THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SOCIETY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

President: A. J. Scriven; *Vice-Presidents:* Professor K. J. Hancock, R. E. Hurst, M.P., Commissioner J. H. Portus; *Hon. Secretary:* C. I. Hayes, c/o Apprenticeship Commission, 50 Grenfell St., Adelaide; *Treasurer:* P. M. Warren, c/o S.A. Public Service Association, 73 Wakefield St., Adelaide; *Committee:* L. B. Bowes, W. A. Brown, J. W. Cross, Miss J. C. Henriott, R. E. Penny, F. Wycherly.

THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SOCIETY OF QUEENSLAND

PATRON: The Hon. Mr. Justice Hanger.

President: Professor R. C. Gates; *Secretary:* Mr. S. F. McManus, Box 1382R, G.P.O., Brisbane, 4001; *Assistant Secretary/Treasurer:* M. W. Prideaux; *Committee:* Messrs. S. Jones, W. Ramm, L. Ledlie, L. R. Wall, S. J. MacPherson, N. J. Mansini, J. P. Coneybeer, D. Fisher, F. W. Brown.

THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SOCIETY OF VICTORIA

PATRON: Sir Richard Kirby.

President: W. P. Evans; *Immediate Past-President:* A. P. Aird, Q.C.; *Vice-Presidents:* G. Polites, K. W. McDermott, R. D. Williams and A. E. Woodward, Q.C.; *Secretary/Treasurer:* J. F. Currie; *Assistant Secretary:* K. C. Piesse; *Assistant Treasurer:* J. R. Faichney; *Members:* H. H. Bishop, K. W. Hince, Professor J. Isaac, J. Robinson, E. P. Rogan, Dr. I. G. Sharp, K. C. Stone, L. C. Whitwell.

THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SOCIETY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

President: D. W. Oxnam; *Vice-Presidents:* G. A. Piesley, Professor I. Bowen; *Hon. Secretary:* P. H. Carville, c/o 569 Wellington Street, Perth; *Hon. Treasurer:* A. Petridis, Faculty of Economics and Commerce, The University of Western Australia; *Committee:* A. G. Barker, F. S. Cross, A. N. Hitchman, D. J. Scott, W. McBeath, J. Currie, A. Jones.

Volume 10 Number 2 July 1968

The Journal of Industrial Relations

The Journal of the Industrial Relations Society of Australia

Articles

Sydney University Press

Registered at the G.P.O., Sydney, for transmission by post as a periodical

A Review of Developments in Industrial Relations 1967/68

A. E. Woodward, Q.C.*

Melbourne

The year that has passed since your last Annual Convention has been one of quite unusual interest in the field of Industrial Relations. It has seen the end of a case which could have become a milestone in the history of industrial arbitration, but which now seems as though it will be remembered more for the problems it has created than for those it has solved. The year has also seen a dramatic locking of horns in the trade union movement, with little indication of the final outcome. Another major development has been the first pronouncement by the Commission on the vital subject of redundancy. Equal pay for women has become a very live issue. The basic wage has become a pretty dead issue, although I understand that, as a result of legislative heart massage, it is still clinically alive in this State (N.S.W.). The year has seen considerable disruption of industry—and, noticeably, essential services—by stoppages. All this has led to a great deal of public interest and debate on the theory and practice of industrial relations. There can seldom have been so many feature articles written about the arbitration system in one year.

I find it convenient to deal with the various matters I wish to highlight under the same headings as I used last year.

Disputes

Although authoritative figures for 1967 are not yet available, it seems that the number of man-days lost were about 3% less than in the previous year. The most significant improvements contributing to this result were in building and construction (down 40%), food, drink and tobacco (down 50%), and mining other than coal (down 30%). Offsetting these improvements were engineering, vehicle and metal manufacturing (almost double), paper and printing (seven times worse), and stevedoring (three times worse). On the other hand we must remember that the wave of stoppages following the Metal Trades judgment occurred after January 1 and was accompanied by unrelated stoppages in a number of other industries. Unless the balance of this year proves to be more trouble-free than indications would suggest, 1968 figures may make worse reading than those for 1967.

One disturbing aspect of the disputes of the last year has been the incidence of stoppages in essential industries and services. We have learned what it is like to have our mail services completely disrupted and our air services seriously interfered with. We have been reminded of what happens when our electricity supplies are reduced to the minimum, closing many factories, and how shipping congestion can be aggravated by waterfront disputes.

All these, and the general loss of productivity caused by stoppages generally, prompt some questions about the necessity for such stoppages. Certain it is that many people are prepared to strike today who would never have thought of it ten or fifteen years ago. The list includes air pilots, teachers, journalists, firemen, hospital staffs, architects, engineers, surveyors and draftsmen. This, together with a general public acceptance at least of short-duration stoppages, suggests that discussions as to the existence of a basic right to strike are rather academic. The Commonwealth compulsory arbitration system operates on the basis that only some strikes are illegal. The illegal ones are those carried out in defiance of an award restriction—usually in the form of a "bans clause". But these restrictions are based on the recent past conduct of the union concerned and have no regard to the merits or demerits of any particular stoppage after they are first inserted in the award.

Furthermore, it must be recognized that some future government could at least limit further the so-called penal clauses of the legislation. Thus the test of "lawful" or "unlawful" does not tell us very much.

I suggest, on the other hand, that it is quite unreal to say that all stoppages are equally blameworthy or justifiable—depending on your side of the industrial fence. I think the time has come to recognize frankly that there are such things as responsible and irresponsible stoppages—and that there is no hard and fast dividing line between the two.

I suggest that there are two questions which have to be asked before classifying any particular stoppage as justifiable or unjustifiable. The first of these is whether the stoppage is likely to assist in obtaining some legitimate object which is unlikely to be obtained by other means.

This involves subsidiary questions as to whether the employer is likely to be influenced by such pressure, whether the object sought is a legitimate subject for industrial action, and whether the same result could not be achieved by more peaceful means.

The second question is how much harm will be done to the employer, fellow workers or the community. The employer may be set back so much that he suffers real damage. Of course, this may in turn affect his employees, either by reducing his ability to pay good wages or by forcing him into more capital-intensive development to minimize such labour problems. It is easy to see how fellow unionists and the community can suffer.

The questions can best be answered by notionally putting oneself in the seat of the union leader calling the strike. The answers must then be weighed against each other before a decision can be reached. Obviously the answers to such questions will differ widely from one person to another. But I suggest that these are the questions which should be asked in each case—particularly by the public, who will really be the final arbiters in many cases. Certainly most political and protest stoppages would fail these tests. So would the metal trades stoppages during the course of the Work Value Case which were supposed to hurry it up but in fact delayed it. But what of those after the decision? In spite of the December judgments of Gallagher, J. and Mr Commissioner Winter and

all the fines imposed, amounting to upwards of $60,000, did they not find their justification—at least from a union viewpoint—in the later decision of the Commission which recognized non-absorption of over-award payments? Should we not, at least, draw some distinction between the merits of the two series of stoppages?

The Trade Union Movement

The Power Game

This has continued to be played out at Federal level, where it seems, particularly in the last few weeks, to have become mixed with the Labor Party's internal problems. The 1967 election of the interstate executive of the A.C.T.U. was seen as a victory for the left wing of the Movement, but I think this oversimplifies the position. In some cases at least, the abilities and character of the contestants seem to have played—as they should—a significant part. And although some issues tend to split the executive down the middle, it still seems able to speak with one voice on most matters. It is vital that it should do so, and one can only hope that the divisive influences will, not later than the next Congress, be resolved. I believe that firm central control of the union movement is essential to the industrial well-being of this country. Some quite powerful unions have recently challenged the authority of the A.C.T.U. The Transport Workers' Union, for example, has refused to attend meetings called by the A.C.T.U. to discuss demarcation disputes. And the secretary of the Amalgamated Postal Workers' Union has left the public in no doubt as to his views on the subject. Incidentally, I understand that his description of the A.C.T.U. as "the graveyard of industrial disputes" is not original. For example, it is on record that, when the same thing was said about the N.S.W. Trades and Labour Council, during Mr Bob King's time as secretary, he replied, "If you are handed a stinking corpse, the least you can do is to give it a Christian burial".

To return to the power struggle, it showed itself dramatically in the inability of the executive to fill the position of senior vice-president, following the sad loss to the union movement of Mr J. D. Kenny. This election was seen by most people as a trial of strength between supporters of the secretary and the research officer respectively—looking ahead to a time when the president may decide to lay down the cares of office. Since numbers were evenly divided between Mr J. Petrie and Mr R. Marsh and no one would change his mind, the position will remain unfilled until the next Congress.

In Victoria the division is deeper and more serious. There twenty-seven unions have refused to pay increased affiliation fees which were decided upon by a narrow majority, and, as a result, have been denied voting rights. The executive has drawn up a plan for the re-organization of the Trades Hall Council which may meet some of the objections of the dissident unions—but there are some aspects of the re-organization that they may not like. Unless they capitulate and pay their outstanding fees (variously estimated to amount to between $70,000 and $100,000) they will have no say in the new arrangements. It is said that both in Victoria

and Tasmania there has been talk of breakaway Labour Councils being formed. The probable lack of recognition by the A.C.T.U., employer organizations and governments would be likely to reduce such a move to an empty gesture.

One unfortunate result of the failure to pay fees has been the inevitable reduction in the THC's already overworked staff. The union movement will never be fully effective until it spends more on full-time officers and skilled assistance. Some unions have shown signs of recognizing this in the last year, but many subscriptions are still below the modest $16 p.a. suggested by the A.C.T.U.

National Wage Levels

The National Wage Cases of 1967 produced an all-round $1 increase in July.

The very length of the Metal Trades Work Value hearing had created an expectation of significant increases, but few had expected that the claim of $7.40 for the tradesman would be granted in full. However, the December decision did just this, among increases ranging from nil to ten dollars, with $1.60 for the process worker. This was followed in February by the Full Bench hearing which reduced for the time being all increases over $1.60 to 70% of those previously announced. This decision having gone a long way towards resolving the absorption argument, at least until the matter comes up for review next August, industry is now facing up to the next crucial debate—as to the "flow" of the increases into other awards. So far it is generally true to say that only the obvious and inevitable flow has occurred. Elsewhere, work value cases have been started but no clear picture has yet emerged.

Questions still to be answered include the following:

(i) Will tradesmen's rates in other awards retain their present relationship with that of the metal tradesman?

(ii) What will be the effect of the new tradesmen's rates on salaries of related supervisory staff in other awards? Would changes in such salaries have widespread repercussions in those awards?

(iii) Will the amount of inevitable flow from the Metal Trades Award be sufficient to enable it to be said that there has been a change in the general level of blue-collar wages, thereby making some change inevitable in other manual awards?

(iv) If some increases occur in all or most manual awards, will this necessarily lead to a review of white-collar standards?

(v) What will be the interaction between possible flow from the Metal Trades Award and the National Wage Cases this year and next?

Wage Fixation Theory

Work Value

The Metal Trades Case raised a number of interesting questions about work value cases. The Commonwealth put forward submissions designed to establish a more logical and less intuitive approach to such cases. The main point made was that any work value hearing should define the

relevant elements of work value and their respective importance. The factors suggested by the Commonwealth were substantially the same as those mentioned by Moore, J. in his judgment—"the qualifications necessary for the job, such as apprenticeship; the training required on the job; the attributes required in the performance of the job, such as mental and physical effort and dexterity, innate or acquired; the responsibility for work and equipment and for the safety of other employees; and any conditions of unpleasantness inherent in the job".

Although the Commonwealth constructed a series of alternative point scores for the classifications inspected, based on the evidence of its expert witness and giving different weights to the several factors, the Commission was not invited to do any more than have regard to these results in arriving at its necessary exercise of judgment. The methodical approach urged by the Commonwealth was rejected by the unions as too restrictive and as inappropriate for the particular job in hand. It received some limited encouragement from the employers and quite strong endorsement from the Bench—in general terms from Moore, J. and in considerable detail from Mr Commissioner Winter. Whatever may be said of detailed job evaluation procedures, the case for identifying and evaluating the different elements of work value in each case seems very strong.

One of the other problems raised by the Metal Trades Case was how to deal with a large number of classifications in a single award. Detailed inspections of each classification were impossible. One in ten or, at most, one in five was looked at sufficiently closely to enable a clear judgment to be formed by the Bench.

Broadly speaking, the two alternatives available to the Commission were to make assumptions about the remaining classifications or to ask the parties to bring their knowledge to an attempt to reach agreement about them in the light of wages prescribed for classifications which had been the subject of inspections and evidence. The making of assumptions, which the majority of the Bench was prepared to do, certainly offered some practical advantages—but it seems, with respect, hard to justify in terms of wage fixation theory.

Other interesting aspects of the Metal Trades Case included the following—

(a) the completely negative attitude of both employers and unions towards the tidying up of the award. In the words of Mr Brodney for the Australasian Society of Engineers, "Leave the award alone, warts, carbuncles and all". Among suggestions which appeared to find favour with the Bench were—
  (i) the splitting of the award into more manageable separate awards;
  (ii) the creation of some new classifications;
  (iii) the amalgamation and redesignation of some existing classifications;
  (iv) the rewriting of some job definitions;
  (v) the removal of unnecessarily small money gaps between classifications;
(b) the findings that methods engineering (by increasing the continuity and tempo of work) had made it more and not (by reducing fatigue and individual responsibility) less valuable;
(c) the willingness of the Commissioner and the unwillingness of the two presidential members to consider existing over-award payments as a factor in their decisions as to appropriate award wages;
(d) the acceptance by the majority of the argument that improved and intensified teamwork in the industry had increased productivity and thus increased work value—and the rejection of this argument by Moore, J. on the ground that such matters are best dealt with in National Wage Cases concerned with overall productivity increases;
(e) the concept of Gallagher, J. that while wages for tradesmen need not attract, they must certainly not deter potential apprentices;
(f) the wide extent of over-award payments by way of over-classification revealed in inspections and evidence; and
(g) the wide ranges of dexterity and concentration comprehended by the classification of "process worker".

Over-award Payments

I have referred to the question of absorption of over-award payments. This was the first crucial issue raised by the Metal Trades Decision. It is worth remembering that the unions were asked about this during the course of the hearing and said in effect that they could give no undertaking that they would accept such absorption. During the hearing a document was tendered in evidence which made it clear that at least the union shop stewards in Victoria would "bitterly resist" any absorption. Moore, J. in his dissenting judgment cast doubt on the practicability of general absorption at a time of full employment. But the majority declared that at least some absorption would be consistent with their intentions and that employers should be left free to decide what degree was appropriate. Naturally enough, employers generally decided that full absorption would be most appropriate and they endeavoured to close their ranks along these lines. Some of their members decided to be generous but any who attempted to compromise with a partial absorption received a frigid reception from the unions. A head-on clash was building up to major disruption when a reconstituted Full Bench of the Commission regained the initiative, changed the basis of the award by recognizing the fact of non-absorption, and reduced the size of the award by deferring 30% of it except at lower levels. It is fair to say that by this time the Commission found itself in a very difficult position and probably had little choice except to do something alone the lines it chose. But the difficulty of justifying the decision in theoretical terms was indicated by the absence of reasons. The decision was severely criticized by the unions, metal trades employers and the press.

It certainly created problems for those employers, such as the State Electricity Commission in Victoria, who were making no direct over-award payments and so had had to pay the increases in full, but were now entitled to reduce them. Others who were bound by some agreement to pay award increases found themselves in similar difficulties.

Looking back on this brief history of—

(a) a closing of ranks by the employers to ensure a major degree of absorption;
(b) an inflexible refusal by the unions to accept any absorption;
(c) major industrial strife;
(d) the Commission stepping in to retrieve the situation by a compromise—

it is interesting to speculate on which of these developments could have been avoided. Obviously the majority judgments anticipated that one of them could have.

Certainly some observers have suggested in the past that the elimination or reduction of over-award payments was something the Commission could achieve of its own motion. It now seems that this result can only be obtained (if it is desired) by reaching an understanding with the relevant unions before an award is made. Such an understanding seems unlikely to be achieved in the present economic climate.

Equal Pay

The first essential in any discussion of this subject is to define your terms. Obviously the average woman in employment will never earn as much as the average man because she is younger, less experienced, less skilled and, perhaps, less willing to accept responsibility. So, for example, where a husband and wife of equal intelligence and natural ability are both working, there will always be a tendency for the wife to earn less. This is because both the woman and her employer recognize that her continuity of employment is vulnerable. A woman may, whether she is married or unmarried, find it necessary or desirable at quite short notice to cease following her occupation.

We must therefore say that when we speak of equal pay we mean, at least, equal pay for equal work. But again we must be careful. It certainly does not follow that men and women whose work has the same description or title are doing equal work. This was made clear last year by the Full Bench in the Clothing Trades Case. Because of a possible difference in duties it does not necessarily follow that a female nurse should receive the same as a male nurse—it may be that it should be higher or lower. The work must be, in fact, the same before equal pay is awarded.

A ruling along these lines would be sufficient to cover those cases where women are doing work normally or frequently performed by men and doing it with the same degree of training, exertion, responsibility and so on.

But to get to the heart of the equal pay question we must speak not merely of "equal work" but of "work of equal value". If this principle were adopted it would extend to work normally performed only by women and would ensure that their wages did not suffer simply because it was women's work.

In this country the position is confused by the female basic wage which created an arbitrary distinction between the wages of men and women

in most awards and which has been carried forward into the total wage of each sex.

Apart from the importance of avoiding confusion, there is a vital practical reason for distinguishing between "equal pay for equal work" and "equal pay for work of equal value". According to one estimate I have seen, the former would cost about $25m. per year and the latter $500m.

How far have we moved towards equal pay in either sense? The position can be roughly summarized as follows:

Teachers

N.S.W. finished introducing equal pay in 1963.
S.A. began in 1966 and will complete the process in four years.
Tasmania began this year and will complete in five years.
Victoria began this year and will complete in three years.
Queensland began last year and will complete in two and a half years.
W.A. began this year and will complete in five years.

Public Service

The Commonwealth and Victoria have equal margins for equal work. N.S.W., S.A., Tasmania and, since last year, W.A. all either have, or are in the process of introducing, equal pay for equal work. I understand that Queensland lags behind the other States with no significant equal pay provisions.

In none of these public services does equal pay for work of equal value apply. In other words, "equality" does not extend to predominantly female work.

Private Enterprise

Equal pay for equal work has been extended by award to some N.S.W. industries. In South Australia legislation to permit this was introduced last year and similar legislation will be brought down, if found necessary, in W.A. Otherwise there is very little requirement to give equal pay even for equal work.

We come now to the Federal arbitral sphere. Here there have been four significant developments.

In the first place the Full Bench in the 1967 National Wage Case awarded a $1 increase in total wage without distinction between men and women. In doing so it said that the Commonwealth, employers and unions should investigate a policy for the gradual introduction of equal pay. Later, in the Metal Trades Case, the Bench again indicated that it would have awarded equal increases to males and females had it not been for a contrary agreement of the parties.

Secondly, claims seeking equal pay for females employed in private banks have been referred to a Full Bench. Thirdly, there is an appeal pending against a decision of Mr Commissioner Clarkson awarding equal pay to females employed in Commonwealth Hostels.

Finally, the A.C.T.U. has decided to launch a test case on equal pay.

This claim has not yet been lodged but there have been discussions between the A.C.T.U., A.C.S.P.A. and the High Council of Public Service Associations designed to co-ordinate their efforts to obtain equal pay.

It is interesting to speculate when these claims will be brought on. There is a considerable body of opinion within the union movement which wishes to press on with them. But there are obvious difficulties from the union viewpoint in getting these cases caught up with the National Wage Case expected to start on August 6 or with the continuing claims arising from the Metal Trades Work Value judgments.

The Basic Wage

One of the least significant events of the last twelve months has been the demise of the basic wage. I am unable to see this as anything other than a change in procedure—an assurance that National Wage Cases will deal at the same time with all elements of the wage. The Bench can still award a flat rate increase common to all classifications, a percentage increase, a variation of either or a combination of both.

Redundancy

This is another field in which there have been some interesting, but not definitive, developments in the last twelve months.

In the H. C. Sleigh case, the Full Bench of the Arbitration Commission has refused to order the employer to retain men in its employment but has done so in terms which would not rule out such an approach in another case. It has instead directed the parties to confer in an attempt to reach agreement on appropriate compensation for loss of employment. The only statement of principle is that employers about to introduce automation likely to disrupt employment should take employees and relevant unions into their confidence as early as possible in the planning stages. In return the workers should attempt to understand the employer's viewpoint and to co-operate with him.

One of the first decisions made by Professor Isaac in his arbitral role as the Flight Crew Officers Industrial Tribunal was a redundancy scheme for Ansett-A.N.A. helicopter pilots. In determining the amount of severance pay he would prescribe he took into account the specialized skill involved in the work; the reasonable, but probably not equivalent, alternative employment prospects; the career and retirement security which the pilots had appeared to have; the unsatisfactory handling of the matter by both the employer and the union; and (because of the special nature of the industry) prevailing overseas practice in the industry.

The order made was for one month's pay plus an additional month for each completed year of service up to a maximum of five months' pay. In addition there was a provision that these pilots should be given preference for re-employment with the company during the next two years.

The redundancy provisions of the National Stevedoring Conference will not become effective for some months yet, but already steps are being taken to encourage and assist transfers from ports with surplus labour to Sydney and Melbourne where there are shortages.

In the State jurisdiction in N.S.W., Beattie, J. laid down some guide lines on redundancy during a conference held on the new Broken Hill Industrial Agreement. These were—

1. To provide where possible and as a first aim, appropriate alternative employment. If, but only if, this were found outside Broken Hill, compensation should be paid for any loss of the equity in the worker's home up to, say, $2,000, and there should be a payment to cover removal costs, and low-interest loans for housing should be available.
2. Where employment cannot be found there should be a lump-sum severance payment, based on years of service, with an agreed upper limit. Again payment should be made in appropriate cases for any loss of equity in a home.
3. In return for such provisions, unions should co-operate to see that economic operations are maintained right up to the time of close-down.

In Victoria the S.E.C. has, by private treaty and not without some difficulty, reached agreement with the Trades Hall Council about appropriate redundancy arrangements for some of its employees who are likely to be made redundant by the closure of old generating plants. It is based on the pace-setting agreement entered into the previous year by the Gas and Fuel Corporation to cover the imminent introduction of natural gas.

As I see it, there are certain basic problems in most redundancy situations. These may be summarized as—

(i) How to direct most assistance to those who need it most and avoid unnecessary compensation.
(ii) How to keep the people the industry needs without putting on to the labour market those who are least able to find other employment.
(iii) If severance payments are to be an alternative to new employment, how to define suitable new employment and how to avoid a built-in incentive to dodge such employment.
(iv) If detailed provisions are made to deal with each case on its merits, how to avoid complicated administrative machinery.

Another problem which may arise, and could be serious if it does, is what can be done for workers when automation in an industry results not only in some employers dismissing men but also in other employers going out of business, with or without any sale of goodwill to other continuing businesses.

Arbitration System

The year has seen an interesting extension of the compulsory arbitration system in the creation of a special-purpose tribunal for pilots, navigators and flight engineers in the airline industry. This has been attached to the existing structure in a way which enables the tribunal to use the administrative facilities of the Commission; it can exercise most of the powers of the Commission and, relying on the Trade and Commerce power of the Constitution, it has been given a jurisdiction wider than would have been possible under the Industrial Disputes power. The legislation is framed in such a way that it permits the tribunal to be brought more closely within the framework of the Commission in that the tribunal's

powers could be exercised by a member of the Commission—either a Presidential member or a Commissioner. Another interesting aspect of the amending legislation is the power to appoint another person to exercise the powers of the tribunal in a particular matter, if the person holding the permanent appointment is unavailable. Finally there should be noted the important power under the Act to declare an association and to deal with it accordingly just as if it were a corporate entity and a registered organization. This has nullified the efforts of the Federation of Air Pilots to ensure that that body remained an unincorporated association, which it was virtually impossible to make accountable under the Act.

The other notable fact about the setting up of the Flight Crew Officers Industrial Tribunal is the identity of the first three-year appointee to this part-time office. Professor Isaac is well known in the Industrial Relations Societies of this country, particularly as the Foundation President of the Victorian society. His new task is a challenging and exacting one and it is fair to say that his work will be watched with great interest—not only for its inherent importance but also because it means that an expert academic economist has been appointed to an industrial relations tribunal.

There has been some recent discussion about the desirability of economists being appointed to the Arbitration Commission so that they can participate in cases involving national economic problems. If I may express a personal view on this matter, I am all for economists playing a more active part in National Wage Cases. But this does not require their appointment to the Commission. I would like to see a short list of economists who could be invited to sit with the Bench on National Wage Cases, to advise and assist generally, to take part in the hearing and in any subsequent discussions preceding judgment, but not to have to accept responsibility for that judgment. In this way the Commission would, over a period, have the advantage of a cross-section of economic wisdom. Difficulties about giving powers of decision to persons whose views on such matters were known would be avoided, as would the problem of what use to make of such persons between cases of national economic importance. They would not be lost to their academic profession.

Under this heading I touched last year on one field which had, to a point, been removed from the arbitration system to that of collective bargaining. I refer to the stevedoring industry. I do not yet feel free to discuss in any detail the developments in this industry, but I can properly say that the National Stevedoring Industry Conference continues to work remarkably well. In spite, or perhaps because, of the wide representation on it, and in spite of the clear conflict of interest on many matters, the Conference has been able to reach agreement over a wide range of subjects. So far nothing has arisen within its charter which the Conference has found itself unable to resolve. Such problems as have arisen in putting permanent employment into practice in five major ports to date have occurred outside the Conference. Some have been related to the new system and others have been coincidental. The problems have been at least as great as was expected and some of them are still troubling us. But none is inherent in the system and all can be solved. Speaking for myself, I have no doubt of the correctness of the Conference decision to introduce permanent employment.

Conclusion

In concluding, I should perhaps refer to some of the matters which might have been dealt with in this summary and are not. Some I have omitted because they are esoteric and although worthy of detailed study, are not part of the main stream of industrial relations in this country. This would apply to the New Guinea Public Service Case and to further developments concerning award rates for Aborigines in the Northern Territory and Queensland.

Other disputes, although attracting a good deal of attention at the time, and in some cases touched on in some aspect above, do not, in my selective view, warrant consideration in detail here. This applies to the stoppages of N.S.W. transport, the postal disputes, and also to the airline disputes concerning superannuation, Qantas flight stewards, and transport workers. The models and mannequins of Victoria have predictably attracted rather more attention than is usually accorded to inter-organizational squabbles. Actually there is an interesting industrial relations point lurking here, about people on that hazy borderline between employees and independent contractors. It has also arisen in relation to transport workers, but since the picture is still far from clear it can safely be left to a later time.

Finally, mention should be made of the reconstitution of the National Labour Advisory Council. It is clearly a good move in theory to provide for regular consultation between employers, unions and government on matters of common interest. It could assume an important place in the industrial relations of this country, and could show the way to similar bodies established at state level. How successful it will be depends firstly on how successful the participants want it to be, and secondly on the sort of personal relationships that can be established between its members; because personal relations are at the heart of industrial relations.

Reference

* A paper given at the Tenth Annual Convention of the Industrial Relations Society of N.S.W. at Terrigal, May 1968.