The Collective Bargaining Unit

This is not an article on the pros and cons of the Public Administration Collective Bargaining Unit, but rather a discussion of the various issues related to a fundamental term and concept in the award of union recognition for a segment of employees and the consequent impact on collective bargaining.

The term collective bargaining unit refers to a class or classes of employees at a workplace in respect of which an employer has granted recognition to a union as the sole bargaining agent for collective negotiation purposes. This appears reasonably straightforward, but there is no definition in the Employment and Industrial Relations Act of what a collective bargaining unit is or comprises.

In terms of EIRA, a ‘class’ of employees refers to a group or category of employees listed in a collective agreement, provided that where there exists no such agreement, it refers to the work actually performed rather than the title or name of the post. So the work performed is an issue which needs consideration where there is no collective agreement in determining what constitutes a class and possibly an appropriate bargaining unit.

The type of work carried out by workers in an enterprise depends on the particular industrial sector in which it is operating and the economic role it has as well as by the fact that the groups of workers carrying out different tasks can be grouped into various divisions,– blue collar, white collar, technical, administrative, sales, manufacture, managerial etc. Previously there used to be arbitrary bargaining units based on the grouping together of ‘industrial grades’, ‘non-industrial grades’, ‘clerical grades’, ‘executive grades’ or ‘professional grades’. This, necessarily incorporates a number of classes and, in practice, problems can arise when recognition has been granted to, or a collective agreement incorporates, a number of classes.

It might seem obvious that at least in classes where there is some form of progression or promotion to a higher class, and therefore there is a similarity in basic core skills and duties, it would appear that the classes should be grouped together in one collective bargaining unit, which should not be fragmented. But what happens if a union has some members in for example technician grade, but not in senior technician grade? Or if two unions want sole recognition for different related classes which the employer feels should be treated, or had to date been treated, as a sole bargaining unit? Can an employer’s refusal to award recognition on the basis that this does not comprise an appropriate collective unit hold water?

There is also the possibility of grouping workers on the basis of qualifications or competencies

“So the work performed is an issue which needs consideration where there is no collective agreement in determining what constitutes a class and possibly an appropriate bargaining unit.”

(Continued on page 2)
required. This is reflected when such workers are grouped in a collective agreement on the basis of ‘Officer I’ or ‘Officer II’ with different salary scales, which in themselves incorporate various classes or sub classes. Sometimes the issue of qualifications required to apply for a job is held as a criterion which should be given consideration. However there have been requests for the fragmentation of for example a lecturer grade or a teaching grade based on the subject being taught. This would appear to be taking the case for self determination of employees to the extreme and causes headaches, primarily, but not solely, to management.

At the same time, the dynamics of the working environment sometimes necessitate the development of a new category of employees which might emanate from a recognised collective bargaining unit. This possibility could not have been foreseen and was not contemplated when the existing collective bargaining unit has been recognised. Do these employees have a right to be represented separately and to be recognised as forming a separate collective bargaining unit, possibly by a different union than the one recognised to date?

On a side note, the class of employment is very important because the seniority in the class is the criterion on which the last in first out principle is applied in cases of redundancies. It is thus important that the actual classes in a collective agreements are clearly spelt out to prevent the possibility of future headaches in sorting out perceptions of lack of fairness in trying and emotional circumstances, as redundancies usually are.

To further complicate matters, there is usually a standard clause in most collective agreements stating that the recognised union will remain recognised as the sole bargaining agent for the categories covered by the agreement so long as it retains a majority of employees covered by the agreement as members. This may prima facie appear to be quite straightforward. However, it is usually unclear whether this majority refers to a majority within each class or within the various classes as a whole. This has caused problems when another union, at some later stage, claims majority representation and requests sole recognition for a class or classes within the bargaining unit. A three way dispute usually develops between the employer, the recognised union and the union claiming recognition for part of the unit. These are not easily resolved.

Workplaces where 2 or 3 or even 4 unions are recognised in respect of different classes of employees exist. This is a cause of headaches to both HR and unions, especially but not exclusively in collective agreement negotiations. A case is often made by the employer that union fragmentation amongst his workers is not the best way forward for either the employees themselves or for the enterprise. However there is uncertainty as to whether concerns regarding worker fragmentation should be given more weight over the right to union association and representation.

There is also the issue of what happens when groups of employees are involved in a transfer of business scenario in the private sector. This is to some extent already catered for under local legislation, whereby the employees’ representative remains recognised in respect of the transferred employees until such a time as a new representative is in place. The situation with regards to employees, whether in a single class or in a number of classes, who are deployed / seconded / detailed / assigned from a government entity to another one, whether already existing or being set up through the amalgamation of other entities or departments, or from the public service to a government entity, is less clear.

A balance needs to be found between the employee’s legitimate right to association and representation and the practical implications of excessive fragmentation of a workforce."

"A balance needs to be found between the employee’s legitimate right to association and representation and the practical implications of excessive fragmentation of a workforce."

When setting out on any relationship, efforts to set off on a good note give that relationship a better chance of developing reciprocal trust. At the end of the day, any appropriate guidance or legislation which is available to all parties concerned would apart from helping to ensure a level playing field, decrease the possibility of disputes on such matters thereby avoiding strife at the crucial development stage.
The Wage Regulation Orders

The Wage Regulation Orders (WROs) are Subsidiary Legislation (SL) designed to regulate the minimum employment conditions for employees working in specific sectors of the local labour market (LM). There are 31 different WROs currently in force in the local scenario regulating various industries.

The conditions of employment mainly regulated by the WROs are the normal hours of work per week, the minimum remuneration of employees, the minimum weekly hours of rest, the minimum overtime rates, vacation leave, sick leave and special leave. The WROs however did not always regulate all these conditions mentioned above and in fact this was a gradual development whereby the competencies of the respective WROs were widened to reflect the ever changing labour markets (LMs) in which they were operating.

An example of this is the Construction Wage Regulation Order (WRO) issued through Government Notice (GN) 555 of 1953 which stipulated the minimum conditions of employment of employees as having a normal working week of 48 hours, two sets of minimum wages for male and female whole-time employees, minimum daily rest of an aggregate of one hour, minimum weekly rest of 24 hours, overtime rates of time and a half for all hours in excess of 48 hours per week and double time for work on Saturdays at time and half, Sundays at double time and customary holidays at the rate of double time in addition to the normal wage. It also provides employees with 24 days of holidays with pay, 15 days of sick leave on full pay and 15 on half pay after 1 year in employment, 2 days bereavement leave, 3 days marriage leave, 1 year injury leave and jury leave as necessary without any deduction from pay. This clearly shows the development of this WRO throughout the years from the date of its conception and the same is valid for all the WROs.

An important factor behind the development of the WROs are the relevant Wages Councils (WCLs) which were set up by the Minister if he was of the opinion that there was no effective means of regulating the conditions of employment of employees working in a specific industry. They were designed to function through negotiations between parties representing the employers connected with the industry, representatives of the employees and an independent side headed by a chairman. The agreements reached by the WCLs were then proposed and eventually promulgated as WROs by the responsible Minister.

Throughout the late 1950’s and 1960’s, WCLs for industries like the buttons, shirts, stockings industry, lace making industry, bakeries and confectionary industry, safety matches and candles factories, fishing industry and rubber industries were proposed but no Wage Regulation Order (WRO) did ever materialise in this regard. With all probability the remit of certain WCLs were widened to accommodate the industries just mentioned. An example of this is the safety matches and candles factories which were included under the remit of the Paper, Plastics, Chemicals and Petroleum Wage Council Order (WCO).

The first Wages Council (WCL) to be enacted was that of the Cinemas and Theatres on the 29th May 1952 while the last one was the Private Cleaning Services on the 25th May 1999. On the other hand the first WRO to be enacted was the Cinema and Theatre Wage Regulation Order issued late in 1952 through the GN 552 of 1952 while the last one was that pertaining to the Private Cleaning Services Wage Regulation Order, through LN 15 of 2001.

The origins of the Wages Councils and the Wage Regulation Orders;

The origins of the Wages Councils (WCLs) or Wages Boards as they were referred to lie in Australia where the Victorian Wages Boards Law was enacted in 1896 for the fixing of legal minimum wages in the sweated industries of Australia. The system attracted the attention of European economists and functioned continuously without any major social partners asking for their abolition for around a decade. At the time Australia was a colonial dominion of the United Kingdom (UK) and select committees of Parliament were sent to Victoria to study the Wages Board’s operation in order to find a possible solution to the heavy exploitation of workers in what were termed sweat shops towards the end of the 19th century in the UK. The sweating system was referred to as a complex social problem in an investigation carried out by the House of Lords
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which defined sweating as having no particular method of remuneration, no particular form of industrial organisation but certain conditions of employment these being unusually low rates of wages, excessive hours of labour and unsanitary workplaces. The result of this investigation was the Trade Boards Act of 1909, the origins of the WCLs in the UK. This Act is based upon the Victorian Act but it departs with the framework by targeting only 4 sweating industries and not over 40 as in the Australian scenario.

The UK’s WCLs structure expanded until 1962 when there were sixty councils in place covering 3.5 million workers, but after this date many WCLs were abolished and amalgamated and by 1990 there were twenty-six Councils functioning covering 2.5 million workers.

In the United Kingdom the WCLs set legally enforceable minimum pay rates for the workers under their jurisdiction, together with holidays and holiday pay, overtime rates and other terms covered by conditions of employment. Each Council consisted of an equal number of representatives of employers and workers, together with a maximum of three independent members nominated by the government who had a casting vote if the two sides failed to agree. The UK abolished the remaining 26 Councils in 1993 and in 1998 introduced a national minimum wage for all sectors.

A similar system is also present in the Fiji Islands where 10 WCLs and corresponding number of WROs are in force, the latter system being almost the exact counterpart of the local system. The Fiji Islands were as well colonies of the UK and so one can safely assume that the Maltese system was derived from the UK’s colonial presence in Malta when the Conditions of Employment (Regulation) Act (CERA) legislation was introduced. One thing is clear though, that the functions of the WCLs and the composition just described clearly indicate that the local organisation was derived from the UK’s system.
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When is Age Discrimination permissible?

The principle of prohibition of discriminatory treatment on the basis of age mainly emanates from Subsidiary Legislation 452.95, the Equal Treatment in Employment Regulations (LN 461 of 2004). These regulations give effect to a number of directives - Council Directives 76/207/EEC, 2000/78/EC, 2000/43/EC, 2002/73/EC and 2006/54/EC and apply to all persons as regards both the public and private sectors and including service with the Government in accordance with the Extension of Applicability to Service with Government (Equal Treatment in Employment) Regulations (SL 425.100).

The Regulations put into effect the principle of equal treatment in relation to employment by laying down minimum requirements to combat discriminatory treatment on a number of grounds, which include age. An important point is that the regulations apply to all persons in relation to conditions for access to employment, including the advertising of opportunities for employment, selection criteria and recruitment conditions, whatever the branch of activity and at all levels of the professional hierarchy, including promotions. It is expressly stated that It shall be unlawful for a person to subject another person to discriminatory treatment, whether directly or indirectly, on the grounds of age. However, “any difference of treatment based on a characteristic related to grounds of ... age ... shall not constitute discriminatory treatment where by reason of the nature of the particular occupational activities concerned, or of the context in which they are carried out, such a characteristic constitutes a genuine and determining occupational requirement provided that the objective is legitimate and the requirement is proportionate” (Regulation 4).

The Employment and Industrial Relations Act (Cap 452), by virtue of which the aforementioned regulations have been promulgated, tackles the issue of age in relation to employment in article 36 (14) thereof. Indeed, the latter states that the employer can terminate the employment of an employee when the employee reaches pension age as defined in the Social Security Act. It is clear from the wording that EIRA does not in any way preclude recruitment of persons of a pensionable age. EIRA is giving any employer the right to terminate an employee’s employment relationship upon the employee’s reaching of the national retirement age. This has been accepted by the ECJ in a number of cases.

In Palacios de la Villa v. Cortefiel Servicios SA (C-411/05), the ECJ stated that directive 2000/78 does not preclude a Spanish law permitting clauses in collective agreements that allow employees to be compulsorily retired when they reach a specified age. In Rosenblad v. Qeierking Gebäudeninigungsges (C-45/09), the ECJ held that a German law allowing the employer to agree with employees under a collective agreement that they must retire when they become entitled to a pension could be justified. German law provides that a clause allowing for the automatic termination of a contract of employment when an employee has reached the age when he or she is entitled to a state pension may escape the prohibition on the ground of age. Such clauses may be implemented by collective agreement. The ECJ ruled that the German law does not breach the prohibition on age discrimination in the Framework Directive (2000/78/EC). The ECJ said that the German Government had in mind the legitimate aim of seeking to promote access to employment by means of "better distribution of work between the generations". The termination of the contracts of employment of retiring employees directly benefits young workers by making it easier for them to find work, which is otherwise difficult at a time of chronic unemployment. The rights of older workers are adequately protected as most of them wish to stop working as soon as they are able to retire, and the pension that they receive serves as a replacement income once they lose their salary. The automatic termination of employment contracts also has the advantage of not requiring employers to dismiss employees on the ground that they are no longer capable of working, which may be humiliating for those who have reached an advanced age.

What is important in this decision is that the ECJ observed that German law does not force employees to withdraw from the labour market as it prevents a person who intends to continue to work beyond retirement age from being refused employment on the ground of age.

The European Court of Justice (ECJ) has delegated the application of age limits for the recruitment of certain professionals, such as dentistry and fire fighting, to the authority of the national courts, due to the health responsibility of those professions. Directive 2000/78/EC prohibits discrimination on grounds of age in the field of employment and occupation. However, the directive does not preclude national measures which are necessary for the protection of health. It also allows the national legislature to provide, in certain cases, that a difference of treatment, although based on age or a characteristic related to age, is not discrimination and is not therefore prohibited. The ECJ noted that a difference of treatment based on a characteristic related to age is thus permissible where, because of the nature of an occupational activity or the context in which it is carried out, that characteristic constitutes a genuine and determining occupational requirement. A difference of treatment on grounds of age may also be accepted if it is necessary for the protection of health or if it is justified by a legitimate aim, including employment policy, labour market and vocational training objectives. The Land of Hesse (Germany) has a maximum age of 30 for the
The Industrial Tribunal
Part 1 (Structure and Jurisdiction)

Introduction

On the 23rd February 2005 the Court of Appeal (Civil, Inferior - Judge Philip Sciberras) delivered a decision in the case ‘Rita Nehls -vs- Sterling Travel & Tourism Limited’ where it skilfully articulated a synopsis of the evolution of the Industrial Tribunal in Malta. In brief, the introduction to this decision, recounts that:

The Industrial Tribunal, with exclusive jurisdiction to hear and decide upon all cases related to alleged unfair dismissals and trade disputes, was originally set up in 1976 in force of the Industrial Relations Act (Cap. 266) when employment in Malta was mainly regulated by the Conditions of Employment (Regulations) Act (Cap. 135).

These two Acts were consolidated in the year 2000 by means of the Employment and Industrial Relations Act (Cap. 452). This Act while, in essence, retaining the provisions of the previous two acts, introduced fresh concepts. In particular, with the amplification of what constitutes an unfair dismissal, the judicial competence of the Industrial Tribunal was extensively broadened and came to also embrace jurisdiction to hear and decide upon pleas regarding, amongst others, discrimination and harassment.

Structure of the Industrial Tribunal

After consultation with the Malta Council for Economic and Social Development, the Prime Minister appoints a panel of not more than fifteen persons to act as chairpersons of the Industrial Tribunal, provided that at least three of them shall be advocates of at least seven years experience. These chairpersons are appointed for a period that does not exceed three years from the date of their appointment and may be re-appointed for further periods of not more than three years each.

The Prime Minister, again after consultation with the Malta Council for Economic and Social Development, may vary the composition of the said panel. However, when the appointment of a serving chairperson is not renewed, that chairperson shall continue to hear and conclude those pending cases previously assigned to him.

The Minister, hereinafter meaning the Minister from time to time responsible for Employment and Industrial Relations, appoints two panels of persons to serve as members of the Tribunal when so required. One of these panels is to consist of persons nominated by trade unions while the other panel is to consist of persons nominated by employers’ associations and other organisations representing employers. Nominating bodies have to be represented on the Malta Council for Economic and Social Development.

The Minister, again after requesting fresh nominations from the abovementioned trade unions, associations and organisations, may vary the composition of the said panels of members. However, the name of a member serving on pending cases shall not be removed from the list.

The Minister also designates a public officer to act as Secretary of the Tribunal and may also detail other public officers to assist the Secretary in the performance of his duties. The Secretary has the same powers and duties as those vested in the Registrar of Courts by the Code of Organisation and Civil Procedure. He also has the duty to verify written requests by any party claiming back legal fees charged in excess of those taxed by the Tribunal or, in the absence of such taxation, in excess of the applicable tariff. If the claim is so verified, the Secretary shall order the person to whom the excess charges were paid to refund said charges to the payer thereof.

Trade Disputes, where the matter does not concern bodies corporate established by law and managed by a board or other body appointed by the Government or to persons employed with companies in which the Government has a controlling interest, are heard and decided upon by a Tribunal chaired by one of appointed chairpersons and two other appointed members who shall be selected by the chairperson. To ensure as far as possible a fair and equal representation of the parties in dispute, one of these members is to be selected from the aforementioned persons nominated by the trade unions and the other is to be selected from the persons nominated by the aforementioned bodies representing employers. However, before appointing the said members, the Chairman is to establish a time limit within which the parties in dispute are given the opportunity to agree upon the selection thereof. Should the parties, within the established time limit, agree upon the two persons, chosen from the aforementioned panels, the Chairperson shall make the selection according to that agreement.

Trade Disputes, where the matter concerns bodies corporate established by law and managed by a board or other body appointed by the Government or to persons employed with companies in which the Government has a controlling interest, are heard and decided upon by a Tribunal chaired by one of appointed chairpersons, a member selected by the Chairperson of the Tribunal from the aforementioned panel of persons nominated by trade unions and a member representing the
government, or other body or company involved in the trade dispute who shall be appointed ad hoc by the Minister.

**Alleged grievances that fall within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal as dictated per Title 1 of the Act** are heard and decided upon by the Tribunal chaired by one of the abovementioned appointed advocates.

**Alleged unfair dismissals** are heard and decided upon by the Tribunal chaired by one of the aforementioned appointed Chairpersons.

**Jurisdiction**

In many a case, the competence of the Industrial Tribunal to continue with the proceedings is often a bone of contention between the parties in litigation and the Tribunal's positive or negative decision (mainly preliminary) regarding such dispute is often referred to the Court of Appeal (Civil, Inferior).

Although the ordinary run of the mill appeals regarding the jurisdiction of the Tribunal follow a judgement delivered by the Tribunal itself, there have been instances where the question of the competence of jurisdiction of the Tribunal was referred to the Court of Appeal (Civil, Superior) following judgements, mainly regarding breach of contracts of employment, delivered by the First Hall of the Civil Courts.

Following the enactment of the EIRA, the first decision concerning the competence of jurisdiction of the Tribunal delivered by the Court Of Appeal (Civil, Inferior) was the aforementioned judgement ‘Rita Nehls -vs- Sterling Travel and Tourism Limited’.

The appeal was lodged by the defendant when a preliminary decision by the Tribunal retained that, in terms of the EIRA, it was empowered to continue with the proceedings even though the matter concerned a definite contract of employment, thus departing from the previous norm under the IRA where it was retained that matters concerning definite contracts did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. The Court of Appeal confirmed the Tribunal's decision and added that, in force of the EIRA, the exclusive competence of jurisdiction of the Tribunal was considerably amplified and came to include not only all cases concerning unfair dismissals but also those matters assigned to it under Title I of the Act.

The competence of jurisdiction of the Industrial Tribunal was also considered at length by the First Hall of the Civil Courts and by the Superior Court of Appeal (Civil) in the case ‘Karmenu Vella -vs- General Workers’ Union’ where the applicant, after having resigned from his employment with the defendant, had filed a writ of summons in the First Hall of the Civil Courts claiming that, in view of the memorandum of understanding then governing his employment, he was still entitled for the payment of a sum equivalent to three months wages and a further sum in lieu of outstanding vacation leave previously not availed of. The Union challenged the claim and lodged a preliminary plea claiming that the matter fell under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Industrial Tribunal.

In the case ‘Simon Grech -vs- MH Malta Limited (C-16025) gja Hetronic Malta Limited’ (First Hall, Civil Court - 31st May 2010 - The Hon. Mr. Justice Joseph Zammit McKeon) the Court held that in cases concerning ‘Protection Against Discrimination Related to Employment’ the Tribunal has jurisdiction as dictated by the Act.

On the 30th September 2010, after meticulous considerations, the First Hall of the Civil Court, presided by the Hon. Mr. Justice Joseph Zammit McKeon, retained that the Industrial Tribunal has exclusive jurisdiction to hear and decide upon all cases of alleged unfair dismissal and over those cases carried under Title I of the Act where it is so dictated. In this preliminary decision the Court determined that the Industrial Tribunal does not have any jurisdiction in matters related to the ‘Employment Relations Board’ whilst matters related to ‘Recognised Conditions of Employment’ and ‘Protection of Wages’ are to be determined by the Ordinary Courts.

Following an appeal filed by the defendant, this preliminary decision was confirmed by the Superior Court of Appeal (Civil), (11th November 2011 - The Hon. Mr. Chief Justice Silvio Camilleri, The Hon. Mr. Justice Albert J. Magri and The Hon. Mr. Justice Tonio Mallia).

In a nutshell, as clearly defined by Section 74 of the Act, Trade Disputes are to be referred to the Industrial Tribunal and, as dictated per Section 75, notwithstanding any other law, the Industrial Tribunal has the exclusive jurisdiction to consider and decide all cases of alleged unfair dismissals and all cases falling within its jurisdiction under Title I of the Act.

*End of Part One*
recruitment of officials in the intermediate career in the fire service. The age limit is intended to guarantee the operational capacity and proper functioning of the professional fire service. In the Wolf case (C-229/08), Colin Wolf applied to the City of Frankfurt for an intermediate career post in the fire service. His application was not considered, because he was over the age limit of 30. He was 29 when he applied, but would have been 31 on the date of the next recruitment. In its judgment in the Wolf case, the ECJ found that the directive does not preclude that age limit as laid down by the Land of Hesse for recruitment to intermediate career posts in the fire service. The difference of treatment on grounds of age produced by that age limit fulfils all the conditions for justification laid down by the directive. Thus the concern to ensure the operational capacity and proper functioning of the professional fire service constitutes a legitimate aim. In addition, the possession of especially high physical capacities may be regarded as a genuine and determining occupational requirement for carrying on the occupation of a person in the intermediate career of the fire service. The need to possess full physical capacity to carry on that activity is related to the age of the persons in that career, since, according to scientific data submitted by the German Government, very few officials over 45 years of age have sufficient physical capacity to perform the fire-fighting part of their activities.

In Petersen v. Berufungsausschuss für Zahnärzte (C-341/08), the ECJ was asked to address the age limit set by the German Social Security Code according to which admission to practice as a panel dentist in the national statutory health insurance scheme expires at the end of the calendar quarter in which the dentist reaches the age of sixty-eight. Ms. Petersen, admitted to provide panel dental care since 1974, reached the age of sixty-eight in April 2007. When the Admissions Board for Dentists decided that her authorization to practice as a panel dentist would expire at the end of June 2007, she appealed the decision. A Member State may legitimately consider it necessary to set an age limit for the practice of a medical profession such as that of a dentist in order to protect the health of patients. However, the judgment concluded that the measure in the present case lacked consistency, as the age limit applied only to panel dentists. Outside the panel system, dentists could practice their profession regardless of their age. Therefore, the measure could not be regarded as necessary for the protection of patients’ health. However, according to the judgment, this does not mean that the measure is necessarily prohibited by the Directive. The Court held that an age limit could be admissible where its aim is to facilitate access to employment by younger dentists if, taking into account the situation in the particular labor market, the measure is appropriate and necessary for achieving that aim. In that context, the Court concluded that the age of sixty-eight would appear to be sufficiently high to serve as the endpoint of admission to practice as a panel dentist. Consequently, the Court determined that it is for the national court to identify the aim pursued by the age limit for panel dentists and decide accordingly about its permissibility under the Directive.

In a nutshell, our law prohibits discrimination at the very first stance of access to employment and selection criteria on the ground that the applicant trying to access a particular employment is of a particular age, including a pensionable age. However as is stated in our implementing law and also as ruled by the ECJ, “national legislation which sets the maximum age for recruitment to intermediate career posts in the fire service at 30 years may be regarded, first, as appropriate to the objective of ensuring the operational capacity and proper functioning of the professional fire service and, second, as not going beyond what is necessary to achieve that objective”. (par 44 – Wolf case).

The DIER participated in two major events in 2012 by setting up information stands to provide knowledge and guidance to visitors and other participants on industrial and employment relations. In October it participated in the Foundation for Human Resource Development (FHRD) one-day Annual Conference at the San Gorg Corinthia Hotel in St. Julians. The theme of the conference was The Challenge, Our Journey, The Outcome. In late November the DIER hence participated in the Business and Careers Forum at the University of Malta organised by the University Students’ Council where an effort was made to inform students of basic rights in employment arising from EIRA.

The DIER stands were equipped with a banner and a stand containing inhouse produced leaflets regarding different aspects of conditions of employment. These leaflets can be viewed online through the following link http://www.industrialrelations.gov.mt/industryportal/publications_and_archives/publications/leaflets2.aspx

Set Up of a DIER Leaflet Stand Holder at the Malta College of Arts, Science and Technology (MCAST)

In December a Leaflet Stand Holder was installed for permanent exhibition at MCAST. The Department would like to thank the MCAST management involved for their kind collaboration and for providing the necessary space in the College Library. The aim of this collaboration is that to raise awareness about employment rights among students especially those about to enter the labour market.
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