REFLECTIONS ON THE STRIKE
No rest for the weary

There is, it always seems, an understandable feeling of almost euphoric relief which sweeps over a union and its members once a collective agreement has been signed.

Understandable particularly when a strike or some other form of job action was necessary to win the agreement; unions are made up of their members, the members are people, and there is nothing people like to do more than relax once the big battles have been won.

Unfortunately — and this is particularly so in the case of the Hospital Employees’ Union and its recent strike against the Health Labour Relations Association — the end of a strike only rarely means the end of the fight.

It usually means only the easiest half of the battle has been won; the really difficult part remains to be done.

In the Union’s case, that second half is a complicated maze of implementing the contract which was won, of taking it to the federal Anti-Inflation Board for review, of continuing the difficult task of job evaluation, of having the collective agreement printed and distributed to the membership, of scheduling and holding contract interpretation seminars for shop stewards at 99 hospitals all over the province.

Weary as most of us are after the strike the Association forced upon us, with all its attendant long hours and no-holiday weeks, there is no time to rest.

All Union members, from the newly-initiated member of a six-person Unit in the province’s hinterlands to the provincial president, still have a mammoth task before them: to see to it that the agreement so dearly come by is made to work.

The staff at the provincial office has prepared the Union’s submission to the AIB (no decision on the contract had been made by the Board at press time).

The contract is being printed and prepared for distribution.

Unit officers are studying their new collective agreement, familiarizing themselves with its contents so they may guard against any encroachment on the rights they have fought for.

Everyone has earned a rest.

But there just doesn’t seem to be time for one.

Under the glare of television arc lamps for what he hoped would be the last time in a long time, Union Secretary-Business Manager Jack Gerow looked decidedly uncomfortable.

Facing a room full of reporters, television cameramen and news announcers, he fidgeted impatiently in his chair, pain-fully aware that he was still wearing the blue athletic warm-up suit he had been wearing when he had been pulled from his bicycle in Vancouver’s Stanley Park the night before and rushed off to Victoria to meet with Labour Minister Alfian Williams.

The cameramen finished adjusting their equipment, nodded and Gerow began: “The first strike in the history of the Hospital Employees’ Union is over . . .”.

Gerow was meeting the press on June 10, the last day of the 21-day cooling off period which had interrupted the Union’s three-week-old strike on May 20 (Guardian, May-June 1976).

The night before, Williams had introduced Bill 75, the Hospital Services Collective Agreement Act, in the Legislature.

Now, before the cameras, Gerow was announcing that the Union had decided to comply with the back-to-work legislation that strike votes had been cancelled (28 were taken during the course of the strike and the cooling off period) and that the 72-hour strike notices the Union had served but not acted on had been withdrawn.

Everyone in the room knew the Union had been vindicated: the bill made law everything contained in the Blair Report, which the Union had ratified.

It was the Blair Report which the Health Labour Relations Association had rejected, claiming it was inflationary; it was that rejection which had sparked the strike.

That County Court Judge Ted McTaggart, the special mediator named by Williams when he imposed the 21-day cooling off period, had confirmed everything Industrial Inquiry Commissioner D. B. (Bert) Blair had recommended earlier — except the length of the contract — justified the Union’s claim that the strike had been unnecessary from the start.

That a Social Credit government had legislated the Blair-McTaggart recommendations as a collective agreement could only mean they were a fair, just contract.
The Blair-McTaggart recommendations, which form the basis of the collective agreement imposed by Bill 75, came out of a series of seven Union-Association meetings held between May 26 and June 2.

In his report to Williams on those meetings, McTaggart said:

"My failure to (conclude a collective agreement) centres around the uncertainty of financing.

"The Union accepts the report of Mr. Blair with reluctance; it will settle for nothing less. (See special April edition of the Guardian for details of the Blair Report).

"The Employer (99 hospital boards) says it cannot accept Mr. Blair's report."

McTaggart went on to review the Blair Report, starting by saying that "in view of (Blair's) known integrity and his great experience and knowledge in the hospital industry, and other areas, and the time which he spent (36 days) in coming to his conclusions, it seems to be common ground that a very heavyonus lies on anyone seeking to change his report or set it aside."

The Association, he said, nevertheless "presented a detailed submission requesting changes. The most important of these was that the job evaluation program be implemented subject to its official release and funding by the government, but without any retroactivity."

But, McTaggart said, he was "unable to find any mistake of fact or principle by Mr. Blair in his report," which provided for that retroactivity.

---

**Sims named as troubleshooter; tribunal formed for VGH**

As Judge McTaggart talked to the Union and the HLRA, he said in his report to Labour Minister Williams, "it was soon apparent that the relationship between management and employees was at a very low ebb and had been for a long time."

"In particular, I am concerned with the unsatisfactory situation at Vancouver General Hospital.

"I did receive some encouragement from the parties to explore methods of improving the day-to-day relations between them."

McTaggart added two sections to the collective agreement he was proposing to Williams to try to improve those day-to-day relations and to reverse the "low ebb" of Union-Association relations.

The first clause (Article IV, Section 11) provided for the appointment of a hospital industry "troubleshooter", who would derive his powers under a section of the provincial Labour Code.

A still-to-be-named troubleshooter for the hospital industry will be empowered to try to solve disputes between hospitals and the Union before they reach the arbitration stage.

Under the contract, the troubleshooter will be required to:

* Investigate differences between the hospital and the Union; Define the issues in the difference; and Make written recommendations to resolve the dispute.*

The law allows him five days, from first receipt of the grievance, to make those written recommendations, which are not binding, but which should—hopefully—resolve grievances without resort to arbitration proceedings. But McTaggart obviously felt the problems at Vancouver General needed even more. So he inserted a second new clause (Article IV, Section 11), which set up a tribunal to "consider immediately grievances existing at the... hospital."

The tribunal will be chaired by Sims; Secretary - Business Manager Jack Garow will represent H.E.U. on the panel, Bill Rolfe the Association.

The industry-wide troubleshooter may not be named until the tribunal has dealt with the problems at Vancouver General, where about 50 grievances were on the books when the tribunal was appointed.

Vancouver General Servicing Representative Ray McCready said he thought it would take the tribunal "about two weeks" to clear up the backlog of grievances once it began sitting.
Negotiations remain stalled at West Coast Regional

LATE BULLETIN

Just before press time, McCartney told the Guardian he had reached tentative agreement with West Coast Regional on a contract. He described the agreement as being “almost identical” with the Union’s provincial master agreement, with only minor variations.

Both the employer-paid dental plan and the special leave clause were included in the tentative agreement, he added.

Voting on the proposal by members of the Port Alberni Unit was to have taken place in early July.

The next issue of the Guardian will include a full report on the Port Alberni situation.

Because of those contracts, they were reluctant to give HEU members a fully-paid dental plan, as hospitals whose bargaining was done by the HLRA had done.

Similarly, because the contracts signed with the other associations did not include a special leave clause, the Port Alberni trusts were reluctant to give the benefit to HEU members.

Despite the delays, McCartney said, the negotiations with the West Coast Regional negotiators were very much on a “friendly” basis.

Additional meetings between the Union and the hospital were scheduled for late June, the servicing representative said, but he added it was “unlikely” they would result in a settlement.

Win, loss at Nanaimo

A mid-April award made by Arbitrator Ray Herbert has given physiotherapy aides at Nanaimo Regional General Hospital pay rate adjustments of between $117.25 and $132.75 a month.

The award raises salaries for the aides — which had started at $733 and ranged up to $765 — have been adjusted to the same pay rates earned by licensed practical nurses: a starting salary of $650.25 per month, with a top-of-the-scale salary of $897.75.

In his decision, Herbert noted the Union had asked him to adjust pay rates for the Nanaimo aides upwards to the level paid aides at Gorge Road Hospital in Victoria.

But, he said, the Gorge Road pay scales “reflect an agreement concluded about January, 1974, that physiotherapy, occupational therapy or activity aides should be trained practical nurses or graduates from a formal training course recognized by the hospital for these classifications.”

The Nanaimo hospital argued that, as this training was not a prerequisite to employment in the aide classification there, no pay adjustments should be made.

Herbert rejected the claim, saying “that because of (the work’s) intrinsic character — direct patient care and particularly treatment — the work should attract the L.P.N. rate.”
28 Units – and how they voted

Strike votes were taken at 28 British Columbia hospitals in the period between April 27 – when the Health Labour Relations Association rejected the Blair Report – and June 10, when the passage of Bill 75 meant there was no point in taking any more.

Of those 28 Unis, only one – the Chilliwack Unit – failed to approve strike action; 15 approved a strike by more than a 2-to-1 vote.

Seven hospitals, of course, were struck by the Union before the 21-day cooling off period was ordered.

How the votes went:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Votes for Strike (per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Columbian</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Lake</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount St. Francis</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby General</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Memorial</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond General</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorge Road</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria General</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.A.</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Gate</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Memorial</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Jubilee</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.F. Strong</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Control</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Union, which was represented at the arbitration hearings by Vancouver Island Servicing Representative John Weisgerber, did not fare so well in its attempt to get nursing unit clerk Mrs. Teresa Larsen reclassified in a new job title, nursing unit clerk (psychiatric).

The Union had sought a pay rate adjustment of about 8.5 per cent, with Larsen's salary to rise from $584.50 to $744 per month.

"The apparent basis for the request," Herbert noted in his award, "was the suggestion that there is some degree of risk attendant upon association with psychiatric patients and that they can, in certain ways, be troublesome."

The arbitrator concluded there was no real evidence the job in the psychiatric ward was "significantly different" than the work performed by nursing unit clerks elsewhere in the hospital and rejected the request.

Gorge workers lose

In an award handed down earlier in April, Herbert was not so receptive to the Union's arguments as he was in the Nanaimo dispute, denying outright a request for reclassification of cleaners, ward and housekeeping aides at Victoria's Gorge Road Hospital.

The Union, relying on a "suggestion" from D. R. (Bert) Blair dealing with a pay rate adjustment request at Golden in 1973, argued that employees now classified as cleaners and ward and housekeeping aides at the Victoria hospital should be reclassified in a new three-level pay scale, building service worker 1, 2 and 3.

"In his award, Blair offered descriptions for the proposed classification which I think may be summed up as descriptive of light, medium and heavy cleaning duties," Herbert said, "and, bad though it is supposed to be, reflecting general physical capacity – BSW 1 as 'female work' and BSW 3 as 'male work', with the middle category considered appropriate for either sex."

The Union asked that housekeeping aides – now paid the same rate ($702 to $730) as the ward aides, should be reclassified as BSW 2s, with pay rate adjustments of $778.25 to $790.25.

Ward aides, the Union said, should be reclassified as BSW 1s (with no change in pay) and cleaners should be reclassified as BSW 3s (again with no increase in pay).

"While I have no doubt that the work of the housekeeping aides is, in some respects, more strenuous than the work of the ward aides," the Arbitrator said, "and seems to require more in the way of non-routine response to needs . . . I cannot say the jobs are so different as to require a money differential between them . . ."

RAY HERBERT
The task of designating essential jobs and employees in the event of another hospital strike may be taken out of the hands of the Labour Relations Board and given to the Hospital Inspections Department, Health Minister Bob McClelland hinted in a recent Guardian interview.

The department is included in McClelland's health portfolio in the provincial government.

The health minister stopped just short of confirming the change, saying he could not do so until after he had further discussions on the question with Labour Minister Allan Williams.

But the inspection department "will take a much more active role" in future hospital disputes, McClelland stressed, "particularly in the designation of essential services."

The minister said he also expected to bring the province's hospital boards "much more into the picture" in the event of another hospital strike, since his department had received "numerous complaints" during the recent strike about the "usurpation of their (the boards') role in the running of the hospital."

He did not indicate exactly what form the boards' expanded role would take.

McClelland said his comments should not be taken as criticism of the job performed by the Labour Relations Board—a branch of the provincial department of labour—in the designation of essential services and employees in the recent strike against the Health Labour Relations Association.

"Everyone involved in that strike did as good a job as could be expected," the minister said, "under the circumstances."

"It must be remembered that it's a pretty awesome responsibility when you ask a body like that (the LRB) to determine, first, what are essential services, then how many people—and which ones—are needed to maintain them."

The recently-concluded strike—the first in the Union's 31-year history of collective bargaining with the province's hospital industry—was the first real test of those sections of the provincial Labour Code enacted by the previous NDP government which govern strikes in essential service areas, the minister said.

"Everyone," he predicted, "will be better prepared next time, though we certainly hope there won't be a next time."

That possibility was cast into doubt by the minister's next remark, in which he rejected, in the strongest terms possible, the Union's call for the dismemberment of the HLRA and for direct bargaining with the government in hospital contract negotiations.

"There is just no way this department will engage in direct bargaining with (the) Union," McClelland said, "that is not even a possibility."

"I don't feel it would be a proper role for the minister of health, or his department, to bargain with the Union for so long as hospital boards run the hospitals in this province."

The HLRA, the minister said, not his department, is the certified bargaining agent for the province's hospitals.

To eliminate the Association would be to detract from the authority and stature of the boards, he claimed, and neither he nor his government would be party to any such action.

If anything, the minister said, the role of the hospital boards would need to be strengthened, particularly in the areas of contract negotiations and work stoppages.

BOB McCLELLAND
...and the spark visible already

While it is not yet clear exactly what other changes in the Labour Code the government is considering in its efforts to gain greater control over the conduct of strikes in British Columbia, amendments to the Code already introduced in the Legislature have provided for:

- An extensive broadening of the right of the government to decide what industries and services are “essential” within the meaning of the Code.

Until the amendments, which have been passed after bitter debate in the Legislature but which have yet to be proclaimed as law, the designation of essential services was limited to the hospital, firefighting and police fields.

The new legislation gives the Provincial Cabinet the power to declare virtually any industry or service field essential, thereby drastically reducing the freedom of the trade unions involved in them to strike.

- The stretching of the 21-day cooling off period previously provided for — which the Union was hit with during its recent strike, of course — to almost double that time, to 40 days.

- Stringent new regulations governing the taking of strike or lockout votes.

The Labour Relations Board will be made responsible for seeing to it that the new regulations are followed; the amendments give the Board the right to supervise the taking of strike votes.

Williams, when he introduced this amendment, said he was doing so as a result of complaints about the manner in which strike votes were taken by the Union during its strike against the HLRA.

He did not say what the complaints were, or who had made them.

The Union’s Constitution, of course, already provides for secret balloting on the questions of contract ratification and a strike.

Votes taken during the recent dispute, despite wide public acceptance of rumours that strike votes were conducted by the “show-of-hands” method, were all conducted by secret ballot and only after stringent precautions to ensure that everyone who wanted to vote, did vote.

- Making the Labour Relations Board responsible for supervising the issuing of hot edicts, particularly by the B.C. Federation of Labour, but also by other, non-unionized organizations.

Hot edicts are a call for a boycott of a certain business or services by trade unions, usually issued after a strike or lockout at the business has begun.

Reaction to at least some of the amendments was, surprisingly, almost universal.

Trade unions condemned them as being unnecessary, inflammatory and insidious.

Particularly maddening, they said, was the amendment to provide for new rules for the taking of strike votes, and the supervision of those votes by the Labour Relations Board.

Most trade unions noted the move was a return to policy which had been originally formulated by the Social Credit regime, under W. A. C. Bennett, ousted from office by the NDP landslide in 1972.

The legislation providing for supervision of strike votes had been scrapped even before the old Socred regime was toppled, however, discarded when it became obvious that the Board didn’t have the manpower to carry out the prescribed supervision and that unions were honest enough to count their own ballots.

Surprisingly enough, the stand that the supervision legislation was unnecessary was supported by some of the most traditionally conservative voices in the province.

In Victoria, Vancouver, Prince George, Trail and many other centres around the province, newspapers not particularly noted for their trade union sympathies decried the move as “overkill”, “regressive” and “insulting”.

In and out of the Legislature, opposition MLAs (NDP, Liberal and Conservative) said the move was unnecessary.

The move to place into the hands of the Labour Relations Board the right to order withdrawn any hot edict with which it did not agree was also questioned by many.

More than once it was pointed out that hot edicts have no real force in law: they are simply a call on trade unions to support other trade unions by boycotting a company and its goods or services.
THE TROUBLE WITH OLIVER

An appeal to Labour Relations Board Chairman Paul Weiler on the decision of an LRB hearing into the firing of four employees at Beaver Lodge in Oliver is considered “likely” by Union Servicing Representative Owen Adams.

Adams, who works out of the Union’s Okanagan office, said at press time the decision of the hearing had not yet been officially handed down, but that he had been told unofficially that the firings had been endorsed and confirmed.

The appeal, if launched, he said, would centre on his feeling that the hearing had been influenced by factors other than those which should have properly been laid before it.

The only real question which should have been considered by the hearing was whether the four employees had lost their jobs because they had contacted the Union in a bid to become a certified bargaining unit, Adams said, which would constitute a clear and flagrant violation of the provincial Labour Code.

But the hearing listened to evidence, the servicing representative added, about the changing role of the government-fund Lodge from one of a care facility to that of a training centre.

“This obviously has nothing to do with the question which was placed before the hearing,” Adams said.

The problems at Beaver Lodge began early this year, when some of the 14 employees there contacted another trade union and asked it to represent them and seek certification on their behalf.

That union failed to do so and the employees contacted the Unit chairman of HEU’s Oliver Unit, asking if the Union would assume responsibility for collective bargaining.

A meeting with six of the employees was arranged to discuss the matter — within days of that meeting, four of the six who attended were fired by the hospital.

The four protested to the LRB and a hearing in nearby Penticton was set for early June.

At that first hearing, Adams became aware that the four were not represented by legal counsel and managed to have the hearing adjourned while the Union arranged for Vancouver lawyer Dick Larson to represent them.

When the hearing resumed, Adams said, neither he nor the lawyer were able to keep it from considering evidence totally unrelated to the issue at hand: Were the four employees discharged for seeking certification as a bargaining unit of the Hospital Employees’ Union?

Active organizing at Beaver Lodge will likely continue after the matter has been resolved, Adams said.

workers’ law

Drafting a will

A will, like most things which involve the law, is not so simple a thing as many hospital employees seem to think.

But, compared with many other legal documents, it is a fairly uncomplicated thing. Consulting a lawyer to have a proper one drafted, therefore, is not likely to cost much.

Consulting a lawyer to find out what is involved, and how much the actual drafting of the document will cost, shouldn’t cost anything.

But, as anyone who has had to try to untangle the financial affairs of someone who has just died without leaving a will can testify, it is an essential document.

There is a precise procedure to be followed in the drafting and signing of a will. If that procedure isn’t followed, the document which results won’t be a will.

That scrap of paper, on which “everything is left to my loving husband”, isn’t going to be considered valid, in other words, no matter if it is sanctified by having been deposited in a safety deposit box.

Some basic decisions are required for any will:

- An executor must be named.
- This is the person who will be responsible for seeing to it that the terms and conditions of the will are carried out.

Usually, it’s a relative, a close friend, or a lawyer. Whoever it is, the person should be asked if they are willing to undertake the responsibility of being the executor before the will is drafted.

- The beneficiaries must be determined.

It is common for a person to give everything to their spouse, or the event the spouse dies first — to their children or grandchildren.

For minor children, it may be advisable to establish a trust, to be administered by the executor, which would provide for meeting the expenses associated with the raising of the children and for the balance of the estate to be turned over to them when they come of age.

It is more, not less, important for an unmarried person to draft a will, since there may be confusion about the estate if no immediate, logical heir is apparent.

- For people who do have infant children, a will can be used to designate guardians.

This formalizes the sort of arrangement, often made verbally, where a brother or sister, or a close friend, agrees to look after children if their parents die.

It is almost the only foolproof way to ensure that children are cared for by the persons the parents want, rather than by a guardian named by a court.

As with executors, no one should be named as a guardian who has not agreed to undertake the responsibility before the will is drafted.

“I’m afraid it’s the chicken pox, Colonel.”
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CASH FOR THE BILLS — WHERE IT'S COMING FROM

The Union's strike against the Health Labour Relations Association was expensive, so all bills aren't in yet, but Union Financial Secretary John Darby has estimated that when they are, they will total more than $300,000.

That money went for a lot of things, from coffee and doughnuts for the pickets to printing picket signs, from badges for picket captains to rental of vans to patrol the picket lines.

Paying the bills hasn't been easy, though the Union does have the assets to do so.

But Darby said, "If all the outstanding bills were paid from these assets, very little would remain."

So, in May, Darby put out a call for Unit donations, and the response was immediate, and gratifying: when this issue of the Guardian went to press, more than $12,000 had been donated by 30 Units, and chances were still coming in.

UNIT DONATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul's</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish</td>
<td>430.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. St. Francis</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Denver</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enderby</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invermere</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quesnel</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell River</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithers</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. St. Mary</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny Hill</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lytton</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Falls</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson Creek</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lashich</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. St. Joseph</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's (New West)</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Priory</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $12,757.33

OTHER DONATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Tetz</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Evans</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers at V.C.H.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local 3910, Unif. Workers of America</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. A. Janz</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Union</td>
<td>1,415.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Woodworkers of America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local 1-217</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene and Hugh Duff</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $2,185.86

UNIT LOANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quesnel*</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Alexandra</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillooet</td>
<td>145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlegar</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $1,270.00

*Indicates Units which also made donations.
private hospitals

The case against William Garrison

The dismissal of a shop steward who had the audacity to go home because she was sick was the last straw.

The Union, filing unfair labour practice charges against Richmond Private Hospital and its owner–administrator, William Garrison, has decided to take the case to court.

The charges will specify claims that Garrison and his administrative staff have intimidated Union members, harassed Union members and, generally, tried to bust the Union at the hospital, one of five at which a first agreement was imposed by Joe Weiler last January (Guardian, Jan.-Feb. 1976).

The incident which finally persuaded the Union Servicing Representative Sharon Yandle that no recourse other than an unfair labour practice charges was possible was, in many ways, typical of the attitude the administrator has adopted since that contract was imposed.

Karen Gore, the shop steward for the day shift at Richmond Private, was fired on May 25 after she went home sick for three days following an argument with a matron who had told her the day before she didn’t look well and should go home.

Gore’s real difficulties began in April, when her hours of work were drastically reduced, contrary to the collective agreement (in effect, she was partially laid off). She tried for several weeks to get her hours reinstated, but was unsuccessful.

Unable to handle the continual harassment she received as shop steward, she resigned the Union post, saying she wanted to see if the harassment would stop.

It did. Her hours were reinstated and she was no longer the target of the vindictive diatribes she had been subjected to as a shop steward.

Two weeks after her resignation, at the request of the Unit chairman, she resumed the post of shop steward.

The next day, she carried a list of grievances to the matron (including one which dealt with the case of an employee who had been told she would have to work 14 straight days in order to “earn the privilege” of taking her annual holidays in July). An argument ensued.

The day after that incident, Gore reported to work and found she had been assigned two separate jobs, in different areas of the hospital, both of which had to be done at the same time. Other workers had been assigned either no duties, or had greatly reduced work loads during that time period.

Once again, this case is illustrative of the unfair labour practices charge being withdrawn.

RICHMOND PRIVATE HOSPITAL

At this issue of the Guardian went to press, two new developments at Richmond Private Hospital were announced:

Shop Steward Gore has been re-instated in her job at the hospital, with back pay to compensate her for the wages she lost while she was not working;

Garrison has agreed to remove himself and his matrons from the grievance procedure and to hire a full-time director of employee relations to deal with the Union.

These concessions resulted in the unfair labour practices charge being withdrawn.

Again Gore went to the matron and again an argument ensued.

Finally, at the end of her patience, she said she would do the work.

As she returned to her work, she muttered — to no one in particular — “what a bitch” (referring to the situation at the hospital).

The remark was overheard by the matron, who immediately called Gore into her office and again began screaming at her, this time with another matron in attendance (the second matron had told Gore the day before that she didn’t look well and should consider taking time off for sick leave).

Gore said she wasn’t well and was going home.

The matron told her if she “walked through that door, (she wasn’t) coming back”.

The shop steward walked through the door and went home, where she was confined to her bed for three days.

She was “terminated” that evening.

Garrison at first insisted she had quit, then said she had been dismissed for “screaming and yelling” at the matrons.

The incident was typical of the tactics Garrison and his administrative staff have used to battle the Union since the hospital was certified early last year.

Another example: back in January, just after the first contract was imposed, Garrison arbitrarily eliminated paid meal periods for the night shift workers at Richmond Private, again in direct violation of the contract.

About three months ago, unable to reason with the owner-administrator, the Union launched a grievance over the matter.

Incredibly enough, Garrison refused to accept the grievance; after a screaming tirade against one of the employees who had filed it, he managed to intimidate the staff to the extent that no one wanted to put their name to a protest.

The Union asked chief shop steward Brenda Lovell to file a general grievance on behalf of all night shift employees, which Garrison again refused to accept, saying general grievances could only be dealt with if they affected all employees, on all shifts, at the hospital.

(Continued on page 12)
We're not saying it took a long time to settle the dispute over a contract for 1976, but... Back in September, just before negotiations began in earnest with the Health Labour Relations Association, provincial bargaining committee member Paul Urmon and his wife Sue discovered they had done something right and were going to be parents. Christopher, the new baby, was born on June 9, the day Labour Minister Allan Williams introduced Bill 75 in the Legislature, almost nine months to the day after the happy event which was responsible for the happy event.

Lest anyone be deluded about the willingness of the HLRA to bargain with the Union in good faith, the following item should be illuminating:

On the first day (May 26) of the talks with Mediator D. E. McTaggart, both Union Secretary-Business Manager Jack Gerow and HLRA Chairman Chester Hooper agreed with the Judge that anything which had been agreed to by both parties before Industrial Inquiry Commissioner Bert Blair entered the dispute in December would be "untouchable", automatically a part of any new proposed agreement.

How soon they forget...

On the very last day of the meetings (June 9), the Association suddenly demanded two items — retroactivity on job evaluation and retroactivity on standardization requests — be deleted from Judge McTaggart's recommendations.

This is the sort of thing the Union has had to grow accustomed to in its dealings with the Association, but it's also the sort of thing which convinces us the Association isn't really interested in bargaining with us — only in breaking us.

* * * * * *

The British Columbia Federation of Labour's hot list still includes all Skyway Luggage products, all Seagram's products.

California grapes remain high on the hot list (United Farmworkers' grapes are acceptable; but many of the stores lie about whether their grapes are UFW, so it's easiest just to stay away from grapes altogether).

The Federation is continuing its call for a province-wide boycott of Sandman hotels and motels (the chain is violently anti-union and recently finished building the first hotel in downtown Vancouver built with non-union labour in decades).

Also being boycotted is Tilden Car Rentals, the only major car rental agency to successfully avoid organization by the Office and Technical Employees' Union back in the early 1970s.

The Canadian Labour Congress, again to support the UFW, has labelled Sunmaid raisins and all Diamond-Sunsweet products hot.

Local 351 of the Teamsters' Union (Miscellaneous Workers, Wholesale and Retail Delivery Drivers and Helpers) remain on strike against American Hospital Supply (Canada) Division, which usually markets under the label of Pharmaseal or Texpack.

In a recent decision of the Labour Relations Board, it was ruled that Texpack Division is a part of the American Hospital Supply operation, and therefore liable to the same pressure as that company.

Both companies are under the umbrella of McGaw Supply Ltd.

The Teamsters' strike against Chevron Canada Ltd. (Standard Oil of British Columbia Ltd.) ended May 11.

* * * *

Starting with the last (May-June) issue of the Guardian, the bottom section of pages 11 and 12 has been set aside for the Union Songbook, a section where — for as long as we can find songs to print — songs related to the labour movement will be run.

The page can be clipped and bound, and before too long, can form the basis for a booklet of union music.

Contributions of favorite union songs will be both appreciated and used; mail them to The Editor, The Guardian, 538 West Broadway, Vancouver V6Z 1E9, marked "Union Songbook".

---

**Where the Fraser River flows**

*Written by Joe Hill, Spring, 1912 (to the tune of "Where the River Shannon Flows")*

Fellow workers, pay attention to what I'm going to mention, For it is the clear intention of the workers of the world That we should all be ready, true-hearted, brave and steady, To rally 'round the standard when the Red Flag is unfurled.

CHORUS: Where the Fraser River flows, each fellow-worker knows, They have bullied and oppressed us, but still our Union grows. And we're going to find a way, folks, for shorter hours and better pay, folks. Chorus: And we're going to win the day, folks, where the Fraser River flows!

For these gummy-sack contractors have all been dirty actors, And they're not our benefactors, as each fellow-worker knows. So we've got to stick together, in fine or dirty weather, And we will show no white feather, where the Fraser River flows. Chorus: Now the boss the law is stretching, bulls and pimps he's fetching, And they are a fine collection, as Jesus only knows. Chorus: But why their mothers reared them, and why the Devil spared them Are questions we can't answer, where the Fraser River flows. Chorus: This is one of several songs written by Joe Hill in strike picket camps along the line of the Canadian National Railroad in British Columbia in the spring of 1912. The strike shut down 400 miles of railroad construction and made the Industrial Workers of the World (the One Big Union) one of the most hated labour organizations in the country. Folklore has it that it was during this strike that a Chinese restaurant owner coined the term "Wobbly", using it as a question in an attempt to determine if his customers were IWW members. Hill was murdered in Utah three years later for his union activities.
Solidarity forever

Written by Ralph Chaplin, January, 1915
(to the tune of “John Brown’s Body”)

When the Union’s inspiration through the workers’ blood shall run,
There can be no power greater anywhere beneath the sun.
Yet what force on earth is weaker than the feeble strength of one?
But the Union makes us strong.

CHORUS:
Solidarity forever! Solidarity forever!
Solidarity forever! For the Union makes us strong!

Is there aught we hold in common with the greedy parasite
Who would fash us into servitude and would crush us with his might?
Is there anything left to us but to organize and fight?
For the Union makes us strong.

CHORUS:

It is we who plowed the prairies; built the cities where they trade;
Dug the mines and built the workshops; endless miles of railroad laid.
Now we stand outcast and starving, ‘mid the wonders we have made;
But the Union makes us strong.

CHORUS:

All the world that’s owned by idle drones is ours and ours alone;
We have laid the wide foundations, built it skyward stone by stone.
It is ours, not to slave in, but to master and to own,
While the Union makes us strong.

CHORUS:

They have taken untold millions that they never toiled to earn.
But without our brain and muscle, not a single wheel can turn.
We can break their haughty power; gain our freedom when we learn
That the Union makes us strong.

CHORUS:

In our hands is placed a power greater than their hoarded gold;
Greater than the might of armies, magnified a thousand-fold.
We can bring to birth a new world from the ashes of the old.
For the Union makes us strong.

CHORUS:

Victory at KGPH

The Labour Relations Board issued a cease-and-desist order to the operators of King George Hospital in Surrey on June 11, marking the first occasion such an order has been issued in the Union’s continuing battle with private hospital operators.

In its order, the board instructed the hospital to “cease using coercion or intimidation of any kind . . . ” which would have the effect of compelling employees to quit or not join the Union.

The order followed a complaint by the Union against the King George Private Hospital, alleging unfair labour practices, earlier this year.

As at many other private hospitals where the Union has been certified, employees at King George have been subjected to harassment and mounting pressure since they joined the Union (Guardian, March-April, 1975).