

**STATUTORY MINIMUM ANNUAL HOLIDAY AND EMPLOY-
MENT PROTECTION : REPORT OF THE INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS COMMITTEE.**

Presented to the States on the 4th November, 1980.



STATES OF JERSEY

STATES GREFFE

1980

Price: 50p.

175

P-137

REPORT.**INTRODUCTION**

Members of the States will recall that the following propositions were lodged on 3rd June, 1980—

Statutory Minimum Annual Holiday— P.77.
Deputy N.S. Le Brocq.

Employment Protection— P.78.
Senator R.J. Shenton.

Amendment to Proposition regarding Employment Protection— P.79.
Social Security Committee.

Amendment to Proposition regarding Employment Protection— P.80.
Deputy N.S. Le Brocq.

Deputy N.S. Le Brocq, P.77, Statutory Minimum Annual Holiday.

This proposition charges the Industrial Relations Committee to prepare legislation to introduce a statutory minimum annual holiday graduated from 1 day after 1 month's employment to 15 days holiday, where the normal working week is 5 days, or 18 days' holiday where the normal working week is 6 days after 12 months' employment. It is assumed that the Proposer intends the minimum holiday to be with pay although this is not specified. Therefore the effect of this proposition is to give a minimum annual holiday after 12 months employment of 15 days based on a 5 day working week or 18 days based on a 6 day working week with three weeks wages or salary as payment.

This proposition had formed part of an earlier proposition, P.155 of 1979 lodged and subsequently withdrawn by Senator Shenton.

Senator R.J. Shenton, P.78, "Employment Protection".

This proposition charges the Industrial Relations Committee to prepare legislation—

- (a) to introduce statutory minimum remuneration for a 40 hour week (£42 p.w. for persons aged 21 years);

- (b) to introduce statutory remuneration for an employee required to work on a public holiday— the employee to be paid at the appropriate overtime rate and receive a day in lieu;
- (c) to require employers to publicise (a) and (b);
- (d) to introduce penalties for non-compliance with (a),(b) and (c).

Social Security Committee, P.79— An amendment to P.78.

The effect of this amendment would be to protect the employment of disabled and handicapped persons by exempting them and their employers from the legislation.

Deputy N.S. Le Brocq, P.80— An amendment to P.78.

The minimum rate of remuneration proposed in P.78 is based on certain U.K. Wages Council rates (these are now obsolete). This amendment proposes—

- (a) to tie the minimum remuneration rate to Parish Welfare Benefit paid to a married couple;
(N.B. the rate of benefit will be £49.40 from 1st October, 1980);
- (b) to maintain parity in future;
- (c) that hours worked in excess of 40 hours should be paid at overtime rates of time and a half.

Members will also recall that the States Assembly decided to refer these propositions and amendments to the Industrial Relations Committee and receive a Report from that Committee before agreeing to debate any of the propositions. The foregoing resumé indicates the complexity of these far reaching proposals.

In order to obtain as broad a spectrum of opinion as possible the Committee through the Jersey Gazette invited any member of the public, Company or Organisation to submit their views on the propositions. The Committee wishes to thank those who responded. The Committee also thanks the Economic Adviser for his report on P.78 and the Management of the Jersey Evening Post for information.

These submissions, together with the Committee's own examination and assessment of the propositions, the

implications of the effects and costs of implementation are essential to the report.

Several appendices are attached to the report for further information.

This report covers the four propositions and is now presented in response to the directive of the States' Assembly.

In drawing up this report the Committee has examined the propositions under four main headings—

- I. The extent and justification of the need for legislation.
- II. The cost of implementing legislation.
- III. The effects of implementing legislation.
- IV. Further comments.

I. THE EXTENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION.

Before enacting legislation it is necessary not only to establish and demonstrate the need but also to ensure that the proposed legislation is correct for the need—

1. With regard to P.78— (Statutory minimum wage).
 - (a) The Committee does not suggest that wages are generous for every member of the basic Island workforce of 33,000 but has no evidence that many employees receive less than the minimum wage proposed in P.78: namely £42 for employees aged 21 for a 40 hour week unless there is a trade agreement. The Industrial Relations Advisory Officer received 664 enquiries and complaints between January and August, 1980 and of these only 9 concerned low basic wages.
 - (b) The Jersey Evening Post 'Phone-in' conducted on 17th October, 1979, received 40 complaints; analysis showed that 36 could probably have been resolved by reference to the IRAO— For example complaints from hairdressers about low basic wages frequently take no account of gratuities, commission on sales and services which are part of the wages structure or the fact that many employees are either apprentices

or trainees who do not work a 40 hour week—. The 'Phone-in' was a useful indicator of the extent and nature of the problem and appeared to record some instances of employees receiving less than the remuneration already laid down by agreements— Conversely some complaints were about remuneration which was being paid in accordance with agreements. It will be recognised that it is not always possible during a 'Phone-in' to ascertain all the relevant detail—

- (c) The explanatory note to P.78 repeats the explanatory note of P.155 of October 1979. Senator Shenton says that as a politician "I have found myself very frustrated at times to discover persons in employment earning less than what one considers to be a just wage". The Senator cites two individuals whom he met in the summer of 1979— one was 'grossly underpaid' and the other received no premium payment for working on a public holiday. Senator Shenton also states that "It is my belief that in a community such as ours the sum of £42 for an adult person working a 40 hour week is very low, but regrettably I am still receiving information that people are being paid less than this for working much longer hours". Such information has not been made available to the Committee. The proposition gives no further evidence of the need for extensive legislation. With regard to P.80 which amends the amount of the minimum rate to equate with the rate of Parish Welfare Benefit this amount may in some instances be in excess of the rate of pay reached in trade agreements— therefore if either P.78 or P.80 is accepted by the States in its present form, agreements entered into by employers and employees or employee representatives could be over-ruled by legislation.

2. With regard to P.77 Statutory Minimum Annual Holiday—

- (a) The Committee has no evidence which suggests a public demand for a statutory minimum annual holiday. Of the 664 enquiries and complaints received by the Industrial Relations Advisory Officer between January and August 1980 only one concerned lack of an annual holiday and four concerned duration of annual holiday.
- (b) No comment, apart from one anonymous letter, in favour of a statutory holiday was received as a result

of the publicity attendant on the lodging of the proposition or in response to the notice in the Jersey Gazette.

- (c) Deputy N.S. Le Brocq in this proposition has re-introduced part of a proposition P.155 of 1979 which Senator Shenton had withdrawn. The brief explanatory note merely states this fact. The explanation of the withdrawal by Senator Shenton reads as follows "In the course of discussions with concerned parties I have discovered that although my proposition is in the main supported, there is a feeling that holidays and overtime are something which should be left to individual negotiation. I have been persuaded into believing that employees not covered by Union agreements would be fairly treated, but if in the future I should discover that this is not the case, then I would have no hesitation in bringing forward a proposition on the lines previously expressed".

3. It will be seen from paragraphs 1 and 2 of this section that the Industrial Relations Committee has, as yet, no evidence of the need to introduce statutory legislation to establish either statutory minimum remuneration or statutory minimum annual holiday.

However without anticipating the States decision on the propositions P.77 and P.78 the Industrial Relations Committee must ask "is the proposed legislation correct for the need?"

(a) Adult Age

The proposition P.78 is based on certain U.K. 1979 Wages Council rates which are now obsolete. The present adult rate commences at 20 years of age which it is understood will be reduced to 18 years of age by 1982. Many Union agreements already accept 18 years of age as qualifying for the adult rate. The Committee must advise that in order to prevent anomalies if legislation is introduced careful consideration should be given before maintaining an adult age of 21 years.

(b) Rate of minimum remuneration

Senator Shenton states that he believes the sum of £42 for an adult person working a 40 hour week is very low. The Committee must stress very strongly that for several reasons including the effects of the proposed legislation on wages generally, the States must be certain that the minimum rate is correct and adequate. The Committee suggests that it will be

necessary as a consequence of legislation to establish an Authority who will be responsible for assessing the actual rate based on local conditions.

(c) Minimum holiday

The Committee would recommend that before accepting P.77 the States examine the proposed holiday requirements and compare them with agreements now in force otherwise anomalies will arise.

II. THE COST OF IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.

Whereas it is not possible to put an exact figure on the cost of the proposed legislation it will certainly add to the Island's annual wages and salaries bill which is now well in excess of £100 million (as indicated in the Economic Adviser's Report— Appendix A). (Taking the basic Island workforce of 33,000 a total bill of £100m. means an average annual wage of slightly over £3,000 per worker).

The financial costs may be considered under economic, social and legislative headings.

1. Economic costs

The increased costs will derive from—

(a) Actual minimum rate.

At present there is an undetermined number of workers receiving less than the proposed minimum wage. Also there are two proposed rates—£42 p.w. in P.78 and £49.40 p.w. (1980 rate) in P.80. In addition the average minimum rate payable on comparable U.K. Wages Council rates is approximately £50.50 p.w. Therefore the number of workers who will move to the new minimum wage will depend on whichever rate is adopted.

(b) Adult age.

As stated previously it would appear necessary to determine one age at which the adult rate is to become payable; the present variations are 18 years, 20 years and 21 years. The adult age will also be a factor in assessing the cost.

(c) Effect of 40 hour week on overtime.

The introduction of a 40 hour week will mean an immediate reduction of hours worked in some

industries or the payment of overtime to maintain the hours previously worked. P.78 proposes that overtime rates shall be "appropriate". P.80 states that overtime rates should be time and a half. At present the Hotel and Catering Industry works a 42 hour week and the Farming Industry works a 44 hour week.

(d) *Holiday pay.*

The cost will be determined by the number of employees who will qualify for the first time for three weeks holiday with pay; this will include those who at present either have no holiday entitlement or only part of three weeks.

(e) *Bank holidays.*

P.78 requires payment for working on a bank holiday at the appropriate rate and a day in lieu—

In P.80 the overtime rate for bank holiday work appears to be time and a half.

(f) *Differentials.*

The restoration and maintenance of differentials will be a cost of paramount importance as it may be reflected across a wide area of the annual wages bill in the Island. The restoration of differentials might be achieved by immediate implementation or become part of subsequent wage claims. There is no reason to suppose that differentials previously enjoyed will not be restored as soon as possible. Analysis of many pay negotiations show this to be the norm.

2. *Social costs*

It is an awareness of the social cost which has led the Social Security Committee to lodge the amendment P.79 which seeks an exemption from the proposed legislation for employees "who may be defined as disabled or handicapped". The amendment if carried will protect the employment of those with a serious handicap which affects their productivity capacity. There are others with uncategorised health defects, or the elderly or the part-timer who voluntarily take on work not only for the income it produces but for purposes of rehabilitation, social contacts or to keep occupied, to the mutual satisfaction of both employer and employee— These employment

opportunities will disappear if minimum remuneration becomes law and both sides will be the losers. Trainees will be another group affected by legislation unless the States grant-aid the employer.

These are the social costs— Unemployment and fewer work opportunities for the least able members of society because employers will be forced, particularly in the current economic climate, to employ those with the highest production capacity.

3. *Legislative Costs*

In the explanatory note to P.78 Senator Shenton writes “one cannot see the need for any increase in the size of the Civil Service”.

Not only will there be the initial cost of formulating legislation but then it will be essential to have an organisation responsible for the assessment of an adequate minimum wage and for the subsequent updating of the wage. This organisation will also be required to ensure compliance with the law; this will require inspectors to visit all places of employment checking wages records and holiday rosters. It is neither possible nor compatible with his duties for the Industrial Relations Advisory Officer to carry out these roles as suggested in the explanatory note to P.78.

Without doubt extra staff will be required; accommodation and clerical expenses will surely follow.

III. THE EFFECTS OF IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.

There are two major factors to be considered when examining the propositions.

1. *States intervention in wage negotiation*

It must be clearly recognised that P.78 and P.77 which propose the introduction of minimum remuneration and statutory holidays are no simple propositions; they carry far-reaching consequences. They require government to interfere with wage structure and conditions of work, with free collective bargaining between the employer and employee representatives. The question must be asked— Is this interference desirable or justified?

2. *Practical effects of the legislation*

The practical effects of the legislation are too numerous to list in this Report. If members consider the different aspects already referred to, it becomes apparent that the ramifications

of the legislation are not only complex but multi-dimensional. For example an Authority would determine the minimum remuneration - would it cover basic or actual earnings— on a weekly or hourly basis— would the remuneration be paid pro-rata for a working week of less than 40 hours?

Again, employers would have to maintain records of wages and holidays for perusal by Inspectors. It would be unjust to place on an employee the burden of disclosure of non-compliance with the law.

Differential increases paid without benefit to the employer will inevitably lead to unemployment and a deterioration of good relations between employer and employee.

IV. FURTHER COMMENTS.

1. *Wages Councils in U.K.*

Under the Wages Councils Act 1979 the Secretary of State may make an order establishing a Wages Council to regulate the remuneration and conditions of employment for workers where the existing machinery for settlement is inadequate. In all cases the Wages Council will include representatives of the employers and employees in the trade concerned; in this way the basic principle of self-government in industry is retained. Provided certain conditions are fulfilled the Secretary of State may abolish or vary the scope of operations of the Wages Councils. The number of Wages Councils is continually reducing as adequate voluntary machinery for settlements is developed.

2. *Comments from Employer Organisations*

None of the Employer Organisations (See Appendix B) was in favour of the propositions. The arguments against the propositions were that they would effectively negate all current wage agreements because differentials would have to be maintained. This would lead to a knock-on effect which would be inflationary. To counter this inflationary trend employers will cut back on the numbers employed— The Employer Organisations were in no doubt that the proposals would hurt those whom they aimed to help— namely the low paid, the unqualified and the least able employees. The Employers were concerned at the loss of job opportunities and the unemployment which would face this most vulnerable group.

The Committee firmly endorses the opinion of the Employer Organisations that the damage caused to the industrial relations scene could be considerable and the goodwill and trust built up over the years put at risk.

CONCLUSIONS.

1. The Committee is not aware of a need which merits the proposed legislation— nor is there any public demand. No written communication was received from any Trade Union. There was strong opposition from Employers Organisations.

2. The Committee accepts that there may be some employees who are receiving low basic wages but knows that many complaints can be rectified without recourse to legislation.

3. At least two Members of the States consider that minimum remuneration legislation is necessary. The Committee will continue to monitor the substantiated payment of low wages which are reported to the Industrial Relations Advisory Officer.

4. The Committee is not in a position to assess the cost of the proposed legislation. Suffice it to say that percentage increase of the total Island wage bill will be borne in the main by the Tourism and Agricultural industries with a consequent greater percentage increase on the wage bill of those industries.

The cost to employees who either lose their jobs or are unable to find work because of the legislation will be disastrous.

5. The cost of the restoration and maintenance of differentials will only become apparent as new settlements are agreed. It could be a major factor of the legislation.

6. No case has been made, as yet, for States intervention in collective bargaining or interference with the freedom of the employer and employees, or their representatives, to negotiate. The Industrial Relations Committee is not convinced that the proposed legislation is required in the light of present conditions of employment in the Island and considers that the enactment of such legislation could prove detrimental to local industrial relations.

7. In presenting this Report to the States the Industrial Relations Committee affirms that it is the duty of government to prevent the exploitation of workers (should this occur) and it is also the duty of government to protect the employment of the greatest number of workers. The Committee has endeavoured in this Report to demonstrate the complexity of these far-reaching proposals but is certain that in Debate the States Assembly will welcome and require the expertise of the Finance and Economics Committee, the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee, the Tourism Committee and the Social Security Committee on the particular aspects of the proposed legislation

APPENDIX A.

Report of Economic Adviser to request of Industrial Relations Committee for Comment.

26th August, 1980.

I have pleasure in providing, as requested, my comments on the Proposition to introduce a Statutory Minimum Remuneraton.

In my view, consideration of the case for and against minimum wage legislation should start with the question "what is the main reason for those who the legislation is designed to help being in receipt of a level of remuneration below the required minimum". Is it because employers are able to exploit a surplus labour situation in circumstances where not only are job opportunities difficult to come by but limited financial support is offered to those not in employment; or is it because employers are simply reflecting in the levels of remuneration offered a recognition of the "worth" of the labour obtained in return? Minimum wage legislation may make a contribution towards resolving the first situation but it is largely irrelevant to the second.

Which of the two situations can be most expected to prevail in Jersey at the present time? In the conditions of virtual full employment that have prevailed in the Island in recent years, it is difficult to conceive of the first situation having general application. However, there are undoubtedly many cases where the second situation could and does apply; e.g.

1. Young persons in training where little or no contribution is being made to production and where in addition to the payment of wages to trainees the employer will be faced with other costs of training to take into account in deciding whether or not to recruit.
2. Those with a handicap which affects their productive capacity but who may not be readily identified as disabled or handicapped for legislative purposes e.g. the asthmatic, the mentally retarded etc.

In addition to the foregoing there will be situations where labour is freely offered but where the employer is only prepared to provide employment on the basis of a relatively low level of remuneration because the work or service performed does not

add greatly to the trading income; e.g. married women and those over retirement age engaged in many clerical and other office duties.

Furthermore there will be situations where labour is freely supplied at a relatively low level of remuneration because the employer offers additional payment in kind; e.g. the food and accommodation provided to many hotel and farm workers.

The effect of the introduction of minimum wage legislation on the labour-market situations described above would be two-fold. If labour is retained it will be reflected in higher costs for the employer; the alternative will be for employers to reduce employment as the cost of labour is increased beyond its value.

The impact of higher wage costs will be greatest on the traditionally lowest pay sectors of the economy, agriculture and tourism. For the agricultural industry, dependent on export earnings and facing increasingly competitive trading conditions, where cost increases are unable to be recovered from the market place, higher wage costs must mean further erosion of trading profit, such a prospect cannot be viewed other than with concern at this particular point in time. Other traders may have a greater ability to pass on higher costs through increased prices but, when faced with a generally unreceptive market, to do so will run a real risk of a reduction in trading levels; for example, for the tourism industry there is already concern at the impact of higher tariffs on future demand.

An increase in costs will not be restricted to the direct effect of minimum wage legislation; that is, the increase in the rates of pay of those currently below the required minimum. Other employees must be expected to attempt to restore differentials, and if successful this will further increase wage costs. The total burden will depend on the required minimum wage, but in respect of a total annual wage and salary bill of well in excess of £100 million may not be considered significant. However, in the same way that, if the economic prosperity of the Island is not to be put at risk, annual pay settlements should reflect what can be afforded having regard to the ability of the Island's industries to survive in a trading climate over which they have no control, so too should any other avoidable action that can be expected to increase business costs. In the current recessionary climate particular care is needed to ensure that States policies do not add further to the many problems facing local business.

To the extent that employers are providing employment only because of an ability to reflect the varying attractions of different categories of labour, and particularly the untrained or

less able employees, in the pay structure, the removal by minimum wage legislation of this flexibility can be expected to lead to many of those in these categories now in employment only remaining so if some form of wage subsidy is offered by the States; e.g. training grants or assistance with the costs involved in employing handicapped persons. If this is not done the employees concerned must expect to find fewer job opportunities made available to them.

If it is accepted that the rules of the market place apply generally to the labour market in the Island, any attempt by government to interfere with those rules by increasing the price of labour by statute must be expected to alter the amount of labour in demand by employers. Experience elsewhere has shown that most of those earning low wages, whose cost of hire would be increased the most by minimum wage legislation, are in receipt of a level of pay that reasonably reflects their productive value to their employer. They are frequently those for whom it is most difficult to find employment opportunities and who if made redundant have the hardest job regaining employment.

The foregoing has referred to two "costs" arising from the adoption of minimum wage legislation; the direct economic "cost" affecting the economy as a whole but likely to be largely concentrated on two industries, agriculture and tourism, and the social "cost" for those in the categories identified earlier who will no longer be able to obtain employment. In addition there will be a cost to the taxpayer in implementing the legislation. Experience in other countries confirms that many of those most affected by low wages are mis- or ill-informed as to their rights, are working in small firms not easily policed, and are persons who in recognising the difficulties they would experience in obtaining other employment are frightened to make an issue of their position because of a fear of being made redundant; most complaints about employers failing to pay minimum wages in the United Kingdom are made by people in the process of voluntarily changing jobs. If the implementation of minimum wage legislation is to be based on complaints from those affected, U.K. experience would suggest a low level of effectiveness, a level likely to be equalled through the continued, persuasive, efforts of the Industrial Relations Advisory Officer. If implementation is to be through regular visits to employers' premises, the maintenance of an up to date register of employers and the undertaking of visits will require a number of inspectors.

APPENDIX B.

The Industrial Relations Committee invited comment from the public on P.78 and P.80. The following is a summary of all replies received.

In favour of the propositions.

The Committee received two letters in support of P.78 and P.80. One was from a person who had been unemployed for many years and the second was an anonymous letter from a 19 year old person—

Not in favour of the propositions.

Confederation of Jersey Industry; Jersey Building and Allied Trades Federation; Jersey Chamber of Commerce; Jersey Farmers Union; R.C.A.; C.Le Masurier Ltd., Deputy R.F. O'Connor.

Summary of principal reasons for opposition.

Many of the following reasons were given by more than one employer—

Negate existing agreements; the cost of the restoration of differentials; the loss of holiday differential; inflationary effect; the cost of shorter working week; legislation certain to cause redundancy and increased unemployment; increase in overtime premiums; serious impairment of youth training schemes; legislation would jeopardise employment prospects and be detrimental to existing employment conditions; increase in size of Civil Service; unnecessary damage to Industrial Relations.

No other communications were received.

APPENDIX C.

Jersey Evening Post Phone-in.

40 complaints were notified to the Jersey Evening Post during the phone-in on 17th October, 1979.

Complainants 40	Male 21+	Youths 15-20	Female 21+	Female 17-20
	2	4	15	19
Covered by pre-established employment conditions. Wages and hours.	0	3	10	8
Not covered by conditions.	2	1	5	11

On information concerning the complaint available from the Jersey Evening Post it is estimated that reference to the Industrial Relations Advisory Officer could have had the following results.

Of the 6 male complainants (3 apprentices) 5 complaints could have been rectified— Adequate reasons were not given for intervention by one complainant.

Of the 34 female complainants, intervention by the Industrial Relations Advisory Officer was not justified for 9 cases, intervention was likely to be successful for 22 cases. Adequate reasons for intervention were not given by three complainants.

APPENDIX D.

Position with regard to statutory minimum wage in some other countries.

U.K.

There is no all embracing statutory minimum wage in the U.K. Information concerning Wages Councils is given in the main report.

IRELAND

A National Wages Council consisting of Employers and Trades Unions meets on a yearly basis to establish basic rates of payment to be recommended to commerce and to industry; the law does not enforce the settlements but adequate pressure can be applied by the Unions when found necessary. The Government never becomes involved in the joint consultation but provides the machinery for implementation of an information service.

FRANCE

Collective bargaining between employers and trades union leaders was joined by the Government in 1968 and resulted in formation of the SMIG (Salaire minimum de croissance) which was to secure a minimum growth rate of wages to provide a share in the nation's economic development for the lowest wage earners. This links many allowances, benefits, bonuses and ex-gratia payments. It affects welfare benefit.

Such is the increase in the cost of living that adjustment has now to be made four times each year and a massive on-cost has been the direct result to all employers with a reduction in labour utilised. It affects 750,000 workers of which 250,000 are in Agriculture and the rest in Commerce.

SWEDEN

Legislation covers manual labour, wage rates and terms and conditions of employment are established by a Council consisting of Government, Employers and the Trades Unions and has the force of Law for implementation.

APPENDIX E.

Employment Protection—P.78.

The examples of the Statutory minimum remuneration scales in the Proposition P.78 for consideration in the Explanatory Notes were obsolete. The correct rates of pay are—

		<i>Correct Scale</i>	
<i>Page 4 (1)</i>	<i>Proposition example</i>	<i>1979</i>	<i>1980</i>
<i>Retail food prices</i>	Aged 21+	£41.00	1980 - Maximum reached at 20 years.
	Aged 20 and under 21	£36.15	£50.50
	Aged 19 and under 20	£35.30	£43.90
	Aged 18 and under 19	£34.10	£41.40
	Aged 17 and under 18	£29.00	£35.35
	Aged 16 and under 17	£27.30	£33.30
	Aged under 16 years	£26.05	£31.80
 <i>Page 5(2)</i>			
<i>Bookselling and stationery</i>	Aged 21+	£41.80 £36.55	1980 - Maximum reached at 20 years.
	Aged 20 and under 21	£36.55	£51.80
	Aged 19 and under 20	£35.85	£44.03
	Aged 18 and under 19	£35.05	£39.25
	Aged 17 and under 18	£30.85	£34.55
	Aged under 17	£29.55	£33.10
 <i>Page 6(3)</i>			
<i>News, tobacco & confectionery</i>	Aged 21+	£42.60	1980 - Maximum reached at 20 years.
	Aged 20 and under 21	£40.20	£50.90
	Aged 19 and under 20	£37.80	£45.20
	Aged 18 and under 19	£35.60	£42.60
	Aged 17 and under 18	£32.80	£39.20
	Aged under 17	£30.40	£36.20

*Page 7(4)**Furnishings and Allied Trades*

Aged 21+	£41.90	1980 - Maximum reached at 20 years.
Aged 20 and under 21	£38.00	£51.90
Aged 19 and under 20	£35.60	£44.12
Aged 18 and under 19	£31.60	£38.93
Aged 17 and under 18	£27.20	£33.74
Aged under 17	£25.20	£31.14

*Page 8(5)**Bread, Flour & Confect.*

Aged 20+	£41.40	£50.90
Aged 19 and under 20	£37.20	£45.80
Aged 18 and under 19	£35.20	£43.20
Aged 17 and under 18	£31.00	£38.20
Aged under 17	£27.00	£33.00

*Page 9(6)**Drapery - Outfitting & Footwear*

Aged 21+	£43.75	1980 - Maximum reached at 20 years.
Aged 20 and under 21	£39.75	£51.25
Aged 19 and under 20	£37.40	£43.56
Aged 18 and under 19	£36.25	£38.44
Aged 17 and under 18	£30.85	£33.31
Aged 16 and under 17	£29.35	£31.05
Aged under 16	£28.35	£30.75

*Further reduction in U.K. Wages Councils**Effective 2nd June, 1980**Retail Food and Allied Trades Wages Council*

Replaces—

(i) Retail Bread and Flour Confectionery Trades Council

(ii) Retail Food Trades Council

- (iii) Retail Newsagency, Tobacco and Confectionery Trades Council.

Effective 7th April, 1980

Retail (Non Foods) Wages Council

Replaces

- (iv) Retail Bookselling and Stationery Trades Council
- (v) Retail Drapery Outfitting and Footwear Trades Council
- (vi) Retail Furnishing and Allied Trades Council.