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Board hearings continue

Meeting in a boardroom at Vancouver's Broadway Holiday Inn at press time, three men were hearing arguments over what to include in a new contract for the 30,000-plus HEU members who are covered by the provincial master agreement.

The three — Union Secretary Business Manager Jack Gerow, Health Labour Relations Association appointee Irwin G. Nathanson and Chairman H. Allan Hope — had been meeting at the hotel since early March. Their job, of course, did not end when those hearings did, in late March.

Once the Union's case had been presented (by the provincial bargaining committee, assisted by the Union's staff), and the HLRA had a similar opportunity for input, the three-man panel retired to consider the terms and conditions of the collective agreement which will replace the legislated contract imposed to end the Union's three-week strike in the Spring of 1976 (Guardian, June-August, 1976).

Their contract, imposed by the provincial government and subsequently rolled back by the federal Anti-Inflation Board, expired December 31, 1977.

Talks for a contract to replace it began last Fall, when the Union served notice on the HLRA that it wished to begin negotiations in early September.

The employers' bargaining agent chose to ignore that call for a start to negotiations, and actual talks did not begin until mid-October.

They stalled when the HLRA refused to budg from a list of demands considered completely unacceptable by the Union's bargaining committee, then broke off altogether in mid-December (Guardian, November-December, 1977).

After the negotiations broke off, HEU's bargainers went back to the Union's provincial executive, recommending the contract dispute be put to binding arbitration, under the provisions of the provincial government's then new Essential Services Dispute Act.

The executive, after examining the situation, agreed that arbitration was the most logical avenue open to the Union, and recommended the membership endorse the arbitration move.

That endorsement came in early January, when Union members voted to submit their demands for a fair contract to a three-member panel (Guardian, January-February).

Armed with the support of the general membership, HEU went to the provincial government and informed the minister of labour that it had decided to opt for binding arbitration under the provisions of the highly controversial essential services act.

By late January, the Union and the HLRA had agreed that Hope, a Prince George lawyer (see accompanying story), would chair the board.

Preliminary meetings were held in Vancouver in early February, then the real work of the board began.

At the same time, the tasks of the HEU's bargainers — already Herculean — became more complex, more difficult and more time-consuming.

Before, the negotiators had been kept busy preparing contract proposals, counterproposing HLRA suggestions and working to ensure the wishes of the membership — as expressed at the Sixth Provincial Wage Policy Conference in Vancouver last Summer (Guardian, September-October, 1977) — were incorporated into any and all proposals.

Now, they had the same tasks, as well as the job of putting together a brief which would explain to Hope the justification for each and every item put forward by the Union.

That meant forays into the Union's library, compilation of facts, figures and statistics, and almost continuous references to previous awards by boards of arbitration, mediators and industrial inquiry commissions.

At press time, those tasks continued, as the board continued to hear the submissions by both the Union and the HLRA.

It had scheduled hearings to accomplish that for most of the month of March and will have to set aside a good portion of April for its deliberations.

When its job would be done was impossible to predict.

The only sure thing was that it would, sometime, have a contract for the people who help keep this province's public hospitals operating.

And that made all the work worth the time, effort and energy which went into it.
Provincial master not only concern

HEU has lots of members, lots of Unis, and one master agreement which covers them all, right?

Wrong. While it is true that most of the Union’s 21,000-plus members are covered by the provincial master agreement—which was being considered by a three-member arbitration board at press time (see accompanying story)—there are any number of other Unis whose members are not, for one reason or another, covered by that contract.

And the Union must negotiate separate contracts for each and every one of those Unis.

At press time, more than eight other sets of contract negotiations were underway—or about to get underway.

Some of those negotiations are for HEU members whose hospitals aren’t members of the Health Labour Relations Association, which bargains for most public hospitals in the province.

Such is the case at Port Alberni’s West Coast Regional General Hospital, where Vancouver Island Servicing Representative Bill Muir is currently negotiating a new contract with the hospital’s board of trustees.

Muir is also negotiating a new contract for workers at Powell River’s Olive Devaux Home, where he has tabled a demand for the same contract covering most of the rest of the province’s health care workers.

Talks in Powell River had been adjourned at press time to allow the employers to study the Union proposals.

Probably the largest segment of HEU members not covered by the provincial master agreement are the employees of private hospitals.

Workers at eight Lower Mainland private hospitals, for example, were waiting at press time for the provincial minister of labour to name a chairman to head the three-member arbitration board which will be charged with the task of coming up with a new contract for them.

About 400 workers are employed at the eight hospitals, where one HEU negotiator said “virtually everything remains in dispute.”

The Union has asked for parity with the provincial master agreement, the employers have countered with a proposal which falls within the federal anti-inflation guidelines.

This employer demand came despite the change in the private hospitals’ source of funds, which have traditionally come from either the patients or some other outside (non-government) source.

Since the province’s Long Term Care program came into effect at the start of the year, though, most of the money comes through the provincial treasury, which pays for almost all of the operating costs.

“This means the major differences today between public hospitals and private hospitals are the sub-standard wages and working conditions in the private facilities,” a Union bargainer said.

In North Vancouver, another private hospital has been forced to arbitrate as the Union tries to get a fair wage and decent working conditions for its members.

About 50 workers at the Kiwanis Lynn Manor have entrusted their contract to a three-member arbitration board, whose chairman had not been agreed to at press time.

One of the primary problems there was the employer’s insistence that it would pay retroactive pay only from the date of signing of a new agreement, even though it ignored the Union’s call for negotiations for a full two months after the old agreement expired.

Negotiation for new contracts to replace those agreed to by the International Union of Operating Engineers are underway at two other Lower Mainland private hospitals, Norgate and Edith Cavell.

Not all of the “other contracts” HEU is in the process of bargaining are with non-HLRA members, of course.

In Williams Lake, a three-member arbitration board chaired by veteran hospital industry arbitrator Ray Herbert was expected to hand down a decision for a first contract to cover about 20 employees at Cariboo Lodge.

The Union had asked for parity with the town’s hospital for the Lodge workers, a proposal the HLRA countered with a demand which would have seen the employees permanently locked into a pay and benefit structure which would have lagged about 18 months behind the provincial master agreement.

In Delta, where employees of the Centennial Hospital recently voted to join the HEU, the dispute over a first contract will likely be submitted to arbitration in the very near future.

At press time, HEU and the HLRA — to which Centennial belongs— were trying to agree on a chairman for an arbitration board.

Things had not progressed that far in Penticton, where the Penticton and District Retirement Service recently joined the HLRA.

The Union had served notice on the employer to commence bargaining, but actual negotiations on a contract to replace the one which expired December 31, 1977, had not begun at press time.

The HEU is seeking parity with the provincial master agreement.

Ray Herbert
... decision soon
ORGANIZING

Queen’s Park demands

Angry employees at New Westminster’s Queen’s Park Hospital were waiting at press time to discover whether the HEU or the British Columbia Government Employees Union had won the right to represent them at the bargaining table.

The workers were angry and waiting because the BCGEU had successfully stalled the counting of the ballots they cast on the issue in early March.

Both unions have been organizing employees at the new extended care hospital since last Fall, when applications for certification were filed, first by the BCGEU, then — scant days later — by the HEU (Guardian: November, December, 1977).

That was in early November, after the certification requests were filed, the provincial Labour Relations Board retired to consider the issue, which was left in doubt until mid-February.

On February 17, the BCGEU finally handed down its decision: the workers would be given the opportunity to vote on the question of which union to represent them.

But the Board decision had a twist: the poll would be taken of not only the Queen’s Park employees, but of workers at Burnaby’s Fellburn Hospital, too.

Both facilities are operated by the same group, the Queen’s Park Hospital Society, and the Board decision to order the dual ballot and put the Fellburn employees in the position of having to face the possibility of a change in their union representation, whether they wanted one or not.

The Board’s decision came on a Friday, and ordered the poll to be taken the next week, on Wednesday at Fellburn and on Thursday at the New Westminster hospital.

Two new units

Workers at two Lower Mainland health care facilities have become the HEU’s newest units.

At Vancouver’s Edith Cavell Hospital, workers cast ballots in late January to decide — by an 18 to 12 margin — to transfer membership from Local 882 of the International Union of Operating Engineers to the HEU (Guardian: January-February).

Almost 40 workers are employed at the hospital, where a Unit executive and a bargaining committee have already been elected.

Bargaining for a contract to replace the old IUOE agreement, which expires at the end of April, began in early March.

A month after the BCGEU-conducted vote at Edith Cavell, the Union was given automatic certification covering about 130 employees at Burnaby’s New Vista Personal Care Facility.

The certification at the facility — which, with 300 beds, is the largest operation of its kind in North America — came after 122 of the workers signed Union membership cards.

Bargaining at the facility started in mid-March.

The BCGEU’s business manager, John Fryer, wired the LRFB protesting its decision and requesting a “least three-week delay” in the balloting; this despite his earlier claim that the government workers’ union was worried by the “delays” — sup.

GOING PLACES

‘Trust in me’

Vic Brier “seems to have been looking forward to retirement all (his) life,” though he often thought he never really would make it.

“But with the help of God and the 180, I finally did make it,” the veteran of two of the HEU’s toughest organizing campaigns (Guardian: in an interview after he retired on the last day of 1977).

Brier, with help from Tony Burrell and Alex Paterson, was instrumental in organizing Burnaby General Hospital into the Union; when he moved from his orderly’s job there to a similar position at the G. F. Strong Rehabilitation Centre, he promptly organized that facility into the HEU, too.

A Union member for 26 years, he served as both chairman (1952-1968) and secretary (1968-1972) of the Burnaby General Unit, then served for another year as chairman of the G. F. Strong Unit.

And, he now insists, he spent all that time looking forward to retirement.

“The wheels finally started turning for this big event of my life in November, 1977,” he said, “when I received three letters, one from the old age pension people, one from Canada Pension and the last from the Municipal Superannuation Branch.

“There was no sweat with the old age pension: it was just a matter of proving I was a Canadian citizen, and proving my age.

“I received a letter of approval, so I figure I’m on my way to getting the pension cheque.

“There, again, was no sweat with the Canada Pension Plan, everything went OK.

“My application was approved and I began to figure I was almost to home plate.

“Superannuation, though, was different: I mailed my application to Victoria, with all the necessary supporting papers; then things began getting a little sticky.

“Somehow or other, my wife’s former husband was buried under a different name when he died . . .

“the names on our marriage certificate didn’t jibe, so then the fun started.”

“With eight grandchildren asking us when we were going to

Nelson bid in

Workers at the Nelson Medical Clinic were waiting at press time to hear if the province’s Labour Relations Board would approve their bid to become the HEU’s one hundred and twentieth local Unit.

The Union asked the LRFB for certification of the Unit on January 25, after a majority of the workers asked for HEU representation.

The staff had been certified as a local unit of the International Woodworkers of America for about a year previously, but that union had been unable to get the employers to sign a first collective agreement.

In anticipation of LRFB approval of the request, the Nelson workers have already elected an HEU Unit executive and a bargaining committee.

The workers will seek, among other things, wage increases which will bring their wages up to a level comparable with other health care workers in the Nelson area.

Currently, a Practical Nurse at the Clinic receives about $700 a month; the HEU wage rate for PNs averages about $1,050 a month.

He refused the heart transplant — the donor was a Sacred.

4 GUARDIAN
get married and make things legal, when we were going on our honeymoon, what they should wear to the wedding and the like, things started to get out of hand.

"I knew we were married, because I remember the day clearly: We got married at the registrar's office near Vancouver General, then I went to do a 3 to 11 shift at the Burnaby General Hospital and got off to chair a Union meeting at 8... there was no honeymoon until the weekend.

"So I guessed I'd have to do something about the problem with the Superannuation people, too, though a crazy thought did go through my head: Three pensions, a single man... boy, what a ball I could have."

"My wife was beginning to worry, but I told her not to, that if we had to get married to make the last 25 years legal, we would.

"I sent off a letter to the department of vital statistics in Victoria, along with a money order, and after a few phone calls, letters of explanation and so on, it finally got all ironed out and I still have a spouse."

"There were still decisions to be made, though, as I discovered when I read in the newspaper that the 1978 contract was going to final and binding arbitration."

"The story said the hospitals were 'interested' in the severance allowance clauses and I could see 28 years' severance pay going down the drain with a stroke of a pen."

"Mind you, I had confidence in the Union, but to entrust my fate to some strangers... No, I didn't like that idea at all."

"So I had to make a decision as to whether to retire under the terms of the 1977 contract, and have it for sure, or wait and take a chance. I consulted my ulcers and figured that eight months' waiting would be too much for them, so I elected to finish it up in 1977."

"The next step was my official retirement, on December 31, though I actually didn't quit until January 13, which was a Friday. I did say that was one heck of a day to retire on... which prompted someone to ask me if I was superstitious; I told them 'a little', but added I'd put up with it.

"I was hoping to duck the bad luck by signing off the duty sheet at 0300 on Saturday the fourteenth, but it didn't do me a lot of good, as I fell from a ladder two days later and broke a bunch of ribs."

"I went to my retirement party at my head nurse's house both strapped up and doped up on pain pills...

"By now, I was prepared for anything to happen: I set a 30 mph limit for myself when driving, the other guy was always right, and it was too late, and 'Look before you move' became the order of the day."

"Brier had one final set of bureaucrats to deal with, those at the federal Unemployment Insurance Commission.

"I am hoping that this is possible the end of deciphering forms and filling in... I still haven't received any money, but everything is finally set — at least I hope everything is set."

---

**MILESTONES**

**MARRIED** — Sister Lydia Basso, to Michele Tarolla, recently retired station master from Rome, Italy.

The civil ceremony took place on January 24 in Vancouver, where the couple will live after returning from a two-week honeymoon in New York.

Sister Tarolla is a cook at Vancouver's Grace Hospital. She has been a member of the hospital staff for 10 years, and expects to return to the hospital to work until it is replaced by a new structure.

— Sister Lucille Warawa, secretary-treasurer and recording secretary of the Chilliwack Unit since 1966, to Gerald C. Lepointe, on March 18.

The couple honeymooned in Toronto and Windsor, Ontario, and in Florida, then drove from Windsor back to Chilliwack.

In the Fall, they will fly to Australia for six months, before returning to Chilliwack for the summer months.

**RETIRED** — Sister Carrie Plummer, a Licensed Practical Nurse at the Maple Ridge Hospital since May 1, 1958.


---

**God and the Union’**

The telegram, which did result in the one-week delay sought by Fryer, sparked tempers at the hospital, where employees — on edge after more than three months of uncertainty — had greeted the news that they were finally to be allowed to vote with enthusiasm.

Overnight, lapel stickers (printed up by the HEU) reading "Enough! Let's vote!" appeared on employees' uniforms, without regard to which union they supported.

Then, on February 27, just two days before the postponed poll was to take place, Fryer did it again: In a brief to the LRB, he asked that the Board seal the ballot boxes after the poll was conducted, counting the ballots only after his union's appeal of the original LRB consolidation decision had been heard.

In another last-minute decision, the LRB granted the request.

While employees fumed, preparations began for yet another round of hearings, submissions and legal arguments on the issue of their future.

They have voted... but, to date, their will has not been learned.
AUDITED FINANCIAL REPORT

We have examined the balance sheet of the Hospital Employees’ Union, Local 180, as at December 31, 1977 and the statements of revenue and expenses and changes in financial position for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests and other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. These financial statements do not include the assets, liabilities and operations of the wholly-owned subsidiary, Onishto Holdings Ltd.

Consolidated financial statements of the Hospital Employees’ Union, Local 180 and its wholly-owned subsidiary have been prepared for the year ended December 31, 1977 and have been reported on by us.

REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues and initiation fees</td>
<td>$1,946,934</td>
<td>$1,025,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Rebates to units</td>
<td>187,899</td>
<td>106,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,759,035</td>
<td>918,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management fee</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike assessments and contributions</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>364,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,778,245</td>
<td>1,296,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and employees benefits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>615,724</td>
<td>453,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>27,363</td>
<td>21,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation</td>
<td>24,786</td>
<td>18,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoria</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and other expenses</td>
<td>670,145</td>
<td>495,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual negotiations and policy decisions:</td>
<td>349,080</td>
<td>271,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage policy conference</td>
<td>63,761</td>
<td>18,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations, conciliations, and arbitrations</td>
<td>57,629</td>
<td>66,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job evaluation</td>
<td>50,467</td>
<td>6,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial executive</td>
<td>17,505</td>
<td>22,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private hospital costs</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>3,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing and organizing</td>
<td>190,734</td>
<td>117,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars and conventions:</td>
<td>98,675</td>
<td>70,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>85,465</td>
<td>4,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>139,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita tax</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>1,298,470</td>
<td>1,315,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES (Revenue) FOR THE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 383,235</td>
<td>$(16,945)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Statement for 1977

## Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$68,675</td>
<td>$75,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Severance Pay Trust Fund</td>
<td>$16,527</td>
<td>17,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grant (Note 4)</td>
<td>12,619</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank loan</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Ongheo Holdings Ltd.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due to Oneghto Holdings Ltd.</strong></td>
<td>$98,021</td>
<td>233,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance Pay Trust Fund (Note 2)</td>
<td>$22,281</td>
<td>33,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserve</strong></td>
<td>$92,220</td>
<td>70,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained for the continuation of the Union's activities:</td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>213,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated — Death Benefit Fund</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Changes in Financial Position

### Source of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excess of revenue over expenses for the year</td>
<td>$383,295</td>
<td>$ —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add</strong>: Charges not requiring the use of funds:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds from operations</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLICATION OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$392,116</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Excess of expenses over revenue for the year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges not requiring the use of funds:</td>
<td>16,945</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depréciation and amortization</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds used in operations</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of fixed assets</td>
<td>13,043</td>
<td>5,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in long-term debt</td>
<td>10,805</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of shares</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCREASE (DECREASE) IN FUNDS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR</strong></td>
<td>245,310</td>
<td>265,316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Funds at the End of the Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represented by:</td>
<td>$608,418</td>
<td>$245,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>$706,459</td>
<td>$478,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Current liabilities</td>
<td>98,021</td>
<td>233,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds at the End of the Year</strong></td>
<td>$608,418</td>
<td>$245,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes to Financial Statements

### 1. Significant Accounting Policy

- Depreciation and amortization of fixed assets have been calculated annually on a straight-line basis at the following rates: Office furniture, fixtures and equipment — 10%
- Leasehold improvements — over 5-40 years

### 2. Severance Pay Trust Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at beginning of the year</td>
<td>$70,315</td>
<td>$68,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Provisions for the year</td>
<td>16,142</td>
<td>23,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary contributions</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earned for the year</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>4,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance at end of the year</strong></td>
<td>$85,444</td>
<td>$70,854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Comparative Figures

- Certain of the 1976 comparative figures have been restated for comparative purposes only.

### 4. Government Grant

- During the year the Union received a grant of $12,810 from the Canada Department of Labour to be used under the Labour Education Program. No funds had been disbursed to December 31, 1977.

## Office and Other Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data processing</td>
<td>$41,242</td>
<td>41,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>43,673</td>
<td>43,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery and office supplies</td>
<td>10,173</td>
<td>10,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees</td>
<td>54,259</td>
<td>47,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Guardian</td>
<td>38,435</td>
<td>38,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, advertising and subscriptions</td>
<td>12,534</td>
<td>20,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and telegraph</td>
<td>25,022</td>
<td>25,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance pay</td>
<td>11,864</td>
<td>11,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death benefit payments</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>9,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>7,299</td>
<td>7,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>6,846</td>
<td>6,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit and accounting</td>
<td>12,234</td>
<td>12,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges and interest</td>
<td>9,931</td>
<td>9,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union pins</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>4,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations and gifts</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>7,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office and Other Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$349,080</td>
<td>$271,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Guardian 7**
Allowance to be paid

Women who worked in the province's hospitals in April, 1963, and who retire after reaching age 55, are most definitely entitled to receive severance allowance and to cash out the unused portion of their sick leave.

That was the conclusion of a three-member arbitration board in New Westminster in mid-February.

The grievance involved Violet Mayer, who retired from the Royal Columbian Hospital on June 30, 1977, after 20 years' service.

Her request for the severance allowance and cash-out of unused sick leave was denied by the hospital, which argued she had not retired under the provisions of the Municipal Superannuation Act, and was, therefore, not entitled to either.

The dispute arose because the language of the collective agreement specifies that women in the nursing auxilliary must retire "under the provisions of the Municipal Superannuation Act" to qualify for the benefits.

The Health Labour Relations Association argued this language provided for only a very narrow view of what constituted retirement, an interpretation which would mean, as the board pointed out, that no one would ever have been entitled to severance allowances or cash-out under the provisions of the contract clause guaranteeing it.

The board rejected that interpretation as "absurdity", noting that "in and of itself, that conclusion led the board to reject the employers' interpretation."

HEU upheld

Union members do have the right to bump — and the choice of where to bump is theirs, not their employer's, a three-member arbitration board ruled in Vancouver in late February.

The board made the ruling in the case of Margaret Chan, a practical nurse employed at Mount St. Joseph Hospital.

The grievance arose when she was replaced in the hospital's post-anesthetic room by a registered nurse and the hospital refused to allow her the right to bump, ordering her instead into an existing vacancy.

The hospital argued it had the right to slot Chan into the existing vacancy, an argument firmly rejected by the arbitration board.

The decision upheld the HEU's argument that the contract language guaranteeing the right to bump clearly ensures the right of a senior person whose job or classification has been eliminated, or whose job is affected by a change in the method of operation, to bump any junior person whose job the board could perform.

Second chance

The Union was at least partially successful in its attempts to save the job of a Pittetcon District Retirement Service worker who was terminated in September, 1977.

While the HEU was not successful in getting Elizabeth Gregson her job as a care aide back, it did argue successfully that the health care facility's administration had an obligation to let her try her hand at other jobs in the facility.

The grievance arose when Gregson was fired, after working at the facility for almost three years.

Testimony at the arbitration board hearing indicated she was a good, conscientious worker, who nevertheless failed to meet the "higher standards" which were in force in 1977.

Asked to resign, she refused; the administration then fired her.

In its decision, the three-member arbitration board ordered that she should not have been fired, but laid off, that — as a laid-off employee — she had normal seniority rights in applying for other positions at the residential old-age facility, and that she was entitled to a chance at a less-demanding job.

OTHER UNIONS

Boycott needed to stop lawlessness

The Canadian Labour Congress and the BC Federation of Labour have joined the international call for a boycott of the products of the J. P. Stevens Company, a Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina textile manufacturer.

The boycott of the company's products (Canadian brand names are printed below) came after a similar call in the United States, where J. P. Stevens has been labelled one of the nation's most arrogant corporate lawbreakers.

The company has been found guilty of tax avoidance, discriminatory employment practices, the firing and threatening of union employees and the coercion of other employees through intimidation.

Working conditions at the company's plants have been described as "unbelievable in twentieth-century America": Thousands of workers in the mills have been disabled by the disease byssinosis (brown lung), caused by cotton dust levels almost three times as high as national minimum health standards allow.

Wages in Stevens' plants average 51 per cent below the average national factory wage.

J. P. Stevens has been found guilty of no fewer than 110 violations of the National Labour Relations Act (which does not offer a fraction of the protection provided British Columbia workers by this province's Labour Relations Act) since 1963, more than any other company in American history.

Workers at the Stevens' plants voted in August, 1974, to join the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union; the company has resisted with tactics designed to encourage racism and thus pit black worker against white worker, female employee against male employee.

"The company's long history of lawlessness, its callousness to the rights and needs of its employees, and the inability of the National Labour Relations Board to compel enforcement (of its orders), make it necessary to convince J. P. Stevens' management that (North) American consumers will not condone corporate law-breaking designed to deprive thousands of Americans of social justice and economic opportunity," a J. P. Stevens Boycott Committee spokesman has said.

"We, and the entire Canadian labour movement, call on consumers across Canada to stop buying J. P. Stevens' products."

The products are marketed in Canada under the brand names:

- SHEETS AND PILLOWCASES: Beauti-Blend; Beautieale; Fine Arts; Sintra; Stripo; Bugatti; Tastemaker; Utica; Utica and Mohawk; Yves St. Laurent; Angelo Donghia.
- TOWELS: Fine Arts; Tastemaker; Utica.
- BLANKETS: Foremost; Utica.
- CARPETs: Contender; Galistan; Merryweather; Tastemaker.
- TABLE LINEN: Simtex. HOSIERY: Finest; Hip-Lets; Spirit.
Pay boosted

Three pharmacy assistants at Burnaby General Hospital have been awarded pay rate adjustments which increased their salaries from a maximum of $944.50 a month to a maximum of $1,208.75.

The three-member pay rate adjustment committee — chaired by Morley Fox — ruled the new pay rates were to be effective on June 15, 1976, and that the assistants were entitled to full retroactivity.

The awards mean retroactivity cheques of more than $5,500 for at least one of the assistants, in addition to the new, higher, pay rate.

Leave given

No, HEU members who are getting married don't have to take their five-day special leave for marriage immediately following the ceremony.

But they do have to take it at a time when it can be considered a part of their wedding celebration.

That was the ruling of a three-man arbitration board in Surrey in February, when Surrey Memorial Hospital dietary worker Alice Hilliar was awarded five days leave with pay.

She had been denied the marriage leave — though she had been granted unpaid leave — when the hospital noted that she had not taken it immediately following her wedding ceremony.

The hospital argued that this failure negated her claim, an argument the board rejected with the observation that the special leave contemplated is obviously intended to allow the bride or groom to celebrate the occasion. "Five days," the board noted, "is excessive for the ceremony itself."

But, the board's award cautioned, the onus of proof is on the employee, who must show that the leave is sought to "celebrate the marriage," and not merely to extend the employee's regular vacation or holiday.

Three pots boil over

Three British Columbia hospitals faced crises in recent months, as employees at Surrey's King George Private Hospital, the Nanaimo Regional General Hospital and the Prince George Regional General Hospital told their employers they had had enough.

The dispute at King George — where employees staged a brief sit-in to emphasize their dissatisfaction — centered around the continuing problem of understaffing and failure to bring on temporary staff to replace workers who booked off when they fell victim to the almost-epidemic flu.

The situation was set simmering by that failure, then exploded in late January, when — for the first time in many weeks — the staff was almost all reporting for work.

They were greeted with work orders which doubled (and in some cases, tripled) the workload of the nurses' aides. The aides refused the assignments, and all HEU members in the hospital walked off the job.

The sit-in ended after an agreement was reached which rescinded the work orders and guaranteed that none of the employees would lose any pay.

While the agreement resolved that dispute, the situation at King George remains tense, as it does at the Nanaimo hospital, where problems with an executive housekeeper hired last Fall continue.

The supervisor's attitude towards the employees at the Vancouver Island hospital has already sparked one two-day sit-in (Guardian, November-December, 1977) last October.

His unchanged attitude brought about another crisis in mid-February, one which was cooled down only when Hospital Industry Troubleshooter R. Neil Monroe intervened and held informal hearings with the HEU and the hospital's administration.

Monroe indicated three areas where he felt things could be done to ease the tension at the hospital; his recommendations are under study.

In Prince George, another supervisor has resigned his laundry department post after a short walk-off by workers there in mid-February.

Workers at the hospital said the supervisor was harassing, threatening and attempting to intimidate them. The walkout ended after the hospital agreed none of the protesters would be disciplined or lose any pay.

Two members of the unit met with the administration to discuss the problems.

Full protection for students

The Union has told British Columbia's health care employers it can co-operate with the recently-announced provincial summer Youth Employment Program for 1978 only if students hired under the program are brought under the full protection of the provincial master agreement.

In a letter to administrators in late February, the Union informed the employers it had been forced to adopt this stand "because of the complaints and grievances arising out of HLRA's administration of the Special Memorandum of Understanding made on April 14, 1977."

That memorandum allowed the employment of students under the 1977 YEP, and established a pay rate for them of $4 an hour (Guardian, May-June, 1977). It also established that the students could not be used as replacements for HEU members.

Last year's experience with the YEP, however, showed HLRA and some hospitals did not intend to live up to either the spirit or the letter of that agreement, an intention which resulted in several grievances (Guardian, July-August, 1977).
**APPRENTICESHIP**

**Blair resigns post**

The Union has asked the provincial labour minister to urge D. R. (Bert) Blair to reconsider his January 19 decision to resign as chairman of the joint committee on apprenticeship training.

"We have asked the minister to take this action because the Union agrees completely with the assessment of Blair made at the committee’s last meeting by Blair Anderson, representative of the ministry of labour’s Apprenticeship Training Program Branch," HEU’s Secretary-Business Manager Jack Gerow told The Guardian.

Anderson had described Blair as “the finest chairman this committee will ever have”.

Blair’s resignation came after a January 12 committee meeting at which the Health Labour Relations Association’s representative, Bill Rolfe, made a motion to "suspend any further attempts to implement an apprenticeship program for practical nurses and/or orderlies".

The HLRA’s other two representatives voted to support the motion; the HEU’s three representatives voted against it; Blair and Anderson abstained, as they had announced they would.

Blair declared the apprenticeship program — a contract guarantee since 1974 — was "stalemate" as a result of the vote.

**LETTERS**

'Triumphant record'

The Editor:
(Copy of a letter to Secretary-Business Manager Jack Gerow.)

We, the undersigned, would like to express our appreciation to you and all the people in the Union who have done a wonderful job in winning the case for a wage raise for the Pharmacy Technicians in Burnaby General Hospital (see story, page 9).

Our thanks go to you for the undoubtedly lengthy time spent, and the undaunted efforts in preparing the case and going through with it persistently.

The final victory is assuredly a joyous occasion for all of us and, no doubt, a triumphant record for the Union.

A special note of thanks goes to Brother Grant J. McArthur, who has taken the trouble to come to the hospital to talk to us in order to really understand the whole situation.

Mrs. Inga Anderson
Mrs. Shirley Chin
Mrs. Zubeda Virjee
Pharmacy Technicians
Burnaby General Unit

**BACK UNION**

The Editor:

. . . I would like to say at this time that I have been a member of the Union since 1951, and (I can) think back with a great deal of fondness and respect for such people as Bill and Mary Black, Alex Paterson, Ray McCreary, Jack Gerow, Henry Perkins, Bob McCartney and many more (members) of the HEU staff who have helped keep the 180 rolling and doing such a fine job.

To the members of 180 I say: Back it all the way.

If you had worked in non-union places, as I have, (with their) 12-hour days, split shifts, low wages, no redress, take-it-or-leave-it attitudes, you would value the organization and what it has done for the hospital workers in British Columbia.

**Mines, legal ethic protested**

The Editor:
(Excerpts of a letter sent to Len Marchand, federal environment minister and MLA Dennis Coke, by the Kamloops Unit.)

At the October meeting of the Hospital Employees’ Union, Local 180, Kamloops, the following resolution was passed . . .

Regarding the proposed uranium mine at Birch Island, B.C., by Denison Mines . . .

"We . . . petition you, the minister of environment, to place a moratorium on all future developments of uranium mines, and the production and sales of nuclear reactors, for a period of five years."

"We urge the initiation of the most stringent safety precautions in the mining and milling of uranium and (the) erection of . . . nuclear reactors."

"We demand the acceleration of research and/or development of renewable power sources . . ."

The ever-increasing number of nations capable of producing, and/or having produced, nuclear weapons is reaching a frightening level . . . (and) the International Atomic Energy Commission projects that, by the late 1980s, more than 100 nations will have, or will be able to produce, atomic bombs . . .

There are those who insist that there is no possible danger from nuclear reactors . . .

Sir, there was a time when the medical profession could convince neither industry nor . . . government that asbestos was a potential killer. It was, and still is! Many people had to die before the necessary safety precautions were taken . . .

Sir, we are concerned, and we know you are . . . we respectfully urge you to take positive steps on behalf of all the people of Canada.

**EDITOR’S NOTE: Brother Brier recently retired . . . an interview with this long-standing HEU member is featured on page 4.**

(Minerals, legal ethic protested)

The Miner’s Editor:

Enclosed you will find a memorandum, apparently sent to victims of motor vehicle accidents by members of the legal profession.

(The memorandum counsels accident victims to “keep a daily record of all aches, pains, worries and loss of enjoyment of life . . . resulting from your injuries”; warns them that “. . . the more you complain, the more money you are entitled to”; and tells them “. . . not to be in any hurry to get back to work.”)

While (we) . . . do not question the legality of this memorandum, we do respect the ethics of the legal profession (for) operating in this fashion . . .

The obvious solution . . . is two-fold:

1) An amendment to Section 108 of the Legal Professions Act, “Contingency Fee forBilling.”

2) The introduction of civil legal aid and/or a public defence system.

Henry Theobald, Chairman
wanted just a bit more: in mid-December, it notified the hospital’s management that it was assessing the employees, who were no longer its members, varying amounts ranging from $10 to $15.75.

HEU cried foul, protesting the assessment to the province’s Labour Relations Board, asking it to set aside payment of the assessment.

At press time, the LRB had not yet decided whether the engineer’s union was entitled to the money it was trying to squeeze from its former members.

No one has quite figured out why (and they aren’t saying), but the Health Labour Relations Association, bargaining agent for most public hospitals in the province, wants to know “how much our entire industry is contributing towards the financial support of the unions with which we are involved”.

In a letter presumably mailed to all its members in late January, HLRA asks the hospitals’ administrators to estimate the total annual check off of dues for each of the unions at the hospital.

The hospital wants to know how much HEU members pay to their Union in dues, it didn’t have to ask its members to estimate that... the information is contained in the audited financial statement of the Union, published each year in The Guardian.

It will apparently come as a big surprise to Kelowna General Hospital Administrator Colvin Elliot, but at least one hospital workers’ union — the HEU — will argue with his suggestion that some employees shouldn’t be getting full wages for the days they work.

In a mid-January speech to the Independent Contractors’ and Businessmen’s Association, the former B.C. Hospital Association president suggested that one of the tough questions employers will soon face is whether to continue to pay a full day’s wage to an employee who is chronically ill and who, therefore, presumably does not give a full day’s work.

Questioned specifically, Elliot said it was a proposition he did not feel hospital workers’ unions could argue with.

It came in the same speech in which he said hospitals could save “hundreds of thousands of dollars” if hospital employees were not unionized (which, at least, is a statement we can’t argue with, especially since he noted in almost the same breath that the “savings” would mean hospital workers would not be enjoying either the salaries or benefits they now have).

HEU makes two observations: “chronically ill employees” are paid for the number of days’ sick leave they have earned, and no more; hospitals could also save “hundreds of thousands of dollars” by cutting administrators’ salaries and by dissolving the Health Labour Relations Association, their lavishly-funded “bargaining agent”.

A passing note: The Stephen Brewer, age 30, of Vancouver, who was trusted up and thrown head-first off the Queensborough Bridge in New Westminster in late February after failing to pay off in a narcotics deal was NOT the same Stephen Brewer who edits The Guardian. That Stephen Brewer doesn’t make narcotics deals... and besides, I’m only 28.

RULES
for Nurses & other Members
of THE HOSPITAL

1. No Person shall be received into the House who is visited with the Plague, Ich, Staid-Head or other Infectious disease, and if any such be taken in, then be discharged as soon as discovered.

2. Patients shall not Swear, nor take God’s Name in vain, nor revile, nor miscall one another, nor strike or beat one another, nor steal Meat, nor Drink, Apparel, or other thing, one from the other.

3. Patients shall not abuse themselves by inordinate Drinking, nor Incontinent Living, nor talk, nor act Immediately upon pain of expulsion; and when they go to or return from the Meats and Beds, they shall crave God’s Blessing and return thanks to God.

4. No drink shall be brought in and sold to Patients except by the Physician’s and Surgeon’s Licence.

5. No Patient with the Foul Disease shall go out of his Ward, nor come into the House to fetch anything, nor within Chapel, nor sit upon the seats in the Courtyards upon pain of expulsion.

6. None of the Women shall go into the Men’s Wards, nor the Men into the Women’s Wards, without Licence, upon pain of expulsion.

7. The Sisters shall clean the Ward by Six a.m.

8. Every tenth bed is to be left empty so air and not more than one patient is to be put into each bed.

9. The Sisters shall see that no Card Play or Dicing takes place in the House.

10. If any of the Sisters disorder themselves by brawling with one another, or other misdemeanour, she is to be removed from her Ward and subsequently discharged from the House for ever.

11. Old sheets shall be washed and given the Surgeons for Dressings.

12. No Surgeon shall suffer his Servant to perform any Operations idle or cut open Imposthumes, or Sinews Ulcers, except the Master of such Servants be present, and direct the same.

13. No dead body shall be opened, Dissected or Dismembered without leave from the Treasurer, or Steward in the Absence of the Treasurer.

14. The Sexton shall keep the Chapel and yards clean and make graves site deep, six feet long and three feet wide at eighteens pence each.

FROM THE STANDING ORDERS OF ST. THOMAS’ HOSPITAL 1699-1752
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SUPERANNUATION

Early retirement?

Anyone who is a contributor to the Municipal Superannuation Plan can retire after they have completed at least 10 years of pensionable service. But people who retire before reaching the maximum retirement age (65) aren’t going to get as much in monthly benefits as they would if they waited to reach retirement age.

According to the Superannuation Branch, the retirement benefits an early retiree will receive are initially calculated in exactly the same way as they would be for a person retiring at age 65, but — once so calculated — the benefits payments are reduced.

By how much? That depends...

Early retirees who have completed more than 10 years’ pensionable service, but less than 20 years, and who are not yet 65 at the time they retire, are entitled to receive a pension based on their highest five-year average monthly salary and their years and months of pensionable service.

But that monthly pension cheque will be reduced, by an amount set out in a lengthy table which calls for subtracting a percentage of the benefit which would be payable to a person retiring at age 65. The percentage ranges from an 88.7 per cent reduction for a male retiring at 30 to 7.6 per cent reduction for a woman retiring at age 64. (That table is reproduced on page 49 of the booklet Your Superannuation Plan, available from the Superannuation Branch, Parliament Buildings, Victoria V8Y 4R5.)

Early retirees who have completed 20 years or more of pensionable service are also entitled to receive a pension, again based on their highest average monthly salary and their years and months of service.

But, again, the amount of their monthly pension cheque will be reduced, by five per cent for each year younger they are than the minimum retirement age (60).

In other words, a retiree who stops working at age 56, after having completed more than 20 years’ pensionable service, would have the benefits normally due cut in half, since s/he would be retiring 10 years before minimum retirement age (10 years × 5 per cent = 50 per cent reduction).

Early retirees leaving the work force at age 51 would lose 45 per cent; at age 52, 40 per cent; at age 53, 35 per cent; and so on, down a retiree leaving the work force at age 59, who would lose only five per cent.

GOT A QUESTION ABOUT THE MUNICIPAL SUPERANNUATION PLAN?
Send it to The Guardian, 530 W. Broadway, Vancouver V5Z 1E9. We’ll do our best to get you an answer.