7</sup> but the union argued that many accidents were caused by either faulty equipment or appalling working conditions, or a combination of these.

The frequency of accidents involving both passengers and staff on the railways caused such public alarm that the British Government appointed the 1877 *Royal Commission into the Railways*. The Royal Commission's findings revealed that drivers sometimes worked 10 hours overtime extra to a 12-hour day (that is, a 22 hour shift, often without any breaks), and that four to five hours overtime was common.<sup>8</sup> Two years later, with no improvement in conditions for footplate men – a category that comprised drivers, firemen and engine cleaners – many decided to form their own union. A show down with the Great Western Railway Company over rates of pay was the catalyst for the formation of a new union, dedicated to footplate staff. The first branch of the ASLEF formed at Sheffield on 7 February 1880.<sup>9</sup> In a decade, the union gained a membership of 3,600,<sup>10</sup> although for years it struggled to convince not only the non-unionised but also the footplate members of the ASRS of the benefits of joining ASLEF. In 1885, ASRS had a total membership of 26,360 of which about 7,000 were locomotive men, and thus potential ASLEF members.<sup>11</sup> The two unions maintained a hostile relationship, broken periodically by ASRS' attempts to amalgamate and ASLEFs to federate – neither of which was achieved in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>12</sup>

The WALEDF&CU dated its formation from 1898. Although Acts legalising trade unions had been passed in all the other mainland colonies by 1886, this did not occur in Western Australia until after Federation. Yet despite being denied legal status, WA unions that formed in the last two decades of the nineteenth century – whose membership consisted largely of immigrants from Britain or the eastern colonies – were not always suppressed. In 1890, six small unions and an Eight Hours Association existed in the Perth metropolitan area. These may have included a forerunner of the WALEDF&CU.<sup>13</sup>

Footplate men's unions had formed in the eastern colonies in the 1880s. By 1891, representatives of enginemens' associations in NSW, South Australia, Queensland and Victoria met in Melbourne and decided to conduct a ballot of their members with a view to forming the Federated Railway Locomotive Enginemens' Association of Australasia, which became a reality in 1901. While this federation pre-dated the formation of WALEDF&CU, Western Australia [WA] affiliated with other locomen's unions under a new banner of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemens [AFULE] in 1921.<sup>14</sup> As in Britain, throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century these unions resisted attempts by the general railway workers' unions to amalgamate.

The other Australian footplate unions had similar titles to ASLEF and WALEDF&CU; they catered for the same grades of workers, had the same promotion system (detailed below) and similar rules and structures of governance. Strict rules characterised the early railway unions in all of the Australian colonies/states and Britain, as is shown by a comparison between ASLEF's revised rules (1906) and the 1886 rules of the Victorian Locomotive Enginedrivers and Firemen's Association [LE&FA). The 1886 LE&FA rules required intending members to be proposed and seconded by two existing members of the Society. Likewise, ASLEF's early Branch Minutes contain lists of names of men nominated by members at the Quarterly meetings. These were proposed and seconded individually but usually put as a group for the members to vote upon. Members were encouraged to recruit others to the branch, and the most successful recruiters received medals.<sup>15</sup> LE&FA members could vote against a man joining the union, and if rejected, he was not to be proposed again for six months.

Those joining LE&FA paid seven shillings as an entrance fee and one shilling per month thereafter. Members with dues six months or more in arrears forfeited their rights, including voting, and if in arrears by twelve months, ceased to be union members. Both sets of rules imposed a penalty of expulsion upon any member convicted of felony unless he could 'satisfactorily establish his innocence'. Exactly the same wording was used, suggesting that the rules came from a common source. But there were differences, too. An LE&FA member was expelled if he was found to be misusing Society funds, whereas ASLEF merely empowered the union's Executive Council to determine anything upon which the rules were 'silent', and to 'fine any member not exceeding 20 shillings'. Any LE&FA member who was drunk on duty on the footplate, forfeited 'all benefits and good offices of the Association'.<sup>16</sup> Likewise, ASLEF members who caused an accident while intoxicated did not receive legal and defence benefits from the union. Strict rules applied about who qualified for benefits; for example, if a man

left work of his own accord he did not qualify. Fines, suspensions or expulsions applied for members disobeying the rules, including boasting of independence 'towards his employers or foremen on account of his being a member of the Society'.<sup>17</sup>

'Each set of union rules detailed the number of office bearers, their method of election and their duties. The Secretary and the Treasurer of the LE&FA were elected annually by ballot. Secretarial duties were to attend meetings; receive and sign for members' contributions; keep branch accounts (a correspondence book, a minute book, a cash book, a proposition book for cards of proposed members, a block receipt book, an attendance roll); conduct correspondence; summon meetings; keep minutes, and give notice to members in arrears. The Treasurer was to attend meetings; receive moneys from the Secretary, and keep a Cash Book and a block receipt book.<sup>18</sup>

In Western Australia, the Union's first headquarters were established in Market Street, Fremantle in 1898 and a full-time, paid Secretary was appointed after election by the membership. Other office bearers elected were: President, Treasurer, Trustees and Auditors – the latter until 1910 being merely Union members without training in accountancy.<sup>19</sup> ASLEF branches elected committees consisting of a chairman, a vice chairman, a secretary, a treasurer, a sub (or assistant) secretary if the branch size warranted it, a check steward, auditors and committee men.<sup>20</sup> The records indicate, therefore, similarities among the footplate unions with regard to rules, and the titles, appointment and role of office bearers.

What caused these similarities? To what extent did British immigrants influence the development of the Australian locomen's unions? Elsewhere, it has been shown that British workers were significantly represented in the workforce at the Midland Railway Workshops at Perth, and that they imported 'British' ideas including class-consciousness, the closed shop and deference towards 'superiors'.<sup>21</sup> Research has yet to ascertain a similar impact in the railway footplate workforces of WA or the eastern colonies, although the following examples indicate that this may have occurred through either significant individuals or mass immigration.

Derbyshire-born Robert Hollis, an early General Secretary of the NSW LEDF&CA, went to work at the age of 13 in the Midland Railway Company, reaching the grade of engine driver in 1878. Although an executive member of the ASRS in 1877-8, he became disillusioned by the union's conservatism, but he did not join ASLEF. In 1884 he and his wife, Alice, emigrated to NSW, where Hollis

joined the Railway Department and soon became general secretary of the LEDF&CA which had formed in 1883. Hollis' experiences in England convinced him of the value of a union dedicated to drivers, firemen and cleaners, and he opposed attempts by another Englishman, William Schey, to organise railway workers into one union.<sup>22</sup> Hollis, arguably, had a significant influence on the development of the footplate union in NSW.

Other British emigrants who had careers in the NSW railways were not in the footplate union, but did make decisions that influenced railway management and therefore the working environment of railway employees. Scottish-born David Kirkcaldie, who worked for 15 years as a clerk in the North British Railway before emigrating to Australia in 1876, was appointed one of three NSW railway commissioners in 1897.<sup>23</sup> One of Kirkcaldie's predecessors, Edward Eddy, who had a similar background as a clerk on the London and North Western Railway, was regarded as being:

... the driving force behind the establishment of the Railway Institute. The sense of identity, which he encouraged among his employees, may have contributed to the very spirit of the unionism that he opposed; it certainly led to the development of a mystique about him that railwaymen have nurtured to the present day.<sup>24</sup>

Immigrants from the eastern colonies and Britain formed the nucleus of the WA colonial railway staff. An indication that significant numbers of British railway workers may have come to Australia at the turn of the century is in ASLEF's encouragement of blacklisted members to emigrate after the 1887 strike by Midland Railway Company staff. As many sacked ASLEF members had their service records inscribed, 'Not to be used in the United Kingdom', emigration was the only option for those wanting to continue working in their trade. ASLEF members could apply for an emigration grant of £5 or £10; for several years, the names of those who received grants were recorded in the union's annual balance sheet. In 1887, the year of the Midland strike, the union assisted 56 members to emigrate. Regrettably, destinations were not recorded. The 1887 figure was exceptional, however, and in most years the numbers assisted were very small.<sup>25</sup> The extent of British influence in the formation and development of the WA footplate union, therefore, remains to be proven.

There were significant differences, too, in the development of the British and Australian unions. Unlike ASLEF, the Australian footplate men's unions were granted recognition as employees' representatives when the Federal and State Arbitration Courts were established. The Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, legislated under the Federal *Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904*, had both arbitral and judicial powers. It could make awards specifying

wages and conditions of employment in settlement of interstate disputes and interpret and enforce awards, if necessary imposing penalties on any parties who did not comply with award provisions. The Act also provided for the registration of organisations of employers and employees.<sup>26</sup> By the time the federal Act became law, the states had established their own arbitration and conciliation courts.

In WA, the adoption of the conciliation and arbitration system was the major impetus for legalising trade unions, which was achieved through the passage of the *Trades Union Regulation Act* in February 1902. Arbitration was compulsory and union officials who challenged the system and encouraged their members to strike could be sentenced to six months imprisonment, but employers equally had to abide by the law.<sup>27</sup> The WALEDF&CU was registered as a Union in the WA Arbitration Court on 21 February 1902, and the first agreement between the Union and the Commissioner of Railways for Western Australia was drawn up in July. The *1902 Agreement* contained 32 clauses, covering the necessary qualifications for drivers, firemen and cleaners; wage rates; working conditions and methods of promotion.<sup>28</sup> It embodied a strictly hierarchical system, with advancement based upon experience and ‘good conduct’.

Drivers were required to pass an examination and hold a certificate issued by the Chief Locomotive Officer (later the Chief Mechanical Engineer). Prior to sitting the examination, they had to serve as a fireman on the Western Australian Government Railways (WAGR) or as a driver or acting driver on another railway. Preference was given to WAGR employees. After reaching the rank of Driver Fifth Class, a man achieved promotion by length of service. After a year, he could be promoted to Fourth Class; a further eighteen months’ service enabled promotion to Third Class; with Second Class being achieved after another two years’ experience, but then it was a wait of four and half years before any further promotion. A man reached the status of Driver First Class only after a minimum of nine years service as a driver in the WAGR. Apart from the status, there was of course financial benefit in promotion. By 1913, Driver First Class received a daily wage of fifteen shillings, compared with eleven shillings earned by Driver Fifth Class.<sup>29</sup>

Firemen also had to pass an examination and hold a certificate of competency. Preference was given to WAGR cleaners who sought promotion to fireman; non-WAGR applicants had to have firing experience as well. The Agreement stated that non-WAGR staff would be appointed if ‘in Chief Locomotive Officer’s opinion there is no one qualified in the WAGR employ’.<sup>30</sup> Although cleaners were

not required to undergo theory examinations, they had to pass a medical examination to ensure that they were physically fit and they also underwent tests by the Medical Officer of the Railways Department for vision, hearing and colour blindness. They had to supply three testimonials of character from people 'of good repute'.<sup>31</sup> By 1914 there was an accepted line of promotion from callboy to cleaner. Similar agreements were drawn up in the other Australian states between their State Arbitration Boards and the various locomotive enginemen's unions.<sup>32</sup> But not all were happy with their agreements; the Victorian union went on strike in 1903, with disastrous consequences for their working conditions.<sup>33</sup>

In contrast, in Britain, it was not until 1919 that national standards of advancement for footplate men were agreed between employers and employees. This advance was facilitated by the British Government taking control of the railways in World War I, but was won only after the 'ten shilling strike' of 1918.<sup>34</sup> Promotion from engine cleaner to fireman was by qualification and seniority when a vacancy arose. When a cleaner had completed 313 turns (shifts) as a fireman, he qualified to be paid as a second year fireman when firing, and each 313 subsequent turns of firing duty equalled one year's service as a fireman, paid accordingly. Cleaners aged below 18 were permitted to act as firemen on shunting engines, but not on the main line. A fireman qualified as a second year driver after 313 turns as driver, each 313 turns of driving being equivalent to one year's service as a driver; paid accordingly. A fireman with 10 years firing service, including the first 313 turns of driving, would be paid the minimum driver's rate.<sup>35</sup>

In summary, while the footplatemen's unions in WA and Britain were formed in similarly hostile circumstances, and had to establish themselves in competition with general railway workers' unions, their circumstances differed. One major difference was the establishment of the Australian arbitration system, at both state and federal level, which immediately recognised the union as the employee's representative. Some criticised the Australian Arbitration Court for 'favouring' trade unions, rather than employers. James Ryan, a former President of the King Political Labor League in NSW, asserted in a letter published in the *New York Times* in December 1916:

Yes, the court has failed occasionally in forcing its ruling upon labor unionism, but it has never failed in compelling capitalism to obey it. That seems one-sided, and is a good argument for abolishing the court, but let us have a look into it. Mr Justice Higgins, President of the court, once said to a lawyer, representing employers appearing before him, and who was painting unionism as a fiendish thing with claws: "I would remind you that the very existence of this court is to foster unionism".<sup>36</sup>

In the debates surrounding the establishment of the 1907 Railways Conciliation Board in Britain there appears to have been no reference to the Australian or New Zealand systems. Far from ‘fostering unionism’, the initial scheme was so unsuccessful from a union point of view that ASLEF Secretary, Albert Fox, sarcastically referred to it as: ‘the Confiscation Board’. The Board did not recognise trade union officials, and many matters, including disciplinary issues and punishments, were outside its authority.<sup>37</sup> Yet ASLEF was aware of the Australian arbitration system and how it worked. In 1902, the *Locomotive Enginemen’s & Firemen’s Magazine* published, without comment, an article on the establishment of the NSW Arbitration Court, outlining its personnel and provisions – including ruling on strikes, lockouts, dismissals, fixing of a minimum wage, and giving preference of employment to unionists.<sup>38</sup> Neither did the article inspire comment among the readership. While some ASLEF branches welcomed arbitration,<sup>39</sup> others viewed it with a suspicion that was still evident three decades later, when, in 1934, Kings Cross Branch of ASLEF sent a resolution to the Union’s Executive Committee stating that ‘we cannot accept any form of compulsory arbitration’, which they saw as something being ‘foisted on them’ by the employers.<sup>40</sup> This dislike of compulsory arbitration may have been why ASLEF did not look to the Australian system as a model on which to base a conciliation scheme. Yet, under the British Conciliation scheme, it was not until the National Agreement of 1919 that machinery in any way comparable to the provisions of the Australian system was established whereby:

The Negotiating Committee of the 2 unions [ASLEF and ASRS – now the National Union of Railwaymen (NUR)] will be recognised as the medium for dealing with all questions affecting rates of pay and conditions of service while the present negotiations are proceeding.<sup>41</sup>

Prior to the National Agreement, if employees of a grade or group of grades wanted to bring to the Company’s notice a matter affecting their wage rates, working hours, conditions of service or contractual arrangements, they were required to present a signed petition of at least 25 signatures, and to provide evidence that at least 25 per cent of the men concerned had agreed to this step. The petition had to include the names of a deputation, who could be accompanied by the Secretary of the men’s side of the Conciliation Board. This person was an elected representative but he did not necessarily represent a union and, even if he did, he may have been a member of a different union. Disputes often arose where ASLEF members felt that ASRS members represented their interests inadequately. The Company was obliged to receive the deputation within 14 days and give a reply in writing within 28 days. The Agreement provided for individual



employees, or individual depots, to make application in writing to their immediate superior, after which the Company could designate a local superintending officer to hear the case. If the Company's reply was unacceptable, or there was no reply within the stipulated period, the deputation was empowered to require any matter to be referred to the appropriate Conciliation Board, by written application to the Secretary of the employees' side of the Board.<sup>42</sup>

Overall, ASLEF appears to have had little knowledge of achievements of Australian enginemen's unions. Although ASLEF established links with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, USA, including reciprocal visits,<sup>43</sup> there is no evidence of similar links between the British and Australian unions, nor any indication that ASLEF was aware of industrial advances made by Australian railwaymen. Early ASLEF historian J.R. Raynes commented that:

A fraternal visit by Brother G. A. Allen, General Secretary of the Queensland Locomotive Enginemen, Firemen and Cleaners' Association caused Mr Fox to proudly exclaim that they had cemented the whole of the English-speaking locomotive men.<sup>44</sup>

Yet this visit, which took place around 1909, was not mentioned in that year's *Annual Report*.

One factor that inspired comparison, however, was nationalised versus private railways. Issues of the *Locomotive Enginemen's & Firemen's Magazine* in 1899 featured a debate between an anonymous 'shareholder' arguing against, and William Wilson, secretary of the Railway Nationalisation League, favouring nationalisation of Britain's railways. Wilson used Australian examples to demonstrate that nationalisation would yield greater profits for investors, less expensive freight rates for business, as well as lower fares for the travelling public.<sup>45</sup> He did not, however, comment on advantages to railway workers. This debate occurred during the era when Britain's railways were owned and run by over 50 private companies, who by 1907, retained 3,000 directors. According to historian Robert Griffiths, it was 'an industry riddled with waste and unnecessary duplication'.<sup>46</sup>

In conclusion, the WALED&CU formed in Western Australia in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, closely resembled in structure, organisation, rules and culture both the British union ASLEF and the footplate unions formed the eastern Australian colonies. These similarities, arguably, were instigated by the presence of large numbers of British railwaymen, including those who advanced to high positions in

colonial railway administration. Between 1902 and 1913, however, the union succeeded in achieving conditions not gained by ASLEF until the National Agreement of 1919. Circumstances differed across Australia, with the NSW and Victorian footplate unions, in particular, suffering as a result of the disastrous 1917 General Strike, which did not affect Western Australian unions. Before this, however, Australian unionists had been regarded by some as being the envy of the world. Yet, surprisingly, events and advances in Australia had little, if any, impact on the British footplate union. Even if they had, it does not necessarily follow that ASLEF would have been able to negotiate better conditions for its members earlier than when the national agreement was accepted in 1919.<sup>47</sup>

## Endnotes

---

- <sup>1</sup> For example, Jim Moss, *Sound of Trumpets. History of the Labour Movement in South Australia*, Wakefield Press, Netley, 1985, p. 94-95, discusses factors that led to the development of the union movement in South Australia as including: the formation of a Builders' Trades Union Society (1839) and a Progressive Society of Carpenters and Joiners (1845), as well as the 'revival' of the British trade union movement in 1845 and the 1871 Parliamentary Act legalizing British trade unions.
- <sup>2</sup> Bruce Scates, *A New Australia. Citizenship, Radicalism and the First Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1997, pp. 76 ff argued that both the 'new' and 'old' unionism were 'in need of serious reevaluation'; in particular the assertion that the 'mass unions like the shearers' were the 'vanguard of the Australian working class'.
- <sup>3</sup> Tom Sheridan, *Mindful Militants. The Amalgamated Engineering Union in Australia 1920-72*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1975, pp. ix, 23, 12.
- <sup>4</sup> R. Gollan, *Radical and Working Class Politics. A Study of Eastern Australia 1850-1901*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1976 edition, pp. 15 ff, and F. Bongiorno, *The People's Party. Victorian Labor and the Radical Tradition 1875-1914*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1996, p. 13.
- <sup>5</sup> 'The railwayman's catechism', Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants Records, Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick, UK, MSS.379, item 127/AS/1/1/2.
- <sup>6</sup> Robert Griffiths, *Driven by Ideals. A History of ASLEF*, ASLEF, London, 2005, p. 30, points out that, despite the passage of the *Railway Employment (Prevention of Accidents) Act* of 1900, 511 fatal accidents and 4,243 injuries were suffered by railway staff in 1911, compared with 396 and 2,193 respectively in 1888.
- <sup>7</sup> MSS.379, item 127/AS/1/1/2, ASRS Proceedings & Reports 1876, p. 4.
- <sup>8</sup> MSS.379, item 127/AS/1/1/2, ASRS Proceedings & Reports 1877 p. 5.
- <sup>9</sup> Norman McKillop, *The Lighted Flame*, ASLEF, London, 1950, p. 19ff.
- <sup>10</sup> MSS 379, Box 22, *ASLEF Annual Report, 1891*.
- <sup>11</sup> Griffiths, *Driven by Ideals*, p. 25.
- <sup>12</sup> For example, following libel action that ASRS brought against ASLEF in 1894, see the General Secretary's comment, *ASLEF Annual Report, 1894*, p. 9: 'We are glad to find that our Society can be conducted without resorting to a policy of abuse, slander and libel of other people, including railway officials and others, to keep the Society intact'. etc, etc.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> William Somerville, ‘An Economic History of Western Australia with Special Reference to Trade Unions and the Influence of the Industrial Court of Arbitration’, J. S. Battye Library of Western Australian History, Accession no. 451A, vol. II, p. 315. See also D. Mossenson, ‘Gold and Politics: the Influence of the Eastern Goldfields on the Political Development of Western Australia, MA Thesis, UWA, 1952, p. 14.
- <sup>14</sup> Rail, Tram & Bus Union NSW Locomotive Division History’ <http://rtbu-nsw.asn.au/locomotive/about/20.html> accessed 29 November 2006.
- <sup>15</sup> See, for example, Minutes of Exeter Branch 28 March 1897 [MSS.379/6/EXE/1]. The meeting agreed that A. Jones be presented with a silver medal from the branch funds for his energies in getting 16 new members for the branch.
- <sup>16</sup> Melbourne University Archives, Baillieu Library, AFULE Collection Accession No. 96/83 – Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen, item 6/1 LE&F Assn Revised Rules 1886.
- <sup>17</sup> ASLEF records, Carmarthenshire Country Archives, Accession no 2208-4006, item 4/1/1 Revised Rules of ASLEF, 1906, pp. 4-5, 11.
- <sup>18</sup> Melbourne University Archives, Baillieu Library, AFULE Collection Accession No. 96/83 – Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen, item 6/1 LE&F Assn Revised Rules 1886.
- <sup>19</sup> WALED&CU Papers, [held in Battye Library but not accessioned at the time of writing] Box 1, WA Loco Audit reports 1904-09, 1904 correspondence; Circular 9 September 1910.
- <sup>20</sup> See, for example, Modern Records Centre Warwick University, ASLEF Papers, MSS.379/6 EXE/1, Exeter Branch Minutes, 31 December 1893.
- <sup>21</sup> See K. Bell, ‘The Midland Junction Railway Workshops, 1920 to 1939, *Studies in Western Australian History XI; Western Australia Between the War 1919-1939*, ed. J. Gregory, June 1990; B. Oliver, ‘The British Origins and the transformation of work culture in Australian industry’ in K. Darien-Smith, P. Grimshaw, K. Lindsey & S. Macintyre, eds, *Exploring the British World*, RMIT Publishing, Melbourne, 2004, pp. 1032-1046.  
<http://www.australian.unimelb.edu.au/BritishWorld/bios.html#Oliver>
- <sup>22</sup> J. C. Docherty, “Hollis, Robert”, *Australian Dictionary of Biography Online Edition*, <http://www.adb.online.anu.edu/biogs/A090342b.htm>, accessed 29 November 2006.
- <sup>23</sup> J. D. Walker, “Kirkcaldie, David”, *Australian Dictionary of Biography Online Edition*, <http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A090609b.htm>
- <sup>24</sup> R. M. Audley, K. J. Cable, “Eddy, Edward Miller Gard” in *ibid*.
- <sup>25</sup> Modern Records Centre, ASLEF Papers, MSS 379, Box 22, *Annual Report 1887*. See also *Annual Report 1888*, 26 members assisted to emigrate; in 1889, (2); 1897 (2); 1906 (4); 1907 (3); 1911 (5); 1912 (6 grants) and so on; also Griffiths, *Driven by Ideals*, pp. 19-20.
- <sup>26</sup> ‘Commonwealth Court of Conciliation & Arbitration (1904 - 1956)’ in Australian Trade Union Archives, <http://www.atua.org.au/biogs/ALE1416b.htm>, accessed 6 December 2008.
- <sup>27</sup> James Ryan, Letter to the *New York Times*, 10 December 1916.
- <sup>28</sup> WAGR Papers, State Records Office of Western Australia [SROWA] AN195/7 Accession No. 1381, item no. 1/1902-1910 Box 1 Commissioner Railways/WAWALED&CU.1902 Agreement [hereafter *1902 Agreement*]
- <sup>29</sup> WAGR Papers, SROWA, AN 195/3a, Accession No. 1101, File 175/1913 (hereafter *1913 Agreement*).

- 
- <sup>30</sup> *1913 Agreement*, Clause 2.
- <sup>31</sup> *1902 Agreement*, Clause 5.
- <sup>32</sup> For example, the NSW LEF&CA was registered in the NSW Arbitration Court in 1902. See Peter O'Connor, *On Wooden Rails. Celebrating 150 years of Work on the NSW Railways*, RTBU, Sydney, 2005, p. 69.
- <sup>33</sup> Melbourne University Archives, Baillieu Library, AFULE Collection Accession No. 96/83 – Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen, Item 8/1 Industrial Negotiation 1903–1924. Legal Opinion from Corr & Corr Barristers & Solicitors, 28 Sept 1907 re Classification of Engine Drivers (Ref to 1903 strike).
- <sup>34</sup> Griffiths, *Driven by ideals*, pp. 82 ff.
- <sup>35</sup> ASLEF Papers, Box 1, National Agreements, Circular of 29 August 1919 (No. 1937).
- <sup>36</sup> James Ryan, Letter to the *New York Times*, 10 December 1916, emphasis mine.
- <sup>37</sup> *1911 Royal Commission into the Working of the Railway Conciliation and Arbitration Scheme*, pp. 19 ff.
- <sup>38</sup> *Locomotive Enginemen's & Firemen's Magazine*, vol. 15, no. 3. March 1902, pp. 101-4.
- <sup>39</sup> See, for example, ASLEF papers, Doncaster County Archives, D55/2/1 ASLEF and ASRS Joint Committee Minutes, 18 June 1902 to August 1906. A meeting on 5/4/03 resolved to instruct the General Secretaries of the ASLEF and the ASRS to appeal for arbitration.
- <sup>40</sup> ASLEF Papers, MRC, Warwick University, Box 29, King's Cross Branch, Report, May 1934.
- <sup>41</sup> MSS 379/BOX 1: National Agreements – Rates of Pay & Conditions 1919–1922. Railway Executive Committee Circular No. 1786, dated 3 April 1919 – terms of Agreement with NUR and ASLEF, p. 5.
- <sup>42</sup> ASLEF Papers, Modern Records Centre, Accession No. MS.379, Box 24, Folder: 'Historical Documents relating to ASLEF pre-1948'. Booklet *Railway Conciliation Scheme* sets out the way the Scheme is to work. [1915]
- <sup>43</sup> *ASLEF Annual Reports 1910, 1911; Engines and Men. The History of the ASLEF*, by J.R. Raynes, Goodall & Suddick, Leeds, 1916, pp. 142, 145. Also Griffiths, p. 47.
- <sup>44</sup> Raynes, p. 144.
- <sup>45</sup> *Locomotive Enginemen's & Firemen's Magazine*, vol. 12, no 1, January 1899, pp. 2-3; no. 2, pp 64-5; no 3, pp. 106-7.
- <sup>46</sup> Griffiths, *Driven by Ideals*, op. cit., p. 47.