

**Lanny Chudyk**

December 22, 2017

Interviewer: Winston Gereluk

Videographer: Don Bouzek

LC: Lanny Chudyk, President, Civic Service Union 52, City of Edmonton.

Q: Tell me about your background.

LC: I grew up on a small family farm in North-central Saskatchewan, about 65 miles a little bit south and mostly east of Prince Albert. I went to a two-room country school. One of the rooms was grade 1 to 8 and the other room was 9 to 12. I was in that school until grade seven, when the school closed and we were bussed unto Gronlid, Saskatchewan, about 10 miles from our family farm.

The bus ride was about 40 minutes in the morning and about an hour and a half in the afternoon. Chores on the farm started when I was about six years old. My wife today gets upset with me because I get up early in the mornings, and she says, why don't you sleep in? I said, from the time I was six I was probably up at around quarter to 6 in the morning, had to help dad with the chores in the barn, milking cows, feeding livestock, getting cleaned up, had breakfast, go to school. When you got home from school around quarter to five or so a quick supper, supper was always around 5, and then we had chores that were another hour or two. I was used to that throughout my whole life as a student.

I went to that school from grade seven. We had an elementary junior high in Gronlid, Saskatchewan. Gronlid probably had a population of about 150 people, and bussed in kids from all around the work areas. But when I went to school Maryville, my first school, probably half the kids in grade 1 didn't speak English. I grew up in a predominantly Ukrainian and Polish community. The Ukrainian community was sort of east of Maryville and the Polish community was west of Maryville. At that time we didn't get along all that well. There were always issues around your ethnic background, your church. A lot of the kids I went to school with were either Greek Orthodox, Ukrainian Orthodox, or Roman Catholic. My mom was a Norwegian speaking person, so in our household we didn't speak either Norwegian or Ukrainian – it was English. So I guess I had a bit of a heads up in elementary school because I was very fluent in English when I started school. There was a bit of bullying and teasing from some of the kids because I didn't speak a lot of Ukrainian. I knew a few words but most of those weren't the repeatable words – the ones that I heard dad speak around the farmyard when he was upset with a piece of equipment or something and the ones my mom used to wash my mouth out with soap occasionally. But it was a whole different time than today.

Bluntly, one of the things I really hated about my childhood was when we first got a telephone on the farm. I was probably in about grade 3 at that time. If you got in trouble at school, you couldn't get home quickly enough, because your parents knew already. That damn telephone! There wasn't any explanation to be heard. It was, the teacher said, so that was it. If you got punished in school you probably got more at home, so you learned to be a little bit more circumspect in school. But I went through high school. We had a TV I think in 1958 or 1959; we had two channels, both black and white. I was always interested, my dad was very involved in

politics, but most of the farmers in our community were. They all belonged to one party or another, and back in those days they were probably either CCF, which became the NDP later on, or Conservative.

All the parents too were pretty much involved in the school board; they all attended school board meetings. When I was a kid those school board meetings would be packed. When I moved to Edmonton in 1973, I actually came to Edmonton in '71 and stayed a few months, went back to Saskatchewan, and then moved here permanently in 1973. I had a son who was six around 1979, and I started attending school board meetings. I was shocked by the lack of participation from parents at school board meetings here. There were more trustees at the meeting than there were parents. Where I grew up in Saskatchewan, every farmer was involved in politics, school board, and all that if they had kids. So it was kind of an eye opener here but that's when I started to get involved in politics.

Of course in the Gronlid area federally, John Diefenbaker was our member of parliament. By the time I was 15 or 16 I was a member of the Young Conservatives of Saskatchewan. I met Mr. Diefenbaker a couple of times personally. Back in those days 'Dief was the Chief,' and he was certainly somebody in Saskatchewan who was looked up to and admired. He was actually probably more of a populist than a dedicated Progressive Conservative. We certainly became involved. The CCF government at the time, we would have George Willis, who was minister of highways back in those days in Saskatchewan, attend the high school graduations along with I think - in grade 11 - John Diefenbaker attended and was a speaker. It certainly opened our eyes to politics. I was on the student council, played some sports.

I loved going to school because if I didn't go to school there was more work on the farm to do, so school was always a lot more fun than work. Then around 1971 I had some friends that had moved to Edmonton and I came up here for a little bit, but prior to that when I got out of high school I went to work. I first worked at the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce for about a year and a half in Saskatchewan. Back in those days the banks didn't pay a hell of a lot of money, but I was single and probably would've stayed with the bank except for the fact that my dad broke his leg on the farm and was laid up for a while and I had to come back home to help with the farm. So I came back home, helped with the farm, and by the time dad got back on his feet and was able to do what he did on the farm I wandered off here. I took a look here, came back to Saskatchewan, worked as an elevator operator for a few months. Then I went to work in the Melfort Union Hospital for about a year as an apprentice steam engineer, and then got a job in Manitoba, La Paz Manitoba, at the sawmill. I became a member of the United Woodworkers of America and probably spent about a year and a half there and was exposed to some pretty radical union politics as compared to what we see here in the City of Edmonton with civic politics. I was quite impressed by the union in the workplace.

Then, early in 1973, my uncle, who lived in Kamloops BC and had worked for Weyerhaeuser as a faller in the bush, logger for 20 some years, chatted with me. Back in 1956, we had actually moved to Kamloops for about six or eight months in the winter. My dad got a job there and decided he was going to leave the farm and go work out in the bush with uncle Nick. But then my grandfather passed away in April of 1957, and we had to go back for the funeral. Then we just ended up staying. But while we were in Kamloops I got pretty tight with my uncle, even

though I was a little kid. Being a farm boy from Saskatchewan in the big city of Kamloops at the time, it was kind of intimidating. I was pushed around a bit in school until my uncle taught me how to box. I learned how to box so I was able to take care of myself, and the bullying and teasing stopped at that point because I was obviously a kid who could look after myself.

But as I was saying, I was on my way to BC to get a job in the bush with my uncle. I stopped over here [in Edmonton] to visit some friends, and decided to stay for a few months. I applied on a job with the City of Edmonton's drainage branch, and the director of the City of Edmonton laboratories at the time where I was applying was Glen Brown. Glen came from Carrot River, Saskatchewan, which wasn't all that far from where I grew up, so we chatted about that. I was at a retirement banquet this summer and Glen, who's been retired now for a number of years, was there. He had a few words to say about the retiree and how Glen had hired him and had hired me. But I said, I think I have a sneaking suspicion I was only hired because I came from the same part of the country Glen did. He kind of smiled and nodded, yes that's right.

But here I am all these years later. I got married, had a kid. You think you're getting a job just for a few months, and then time flies pretty quickly and you start to get into that 35, 36 year age group. You've got now 10 or 12 years in with the employer, you've got a pension plan, you've got a fairly decent benefit package, it kind of gets hard to leave. So I stayed. But from day one I was involved with the union here in the City. I will say, back in those days - and that was 1974 when I was hired permanently here - there was an orientation package that you were given when you became a City employee. If you were a CSU 52 member or a CUPE member of whatever it was, you were given information about our union, who your shop steward was, your union office and all kinds of things like that. Having been exposed to the United Woodworkers of America in La Paz, Manitoba, I saw the advantages and the necessity of being a unionized member in the workplace. I became involved right away, attended union meetings, got on a couple of committees.

I eventually became a shop steward probably about seven or eight years after I became a City employee. Our current shop steward at the time moved into a management position and I was encouraged to run for the position. Became a shop steward, was involved in the process of decertifying from CUPE as a CUPE local. Back in 1974 when I was first hired, we were CSU 52 - CUPE local 52 basically. We had a strike in 1976 and were out for about two weeks because of financial concerns in the offer. The City was refusing to bend at all. But that was also the year that Prime Minister Trudeau brought in price and wage controls. Finally the City said, you know what guys, we'll give you what you want. So we came back to work and then the contract was reviewed by the federal government's Price and Wage Control Commission or Board or whatever it was, and they rolled it back. So we were out for two weeks and we really didn't achieve anything.

At that time I thought, you know, I need to get a little more involved in here, because some of us felt we were being a bit misled through the whole process. But we didn't get any support from CUPE national during that strike. We were quite taken aback by that. CUPE national's rationale was that they had all kinds of labour unrest and issues going on in Eastern Canada and they just didn't have the resources to support us. At that point we decided, you know, we'd probably be better off as an independent union. A bunch of us got together. Leo Durkach is still Treasurer of

CSU 52. He was involved back then. Gary Iskiw, there were a number of us. So was Sonya Wuschenny, who was a long-time CSU 52 member.

We did the work to decertify from CUPE and we recertified as CSU 52, an independent union in 1978. From 1978 to this date, we've been an independent union. The first few years, there were some struggles. There were some issues around representation, financial concerns. But today CSU 52 is a very successful union. We have an office staff of 19, we have eight labour relations officers, a director of labour relations. We recently hired an organizer to do internal engagement and external organizing for us. We have about 6,200 members throughout our five different bargaining units. The union has significant resources in the bank. We bought this building about a year and a half ago from HSAA and we're very happy with that.

That being said, in the late '80s I got a little more involved, sat on some committees in the early 1990s. I think it was 1992 when Marion Leskiw, who was a former president of CSU 52. Now Marion's been retired for about five years. Marion decided at that time that he would run for the position of President. I'd met Marion at a number of union meetings and was quite impressed by him. So when he decided in late 1992 to run for the position of president, I became his campaign manager and ran his first campaign for him. Marion was elected and he stayed on for 18 years, until he decided to retire. Today Marion does some consulting work for me. I value his experience and his knowledge. Sometimes you need somebody who is a little bit outside of the process to kind of settle things down; some first reactions might not be the appropriate ones.

To go back a little bit, in the mid to late '70s when I first moved here, I lived out in the Beverly constituency. I got involved very quickly with provincial politics here. I can't remember the exact year, but it had to be the late '70s when Gene Mitchell decided to run for the MLA's position in the Beverly area, and I worked on his campaign. I think I met Winston there for the first time in an office, and I know I met Reg Basken back then for the first time. Since then I've stayed involved in politics. The last provincial election CSU 52 was a strong supporter of the current NDP government. We generally are not a union that is completely affiliated with one party or another; we try and make sure that the positions we take and the relationships we have are beneficial to our membership.

We worked very hard back then to make sure this government was elected and the previous one was unelected. I was surprised with Alberta politics when I came here, because I came from Saskatchewan where if you got two terms, after Tommy Douglas was CCF premier for a long time. After that, if you got two terms, you were probably turfed and a different party brought in, and they may be turfed after their first term. But I came here to Alberta and I'm looking back at the history of the province, and Social Credit was in power forever. Then the PCs came in and no matter what they did or didn't do, they remained in power. Honestly it was a shock to us when the NDP were elected in 2015. I don't think even a couple of months before the actual election there was really an expectation of a majority government particularly. But coming out of Saskatchewan where party politics was pretty much in flux – you're gone, you're in, you're gone, you're in – it was a shock coming here. That's about where I am right now. Winston, what haven't I covered?

Q: Let's go back to your childhood. You're a Ukrainian Norwegian boy. Did it mean much to you to be Ukrainian? Or by the time you were born, was that not part of the popular culture?

LC: For me I was always proud to be Ukrainian. My grandpa Chudyk used to sit me on his knee and tell me a lot of stories about his background, where he came from, why he immigrated to Canada, his take on religion, etc.

Q: Talk a bit about the religion.

LC: I grew up in a family where my mom was quite religious-oriented. My grandpa Chudyk apparently was booted out of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox church because he had a habit of arguing with the priest, I guess. Some of his opinions weren't taken too easily by the priest, and eventually grandpa got asked not to attend anymore. I guess my grandma continued to attend church, but grandpa didn't. That seemed to have spilled over to the boys in the family – my dad and my uncles. While my mom insisted on Sunday School and church when we were kids, and that was in the Lutheran church, my dad set foot in a church for only two occasions – a wedding and a funeral. Other than that, religion was something that we took with a grain of salt as kids do growing up on the farm. To this day, while I don't disbelieve in something higher. . . I mean I guess as a kid one of the things that struck me was when I got into a discussion, and I must've been probably 13, 14, 15 with somebody in school, and I was baptized but some kids weren't baptised. They're like, well you're not going to be saved. I'd say, well tell me this. So somebody lives in the jungle, they've never been exposed to Christianity or any other kind of religion, but they're a really good person. They've treated people well, they've been helpful, they've cared for people all their lives, then they die. But they're not going to be saved, they're not going to go to heaven; they're not going to be in some place, if there is a place, that is good because of what they've accomplished in life just because they haven't been baptised? To me that seemed to be a bit of a stretch, particularly since I'd seen some overly religious people in our community who weren't all that good and didn't treat people all that well. I thought, you know, it's probably overblown a bit.

I think the best thing that you can do is try and be the best person you can be. Whether you go to church or you don't go to church, what's the difference? Actually as a kid growing up, my mom used to spend Sunday afternoons watching Jimmy Swaggert and Oral Roberts, the born again evangelists who apparently had a lot of worldly faults. I used to get a chuckle out of that, particularly the part where mom would be harassing dad to write a cheque because we have to send money because the world is going to end. I'd say, but mom, if the world's ending, why the hell do they need the money? I was kind of on the wrong side of mom a lot of the time. We had a great relationship but I was kind of an independent thinker where the rest of my brothers and sisters kind of conformed to mom's thought. Believe me, mom ran the house. I remember my dad used to go out sometimes and sit around with a few other farmers in the pub and have a few beers. He didn't come in the house for a few days after that, he'd spend most of his time out in the yard doing something. That was an interesting dynamic.

I grew up with an early understanding in my grandparent's house too; my grandma ran the house. Grandpa, if he did something untoward, he'd disappear too. So I was used to being exposed to strong women. Bluntly I'll say it, in my work relationships, my school relationships with fellow

students and at work here in this office, in drainage when I was with the City I've looked at people as being people, not necessarily male and female. We're all human beings. I always had a problem wrapping my head around just because you're a female you shouldn't be doing this or you should be doing that.

CSU 52 was a fairly natural union for me to be a part of, because even today our membership is probably 60 plus percent female. Even today it's still a struggle in some work areas to get female representation in those work areas, even when they are qualified and able, because it's still kind of looked down a bit sometimes. Some of the engineering areas particularly, it's still a male dominated society, some of our fellow unions in the City. Edmonton Police Service I think has come a long way over the last 20 years in integrating females into the service, not to say there still aren't issues there for females in that service. Edmonton Fire, maybe not quite as progressive at this point as you would hope. But those types of work areas seem to attract a macho kind of bravado and it takes time. When I first started in CSU 52 in the late or mid '70s, CSU 52 was still a work area where women were clerks and maybe janitors. It was quite progressive to have a female lab tech even at that time. They worked as librarians and traditional female work areas basically. I've certainly seen a significant change. As I say thought, some of the areas are still a little behind, but we're hopefully catching up.

Q: Has CSU specifically addressed that?

LC: Oh yes, we've taken initiatives a number of times in contract bargaining, discussions with the employer around wage equity, work equity, etc. One of the things I realized early on: I think a lot of businesses, not just the City of Edmonton or any of our bargaining units, but my job was environmental inspector so I used to interact with all kinds of private industry. The first thing I noticed was that the most important person in that workplace is the person you first meet. In most businesses the first person you meet is that receptionist at the front counter. I came to understand later on that the perception that you get from that person that you first meet generally is a reflection of that business. If you have somebody at the counter who is knowledgeable, friendly, polite, professional, you probably have a company that's run that way. If you had somebody who's got a cigarette hanging out of their mouth and they're, what do you want, when you went back to do your inspection in the actual work areas you saw a situation that was reflective of what you saw at the front.

In the City and with CSU 52's membership, those people at the front, those clerical staff – and I'll say that even today – I don't think that their pay is reflective of their worth in the organization. Without that clerical staff, that accounting staff, those receptionists, you wouldn't run an organization very well. It's their expertise and their abilities that really are the underpinnings of that organization, and we don't recognize that quite often. CSU 52 certainly does, and we continue to push that perception. It's much like society in general today. We have a segment of society, a very small segment of society, that controls most of the wealth in this world. But that wealth that they create is created on the backs of somebody down on the floor who's doing the work. I'm dismayed when I hear ordinary people say that that teacher doesn't need an increase, that nurse makes more than enough money. But they will go bonkers when you trade Wayne Gretzky because - oh my god, pay him what you need. That's not a reflection on Wayne, I think Wayne Gretzky was a great hockey player and a great person. But it's about what

are our values in society. We're willing to pay athletes tens of millions of dollars in one year just to see them perform but that doctor, that nurse, that teacher...

By the way I will say, I had a teacher in grade 5 and 6, Mrs. Klein, in our little two-room school, who today I will say I owe a lot to her. She was very instrumental in formulating who I am today by taking an interest in me, encouraging me to read. She was my first teacher who really pushed the read, read and read; if you can read you can do anything. Mrs. Klein lived about four or five miles from my grandparents and quite often on Friday nights when her husband, because she had a teacherage at the school, and her husband would drop her off Monday mornings and then pick her up Friday nights. My sister and I would catch a ride with them and then my grandparents would pick them up from their farm. We had great conversations with Mrs. Klein. The one thing that she emphasized and pushed continually was learning – you need to continue to learn. The only way you can learn is by being fluent in the language, being able to understand the written word, and reading. The more you read and the more you expose yourself to not just one line of thought but a number of different lines of thought, even to this day I spend a lot of time reading. Unfortunately, a lot of it is union materials. I haven't had the time in the last five years to read some of the stuff I used to read on a regular basis; I hope to one day get back to it.

Q: In the Ukrainian community that you came from, was education highly valued?

LC: Absolutely. Education in my community, the Ukrainian community - Polish community back then – was very highly valued. Our parents? I mean if I came home with five As, two Bs and a C I was probably in trouble, because there was no excuse for that. Time was always made for schoolwork and studying. In our house there were certain times of the day that certain things had to be done – milk the cows, feed the livestock. But other than that, education was really the most important thing. Most of our parents from the friends that I had when I grew up wanted to see their kids get a good education, and I think that's why the parents were so involved in the school board. They wanted to make sure that we all went to university or something afterwards, but back in the late '60s early '70s it was really university. There weren't a lot of trade schools in place, at least not in Saskatchewan at the time. So when I did finish high school I spent half a year in university at University of Saskatoon. Having a lot of freedom all of a sudden without anybody overseeing you turned out to be a bit of a problem. So I kind of got asked to leave when the Christmas semester came, and was asked to sort of rethink my educational plans. If you were planning on re-enrolling the next fall, you might need to dedicate yourself a little more to school and a little less to partying and friends. I ended up getting a job and then I came to Edmonton. When I did come to Edmonton, I took a number of night courses at University of Alberta, NAIT. I got a certificate in Environmental Law from NAIT a number of years ago and generally continued until I became president of CSU 52, which is a full time job, a much fuller time job than my previous full time jobs. So I continue to learn, but in a different work atmosphere now.

Q: What has changed over the years in the City of Edmonton as employer?

LC: When I first came to the city and began working with City of Edmonton drainage (as we know it today, back then what were we, water and sanitation I guess), I worked out of the Goldbar wastewater treatment plant. I worked out of Goldbar from the fall of 1974 until the spring of 2009, when EPCOR took over the Goldbar wastewater treatment plant. My group

didn't move into EPCOR because we had bylaw responsibilities and EPCOR weren't able to administer the municipal bylaw acts. So we moved into another location not far from Goldbar, but stayed with the City of Edmonton. I worked out of there from, like I say, late '74 until sometime early in 2009. When I started, the city was a different city – it was much more small-townish than it is today. When I first looked at the union rolls for CSU 52 back in '75, '76, probably 70 percent of the names were Ukrainian. We were predominantly the main ethnic group in at least the City of Edmonton's drainage utility or drainage group at the time. CSU 52 has from its origins been dominated by Ukrainian heritage.

Q: Why do you suppose that was?

LC: I don't know. Maybe our parents, our grandparents brought an active political orientation to us. I know my grandfather when he left Ukraine in 1905, was involved with political unrest in Ukraine. At that time it was ruled by Tsarist Russia. My grandpa got involved with some group; I'm not sure if it was the Leninist groups at the time or whatever it was. He related the story to me that, in 1905, he and his brother were ambushed by Tsarist police. His brother was killed and grandpa had to leave the country. He had to leave behind his wife and a couple of small kids. He immigrated to the United States in 1905. He worked on the railways for about a year and a half. and then heard about land grants in Canada and Saskatchewan. He had saved up enough money to buy a quarter section of land, and came to Saskatchewan. A couple of years later, he was able to bring his wife and their two children over. They ended up having 11 kids altogether on the farm.

When I say having them on the farm, I mean having them on the farm – no hospital, no doctors. You might have a midwife in the area who knew how to deliver a baby – a totally different lifestyle. But grandpa was very instrumental too in saying you have to be involved, you have to be part of the community, you have to be part of the process. I remember him telling me in the late 1950s - and this is a long time ago now - saying, people don't appreciate the democracy they have. We didn't have democracy when I was growing up. You need to vote, you need to take part, you need to learn the language, and you need to learn the customs. That doesn't mean though - he was very clear about this - that you need to give up your ethnic customs, your religion, your ethnic heritage.

That was one of the things I saw when I was a kid growing up. We were encouraged to be Canadian and speak English and be part of Canada and part of the province in all of its organizations, but to still value where we came from. I see that today. You hear comments occasionally from people that aren't, you know I hear comments about the Sikh community, the East Indian community – those people, they get their own elected. Well they're taking part in the process that we have in this country, which is freedom, democracy, be involved. One of my good friends is Amarjeet Sohi. Amarjeet is to me a prime example of somebody who's come from another country and another culture. This is something that I tell my grandkids, that he's somebody you should look up to. I don't have a lot of tolerance for racial discrimination, discrimination of any kind. Anybody can be anything that you want to be if you want to put an effort in and you want to work towards it.

Q: Is your union dealing with it today? Is it still an issue?



LC: It certainly is an issue. I don't know if you've seen some of the bullying and harassment stuff we've had in the media over a month ago. Both Post Media papers and CBC have run a number of front page stories over a number of days around bullying and harassment. This is the culture in the City of Edmonton's workplaces that has developed over the last seven to ten years particularly. I don't think it's ethnic based but it certainly is a harassment and bullying culture around treating people poorly in the workplace. I'm not sure how this has developed. Back in the late '90s, CSU 52 and the other unions in the City had significant levels of grievances, grievances moving to arbitrations. We had no labour relations to speak of with the City's senior management at the time. At that point in time both parties agreed something needed to be done, so we developed the Working Relationship Agreement, which is a set of ideals that we all agreed we'd work towards and espouse in our daily relations with each other. It worked fairly well for quite a while. But I think over the years as time goes by – and that was 20 years ago this coming 2018 – you start to take things for granted. That's not just a one-sided thing, the unions too.

At the top of the level - at my level - the presidents of other unions, the City managers, council – I think at those levels we still value that document and we're trying to live it. But we haven't really pushed it down through the organization; the organization hasn't been immersed in it again. Over the last five to seven years, particularly in the City of Edmonton – human resources, labour relations, unionized positions, management – there was been tremendous turnover. As baby boomers retire we've had significant people leaving the organization from all levels and being replaced by new people, quite often people, particularly in the labour relations management area, people who have come directly from school. They have degrees in Labour Relations, they have degrees in Communications and Organizational Behaviour, all of these things. But they haven't actually worked in the workplace.

When I came to the City and up until about ten years ago, most of the people that were in senior City positions were people who had worked their way from the bottom through the organization. Al Mower, when he was City manager; Bill Burn, who was in drainage for years; a number of senior managers had worked their way from the floor to the top, so they understood the working place. Now we've hired people who have come directly out of school and don't have that life experience of being that worker down there and understanding some of these issues, and it's creating problems for us. We have all kinds of stuff going on in the workplace that is totally unacceptable. CSU 52 has stepped up in the last few months to say, this can't be tolerated any longer. I've been attending executive leadership team meetings for the last year and a half saying, the culture is broken, we need to commit ourselves to rebuilding this culture. The problem is, Winston, that when you have people who've been in charge over the last seven to ten years who have presided over the falling apart of this culture, it gets very difficult to trust them and be confident that these are the people who are going to be able to rebuild it. That's one of the biggest concerns I have. I'm not pointing fingers at any particular individual. I think over a period of time, because of a number of developments, one of the biggest issues we have is that we've become very dedicating to hiring people into senior management positions solely because of their technical skills. When these people are hired into these middle to higher level management positions, they aren't out there stamping engineering drawings or anything – they're managing people. That's really what their job has become, is to manage people. Bluntly, a lot of them do not have the people management skills that you need.

This has become a significant issue in the workplace. When you have a manager who has issues brought to him and decides he's got to resolve those issues by just going in his office and shutting the door, thinking that now it's gone away. No it's not gone away, it's just going to get worse. CSU 52 right now this summer I decided, I'm talking and I think people are listening, but I don't know if they're really hearing what I'm saying. So I instructed my LROs here to start grieving every god darn thing that comes across our desk if we think it is a legitimate issue that we should grieve. Before that we've tried to work through issues and we weren't getting anywhere. So I'd say from late July to today we probably just in the City of Edmonton have about 145 to 150 active grievances. We have four other bargaining units and those include Capital Power, Edmonton Public Libraries, TELUS World of Science, and a fairly significant sized unit, EPCOR. In those four units we have five total grievances. My staff here can't remember the last time any grievance in any one of those four units has actually gone to an arbitration. We can generally sit down and resolve most of them, not to say we don't have some issues in the workplace. Every workplace has some level of bullying and harassment. We see it in all segments of society – school, other workplaces. It's always there to a point. But the City one runs much deeper than that and is very concerning to me.

Q: Does the collective agreement with the City allow you to take grievances to arbitration?

LC: We can go to arbitration. What the City has had, how the City's system works is this. If there's a respectful workplace issue – harassment, bullying, whatever it is – we file a grievance. A member can file a complaint under the respectful workplace process that the City has had in place to date. Under that process, the complaint goes to human resources, and human resources investigate the complaint. That investigator, which is generally an internal human resources person for the City of Edmonton, gives the report to human resources, they share it with senior management in whatever the area is, and they decide what the resolve is regarding the complaint. Is somebody being suspended, somebody punished in whatever shape or form.

The concern we've had, and I've said this in the media -- I've said it on TV, I've said it to the papers over the last six weeks – is that we don't trust that process. Over the last couple of years we've had some significant issues in the workplace that we don't see any resolve or outcome that has punished or dealt with the perpetrator. I've been saying for over a year and a half at senior meetings with City officials, including the City manager and deputy City managers and some councillors, that we needed an external ombudsman process where my membership and memberships in other unions, and bluntly, CEMA, the City of Edmonton's Management Association, which doesn't have the same representative powers that the unions do, and their members are probably the recipient of even more bullying and harassment than my members are, but they have nowhere to go. The internal political system might just say, well you know what, if you're going to complain we're going to get rid of you. Bluntly, they don't have the protections around this missile that we do. We've been arguing about this about.

About six weeks ago, Elise Stolte, from Post Media, came to me to say, Lanny, I want to chat with you because I'm going to run a story. Some of your current members and some people who were members of your union in the past who have left the employment of the City have come to me with their stories and I want to run it by you to see what you think. Maybe you can contribute to the story or you can set me straight on some of these, because I don't want to publish

something that's not factual. I met with Elise right in this room. The first meeting was probably two and a half hours. When she started running her story by me, it was pretty accurate. At that point in time I said, you know, I'll comment for you, because I'm not going to throw my current membership or even previous members who felt they had to leave because of bullying and harassment under the bus. What we have today Winston is a council who have decided that there needs to be some kind of external process. We're still working our way through it. I am concerned that it's going to attempt to be manipulated a bit by senior City management; I don't believe it will be so much by Council. Some of the councillors are very concerned about what's going on – Councillor Nickel, Councillor Caterina particularly have significant binders full of complaints that have come to them from my membership. One of the biggest problems with this whole process is we as a union have never been able to see the raw report from the investigator, we always have been getting something that's been edited by human resources or management, a summary. They keep continually talking about privacy issues and they can't share the report, so at the end of the day we don't really, even though we do our own investigation and we're pretty sure what went on, it's difficult for us to have been able to deal with the results of the report.

Q: Why should the citizens of Edmonton think of their city as performing a lot of valuable services for them? Why should we be proud of our city and the kinds of services we get as taxpayers?

LC: I've worked with the City and for the City since 1974. Generally, we have very good people, very conscientious, very loyal people working for the City of Edmonton. That includes from the top down. The nature of the union/management relationship is always a bit of an opposition type relationship. But that being said, there are many really good supervisors and managers in the City of Edmonton.

I'll go back to the Goldbar wastewater treatment days. My guys from Goldbar, when we were taken over by EPCOR, which is an arms-length semi-private organization, a for-profit company, and I don't begrudge them the fact that they're a for-profit company, that's their business. When Goldbar was taken over, the wastewater treatment plant, in 2009, a lot of our long term senior people – and that was management and unionized staff – were very opposed to it. Over the years, from late 1974 until the early 2000s, the City had become progressively an organization, an employer who was very committed to the environment. At Goldbar the mantra had always been to be the best we could possibly be. In order to do that, we had employees – managers and unionized staff – who would go above and beyond. We had people who would put in time without billing for it, because work needed to be done. In the late 1990s we had a City review where there were significant cutbacks in staffing. But the guys at Goldbar – and I use Goldbar because that was a group that I was intimately involved with and have extremely good knowledge about. . .

And I know the same thing happened in other work areas in the City. People stopped putting in for overtime because the work needed to be done. People were being let go, budgets were tight, but they were committed. They were committed to the environment, they were committed to serving the citizens of Edmonton. I'll tell you today, as a union president, one of the first things I should be saying to my members is, you shouldn't be putting in time without being paid for it. What you end up doing is skewing the need for staff – the work gets done, we don't need any

more staff. But as we're going along through this, and this could be one of the issues around the culture that's developed today too, is those managers at the middle and top levels have goals to meet, they have productivity targets that have to be put into place.

As the city has grown and gone from a city when I first came here of about 400,000 to a city of almost a million people now, the workforce really hasn't kept pace with the growth geographically and population wise to provide the service that needs to be done. You have a council who are generally very committed to the citizen and to the city itself. Sometimes we have disagreements on political culture and how things should be done, but this council and the last council I think are extremely committed to making the city of Edmonton a great city, a modern city, one that responds to the needs of the different segments of society. There's been some criticism, and hey! - I've criticized a few things. I'm still a bit skeptical about building an arena for a billionaire. We pay most of the money for the building and a lot of the infrastructure wasn't even counted into the cost. It's sort of like if I go into partnership with somebody I expect that we both contribute to the cost of building the business, and then when there's profit coming out of the business we both kind of share the profit. But apparently that's not the model here.

That being said, we have councillors, and it shocks people sometimes when they hear the councillor names like Mike Nickel, Tony Caterina, who are looked on as being these right-wing business type councillors. They're the most supportive of our membership and our needs within the City of Edmonton. The unions have a great relationship with Mike Nickel and Tony Caterina. In the five years I've been president of CSU 52 they have never once voted against our issues in council. They have been extremely supportive of our concerns and our issues around workplace culture, privatization projects. Mike Nickel is a guy who says, I'm a businessman; I'm not a union guy Lanny, I'm never going to be a union guy; I'm a dollars and cents guy. I know what a business does and why a business is in place, and that's to take as much out of a project as I can possibly take. That's why I support most work being done inside by unionized employees. Mike has proposed that the City should have their own cement plant, the City should run their own paving operation, neighbourhood renewal. Like Mike said, this isn't a project, this is ongoing work. It should be done internally; it should be done by City employees with our own equipment.

Sure, when we get into it initially, there's a fairly big hit to get the operation started, but over 10 and 20 years, it's much more efficient financially for the citizens of Edmonton to have that run internally by unionized City employees. The Alberta Federation of Labour, the Edmonton District Labour Council were shocked to find out that we support these guys and why we support them. A number of years ago when he first ran for council the first time, Mike Nickel was part of that group called The Stick Men. They were a very right-wing Conservative group and they had big billboards up around Edmonton occasionally espousing contracting out, privatization and that. But as Mike says today, you know, once I got to be a councillor and I understood and learned some things, my job as a councillor is to get the best bang for the buck for my constituents, and that gets done internally generally. He said, and I totally agree with him, if you've got a one-off project that's a short duration, it doesn't make sense maybe to go into buying expensive equipment and hiring staff just for a three or four-month project, doesn't make sense.

Q: It troubles me when I see the fragmentation of the labour movement in this province. How do I come to terms with the fact that CSU 52 chooses to stay an independent union? You are still part of the labour movement, but how do you square that with the fact that you're an independent union?

LC: CSU 52 is an independent union. When we went independent in 1978 and up until I became president, we maintain a very arms-length relationship with CUPE national, the CLC, the Alberta Federation of Labour, and most of those groups. It wasn't until the mid 1990s that we sat down and even decided to be at the same table with some of our brother unions within the City of Edmonton. We were basically blacklisted to start with by CUPE because we left CUPE. So the major union groups throughout the country, like CLC, wouldn't have anything to do with us as long as CUPE was upset with us. But back in the mid '90s we had developed working relationships in some of our work units with CUPE business agents particularly, not maybe their political leadership but with their business agents. Myself, Ed Goldbar, our monthly union management meetings were attended by CSU 52, CUPE local 30, and the International Brotherhood of Workers Unions.

I really didn't care at that time about the presidents' problems with each other, but in our workplace it was important that the shop stewards from those three unions worked together. If I had an issue at Goldbar with my members, they probably had the same issues in the other unions at that worksite. Once we all got to know each other and worked together, we decided, you know those guys at that level, well if they want to fight that's fine, that's their business, but we all work together here. Bluntly, I got some flak from my union leadership in my office about that and I said, you know what, I really don't care – this is to the benefit of our people in the workplace. So we started developing, it took a while, it took a bit of convincing to get Marion to sit down at the table with CUPE guys just to talk unofficially about the issues and how we could work together. It was very plain that the employer loved being able to divide and conquer and drive wedges.

You know how bargaining used to work. They get one group to settle and they would have sort of a kicker off to the side. The rest would say, this is the deal guys – they've signed, you gotta sign. So we'd all sign, we were forced to sign basically. Then the other guy who signed first got an extra 1 percent somewhere down the line. So that went on and we decided that wasn't a good way to work. We convinced Marion to sit down with the CUPE guys, hey let's at least work informally together. We had Jerry Foots at the time in CUPE, Ken Balkwell was a CUPE business agent. Those guys really didn't give a darn about the political things nationally and provincially, it was about us at the table ourselves. Out of that grew the Coalition of Edmonton Civic Unions. We decided to formalize. As we chatted with CUPE then we ended up bringing IBEW for a while, the Amalgamated Transit Union guys. We had some of them come and go over time, depending on what their political leadership's thoughts were. The Coalition of Civic Unions became a fairly substantive entity in the City, and about ten years ago we extended that to Calgary. We have a north/south coalition now where the Calgary unions – they have an ATU, they have IBEW, there are a number of CUPE locals – we meet five to six times a year in Red Deer. We coordinate strategies and we talk about common problems. Bargaining particularly is something that we talk about.

But once I became president in 2012 - I think I'd probably been in office about two weeks when I got a call from Gil McGowan. Gil wanted to have breakfast and chat. I explained to Gil at that meeting that some of my board is still long time from way back and they still have some of the grudges and some of the suspicions about the Labour Movement in general. When I went back to my guys and said, hey I met with Gil, it was like, oh my god. It was like I'd met with a vampire or something. I said, no actually we had a good chat. So Gil invited me to the AFL convention as an independent observer, and we have an agreement in place that while personally I would like to see us become part of the Fed and I think it will happen sooner rather than later, but we take part in certain things that affect us greatly too, like the local authorities pension. In 2014 we created a provincial coalition of unions to deal with the pension issue. CSU 52 pays their dollar per capita freight on whatever the cost of that particular issue is, and in return for that we get a vote at the table just like any other Fed member.

Last year we created a coalition on coal, the transition from coal to natural gas. It affects us, like IBEW, the United Steel Workers, the Fed. We all have members who work in these coal communities and are going to be affected greatly by the transition. We determined early on in that coalition which we are part of and we pay our way and we vote on it. . . Concern number one, our workers, who are going to be greatly affected by this, how are we going to transition them into other jobs and other work? Of course we were lobbying the province on this quite significantly. But equally as important for us in that coalition was what happens to the community. The communities who are going to lose their coalmining – and most of those communities are almost completely dependent on that industry to survive – what happens to them? So we have been working diligently with this government and we have certainly been pushing the viewpoint that you can't leave the community behind. Something has to be done to help these communities survive. That's one thing CSU 52 has always been from day one, a more community based union than a national. The nationals and internationals have political concerns and they expend a lot of time, energy and money on lobbying governments around more national interests.

We were concerned back in the late '90s early 2000s when Ralph Klein significantly cut dollars coming into the communities around mental health, around childcare, around community based groups that gave children particularly someplace to go. CSU decided to move away from United Way funding because the United Way gets lots of money, they have lots of money. But those dollars don't go back quite often into small community based organizations that provide a service for this area of the city or that area of the city. We contributed a lot of our money into that part of it. When we opposed Goldbar going to EPCOR or drainage moving over to EPCOR as you saw earlier this year, it wasn't because the union is losing anything. We maintain that membership, our members make more money, they have a better benefit package in EPCOR, ergo CSU 52 gets more union dues coming in. We opposed that because we see it as a community problem. We see it as a for-profit company. The City provides that public service supposedly at a cost, whatever the service costs is what we pay. EPCOR is going to provide that same service at that cost, but they're going to build in a profit margin. Who pays for that? The user.

Q: The profit comes back to the City though.

LC: Not all of it. Some of it comes back to the City. We're the major shareholder. That profit was coming to the City anyway. That drainage utility could give the City, while it was held within the City, the same profit or the same dividend that the City is now getting from EPCOR. But the problem I have with all of this, Winston, is we go through the years when the feds download services to the province and then the province downloads services to the municipal areas. At the end of the day nobody's taxes ever go down. We've moved Edmonton power, water services, drainage services out of the City of Edmonton's tax base to pay for those services to private utilities or to even a public utility which bills you for that service separately from your tax base. But your taxes don't go down. We have very vulnerable people in society, seniors who are on very limited incomes.

I heard somebody tell me a few years ago, well they should've saved a little more. If they have this miniscule pension, why don't they have a better pension? Well because 50 years ago that pension paid enough for them to survive. Today it doesn't. Don't we have an obligation to society? That's one of the ruling tenets of CSU 52. One of our biggest principles is what do we owe to the community? We've always and continue to do that. I got some flak from my membership about opposing drainage going to EPCOR because some of those members had taken a lot and said, you know what, I'm going to make more money over there, I'm going to have a better benefit package over there. There's a lot of perks, so why are you opposing this? Well because we have people in society who need somebody to represent them. Today we have an issue with ETU around transit service. A good portion of council and the administration are pushing to delete a lot of outlying route service and moving that to somebody like Uber or a ride-share company running it. What happens to that senior who is on a very limited income? A senior bus pass is approximately \$15 a month right now, and you can go wherever you need to go. If you're going to use Uber, believe me, you aren't going anywhere for \$15 a month. Those people are on very limited incomes. I have mothers in CSU 52 who have two or three kids and they don't have a male partner in the house any longer, and they're getting by on a Clerk 2 wage. They rely on transit. If a good portion of the service is going to be cut back and privatized, what happens to those people? And why were they paying taxes?

Q: What are the major challenges facing your union, your members, or the labour movement in general?

LC: Some of the major challenges facing us? Well, first of all we've done a poor job over the years of communicating, not only to our members but society in general what we do, what we represent, and why we do it. I think we all know through a great part of society when you mention unions people think they're just a bunch of self-serving people who are only there to get what they can get and to hell with the rest of them. Well when you look at major social legislation that has been brought into place in this country over the last 50 to 60 years, most of it was driven by unions. Maternity benefits, pension plans, public healthcare – all of these in one shape or form or another have been driven by or significantly supported by the union movement. The reason for that is because we think everybody in society should share in the wealth of that society, and bluntly, we're a very wealthy society. Getting back to where I think we dropped the ball, is explaining one of the greatest benefits of unionization in Canada - for unions themselves - is that we have the automatic check-off, the Rand formula, and if it's a union shop you pay your dues, the union gets it. I think over the years we kind of took some of that for granted.

CSU 52 has embarked on a major grassroots reengagement program with its membership because we've probably become distant from our membership in some ways. If we had to fight for those dues dollars every year, we'd probably be more close to the grassroots. But when you look at schoolbooks in Canada and in this province, you'll see very little about unions and the role they've played in the social society of this country over the last 50 or 60 years. We shouldn't be allowing that to happen. I've got members who think, younger members particularly, who think the benefits they have in the workplace have been provided because the employer was so magnanimous and generous they just decided to give it to them. They don't understand the fight that we've gone through since the '30s on, the sacrifice some people have made and the gains we've made.

I remember some coming to me, in particular ones who'd been in the workplace for six months or a year saying, I don't like this damn seniority stuff. I'm better than that guy, I should get that job. I said, you know what, so when you've been here ten years then you come talk to me that you don't like seniority. Generally around the eight or nine year mark they all start to like seniority a little better. It would be great if we had a society where everybody was treated equally and fairly. But without seniority, there's a lot of abuse that goes on in the workplace. I'm fighting a battle right now around our bargaining clause or our collective agreement clause around seniority. CSU 52 for an inside workers union has a fairly unique seniority clause. The employers even said that to me, that you know, nobody else has that kind of a clause, and it creates a problem because we can't hire the best person. I said, well you know, I understand some of your concerns but when a situation comes to me where somebody's been hired on a temporary 90 day appointment and then after the 90<sup>th</sup> day they get lateraled into an 11 month position without a posting, and then the next thing I find out they're now a permanent person in a fairly senior position and nothing's ever been posted, while you have somebody who's been in that work area for 12 years and would have the qualifications if you posted that position, actually has filled in for significant lengths of time in that position, that person's not qualified? Oh and by the way, as it turned out that 90 day person who was then lateraled into a temp and then given a permanent position just happened to be a roommate of a senior human resources person. This is why we need things like seniority in the workplace. CSU's seniority clause for our type of worker is unusual, and if we meet the minimum calls on the posting then seniority is the determining factor. It's a pretty gold-plated seniority clause; no other union in the City has that clause. Sad to say - and I will say this about us - we had that clause in our other bargaining units and over the years we allowed bargaining committees to bargain it out. Since I've been president of the union, I've reformed how our bargaining committees operate. We now have a senior labour manager in CSU 52 who is our senior negotiator, and that's Joe Childs; lots of experience, very good negotiator. But I insist Joe is the lead at the bargaining team table now. One of our LROs is a resource that sits at the bargaining team, and we don't elect bargaining team members anymore from the floor. We ask for an expression of interest from any member who may be interested in serving on that unit's bargaining team and then we do interviews around that. What I want to make sure is when I get a bargaining team in place that bargaining team understands their job is to represent all the membership in that bargaining unit, not specific groups within the bargaining unit.



Too often in the past we had bargaining teams that had specific issues they wanted to address, and the rest of the issues... And quite often Winston, I know you're aware, that what the member out there considers a main problem that needs to be addressed in bargaining isn't what we see sometimes in the office. I can probably send out a bargaining survey, and I could tell you what three of the five issues are going to be in any bargaining, because they're always the same. You've got wages, that's always number one. Then you've got issues around the benefit programs, that's always number two. Personal leave days will be number three if not number two in the City of Edmonton. One of the things we're struggling with with the City of Edmonton, our collective bargaining agreement is an old collective bargaining agreement. There are lots of clauses in there that I do understand impact a modern organization operating efficiently. We've offered a number of times that let's go to the table and let's rewrite some of these clauses, but we need to do that collaboratively. Last round of bargaining, politically we put pressure on to get an agreement. The City's bargaining team wasn't happy that they were circumvented by the political process to do the dollars and cents. But even when we agreed to do the dollars and cents, we said, let's do dollars but let's talk about the language in this agreement in some of these issues because it's outdated and we need to renew it. Nope, we're not gonna do it. So today we still have a very outdated... Now with Cap Power during the last round of bargaining, our team came forward and Cap Power's team came forward. We chatted about the workplace in Cap Power. Our members said, you know what, that's not how we do that and that's not how that gets done and this doesn't apply. We rewrote that whole agreement and it was a very consensual working together atmosphere and we worked well with them on that. The City of Edmonton one has been very difficult in the last few years to get any movement. EPCOR, Cap Power have a very flexible benefit program that the companies like and we love. The City of Edmonton one is an old style benefit program, no flexibility whatsoever; it doesn't really serve anybody very well.

Q: It must be specific to job classifications.

LC: Those have to change. You know Winston, when the drainage utility moved from the City of Edmonton to EPCOR on September 1<sup>st</sup>, we had a pretty good working relationship with EPCOR and transitioning our people over. EPCOR was really good to work with on that. We had an issue around our Engineer Tech 2s because EPCOR said no those Eng Tech 2s do not equate to T3s in EPCOR; we've looked at the classification description. So we asked to see it. It was something that was 20 some years old and bore no resemblance to the great majority of our Eng Tech 2s today and what their job descriptions are. EPCOR was shocked when they found that out, because they thought it was fairly up to date. To EPCOR's credit, they've agreed and we're working through a process now. We've got 55 Eng Tech 2s that were affected. We're sitting down with the EPCOR LR people and going through each one individually to compare what their individual job today is to EPCOR's T2 and T3 series. We fully expect probably 70 percent or so will end up being T3s and some legitimately aren't. This is one of the problems we have. The City classification system is so outdated and such a mishmash. I have Clerk 2s here who, I've a Clerk 2 here and a Clerk 3 here in different work areas, different departments of the City. This Clerk 2 has way more responsibility and educational qualifications needed than this Clerk 3 over here. It's a real problem. We have to fight to get every single...

Q: Are unions going to survive?

LC: I think I am optimistic, Winston. I think we have a number of good young labour leaders in this province who recognize some of the problems, recognize the fact that we need to go back to our membership and not take them for granted. We need to go back and re-educate, reintegrate, re-involve our own local memberships. We need to work together. We need to be more public in presenting and arguing our views and what are concerns are. One of the things - and I see this throughout the Calgary unions and ours and I'm sure Gil McGowan over at the Fed feels the same way - our roles in society aren't just necessarily to get the best possible deal we can for our members. It's also to be a responsible member of the community. I think that's where we really need to go and really need to advertise and to be part of the community.

CSU 52, in fact, has just created a new committee called a Public Events Committee. Part of that committee's task is going to be involved in the different types of public events that take place - be a sponsor, be a part of it, be visible. We have the street performers renting space upstairs in our building, we fund them significantly, we take part in their events. We have Silver Skate, which does a lot of winter festivals. CSU 52 is a big supporter of theirs monetarily so they can do what they do. In return for that, we get a lot of advertising and good plugs from them about what a community participant CSU 52 is. I've been chatting with Gil McGowan about how can we all work together and get our message out better into the public. Gil's come to us to say, look, I've fallen down too because we ended up with HSAA, United Nurses, the Fed being the biggest groups, and kind of ignoring the smaller union groups. In fact two weeks ago Gil attended a north/south coalition meeting of ours and gave us an update on pensions and a few other things, took questions. Gil is committed to attending our north/south meetings on a regular basis, not to be part of the full meeting but to give updates and answer questions, to communicate with us. I think that's a big first step.

I think the biggest step we need to take is to figure out how we can reach into the public school system, because that's where it starts. We have to educate people. One of the biggest problems we have is the modern society's communicative process. It's all about sound bytes now. If it's more than a minute, you're probably going to get tuned out, so you've got to get something in quick. But I think it's important that we start at those younger age levels and get something in textbooks and something in the school process. We've been working hard here. You know Winston, when I first started back in 1974 the City had an orientation process that was very comprehensive and significant. Part of that was safety around your work area but a good portion of it was around your union. Over the years that sort of evaporated. Even the safety orientation - and I've been criticizing the employer for that - is we rely too much on computers to do the orientation. Okay go in here, read that, click this, click that, and you're done. How much of an impact does that make compared to somebody who's been in the workplace talking to you? When I was oriented in the City when I first started, it was a full day, it was a full day classroom. Another part of it that we don't do anymore is the medical part of it. We updated first of all the City nurses office on what vaccinations we had and what we didn't have. We couldn't go into a worksite with sewage or anything without being vaccinated first. That doesn't happen today. I had people come to me a few years ago, probably 2009 just before I left Goldbar or 2008, a university student who was working in one of the grit tanks down there as a part time labourer during the summer making some money. He came and said, you know what Lanny, I go to university, I'm not stupid. Some of us hadn't had our tetanus shots here or our Hep C shots. We've asked, when are we going to get this, and they say, well you know we just wanna wait

until we get the full crew together and then we'll do it all at once. So I went and talked to our director at the time, who was Vince Corkery, and I said, these aren't even my guys, these are CUPE guys. But how come these guys aren't getting their shots before they go into the worksite? Oh no, they get them. I said, no they don't, they haven't. Some of them have been here for two weeks now and they still haven't had their tetanus or Hep C shots. Oh, they didn't know. When I started in the mid '70s that was a no-brainer.

Now the management structure organization has sort of broken down in a lot of areas, and I think a lot of it is because of computers and all - everybody relies on that to get everything done. The human factor is kind of left behind. Like one of the biggest problems I see in society came out when my wife and I were shopping a few years ago at Safeway. It was shortly after they started bringing in the automated cash registers. One of the clerks said, oh this is so much better, I don't have to stand behind a till all day. Well my wife said, you know what, you aren't going to be having to work here neither pretty soon, because those are going to take your work.

[ END ]