

GL/LF
13 June 2018

Mr Pat Watt
Marketing and Sales Director
LloydsPharmacy Limited
United Drug House
Magna Drive House
Magna Drive
Magna Business Park
Citywest Road
Dublin 24

Re: Industrial Action 14th June 2018

Dear Mr Watt

With just twenty-four hours to go to the above dispute I wish to raise the following issues;

1. In a number of communiques issued by the Company in recent days much emphasis has been placed on the need for patient/customer care. This is an objective our members will strive hard to achieve, however they or this Union will not accept the implication that their decision to engage in a course of industrial actions over the next three weeks compromises in any way their professional commitment to the patients and customers of LloydsPharmacy. The responsibility for any negative consequences in this regard lies firmly with the employer and its refusal to allow a significant amount of its workforce be formally represented by Mandate Trade Union.
2. Reference has also been made to the obligations placed in particular on our members employed as Pharmacists arising from the Code of Practice on Dispute Procedures. As you are well aware the Code is not legally binding, however its main intent is to establish a framework under which parties can voluntarily agree certain procedures governing the handling of disputes. Within the terms of the Code much emphasis is placed on *"acceptance by the parties of awards, decisions and recommendations which result from the final stage of the dispute settlement procedures where these include investigation by an independent expert body such as the Labour Court..."*. It is both highly unfortunate and ironic that the main cause of the industrial dispute commencing tomorrow arises from the indisputable fact that LloydsPharmacy has refused to adhere to the recommendation of the Labour Court where they stated that the employer should engage with Mandate Trade Union in order to deal with our members' outstanding pay and benefits claim. The unacceptable nature of this decision is heightened even more considering the employer decided to participate in the Labour Court hearing that gave rise to the recommendation. Whether you accept it or not, agreement to so engage gives rise to legitimate expectations by employees and the general public that the employer was prepared to be bound by the terms of the Court's final decision.

3. In another communication to staff a reference is made to “unofficial industrial action” and furthermore a request is being made of Pharmacists to relay this clear untruth to external parties i.e. local GP practices. I am now calling on the Company as a matter of urgency to take whatever measures that are necessary to rectify this grievous allegation and to make these measures known to the undersigned without unnecessary delay. Failure to do this will leave us with no option to further act to defend the good name and reputation of Mandate Trade Union.
4. Based on the above it is clear that tomorrow’s industrial action is entirely avoidable and it is equally clear what has to be done to make sure it doesn’t happen. The principle responsibility in this regard rests firmly with the employer and once again I remind you that representatives of this Union remain, at the shortest notice, available to engage with management representatives to bring about an agreed and mutually acceptable outcome to the issues currently in dispute. For the last time I would strongly urge that the employer avails of this opportunity.

**Yours sincerely
For Mandate**



**Gerry Light
Assistant General Secretary**

c.c. Paul Reilly, Managing Director