PART I

INTRODUCTION

The way work is structured and administered directly affects the economic performance of the firm, the quality of working life of the employees, and the very fortunes of a nation. With the globalization of markets and enterprises, multinational corporations face unique challenges in setting the terms and conditions of employment. No one consistent set of policies can span multiple national jurisdictions, yet employees often have assignments that involve rotation among various locations and working together in teams with people each operating in different countries. The result is a wide array of dilemmas and tensions that are brought into sharp relief by this coursebook.

The assumption of this volume is that a significant cohort of human resource managers are active in companies that function multinational and that more are likely to be engaged in such enterprises. Consequently, lawyers are and will increasingly be called upon to advise managers about employment policies and practices in that environment. Even as corporations seek, if not complete uniformity, at least to harmonize their human resource (HR) policies, employment law and employment relations remain deeply rooted in the nation state. Thus HR policies within a single enterprise may differ because of the legislation, administrative policies, and court decisions these legal systems produce – especially as limits on what management would like to do: the very structure and assumptions on which these legal systems operate, the role of the rule of law in human resource management, can have centrifugal effects.

We have chosen five countries for comparative purposes. The United States has been chosen not because we view its law as in any sense a model – though, as will be seen, it does represent something of an economic neo-liberal outlier compared to the others – but because U.S.-based companies represent the most significant group in the multinational corporate universe. We selected four others, that number being manageable without overwhelming the student, for two reasons. First, for their educational value because their labor laws are quite distinct from one another. Indeed, the countries span different legal traditions (common law and civil law; English, French, and German legal roots). Second, the countries represent a range of economic and cultural contexts (liberal versus coordinated markets; developing versus developed economies; and Eastern versus Western cultural traditions). Third, these countries all host large numbers of outside multinationals. Just consider the data on U.S. and U.S.-affiliated
multinationals hosted by these four countries. The figures for the last year for which data are available are set out in Table I.1.

Table I.1 U.S. multinationals in comparison countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of U.S. affiliates</th>
<th>Number employed by them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>312,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>452,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>649,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>590,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These materials proceed on a problem-focused basis. We believe that in lieu of purely descriptive accounts, discussion of the law is enlivened by confronting it in application. It is often the case that different legal systems yield equivalent results, albeit by very different doctrinal means. The problem method draws out practical equivalence, doctrinal analogies, as well as differences in analyses and outcome. For a notable example in employment law see WORKPLACE JUSTICE: EMPLOYMENT OBLIGATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE (Hoyt Wheeler & Jacques Rojot eds., 1992). We have accordingly devised a set of problems that we thought would represent the kinds of real world issues HR managers and their lawyers confront. We have vetted them with a sample of mid-career and senior HR managers as well as lawyers in the U.S. and abroad in advance of submitting them to our panel of legal experts. These responses are accompanied by additional references and suggested readings which, in turn, should stimulate further in-depth consideration of how, and why, these systems function as they do. But a caveat is worth mentioning here even if it will emerge

1 We considered China and India but chose not to include them. They are economically significant globally and will become even more so. Nevertheless, in both countries the content of the law, the ease of access to the law, and the effectiveness of enforcement are works-in-progress. We concluded, that, for the time being, the coverage we chose is adequate for systemic variety, and that Brazil stood in good stead as an important, rapidly developing country: hourly compensation costs in manufacturing increased in 2010 over 2009 in Brazil by about 24 percent in U.S. dollars while in the U.S. they increased by about 2 percent (Daily Labor Report, 245 DLR D-1 Dec. 21, 2011).

2 Other leading works featuring this methodology but only touching on issues in employment are GOOD FAITH IN EUROPEAN CONTRACT LAW (Reinhard Zimmermann & Simon Whittaker eds., 2000) and PERSONALITY RIGHTS IN EUROPEAN TORT LAW (Gert Bruggemeier, Aurelia Ciacci & Patrick O’Callahan eds., 2010).

3 Because German law is so highly textured the assistance of two experts in German labor law was needed. Professor Waas attended to Problems 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21. Dr Fischinger attended to Problems 5, 6, 7, 9, 14, and 15 and also supplied a translation of the German “Social Plan” set out in connection with Problem 10.
with clarity as the problems are worked through: the bare fact that a practice or policy might be lawful speaks not at all to whether it is desirable – or tell us how employers, unions, and employees actually behave. *Can* does not imply *ought*. Put differently, the question might be posed in each case regarding how the law facilitates or hinders the implementation of best practices.

With the assistance of the consulting HR managers we identified six areas where the kinds of problems they confront are most common and where the differences – and similarities – are most salient:

- **Employee voice.** Does the law allow or require that employees be heard in company decisions? If so, on what subjects, by what means, and with what legal consequences?
- **Discrimination.** Most countries forbid discrimination by employers on some invidious, usually class-based grounds. How do these play out in commonly encountered scenarios? Do these vary from country to country? If so, why?
- **Privacy.** Over the past several decades demands for the protection of personal data have accelerated in tandem with the proliferation of technologies that make more and more data available and render employees more and more transparent. Does the law limit the deployment or utilization of these technologies? Does it protect employees against intrusion in the workplace or in private life?
- **Wrongful dismissal.** Does the law constrain the employer’s ability to discharge an employee? On what grounds? Subject to what procedure? With what consequences?
- **Compensation and benefits administration.** Can a corporation have consistent compensation and benefit policies that span nations? How can pay and benefits be fair given different legal constraints across countries?
- **Global supply chain and labor standards.** Does the law – “hard law” – impose any obligations on companies vis-à-vis the labor standards of their foreign affiliates, contractors and suppliers? If not, does “soft law” – international norms or efforts by non-governmental organizations – affect what companies do in that regard? If so, how and with what consequences?

This is a time of fundamental change in the human resource function. Key elements, such as benefits, compensation, training, and HR analytics are increasingly being outsourced to external providers. At the same time, in a global knowledge economy, talent management and change management are more central than ever to the economic fortunes of a multinational corporation. Equally, virtually every nation sees human capital as the foundation for its future success in the global economy. The six problem areas selected for this
MULTINATIONAL HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND THE LAW

volume are emblematic of a fundamental reality, which is that employers and employees have both common and competing interests. The law is the foundation on which these mixed motive relationships are navigated and mediates the degree to which the potential of human resource management is or is not realized. The primary purpose of this coursebook is to educate future professionals on this emerging and important domain at the intersection of national labor and employment laws, on the one hand, and multinational employment practices, on the other. A secondary, but perhaps further reaching purpose is to motivate broader debate and dialogue on these issues. The full array of cases and examples presented here point to limits in the institutional arrangements and alternative approaches, conceptually and in outcome. Additional notes, comments, and questions are appended to stimulate research, discussion, and thought. In larger perspective, this book as a whole can be understood as a problem statement for which we do not yet have the answers.

The HR practitioner should help hone the founding concepts of the organization and … ask tough questions … holding companies true to these tenets. They have to make the C-suite aware of the impact of their decisions on consumers and employees in diverse environments. It is an awareness of social and cultural assumptions that could be very supportive or damaging to their ultimate goals … it is HR’s job to create insight and appreciation … so that the mission, vision and values of the organization can best be realized.

Vice President, Employee Relations, Health Care

A. SKETCHES OF THE LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT LAW SYSTEMS

The texture of a nation’s labor and employment law is invariably complex and highly nuanced. It is hard enough to master one system let alone five. What follows are brief sketches to outline the structure of these countries' systems to put the reader on a map, so to speak. At the close of these sketches a brief statistical display of the demographics of the jurisdictions is set out. The content-specific aspects of the law will be dealt with in the course of analyzing the problems for discussion.
EMPLOYMENT LAW IN AUSTRALIA: A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Political structure, governance and legal system

Australia is a federation, comprising the Commonwealth of Australia, six States (New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania) and a number of Territories, of which the two largest are the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory.

Australia has a written Constitution, which establishes a system of federal courts and confers power on a bicameral parliament to legislate on certain specified matters. Each of the States has its own Constitution, parliament and court system. State parliaments have a “plenary” or residual power to legislate on any matter, though if any of their statutes are inconsistent with a valid federal law, the federal law will prevail. The Territories have been afforded a measure of self-government, and also have their own legislatures and court systems. But their laws can be overridden by the Australian Parliament, which can legislate on any matter arising in a Territory. By contrast, the Australian Constitution protects the States in certain ways from the exercise of federal powers.

Although the Australian Constitution is loosely modelled on the US Constitution, the Commonwealth, States and Territories each operate a “Westminster” system of government, in which the executive government is formed by the party (or coalition) with a majority in the lower house of parliament. Hence there is no clear separation between the legislature and the executive.

Like the US and other former British colonies, Australia’s legal system still accords an important role to the “common law” – judge-made law developed by reference to established principles and precedents. The common law can be – and often is – excluded or overridden by legislation. But important aspects of the law of contract and the law of tort (civil wrongs) are still governed by common law principles.
Responsibility for employment regulation

Australia’s employment laws are amongst the most complex in the world. The reasons for this are many and varied. They include the absence of any clear demarcation in the Constitution between federal and State authority over employment matters, as well as a historical attachment to the use of compulsory arbitration by public tribunals to resolve labour disputes and regulate minimum wages, working hours and other employment conditions.

Importantly, however, the picture has begun to simplify in recent years, thanks to a series of major reforms that have culminated in the federal Fair Work Act 2009. With the cooperation of the States, and with effect from 1 January 2010, this statute now operates to regulate employment conditions and labour relations for all private sector (i.e. non-governmental) employers. The only exception is Western Australia, although here too all companies are covered by the federal statute.

For the most part, the Fair Work Act operates to the exclusion of any State or Territory labour laws. However, there are important exceptions. The regulation of occupational health and safety (OHS), workers’ compensation, training and child labour, for instance, are all matters that are primarily left to the States and Territories. Hence a company that operates throughout Australia has traditionally had to comply with eight different OHS statutes, although a recent attempt has been made to harmonise those laws. Most States and Territories have now enacted a model Work Health and Safety Act to replace their former legislation. Discrimination or equal opportunity is another matter where federal, State and Territory laws may co-exist.

Minimum employment conditions

Under the Fair Work Act, all employees (including managers) are entitled to the benefit of the National Employment Standards (NES). These create minimum entitlements in relation to various forms of leave, as well as matters such as notice of termination and redundancy (severance) pay. They also cap working hours at 38 per week, plus reasonable additional hours.

In addition, most non-managerial employees are covered by a further and more detailed set of minimum entitlements, enshrined in an instrument known as an award. Traditionally, awards were made by industrial tribunals in settlement of labour disputes, and there were thousands of such instruments. However the award system has just been reviewed and radically simplified. Most employees are now covered (if they are covered at all) by one of the 122 “modern awards”
that took effect on 1 January 2010 – although until 2014 it will still be necessary to refer to old awards for transitional purposes.

Each modern award is framed to cover specified types of work within a particular industry, sector or occupation. If a job comes within one of the “classifications” in an award, the employer must pay the minimum wage rate set for that classification. There are usually a number of different rates for each classification, based on the worker’s levels of experience or training. Awards usually also have detailed provisions as to the range of hours employees can be expected to work, and typically impose loadings or penalty rates for overtime, shiftwork, evening or weekend work, or work on public holidays. “Casual” (temporary) employees are also usually entitled to a premium of 25 percent on their wages, in lieu of any entitlement to annual leave, personal leave or severance pay.

For employees who are award-free, including most managers, there is a statutory minimum wage. But for the great majority of lower-paid employees, it is an award that will set their minimum wage. And that minimum wage can and does vary according to the type of job, how much experience they have, and what sort of hours they work.

In addition to the requirements of the Fair Work Act, employers may have to comply with other labour statutes. For example, federal law generally requires employers to contribute a portion of each worker’s ordinary pay into a superannuation (pension) fund on their behalf. The required percentage is currently 9 percent, but will rise to 12 percent by 2019. State and Territory laws also oblige many employers to provide “long service leave” to employees who have been continuously employed for (generally) 10 years.

Collective bargaining

Australia has a strong tradition of trade unionism and collective bargaining. Although union density has fallen to 13 percent in the private sector, it is still common for larger employers to negotiate collective agreements that set wages and other employment conditions. Since the early 1990s, it has become standard practice for these agreements to be registered under labour statutes. A registered agreement displaces the operation of any award(s) that would otherwise apply, and is enforceable under the statute in the same way as an award. It applies to union members and non-members alike.

There have been many changes to the rules relating to registered agreements over the past few years. But under the system created by the Fair Work Act,
enterprise agreements (as they are now known) may be made for all or part of a single enterprise, or for a group of enterprises. They can have a nominal duration of up to four years. After agreements reach their expiry date, they continue in operation, but can be more easily replaced or terminated.

Enterprise agreements can be negotiated with one or more unions, or directly with a group of employees. Either way, the final text must generally be approved by a majority of employees in some sort of vote, before being submitted to Fair Work Australia (see below) for approval. An agreement will only be approved if it leaves each affected employee “better off overall” than they would be under an otherwise applicable award.

An employer cannot be forced to bargain, unless a majority of employees request an agreement. Once bargaining is initiated, however, all concerned must negotiate in good faith, though there is no obligation to bargain to conclusion. Employees may take “protected” (i.e. lawful) industrial action in support of a new single-enterprise agreement, though only after the expiry date of any existing agreement. Employers can only initiate a lockout in response to protected action by employees. Any other form of industrial action is unlawful.

Unfair employment practices

The Fair Work Act allows a dismissed employee who has served a minimum qualifying period to challenge the fairness of their dismissal. A successful claim may result in reinstatement (plus back pay), or compensation of up to six months’ remuneration. Higher-paid non-award employees, including many managers, are excluded from making such a claim.

The Act also contains various “general protections” against discriminatory or otherwise wrongful treatment at work. For example, it prohibits an employer from taking adverse action against an employee or job applicant on the ground that they are a union member or non-member, or that they have or are proposing to exercise some sort of “workplace right.” There are also a range of other federal, State or Territory laws that deal with discrimination on the grounds of race, gender, age, disability, and so on.

The employment contract

Each employee is considered to have entered into a contract of employment, whether this is formally documented or not. To the extent that the parties have not expressly reached agreement on matters such as the duration of the hiring, or the employee’s obligation to comply with instructions, the common law will
imply appropriate terms on these matters. In practice, detailed employment contracts tend to be written only for managerial or professional employees.

It should also be emphasised that relatively few employees in Australia are engaged on an “at will” basis. Assuming the hiring is not for a fixed term, an employer must generally give notice before dismissing an employee, other than in the case of serious misconduct. The one major exception may be casual employees. It is often assumed that a casual can simply be refused any further work, without any need for notice, although the issue has not been fully tested. In any event, there have been many examples of long-term casualls successfully bringing claims for unfair dismissal.

An employment contract can lawfully offer wages or benefits that are more favourable to an employee than the minimum entitlements set by the NES, an applicable modern award, or any other labour statute. But a promise to accept less than any of those entitlements is not enforceable.

Regulatory agencies

There are two main regulatory agencies under the Fair Work Act. Fair Work Australia (FWA, renamed the Fair Work Commission on January 1, 2013) operates for certain purposes as a tribunal, but in other ways through administrative decisions. Its responsibilities include:

- adjusting minimum wage rates;
- reviewing and updating awards;
- policing industrial action and other tactics used in negotiating enterprise agreements;
- helping to resolve bargaining disputes, including (though only in limited instances) through compulsory arbitration;
- scrutinising and approving enterprise agreements;
- resolving disputes arising under awards, enterprise agreements or the NES, where the parties have agreed it should have that role; and
- determining unfair dismissal claims.

The Fair Work Ombudsman promotes compliance with awards, enterprise agreements and other statutory obligations. Its inspectors have the power to enter workplaces, investigate breaches and launch prosecutions. It is also responsible for providing education and advice on workplace laws to employers and employees.
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For a general overview of Australian employment law, including the Fair Work Act, see ANDREW STEWART, STEWART’S GUIDE TO EMPLOYMENT LAW (4th ed. 2013). An online supplement was accessed at www.federationpress.com.au/supplements/.

More detailed accounts can be found in BREEN CREIGHTON & ANDREW STEWART, LABOUR LAW (5th ed. 2010) and ROSEMARY OWENS, JOELLEN RILEY & JILL MURRAY, THE LAW OF WORK (2d ed. 2011).

Because of the massive scope of the recent changes to Australia’s laws, not all accounts of Australian labour or employment law are up to date. Care should therefore be taken when reading any material written prior to 2009.
EMPLOYMENT LAW IN BRAZIL: A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Political structure, governance and legal system

Brazil is a federation, comprising 26 States, its Municipalities and the Federal District (Brasília). It is a complex political structure, which concentrates power on the federal level. Its political structure may be attributed to historical reasons as the country was originally organized as a centralized empire after independence in 1822. Federal importance as a trend has thus survived the proclamation of the Republic in 1889 and the seven Constitutions the country has known since independence.

Brazil promulgated in 1988 its seventh written Constitution. This established a system of federal courts, with four different branches: federal (which examines cases that have a State agency as one of the litigants), electoral, labor and military (which examine, respectively, electoral, labor and military matters). The National Congress is a bicameral parliament entitled to a wide array of exclusive legislative competence, which may be delegated to the States through the approval of a specific statute by a higher quorum. The Union, the States and Federal District also have a concurrent legislative competence, though if any of their statutes are inconsistent with a valid federal law, the federal law will prevail. Accordingly, the States and Federal District may legislate on any matter which is not an exclusive prerogative of the Union or the Municipalities as the latter also have exclusive legislative competences. Each State has its own Constitution, parliament and court system.

The Brazilian system of government is presidential and elections are held every four years. The President is directly elected by the people and the electoral body is actually composed of 140,646,446 voters. As for the National Congress, the electoral system is purely proportional for a scenario of 30 political parties, the latest created in June, 2012. No party has been able to obtain a Congressional majority which has to be negotiated at the beginning of every legislature term. Hence there is a clear separation between the legislature and the executive.
Brazil's legal system is clearly civil based although a complex system of judicial precedents has been developed by the Higher Courts over the years.

**Responsibility for employment regulation**

The Constitution establishes that Brazil’s employment laws can only be issued by federal authority and some labor rights have constitutional status. Although the Labor Code was issued in 1943, it is still valid in every aspect which is not contrary to the constitutional regulation. Discussions over the Labor Code reform have been on the public agenda for many years although no conclusion has been reached so far. Employment regulation is thus homogeneous for the whole country.

Brazil’s Labor Ministry also has legal competence to regulate occupational health and safety (OHS) conditions. Over the years, it has produced a series of 35 OHS statutes that regulate most of the working conditions on the matter, the latest issued in March, 2012. Employers are compelled to enforce such administrative statutes which are verified by Labor Inspectors.

Public employees are not regulated by the Labor Code and have a specific regulation which replicates most of the labor standards. Federal public employees are thus regulated by the Federal Statute 8,112 (1990). States and Municipalities have their own Public Service Statutes. Nonetheless, all of them have to comply with constitutional labor rights.

**Minimum employment conditions**

Brazilian labor regulation does not have a specific statute that sets a minimum for employment conditions. Actually, all employers are bound by the Constitutional labor rights and the dispositions of the Labor Code. Among other rights, the Constitution entitles every employee to a minimum wage (which was last fixed in January 2012 at the equivalent amount of US$ 306.00 per month), 30 days of vacation with an additional payment of one third of the employee's salary, a 13th salary at the end of a year, a 30 day delay at least for dismissal, payment for overtime hours of at least 50 percent more than for normal working hours. It also caps working hours at 8 per day and 44 per week.

Every employee is entitled to an individual Time Service Guarantee Fund (FGTS) account to which the employer is required to contribute with a monthly deposit equivalent to 8 percent of the employee salary. Once the employee is dismissed the employer is required to make an additional deposit equivalent to 40 percent of all deposits previously made and the employee is
allowed to withdraw all the savings in his FGTS account. The employee is also entitled to unemployment insurance which may last from three to six months according to the duration of his last labor contract. However, if termination is due to “just cause” (an employee’s serious misconduct), none of these three benefits – additional employers’ deposit, FGTS account withdraw, or unemployment insurance – is available.

A temporary job guarantee is an entitlement for union leaders from the time they present their candidacy until one year after their term if they are elected, for pregnant women from the time of conception until five months after the birth, and for victims of work accidents from the accident until their full recovery as attested by the Social Security services. A lifetime job guarantee is only available for public employees after they completed three years’ experience.

Collective bargaining

Brazil has a unique situation as regards trade unionism and collective bargaining. Employers’ and employees’ unions are respectively established on an economic or professional basis. Thus, for example, collective bargaining in the civil construction area is done between the Civil Construction Industry Union and the Workers in the Civil Construction Union. Formerly, unions were required to have State approval before coming into existence. After the 1988 Constitution, State approval is no longer required. Still the Constitution has maintained the “unicity” principle which allows the sole existence of one single union for each economic or professional category in a given territorial basis which cannot be inferior to a Municipality. Unions are allowed to regroup themselves and create a confederation. As regards the requirements for the establishment of a confederation, they must: (a) reunite at least 100 unions from the five different Brazilian regions with a minimum of 20 unions in three different Brazilian regions, (b) cover five different economic sectors, and (c) represent at least 7 percent of all unionized workers in the country. Nowadays, there are six union confederations in the country which play an important role in Brazilian politics; but only five are officially recognized currently as the sixth no longer represents more than 7 percent of unionized workers. Union density is around 18 percent and regardless of being unionized every employee is required to pay an annual union tax equivalent to one day’s pay. This peculiar scenario allows unions to exist regardless of their legitimacy and creates extremely difficult requirements for the making of a confederation.

Employers cannot be forced to bargain. Still, since collective bargaining may happen between unions that represent economic and professional categories entirely, a collective agreement reached in this manner will be enforceable in all
labor contracts in their respective economic and professional category, regardless of the employers’ and the employees’ desires. Unions may also negotiate and establish collective agreements with single companies and in such cases their dispositions apply to all the labor contracts of the particular company. Collective agreements are valid for a maximum period of two years when they have to be renegotiated. In any situation, once bargaining is initiated, all concerned must negotiate in good faith, though there is no obligation to bargain to conclusion. Briefly, labor conditions are primarily defined by statute and collective bargaining is mostly used to enhance employees’ rights. Therefore collective bargaining cannot result in a reduction in labor rights nor go against statute dispositions.

Unfair employment practices

Any employee is entitled to challenge the employer's practices as unfair or wrongful at any time. Labor Code dispositions forbid employers to discriminate on the grounds of race, gender, age, disability, and so on. Still a successful claim can only result in reinstatement (plus back pay) when the employee is in a job guarantee situation. Most claims end in compensation, which has no economic limit. This has led to a litigation explosion which is nowadays enhanced by the possibility of obtaining punitive damages for unfair or wrongful employment practices.

The employment contract

Employment contracts are supposed to be formally registered in the Employment Record Book. Yet the absence of such formality does not invalidate the existence of a contract. Employment contracts are usually signed for an indeterminate duration, although an experience period of 90 days is possible. If they are for a determinate length of time they may not exceed two years. Every modification in the employment contract is supposed to be written in the Employment Record Book.

Thirty days notice is required for dismissal during the first year of the employment contract if it does not have a fixed term or specify the end of the experience period. For every completed year of work, three more days have to be added to the notice period. However notice is not required in the case of serious misconduct, which is exhaustively defined by the Labor Code.
Labor justice

There are no regulatory agencies in Brazilian employment law. Employment litigation is settled in a federal specialized judicial branch which is structured in three levels: Labor Judges, Labor Courts and the Superior Labor Court. Labor Judges are attached to one of the 24 Labor Courts and have jurisdiction over one or more Municipalities. Labor Courts examine the appeals against Labor Judges’ decisions. They also work as a first-level jurisdiction for litigation arising from collective bargaining. Labor Court decisions may be appealed to the Superior Labor Court, which decides every case in last resort. An extraordinary appeal may be made from a Superior Labor Court decision to the Brazilian Supreme Court if the case deals with constitutional matters.

Since 1941, the Labor justice system has examined over 70,000,000 cases. Still, more than half of these were filed over the last 14 years (1998–2011). Between 1994 and 2010, annual cases averaged 2,463,984.5, with no single year having less than 2,000,000 cases. Finally, by 2011, the cap of 3,000,000 cases was overcome as 3,061,172 cases were received. As “only” 3,016,049 cases were decided, by the end of the year the number of unsettled cases still stood at 1,450,197. The numbers are impressive and show not only that litigation is on the rise but also that almost every Brazilian employee has at least once in his lifetime had his day in a Labor Court.
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EMPLOYMENT LAW IN GERMANY: A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Political structure, governance and legal system

Germany is a federal state, comprising 16 partially self-governing States (Länder) ranging from so-called “city-states” (Berlin, Hamburg, Bremen) to “territorial states” like North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden-Württemberg and Bavaria.

Germany has a written Constitution, the so-called Basic Law (Grundgesetz) which was promulgated on 23 May 1949, as the fundamental law of those states of West Germany that were initially included within the Federal Republic. When the Communist regime in East Germany toppled in 1990 and the German Democratic Republic peacefully joined the Federal Republic of Germany, the Basic Law became the Constitution of the reunited Germany. The main body of the legislative branch is the Bundestag, which enacts federal legislation, including the budget. The Bundesrat represents the States and participates in federal legislation. The Basic Law fixes a number of matters such as foreign affairs and defense within the exclusive legislative power of the Federation. On matters within the concurrent legislative power, the States have power to legislate so long as and to the extent that the Federation has not exercised its legislative power by enacting a law. The Basic Law enshrines a number of basic (fundamental) rights which may be restricted only if certain requirements are met. In no case may the essence of such a right be affected. Basic rights are of major importance in the area of labor law for they bind the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary as directly applicable law. In particular, in those areas, like strike and lockout, where no statutory law exists, the respective lacunas are filled by judge-made law which is essentially derived from basic rights as well as fundamental constitutional principles such as the so-called “social state” principle.

Labor courts

There is an extensive system of labor courts with jurisdiction for both individual labor law – mostly concerning contracts but also including wrongful dismissal
claims – and collective labor law, including the rights of both unions and works councils. These exist at three levels. The courts of first instance and the intermediate courts of appeals are state courts, called respectively labor courts – Arbeitsgerichte (cited as ArbG) – and Regional (or State) Labor Courts, Landesarbeitsgerichte (cited as LAG). At the apex is the Federal Labor Court (Bundesarbeitsgericht, or BAG), which hears appeals only on questions of law. All three courts are tripartite: ArbG and LAG cases are heard by a panel presided over by a professional judge and two lay judges, one selected through nomination by employers and the other by unions. The lay judges have the same authority as the professional judge. Appeals from the ArbG to the LAG essentially involve a de novo presentation of the case, but lawyers need not necessarily be involved. The BAG is also tripartite, functioning in panels, known as Senates, geared to particular sets of legal questions and the tripartite membership is enlarged. It is possible for the BAG to sit in a Grand Senate for especially important cases.

Responsibility for employment regulation

Labor law (including the organization of enterprises, occupational health and safety, and employment agencies, as well as social security, including unemployment insurance) is among the matters within the concurrent legislative power of the Federation and the States. Since the Federation has made ample use of its power to legislate, state laws barely play a role in this field, however. As opposed to many other countries, there is no uniform Labor Code in Germany. Statutory labor law is widely spread over various Acts. For instance, there are specific Acts on temporary agency work, fixed-term employment contracts and part time work. Dismissal protection is dealt with in the Dismissal Protection Act (Kündigungsschutzgesetz). The Works Councils Act (Betriebsverfassungsgesetz) establishes the so-called works constitution. Collective bargaining is the subject of specific legislation, too (Tarifvertragsgesetz).

Though various Acts exist in the field of labor law, some areas have not been addressed by legislation. This is why judge-made law plays an important role in Germany, with the rules primarily derived from basic rights and principles of the Constitution. Constitutional provisions are not directly applicable between employer and employee. They are, however, indirectly applicable because, according to the courts, they form the criteria for interpreting the so-called general norms of civil law like bonos mores and good faith.

Over the last few decades there has been an increased Europeanization of German labor law. A case in point is the General Act on Equal Treatment (Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz) which came into force in 2006. The Act
explicitly prevents employers from discriminating against job applicants or employees on the basis of gender, race or ethnic origin; religion or belief; age; disability; or sexual orientation. By passing this Act, Germany implemented four EU directives regarding anti-discrimination. Before that time, anti-discrimination rules in Germany were essentially based on human rights and the case law of the courts.

The employment contract

Between the employer and the employee a contract of employment exists. A person is in principle regarded as an “employee” if he or she is in a position of subordination. However, the courts take a “holistic view” which means that even subordination does not represent an indispensable requirement. Instead, various criteria are used as indicative of the existence of an employment relationship. Next to “employees” the law recognizes so-called “quasi employees” (Arbeitnehmerähnliche). Persons who belong to this category are economically dependent on another person and enjoy some labor rights. Contracts of employment are not required to be in writing. However, the employer is obliged to provide the employee with a written statement of all terms and conditions of employment.

As far as the employment relationship is concerned, freedom of contract is considered to exist only with some limitations. The Federal Constitutional Court once expressly stated that power was unevenly divided between the employer and the employee. Hence, freedom of contract could not guarantee a proper balance of interests. According to the court, the legislature has to step in to make up for a lack of protection.

The employment contract has many distinctive features. For instance, pay may be due even without work being performed by the employee. Such is true, for instance, in the case of sickness. According to German labor law there is a continuation of full salary payments for a period of six weeks if an employee is sick. Such is also true under the so-called doctrine of “works risks” which was developed by the courts. Under this doctrine an employee retains his/her entitlement to remuneration if, for example, lack of energy or raw materials makes it impossible to work. As regards holidays, a statutory claim exists for 20 working days’ vacation per calendar year for employees who work a normal five-day week (i.e. four weeks’ vacation). However, it is more typical for an employee to receive between 25 and 30 vacation days per calendar year, on the basis of collective agreements.
Under a five-day week, the average working time is between 35 and 40 hours. Daily working time generally may not exceed eight hours. Female employees are entitled to full paid maternity leave, starting no later than six weeks before the expected due date. All employees, both male and female, are entitled to a maximum of three years’ parental leave per child.

Employees who perform work under a fixed-term contract must not be discriminated against either. The term of a contract may in principle be fixed only if there is a valid reason to do so (temporary business needs, substitution of another employee, etc.). Temporary agency workers in principle enjoy the same basic working and employment conditions for the duration of their assignment at a user undertaking that would apply if they had been recruited directly by that undertaking to occupy the same job.

In contrast to many other countries, there is no general statutory minimum pay in Germany. However, collective agreements constitute minimum terms and conditions of employment. In some areas collective agreements have been declared universally applicable by the state.

**Dismissal protection**

General legal protection against dismissals is based on the Dismissal Protection Act (Kündigungsschutzgesetz). The Act applies to employees with continuous service of at least six months as long as they work in an establishment comprising more than 10 employees on a regular basis. Under the Dismissal Protection Act a dismissal is null and void if it is not “socially justified”. The substance of the law will be taken up in discussion of the problems under that head.

In addition to the Dismissal Protection Act which enshrines “general” dismissal protection, various other statutes exist that aim to fix specific dismissal protection for particular employees. Specific provisions exist *inter alia* for disabled persons, pregnant women and women on maternity leave, persons on family leave and persons on caring leave. What is more, there is specific legislation with regard to persons holding an office within the framework of workers’ co-determination, in particular representatives of employees on company boards and members of works councils.

Finally, protective rules exist that are based essentially on judge-made law. These rules were established due to the limited area of applicability of the Dismissal Protection Act. According to the courts, every employee must be granted a certain minimum protection against dismissal under the fundamental
right of profession as guaranteed by the Constitution. Accordingly, even if the Dismissal Protection Act does not apply, a dismissal may be found illegal by the courts for contravening the principle of good faith or being in breach of *bonos mores*.

**Co-determination**

The essential feature of the German employee representation system is the dualism of the representation of workers’ interests by trade unions, on the one hand, and of works councils, on the other hand. Under German law works councils are independent legal bodies with the specific task of representing workers in the respective unit (the establishment in the case of a works council). Trade unions, on the other hand, have a more comprehensive task, namely to represent workers’ interests at the bargaining table. Works councils form autonomous legal bodies which represent workers’ interests independently. Workers’ representatives at plant level are not necessarily members of a trade union, nor are they simply nominated by a trade union. Instead, they are essentially elected by all employees who work in a given establishment, irrespective of whether they are union members or not. The role of works councils will be discussed in several of the problems.

In addition to employee representation at plant level, there is a system of employee representation on corporate boards. While co-determination by works councils takes place at the level of the individual plant or establishment, the level of “entrepreneurial co-determination,” as it is known in Germany, is the enterprise level, if not the level of a group of companies. Works councils’ entitlements seek to restrict the powers of the employer in relation to (organizing and running) the establishment. In contrast, “entrepreneurial co-determination” aims at allowing employees (or their representatives) to participate in decisions that are taken in corporate boards. The extent of co-determination at board level depends on the size of the company concerned and its legal form. If, for instance, a stock corporation (*Aktiengesellschaft*) or limited liability company (*Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung*) employs more than 2,000 persons on a regular basis, one half of the seats on the supervisory board of such company are reserved for workers’ representatives. Since the chairman enjoys a double vote in case of a tie (and shareholders are in a position to ensure that one of their own is elected as chairman of the board), a slight (if determinative) predominance of capital owners is ensured.
Collective bargaining

Trade unionism and collective bargaining play an important role in Germany. Though union density has fallen to considerably less than 20 percent, around 60 percent of employees in the West and 50 percent of employees in the East of Germany are in one way or another bound to collective agreements. Only in relatively rare cases are collective agreements concluded by a trade union and an individual employer. The predominant level of collective bargaining is the individual branch or sector of industry, with collective agreements being concluded between employers’ associations and trade unions. Collective agreements take normative effect. They are directly binding on employers and employees if both are members of the associations that have concluded the collective agreement. The employer must belong to the relevant employers’ association and the worker must belong to the relevant trade union. Because only a minority of workers belongs to a union, collective agreements mostly become (indirectly) effective by being referred to in individual contracts of employment. Most employers are prepared to offer such reference in order to limit the willingness of their workforce to join a trade union.

Workers have the right to strike because bargaining without the right to strike would be no more than “collective begging,” in the words of the Federal Labor Court. That the right to strike is based on the right to bargain collectively has an important consequence, namely, that the right to strike is guaranteed only insofar as the strike is related to that very purpose. A strike is lawful in Germany if and only if its underlying objective is to reach a collective agreement. As a result, “wild-cat strikes” are prohibited in Germany. When determining the lawfulness of a strike, extensive use is made of the principle of proportionality or ultima ratio. According to the courts, a strike is illegal if it is evidently neither necessary nor appropriate when taking the aim of industrial action into account. By assessing the lawfulness of a strike according to these standards, the courts are prepared to grant trade unions wide discretionary power and to exercise a considerable measure of self-restraint.
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Overview of the Japanese labor law system

The Japanese labor law is understood to comprise three major branches: individual labor relations law, collective labor relations law, and labor market law. These three branches have their legislative basis in the Constitution promulgated in 1946.

The Constitution

The Japanese Constitution guarantees fundamental social rights in Articles 25 to 28. Article 25, commonly called the “right to live” provision, proclaims the principle of the welfare state. Article 26 establishes people’s right to, and obligation regarding, education. Articles 27 and 28 deal directly with labor and employment relations as seen below.

These provisions on the fundamental social rights were influenced significantly by the Weimar Constitution in Germany. These social rights provisions in the Constitution provided an important political and legislative basis for developing social policy in Japan.

Individual labor relations law

Article 27 paragraph 2 of the Constitution (“Standards for wages, hours, rest and other working conditions shall be fixed by law.”) requires the state to enact laws to regulate terms and conditions of employment. This article provides the legislative ground for individual labor relations law.

---

4 Kazuo Sugeno (Leo Kanowitz trans.), JAPANESE LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT LAW (University of Tokyo Press, 2002); Takashi Araki, LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT LAW IN JAPAN 7 (Japan Institute of Labor, 2002).
5 Article 25: “All people shall have the right to maintain the minimum standards of wholesome and cultured living. In all spheres of life, the State shall use its endeavors for promotion and extension of social welfare and security, and of public health.”
6 Article 26: “All people shall have the right to receive an equal education correspondent to their ability, as provided by law. All people shall be obliged to have all boys and girls under their protection receive ordinary education as provided for by law. Such compulsory education shall be free.”
7 Art. 27 para. 3 of the Constitution, concerning prohibition of child labor (“Children shall not be exploited.”), is incorporated into the child labor protective provisions of the LSA of 1947.
After World War II, the government established the Ministry of Labor in 1946 and enacted a series of worker protective laws. In 1947, the Labor Standards Act, the Workers’ Accident Compensation Insurance Act, the Employment Security Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act were enacted. Among these, the Labor Standards Act (LSA) is the most important and comprehensive piece of protective labor legislation, establishing minimum standards of working conditions.


Apart from labor protective norms sanctioned by the criminal penalties and administrative supervision, important rules governing individual labor relations have been established by the courts through the accumulation of judgments. To borrow a German expression, they are not Arbeitsschutzrecht (labor protective law) but Arbeitsvertragsrecht (labor contract law). In 2007, the Labor Contract Act (LCA) was enacted and some of the important case law rules were incorporated into the Act.8

**Collective labor relations law**

Collective labor relations are mainly regulated by Japan’s Constitution, the Labor Union Act (LUA) of 1949 and the Labor Relations Adjustment Act of 1946.

The Constitution of Japan guarantees workers’ fundamental rights. Article 28 of the Constitution reads, “the right of workers to organize and to bargain and act collectively is guaranteed.” Any legislative or administrative act that infringes upon these rights without reasonable justification is therefore unconstitutional and void. Workers are immune from any criminal or civil liability for their engagement in proper union activities. Article 28 is understood to stem from the provision in the Weimar Constitution of 1919, which guaranteed freedom of association and created the “third-party effect” (Dritt wirkung),

---

regulating relations between private citizens. Thus, in the opinion of most, Article 28 is construed as regulating not only relations between the state and private citizens, but also relations between employers and workers. Consequently, workers have a cause of action against an employer who infringes upon their union rights. For instance, a dismissal of a worker by reason of his/her legal union activities is deemed as null and void because it amounts to a violation of the constitutional norm.

Article 28 is further interpreted as entrusting the Diet with the power to enact statutes to effectuate basic union rights. Accordingly, the LUA sets requirements for “qualified” unions, establishes the unfair labor practice system prohibiting employers’ anti-union actions, gives collective bargaining agreements normative effect, and establishes the Central and Local Labor Relations Commissions. The Labor Relations Adjustment Act was also enacted in 1946 to facilitate the resolution of collective labor disputes. Under this Act, the Labor Relations Commissions are entrusted with the conciliation, mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

From a comparative perspective, it is noteworthy that Japanese law not only gives civil and criminal immunity to proper acts of trade unions, but also encourages collective bargaining by imposing a duty to bargain on employers and by sanctioning it through the unfair labor practice system.

Labor market law

Article 27 paragraph 1 of the Constitution (“All people shall have the right and the obligation to work.”) has been interpreted as requiring two political obligations on the part of the state. First, the state shall intervene in the labor market so as to enable workers to obtain suitable job opportunities. Second, the state bears a political obligation to guarantee the livelihood of those workers who cannot obtain such opportunities. This article forms the basis of “labor market law.”

Corresponding to the first legislative mandate, various statues were enacted. The Employment Security Act of 1947 regulates employment placement services, recruitment and labor supply businesses. The Employment Measures Act of 1966 proclaims the general principles of labor market policies. Other

9 Sugeno, supra note 4, 15.
10 Art. 27 para. 1 also mentions the obligation to work. The literal meaning of the phrase implies industrial conscription. However, since that interpretation is not appropriate, “obligation to work” is interpreted to mean the state has no obligation towards those who do not have an intention to work. Thus, the availability of unemployment benefits is confined to those who intend to work.

Major laws regulating labor and employment relations in Japan

Constitution

Article 27: right to work, mandate to establish minimum standards of working conditions by statutes

Article 28: right of workers to organize and to bargain and act collectively

Individual labor relations laws

Labor protective laws

Labor Standards Act

Minimum Wages Act

Security of Wage Payment Act

Industrial Safety and Health Act

Workers' Accident Compensation Insurance Act

Equal Employment Opportunity Act

Part-time Work Act

Child Care and Family Care Leave Act

Labor contract laws

Civil Code Article 623–631 (Employment Contract)

Labor Contract Act

Labor Contract Succession Act

Collective labor relations laws

Labor Union Act

Labor Relations Adjustment Act
Labor market laws

- Employment Measures Act
- Employment Security Act
- Worker Dispatching Act
- Employment Insurance Act
- Older Persons' Employment Stabilization Act
- Disabled Persons' Employment Promotion Act
- Regional Employment Development Promotion Act
- Human Resources Development Promotion Act

Minimum standards of working conditions fixed by mandatory statutes

Worker protective laws

The individual employment relationship between an employer and a worker is regulated by labor protective laws such as the Labor Standards Act, the Minimum Wages Act, the Security of Wage Payment Act, the Industrial Safety and Health Act, the Workers’ Accident Compensation Insurance Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, and the Worker Dispatching Act.

As mentioned already, the most fundamental and important of these is the Labor Standards Act which establishes minimum working standards, such as employers’ duty of full payment of wages (Art. 24), maximum working hours (8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, Art. 32), paid leave (10 to 20 days a year, Art. 39), special protection of young workers (Arts. 56–64) and pregnant women (Arts. 64–2 to 68), workers’ compensation for work-related accidents (Arts. 75–88), rules of employment (Arts. 89–93) and supervision (Arts. 97–105) and penalties (Arts. 117–21).

LSA applies to all establishments which engage in the employment of workers irrespective of the number of workers. The exceptions are family businesses which employ family members only (Art. 116 para. 2), domestic workers (Art. 116 para. 2) and other employment relations for which special regulations apply, namely seamen (Art. 116 para. 1) and some civil servants. From a comparative perspective, the Labor Standards Act is very broad in its coverage.
Working conditions set forth by employment contracts, work rules and collective agreements that are inferior to the standards set by the Labor Standards Act are void and replaced by the Act’s mandatory legal norms (LSA Art. 1311). Minimum standards prescribed in worker protective laws are enforced by the Labor Standards Inspection Offices, in addition to the sanction of criminal penalties.

To provide flexibility, the LSA allows deviation or derogation from the mandatory norms based upon a “labor-management agreement (majority representative agreement).” The majority representative agreement is different from a collective bargaining agreement concluded between employers and labor unions. The majority representative agreement is concluded between an employer and a “representative of the majority of workers at an establishment,” namely a union organizing a majority of the workers in the establishment or a person representing a majority of the workers in the absence of a majority union. Deviation from the mandatory minimum standards is allowed when the Act explicitly prescribes such derogation. For instance, the LSA requires a majority representative agreement for deduction of wages, hours-averaging schemes or overtime work.

Labor contracts (individual employment contracts)

The LSA requires the employer to clarify the working conditions to the worker when concluding a labor contract (LSA Art.15). Article 5 of the Ordinance for Enforcement of the LSA (OELSA) enumerates matters which shall be clarified. In particular, clarification pertaining to the place of work, content of work, work hours, payment of wages, and retirement must be made in writing (OELSA Art. 5 para. 2).

It is, however, rather rare for an employer and a worker to make a written contract and prescribe concrete working conditions in detail. Workers merely agree orally that they will work for the company. To satisfy the requirement to clarify working conditions, the employer usually presents the worker with the work rules, which cover most items to be clarified. As long as the worker raises no objection to the content of the work rules, he is regarded as having agreed to the conditions. Thus, the conditions stipulated in the work rules become the substantive content of employment contracts.
Work rules

Work rules are the most important legal tools regulating terms and conditions of employment in Japan.

Duty to draw up work rules

Work rules are a set of regulations set forth by an employer for the purpose of establishing uniform rules and conditions of employment at the workplace. Article 89 of the LSA prescribes that an employer who continuously employs ten or more workers must draw up work rules on the following matters: (1) the time at which work begins and ends, rest periods, rest days, leave, and matters pertaining to shifts, (2) the method of decision, computation and payment of wages, date of payment of wages and matters pertaining to wage increases, (3) retirement including dismissals, (3–2) retirement allowances, (4) extraordinary wages and minimum wages, (5) cost of food or supplies for work, (6) safety and health, (7) vocational training, (8) accident compensation, (9) commendations and sanctions, and (10) other items applicable to all workers at the workplace. Items 1 to 3 are absolutely mandatory matters which must be included in the work rules. Items 3–2 to 10 are conditionally mandatory matters which must be included in the work rules when the employer wants to introduce regulations concerning these matters.

When the employer institutes the work rules for the first time or when the work rules are altered, the employer must submit those new rules to the competent Labor Standards Inspection Office. The rules must also be made known to the workers by conspicuous posting, distribution of printed documents or setting up accessible computer terminals (LSA Art. 106, OELSA Art. 52–2). The duties for drawing up, submitting and displaying work rules are sanctioned by criminal provisions (LSA Art. 120).

In drawing up or modifying work rules, the employer is required to ask the opinion of a labor union organized by a majority of the workers at the workplace or, where no such union exists, the opinion of a person representing a majority of the workers. However, a consensus is not required. Even when the majority representative opposes the content of the work rules, the employer may submit them to the Labor Standards Inspection Office with such an opposing opinion and the submission will be accepted. In this sense, the employer can unilaterally establish and modify work rules.

Though it is not clear from the provision, it is generally interpreted that “ten or more workers” should be calculated not in the enterprise but in the establishment, on the rationale that work rules apply in each establishment and procedures for drawing up work rules presuppose each establishment as a unit (LSL Art. 90).
The legal effect of work rules and their unfavorable modification

The work rules apply to all workers in a workplace or establishment. Work rules cannot violate enacted laws or collective agreements applicable to the establishment (LSA Art. 92 para. 1). The LSA gives work rules an imperative and direct effect on individual labor contracts. Namely, the Act states that employment contracts that stipulate working conditions inferior to those provided in the work rules shall be invalid and that such conditions are to be replaced by the standards in the work rules (LCA Art. 12).

The LCA incorporates the established case law on reasonable modification of work rules. As a principle, the modification of work rules without a worker’s consent is not binding but if the modification is reasonable, such modified work rules have a binding effect on all workers, including those who were opposed to the modification itself (LCA Arts. 9, 10). Underlying this ruling is a consideration for employment security and the necessity for adjusting working conditions. Traditional contract theory dictates that a worker who opposes the modifications of working conditions be discharged. However, according to the established Japanese case law, such a dismissal may well be regarded as an abuse of the right to dismiss. On the other hand, because the employment relationship is a continuous contractual relationship, modification and adjustment of working conditions are inevitable. In light of these circumstances, Japanese courts have given unilaterally modified work rules a binding effect on condition that the modification is reasonable. These unique rules can be called the Japanese version of “flexicurity,” reconciling flexible regulation of working conditions with employment security.13

Collective agreements

The fourth vehicle for regulating the content of individual labor contracts is a collective bargaining agreement between the employer and the union.

Normative effect

According to Article 16 of the LUA, any portion of an individual labor contract is void if it contravenes the standards concerning conditions of work and other matters relating to the treatment of workers that are provided for in a collective agreement. In such a case, the invalidated parts of the individual contract are governed by the standards set forth in the collective agreement. Similarly, if there are matters that the individual employment contract does not cover, the same rule applies.

13 Araki, supra note 8.
Therefore, the “normative effect” actually consists of two legal effects: an imperative effect that nullifies the portion of an individual contract that contravenes the standards contained in the collective agreement, and a direct regulating effect that alters provisions of the individual contract.

Collective agreements not only supersede individual contracts but also invalidate work rules that contravene the collective agreement (LSA Art. 92).

Enterprise-level bargaining and legal effect of collective agreements

Almost all collective agreements in Japan are concluded at the enterprise level because unions are normally organized on an individual company basis. Consequently, in contrast to the practices in Western Europe, collective agreements can regulate not minimum, but actual working conditions. Therefore, according to the accepted interpretation, the normative effect of collective agreements invalidates not only disadvantageous individual contracts but also advantageous contracts unless the collective bargaining agreement itself allows such contracts. In other words, *Günstigkeitsprinzip*, or the principle which permits more favorable individual agreements, is not generally accepted. Decentralized collective bargaining enables the parties concerned to adjust and determine working conditions in a particular company swiftly and appropriately.

Employer’s duty to bargain collectively

In most industrialized countries, because employers have no duty to bargain, labor unions must put economic pressure on employers to make them come to the bargaining table. In contrast, the Labor Union Act imposes upon an employer a duty to bargain with a union in good faith, and a refusal to bargain is prohibited as an unfair labor practice (LUA Art. 7 no. 2).

The duty to bargain in good faith is not synonymous with the duty of co-determination. The employer must bargain in good faith, but he is not forced to make concessions or to reach an agreement.

As to the introduction of the unfair labor practice system, the Labor Union Act of Japan is modeled on the Wagner Act in the United States. However, the LUA does not adopt an exclusive representation system. Each union that meets statutory requirements enjoys full-fledged rights to bargain collectively and go on strike. Therefore, in Japan, there are neither elections to choose an exclusive representative of workers nor the notion of a bargaining unit. A union that organizes a few workers in a single company has equal bargaining rights with a

14 Sugeno, *supra* note 4, 589; Araki, *supra* note 8, 175.
union that organizes the majority of workers in the company (plural representation system).

A second difference is that, unlike the Taft-Hartley Act in the United States, the LUA does not impose a duty to bargain on labor unions.

**Enforcement mechanism of labor law**

**Court system**

Japan has no courts specially designated for labor litigation. All labor and employment related lawsuits must be filed in ordinary courts. The judges are professional jurists.

Japan has a three-tiered court system: district courts (including Labor Tribunals), high courts and the Supreme Court. The district court in each prefecture is usually the court of first instance. A party may appeal from a judgment of the district court to the competent high court. It is possible for a party who is not satisfied with the judgment to make a further appeal to the Supreme Court. However, the grounds for appeal to the Supreme Court are limited to errors of interpretation of the Constitution or other violations of the Constitution in the original judgment (Code of Civil Procedure, Art. 312 para. 1). The Supreme Court also has discretion to accept appeals where the original judgment contradicts the precedents of the Supreme Court or involves other significant matters concerning the interpretation of law (Code of Civil Procedure, Art. 318 para. 1).

Until 2006, Japan did not have a labor court system with lay judges like Arbeitsgerichte in Germany, Employment Tribunals in the UK, and conseil des prud’hommes in France. Faced with the rapid increase in individual labor litigation, however, Japan introduced a new labor dispute resolution system called the Labor Tribunal System (Roudou Shinpan) in 2006.

The Labor Tribunal System established in each district court in Japan is a procedure consisting of one professional judge and two lay judges recommended by labor and the management side respectively. In a sense, therefore, the Labor Tribunal System is a Japanese version of a tripartite labor court, although it is not a separate court but a forum established in an ordinary court.

---

15 Cases where the amount at issue does not exceed 900,000 yen must be filed in a summary court. The cases filed in the summary court can be appealed to a district court and to an appellate court, but not to the Supreme Court.

Because the new tribunal is in principle aimed at overcoming delays in labor litigation, the Labor Tribunal must decide the case within three sessions. This means that a filed complaint will be disposed of within three or four months. Its hearings are informal and not open to the public. If either party rejects the Tribunal’s decision, it has no effect, but the case is automatically transferred to the regular civil section of the same district court.

Since its coming into operation in 2006, the Labor Tribunal System has enjoyed a strong reputation for its expedited procedures and high performance with a high rate of settlement (80 percent).

**Administrative agencies of the national government**

The Ministry of Labor was responsible for the administration of labor law and labor policy until the end of 2000. However, as a part of the reform of Japan’s central bureaucracy, the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Health and Welfare were merged and the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Labor (MHWL) was established in January 2001. Within the MHWL, several bureaus are in charge of the administration and implementation of labor laws. The MHWL maintains Prefectural Labor Bureaus in each of the 47 prefectures to implement the laws at local level.

The Labor Standards Bureau within the MHWL administers labor standards established by the Labor Standards Act, the Minimum Wages Act, the Industrial Safety and Health Act. The Labor Standards Bureau also administers the Workers’ Accident Compensation Act. Actual implementation of this labor protective legislation occurs through the Labor Standards Inspection Offices in each prefecture. Approximately 3,500 Labor Standards Inspectors work at 343 Labor Standards Inspection Offices throughout Japan. The Labor Standards Inspectors are authorized to inspect workplaces, to demand the production of books and records, and to question employers and workers (LSA Art. 101). Furthermore, with respect to a violation of the LSA, Labor Standard Inspectors shall exercise the duties of judicial police officers under the Criminal Procedure Act (LSA Art. 102).

A worker may report violation of labor protective laws to the Labor Standards Inspection Office. Dismissal and other disadvantageous treatment by reason of such a worker having made a report is prohibited by criminal sanctions (LSA Arts. 104, 119 no.1).

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act is administered by the Equal Employment, Children and Family Bureau within the MHWL. Under its Prefectural Labor Bureaus, the Equal Employment Offices (*Koyo Kinto-shitsu*)
are responsible for the daily enforcement of the laws related to employment equality and harmonization of work and family life.

The Employment Measures Act, the Employment Security Act, the Worker Dispatching Act and other labor market policy and regulations are administered by the Employment Security Bureau within the MHWL. The Public Employment Security Offices are responsible for public placement services, vocational guidance, and the employment insurance system, including distribution of benefits and grants to workers, as well as firms.

Labor Relations Commission (Rodo linkai)

The Central Labor Relations Commission at the national level and the Local Labor Relations Commissions in each prefecture deal with collective labor disputes. This commission is an independent administrative committee comprised of an equal number of commissioners representing employers, workers and the public interest.

The Labor Relations Commission has two main functions. First, it engages with collective labor disputes through conciliation, mediation and voluntary arbitration. Second, it adjudicates unfair labor practice cases and issues remedial orders when it finds that an unfair labor practice was committed by an employer.
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EMPLOYMENT LAW IN THE UNITED STATES: A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The United States is a federal structure composed of a national government and 50 states in addition to the District of Columbia and other possessions. The federal government is composed of an executive branch – including autonomous administrative agencies – a bicameral legislature and a three-tiered system of federal courts: district courts, circuit courts of appeals, and the Supreme Court. Actions of the federal government within its constitutional sphere are binding upon the states. Thus, federal legislation may preempt state action, that is, reserve a field of regulation to it exclusively, or allow the states to act so long as they do not contravene the federal scheme.

Each of the 50 states has its own three-branched governmental form: its own constitution, which may be more capacious in recognition of individual rights than is the federal constitution; its own executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

Unlike some countries where the constitution sets out labor rights or whose bill of rights is taken to be part of the order of legal values that infuse private employment relations – Germany is an example of this – with one exception, the abolition of slavery, the federal constitution controls public, not private centers of power. For example, an employee cannot invoke a constitutional right of free speech against an action of a private employer. In some states, however, the state constitution may act on the private sphere as, most notably, do some provisions in California.

Responsibility for employment regulation

Until the constitutional revolution of the New Deal in the 1930s, the power of Congress to legislate regarding the terms and conditions of employment, even of employees who worked for employers engaged in interstate commerce, was extremely limited: only if the employee actually crossed a state line in the performance of his or her work did Congress have any power. Thus, the basic regulation of employment fell to the states either by common law – contract or tort – or by legislation. In a scenario that is echoed in the global economy today, competition between the states could be conducive toward a “race to the
bottom,” for business to locate—or relocate—to states that allowed lower pay or poorer working conditions. That fact served as a barrier to such state reforms as the elimination of child labor or improving occupational health and safety. Interstate competition in labor protection generally, and especially hostility to unionization via so-called “right to work” laws, persists today.

Minimum employment conditions

Collective bargaining law

The law of collective bargaining is federal—in the Railway Labor Act (which, oddly, includes airline employees) and the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), which includes many but by no means all private sector employees. It excludes, for example, independent contractors, domestic workers, and supervisors. The NLRA allows employees to engage in collective bargaining by a system of exclusive representation by majority rule—a model little followed elsewhere in the world. It prohibits conduct by employers and unions that interfere in the right to form a union (or to refrain from doing so) and regulates good faith in collective bargaining. The Act is administered by an administrative agency, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), which has regional offices throughout the United States. Critically, under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution, the fact that the power to regulate employee representation is given to a federal agency has been held to preempt the states from taking any action, by legislation or by common law, that does or might upset or interfere in the federal system.

Union density in the private sector has been in steady decline since the mid-1970s. Today, unions represent about 6.6 percent of the civilian non-agricultural labor market; but, given the exclusions from coverage, union density with respect to those capable of exercising the right to engage in collective bargaining is actually a bit higher.

Other preemptive federal employment law

There are a variety of other federal laws that preclude state action but, with one exception, these tend to address narrowly defined and closely regulated subjects. The major exception is the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) which broadly regulates pension and welfare benefits. It sets out a preemption clause that sweeps away all state law insofar as it “relates to” that which ERISA regulates, subject to exceptions.
Non-preemptive federal law

For the most part, federal employment law sets floors of rights. The states are accordingly free to echo that which Congress has established or go beyond it; and they do. Some of these federal laws are:

- The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) which regulates child labor, sets out a federal minimum wage, and requires the payment of time and a half for work in excess of a 40-hour week, subject, however, to extensive and elaborate exemptions.
- The Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), which establishes a command and control structure and a system of standards and sanctions.
- The Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (WARN), which provides for 60 days’ notice of plant closing or mass layoff.
- The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), which requires eligible employees to be given up to 12 weeks’ unpaid leave for family and medical emergencies.
- Anti-discrimination in employment laws, starting with the Equal Pay Act in 1963, requiring equal pay for equal work for men and women (not comparable pay for comparable work, as in some countries), and expanding thereafter to prohibit employment discrimination on grounds of: race, sex, religion, national origin (all under the Civil Rights Act of 1964), citizenship (under immigration law), age (under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act), and disability (under the Americans With Disabilities Act). Again, unlike many countries no law requires employers to provide paid vacations or paid leave – for illness, childbirth or child care.

Employment law: state law and the “at-will” rule

The law governing the formation and existence of an employment relationship as well as the terms and conditions of it is largely state law. Who an “employee” is for federal statutory purposes is a federal question to be decided under each such statute. For the most part, U.S. law applies a more rigid employee/independent contract or distinction at both the federal and state levels.

Employees also confront the legacy of the late nineteenth century’s embrace of laissez-faire. In that period the states adopted the rule that absent agreement on employment for a fixed term – or strong evidence implying such a term – the employment was indefinite and so terminable by the employer or employee without notice. To this the courts added the notion that the power to terminate was unfettered by law; it was irrelevant that the employer acted mistakenly, arbitrarily, or even maliciously. The “at-will” rule is much criticized today and has become riddled with exceptions, legislated and judge-made; but it persists,
which, because of the many exceptions that can vary significantly from state to state, makes the U.S. law of employment almost bewilderingly complicated. Unlike Germany, Japan, Australia, Brazil, and a great many other countries, there is no general right not to be dismissed wrongly — aside from statutes in Montana and Puerto Rico.

**State protective legislation**

Many states do echo or go beyond non-preemptive federal law: they provide a higher minimum wage or add protected categories not included under federal antidiscrimination law, for example, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identification, obesity (Michigan), or “appearance” (District of Columbia). As a result, there may be a multiplicity of fora, administrative and judicial, federal and state, to which an aggrieved employee may have resort.

State laws deal also with such matters as: occupational safety and health, including mandatory rest periods; workers’ compensation; unemployment compensation insurance (under a federal system but subject to state participation with considerable areas of state discretion); drug and alcohol testing; whistleblowing and other conscientious objection; plant closing; job references; wage payment; covenants not to compete; trade secrets; employee privacy; and a good deal more.

**The common law**

There is no federal common law of contract or tort. Federal courts may have jurisdiction to hear cases presenting such issues where the parties are from different states — for example, a Delaware incorporated corporation being sued by an Illinois employee — under so-called “diversity of citizenship” jurisdiction where the dollar amount is above a certain threshold, but the common law to be applied in such cases is that of the relevant state under the forum state’s “choice of law” rules. Thus such matters as defamation, deceit, invasion of privacy, infliction of emotional distress, interference in prospective economic advantage, breach of loyalty or fiduciary duty are matters of state law. In some areas, the states generally take a uniform approach — indeed, there may be a “uniform state law” — but in others they differ, sometimes sharply.

**Vindicating legal rights: courts, administrative agencies, and arbitrators**

In some cases the aggrieved employee has available — or must resort to — an administrative agency. For example, claims that an employer has interfered in or coerced employees in their right to unionize or engage in other acts of statutory mutual aid or protection under the Labor Act must be made to the General Counsel’s office of the NLRB which may — or may not — issue a complaint and
pursue legal process. There is no private right of action under that law. Claims of unlawful employment discrimination under the Civil Rights Act must first be presented to the federal and any cognate state administrative agency; and if they decline to sue, which is most often the case, the individual has to secure counsel and bring a lawsuit on her own. The United States has no labor court, unlike, for example, Germany or Brazil. Consequently, resort must be had to state or federal court which, as a practical matter, means that the aggrieved individual must secure legal counsel.

A number of American companies have adapted policies that require non-unionized employees to forego access to the courts and submit all their legal claims to arbitration systems of the company’s devising. The United States Supreme Court has upheld the enforceability of these plans under a 1925 federal law so long as due process is afforded. The states are not free to adopt policies disallowing employers that power.

References

There is no single comprehensive treatise on all of U.S. labor and employment law. Rather, there are comprehensive volumes treating the law of collective bargaining, employment discrimination, occupational health and safety, wrongful dismissal, covenants not to compete, and so on. The relevant references on U.S. law will be adverted to in the discussion of the problems that ensue.

B. SOME DEMOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

From an HR practitioner’s perspective, it is important to understand the demography of the labor markets that you choose to compete in. Whether they be existing markets and mapping trends, or analyzing information and trends as you aspire to new markets. These demographic realities shape the competitive and structural forces to which we will need to respond. Having a clear understanding of these trends can help identify potential shifts in protections or priorities for enforcement. Additionally, for a values-driven organization (as opposed to a purely bottom-line driven organization) understanding and being comfortable with these structural profiles can help drive policies relevant to your market space. Crafting these policies to reflect the demographic realities that you face can provide a significant opportunity to gain an advantage in attracting and retaining talent.

Director, HR, Industrial Manufacturing Sector
More comparative data will be set out in connection with the discussion of specific problems. What follows will give a broad overview of the five countries presented for comparative study.

Table I.2 Workforce size, education expenditure, and UN education index by country (2007, estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Workforce size (m)</th>
<th>Education expenditure (as a percent of GDP)</th>
<th>UN education index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>99.47</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>66.07</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>153.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/as.html. The UN education index is measured by the adult literacy rate (with two-thirds weighting) and the combined primary, secondary, and tertiary gross enrollment ratio (with one-third weighting). The adult literacy rate gives an indication of the ability to read and write, while the GER gives an indication of the level of education from nursery (UK & others)/kindergarten (USA & others) to postgraduate education.

Table I.3 Labor force participation, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Employment-population ratio – Total (Percent of civilian working-age population)</th>
<th>Labor force participation rate – Total (Percent of civilian working-age population)</th>
<th>Labor force participation rate – Men (Percent of civilian working-age population)</th>
<th>Labor force participation rate – Women (Percent of civilian working-age population)</th>
<th>Women’s share of the labor force (Percent of civilian labor force)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The first row, employment-population ratio represents the total percentage of working-age civilians who were employed in 2009 (the balance were unemployed or not looking for work). The second row includes all participants in the labor force, employed and unemployed. The next two rows represent the same percentages, broken down for men and women. Finally, the women’s share of the labor force represents the percentage of the civilian labor force (the middle three rows) who are female.
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Table I.4 Labor participation rate by gender (% female and % male, population aged 15+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table I.5 Unemployment rate by gender (% female labor force and % male labor force)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table I.6  Population age distribution by country (2008, estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>0-14 years</th>
<th>15-64 years</th>
<th>65 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
