During Master Agreement arbitration

HLRA New Offer — Zero Per Cent Wage Increase

The HLRA has taken a drastically new position at the bargaining table during the Master Agreement arbitration and offered HEU no wage increase for 1982 and 1983. HEU members will be increased to learn that the HLRA has withdrawn its previous August, 1982 5 per cent wage increase offer (with no retroactivity) for 1982. It’s long gone down, the member of HEU’s Provincial Bargaining Committee.

The new rate (0) per cent HLRA offer was presented during arbitration hearings held August 25-27 in Victoria before arbitration board chairman Don Munro.

The offer shows contempt for the plight of HEU members who are now facing excessive workloads at hospitals and health-care facilities due to government cutbacks. HEU and HLRA are scheduled to complete their cases before the arbitration board by late September.

A final decision on the 1982 issues is not expected before early November. HEU is arguing for a 20 per cent wage increase effective Jan. 1, 1982. HEU does not endorse the government’s wage restraint plan (the Compensation Stabilization Program). HEU has gone on record as calling the CSP one of the most reactionary and inhumane government schemes ever devised.

After the arbitration board makes its award, a further delay is expected when the award stands the test of CSP Commission, Jan. 2, 1982.

Report On The Larson Decisions

Because of the cutbacks in health care spending by the provincial government, and the subsequent unprecedented number of layoffs, a number of disputes have arisen between HEU and HLRA relating to the layoff, bumping and recall of hospital employees.

These disputes have been referred to Industry Trouble Shooter Dalton Larson who has been granted binding powers equivalent to an Arbitration Board.

In a Memorandum of Agreement signed late in July, the parties agreed that any decisions made by Larson would be binding upon both HEU and HLRA as well as all hospital employers covered by the Master Agreement.

A summary of the Larson decisions that were available at Guardian press time appear on page 3.

Concentration Delegates Face Pressing Issues

A number of serious and pressing concerns to HEU’s 25,000-strong membership will be raised and discussed by over 400 delegates attending the Union’s Thirteenth Biennial Convention Sept. 27-30.

This month’s convention will be conducted against a backdrop of massive layoffs in the health care industry as well as employer attempts to take advantage of hospital employees because of government financial negligence.

The 51 constitutional amendment proposals from HEU Units are wide-ranging and include one from the Kankoono Unit to increase HEU’s defence fund to $2 million.

Conference Delegates Face Pressing Issues

Other Unit constitutional amendment proposals cover such varied and diverse topics as an increase of members on the Provincial Executive, communication during Master Agreement bargaining, reducing the number of delegates to HEU conventions and monies spent from the Political Education Fund.

Constitutional amendment proposals from the Provincial Executive include an increase in the monthly membership fee of 1.25 per cent of gross salary (with a minimum of $5 per month), elimination of the convention registration fee.

Conf ed on p. 8

Workloads Now “Oppressive”

Grim Future For Health Care

The financial mismanagement and lack of social policy demonstrated by Health Minister Kim Nixon and Premier Bill Bennett has now placed the state of health care in B.C. in a precarious state. The very future of a decent health system in B.C. today hangs by the thinnest of threads. In fact, what is holding up the health care system, despite cruel and insensitive cuts by the government, is the dedication of health care workers.

HEU members daily face excessive workloads because of the cutbacks in government funding and although these oppressive workloads are being met today, it is unknown how long HEU members can be expected to carry government mismanagement on their backs.

Late in July, Bennett and Nielson held out a promise that health care was not going to be affected by government restraint. In the July/August Guardian, HEU stated it was not privy to conditions on the basis of Bennett’s promise of increased health care expenditures.

The Vancouver Sun played a similar sleight of hand in August when, in an editorial, the newspaper commented on the government’s dismal performance in health care.

“Now we are all convinced that the $90 million saved (by doctors’ fee) rebalances and the chopping dentists would be spent in the hospitals. There is no way whatever that the public will be able to tell if it is. What is happening is that the government is trying to make up for its poor management of the health system and its economic forecasting mistakes.”

We thought the day might well come to its senses but it
Biennial Convention '58


Biennial Convention '82

Over 400 HEU members from every corner of the province will take part as delegates to HEU's upcoming Thirteenth Biennial Convention in the democratic process that is the Hospital Employees' Union.

The task they have before them is a formidable and challenging one. The delegates' mandate will be to chart the future course of HEU and to do so in such a way as to advance HEU's longstanding tradition of democratic membership participation.

The delegates will be vested with all the sovereign powers of the union for the four days that the convention is in session from September 27 to October 30.

With these powers, the delegates will make the essential policy decisions that will guide HEU over the perilous roads that lie ahead. One of the most perilous roads that HEU travels today is the one of confrontation with the provincial government which is bent on dismantling the health care system and destroying the economic security of health care workers.

For HEU there must be no turning back. HEU must continue its course of defending the rights of B.C.'s sick and injured and at the same time, secure, maintain and advance the interests of the membership.

There are a number of landmines awaiting HEU members, most of them planted by the provincial government. But it is not just the provincial government that is the enemy of health care.

Too many B.C. hospital administrators and boards of trustees are all too willing to be Sacred "hatchet men".

HEU is meeting the challenge by taking the provincial government to court (page 1 story) in order to reinstate the thousands of health care workers who have been laid off because of unconscionable financial cutbacks in health care.

It is a certainty that those at the Convention will have all this mind when the Convention is in session.

Delegates to Convention '82, just like the delegates (pictured above) at HEU's first Biennial Convention in 1958, will continue HEU's strong tradition of seeking and achieving highly-principled goals for health care workers.

HEU's history of achievement will serve as a reminder to all HEU delegates when they gather in Richmond September 27-30.

HEU's unwavering spirit of achievement has succeeded in not only improving the quality of health care delivered at B.C. hospitals and health care facilities but also in guaranteeing decent compensation for the work being performed by HEU members.

After the convention is over September 30, the delegates decisions will be the voice of the 25,000-member Hospital Employees' Union.
Florence Nightingale Unit members (from left) Maria Yee, Louise Brown and Mary Dober listen during a special unit meeting Sept. 8.

To Recall To Any Vacancy

Laid-off Employees Not Entitled

On the question of "What is the Employer's obligation under Article VI, Section 2 (b) of the Master Agreement?" Larson decided that employers have no obligation to recall laid-off employees to do temporary work following an extended or indefinite termination date.

By temporary work that would be ordinarily done by casual employees, i.e., work of a duration less than one month.

Therefore Larson decided that the words "work of an on-going nature" limits the obligation of the employers to recall employees to such work where both parties agreed was defined as "work without an anticipated termination date.

HEU took the position that laid off employees were entitled to be recalled to any vacany whether of a casual, temporary or on-going nature.

Larson added that an employee who refuses to return to work is not given a restraining order or even minimised within 7 days of a notice of recall. The employee is not notified if he leaves the job and there is no more any argument that laid off employees are entitled to bid on vacant jobs under Article VI, Section 13.

"Only where an employee agreed to a recall and then fails to report for work within 7 days is the employer deemed to have abandoned work for her/his employee," Larson said.

Furthermore, Larson decided that the employer's obligation to recall the most senior employee first is not present.

"He said that the employer is only obliged to make offers to those that would be the most senior employees and if unable to do that then it will go to the next most senior employee on the seniority list.

31 Days To Exercise Bumping Rights

HEU members will have 31 calendar days with pay to exercise bumping rights.

The decision made a distinction between "bumped" and "replaced" employees.

Laid-off employees are those, according to the agreement, eligible to be bumped for bumping rights or choose not to exercise them and therefore are entitled to whatever notice period is provided by the Agreement in accordance with their seniority.

"Replaced" employees are not "necessarily" entitled to any notice period, provided by Article VI, Section 8 (b) because "those notices provisions apply only to employees who are laid off.

Larson said that a "bumped" employee is not laid off when her/his job is bumped but rather "displaced" since their employment continues (by exercising bumping rights) although their job may not.

HEU took the position that a "replaced" employee is entitled to whatever notice period is provided by Article VI, Section 2 (b) of the Master Agreement. The Union reasoned that a previous arbitrary hearing held chaired by Charles Stewart (November 1978) said that an employee has 28 days within which to exercise bumping rights in circumstances when the Master Agreement gave the employee the right to 28 days notice of a impending lay-off.

Larson said that since those provisions have now been changed entitling employees to a range of notice from 31 calendar days to 6 months, the Union position, therefore the bumping period should be extended accordingly.

Larson ruled that senior employees who are displaced and the determination of their jobs shall be the most exercise their bumping rights within 31 calendar days from the date of Notice of Lay-off. The majority, similarly, employees who are bumped by a replacement shall have 31 calendar days within which to exercise their bumping rights.

He also said that displaced employees have a choice to exercise bumping rights or within 31 calendar days. If an employee chooses to be laid off, that employee is obliated to give them lay-off notice under Article VI, Section 8 (b).

Notice of Layoff While on Leave

Notice of layoff to employees if they are on Workers' Compensation, sick leave or paid or unpaid vacation can not be taken effect prior to the date of lay-off.

The Employer is not required to notify laid-off regular employees of management by personal contact, letter or any other written notice.

"If because of the Restriction Program the hospital terminates an employee and then at a later date reinstates the job, the former incumbent is not automaticaly entitled to go to her/his former position, however the hospital is required to post a job again," Larson said.

The hospital cannot utilize "staggered lay-off" to prevent lay-offs or lay-off notice of vacancies over employees who are laid off due to management.

The Employer is required to notify laid-off regular employees of management by personal contact, letter or any other written notice.

Notice of layoff to employees if they are on Workers' Compensation, sick leave or paid or unpaid vacation can not be taken effect prior to the date of lay-off.

The Employer is not required to notify laid-off regular employees of management by personal contact, letter or any other written notice.

"If because of the Restriction Program the hospital terminates an employee and then at a later date reinstates the job, the former incumbent is not automaticaly entitled to go to her/his former position, however the hospital is required to post a job again," Larson said.

"The hospital cannot utilize "staggered lay-off" to prevent lay-offs or lay-off notice of vacancies over employees who are laid off due to management.

The Employer is required to notify laid-off regular employees of management by personal contact, letter or any other written notice.

Notice of layoff to employees if they are on Workers' Compensation, sick leave or paid or unpaid vacation can not be taken effect prior to the date of lay-off.

"If because of the Restriction Program the hospital terminates an employee and then at a later date reinstates the job, the former incumbent is not automaticaly entitled to go to her/his former position, however the hospital is required to post a job again," Larson said.

"The hospital cannot utilize "staggered lay-off" to prevent lay-offs or lay-off notice of vacancies over employees who are laid off due to management.

The Employer is required to notify laid-off regular employees of management by personal contact, letter or any other written notice.

Notice of layoff to employees if they are on Workers' Compensation, sick leave or paid or unpaid vacation can not be taken effect prior to the date of lay-off.

"If because of the Restriction Program the hospital terminates an employee and then at a later date reinstates the job, the former incumbent is not automaticaly entitled to go to her/his former position, however the hospital is required to post a job again," Larson said.

"The hospital cannot utilize "staggered lay-off" to prevent lay-offs or lay-off notice of vacancies over employees who are laid off due to management.

The Employer is required to notify laid-off regular employees of management by personal contact, letter or any other written notice.

Notice of layoff to employees if they are on Workers' Compensation, sick leave or paid or unpaid vacation can not be taken effect prior to the date of lay-off.
HEU Staff Appointments

HEU is pleased to announce the appointments of John Hurren and Ken Strange as staff representatives in charge of regional staff

Brother Strange, a former staff representative of the United Steel Workers of America in Kamloops and Trail, will work out of HEU's new Kootenay Regional Office in Nelson.

Strange worked for the Steelworkers Union for eight years and has been employed for 13 years at the Cominco smelter in Trail. He commenced his duties August 8.

Brother Hurren took over his duties at HEU's Prince George Regional Office July 19. Hurren worked for the B.C. Government Employees' Union for seven years in a number of positions including that of Assistant Director of Collective Bargaining and Arbitration. Prior to that he served for 7 years as a elected officer in the BCSEA including a stint on that union's Provincial Executive.

LTC Negotiations Continuing

Negotiations are continuing between HEU and HLRA with respect to the renewal of 16 collective agreements affecting certain Long Term Care facilities covered by the Long Term Care Standards Agreement.

HEU and HLRA met in August based on HEU's contention that the negotiations become an integral part of the Master Agreement on which the union was panel chaired by Don Munroe.

It is the goal and objective of HEU to integrate these negotiations into the overall collective agreement of the parties and given what HEU understands to be the Employers' membership position with HLRA on the same basis as other LTC facilities which are presently covered under the Master Agreement.

The 16 facilities are: FINNISH LODGE, Burnaby; YUCALTA LODGE, Okanagan Falls; PARK HOMELodge, Chilliwack; GLACIER VIEW LODGE, Comox; SWAN VALLEY LODGE, Cranbrook; BURRAND MANOR, Golden; MOUNTAIN VIEW LODGE, Lillooet; Forth's PARK VILLAGE, Port Alberni; RIDGEWOOD LODGE, Prince George; MOBERLY PARK MANOR, Revelstoke; FINNISH CANADIAN REST HOME, Vancouver; SHAUGHNESSY MANOR, Vancouver; OMEDA LODGE, Vanderhoof; ROSE MANOR, Cowichan; QUITMALA COMMUNITY SERVICES Inc., White Rock; HALCYON COMMUNITY HOME, Nakusp.

Small Town Act Won't Fool Unions

HEU doesn't think Premier Bill Bennett was kidding anyone with that recent "I come from a small town" reference when referring to the B.C. Government Employees' Union contract dispute.

Bennett had this to say about the dispute, as reported in The Vancouver Province September 5: "I come from a small town where we care about each other, where we rely on each other, and help neighbours and when times are tough we know where to find another helping hand.

"This is new for us, where we have to deal with industrial relations that I just don't know how to deal with the government, which has its roots in tough financial straits. In fact, we're short on time and we've got to act for the time for everyone to cooperate." That sort of charlatan Aca-

Emethyene Oxide (ETO) "potential carcinogen"

HEU urges all HEU members who work with or near ethylene oxide (ETO) to be aware of its potential dangers.

The Union also urges HEU members to ensure that management complies with procedures outlined in a January 1982 memo from Health and Welfare Canada to hospital administrators.

Highly placed memos were reported in the March and April issues of The Guardian. Copies of the memo as well as other important information regarding ETO were mailed to Unit Secretaries-Treasurers August 19.

The Canada Safety Council has now issued a hazard warning about ETO saying it should be regarded as a "potential occupational carcinogen."

Health officials in California are concerned that 12,000 hospital workers in that state's The Hospital Guardians, September 1982 / 4

Healthcare In Decline Say Survey Respondents

The results of a survey released in August by the Alliance to Save Health Care paints an alarming picture of the province's health care system.

And what is doubt frightening is the fact that this poll of health care workers was done prior to the health care cutbacks in May and June.

The 49,000 health care workers in B.C. were asked what the state of health care is and the percentage of answers that were given:

- over half of the respondents said staffing was inadequate
- 22.3 percent said staffing decreased over the previous year
- nearly half said they did not have enough time to "complete all duties safely and satisfactorily"
- over 50 percent said workloads increased over the past year
- 56 percent said in-service education was inadequate or non-existent
- over two-thirds said short-staffing caused them to do things by themselves they should have help doing
- one-quarter said there was inadequate maintenance of machinery and equipment
- nearly one-third described cleanliness as inadequate

Health Minister Jim Nielsen was sent a copy of the survey results on August 20 but as of early September at Guardian press time he had not bothered to respond to an Alliance request for an immediate meeting to discuss the problems.

No Commitment From Government

Cont'd from pg. 1 come when the government responds. The medical society and Nielsen and not read the interim report of the Public Commission on Social and Community Service Cutbacks? The horror atonism that the commission heard resulting from cuts in health care spending were enough to bring tears to

Even if the government now supported the democracy and announced increased spending in health (during or just prior to the next election campaign), voters will recognize it for what it is — cheap electioneering and no real commitment to the public's need for a reliable and well-funded health care system.

Patients Day Demonstrates Government Underfunding

A so-called Patients Day held August 15 at Sunny Hill Hospital For Children, organized by the hospital's management to raise funds, demonstrates the serious underfunding that exists at the Vancouver hospital.

Many HEU members have been laid off this year at Sunny Hill because of provincial government cutbacks and this has resulted in a deterioration of the children's care, according to the award.

The board rejected an employer presentation that any employer presentation that any new patients day contingent upon the Ministry of Health providing funding for the plan.

that the students should not be performing the work of the qualified, laid-off HEU members. HEU took the firm position that the laid-off HEU members, who are experienced in health care, should be recalled before untrained students were hired.

Unit Chairperson Isabel O'Brien told The Guardian that the event held August 15 was a "clear signal the hospital is desperate for funds."

"Shouldn't the hospital be given the money to pay for the people who are trained to do the job of looking after the patients" she added. "If the hospital wants the money, they should pay the people who are trained to do the job," she concluded.

The Canada Safety Council has now issued a hazard warning about ETO saying it should be regarded as a "potential occupational carcinogen."

Health officials in California are concerned that 12,000 hospital workers in that state's...
Members recognize Union effort

HEU Successful In Overall Dietary Classification

The Pack Consent Award regarding dietary job matches, signed in March by HEU, HLRA and Arbitration Board Chairman Ed Pack, covers 88 classifications in 112 institutions. Of those 589 classifications, only 28 (4.9 per cent) were red-circled.

The Guardian interviewed several HEU members who were classified this year for their comments about dietary classification.

Problems HEU Had To Face

In classifying dietary positions, HEU faced some problems because of the way the provincial government clearly undervalues and underpays certain employees.

HEU's mandate from the Hope Arbitration Award was to match as nearly as possible to government job specifications. In the case of food service supervisors, for example, the jobs seemed to fall within the Food Service Worker's specification with a rate that paid $1,500 per month.

HEU persuaded HLRA through negotiations to agree to a Cook 3 rate of $1,800 per month (August 1, 1981) as a floor rate. HEU recognizes that the results of this process are unacceptable to all employees who were red-circled but the Union was tied, through the Hope Award, to both the satisfactory and unsatisfactory aspects of the government pay structure. It will be the task of future collective bargaining to remedy any inequities in the pay structure imposed by both the Hope and the Pack Arbitration Awards.

Herb Scholz, Charge Cook
Vancouver General Hospital

"Classification was a tough fight for the Union. HEU did the best it could but HLRA kept trying to under-value the jobs. I can understand the food service supervisors feeling like they do about being red-circled and I don't blame them for being upset about it but the Union did all it could for them.

"And those damn (government) cutbacks. First we finally get through classification to get a decent wage and now I find out my job is being deleted in October. You fight to get something and then the employer chops you down again."

Ellie Cavanaugh, Dietary Aide
Lions Gate Hospital

"It's too bad it took so long to get settled but I'm glad it's over for dietary employees. I'll tell you one thing. It's much easier to work when you know you've been properly classified and getting a decent wage. The Union did a great job as far as I'm concerned."

Mary Voth, Dietary Aide
Royal Columbian Hospital

"I was happy with what the Union did for the members on classification. Not everybody got what they deserved but certainly the majority did and that's as much as you could ask for under the circumstances."

Peter James, Food Service Supervisor
Vancouver General Hospital

"I know HEU did the best it could to get us supervisors classified fairly in the face of a hostile employer attempts to red-circle our positions. It was tough on us because the red-circling that did take place happened at a time when staff is being reduced. So it punishes food service supervisors doubly because not only are our salaries being reduced but our work load is increasing."

Ramona Brady, Retail Cashier
St. Paul's Hospital

"Naturally, I'm happy with classification. It took a long time but it was worth it considering the upgrading most people got. I'm definitely appreciative of the Union's effort in getting the jobs upgraded but I do feel for those who's positions were not."

Terry Miller, Head Cook
Royal Columbian Hospital

"I have no complaints about classification. What bothers me now is that with all these layoffs, there is incredibly more work to do in the kitchen. Are we being punished by the hospital and government for getting a raise, or what?"

Dave Elphick, Cook
Lions Gate Hospital

"I am very happy with classification although there are some who didn't get a very good deal. I feel a lot better about my job now that I've been properly classified and I think HEU should be given credit for doing the very best it could for Union members under classification."

"You must be registered in order to vote in any provincial elec- tion. Look under "Electors" in the provincial government listings of the telephone book for voter registration information.

The Hospital Guardian, September, 1982/5
This Guardian feature highlights the reminiscences of a retired HEU member when the profiled member worked in a B.C. hospital or health care facility.

Because of the unprecedented amount of lay-offs that have occurred, the hospital administration has been continually reducing the staff in the B.C. health care system. As a result, the amount of work that has been taken place at the large hospitals in the province and health care facility in the province. Many HEU members in fact may be utilizing their bargaining rights for the first time this year and as such result feel a degree of uncertainty about where they will eventually be called to duty in the future if their current shift or job is eliminated.

The situation is so bad that a fellow HEU member has in fact been some psychological side effects such as anger and frustration. This is how much was caused when the HEU member lost his job.

HEU members who feel this uncertainty should keep in mind that the right to be bumped is based upon an employee's accumula-

ted seniority with the present employer. The length of service or the seniority rights in any practicable work environment is a right and is widely and almost universally accepted in practice.

Seniority and limitations in a con-
tact aim to provide maximum security, regardless of the influence those who have earned the longest service.

HEU members must remember that seniority provisions protect employees from unjustified layoffs, but not from layoffs in cases such as the serious illness of a close relative. If an employer would be forced to fire a person and choose who to fire, he/she wanted to keep a job and so that system would lead to all injustices.

Although the system of bumping creates a degree of discomfort, it is necessary to ensure that senior employees are rewarded for their years of service.

HEU members who have no bumping rights because of limited seniority should not get impatient. Members who exercise their bumping rights but rank behind a member of the administration may have to appeal to arbitration and may be that if they do not understand why bumping rights must be exercised. Seniority rights are important because it means that the more years a member has, the better his or her chances.

An HEU member at Vancouver General with 8 years experience states: "There's been a wave of layoffs in the public service and already and naturally enough there was a lot of resentment at first, usually though, from people who don't understand why bumping rights must be exercised. Seniority rights are important because it means that the more years a member has, the better his or her chances in the public service."

"When I was first bumped, I was a little shocked but I soon started to think about it..."

Public Commission interim report

The formation of the public commission was announced by the government in the form of an act of legislature, and the deliver-

ance of the program is to be announced by Premier Bennett.

"Three of the most significant testimony was that of the public hearing. The statement of the people of B.C. in the report is that of the people of B.C.

"Overwhelmingly the evidence presented to the Commission by the people of B.C. and the Commission's report are such that the "health care (health care) is seen to be an essential service that people feel should be properly paid for with public money."

The subject of health care, testimony came from patients, relatives of patients, hospital staff, hospital trustees, hospital employees, professional associations, citizens outside the health care system, as well as from people who testified on behalf of HEU by Union Directors Bill Rolfe and Roy McCready.

The report recorded that the staff from long-term care facilities came to the hearings to speak on behalf of their members. The report also said that testimony, presented on behalf of HEU by Union Directors Bill Rolfe and Roy McCready.

In the area of health care funding, which the report stated that the government was willing to pay for, two points were noted: first, that HEU should not be charged and that the hospitals were balanced. Second, that there was a fixed budget in which the hospital budgets in B.C. are being held to less than 6 per cent.
An HEU goal to end discrimination

Equal Pay For Work Of Equal Value

HEU members now know "equal pay for work of equal value" is one of the issues that is to be arbitrated for the 1983 portion of the Master Agreement, as was outlined in the July 12 interim arbitration award.

The issue of equal pay for work of equal value is a very important one to HEU because of the discrimination that now exists against female health care workers.

HEU is seeking a non-discriminatory base rate of pay based on the cleaner rate ($1,600 per month as of August 1, 1980) with existing departmental differentials maintained.

However, government wage cutbacks and employer resistance to equal pay for work of equal value has, to date, continued wage discrimination against women.

HEU went on record earlier this year to continue its fight to negotiate equal pay for work of equal value in spite of wage controls. Equal pay for work of equal value is strongly backed by the Union's vast majority — women who earn less than the base rate given male HEU members in B.C. health care facilities.

Equal pay for work of equal value is a phrase used to describe the minimum rate of pay for women equal to the minimum rates of pay for men where the job factors of skill, effort and responsibility are substantially the same.

Equal pay for work of equal value is not the same as equal pay for equal work.

Both to end wage discrimination against women. But, they each refer to a different kind of discrimination.

Back in 1973, HEU argued that LPNs and Orderlies did substantially the same work and should, therefore, have the same rate of pay. After a long battle, the Union won. LPN's wages were raised to equal the orderly rate. That is equal pay for equal work.

But, many women work at jobs that men do not generally do. This includes clerks, food service workers, and nurse aides, among others. Equal pay for equal work does not apply here because the work is not the same.

But, discrimination remains. In most industries, the lowest paid women's jobs pay less than the lowest paid men's job. For example, in the hospital, the lowest paid women's job (Clerk I) pays about $1,167 per month while the lowest paid men's job pays about $1,300 per month.

The cleaner is, historically, the lowest paid predominantly male job. HEU's logic is simple — if men in the industry do not work for under $1,600 per month, there is no reason that women should.

When discussing equal pay for work of equal value, the question of how you measure value always comes up. The Canadian Human Rights Commission says you design a job evaluation system which measures the skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions required for each job. HEU has tended to stay clear of the method for a number of reasons. Job evaluation has a tendency to reduce men's wages. It is an expensive, complex, time consuming procedure. It pits worker against worker, and in the hospital industry, where the vast majority of workers are women, comparing under valued women's jobs to other under valued women's jobs, would not eliminate wage discrimination.

HEU is concentrating on eliminating the basic wage discrimination against women in hospitals by focusing on the very simple question: If men in hospitals are not expected to work for under $1,600, why should women?

If the E. R. Peck Tribunal had the jurisdiction to break tradition, to end discrimination and to compensate clerical employees for the obvious value of their skills, efforts and responsibilities, then and only then would the tribunal have issued an award that would be "final" as far as HEU is concerned.

As long as clerical workers and other women workers are underpaid under wages that are discriminatory and do not recognize equality, HEU will continue its fight to win equal pay for work of equal value.

If there was any doubt about the need for HEU's equal pay for work of equal value campaign that doubt has been shattered by the Peck Award.

Premier Bill Bennett publicly supported the equal pay for work of equal value concept at a gathering of the Social Credit Women's Auxiliary in November last year when he said equal pay must "become a cornerstone of Social Credit policy."

Bennett said in an interview with the Province newspaper that he had hoped HEU would eventually win equal pay for work of equal value, that women should be entitled to the same wages as men even though their jobs may be different.

"It is a fact, and not a pleasant fact, that women today for equal work do not receive equal pay," Bennett said.

We take it the premier wasn't just trying to win political points when he said that but instead is now committed to the equal pay for work of equal value concept.

HEU's Provincial Executive established an equal pay for work of equal value committee in November 1980. That committee met regularly right up to HEU's Eighth Provincial Wage Policy Conference in October of 1981.

The committee made a number of recommendations to HEU's Provincial Executive during that time, including the following:

— that women achieve equal job access in the industry;
— rejection of the human rights code as an avenue in seeking to change discriminatory wage rates being paid to women;
— amendment of the Essential Services Disputes Act so that arbitrators appointed under the Act are mandated to settle equal pay issues;
— adoption of "across-the-board" rather than percentage increases;
— avoid job evaluation since it tends to bring male wages down rather than bringing female wages up;
— rejection of the increment method as a means to increase wages since it means a delay of a number of years before the worker reaches the final increment step. The delay is unfair if the worker is improperly qualified to receive the highest step well before the total period of time required to reach the final rate has elapsed.

The committee's mandate was to develop and implement an awareness and bargaining program that would strive to eliminate the male/female wage rate discrimination that presently exists in the health care field.

The Hospital Guardian, September, 1981/7
May Small, an accounting clerk at Richmond General Hospital for the past 25 years, is an inpatient account clerk responsible for the financial aspect of patient care. The article discusses May's experience and the challenges she faces, as well as the importance of accurate billing and patient care in hospital settings.

May Small has been an account clerk for the past 25 years at Richmond General Hospital. She is responsible for ensuring that all financial aspects of patient care are accurately recorded and billed. The article highlights the importance of this role in maintaining the hospital's financial stability and ensuring that patients receive quality care.

May Small's experience at Richmond General Hospital is shared with other hospital account clerks, who face similar challenges in their work. The article serves as a reminder of the critical role that hospital account clerks play in ensuring that patients receive the care they need while the hospital remains financially viable.