CHAPTER 4.

WELFARE AT CADBURY-FRY-PASCALL.

There are a number of similarities between the firms of E.Z and Cadbury-Fry-Pascall (Cadbury). Both these firms chose Hobart as their site, received generous federal and state government assistance, had extensive welfare schemes, complex ideological justification for these welfare schemes and an almost complete absence of industrial unrest. This chapter will explore the extent of Cadbury’s welfare schemes, the reasons Cadbury gave for establishing these schemes, the relationship of the welfare schemes to the Cadbury beliefs and worker acceptance of these schemes.

The establishment of the Cadbury factory at Claremont, Hobart, marked the extension to Australia of a welfare tradition that had started in England forty years earlier with the establishment of Bournville. In 1879 George Cadbury decided to move his cocoa and chocolate business from the centre of Birmingham to Bournville on the outskirts of that city. The reason, according to Williams, was that the Cadbury’s had grasped the principle that ‘the welfare of a business and that of its work
The Cadburys were Quakers who had an intense interest in social problems and social relationships. The source of that interest was the Quaker belief that the 'Light of Christ' is given to each and all and 'that of God in every man'. Thus each person is of particular interest as an individual and of equal interest among individuals and should be given the fullest opportunity of giving expression to the 'Light' that is within him. According to Child the Quaker social conscience has four intertwining facets which are closely related to the importance accorded to individual personality. These are a dislike of exploitation and profit of one man at the expense of another; a traditionally puritan view of the 'stewardship of talents', stressing the value of hard work, lack of waste, the careful organisation of resources, personal renunciation, all for the service of others; a tradition of egalitarianism and democratic relationships; and an abhorrence of conflict between men. Quakers tended towards the view that if men lived by that kind of this worldly ethic, they could attain a social situation in which morality would prevail over existing

---

human and social differences. This utopian inclination to believe that ideals could eventually prevail over countervailing forces in the social structure was a driving force behind the Cadbury attempts to reform the workplace and the worker's homes.

At the time he moved his factory to Bournville George Cadbury believed there was a number of flaws in society that were demoralising the people and therefore the nation. Industrialisation was degrading human life through long hours, low wages, loss of morals, loss of health, and most importantly loss of efficiency. Some thirty years later Edward Cadbury wrote extensively about the effects of demoralising working conditions on the working class. Comfortless homes and depressed physical energy had caused poverty and drinking resulting in a deadening of all desire for improvement in the worker. The workers' social environment was reflected in their mood and could only be improved by exposure to the beneficial effects of improved moral and material conditions. General experience had shown, he said, that higher wages, together with better education and improved

---


4 E. Cadbury and G. Shann, Sweating, (London, 1908), pp 57-64.
social surroundings ultimately meant the general uplifting of the workers. It was true that drinking caused poverty but, he attested, it is equally true that depressed physical energy and comfortless homes caused drinking. It was in these comfortless homes that clothing was made and through meeting these depressed souls disease, Cadbury was sure, must be passed at great cost to the community. He concluded that when the labourer could not maintain himself at a reasonable standard of decency and comfort, 'the decline in industrial efficiency is rapid.' It was not just a decline in physical efficiency but in all those qualities such as hopefulness, freedom, self-respect and social ambition, 'which are so valuable a national asset,' are deteriorated or lost resulting in men and women whose spirits are broken and become inefficient casual labourers or worse.

Bournville was designed as a model village that would not only attract labour but would give the workers the moral and material circumstances in which they could raise themselves. The village at Bournville was planned to be as healthy as possible. The houses were designed and built to allow the greatest possible circulation of air.

---


6 Ibid., p. 64.
and entry of sunshine, and were of varying design and block placement to avoid visual monotony. The occupants were given fruit trees as a recognition of the economic value and healthy exercise a garden could provide. The recreation facilities provided were impressive, and included football, hockey and cricket grounds, bowling greens, netball and tennis courts, gardens and swimming baths. The baths provided healthy recreation and aided the cleanliness of the employees, which was a most desirable quality in a food production factory. The houses were sold at cost price on a 999 year lease that was designed to discourage speculators. In 1900 the estate was made into the Bournville Village Trust, which automatically reinvested all the revenue it received into model housing. The Bournville houses were open to people other than Cadbury employees. This was because social mix was seen as desirable, and efforts were made to ensure that persons of different interests, character, income and social class in the village. The Cadburys believed that seeing persons of other than their own class would nurture a spirit of emulation in the working class, thereby raising their standards and preventing them sinking into the 'submerged mass' or 'residue' and becoming the inefficient casual labourer that Edward

---


8 Williams, op. cit., p. 235.
Cadbury feared. Tenants paid as rent of 4% of the capital invested which was an average return on investment for the time. It caused rents to be higher than the residents would have liked causing predictions that such high rents would cause a mass exodus from Bournville. It may be that the perceived high rents in a selected the Bournville village residents for Cadbury's. Although Cadbury may have preached the virtues of the social mix in reality residency in the Village was open only to Bournville employees, who were well paid by the standards of the day, and to well paid workers from other industries. Bournville was therefore really only open to a select and perhaps one should say self selected portion of the working class who had the affluence and the inclination to participate in such a controlled environment. and so were not likely to sink into the 'residue'. The casual labourer would be unlikely to be raised by Bournville as he could not afford to live there and experience its uplifting effects. Given the self selected nature of Bournville it is not surprising that Barrow Cadbury was able to claim 'I have always felt, if I was any good in commerce, it was due to the fact that I just didn't experience class distinctions. I suppose there is such as thing as the class war but I never met

---

8 Bournville Village Trust, The Bournville Village Trust, (Bournville, 1955), passim.
it among those with whom I was working.' The structure of Bournville worked to ensure that he did not.

The Cadburys were well aware that their high wages and attractive employment conditions made them desired employers. They were therefore able to impose rigorous entry requirements for employment based upon educational attainment, general tone and character and physical efficiency. Preference was given to applicants from secondary school and the higher grades of primary school, who would have been in the minority at this time. It was desirable for the applicants to have just left school as 'they have not lost their habits of discipline.' Female applicants were given a schedule of questions. The answers of each were later verified by a visit to her home. This performed the unspoken task of ensuring that her home reached the relevant Cadbury standard of cleanliness and morality. Applicants were required to live within three miles of their work. This may have been to ensure that the community within a three mile radius of the works had a high concentration of Cadbury employees thereby enabling Cadbury to keep a remote eye over their employees outside work hours.

---


Cadburys preferred to select younger people and train them rather than older people as they believed that older employees were not so readily trained in new habits and methods. Employees were selected on the basis of their educational achievement, general tone and character, and physical efficiency. Once members of the company employees were given the opportunity to attend a number of educational courses namely evening classes, physical training classes, miscellaneous classes, apprenticeship scheme and trade classes. The Cadburys believed that in developing these schemes they had endeavoured to keep in mind that the employee must be considered as end in himself. Education should develop in a worker 'a capacity for a life varied in interests and tolerant in outlook' and would develop initiative, self control and general knowledge that could be used by the firm to create economic value.\(^{12}\)

Once employed by Cadbury the morals of the workforce were strictly monitored. Married women were not employed as the Cadburys believed the outcome would be to make the husbands indolent through living on their wives' wages, and the women would be unable to proper care to the home and the children.\(^{13}\) Within the factory every precaution


\(^{13}\) Gardiner, op. cit., p. 31.
was taken to avoid the serious moral danger that would almost certainly arise from the indiscriminate mixing of young people in factories,\textsuperscript{14} to the extent of designing the factory with separate corridors for each sex. Each day at 9 o'clock, after 8 hours work, work stopped for 10 minutes and the entire workforce of 3000 people crowded into the dining room. A hymn was sung followed by a reading from the Bible by one of the Cadbury brothers and a short comment on the reading. It was, as Barrow Cadbury commented, 'a bit of the Sunday adult school carried into everyday.'\textsuperscript{15}

At the factory the workers were provided with various welfare schemes and provisions, such as a works doctor, dentist and subsidised meals. Sickness, death, old age and unemployment benefits were set up to provide for the workers in their time of need. The company organised through the medium of the factory a large number of clubs, some of which were sporting whole others were cultural such as the Dramatic Society, Musical Society, Choral Society, Silver Band and Folk Dance Society. Still others were hobbyist such as the Gardening Club and the Model Yacht Club.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} Bartlett, op. cit. p. 38.
Quaker views placed emphasis on the common will towards industry, which, together with the 'spirit' of each individual's attitude towards his fellows, was regarded as the ultimate assurance of worker/management cooperation. This outlook was grounded in the Quaker belief that if the goodness in every man is allowed adequate expression, the "Light" of each can only serve to unite them. It followed that the means to a cooperative response from a workforce was management on the basis of personal kindness rather than harsh authoritarianism.\textsuperscript{17} For the Cadburys the aim was an industrial system whose proper and normal system was one of mutual goodwill and absence of conflict. They expected this aim to be attainable in the business enterprise which permitted the fullest degree of personal expression, in which relationships are activated by the correct personal 'spirit', and whose purpose is geared towards the goal of service to the whole community. The image of Cadbury at the turn of the century was a benevolent paternalistic employer with a keen sense of moral duty to those underneath him was not as relevant from about 1905. Cadbury still continued to advocate model housing and welfare but the emphasis for it was changing from finding 'God in every man' to the necessity of these measures to deal with the threat of the working

\textsuperscript{17} Child, op. cit., p. 295-296.
class. When Edward Cadbury denigrated the practice of sweating in 1908 it was from the perspective that sweating was debilitating not only the working class but the whole nation through an increased threat of disease. The threat to society was therefore a lack of cleanliness that could be removed by the abolition of sweating and consequently enabling the worker to earn better wages and thereby live in better conditions. In 1913 the threat was not from the working class’ disease but from its radical demands. Cadbury wrote that the working class thought that ‘in the past they have not had a fair share either in the wealth or the leisure of the immense gain that has been made through then progress of science and invention’ and concluded that in the future the workers would desire a more equitable distribution of wealth and leisure and would want some control of the industry that employed them. Cadbury urged industry to experiment with industrial organisation before the problem became acute. The Cadbury message to other industry was that if they wished to benefit from industry as it then existed they must abandon the pure profit motive and substitute a new system of managerialism based on a regard for the interests of workers and society rather than pure profit.

18 Cadbury and Shann, op. cit., passim.

The Cadburys took steps to deal with the changes that were occurring in industry and labour. The Quaker concept of service became redefined as the employer's obligation to achieve maximum business efficiency as this would benefit both the employees and society. Cadbury would pursue efficiency by continuing with measures they had already instituted such as Bournville and by introducing new measures such as the Works Councils which would give the workers a voice but not influence within industry. There was greater emphasis on achieving efficiency through scientific and professional means. Cadbury claimed that management cater for workers personalities by creating a more rewarding social environment out of the factory situation. This was to be achieved by means of the employee centered and non-authoritarian style of labour management so that the 'workers shall be better for that association [with management] and shall be better citizens as well as better workers.' The new concept of professional leadership that was sympathetic and had knowledge of individual weakness and strength, was claimed to be instrumental in creating compensatory social satisfactions, and in developing those individual personalities that were so vital in Quaker eyes. It was

---


21 Child, op. cit., p. 304.
this new style of Quaker thought which stressed business efficiency that was to be influential at Claremont.

In the period prior to 1920 Cadbury's of Bournville, England, made a decision to establish a factory in Australia to produce cocoa and chocolate. This was to be their first factory based outside Britain. An Australian commission comprising William Cooper, Thomas E. Cooper, Arthur Hackett and E.H Colleyshaw was formed to consider the various claims of Sydney, Melbourne and Hobart as potential manufacturing centres for chocolates. They investigated a number of sites in each of the cities. In September 1918 William Cooper wrote to Cadbury Bros. at Bournville outlining his general impressions of the respective merits of the various capital cities as factory sites. He warmed to the fact Hobart's climate was the most similar to England's of all the cities, that it was the centre of the Tasmanian fruit industry, that there were ample supplies of most of the English small fruits such as currants and raspberries and that it had its commanding advantage of cheap hydro-electric power. Hobart's perceived disadvantages were its relatively small population, which was less than 43,000 persons, and its relatively inconvenient transport as compared with that of Sydney or Melbourne. If it was intended to establish a garden suburb on Bournville lines, Cooper

---

22 Minute Book 6/1/20-9/8/22. C.C.
believed Hobart afforded the most promising opportunity but he took it that the 'sacrifice for the Bournville ideal must not be too heavy.' Cooper believed Hobart was at a distinct disadvantage in terms of the quality and quantity of its skilled labour but was certain that the prestige attached to Cadbury's and Hobart's reputation as a health resort should mean they would have no difficulty in attracting sufficient labour from interstate. Unskilled labour was thought to be plentiful and probably of better quality and more amenable than the labour in Sydney. He thought that Hobart workers did more work and for lower wages than in Sydney. He attributed this to 'the less sophisticated character of the men' and the cooler climate and believed that while the men may become more sophisticated over time the placating effects of climate would remain.

In spite of Cooper's fears about the expense of building another Bournville in Australia George Cadbury still believed it was advisable to aim at building a 'self contained community', with its own atmosphere and spirit which would be 'conducive to harmonious working.' The factory, he thought, would be best placed in a small town or self-contained suburb rather than as part of a large

---

83 Board Meetings Minute File 1924. No. 1-91. W. Cooper to Cadbury Bros. 17/9/18. C.C.

84 Private and Confidential Information for Australia. First File. W.Cooper to Bournville. 17/9/18. C.C.
city; and preferably it should be close to a good residential district. It would then be possible to house the work people near the factory and the residential land around the factory would be capable of being cultivated and giving the people their own gardens. He did not favour locating the factory near docks because although this might offer unloading advantages its general location was unsuitable for a food factory and an 'equable labour atmosphere would not be possible in such a neighbourhood'.

The full Commission met on 6 January 1920 to consider the various claims of Sydney, Melbourne and Hobart. The Commission had decided that as Sydney did not have any fresh water streams suitable for refrigeration and haulage purposes the factory should have a harbour frontage. Sydney was, for reasons that cannot be found, judged unsuitable turning the committee's attention to Melbourne. One site considered was close to the fresh water of the upper Yarra and in a well populated area but was judged unsuitable as it was filled ground that had been for many years used as a tip. Another site, which was also located on the upper Yarra and was convenient to the city, was situated close to noxious trades such as

---


26 Minute Book 6/1/20-9/2/22. Minute No.1. C.C.
fell mongering and wool washing and was prone to flooding. It did not measure up to the committee's exacting standards regarding cleanliness and was also discarded.

The remaining site to be considered was Hobart. The Premier, Sir Walter Lee, used his influence to arrange berths on the steamer 'Manuka', which left Sydney on 23 February with three members of the Commission aboard. The Commissioners interviewed Lee about the possibilities of Hobart as a manufacturing location and inspected some property at Claremont as a possible factory site. They reported that the site was '...a long promontory jutting into the R. Derwent from W. bank ... its area is 246 acres with a water frontage of about 5 miles ... The main railway and road to Launceston run alongside the neck of the isthmus and Claremont Railway station is opposite the promontory. Distance from Hobart-8 miles. Town water laid on. Nearest gas-Glenorchy. Railway siding and wharf possible. Offered price £12,500.'

The committee met on 5 March 1920 to weigh the merits of Melbourne against Hobart as factory sites. Melbourne had a £10,000 advantage, representing expenses that would be incurred in Hobart but not in Melbourne, namely freight

27 Ibid. Minute No. 2. C.C.
28 Ibid. Minute No. 7. C.C.
costs of materials purchased from the mainland, extra packing cases for manufactured goods, and depot expenses. Hobart's advantages were intrinsic features whose value could not be precisely calculated. Hobart's lower summer temperatures would mean less refrigeration and fewer lost half days when the factory would be forced to close due to excessive heat and the goods would have a better appearance and keeping quality. The Commissioners believed Hobart had a more settled and amenable labour force and in consequence they could expect greater output per man hour. The committee interviewed Herbert Gepp of E.Z and Sir Henry Jones of I.X.L, and had been assured by them that they should have no difficulty in obtaining all the unskilled labour they required. Mr Propsting, the Minister for Railways, had undertaken that, provided the service was used by not less than 100 persons, the railway authorities would run a special workers train to the factory. The committee unanimously agreed that Claremont was the best site, but as it did have some adverse conditions, they decided the facts should be sent to Bournville to obtain final approval of that site.28

At the Commissions meeting on 11 May 1980 it was announced that a cable had been received from Bournville announcing 'Unanimously agree Hobart Claremont site.'

28 Ibid. Minute No. B. C.C.
Cadbury.' It was arranged for T.E Cooper and E.H Colleyshaw to go to Hobart to advise the Premier, Sir Walter Lee, that they would be prepared to come to Hobart subject to the promises made being fulfilled. The Commissioners were well aware of the Tasmanian government's anxiety to 'get manufacturing there and the government are out to make things as attractive as possible to all manufacturers.' The government's anxiety was translated into an undertaking that it would put the rail right up to the factory free of cost provided Cadbury made the necessary land available. Cooper and Colleyshaw argued that the railway connection into the works was of little use unless there was a rail connection to the end of the interstate wharves. The Government undertook that it was quite willing to extend the railway to the pier heads.

After having decided to build the factory at Claremont, the Commissioners found there was a serious shortage of carpenters who were so necessary for the construction work. A meeting was arranged between Arthur Hackett of

---


31 Ibid. Minute. No. 16. C.C.


Cadbury’s, J.H Butters of the Hydro Electric Department and representatives from the railway department and E.Z to come to some equitable arrangement for the sharing of the available labour. Butters revealed the large amount of influence wielded by E.Z even at this early stage when he warned Cadbury’s that if they unduly interfered with the labour employed by E.Z they might find themselves in a serious position as this company had a premier call on electric power. Cadburys were surprised to say the least as they had not known that the Hydro Electric Department was so firmly committed - indeed tied - to E.Z and had been led to believe that they would be able to have all the power they needed. They undertook to get a reply from Butters in writing.34

The Bournville management was anxious that the Commissioners should start planning and building the Garden City that was to surround the factory as soon as possible. The Cadbury vision of Australia was one where the 'primeval calm is as yet undisturbed by the syncopated clamour of modern industry', and in which there could be 'peaceful Garden Cities that surround droning factories from which ... pour endless streams of 1/4 lb. tins ...'.35 The planning and implementation of

34 Minute Book 6/1/20-9/12/22. Meeting 2/7/80. Minute No. 31. C.C.

35 Board Meetings Minute File 1924. No 1-791. L.J Cadbury to A. Hackett. 31/5/80. C.C.
the Garden City was delayed by confusion by the Australian Commissioners over where their role ended and where Bournville's began in the whole process. Bournville had intended to send an expert to Claremont to plan the site but had taken on the role of planning the site themselves. The Australian Committee suggested to Bournville that it should dictate the planning principles but leave the actual details of construction to the Australian Committee.36

The Commissioners decided that the first ten or twelve cottages should be erected near the factory and that the areas for shops and public buildings would be arranged later.37 They continued planning the layout of the village which was seen as next in importance to the planning of the factory. The Committee proposed that the first dwellings should face the main road to gain the early benefits of water gas and easy access. The Civic Centre was to be a wide area facing the main entrance to the factory where room was to be left for public buildings and shops. A ten acre site for the recreation ground had been chosen only a short distance from the factory gates and a concrete cricket pitch laid. The Commission wanted guidelines instituted that would

---

37 Ibid. Minutes. 17/8/80. C.C.
specify the minimum block size, regulate the number of houses on each block and specify the purpose for which the block could be used. It wanted to specify that, to prevent speculation, each person buying land must guarantee to build within a certain period of time. It recommended that no public house licensed for the sale of alcohol or any objectionable trade should be permitted, and that the Estate, as the area surrounding the factory came to be known, should be controlled by an Estate Department in connection with and under the supervision of the Works Office at Claremont.

Bournville had suggested that the Commissioners should engage local builders to build a certain number of the cottages, with Cadbury subsidising the rents to guarantee the cottage's affordability. The Commissioners were uncertain about how the scheme was to be financed, the amount of rent that tenants should be charged, whether residents of the estate should be confined to Cadbury employees as either tenants or residents. If land should be sold or leased they were uncertain of the terms of the lease and the price they should charge for blocks of land and asked Bournville for guidance.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{38} Board Meetings Minute File Jan 1920 to Dec 1921 Jan to Dec 1923. Minute Book File Jan 1920 to Dec 1921. William Cooper to Bournville. 31/8/20. C.C.
Bournville approved the Commissioners suggested layout but, noting that the Commissioners were not town planners, requested that they 'obtain the views of a good architect on plans for the site'. The Commissioners decided to ask a local town planner, W. Scott-Griffiths who had planned the Springfield Estate, his terms for 'planning the estate as a model industrial village.' The eminent South Australian town-planner George Reade was also asked for his opinion on the estate plans. In his reply Reade stressed that two main factors should be taken into consideration. The first was that an efficient and economical plan of development would secure all the advantages and attractions of a modern industrial village at the minimum cost in terms of services. The second factor was that domestic architecture should be adapted to local climatic requirements and accepted standards of accommodation and tenure. He believed that ideally the scheme would profit from the advantages of skilled economic planning of workmen's cottages. Such planning had evolved in Great Britain under modern garden city and housing practice, and had made material reductions in building costs.


41 Minute Book 6/1/20-9/2/22. Meeting 21/9/20. Minute No.91. C.C.
Reade thought local conditions in Hobart were very different to those experienced on the mainland, and that such conditions called for a skilled adoption of design to local climate, costs, custom and conditions. He believed that the average Australian architect was apt to prove either expensive or unenlightened in the design of workers cottages. Reade therefore recommended that a Bournville architect be brought out to work with Scott-Griffiths in laying out the land, and that a local architect, experienced in Hobart’s conditions and materials, should design the houses and recreation facilities. He concluded: ‘To get improved and at the same time more economical results in housing the worker in Australia, and creating conditions favourable to the acceptance of welfare work and supervision, outside the factory as well as within, I think that the combination of minds is necessary.’

The Commissioners had to confess to Reade that they had employed Scott-Griffith’s to prepare an estate layout but stated that they were sceptical of some of his ideas. ‘We do not think that the provision of rear gardens or playgrounds will be at all satisfactory; they will tend to become receptacles for rubbish of all kinds ...’.  

Using this as a justification the Commissioners asked Reade 'that if you yourself, in whom our Home people have much confidence are prepared to come over and lay down the principles clearly on which the work should be done, in consultation with a local man'. In that event they would 'not only have a plan to work with but an Adviser constantly within reach.' Reade was about to depart for the Malay states and cabled that he would be unable to visit Hobart before December 1981. The Commissioners thought that the main road to the factory site must proceed and that certain houses had to be erected to accommodate the workers arriving from England but in general the layout of the Estate could be postponed for a couple of months.

In November 1980 Cadburys sent Arthur Hackett and T.E Cooper to Adelaide to glean what knowledge they could from Reade prior to his departure overseas. Reade made it obvious to Cooper and Hackett that their first concern should be whether the land would be leasehold or freehold. The Commissioners did not know and could only suggest that they wanted to retain control over the size of the building blocks, park areas and other related matters. Reade proposed a rather grandiose civic centre, which the Commissioners believed could be scaled down in

43 Ibid. Cadbury to C. Reade. 6/10/80. C.C.
44 Ibid. W.Cooper to C.Reade. 6/10/80. C.C.
size as it decreased the number of houses that could be built close to the factory. The proposed block sizes, Reade thought, were too large as 'a large number of people do not want a big area of land and would not go in for gardening' and the surplus land would become untidy. Reade promised to sketch out his ideas for the plans and submit a report on them to the Commissioners.45

In his report Reade made a number of pertinent suggestions on the aesthetics and traffic flow of the approach roads. He proposed 'in view of the permanent nature of the subdivision, the need for foresight in "layout" and future requirements, as well as the "Bournville" tradition of good housing and high ideals associated with the garden suburbs and factory sites of Messrs. Cadbury Bros.' that an esplanade should be built around the foreshore. Its advantage would be to allow the houses to face the water. Reade believed the Cadbury plan did not make sufficient provision for reserves which, in 'the modern garden suburb ... are regarded as essential for public requirements and buildings as well as the conservation and development of the social welfare of the community.' He wanted to see sites reserved for shops, public buildings, churches, fire station, institutes, town hall, hospital, men's and women's hostels and

administration blocks. Otherwise the placement of buildings would become indiscriminate and random thereby defeating the purpose of planning and raising administration costs. Reade warned that the housing conditions working men were prepared to accept in Australia were very different to those deemed acceptable in England. He believed conditions were so markedly different that the widest adaptation of English methods should be practiced. It was vital, he thought, that if the company did not immediately intend to develop the area and build the houses, steps should be taken to preserve and control the estate until complete development upon specified lines had taken place. He recommended that if Cadbury wished to retain building authority then some form of cooperative and administrative trust similar to the Bournville Trust must be formed.48

William Cooper expressed general satisfaction with Reade’s plans but felt ‘Mr. Reade has shown a somewhat exaggerated idea of the greatness and importance of the community which his work is intended to serve’. Cooper proposed to follow Reade’s plan and was keen to start building houses on the estate even thought the problem of whether the land should be freehold or leasehold had not yet been resolved. He advised Bournville that in

48 Ibid. Reade to Cadbury Bros. 16/11/20. C.C.
Australia leasehold was viewed unfavorably and that the Company should therefore consider disposing of the land on a freehold basis. He urged Cadbury to build the first few houses as this would defer the problem of land disposal.47

By early 1981 arrangements had been made for the Hobart architects, Hutchison and Walker, to prepare plans and specifications for seven three-bedroom houses, four houses with two bedrooms and a slightly larger house for a Bournville manager at an approximate cost of £10,500.48 Plans were announced for another 3 cottages in late 1981 bringing the total to 15 houses.48 The English workmen, who had arrived from Bournville, were impatient for work to commence on their houses. One of their number, H Colbourne, attended a Committee meeting and told the Commissioners that the workers would be dissatisfied if they had to pay rents as high as 25/- per week but would be prepared to pay 15/- per week.50 The Commissioners


48 Ibid. T.E Cooper to Cadbury Bros. Bournville. 27/1/81. C.C.


requested guidance on setting the house rentals from Bournville even though they thought Bournville would fix a return of 6%. This would set the rent on the largest house at 30/- per week, 25/- per week for the three bedroom houses and 21/- per week for the smallest cottages. The Commissioners thought this would be a fair rent in view of the fact there was a severe housing shortage that had caused a three bedroom house to bring a rent of 25/- per week.\textsuperscript{51}

George Cadbury expressed the opinion that in general the Estate layout seemed on the extravagant side. He thought the roads were unnecessarily wide and that Reed's proposal of an esplanade around the promontory would be expensive, adding that while it was desirable, 'to my mind it would be totally unnecessary.'\textsuperscript{52} The Australian directors did not completely accept this criticism. They believed Bournville had a false idea of conditions at Claremont, and expected progress to have been more rapid than was possible.\textsuperscript{53} The Australian directors replied that they understood the difficulties Bournville had in


trying to set up an Australian estate from such a great
distance, but pointed out that they had received little
guidance from Bournville except to consult with Mr Reade
and follow his advice. As Reade had not visited the site
when he made his plan the Australian Commissioners
directors had found they were constantly striking
problems and had consequently invited Captain Earle,
Reade’s assistant, to visit Hobart and spend some time on
the estate. Captain Earle had produced a further plan
which had made the Commissioners feel more confident.
Earle had made a number of alterations such as decreasing
the number of back roads and scaling down the recreation
grounds. The Commissioners agreed this plan was still on
the extravagant side but, not knowing Bournville’s views,
they had given the idealist Earle some latitude with his
ideas.

The Australian Commissioners lamented that they still did
not know how they should dispose of the land on the
Estate. They believed that, from an idealistic
standpoint, the best way to develop the estate would be
to hold the land and develop it themselves. They also
recognised that from the cold business point of view the
best way would be to sell the blocks and arrange such
restrictions on the development that the end result would
largely express the ideals they held in town and factory
planning. The Commissioners had initially suggested that
blocks at Claremont could be sold for £100 per acre but had been prevented by Bournville on the grounds this was an insufficient price. The Australian Commissioners believed that the price of land was no longer an issue. They believed the lead Bournville had taken in building the first twelve cottages would act as an incentive for other people to buy blocks of land and erect houses. The Commissioners believed that, when the 'second Bournville' was in working order, land would sell for approximately £900 per acre but until this happened they would have to sell the land at a lesser price to encourage the workers to build their own cottages at Claremont.  

In November 1981 the Estate tenants had made a combined protest at the high rentals charged for the company houses. The Commissioners decided to slightly reduce the rentals and give a small increase in wages to some employees. This applied only to those employees from Britain. Over time both the Australian Commissioners and the Bournville directors lowered their opinions of what could be reasonably expected as a return on costs through rentals. By early 1982 the Australian Commissioners were advising that to obtain a return of

54 Board Meetings Minute File Jan 1980 to Dec 1981.
T.E Cooper to Cadbury Bros. Bournville. 8/6/81. C.C.

55 Minute Book 6 Jan 1980 to 9 Feb 1982. Meeting
23/11/81. Minute No. 212. C.C
4% on investment a rental of 27/6 would need to be charged for the larger cottages and 24/6 for the smaller cottages. They believed such high rentals could not be paid by ordinary workingmen unless there was an increase in wages, but that was viewed as very undesirable. The Bournville directors gave the Commissioners the power to reduce rents as they saw necessary. The difficulties involved in obtaining an economic rent showed the Bournville directors the impossibility of Cadbury at Claremont ever erecting a large number of houses on the Estate. The Commissioners were therefore given the liberty of selling plots of land, subject to the restrictions imposed by the Cadbury town planning ideals.

There was a feeling amongst the Commissioners that Bournville's financial stringency and requirement for economic rents was jeopardising their ideal of a factory in a garden. Edward Cadbury justified Bournville's eye for economics when in a remarkable letter he stated that 'the essential feature of a well organised factory is based upon the atmosphere in which people work. If there is an atmosphere of kindliness and confidence, and an average living wage, fair discipline with no favoritism and vindictiveness, that is what is needed to make an

56 C.F.P Minutes from 30 August 1920. Minutes Meeting at Bournville 17/1/22. Minute No 139. Rents of Cottages at Claremont. C.C.
ideal factory ...’. That was standard but then Cadbury continued 'whether a factory is an ideal one or not does not depend upon the amount of money spent on costly schemes of Welfare Work, but entirely upon the spirit in which the factory is run. Therefore in urging you to keep down your overhead charges I do not feel we are at all in any way jeopardising the efficiency or the ideals of the factory.’

In 1923 Cadbury sold the cottages it had erected to their English tenants at cost price with 10% deposit and payment of the balance over a period of 5-10 years at 6% interest. Blocks of land were offered for sale at prices the Commissioners considered to be cheap but in October 1923 they had still not sold any land. The few employees who had approached the Commissioners about the land had also expected assistance with housing loans. This prompted the Commissioners to suggest that an employee housing scheme similar to the E.Z one, which was proving to be very popular, should be put in place. This proposal did not come to immediate fruition as the Bournville directors decided to suspend the home building

57 C.F.P Committee Minutes. 19 March to 7 September 1923. E. Cadbury to T.E Cooper. 24/4/22. C.C.


59 Private and Confidential Information for Australia. Second File. T.E Cooper to Cadbury-Fry-Pascall Committee. 15/10/23. C.C.
scheme for a year. The Australian Commissioners did not agree with Bournville's decision. They believed that housing was 'the most important phase in the Welfare Work, most other Welfare activities depending on the building up of a community around Claremont works', and recommended that a home building scheme should be set up as soon as possible. In late 1984 the Commissioners decided that a home building scheme, similar to that operating at Bournville, should come onto operation at Claremont. The firm would lend a maximum of £800 at 3% interest to those who wished to build on the Claremont peninsula. In exceptional circumstances a loan could be made to a person who wished to build outside the Claremont peninsula but they would be charged an interest rate of 5%. Bournville gave £10,000 for housing purposes at Claremont in the belief that it 'would contribute considerably to the well being of the community there.' In 1985 the Commissioners decided to divest themselves of the cottages that had been erected by offering them for sale to the tenants under the terms

---
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and conditions of the home building scheme. This marks a change in the Cadbury housing strategy. The emphasis changed from Cadbury building rental houses and attempting to sell blocks of land to employees. Cadbury realised that the only way it could develop the Estate was to build houses and then recoup the expenditure by selling to employees.

The Commissioners were very conscious of obtaining 'fair' rents on the houses they did retain and reported a gross return of 5.51% on capital value of its 24 rental houses in 1937. From the 1930's Cadbury's attempts at house building were sporadic and often used as a lure to attract labour to the factory. In 1944 the Commissioners tentatively decided to build six houses on the grounds that 'it was desirable for the estate to be developed, and we should aim at getting as many people as possible to live near the factory, irrespective of whether or not they are employees, as this should result in a valuable contribution to local labour to the factory in future years'. Cadbury were faced with conflicting demands over their housing scheme. Bournville did not want to sell blocks of land on the Estate for excessively low

---
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prices and were very conscious of obtaining 'fair rents' that were often in excess of the amount employees were prepared to pay as rental. The result was that the tenants complained of high rentals and the block prices on the Estate were too high to attract buyers. In order to develop the Estate along the lines they had initially envisaged Cadbury were forced into the expensive situation of building houses and then attempting to sell them to employees. The long term idea of building a community on the Estate never entirely disappeared but after the initial burst of house building Cadbury only built houses to attract labour in times of shortage. Overall the Company built 84 houses.67

Although there was a certain amount of indecision in the direction the estate should take, considerable progress had being made on facilities for the workers and English immigrants who had settled on the estate. At the factory Cadbury had provided dining facilities for 500 persons. Following the precedent set at Bournville the men and women were kept separate in the main dining hall and separate dining halls were provided for directors, office staff and foremen.68 In 1981 the Cadbury Fry Pascall Athletic Club had been formed. Even though its members

67 Cadbury Schweppes Australia Ltd, Annual Report 1975, Community Programmes.

were mainly construction workers rather than production workers Cadbury directed that it should be properly organised under the supervision of the Company and decided that the Athletics Club Committee, with the addition of A. Hackett, should consider the constitution of the club and the formation of rules. The members of the Cadbury Fry Pascall Athletic Club had earlier approached the Commissioners with a request that Cadbury pay the cost of materials for a pavilion. There is no record of in company records or newspapers that indicate whether Cadbury paid for the material or if the pavilion was built.

A number of the workmen brought out from Bournville to settle at Claremont were Quakers. As a Quaker William Cooper was aware that there was no appropriate place for worship on the estate and was most anxious to assist the Quakers to find an appropriate place of worship. He was conscious of the fact Cadbury were bringing Quakers men out and settling them in a place where there were few opportunities for religious or social meetings. The Claremont Quakers wanted a plain building which could be used for Quaker meetings, Adult school and other events. Cooper thought such a building would be a great bonus to

---

59 Minute Book 6 Jan 1920 to 9 Feb 1922. Meeting 2/2/22. Minute No. 263. C.C.
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the Estate as there was no place where 'social work, classes for young men or meetings of any ordinary kind' could take place. He believed there would be no difficulty in finding a site which would be convenient to both for the Village and works settlement.\textsuperscript{71} Bournville was quite willing for the company to lease land and agreed to pay £500 to £600 towards the cost of a building.\textsuperscript{72} The Commissioners agreed to lease land on the estate to the Society of Friends for a term of 99 years at a yearly rental of 1/- and in accordance with the Company's planning guidelines, the building plans had to be approved by the Company. The hall could not be used for any purpose other than a Meeting House of the Society of Friends without the approval of the Board.\textsuperscript{73}

The Estate's distance from Hobart made the Commissioners very aware of the need for recreation and social facilities for the workers who had chosen to live there. In early 1922 the Commissioners asked Bournville if they would agree to lease a small plot of land on which a hut could be erected for recreation purposes. Bournville agreed and suggested to the Commissioners that they might

\textsuperscript{71} C.F.P committee Minutes. 19 March 1923 to 7 September 1923. W. Cooper to E. Cadbury. 29/1/21. C.C.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid. E. Cadbury to W. Cooper. 17/5/22. C.C.

\textsuperscript{73} Board Minutes and Index 1924. Meeting 14/2/24. Minute No. 162. C.C.
consider the introduction of a recreation scheme along the lines of the one in operation at Bournville. Under this scheme the firm paid £1 per head and then gave the money to a committee for distribution.74 A Claremont Estate Social Club was formed by early 1983.75 The social club was in the old hospital building on the estate. It contained a billiards room, reading room, a small room for committee meetings, a larger room for lectures which could also be used for dancing, a library and provided a meeting place for the Musical and Camera Clubs and the Education Committee.76 The Club, which was open to all employees, was largely managed by the members themselves and was for the benefit of the families on the estate and surrounds. The Bournville directors were enthusiastic about the club because 'the Claremont inhabitants are very much cut off from the conveniences, and especially the entertainments of town, which are accessible to most of the employees, and we are very glad to have the opportunity of making some special provision for the Claremont tenants and their families.'77


75 Ibid. Meeting 19/3/23. Minute No. 239. Billiard Table for Claremont Estate Social Club. C.C.

76 Private and Confidential Information for Australia. Second File. T.E Cooper to Bournville. 19/9/23. C.C.

directors believed membership should be restricted to Estate residents as most Cadbury employees were catered for Hobart's social and recreational facilities. They pointed out that the majority of the workers could not use the club's activities as they started after the worker's trains had departed for Hobart. The Commissioners were afraid that, because the majority of workers lived some distance from the factory, the social club's success would be hindered. Their concern became reality when the Secretary of the Social Club reported that the club's activities were being hampered and limited in scope by the fact membership was open only to Cadbury workers. He suggested that membership should be opened to all Claremont residents even though they may be unconnected with the factory. This, he believed, would enable the club's social activities to be broader and give workers an opportunity to meet people who had interests outside the works. Bournville felt a responsibility for the social needs of the Estate residents, some of whom it had brought from Bournville, but where not wholly aware of the difficulties involved.
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in organising such clubs with only small numbers of people. The Commissioners were more aware of the compromises that had to be made to run these facilities successfully.

In the meantime development continued on the estate. The Company decided that a site near the railway station was suitable for a school and agreed to give land to the Government for this purpose81 and is the site of the present day Claremont Primary School. A recreation ground had been drained, ploughed and had holes filled. A number of shade trees were planted around the Girl’s recreation ground, and a separate recreation ground approved for the young men82.

A Welfare Committee had been established prior to 1983 but it was only late in this year that a committee was formally constituted to draw up a constitution. In many ways the Welfare Committee was similar to E.Z’s Cooperative Council although it did not have the same emphasis on trading activities. The Welfare Committee comprised five management representatives appointed by the Board and eight elected workers representatives. Two representatives were elected by the male workers, another

---

81 Private and Confidential Information for Australia. Second File. T.E Cooper to Bournville. 19/9/23. C.C.

82 Board Minutes and Index 1924. Minute No. 560. 31/7/24.
two elected by the female workers, a single representative elected by the office workers and a further representative elected from each of the Athletic Club executive, the Musical Dramatic and Library Committees, and the Canteen Committee. The Welfare Committee's role was to supervise recreation and grounds, education, social work, sickness and insurance, and the canteen. In 1984 the Welfare Committee appointed a sub-committee to look into the possibility of holding a works pic-nic. The sub-committee recommended that an annual pic-nic be held at the factory grounds for the workers and their families. The picnic would have a programme of sports during the day and would be concluded with a social at night. Cadbury would pay the costs associated with the event. The tradition of the picnic has lasted until the present day.

Cadbury were concerned for the health of their workers and implemented a number of schemes for their benefit. In 1921 the Commissioners took steps to procure a works

---
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The Commissioners decided not to employ a doctor solely at the works but to arrange for a doctor to visit the works when required. In 1922 the Factory Committee, which was very similar to E.Z.'s Works Committee, recommended the formation of a compulsory 'Sick Payment Scheme.' This suggestion came to fruition when in 1924 a committee, representative of the whole works, deliberated upon the formation of a Sick Benefit Scheme. It recommended a scheme similar to the Bournville Works Sick Benefit Scheme with certain modifications. A man over 21 paid 6d. per week to receive 20/- for the first 13 weeks and 10/- for the second thirteen weeks. A woman over 21 paid 6d. per week to receive 12/- for the first thirteen weeks and 6/- for the second thirteen weeks. Persons under 21 paid 4d. per week to receive reduced benefits. The scheme was self-funding until 1933 when it became a joint contributory fund. Cadbury agreed to contribute a sum equal to 50% of the amount expended on sickness benefits and associated administration to a maximum of 7/6 per member per annum. As a result member's contributions declined to 2 1/2d per

---
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week for boys and girls under the age of 21, and to 4 1/2d per week for men and women aged over 21.\textsuperscript{81}

Operating as an adjunct to the Sick Benefit Fund was the Distress fund. Initially collections had been taken up in the factory for workers in necessitous circumstances but this was ad hoc and not entirely effective. At the recommendation of the Welfare Committee in 1926 a more formal distress fund was set up. It was funded by periodic collections throughout the works and was administered by the Welfare Committee.\textsuperscript{82} This was discontinued in 1933 in favour of the C.F.P Works Sick Benefit Scheme. Each member contributed 1/2d. per week for the benefit of those members 'who may be in distressed circumstances as a consequence of personal sickness or accident.'\textsuperscript{83} In the same year a hospital fund was set up to cater for the members of the Sick Benefit Fund. Upon payment of 1d. per week members were covered for up to 5/- per day hospital bed charges and payment of all other residential charges up to a maximum of £6/6/0 per year. Provision was also made for Sick Benefit Scheme members to receive a refund of 30% of the receipted account from the Cadbury official dentists.\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{81} Board Minutes 1929-30. Minute No. 272. 9/12/33. C.C.
\textsuperscript{82} Board Minutes 1925-26. Minute No. 57. 4/3/26. C.C.
\textsuperscript{83} Board Minutes 1929-30. Minute No 272. 9/12/33. C.C.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid. C.C.
In 1924 the Claremont Works Suggestion Scheme came into operation. The object of the scheme was to encourage employees to put forward ideas for increasing the efficiency of the business or for improving the welfare of the workers. The types of areas suggestions could be made in were the saving of time, labour or material in manufacture; improvements in quality, appearance or wrapping of goods; the introduction of new goods; advertising and other methods of increasing sales; cleanliness in production and the elimination of foreign matter; safety and comfort of employees; social and athletic activities and similar interests. Every three months a committee would submit recommendations for awards or money prizes, depending on the value of the suggestion.\(^5\)

In the same year Bournville sent the Commissioners a list of the requirements Claremont employees would have to fulfill to join the Bournville Works Pension Fund. Under British Income Tax requirements the Claremont workers would have been required to pay 17% more to receive the same benefits. The commissioners thought it advisable to enquire whether a separate fund for the male employees at Claremont would be exempt from Federal and State income

\(^5\) Board Meetings Minute File No. 1-791 of 1924. Claremont Works Suggestion Scheme. 11/2/24. C.C.
The idea lapsed for a further year until the Welfare Committee recommended that a pension scheme or Superannuation Fund be instituted. The Commissioners decided to advise the Committee that a scheme would be considered and put into operation as soon as circumstances would allow. The question of superannuation was again debated in 1928 when Bournville pondered whether it had a moral obligation to make some provision for the male employees at Cleremont on retirement through a pension scheme. However the Directors believed 'it would be extremely difficult to undertake an obligation of this sort while the business is still so far from being established on a profitable basis, and that it is in the interests of the employees themselves, in order to assure their continued employment with the Company, not to do anything which would delay the conversion of the present loss into a profit.' This reveals the change that Cadbury philosophy was undergoing at that time. The emphasis had changed from one that saw service as providing the employees with benefits to one that saw service as providing the employees with jobs.
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Cadbury's at Claremont recorded their first profit - £17,800- in 1929. The next year saw the onset of a general depression and the idea of a pension fund was not brought up again until 1938. The firm estimated it would cost a total of £7408 per annum to run the fund with its contribution being half this amount. The fund was established soon after and, like many of the Cadbury schemes was graduated with one scale for management, a second for the men, and a third for the women.

Although benefits such as pension funds may have been slow to emerge, the Claremont workers appear to have participated in company activities at least as enthusiastically as their Zinc Works counterparts. Amongst the company sponsored clubs were a soccer club, golf club, cricket club, youth club, girl's club, swimming club, tennis club, colour camera club, floricultural club and social club. Some of these clubs were short lived but many continued for a considerable number of years. The golf club still continues albeit in a slightly different form, as the Claremont Golf Club.

---
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employees to gain technical or general education with the assistance of the company. In 1982 the Factory Committee recommended to the Commissioners that the company should refund the Technical school fees of those students who received satisfactory reports on attendance and progress and suggested that Cadbury should approach the educational authorities and request that facilities should be provided for a more general education as well as a technical education. A further recommendation was that students be paid by Cadbury for the time they took to attend evening classes. Cadbury attempted to get its employees to study commerce at evening classes held at the University by offering to refund half the fees upon successful completion of the course.

Cadbury's efforts at providing housing and welfare schemes for its employees was well received by the press. In an article on women workers in September 1984 the Tasmanian Mail described Cadbury and some of their welfare efforts in the following terms: '... the girls seem to be cared for in every way ... There is an entire absence of ugliness with which one instinctively associates a factory .... There is a tennis court, a basketball court and next year, I was told, the factory

102 Minute File July-December 1982. Minute No. 130. Factory Committee to Commissioners. 26/4/82. C.C.

103 Board Minutes 1985-86. Minute No 79. 6/3/85. C.C.
will have the best hockey ground in Hobart. Cadburys already have a hockey team and it is hoped before long the girls will begin to play basketball ...

In spite of the care Cadbury had taken to provide healthy and attractive surroundings and relieve boredom through job rotation, according to the *Tasmanian Mail*, the women were not interested in promotion or in earning extra money through a bonus system. It was possible to achieve the responsible position of forewoman or deputy forewoman, 'if they had ambition, energy and initiative to do so.' The problem, according to a member of staff, was that 'the majority of girls seem content to go on indefinitely with ordinary work so long as they are well paid.' The reporter was told the women had the opportunity 'by exerting special care and energy' to increase their wages by bonuses to above the piecework base rate. In spite of this incentive 'the girls are not very enthusiastic over the scheme.' The article concluded that most women were happy with the prescribed union rates which enabled them 'to buy as many blouses and jumpers as they like and go to the pictures as often as they want (to quote the director) and they will not trouble to earn extra money.' \(^{104}\) The implication was that Cadbury had provided benefits for the women but they were too lazy to want promotion or extra pay.

\(^{104}\) *Tasmanian Mail*, 3/9/84.
The *Tasmanian Mail* attributed this lack of ambition chiefly to the poor level of education amongst the women. It believed their minds were 'so untrained that their wants are extremely limited.', and that if 'they were better educated many of them would wish for a more varied life instead of fearing responsibility and preferring monotonous work to the interesting and varied positions of forewoman, deputy forewoman or chargehand. It asserted that because the women worked comparatively short hours, performed relatively unstrenuous work, and did 'not have to exert their brains very greatly during the day.', there was nothing preventing a woman from attending night classes and broadening her ideas and therefore ambition except, it was intimated, sloth.105

The women at Cadbury's were affronted by this article which, in effect, labelled them as lazy, unambitious and frivolous. The women wrote letters to both *The Mercury* and *The News* criticising the *Tasmanian Mail*'s article. The two papers did not publish the women's letters and they were forced to turn to the Female Confectioners Union journal, *The Women's Clarion*, which published them in full. In the unpublished letter to *The News* the women asserted that after spending the day from 8 a.m to 5.20 p.m indoors working they did not feel 'the least inclined

105 Ibid.
to study in the evening.' They acknowledged that whilst sporting facilities were freely available the women did not have the time to play sport during the day. The women preferred to spend their few leisure hours in the most enjoyable manner. They intimated that education was of little use when 'how many girls out of 400 employed there are going to have a chance of holding responsible positions, however well educated they may be?' It was contended that the work was monotonous, and that job rotation did not occurred infrequently, and that the very nature of the work often prevented an educated woman from displaying the extent of her knowledge. The women concluded by saying that if a woman did not progress through promotion 'we feel assured that her employer wouldn't feel concerned or put out if she did so.' They contended, that contrary to the impression given by the Tasmanian Mail, the bonus was eagerly sought when it was offered. The Women's Clarion concluded that the bonus system was a breach of the agreement between the union and Cadbury's end would have to be discontinued.\textsuperscript{108} Welfare most likely gave the women some benefits but the reality for the women workers at Cadbury was that, in spite of the Company's welfare efforts, the work was tiring, monotonous and spread over a long day.

Welfare at Cadbury, although not on the scale the

\textsuperscript{108} The Women's Clarion, Vol. 4, No. 36.
Commissioners had initially envisaged, was still quite extensive. The housing scheme in particular never reached their expectations. The idea of establishing of model garden city at Claremont had come from Bournville where the directors, such as George Cadbury, were well aware of the placating effect of company housing on industrial unrest. The Claremont estate, however, did not reflect the success of Bournville in either scale or worker acceptance. The only workers who lived there were the English immigrants, who had been brought out from Bournville to train and supervise the local workforce, who showed no interest in either renting or building at Claremont. This may have been because Claremont was isolated from the facilities of Hobart, the housing rentals on the estate were too high, the blocks of land were too expensive or that the workers did not want to live on the estate surrounded by their supervisors. The workers did, however, participate in the various clubs and schemes such as the C.F.P Sick Benefit Scheme and the Pension Fund. As occurred at E.Z, these schemes tied the worker to the company. They gave him or her a better quality of life and a feeling, through having paid money to join a scheme or given some time to a club, of having some commitment to Cadbury.
CHAPTER 5.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AT CADBURY-FRY-PASCALL.

The idea of industrial welfare and relations espoused at Claremont was borrowed from Cadbury at Bournville. It was not couched in Gepp's rhetoric of reciprocal responsibilities and duties between workers and management but was more obscure. The Cadbury's believed a man reflected his environment. Although business rationality prevented them from creating a second Bournville, the Cadbury's were convinced that a factory run on appropriate lines would produce efficiency. This chapter examines the structure put in place by Cadbury and the state to manage its workforce, and the effect these measures had upon the workforce.

At Bournville the Works Councils, which were formed in 1918, were the centre of Cadbury's industrial relations policy. There were two works councils - the men's and the women's - each of which had management and workers represented in equal numbers. The Councils operated in a definite sphere bounded on one side by management and on the other side by the trade unions and dealt with 'the field of factory and office administration, in so far as it concerns working conditions.' Cadbury believed the 'Councils are essentially concerned with the human
relationships ... on which the morale and efficiency of an industrial organisation largely depend. The Bournville Councils presided over the airing of grievances, the organisation of benevolent schemes, the provision of amenities for working hours and leisure, efforts to increase production efficiency and raise standards of health and safety at work and the formulation of Works rules. Much of the Council's work was done by a number of committees such as the Rules and Discipline, Suggestions, Health, Welfare and Recreation, Scholarships, and Finance and General Purposes. The Company outlined that the Councils were not a medium for giving employees a voice in the direction of the company, nor did they have any relationship with industrial co-partnership or profit sharing. Their role was to aid with the administration, as opposed to the direction, of the company.¹

This organisation was to an extent replicated at Claremont. The smaller scale of Claremont meant the Committees were not as numerous or large. There is evidence that a Factory Committee, which was Claremont's equivalent of the Bournville Works Councils, was in operation in early 1922, the Social Club in early 1923, the Welfare Committee by late 1923, the Musical and Dramatic, Library and Canteen Committees by 1925, and the

¹ Cadbury Bros. Ltd., A Works Council in Action, (Bournville, 1955), passim.
Education Committee by 1928. As we have seen Cadbury at Claremont provided a number of welfare schemes, such as the C.F.P Works Sick Benefit Scheme and the Claremont Pension Fund, that had their genesis in Bournville. Others benefits, such as the Home Building Scheme, was a modified version of an E.Z scheme.

Cadbury at Claremont did engage in dialogue with E.Z. The Commissioners conferred with Gepp on labour availability prior to establishing the factory², borrow E.Z’s journals on industrial welfare. In mid 1923 at Cadbury’s request A.W. Hutchin, E.Z’s Industrial Department’s Superintendent, had advised the Commissioners on ‘industrial matters in so far as they effect your organization at Claremont.’ Hutchin was confident that ‘with a constructive industrial policy steadily operating, and broadening in its application from year to year as warranted by the economics of the business, a thoroughly sound position will be reached.’ On the other hand unless a coherent industrial policy was implemented ‘the disintegrating forces brought to bear by the somewhat militant trade union officials who are unfortunately so plentiful in Australia ‘could hamper the

² Minute Book 6 Jan 1920 to 9 Feb 1922. Minute No. 8. C.C.
development of the industry and affect profitability. In Hutchin’s eyes a structured industrial policy brought a coherence and predictability over the workforce, and isolated them from the effects of unsettling external factors such as trade unions.

Hutchin, echoing his E.Z experience, believed that the agreement Cadbury had made with the Female Confectioners Union was ‘essentially reasonable and much less irksome in its provisions than most awards of the Federal Arbitration Court’ and advised Cadbury to get the male operatives under a similar award. The greatest difficulty facing Cadbury, he believed, was to get all the workers at the factory covered by one award or determination under the Wages Board. This was desirable, according to Hutchin, because of the ‘disturbing influence’ of having a large number of awards within the factory that are constantly coming up for review and changing because of cost of living figures. This created needless friction and could threaten profitability. It was therefore essential to have uniformity of wages and conditions in the interests of ‘contentment and efficiency.’ Once the factory was covered by a single award or agreement ‘increases and decreases then become universal in their application, conditions are made suitable to the industry
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and not the craft, and proper co-ordination is possible.' Hutchin suggested that it would not be possible to invoke the assistance of the Wages Board until 'the employees become consolidated by community of interest and possessed some type of corporate organization through which they could express themselves, and with which the management could deal.' Most likely Hutchin envisaged that an equivalent of the E.Z Works Committee would fulfill this function. The strategy behind this was that the Cadbury would then be able to demonstrate that the workers had abandoned their unions and accepted the authority of a company formed decision making body. Cadbury would then be able to argue that the workers should therefore be bound by the decisions of an company specific wages board rather than the craft specific awards of the federal courts.

Hutchin believed that management should attempt to find a common meeting ground between themselves and the workers. This, he thought, could be found in the direction of sickness and accident benefits and suitable sports. He believed that the methods used to bring such schemes into operation should be as indirect as possible and as much control as feasible be given to the workers. He warned that Australians were very suspicious of the direct approach and would far more readily stand behind proposals emanating from themselves than any that
management may care to make. Hutchin suggested that when some of the welfare and sporting activities had been running for a number of months, the opportunity should be taken to 'engineer a meeting of delegates from each to discuss the formation of a joint association to co-ordinate the whole and gradually extend the co-operative activities of the Claremont working community.' Once this had been done he did not think it would be too difficult to get the employees to suggest that an executive officer should be employed to organise these activities.

Obviously thinking of C.R.Baker and his role in the E.Z Cooperative Council, Hutchin outlined the qualities needed to perform this task. This person should be or have been 'a working man of the more intelligent type, one who understands the minds and aspirations of the workers, and is also able to appreciate the difficulties of the employer. He should be one who can take an impartial view and an impartial attitude ...' 

Hutchin concluded that the success of Cadbury's industrial policy would be dependent upon the 'complete absence of paternalism and the conduct of the employees institutions being left very largely to themselves, helped out all the time by the inspiration and leadership of the Company's industrial officers exerted in such a way as to 'leave the impression in the minds of the employees that they are "running it" and not "being
He believed that Cadbury’s organisation as it stood at that time could not cope with this increase in activities and suggested that an Employment Department, with similar responsibilities to that performed by the Industrial Department at E.Z., should be put into place. The Department’s activities, he thought, could be disassociated from management by being placed outside the general office area preferably near the mess rooms and recreation areas. The company was, in Hutchin’s view, to act as the hidden hand directing the worker’s leisure and work time activities in the manner that best suited its ends.

Hutchin’s ideas must been in sympathy with those of Cadbury because he was engaged as an industrial consultant from 1 March 1984 on a salary of £185 per annum. Even with the advantage of Hutchin’s experience the Cadbury schemes were never as elaborate or extensive as E.Z’s. The scope of Cadbury’s Welfare Committee was not as extensive as E.Z’s Cooperative Council. It did not participate in any trading activities, but like the Cooperative Council it did oversee the various sporting clubs and welfare benefits such as the C.F.P Works Sick

---

4 Ibid.
5 Board Minutes and Index 1984. Minute No. 347. 8/5/24. C.C
Benefit Scheme. Cadbury’s medical schemes do not appear to have been quite as extensive as those at E.Z but this can be accounted for by the relative sizes of the workforces and the differing types of production. The size of the workforce at E.Z was between 525 and 1300 persons7 whilst that of Cadbury was generally smaller ranging between 165 and 787 depending on economic circumstances. The fact that workers at E.Z laboured under dirty and dangerous conditions made facilities such as a Works Doctor a necessity whereas in the relatively safe and clean conditions of a food factory like Cadbury the provision of such facilities was more of a luxury. Cadbury set up a Factory Committee, and although there are not any records that clearly define its function, its name and its role in suggesting schemes that benefitted the workers imply that it was modelled on Bournville’s Works Councils. Its implicit function, like E.Z’s Works Committee and Bournville’s Works Councils, would have been to remove from the union’s domain many of the smaller personal activities, such as grievance solving, and in this way make the union seem less immediate and

---

7 E.Z. Records. A/1-3. Meredith to Industrial Department. 15/11/30. A.O.T.


relevant to the workers.

As we have seen there were many similarities in inclination between the two workforces: both showed disdain at building or renting homes at the respective companies' estate but participated fully in the company welfare and sporting schemes. Although Cadbury could boast, as did E.Z, that they had not lost a single day of production through stoppage, Cadbury's record of industrial conflict made E.Z's look like a veritable battlefield. The two companies' strike record is noteworthy in a period of time when Australia was sometimes racked by industrial action, but the Cadbury record is especially outstanding. The similarity in organisation between the two companies in terms of welfare benefits goes far to explain the low strike rate but to explain why Cadbury had an even lower incidence of strikes than E.Z we must look at differences between the two factories.

There are two basic differences between E.Z and Cadbury. Both firms can be classified as being in the secondary manufacturing sector but had quite different styles of production. E.Z can be classified as a heavy industry that primarily produced metals whilst Cadbury can be classified as light industry manufacturing foodstuffs. The second difference is in the area of workforce
composition with E.Z.'s workforce being entirely male whilst the Cadbury workforce was made up of both males and females. Cadbury operated a highly segmented workforce that was divided not only in terms of pay and hours, as was E.Z, but in terms of gender and there were numerous divisions within each of these categories. Available figures suggest that the proportion of women in the Cadbury workforce ranged from 29% to 60%. As a general rule the more affluent the times the more women that were employed in the factory as the need for them fluctuated closely with the demand for Cadbury products, whereas the men's jobs were often associated with tasks such as machinery maintenance which were more cushioned from economic influences. The tasks the women performed differed greatly from those performed by men and they were more likely to receive piece rates and be organised along scientific management lines. In 1924 Cadbury proposed to take the most efficient woman in the department and give her particular training in her work 'giving particular attention to "Motion Study"'. This woman would then be required to train the other workers in her department. That women were employed in such


11 Board Minutes 1934-38. Factory Directors Report No. 26. 30/5/34. C.C.

12 Board Minutes and Index 1924. Minute No. 386. 29/5/24. C.C.
tasks as wrapping chocolates reflected the biological assumption justification that their fingers were inherently more nimble and therefore more productive than men's.

As was the case at Bournville women were compelled to resign when they became married as Cadbury believed that once married a woman's place looking after the home and the children. As well as being separated by sex, and distinguished by wages and work, the women were as mentioned separated from the men at mealtimes. This reflected the Bournville belief as to the moral dangers of the sexes mixing. The effect of these distinctions was to create a sharply divided dual labour force. The women were part of the secondary labour force where their work was characterised as unskilled, poorly paid, poor job security and low chances of career advancement; whereas the men's work was part of the primary labour market with work that was classified as skilled, enjoyed better pay, greater job security and some chance of career advancement.

The workforce at Cadbury was also, as at E.Z. separated

---


14 Gardiner, op. cit., p. 31.

15 Minute Book 6 Jan 1920 to 9 Feb 1922. Meeting 11/5/20. C.C.
by a finely graded hierarchical ordering. The Directors, office staff and foremen were to have separate dining rooms. Certain sections of the office staff had privilege of not signing on and off. Foremen and forewomen 'B' were given 22 days leave per annum instead of the normal 20 days per annum. Foremen and forewomen 'A' could receive one half day leave of absence a month while forewomen and foremen 'B' were entitled to a half day every two months. The privilege of not signing on and off was later extended to charge hands, whilst this group and staff clerks did not have to present pass out checks when leaving the factory at other than ordinary times. The effect of these visible and generally obvious distinctions was to further fragment the workforce, and to make it difficult to create a sense of rank and file cohesion.

The workforce was also separated, to a degree rather uncommon in Australia, by nationality. Cadbury had brought a number of skilled workers and supervisors from Bournville to help start up operations at Claremont and train the local labour force in the finer points of confectionery production. In 1922 the English women workers complained that they were receiving less pay than

---

16 Board Minutes 1925-26. Minute No. 87. 16/3/26. C.C.

17 Board Minute File 1931-33. Minute No. 396. 18/8/39. C.C.
in Britain. They had accepted lower rates on the understanding that the cost of living would be less in Australia but had found this was not so. The Commissioners decided that the women should not be paid less than they were receiving at Bournville, and increased their pay accordingly.\textsuperscript{18} This group of English supervisors, housed in the Claremont estate, paid superior wages and imbued with the Bournville spirit, would have formed a cohesive group that Cadbury could depend upon to be loyal and committed to the company.

Unions were present at Cadbury very soon after the factory was established. In spite of the efforts of the union officials on behalf of their respective memberships, their efforts were hindered by the particular nature of the workforce, and bickering between the two main unions. The Female Confectioners Union (F.C.U) was an active union for women confectioners that was based in Melbourne and led by the energetic Margaret Wearne. The union's proclaimed object was 'to uphold the rights of combination of labour ... and to improve, protect and foster the best interests of its members. To obtain and maintain for its members reasonable hours of work, wages and industrial conditions, and when differences occur to assist in their settlement by just

\textsuperscript{18} Minute Book 6 Jan to 9 Feb 1922. Meeting 26/1/22. Minute No. 260. C.C.
and equitable methods. To promote peace by all amicable means, such as conciliation, arbitration or permanent boards ...’

In the first volume of the union's journal 'The Women's Clarion' she outlined her belief that great and difficult problems awaited solution and that women must play an equal part with men in an endeavour to solve them. The journal was intended to be a "clarion call" to the union members to awaken them to a truer realisation of the greater opportunities that await women in the future. Unionism, she declared, was the finest expression of cooperative effort.

The union was quick to criticise Cadbury's for their welfare schemes. They charged that the Commonwealth Government had spoon-fed overseas firms and the 'Tasmanian Government have tripped over themselves to gratify their every wish.' The Commonwealth Government had encouraged Cadbury by allowing the company to import their chocolate making machinery without duty whilst the State Government had, it alleged, 'built a railroad from Hobart to Claremont ... at a cost to Tasmania of £3500'. It continued stating that 'the whole tendency is to look upon them [Cadbury] as public benefactors who are out to reorganise our social system by promising the building of

---

18 Female Confectioners Union-Federal Board. Rules of Union. M.U.A.

bungalows, swimming baths and bowling greens for employees. All this and many other things can with the money C.F.P has saved by the Government's action in allowing free entry of their machinery. The bungalows, swimming baths and bowling greens, if constructed, will be therefore actually constructed out of the Australian public's funds, since the saving in duty really belongs to the Australian public.\(^{21}\)

At the request of the Cadbury employees Wearne and the union secretary, E.H.A Smith, visited the factory in early 1983 with the intention of getting Cadbury to sign an agreement on wages and conditions. The union requested that the Company make retrospective pay to their employees for the holidays falling on Good Friday and Easter Monday. After a meeting Cadbury agreed to sign the award which was to come into effect on 1 July 1983. The Women's Clarion believed the agreement 'meant a good deal to the girls. The rates of pay and conditions were very much improved.'\(^{22}\) A.W Hutchin did not concur with this opinion when he stated that the agreement was essentially reasonable and much less irksome in its provisions than most Awards of the Federal Arbitration Court.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{21}\) The Women's Clarion. Vol. 1. No. 4. 20/2/82. M.U.A.

\(^{22}\) Ibid. Vol. 2. No. 24. 20/10/83.

\(^{23}\) Private and Confidential Information for Australia. Second File. A.W Hutchin to E.H Colleyshaw. 27/3/83. C.C.
The great majority of the women in the factory joined the union causing Smith to predict that non-unionists would face a 'warm time'. C.E Culley, who was secretary of the Trades Hall and Labour Council and the member for Denison in the House of Assembly, was placed by the union in charge of Tasmanian affairs.24

The F.C.U had reason to be optimistic about their success but little did they know of the difficulties that were to face them in the future. Culley reported in July 1923 that the women were satisfied with the agreement but that there had been some ill feeling over the holiday pay. The unionists believed that only they should receive the holiday pay whereas Cadbury were paying it to unionist and non-unionist alike.25 The F.C.U’s attempts to organise the women were not helped by the fact that Cadbury would lay off workers when there was a downturn in demand or excessively warm weather. In March 1924 Culley reported that Cadbury had dismissed a large number of women due to a downturn in demand or "slackness". At that stage the F.C.U had 184 members in the factory but Cadbury had paid off more unionists than non-unionists. For Culley to have mentioned this point he must have believed that this was an attempt by Cadbury to

25 Confectioners Union. Meetings of Executive Victoria-Tasmania. 16/7/23. M.U.A.
intimidate unionists, and deter women from joining the union. The unionists still felt resentment over non-unionists being paid for holidays that had been secured by the union. These facts led Culley to admit that 'things at Cadbury were not in too good a position.' The situation was largely unchanged in 1986 when Culley reported that 'the girls in Tasmania were at a disadvantage as they were losing a lot of time at Cadbury and as a result it was making it most difficult for him to see the girls.' He had approached management about the amount of time lost but they had said it could not be helped. In this manner the precarious job situations and intermittent employment of women at Cadbury made it difficult for them to be organised and properly serviced by the union. The women reported that Cadbury management were telling them that non-unionists could be paid for holidays, causing Culley to approach Cadbury and secure an agreement that if a new employee did not join the union she should not be paid for holidays.

Although one would anticipate this move should increase union membership, Culley reported that the branch was 'not as bright as it should be'. Cadbury had experienced a downturn in demand causing a number of the women to be unemployed at various periods of time. He was experiencing a great deal of difficulty getting women


27 Ibid. 1/3/26. M.U.A.
who had just started work at the factory to join the union in spite of the fact they would not receive holiday pay unless they were union members. He believed 'the members of the Union were not taking the interest they should' and had stressed to them that unless they took a keen interest in the union it may go out of existence leaving them to the mercy of the employers to give them what conditions they may see fit. He warned that Cadbury were asking the union to meet with them to fix up a new agreement and that, in his opinion, Cadbury wanted to reduce wages and alter the conditions of the agreement. This threat had caused, he believed, quite a number of women to become financial members of the union. The result was that at 30 June 1988 out of the 173 women employed at Cadburys 187 were members, although a large percentage were in arrears.28

The F.C.U met with Cadbury in 1928 to discuss the log of claims for a new agreement. A conference of all employers of Female Confectioner's Union members had originally been held in Melbourne but as Cadbury were not able to attend a special conference was held in Tasmania. The union was represented by Warne, Hill and Culley and Cadbury by Booth and Smith. In 1923 the union, in an Arbitration Court agreement, had agreed to work a 48 hour week for the following weekly wages:-

28 Ibid. 17/7/88. M.U.A.
In 1928 the union log of claims requested a 44 hour week and the following weekly wages:

| Junior Female | <16 | 20/-     |
|               | 17  | 25/-     |
|               | 18  | 31/-     |
|               | 19  | 37/-     |
|               | 20  | 42/6     |
|               | >20 | 50/-     |

Although the log had been accepted by employers in Victoria this did not mean that Cadbury were prepared to meekly agree to the new rates. Booth argued that Cadbury were handicapped by being based in Tasmania and as the company was a Tasmanian industry he could not see why their wages should be based on Melbourne cost of living figures. Culley retorted when Cadbury was established Tasmania had a higher cost of living figure than Victoria but the union agreed to use the Victorian figures for the
sake of uniformity. He did not believe the company had been disadvantaged by locating in Tasmania for '... they have an advantage in my opinion because of the fact they have cheaper power. When you talk about peace in industry I am out to establish it.' He argued that a wage reduction would cause industrial disruption, 'when you are going to break in and endeavour to decrease the wages of people who have been working in the industry for the last 5 years. I am afraid you are not going to create peace in industry.' and pointed out that Cadbury’s had the opportunity to change to Tasmanian figures when the last agreement was fixed, but had not done so. He believed the women deserved Victorian wages, which were obviously more than Cadbury was proposing, because each employee was put off for an average of 6 days per year due to hot weather or lack of demand. During this time they could not seek alternate employment and, he argued, this loss of employment time should be built into the women’s wages by giving them the higher Victorian rates. Cadbury were disgruntled at having to 'force' people to join the union by withholding holiday pay and had been censured by the Bournville board for surrendering to union pressure. Culley believed Cadbury did not have an objection to their employees becoming union members and that new employees should be clearly told of the holiday pay provision when they joined the union. He alleged that this had never been done and that 'some of the people
holding responsible positions out there have been trying to impress upon them that they can get these things without joining.' The union was victorious on this occasion. The Commission advised Cadbury that they should determine wages by the Melbourne cost of living figures and after further argument Cadbury agreed to this proposal. 29

In spite of having gained better wages for the women than Cadbury were prepared to pay, this did not result in the women showing any more commitment to the F.C.U. The position of the union did not improve and appears to have declined further in the depression years. In 1929 Culley reported that a number of members had been dismissed due to a lack of work and that the stewards were finding it difficult to collect the union contribution. Three years later he advised that owing to lost time a number of women were unable to pay their dues, while others were reluctant to pay their dues because non-unionists received the same conditions as unionists. It would appear that Cadbury were awarding unionists and non-unionists exactly the same conditions even though they were obliged to give them only to unionists. Uniformity of conditions for unionists and non-unionists made union membership appear to a number of women as an unnecessary

29 Female Confectioners Union. Federal Board. Log of Claims and Court Hearing. 1928. M.U.A.
drain on their wage and had the effect of discouraging them from joining the union. The shop stewards, Culley said, had laboured under difficulties as they had been transferred to other departments. A likely effect of the general shedding of labour was a shuffle of labour causing many women, among them the shop stewards, to be moved to other departments. The stewards would then be faced with the difficult task of establishing a relationship of trust with the women in the new department which would hinder their short term effectiveness as shop stewards. He declared that he would spare no effort to reorganise the women to try to get them to take more interest in the organisation.  

Culley’s efforts were in vein for the following year he reported that the Tasmanian Branch’s position had not improved. In an effort to revive flagging membership Culley had addressed the workers each week and had circulated a pamphlet outlining Cadbury’s proposal to lower wages by 10% and alter the Proportion clause. This would enable Cadbury to employ a greater number of juvenile employees thereby displacing some women employees. He reported that ‘apathy amongst the employees was deplorable.’ and that the Union’s state president, Miss Fisher, had resigned partially as a consequence of

---

the women's apathy. Cadbury employed only 60 or 70 women and, unlike their mainland counterparts, when the cost of living figures were released they had seized the opportunity to immediately reduce wages and were now paying 43/6 as against 45/6 being paid in Victoria. The situation was unchanged in 1935 with Culley still having difficulty organising the women and only a small percentage of the employees being union members. The union's efforts were being thwarted, he believed, because the older women were taking an interest in the union but were also the ones leaving to be married and non-unionists could receive conditions as unionists even though these conditions had been secured through the Union's efforts without making any financial contribution to the Union. He could not explain the women's reluctance to join the union as they were aware of what may happen to their wages and conditions if the union did not operate and they were left to the mercy of the employer. Although they may not be members the women had sufficient confidence in the union that if any trouble arose they immediately requested the union to negotiate on their behalf. In spite of this only 20 out of the 250 women employed were union members. Culley was disappointed that some of the women would not concern themselves about their own welfare but stated that he tended to continue to safeguard their position from the employers in the

31 Ibid. 20/2/33. M.U.A.
interest of trade unionism. In 1943 Culley reported that it was difficult to 'organise and keep the girls together at C.F.P'. The fact the steward had organised 96 new members and 2 rooms were 100% organised may have been related to the fact that the women had gained a flow on wage increase from Victoria, which would have made the union seem to be working in their best interests.

The F.C.U's efforts at organising and amalgamating the women was not helped by the 25 year running battle fought between the F.C.U and the F.C.A.A. over amalgamation. In 1986 The Women's Clarion declared 'the men had complete possession of the Confectioner's Wages Board for some 18 years and the wages and conditions that it provided for women and girls and unskilled men were of a most shocking nature. This union deeply regrets that bitter jealousy still exists towards the improvement of the conditions of women workers in this industry, and that most contemptible methods have been used from time to time to injure the organisation that has done so much. The union upheld that until its formation the male dominated unions had neglected the wages and conditions of female workers. It believed it had done much to rectify this

---

32 Ibid. 23/2/35. M.U.A

33 Confectioners Union. Meeting of Executive. Victoria-Tas. 27/9/43. M.U.A.

situation in the 'face of the most bitter opposition of other Unions who should have been allies in its efforts to obtain better conditions for women.' In 1927 the State Conference of the F.C.U decided that 'no good purpose in the interest of the members could be served by Amalgamation or Federation' with the F.C.A.A and instructed the Federal Council not to enter into any negotiations. The absence of any F.C.A.A records make it difficult to draw any conclusions about the union's activities in these years but in 1943 the F.C.U again came under threat from the F.C.A.A who still wished to amalgamate. Culley, who was secretary of the Tasmanian Branch of the F.C.A.A and secretary/treasurer of the F.C.U, Federated Confectioner's Association, called a state conference of the F.C.U to report that the Federal Conference of the F.C.A.A had discussed amalgamation and as a consequence he had undertaken to call this conference. He told the conference that the F.C.A.A's constitution could embrace both sexes, and that if the F.C.U did not agree to amalgamation then the F.C.A.A would organise the women in Tasmania. It did not seem Culley could see any reason for the men wanting to amalgamate with the women. 'Mr. Culley outlined the fact that the women had not been any hinderance to the men
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regarding wages and conditions ... as the women had nearly always taken the initiative and achieved success in many directions and the men had usually benefitted as a result.' 37

In 1943 Culley resigned as secretary of the Tasmanian sub-branch of the F.C.U citing parliamentary pressures as the reason. 38 The following year, after sending out 115 notices for the F.C.A.A's annual meeting and having only 10 people turn up, Culley tendered his resignation as secretary of the Tasmanian Branch of the F.C.A.A. and was replaced by P.J. (Jack) O'Neill. Culley's resignation from the two organisations most likely due to the pressure of being secretary of two bodies that were in conflict. There appears to have been dissatisfaction amongst the F.C.A.A hierarchy over Culley's performance as secretary, particularly on the issue of amalgamation, and this was most likely reflected in the poor F.C.A.A annual meeting attendance. 39 The Federal President, R.S Jackson, did not hesitate to convey this to Culley 'I told him [Culley] fairly straight that in my opinion it was nearly time that you [Lucas] did some investigating re conditions and I would not be surprised if we found he

37 Confectioners Union. Meeting of Executive Victoria-Tas. 5/12/23. M.U.A.

38 Ibid.

39 Female Confectioners Union-Federal Board. R.S Jackson to P.J Lucas. 10/12/43. M.U.A.
had a hell of a lot to hide, as, in my opinion Smith and
his kind are among the worst employers in our industry,
and if I was a Parliamentarian and had the pull Culley
had the position would be entirely different in his
state.'40 The F.C.A.A were obviously far from impressed
at conditions at Cadbury and held Culley largely
responsible.

The appointment of O’Neill as F.C.A.A marked the
beginning of bitter conflict between the F.C.U and the
F.C.A.A over the question of amalgamation. Whilst the
F.C.U had difficulty recruiting members, the Federal
President of the F.C.A.A, R.S Jackson, boasted that his
union had ‘hundreds of requests from girls in our trade
to become members of the union.’ He predicted that ‘after
this month Miss Weerne will have no organisation left,
and it is only out of kindness on our part that we desire
to assist her and this can only be done by
amalgamation.’41

Jack O’Neill related how a meeting of F.C.U members
called by Mrs Kelly, Culley’s replacement as secretary,
did not attract a single person, whilst the F.C.A.A
meeting was held in a packed hall with approximately half
the attendees being women ‘who took a lively part in

40 Ibid. Jackson to Lucas. 18/1/44. M.U.A.
41 Ibid. R.S Jackson to P.J Lucas. 22/6/44. M.U.A.
proceedings.' The women nominated and elected two representatives to the F.C.A.A executive. The F.C.A.A had soon enrolled 120 women and 20 men, with resignations allegedly being forwarded to Miss Warne every day. R.S Jackson concluded '... before very long Miss Warne can write finish to her union in Tasmania ... I think we can congratulate ourselves upon our first attack upon the female organisation.' Whilst the F.C.U had great difficulty in garnering the enthusiasm of its members, there are suggestions that the F.C.A.A had its difficulties with the membership appearing at times to be at odds with the union leaders. Jackson hinted that this was a deliberate attempt by Cadbury and Culley to defeat the F.C.A.A and replace it with the more docile F.C.U' ... I would not be surprised if Cadburys and Culley are behind a move to cause Jack O'Neill as much trouble as possible as they would certainly prefer Maggie to Jack.' The F.C.A.A and the F.C.U were to eventually amalgamate in 1948, but it is very likely that considerable damage had been done to the credibility of both unions in the preceding years, although it is difficult to fully ascertain the effect this would have had on union membership. The amalgamation did have a profound effect on the women workers at Cadbury. Shortly
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after amalgamation the whole industry was reclassified. Five new adult male classifications were devised and all received a margin for skill. The new group in the award doing 'unskilled or labouring work was the women who were all placed in a single classification. They received no margins for doing work which, under the principle of the 1941 award, would have been given a margin if performed by males. This situation was able to occur because of the wage-fixing principles of the Arbitration Court. Under these principles workers could only be described as skilled or semi-skilled if others could be described as unskilled. The ideology of the male breadwinner, the women's industrial weakness and the fact that the women were an easier target now that they were in a union with men rather than separate in their own union combined to make them easily definable as unskilled. It may not have been the intention of the F.C.A.A but a consequence of the amalgamation of the two unions was to ensure, as The Woman's Clarion had noted, that the men enjoyed better pay and conditions at the expense of the women.

The Storemen and Packers Union is the only other union


46 Ibid., p. 12.

whose activities have been recorded at Cadbury. This was a small union whose pay and conditions were covered by the agreement between the F.C.A.A and Cadbury, much to the chagrin of the storemen and packers. In 1925 the Storemen and Packers Union submitted a request for improved wages and working conditions to Cadbury, who refused due to ‘the present conditions’ and because a case was shortly to be stated before the Arbitration Court. Undeterred the Storemen and Packers lodged a claim for a 44 hour week and a weekly wage of £6 and a bonus of 12/- to 15/- for training in early 1927. The industrial advocate for Cadbury, J.L. Moore argued that the storemen and packers were adequately catered for under ‘an agreement with the Confectioners Union.’ If a separate agreement was to be given to this group he believed it should only cover wages so that the general conditions of the factory would cover all groups. The Federal secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union, Mr. Brotherson disagreed and claimed the storemen and packers had only been included in the F.C.A.A agreement by mistake. He argued that the agreement between Cadbury and the F.C.A.A had no authority to act on behalf of the storemen and packers as 95% of this group were not members of the F.C.A.A and had sufficiently different conditions to the confectioners to warrant a separate agreement and produced witnesses to verify this

---

48 Board Minutes 1925-26. Minute No. 176. 7/5/25. C.C.
statement.49 E.H. Colleyshaw, a Cadbury director, outlined how the secretary of the Confectioners, who was a packer, had asked Cadbury to enter into an agreement in 1923. This most likely was O’Neill. Colleyshaw argued that the work of the storemen and packers was closely associated with the manufacturing process and production would be hindered if the storemen were on a 44 hour week while the rest of the factory worked a 48 hour week. He hinted that a 44 hour week and increased wages for the storemen and packers could cause industrial unrest. The judge was not convinced by the Storemen and Packers case. He stated that it would be unjust to the workers themselves to award shorter hours. His argument was that shorter hours would result in less production and therefore cause the cost of living to rise to the detriment of all workers. He concluded with the words ‘one must try to give equality of leisure.’50 Like the state E.Z Wages Board the federal Arbitration Court showed a reticence to award different wages or conditions to any single group within a factory.

The only other industrial dispute to emerge was action by the F.C.A.A in 1944 for more pay. Men working on the cocoa presses believed they were entitled to extra pay because ‘... working on the press is detrimental to them

49 The Mercury, 24/3/27.
50 Ibid., 25/3/27.
and injurious to their clothing, their clothing and boots are quickly rotted away because of the nature of the work performed, that in the Cocoa room, on account of working continuously in a dusty atmosphere their health is affected and the job is a particularly dirty one.' The confectioners wanted margin loadings similar to those proscribed for other organisations whose members were employed at Cadbury's.\textsuperscript{51} The employees grew restless during the considerable delay before their requests were heard before the Arbitration Court, and were doubtless considerably fuelled by the Cadbury's refusal to grant many of the concessions they had agreed to at a conference with the union and had demanded that they be heard in front of the Arbitration court as a dispute.\textsuperscript{52} The workers discontent culminated in a stopwork meeting held on 13 October 1944,\textsuperscript{53} much to the consternation of the federal officials who had seen stopwork meetings held close to Arbitration Court hearings treated most unfavorably by the court.\textsuperscript{54} In the final analysis their claims were rejected by the Arbitration Court, but they were left with the option of approaching the Minister for Labour as Cadbury's had indicated a willingness to

\textsuperscript{51} Confectioners Union Federal Board. O'Neill to Lucas. 31/3/44. M.U.A.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., Lucas to Jackson. 22/9/44. M.U.A.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., Lucas to O'Neill. 18/10/44. M.U.A.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., Lucas to Jackson. 31/10/44. M.U.A.
negotiate over the margins. This industrial action was directly attributable to the Arbitration Court’s tardiness in hearing the case. Overall the unions had some minor victories they acknowledged that conditions at Cadbury’s lagged behind the rest of the industry.

The structures that Cadbury put in place to manage the workforce and avoid industrial unrest and conflict operated on a number of levels. At one level there was the formal structure of the Factory Committee and the federal Arbitration Court. The factory was a joint employer/employee body that oversaw working conditions in the factory and impinged on the union’s traditional ground by dealing with the small matters, such as grievance solving, which comprise a large portion of a union’s workload. Cadbury, unlike E.Z, was bound by the awards of the federal Arbitration Court. The awards, as Hutchin commented, did not appear to be regarded by the Company as being particularly irksome. They were in many ways similar to Wages Boards awards as, judging by the Storeman and Packers case in 1927, the awards covered all workers, and were usually based on cost of living figures. The only difference was that there was one award for the males and a separate award for the females.

The main way Cadbury managed its workforce was through divisions in the workforce, mainly operating through the
sexual division of labour. The women at Cadbury worked under entirely different conditions to the men. Their work was usually piece-rate, poorly paid, insecure and with little chance of advancement. The F.C.U found the women difficult to organise because of the turnover of women caused by the insecure and sporadic nature of their work and the Cadbury policy that forced the women to resign from work upon marriage. Cadbury did not assist the F.C.U’s cause when it gave both unionists and non-unionists the conditions the union had gained for its members. This would have made union membership appear unnecessary to both unionists and non-unionists alike. As well Culley hinted there was some Company intimidation of union members. All of these factors made it difficult for the women to be organised into a coherent force, and ensured they remained the least militant and protected members of the Cadbury workforce. The F.C.A.A does not appear to have been a great deal more active than the F.C.U. Under Culley’s leadership poor attendances at union meetings are recorded. This situation is initially reversed under O’Neill’s leadership but then reverted to poor attendance. The federal leadership attributed this to a conspiracy caused by Culley and Cadbury, but a more plausible explanation was that this was the normal situation. The union’s federal leadership labelled conditions at Cadbury as being amongst the worst in the industry and attributed this to a lack of effort on
Culley's behalf. It could be argued that if the federal leadership had spent more time fighting Cadbury instead of the F.C.U, both male and female workers could have gained in terms of improved conditions rather than the men gaining improved conditions at the expense of the women. The conflict between the unions was a result of the sexual division of labour. The fact that the women were in a separate union under different awards would concern the F.C.A.A insofar as the women, who have traditionally performed work that is classified as unskilled, could encroach on the men's work causing it to become redefined as unskilled and therefore paid lower wages. The only way it could ensure this did not happen was to absorb the F.C.U and its members. The sexual division of labour defined the F.C.A.A's opponent as being the F.C.U rather than Cadbury, causing it to devote its energies towards absorbing that organisation.
CHAPTER 6.

CONCLUSION.

In the course of this thesis the industrial relations policies of each of E.Z and Cadbury have been examined and the consequences of these policies assessed. It is now appropriate to examine the areas of similarity and differences between these two companies and attempt to account for these factors.

The establishment of both Cadbury and E.Z was greatly assisted by the government sponsored rise of manufacturing, which operated at both a federal and state level. The federal government assisted E.Z in securing an advantageous contract for the supply of zinc to Britain and put in place a protective tariff wall that enabled E.Z to sell a large amount of its product on the Australian domestic market free from competition. It assisted Cadbury by allowing the firm to import its chocolate making machinery from Britain duty free. The Tasmanian government was equally anxious to assist both companies by offering cheap hydro electricity and extending roadways, tramways or railways to the companies advantage.

The increasing influence of manufacturers coincided with
the increasing prominence of a restive working class. From these events emerged a new set of beliefs, that can be termed corporate liberalism, which outlined the role and obligations of manufacturers and proscribed measures to placate the working class. E.Z linked its own self interest as being synonymous with national interest in a kind of economic nationalism. It believed that national wealth could only come through increased production as a result of greater efficiency, which could be achieved through cooperation between employer and employee. Cadbury and E.Z both agreed that industrial unrest had been caused by the working classes' poor living conditions. They believed the workers did not really desire better wages but wanted what Gepp termed 'a minimum amount of happiness' and Cadbury termed a factory run in a spirit of 'cooperation and goodwill'. An employer had an obligation, they both agreed, to supply the workers with, amongst other things, good health and decent housing conditions. This would, they believed, result in cooperation between employer and employee, ensure a contented and efficient workforce and witness the disappearance of industrial unrest.

These beliefs were into practice at Claremont and Risdon where Cadbury and E.Z respectively attempted to build model industrial villages. The schemes did not live up to their creators' expectations in many ways. The two
companies were conscious of the cost of house building and were anxious to obtain what they considered to be a reasonable monetary return on their investment. This made the house rentals expensive, and made it difficult to secure tenants from among the employees. Anxious to absolve themselves of the responsibility and expense of building houses, the respective companies offered blocks of land for sale to employees at a price they considered to be very reasonable. In both cases this was met with a lack of employee interest. This may have been because the location was too far from the facilities of central Hobart, the blocks of land were too expensive or simply that workers did not want to live in the potentially stifling atmosphere of a company town surrounded by factory supervisors or company industrial officers as the case may have been.

The other part of Cadbury's and E.Z's welfare centered around the provision of schemes such as medical insurance, pension funds, assistance with medical and dental treatment, and the provision of sporting and recreational activities and facilities. These programmes were more extensive at E.Z than at Cadbury, because of the larger workforce and the more dangerous nature of the work at this firm. These schemes provided the worker with tangible benefits and a better quality of life. The advantage to the company was a more efficient worker who
was committed to the company. Unlike the company’s other
from of payment through wages, which can be spent in a
number of discretionary ways, when the company offers
payment in the form of welfare benefits the worker does
not have the same amount of discretion. He or she can
choose not to participate, and lose a considerable amount
of non-monetary benefits, or to participate on the
company’s terms. The provision of welfare was made to
appear dependent on the economic health of the company,
which was linked by the company to the workers dedication
to the company. It was made to appear that if the workers
cooperated with the firm to reach its desired ends then
benefits would accrue to all.

The effects of welfare were strengthened by the operation
of a number of joint management/employee bodies within
the factory. On one level there was the Welfare Committee
at Cadbury and the Cooperative Council at E.Z whose role
it was to coordinate the various welfare schemes and, in
the case of E.Z, run the Company’s trading activities. At
another level there was the Factory Committee at Cadbury
and the Works Committee at E.Z who were to oversee
working conditions within the two factories and acted as
a grievance solve body. This directly impinged upon the
traditional areas of unions who spend much time solving
members grievances and attempting to gain better physical
working conditions, and would have made unionism appear
less essential to the workers at these two factories.

The state supplemented these structures with the arbitration system. Wages for all workers at E.Z were determined under the Tasmanian Wages Board system. This body was unpopular with the unions as full time union officials could not participate in its proceedings. In its determinations this joint employer/employee body often arrived at lower wages and longer hours than prescribed in federal awards, much to the chagrin of the unions. This led to many union applications to the federal Arbitration Court for exclusion from the Wages Board. These were defeated on the grounds of legal precedent, and because the judge believed that with the Wages Board and Works Committee adequate machinery to determine wages and conditions was already in place. The wages for Cadbury were determined by the federal Arbitration Court, with there being one award for the men and a separate award for the women. Cadbury did not request the formation of a Wages Board as they appear to have found the awards satisfactory from their point of view.

Unionism was weak at both E.Z and Cadbury. The inability of the unions at E.Z to gain inclusion under federal awards, and the fact that the Wages Board and Works Committee took away many union functions such as wage
negotiation and grievance solving, made union membership appear superfluous to many workers. The success of E.Z's integration of its workforce can be gauged by the fact that the largest union, the Zinc Workers Union, was company based and focused solely on issues that arose within the confines of the E.Z. Works. The unions at Cadbury had to contend with the Factory Committee taking away some of their functions in much the same way the Works Committee did to the unions at E.Z. The situation was complicated by the sexual division of labour. The way women's work was organised at Cadbury meant their work was regarded as unskilled, was poorly paid and had a lack of job security. The women could be laid off for periods of time through lack of work or hot weather, and were forced by Cadbury to resign upon marriage. The short term nature of their employment made it difficult for the F.C.U to enrol members. The F.C.A.A members appear to have been apathetic and their federal union leaders was distracted by the prospect of taking over the F.C.U. This was because the work performed by F.C.U members was classified as unskilled and paid accordingly, the F.C.A.A would have been aware of the possibility of the women performing the same work as the men causing the men's jobs to be classified as unskilled. The F.C.A.A's solution was to amalgamate with the F.C.U and reclassify all the women's jobs as unskilled and all the men's jobs as skilled. The sexual division of labour
organised by Cadbury, and the Arbitration Court award structure, redefined the women, rather than Cadbury, as the threat to F.C.A.A members wages and conditions.

Cadbury and E.Z believed it was their obligation to cooperate with their employees and supply them with the housing and welfare provisions that would enable them to become content, committed and efficient. Through their industrial relations policies and schemes, and aided by the state, they attempted to regulate the workers life at home and in the factory. The schemes, although not as extensive as the companies had anticipated, were sufficient to ensure that the companies managed their labour force in such a way as to be rewarded with an almost complete absence of industrial conflict for some twenty years.
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