C2700

IN THE AUSTRALIAN CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION COMMISSION

In the matter of the *Conciliation and Arbitration Act* 1904-1975

and of

the *Public Service Arbitration Act* 1904-1973

and of

NATIONAL WAGE CASE—SEPTEMBER 1975

and of

THE METAL INDUSTRY AWARD, 1971

(C Nos 1128 and 1853 of 1971)
(C No. 1933 of 1974)

and of

THE METAL INDUSTRY AWARD, 1971—PART II—DRAUGHTSMEN, PRODUCTION PLANNERS AND TECHNICAL OFFICERS

(C No. 1909 of 1967)
(C No. 1978 of 1974)

and of

POSTAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIANS' ASSOCIATION (AUSTRALIA)
Claimant

v.

THE AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING CONTROL BOARD and others
Respondents
(C No. 3619 of 1974)

and of

THE PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION COMMONWEALTH PUBLIC SERVICE and others
Claimant

v.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD and others
Respondents
(C No. 3620 of 1974)

Variation of awards and determinations—Rates of pay—Principles of wage fixation, including indexation—Anomalies—Indexation of over-award payments—Relevance of principles to allowances and to new work for which there is no current rate—Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904-1975 *ss.* 34, 36, 39, 40, 41, 44A—*Public Service Arbitration Act* 1904-1973 *s.*15A—*Decision issued.*

On 30 April 1975 the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission (Mr Justice Moore, President, Mr Justice Robinson, Mr Justice Ludeke, Deputy Presidents, Mr Deputy President Isaac, Mr Public Service Arbitrator Taylor and Mr Commissioner Portus) issued a decision [167 C.A.R. 18] in connection with the above applications.

The applications came on for further hearing before the Commission in Melbourne on 29 July 1975.

R. A. Jolly, J. Marsh, R. Sweeney, J. Caesar, R. Scott and *R. Morgan* for the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

W. Richardson, G. Butcher and *E. J. Benjamin* for the Association of Architects Engineers Surveyors and Draughtsmen of Australia.

R. L. Gradwell and *K. Turbett* for the Postal Telecommunication Technicians' Association (Australia).

B. Holdorf and *W. L. Millford* for The Professional Officers' Association Commonwealth Public Service.

B. J. Maddern, of counsel for the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia and others.

P. McCormick, E. R. Cole, T. Orange, V. Moloney and *A. Fitzpatrick* for The Australian Public Service Board.

R. L. Gradwell and *J. Oldmeadow* for the Council of Australian Government Emp1oyee Organizations (intervening).

W. Richardson, G. Butcher and *E. J. Benjamin* for the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations (intervening).

G. J. Nicholls and *J. R. Andrews* for the Australian Public Service Federation (intervening).

P. Barnes and *B. Holdorf* for the Council of Professional Associations (intervening).

J. Sanders for The Australian Bank Officials' Association (intervening).

S. P. Crosland for The Australian Journalists Association (intervening).

B. M. Snedden, Q.C., C. Jessup, solicitor, and *D. Diprose* for the Master Builders' Federation of Australia (intervening).

M. V. Brown for the Commonwealth Medical Officers' Association and and another.

B. E. Hill, Q.C., and *J. Sacker*, solicitor, for The Colonial Sugar Refining Co. Ltd.

R. E. McGarvie, Q.C., *H. Nathan*, of counsel, and *J. Kennett* for the Minister for Labor and Immigration (intervening).

M. J. Sweeney, of counsel, for the Public Service Association of New South Wales.

J. A. Keeley, Q.C., and *P. Dalton*, of counsel, for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of Victoria and others (intervening).

J. Macrossan, Q.C., and *W. C. Lee*, of counsel, for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of Queensland (intervening).

P. Powell, Q.C., and *J. Coombs*, of counsel, for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of New South Wales (intervening).

L. E. Boylan for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of Western Australia (intervening).

A. Robinson and *F. D. Westwood* for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of Tasmania (intervening).

D. E. Packer for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of South Australia (intervening).

On 18 September 1975 the Commission issued the following decision:

On 30 April last we decided not to introduce indexation in principle though we did apply to award rates the 3.6 per cent change in the Consumer Price Index for the March quarter. We also set out in detail a package of principles of wage fixation (including indexation) which we asked parties and interveners to consider and subsequently to debate. It will be recalled that we then said:

> *'The Commission does not operate in an institutional vacuum and the outcome and the future of indexation will, therefore, depend not only on the Commission's decisions but also on the extent to which unions, employers, the Australian and State Governments and ultimately the public at large are prepared to lend their weight to the conditions necessary for the success of indexation.'[167 C.A.R. 18]*

We now have had a series of lengthy submissions which revealed differing attitudes. We have looked dispassionately both at the words and actions of the various institutions about which submissions have been made and they fall into three groups, those who are for or substantially for the package, those who are against it and those who fall somewhere in between.

ATTITUDES OF THE PARTIES, INTERVENERS AND TRIBUNALS

Governments

All governments support our indexation package. The Australian Government made very detailed submissions and suggested a number of changes some of which would have appreciably altered the package. It indicated however that it would continue its support if we decided not to alter our April proposals. We will discuss later some of these suggested changes, although in view of the decision which we have reached it will not be necessary to discuss them all. The State Governments did not support all the proposals of the Australian Government, and in turn they also suggested some changes, though not to the same degree as the Australian Government. Some of them indicated that they would take legislative and other action to give added support to the principles. It is in our view most significant that all governments in Australia should be in agreement to support our proposals, a unity of attitude which is in our experience unique.

Tribunals

The Industrial Commission of New South Wales, the Industrial Appeals Court of Victoria and the Tasmanian Wages Board have in general shown support for the decision of 30 April and have implemented our guidelines. The Industrial Commission of South Australia in its decision of 15 May also expressed its general support. The Western Australian Industrial Commission has already introduced automatic quarterly indexation and has not adopted all our guidelines and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission of Queensland, has in effect reserved its position about our package.

Employers

Amongst private employers, support was expressed by the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia and the Metal Industries Association, South Australia, by the major private trading banks, by the Master Builders' Federation of Australia and by CSR Limited and its subsidiaries. The rest of the private employers continue their opposition to any concept of indexation. It is based broadly on two grounds. The first is that on economic grounds any wage increase at all cannot be sustained and indexation is inflationary. The other is that no set of guidelines like ours will survive the realities of industrial demands and industrial conflict. The Australian Public Service Board expressed general support although it suggested changes in the guidelines.

Unions

The Australian Council of Trade Unions wishes the guidelines to be relaxed both as to the definition of 'changes in work value' and as to catch up and it wishes the guidelines to be extended.

It could be said of the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations that its original submissions amounted to a rejection of the package, but later it indicated that it was in much the same position as the other peak trade union councils.

The Council of Australian Government Employees Organizations, (formerly Council of Commonwealth Public Service Organizations), and the Council of Professional Associations expressed general support though they also sought changes in the guidelines.

The Australian Public Service Federation wanted changes in the guidelines as did individual unions which appeared namely, The Professional Officers Association, Commonwealth Public Service, the Commonwealth Medical Officers Association, The Repatriation Department Medical Officers Association, The Australian Bank Officials Association and the Public Service Association of N.S.W.

Having stated the positions of the peak councils of the unions we must also note that a considerable number of claims are being pressed in the field which are inconsistent with the package. Some of these claims are being accompanied by strike action which could significantly affect the community in an adverse way.

When we announced in April that we would embark upon our present course we said that 'we do not believe that all the evidence and argument which has been put to us can be said to have "proved" or 'disproved" the case for indexation'. We also said that 'indexation can either be a plus or a minus in terms of the interests of society as a whole [*Ibid* at p. 15] and that

> *'If we appear to be somewhat over-cautious about introducing indexation, it is because it is a momentous step going well beyond the old system of basic wage cost of living adjustments in scope; it is because we are concerned about the current difficulties which the economy faces and do not wish to add to them; and it is because indexation can have far-reaching consequences—economic, social and industrial—which may be good for the country but which, if the conditions we have set down for indexation are violated, will be seriously detrimental to the country. Violation even by a small section of industry, whether in the award or non-award area would put at risk the future of indexation for all.'[Ibid at p. 22]*

This should have made everyone realize how fragile the package really was and how easily it could be destroyed. We have before us material which indicates that there are some who appear not to be concerned whether it survives or not. Material about industrial action, about gains in the field and about arbitrated decisions revive the doubts we expressed in April about the future of indexation. We do not in this context overlook the economic arguments put by private employers which we will discuss later.

Criticisms of the Package and Suggestions to Improve it

Having expressed this note of concern we will now consider some criticisms of the package and some proposals to alter it. Although there have been some suggestions that Principles 1 to 6 should be changed, e.g. the State of New South Wales suggested six-monthly rather than quarterly examinations of the C.P.I. and the Australian Government that in the future the effect of movements in the C.P.I. might be discounted for the effect of indirect taxes, government charges and excessive wage increases, we are not persuaded to change any of those principles. The main arguments revolved around Principle 7, but because of the conclusion to which we come we do not think it necessary to deal with all the suggestions about this principle though we propose to deal with some.

We realise that the principles we spelt out effected a radical change in wage fixing principles and could have caused some problems of interpretation. To the extent that any of our following comments conflict with decisions either in this or in any other tribunal, they are intended to be constructive and not critical.

Principle 7(a)

The Australian Council of Trade Unions amongst others submitted that the words 'such as' in Principle 7 (a) 'changes in work value such as changes in the nature of the work, skill and responsibility required, or the conditions under which the work is performed' were intended to indicate that these factors were merely illustrative. This was not our intention in April and is not our intention now. We intend the examples used to be exhaustive and to remove any misunderstanding or doubt we will change the words 'such as' in 7 (a) to the word 'being'.

Our view in April to which we still adhere was that to extend Principle 7(a) to cover all previously recognized forms of work value assessment would be simply to superimpose indexation on wage fixing methods which in 1974 had created instability both industrially and economically. It is disturbing that this is not apparent to many unions and even to some arbitrators. With a multiplicity of systems, organizations and arbitrators, the pressure of historical relationships and the use of the comparative wage justice concept it is extremely difficult for a wage adjustment to be confined to a particular case. We do not intend that the doctrine of comparative wage justice—that universal test which means all things to all men—should be available to justify every wage increase whenever sought.

Another related matter which has caused problems is the time from which work value changes should be measured. Despite strong argument that one should go back to the last 'genuine' work value assessment we consider this is an exercise which in itself could cause endless debate. We therefore adopt as a *prima facie* position the pragmatic approach of a Full Bench in the Municipal Officers Adelaide City Council case (31 July 1975) when the Bench said 'the words are intended to relate to the last movement in the award rates concerned apart from national wage and indexation'. That prima facie position can only be rebutted if a party demonstrates that special circumstances exist warranting a departure from it. Should an application be made for an earlier starting point we envisage that the issue would normally be heard and determined as a preliminary matter. Further where the application is successful and the starting point claimed is earlier than 1 January 1970 only changes that have occurred since 1 January 1970 shall be taken into account and this is so even if there has never been a previous work value fixation. We do not agree that before a job bas been given a work value there must have been some formal process or announcement. The mere existence of a rate in an award is evidence of the fact that the job has been valued even if only by acquiescence. We take this view because we believe that although we should allow some latitude as to starting point, if we left the matter completely open, people might seek to indulge in protracted unhelpful historical exercises.

We must emphasise that changes in work by themselves may not lead to changes in the value of the work. The change should constitute a significant net addition to work requirements to warrant a wage increase. Thus, for example, the use of new equipment may call for more responsibility but if on balance, it also requires less skill and reduces mental and physical fatigue, no increase in work value may be involved in the change. Furthermore, changes in work and in the environment of work are a normal factor of industrial life and the principle of increasing the general wage level annually for increases in national productivity is partly at least in recognition of such changes. Changes in the value of money will not be relevant as they will already have been taken care of in indexation.

Where it has been demonstrated that a change has taken place in accordance with our guidelines, an assessment will have to be made as to how the change should be measured in money terms. This will involve the arbitrator in a difficult task of judgment. The evaluation must take into account that the impact of the decision has to be fitted into a wage fixation environment where increases in labor costs outside indexation and productivity are negligible.

Our final comment on Principle 7 (a) is that the expression 'the conditions under which the work is performed' does not refer to the non-wage provisions of an award which are often referred to as 'conditions of employment'. Our expression relates to the environment in which the work is done.

Principle 7 (b)

As to Principle 7 (b) when we spoke of 'last year's community movements' we meant one community and we meant movements in 1974. Some people have wrongly interpreted 'community' to mean a plurality of communities. It has been put to us that if we were referring only 'to one community, as in fact we were, we should change the principle to fit in with the wrong interpretation we have just referred to. This we decline to do. It was also not our intention that the $24.00 award in the Metal Industry Award should simply be converted into a percentage and applied throughout a salary scale. We were aware that we were departing from past practice and that some people would feel hardly done by but this was inevitable when a new and radical approach was attempted. Moreover we did not intend that paid rates awards should be accorded increases for 1974 which differ from those granted in minimum rates awards when community movements are being considered, nor is it relevant in the context of our decision to compare minimum rates with paid rates after they have been adjusted for community movements.

It was also put to us that the foundation of 7 (b), namely that 'a firm base has been widely established with appropriate relativities between and within awards on 'which indexation can be applied' was inaccurate and that further time was needed for the establishment of such a firm base. It was argued on behalf of both the blue collar and white collar workers that injustices had occurred and would continue to occur if we continued our stand. As we indicated in our judgment of 30 April we were aware then and we are still aware that there are groups who believe that their relativities are not correct. We also believe that the day will never dawn when the whole industrial community will agree that the group of workers is in a proper relationship with every other group of workers. We took a view which would give substantial justice and be in the best interest of society as a whole. Should we be persuaded to change 7 (b), we would allow the question of relativities to be reopened, which even if such reopening were confined to a limited time, would in our view inevitably destroy the fragile package we have presented. We also note that in the A.C.T.U's view 7 (b) is a transitional principle and claims under it should disappear by the end of 1975, a view which we share.

Anomalies

This leads straight to the question of anomalies which was raised by a number of people. The Australian Government for example asked us to add 'anomalies' and 'special circumstances' to the guidelines as situations in which increases could be granted, and variations of this theme were presented by the unions. We have given anxious consideration to this matter because we are conscious of the existence of anomalies. We have already pointed to 'the multiplicity of systems, organizations and arbitrators, the force of historical relationships and the loose application of comparative wage justice. These factors combined with an elastic meaning of anomaly create substantial difficulties in evolving a concept and a procedure to deal with this matter without opening the gates wide to claims and pressures for flow-on on a scale which would destroy the concept inherent in our indexation principles, i.e. that increases apart from national productivity and indexation should be negligible.

While we are not for the present prepared to add anything to the guidelines to deal with anomalies we are, however, desirous that something should be done as soon as possible to provide a procedure for resolving wage inequities while ensuring that the correction of particular inequities is confined. In order to try to introduce relief in this area we propose the following course of action.

Within two weeks the President will call a conference of all the principal parties to explain in greater detail the problems which we see in this area of anomalies. He will ask all those concerned to apply themselves to these problems and after such further discussions as he may deem necessary, to let him have their reactions to and comments upon the matters he will have raised. He will subsequently furnish a report which will be made available to the parties and thereafter debated before this Bench. We would hope that consensus can be reached but if it cannot we will have to consider what action could be taken about anomalies. The President will also seek talks with other tribunals to discuss these problems with them.

The Australian Government has proposed a mechanism for 'integrated reviews' both within industries and between industries which it considers would assist both in assessment of changes in work value and in dealing with anomalies. While we regard these proposals as a thought-provoking contribution to the debate before us, we cannot at the moment see how they could work as a matter of procedure and how the results sought to be achieved by the Australian Government could in fact be accomplished. We would however, ask the principal parties to give serious consideration to them and they could well form part of the discussions with the President which follows from this decision.

Other Matters

The Australian Government requested that we should make an order indexing overaward payments and the A.C.T.U. and other groups asked us to make a recommendation that they should be indexed. In the absence of more precise information both as to the nature and extent of overaward payments we are not prepared to make any global order or recommendation about them. We recognize however that there is a cogent argument in justice that at least some overaward payments should be indexed. We therefore express the view that it would not be inconsistent with our principles for individual members of the Commission after hearing the employers and unions concerned to recommend the indexation of overaward payments when award payments are indexed.

This is an appropriate point at which to repeat and underline a passage from our 30 April decision which of course relates not only to overaward payments:

'Regardless of the reasons for increases in labour costs outside national productivity and indexation regardless of the source of the increases (award or overaward, wage or other labour cost) and regardless of how the increases are achieved (arbitration, consent or duress), unless their impact in economic terms is "negligible" we believe the Australian economy cannot afford indexation.'[Ibid]

The question of the relevance of our guidelines to allowances has been raised. Our decision was not intended to preclude the adjustment of allowances from time to time where appropriate. However, this does not mean that existing allowances can be increased extravagently or that new allowances can be introduced, the effect of which would be to frustrate our general intentions. Our view on this matter is equally relevant to all other award conditions. As we said on 30 April *'the Commission should guard against contrived work value agreements and other methods of circumventing our indexation plan'.*

As to new work for which there is no current rate, we see no reason why an appropriate rate should not be struck in accordance with proper work evaluation. Reclassification of existing jobs would in our view however have to be determined in accordance with Principle 7(a). Matters which were part heard on 30 April should have proceeded according to the principles laid down in that decision and matters now part heard should be treated according to this decision. To the complaint that this is changing the rules in the middle of a case we answer once again that we are aware that many will feel a sense of grievance but we consider any other approach to part heard cases could create even greater injustices e.g. the difference between a case starting on 28 April 1975 and a case starting on 5 May 1975.

Decision as to the Future

In view of all the foregoing we do not think that we could responsibly introduce indexation on any permanent or semi-permanent basis now. It would have been open to us to abandon our attempt for a rational wage fixation system (including indexation) with its intended beneficial effect on industrial relations, employment and prices. The other alternative is, after a further trial period, to allow all concerned opportunity to see whether the package we announced on 30 April can be confirmed with the interpretations and alterations we have now given to it, and perhaps further varied following the President's conferences. We have decided to follow the latter course. The decision has not been easy. The reaction to the package has been mixed but even so the support for it from significant sections of the community, including governments, cannot be lightly brushed aside.

Having considered all the factors involved, including the time factor which has resulted from the length of this hearing, and in the expectation that our guidelines continue to be observed we decide that the following timetable would best serve the interests of all concerned.

1. After the publication towards the end of October of the C.P.I. for September, a brief hearing in accordance with the principles to decide how the Six Capitals figure should be applied to our awards. This will mean that award wages and salaries will be adjusted in relation to the September movement unless the Commission is persuaded to the contrary by those seeking to oppose the adjustments.

2. Soon after that hearing, a hearing to consider what increase, if any, should flow from national productivity movements.

3. A hearing after the publication of the C.P.I. in January next to consider both the December figure and the future of the package.

We point out that simultaneously with this programme the conferences conducted by the President will be going on and after we have received his report we will list it for debate as soon as practicable.

Decision as to June C.P.I.

All the unions asked that the 3.5 per cent movement for the June quarter should be applied by way of a full percentage adjustment to award wage rates. In this they were supported by the Australian Government and all the State Government. They were also explicitly supported by the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia and the Metal Industries Association, South Australia and by the Master Builders' Federation of Australia. The major private trading banks and CSR Limited and its subsidiaries made no submissions on this point. The bulk of private employers opposed the increase partly on economic grounds. They presented material which in their submission indicated that the economy was not able to sustain a wage increase which would add something like $770 million to the annual wages bill.

In April we traversed the economy in some detail and we do not propose to do so again. Despite the special efforts of the Australian Statistician the relevant statistical information available since then only covers a short term and it is notoriously difficult to assess change in the state of the economy on such material. The economic outlook for the immediate future continues to be uncertain and although there are some signs of economic revival, the unemployment rate is somewhat higher now than in April. We repeat what we said then, that from the point of view of ensuring rapid economic recovery and lower unemployment, the safest course would be not to add to wage costs at the present time. Added force is given to this point by the fact that for the 12 months ending May 1975 in relation to the preceding 12 months, the average increase in federal award rates was 32.l per cent for adult males and 39.6 per cent for adult females, compared to the average rise of 16.7 per cent in the C.P.I. for the year ending June 1975. But in the expectation of orderly wage fixation and the long term industrial and economic benefits accruing therefrom, it would be unrealistic to allow real wages to fall now. At the same time it is important to underline once again the critical economic situation we face and the urgency of conforming to the guidelines we have proposed. These will ensure that real wages would not only be maintained for the weak as well as the strong but would in due course also be increased gradually without unduly impairing economic recovery.

In April we said we would apply our principles to the June increase provided there had been 'substantial compliance' with Principles 7 and 8. Despite the evidence of non-compliance with those principles and there is quite a deal, we are of the view that there has been substantial compliance and that we are not precluded from awarding the 3.5 per cent June increase.

For these reasons, all awards and determinations before us will be varied accordingly. The increase to minimum wages will be $2.80 per week.

We warned in April that this hearing might be a long one and our worst fears were realized. We blame no one for this because it was an important case and there were many people with real interests who wished to place' material before us. But it does mean, as we anticipated, that we cannot award this increase from the normal date we had in mind without departing from the Commission's practice of not ordering retrospectivity in national cases. Our decision is that the increase will operate from the beginning of the first pay period to commence on or after today.

Final Conclusions

This Bench has now had the benefit of a number of hearings in which the implementation of a modern system of indexation has been seriously debated. In addition, we have had the unique experience of being able to observe an integrated indexation package in action over the period since 30 April 1975.

During the present hearings, counsel for the Australian Government said that 'the application of principles adopted with a full appreciation of the contemporary conditions after full argument and consideration is more likely to lead to a resolution which is in accord with equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case than the processes of what is often called 'palm tree justice' where each decision depends upon the individual views of the person making the decision'. If the decisions which we have made in this case are adhered to we believe there will be more rational wage fixation, substantial industrial justice and greater economic stability.

We believe public understanding would be assisted if we put in summary form the impressions which we currently hold.

1. This country cannot afford both indexation and unconstrained wage increases. Any suggestion to the contrary is both wrong and mischievous.

2. Of necessity, an integrated indexation package must pass through various stages of development if it is to achieve its maximum potential. That potential is seen to involve giving priority to the maintenance of each worker's standard of living through a combination of wage indexation and tax adjustments and the improvement of that standard of living through annual productivity reviews. To call this process a wage freeze is a misuse of the English language.

3. The progress of indexation through the various stages must be influenced by economic conditions. Any attempt to speed up wage movements by seeking increases outside our guidelines in current economic circumstances will kill indexation.

4. If indexation is abandoned, Australia is likely to return to the wage fixation wilderness of 1974.

5. We believe there is widespread and growing community support for the continuance of indexation and the development of its full potential. We are encouraged to take this view by the fact that the overwhelming majority of trade unionists and members of employer organizations have desisted from taking action to breach the principles.

6. We believe that, with certain exceptions, parties and interveners have taken up stances:

   (i) which support the general approach adopted by the Commission;

   (ii) which accept in principle the necessity for conditions limiting increases outside indexation and productivity reviews; and

(iii) which accept that, in the absence of consensus, the Commission must be the arbiter of what conditions are appropriate to each stage of development and consistent with prevailing economic conditions.

7. We believe the community concern at the present time is to inject the purchasing power of wages and without doubt, the Commission's indexation package gives that form of wage equity its best chance. As must be clear from what we have said, we are also concerned about claims which allege the existence of anomalies and we are anxious to find the means to deal with anomalies without endangering indexation.

8. We make this further observation. The successful implementation of indexation would be an achievement of significance beyond industrial relations. It would demonstrate the capacity of the community to rationalise the divergent aims and ambitions of its constituent groups in the national interest.

Form of orders

The variations of awards and determinations will operate from the beginning of the first pay period to commence on or after today. The variation of the awards will operate for a period of three months therefrom. Weekly rates payable are to be calculated to the nearest 10 cents and annual rates to the nearest dollar. Where necessary junior rates will be adjusted by the same percentage as rates for adults, namely 3.5 per cent. The form of the orders necessary to give effect to our decision under the *Conciliation and Arbitration Act* will be settled by the Registrar with recourse to a member of this Bench. The form of the determinations will be settled by the Public Service Arbitrator.

Hearing Details

1975.
Melbourne,
July 29, 30; Aug. 5-8, 12-15, 19, 20, 22, 26-29; Sept. 2, 4, 5, 8, 18.