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dustries award, the classification and training standards of the award, and the fundamental conditions of employment contained therein. Current award standards must be maintained in the future.

Without strong adherence to this position, the painstaking work over the last few years to modernise regulation of the labour market could easily unravel into de facto deregulation. This prospect is very apparent in the willingness of rightwing unions to abandon the national approach to career paths and training in the scramble to market their services to managements anxious to rationalise union membership. In such marketing it is invariably the national standards of training and classifications which are jettisoned in the name of 'flexibility' at the enterprise.

If this sort of unionism gathers even greater pace, the opportunity to defeat Taylorism will be lost. It is already apparent that employers who are willing to concede sole coverage to a (usually rightwing) union, will demand in return a free hand in the area of work organisation. With such freedom, it is not surprising that employers are turning to neo-Fordist schemes of work organisation and training where new technology is used not to make work more interesting, autonomous and skilled, but to divide the workforce into a highly skilled elite and a mass of poorly trained workers with few prospects of advancement. In the brouhaha surrounding the recent single union deal at Southern Aluminium in Tasmania, it is just this point which has escaped attention. Important though the membership issue is, of equal importance is the plant-specific classification structure which provides no portability of skills, and very uncertain prospects for career advancement within a plant where the key skills are confined to technicians.

While many can see the dangers for union movement cohesion of intertwining union restructuring and 'enterprise bargaining', the adage about the weather holds good - everybody complains about it, but nobody seems to do anything. It's to be hoped that enough principle can be found to allow union rationalisation to proceed without the vital infrastructure of national and industry awards being trampled into irrelevance.

PETER EWER is a research officer for the AMWU national office. He is writing here in a personal capacity.

A MISTAKEN Enterprise

Meredith Burgmann contends that neither the approach of the ACTU nor that of the employers offers much to women.

Internationally, the struggle for equal pay has had varied results. One of the major factors inhibiting success in the industrialised countries has been the presence of enterprise bargaining structures. Those countries with the greatest reliance on decentralised wage fixing have the worst wages gender gaps (Japan and the United States) and those with the most centralised wage fixing systems have the smallest wages gender gaps (Australia and New Zealand).

The wages gender gap is defined as the difference between male and female hourly rates for the job. In Australia, women earn 81.7% of the male wage for every hour worked, therefore the wages gender gap is 18.3%. Although this is not acceptable it is the best rate in the world. In Japan, that much vaunted utopia of enterprise unionism and magical productivity, women earn an astonishing 44.3% less than men.

Japan, of course, is crucial in the enterprise bargaining debate. The Business Council of Australia (BCA), the rightwing think-tanks, and now the NSW government have looked at the Japanese economic 'miracle' and mistakenly equated productivity with enterprise bargaining. Far from being a rational system, enterprise unions in Japan grew up haphazardly in the chaotic post-war years, in many cases carrying on from the patriotic employee organisations which had been devised by the militarists. This process resulted in the formation of over 75,000 unions. For answers to the Japanese economic success we need to look elsewhere.

The other major factor in the wages gender gap is the existence of a strong trade union movement. To some extent, these two factors go hand-in-hand. It is the strong trade union movement that has been able to deliver centralised wage fixing.
A strong trade union movement is crucial because wages discrimination is essentially an industrial problem. Those countries which have sought to solve wages discrepancies by legal or bureaucratic means have failed. Many Canadian provinces and American states have tough equal pay legislation backed up by well-resourced and pro-active Pay Equity Bureaux yet they have failed to dent their wages gender gap (Canada 34.5%; US 29.7%) by more than a few percent. Complaints-based legislation cannot solve an industrial problem at the macro level. Individual women can achieve redress of grievance but the class of low paid work remains.

Why does enterprise bargaining operate against women workers? Women are historically located in the weakest, least unionised, least strategically important, most geographically diverse and lowest value-added manufacturing areas. Australia, in fact, has the most sex-segregated workforce in the OECD countries. So women’s capacity to bargain is restricted by their location in the economy as well as by other factors as such as socialisation, low status and a lack of English.

It is precisely these groups in the industrial relations system which are protected by centralised wage fixing. The wage rises won by the strong unions are shared with the weaker areas of the economy. However, under enterprise bargaining outside a centralised framework, a market-driven free-for-all develops, most aptly summed up by the adage “the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.”

Under these conditions, women suffer in two ways. First, they can be coerced into trading off wages and conditions. An all too familiar scenario would be “listen dears, either you all take a $10 cut or we have to close the biscuit factory/child care centre/boutique tomorrow”. The NSW government’s new Industrial Relations Bill specifically allows for this scenario. Enterprise associations set up under the Act can negotiate sub-award wages and conditions. As long as a minimum standard (at present set at a ridiculous $294) is adhered to, other hard-won conditions can be abolished. The employers (especially the BCA) are particularly interested in hours of work as a ‘flexible’ working condition, and attacks on maternity leave are also common.

The second way in which women’s wages will suffer is that some areas of industry will achieve massive wage blow-outs under enterprise bargaining. Militant sites in the building, metal, oil and other boom industries will achieve substantial wages agreements. This will have the effect of raising wages in the stronger areas which will then have to drift down to the shop floor. The debate within the unions and the Left over the past year has been confused. There has been some support for ‘enterprise bargaining’ from union officials who believe that it has been taking place in their industry for many years. Even Bill Kelty has been guilty of this misapprehension. What has occurred has been over-award enterprise agreements arrived at by negotiations at the union level. Rarely has true ‘enterprise bargaining’ taken place. The workers on the shop floor are generally the weakest bargaining unit for a variety of reasons – personal loyalty, inversion, the possibility of victimisation, among others. It is not an accident that the BCA, Nick Greiner, and John Howard all espouse enterprise bargaining. They want a quiescent and ineffectual workforce. With enterprise bargaining they will get it.

MEREDITH BURGMANN teaches in politics at Macquarie University and is a member of the Women’s Pay Equity Coalition.

FOOTNOTES

1. Because of the different data on which these figures are calculated, they cannot be treated as strictly comparable. However they are a good indication of the magnitude of the difference and are the most accurate figures available.


2. For further discussion of this point see National Pay Equity Coalition, Enterprise Based Bargaining Units: No Equity, No Unions, May 1990.