

HARTNETT

1

a

CSEA HISTORY PROJECT

TOM HARTNETT INTERVIEW

December 18, 2002

□

2

MR. MADARASZ: Any remembrances you're

Page 1

HARTNETT

ready to tell us about and then I'll follow with some questions.

MR. HARTNETT: Okay. My name's Tom Hartnett and I'm an attorney here in town with the Law Firm of Meyers, Suozzi, English & Klein, but I spent probably about 14 years, I believe, in the public service if you will came; came to Albany as a negotiator. I've worked for AT&T in New York City, had just graduated from law school and I'd come up to negotiate labor contracts and came up in the final year of Hugh Carey's tenure and went to the Governor's Office of Employee Relations as an assistant director.

And just to continue on the history piece, I was in the Governor's Office of Employee Relations for about two years and they made me the deputy director which put me in charge of kind of all the negotiations, and then a year later they made me the director, so I was in charge of negotiations with all the unions in the state, particularly CSEA.

But at that time I think we had ten bargaining units: University professors, the

□

3

Professional Unit. Actually I was there when the -- not as director but prior to being director when the Professional Unit was with CSEA and then when they broke off into a separate unit, and the Correction Officers and

HARTNETT

whatever.

But CSEA was the major and prime consideration in our negotiations in those times, so I stayed at the Governor's Office of Employee Relations until 1985 at which point the Governor nominated me for Labor Commissioner and I was appointed Labor Commissioner in '85 after Senate confirmation and CSEA happily testified on my behalf at my Senate confirmation hearing.

And then I started to relate to CSEA in a whole different way as Labor Commissioner, primarily in the health and safety area because in New York State the -- we have within the Labor Department a group called the PESH or Public Employee Safety Program and we enforce all the public sector health and safety provisions, so I went from negotiating with CSEA and working with them to having them come and lobby me and my department for greater health

□

4

and safety protections.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: And then I left Government in 200...I'm sorry, in 1992. I was up in the Labor Department for about seven years and then I went out and joined the law firm that I'm with now and in that capacity had an opportunity to do some work with CSEA, so I like to think that I've seen CSEA in a lot of

HARTNETT  
different and varied lights.

MR. MADARASZ: All right. Let's go back to the beginning then of your first association with CSEA and what was it like? Who did you meet with, what was your impression of CSEA then, and what were the feelings across the table?

MR. HARTNETT: Well, when I first came up to Albany I was in the -- I was an assistant director in the Governor's Office of Employee Relations. I was given what I -- what was considered then the toughest unit to deal with which was the Institutional Services Unit, the ISU, and they were primarily direct care health care workers within the Office of Mental Health

□

5

and Mental Retardation, so I dealt a lot with negotiating with Bob Giles, who has since left CSEA.

Bill McGowan was the president at the time. I remember once going to a meeting at Central Islip and the meeting was going along pretty well until this young, kind of firebrand of a chapter president came in by the name of Danny Donohue who totally disrupted the meeting and caused us enormous grief and as we were leaving we all said, who the hell was that guy?

(Laughter.)

MR. HARTNETT: And I actually got to

HARTNETT

know Danny from that point forward and worked with him in a number of different capacities, but early on he was management's nightmare. I suppose he may -- in many respects may still well be, but he was certainly that then.

MR. MADARASZ: (Inaudible.)

MR. HARTNETT: You know, I don't even remember what the issues were except that he came in and basically made some blanket charges about the State and everybody on the management side and I think he got the atmosphere that he

□

6

wanted there, which was he had us in a kind of a defensive posture and we were, you know, really trying to figure out exactly how we might quiet this guy down, which was probably a good strategy from his standpoint. I may, in fact, still use that strategy today. I'm not sure.

But CSEA itself was the (inaudible) force at that point for so much of -- changes that were going on. I think at that time which was 1979-80 the State was just moving out of what had been a kind of paternalistic attitude toward unions and CSEA was in the forefront of saying, you know, we're gonna negotiate hard at the table. We're gonna fight for wages.

The contracts when I first came up into the State in 1978, every other term in the contract was "meet and confer, shall consult."

HARTNETT

In other words, a lot of touchy-feely kind of language, but there wasn't a lot of concrete language that said, you know, thou shalt not do this or you shall meet with the union and get their approval prior to implement that.

So those kinds of things were not in the contracts when I first arrived, but as we

□

7

started to -- as I started getting involved with it, CSEA came forward -- not as a result of my presence but CSEA was just at that point where they were becoming much more aggressive and saying, you know, we want to meet and confer with you. We want you to seek our agreement on this.

And so as a result of that those early negotiations, I guess, in '79 and then again in '82, they were fairly contentious negotiations and Bob Giles, the fellow that I dealt with at the Institutional Services Unit, was a very aggressive guy who was out of one of the institutions. I forget which one now, but he had a wealth of knowledge about some of the good and some of the bad that was goin' on and he was not shy about sharing that at the table, so --

And then, of course, once we finished with the union negotiations, then we will go into the (inaudible) negotiations with Bill McGowan, who was a character of major

HARTNETT  
proportions, I always felt.

MR. MADARASZ: I would like to digress  
with a little sketch of him at this point.

8

MR. HARTNETT: He was a very, very  
interesting guy. I think he was -- if my memory  
serves me correctly I think he was a TV  
repairman from west Seneca. I think that was  
his occupation and while he didn't have any  
advanced degrees or the like, he kind of knew  
where the deal was and he knew what the people  
needed.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: And was extraordinarily  
adept at voicing that at the table. He was not  
a slave to good English and he would  
occasionally go before the (inaudible) and say  
just marvelous things. I remember being at a  
press conference with him once where he said the  
members were getting their dandruff up. That  
was one of his lines.

(Laughter.)

MR. HARTNETT: And he kind of -- I  
often wondered whether he said those things on  
purpose. He would crack up the press corps.  
They kind of adopted him as their own, so he was  
a shrewd guy and he always had this cigar which,  
when he really used to get aggravated -- we had

a fella in -- who worked for me when I was at (inaudible) who was our research director who was a very learned individual, had a lot of degrees, was a slave to members, and he would come to the table and give these dissertations on why we could only do a two percent or two and a half or three percent wage increase, whatever, and I always remember the time Bill McGowan who -- he used to smoke this cigar, and he'd put, you know, maybe an inch of it, you know, in his mouth and he would -- so it wasn't a pleasant sight as he would kinda wave it around at the table.

MR. MADARASZ: Yeah.

MR. HARTNETT: But this fellow, Jerry Shrout (phonetic) who was my research director was drinking coffee and he put his cup down on the table and McGowan at some point took his cigar and put it in his coffee.

(Laughter.)

MR. HARTNETT: And I don't think Jerry was ever the same after that. He lived in fear of Bill (laughter) but Bill was, again, one of those guys that, you know, you could have

□

someone come to the table and do, you know, 25 minutes of actuarial science, a really

HARTNETT

impressive numerical presentation, and Bill would say, well, that may be and that's all fine, but I need four percent and I ain't leavin' till I get four percent, and he would kinda take the wind out of what everybody says and then he would hang tough until he got what he was after.

So he was a very kind of interesting guy who played to his strength, had a lot of down-home stories about life in the facilities (inaudible) and I thought did a good job.

MR. MADARASZ: Good. That's a good picture. I haven't heard that story of the cigar in the coffee before. That's good.

MR. HARTNETT: Oh, yeah. He was a very interesting guy.

MR. MADARASZ: See, there are little things about people that sums up or tells you who they are. I think that cigar thing is kind of it. I mean it just -- and the dandruff thing.

MR. HARTNETT: The other thing about

□

11

Bill is that -- he was a tremendous advocate as was CSEA for women in the workplace and I was at the Governor's Office when we did the parity equity settlement where we brought up a number of primarily female-occupied titles up to a greater parity based on a fairly comprehensive

HARTNETT

study that we had done by the State University.

And I remember going to do a press conference with Bill McGowan and the upshot of the study was that a fair number of people were gonna be upgraded and not a lot of people, since some titles were undervalued and some titles were kind of slightly overvalued, so I said to Bill, we kinda left open the potential for downgrading and so I said to Bill, let me handle that during the press conference because we're gonna be out here talkin' about a lot of good news for the membership but, you know, I have to -- I'm representing the State and I need some things to say.

So he said, okay, don't worry about it. We'll take care of it so, of course, we go to the press conference and the first question a reporter asks is how many people are being

□

12

downgraded. And McGowan says, (inaudible) no one, no one's gonna be downgraded, so I said, well, thanks, Bill. That's an enormous help to me.

(Laughter.)

MR. HARTNETT: But he was a -- he was quite a character, I guess.

MR. MADARASZ: Now, the pay equity thing, how did that start? I mean where did that issue --

HARTNETT

MR. HARTNETT: Right around the time that CSEA was also most aggressively pulling out these contracts and saying we don't want to (inaudible), we want an agreement, and putting some tough language in the agreements, there was also a -- the movement into the forefront of women's rights and women in the workplace and this was right around the time that we negotiated day care centers and a vehicle to allow day care centers to be created in a variety of different facilities around the state, and I think that was probably the first union that ever really did that on such a comprehensive basis.

□

13

So we were all being sensitized by the union and by the women in the union to some of these issues. I confess that I did not get a good sense of what on-site day care was all about until I went into negotiations and started talking to a lot of the women and the CSEA bargaining teams at that time were close to 50 percent if not greater made up of women, and so those issues started to come to the fore.

And one of the issues that came was -- by the way, the education, expertise, daily activities of this title are not totally dissimilar to this title. In some cases, they might even be more rigorous than this title.

HARTNETT

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: This title is 95 percent male, this title is 95 percent female. Is there some reason why the top pay on this one is \$10,000 a year and the top pay on this one is 15? So we said we'll take a look at it and we had a very reputable group up at SUNY look at it and they -- and once they arrived at a methodology to try and compare what were seemingly different occupations but, of course,

□

14

they were different occupations, but not so much different in terms of the expertise, the daily activities, the educational background, the minimum qualifications, when we got through all that they were very much the same, so the pay should not have been as disparate as it was.

So that kind of affected the women within CSEA who were emerging as -- I think they were probably 45 to 50 percent of the work force at that point in time.

MR. MADARASZ: This was in '70?

MR. HARTNETT: This would have been '79 and '82.

MR. MADARASZ: All right. Good. Now, after McGowan was McDermott.

MR. HARTNETT: That's correct. Joe McDermott.

MR. MADARASZ: Dealt with him, too?

HARTNETT

MR. HARTNETT: Yes.

MR. MADARASZ: Give a little sketch of him, like working with him.

MR. HARTNETT: Different than -- different than Bill. Not understood the process very well, understood the State and how it

□

15

functioned. Was very good at articulating discrete issues while with the State and I, by this time, had moved, I believe, up to the Labor Department. I didn't have that much direct interaction with Joe as I did with Bill, but Joe was a very effective leader who I believe came out of the Department of Transportation and I think what's interesting is as a president comes out of a particular agency, a particular discipline, and I know out of necessity kind of know a little bit more about that and champion some of those things.

So Joe was (inaudible) on the transportation issues, very good on the institutional services unit issues as was Bill, and they together in a kind of an interesting way -- I just want to digress for a moment.

One of the things that they did which was enormously effective was they did a campaign and I guess it was probably '79-'80 about Mental Hygiene and moving people out into the community, which was enormously effective and

HARTNETT

there was a lot of posters around the state and billboards that said "She was Dumped" and it had

□

16

a picture of a lady looking (inaudible) in a setting that perhaps wasn't as good as it might have been.

MR. MADARASZ: I remember them.

MR. HARTNETT: And as a result of that (inaudible) that drove Hugh Carey nuts, that went on to see these posters and billboards and the like. He then put myself and some others, and at the time I worked with a guy by the name of Sandy Fisher (phonetic) who was the director of the office when I was the deputy, and put us together and out of that along with the law firm that was representing CSEA at the time, was negotiating a thing called the Morgatta (phonetic) Memorandum which was a memorandum that said in state facilities there'd be a certain level of staffing based on the number of patients.

And what's interesting about that, I think, is that I had occasion during my career to go out and speak with parent groups about the quality of care in the facilities around the state in the Office of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and the parents in many respects are

□

17

HARTNETT

the real continuity in the system.

Because if you had -- unfortunately had a child that needs those services, you become very wise about the server. You become a monitor of the care at that facility. You maybe get on the board of visitors in the facility and, of course, you go to see your child probably on a regular basis.

So when those folks talk about the system and changes in the system, you gotta stop and listen and these mothers told me that the greatest change that they saw in the system for the good was as a result of the Morgatta Memorandum because with the Morgatta Memorandum, it stood for the proposition that if you had a hundred patients, you had to have 250 direct care staff, whatever that ratio was.

And that is something that CSEA fought for because their members wanted that because they were concerned about the health and safety of their members, the work schedule of their members and the care being given to the patients.

Now the order of those things might be

□

18

slightly different from the State's perspective but the bottom line is the list is the same;

HARTNETT  
it's just a question of how they get kind of  
jiggled around.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: So CSEA in fighting for  
what it was interested in actually improved the  
quality of care in New York State immeasurably  
and again that's not me saying that. That's  
people who have real expertise and a real  
involvement with the system, so -- and that was  
Bill McGowan and Joe McDermott that really  
pushed that and did a terrific job, I thought.

MR. MADARASZ: Okay.

(Inaudible conversation.)

MR. MADARASZ: I want you to just give  
me little pictures of things like that that  
happened. I mean you seem very well prepared  
for this. I don't even have to ask you any  
questions. I know Steve gave me -- you said now  
you were on the other side of the table because  
that's what we're talking about. Give me some  
more about Sandy. Tell me more about Sandy  
Fisher and what he was like --

□

19

MR. HARTNETT: Sandy was a very  
different guy. He didn't have any background in  
collective bargaining. When I came into the  
State I had already negotiated contracts in the  
private sector. Sandy did not and that was, you  
know, kinda good news and bad news. Bad news

HARTNETT

was -- he was a quick study so the bad news didn't last too long, but the good news was he didn't feel a need to defend.

You know, very often when you see a management negotiations or a management in negotiations they feel the need to defend in a large system the conduct of every commissioner, every supervisor or whatever. One of the things that I thought Sandy was very good at is recognizing that there were a lot of decisions that are made out there that he would not have made and that he was not gonna be burdened in negotiations by having to defend every one and he wasn't afraid to say, hey, I'll change things.

And of course, he had the ear of the Governor, which was always helpful.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m-m.

□

20

MR. HARTNETT: I mean when I became the chief negotiator for the State I was -- did my own before I got the job, I became pretty close with Mario Cuomo when he was the Governor, so I kinda had his ear, and that of course enables you to go to the table and say, well, if you listen to the union, it made a lot of sense about this issue.

There needs to be a change. Of course you can say that the commissioner that's

HARTNETT

impacted by the change, but you know you can always at some point go to the Governor and say, you have to do this to the benefit of collective bargaining, for the benefit of how we run this corporation known as New York State, and for the benefit of the government.

So Sandy is a good negotiator in that he didn't bring a lot of the baggage with him that sometimes negotiators do bring and he got a lot done. Pretty effective guy, I thought.

MR. MADARASZ: So really it wasn't exactly adversarial with CSEA on one side of the table and you on the other.

MR. HARTNETT: Well, to some extent

□

21

that was true and I mentioned that CSEA came and testified at my confirmation hearings for Labor Commissioner and in part they joked that they were glad to get rid of me out of their (inaudible) and get me over to Labor, but I think they thought that I was fair and reasonable and right around that time, 1982 was in my judgment kinda the high point of labor-management cooperation in the State because we recognized that in an environment where 90 -- upwards of 90 percent of the work force is organized, that if you're gonna be able to get things done effectively you have to work with your partners and one of the major partners is

HARTNETT

the union.

(Inaudible) then the State was in getting legislation passed with their political clout. They knew most of the politicians, they knew the work force, they knew the issues, so why would you not want to partner with someone like that.

Now, what you need in that environment is a union that's confident enough in itself and a management confident enough in itself to be

□

22

able to say better but we're still gonna argue about 15 or 20 percent of the stuff, but we shouldn't be arguing about resources for day care because that's gonna help us by retaining a quality work force.

We shouldn't be arguing about health and safety issues. We shouldn't be arguing about training issues. We shouldn't be arguing about making the work place safer. Those kinds of issues we ought to be working together on.

And we would address whether or not there should be a four percent increase or a five percent increase or whether or not due process means you have to have notice and discipline or whatever. Those things will continue to maybe go back to our Commissioner Rowe, but on the lion share of stuff we can actually work together.

HARTNETT

And we were fortunate at that time that we had Danny Donohue, for example, who was a strong believer in this and someone who was pushing that for a very long time at the facility (inaudible). He started to progress up through the hierarchy of the union and was able

□

23

to push it, and again it takes confidence, I think, and leadership 'cause it's very easy to go before a crowd of delegates or managers or employees and say, yeah, we're gonna go in and we're gonna bring 'em to their knees and we're gonna do this, that and the other thing, and that's that kind of (inaudible) speech where we didn't just (inaudible) but where does it get you?

I mean in the final analysis, there's a positive impact on the bottom line and I think it takes a courageous leader to stand up in front of the union meetings and say we're gonna agree with 'em on this because it's gonna mean a better work place and we're gonna work with 'em on training and we're gonna do some other things.

So that round of negotiations we set up primarily the management committees, we set up the joint training funds, we set up the CSEA employee benefit fund so they could deliver certain health care benefits directly. We did a

HARTNETT

lot of that in '79 and '82 and then I'm not -- I didn't follow the negotiations that closely

□

24

since then, but I know that basically I think that is probably the most progressive time in my judgment 'cause we really started a lot of those things, on-site day care and whatever, and we would actually put money in the contracts to do that.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: And the reason we would do that, and I'm not telling tales out of school here, was that we would be locked into the cost of the bargaining agreement that would be there and if it was a three-year deal we were without funding and we wouldn't have to worry about the Division of the Budget coming and taking the money off the table so they were after things like day care and training. We were true partners in that we said if we could put this money in the contract you know you have it for three years and you'll be able to educate the work force.

That, of course, was great for the union because they're providing good training benefits for their members. In fact that as the employer it was great for us because we had that

□

25

HARTNETT

competent qualified work force doing the job.

MR. MADARASZ: Now you've mentioned Danny, let's -- give me that same kind of biographical sketch of Danny because you saw him at the beginning, you know, to where he is now. Any stories to tell --

MR. HARTNETT: Well, that first meeting, of course, down in Central Islip where he come in and he was a real kind of rabble rouser and at that point I think he was somewhat of an outsider evaluating all the deals that were being made on the statewide level and supporting those that he agreed with and he was not shy in terms of voicing his concern about those things that he was not particularly happy with.

And at that meeting we were, well, this is probably the guy that we're gonna be dealing with in the future and then he started to be appointed to labor-management committees and whatever and Danny, I always thought, possessed a lot of the real attributes that a labor leader needs.

First of all, he's not shy and he's

□

26

willing to stand up and voice his concerns and that's obviously very important. He also has the ability to know when the deal is there and,

HARTNETT

you know, there are people that are very good at getting up and listing their concerns but there's a window of opportunity to make a deal and sometimes they go right past the window.

MR. MADARASZ: Yeah.

MR. HARTNETT: The window closes and then they're out there in the cold. I think Danny knows when he's gonna get the best deal for his members and that's when he's prepared to sit down and talk turkey and get it done.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: If he doesn't think it's sufficient for the members he won't go near it. He is a guy that you would notice even as a local chapter president. And then he started to get very slowly more responsible positions as he goes up through the union and I started to work with him on a lot of different issues and he always brought, you know, the membership to the table.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m-m.

□

27

MR. HARTNETT: He might have been by himself, but he always had the membership with him and we used to -- we used to kid about him and say there's three things on his mind all the time when he sits down and talks to ya, and it's the membership, the membership, the membership. I mean he just never takes his eye off that.

HARTNETT

And then, of course, he's the beneficiary of having been a -- I forget what he was now. I think he was a driver. I introduced him once as that he always refers to himself as a driver and he is a driver. He drove Hugh Carey nuts. He drove Mario Cuomo nuts. I'm sure he's gonna drive George Pataki nuts, but there's an education you get working in a facility and, you know, he's one of the great examples of it.

Because he's actually been there when some of these idiotic edicts from on high go through the filtering process and get translated at the local level, so he brings that sensitivity of having been on the shop floor and knowing what's going on there and he also has a level of sophistication about him so he's

□

28

comfortable in the board room and he's comfortable on the shop floor and kind of everywhere in between.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: And I think that in essence is what a lot of folks are lookin' for in a labor leader. I mean a guy that's willin' to go in, understand the nuances of finance and the like, understand where the employee can go and can't go so they have a sense of where the deal is. The rest are willing to roll up their

HARTNETT

sleeves, sit at the table and say, goddamn it, I'm gonna stay here all night until I get this issue resolved.

MR. MADARASZ: M-m h-m-m.

MR. HARTNETT: And I think he brings those attributes to whatever issue he deals with.

MR. MADARASZ: Right. I've talked to a lot of people who were in CSEA for a long time and it really turned at a point from being a social organization to being a labor union and I think part of that was AFSCME. Were you around when that happened?

□

29

MR. HARTNETT: Yes.

MR. MADARASZ: You were there. You saw it happen and you were involved and you saw it.

MR. HARTNETT: Yeah.

MR. MADARASZ: Did you see the change? Tell me your take on that, on that merge of unions --

MR. HARTNETT: Well, when I first come up to Albany in '78 I figure it was the early stages of CSEA becoming really an aggressive force to be recognized, reckoned with, and just in that next two- or three-year period you started to see the negotiations take a, you know, a marked change for the better. Much more

HARTNETT

aggressive at the table, a feeling like we're partners in this process; not gonna take the crumbs that someone's prepared to give us, but we're gonna fight for what we think is right.

And in the past, maybe someone would come to the table and say, this is what we have, two percent, and the discussion was over. Now I have a group that's saying, well, that's maybe what you think you can give but that's not what

□

30

we're gonna accept.

And then the other thing that I noticed about the contracts were, again, there was a lot of kind of soft language in the contracts.

MR. MADARASZ: Yeah.

MR. HARTNETT: And that became unacceptable. They didn't want -- CSEA said we don't wanna meet with you so you can tell us what you're gonna implement next Monday. We want to negotiate with you so we can decide what we will jointly implement next Friday. Big change philosophically.

Now in the health insurance area which was interesting also, they would come to the table and say don't tell us what benefits you're prepared to give us. We wanna negotiate and, by the way, we canvassed our membership. While you have some geniuses up at Civil Service that

HARTNETT

think this is what we want, let us tell you what we want and it's not necessarily what those guys up in the Campus there told us they wanted.

And then they kicked it to the next level and said, by the way, we don't think

□

31

you're doin' a good job running the health insurance program. If you give us the money for the same benefits, we'll do it ourselves. In fact I don't think they have the program anymore because I think for some reason, in some negotiations, they decided for strategic purposes to give some of it back, but they run a drug program that is very well run and, in fact, in many cases probably run better than the State was doing, and dumped the program and some other benefits.

But there was a clear kind of revolution into a much more aggressive take charge kind of a union.

MR. MADARASZ: And you work -- you do some work for CSEA now?

MR. HARTNETT: After I left the State I did some lobbying for them. I do some consulting with them now.

MR. MADARASZ: You're up to date on what's goin' on in CSEA now?

MR. HARTNETT: Well, I'm not -- I wouldn't consider myself an expert but I do --

HARTNETT

MR. MADARASZ: You've been around

32

different sides of the table long enough to see the progression up till now.

MR. HARTNETT: Oh, yeah.

MR. MADARASZ: (Inaudible) this picture from when you first met McGowan to now and how you would characterize CSEA.

MR. HARTNETT: Well, the involvement with AFSCME, which I always viewed initially, and this is just my opinion, that early on there was an affiliation with AFSCME that wasn't -- there wasn't utilization of all the services that AFSCME might offer.

And probably it's gone both ways. AFSCME maybe didn't appreciate the sophistication and the contacts and the like that CSEA brought to the organization and CSEA I don't think appreciated what AFSCME could do for them, or perhaps wasn't taking advantage of all of that early on.

MR. MADARASZ: Yeah.

MR. HARTNETT: That changed pretty quickly, and I think by the early eighties there was a sense that by the way if we asked AFSCME to do XYZ they'll do a good job and they'll do a

33

HARTNETT

good job in Washington, DC and that will help us here.

And what's happened now as I've watched it is there's kind of this synthesis of two very formidable classes, CSEA at the New York State level, AFSCME at the national level, so that the Congressional delegation, for example, not only hears from AFSCME but then the message is reinforced by CSEA and they not only hear from CSEA on a New York State issue but that message is then reinforced by the people in Washington.

So there's a real kind of synergy there that I think has made this a very, very effective organization and I think Danny's done a tremendous amount to help bring that about; that feeling like, you know, we're strong, we're aggressive. We're also part of a larger organization that can do some pretty formidable things also.

MR. MADARASZ: They can throw a one-two punch?

MR. HARTNETT: Exactly. Exactly.

MR. MADARASZ: Good. Did I leave

□

34

anything out that you had already thought about?

MR. HARTNETT: No, other than I have -- I was out at a function recently and I met a

HARTNETT

former budget director from New York State and we were talkin' about the unions, the public sector unions, and CSEA in particular.

And, you know, from a management standpoint what typically happens is a group of the budget director, the head of OER, the Governor's Office of Employee Relations and someone like from the Governor's Office will get together early in negotiations and try and decide where we're going and what can we afford and whatever.

And while those people very often have the best intentions, without some advocacy on the other side, left to their own devices, and I was part of those meetings, so I can state this pretty accurately, they'll opt because of the fiscal constraints and the like for something that's modest, to characterize it in a kind way.

So I said to this guy that I met the other day who was a former budget director, assume that the State employees have received a

□

35

50 percent increase over the last ten years. What do you think it would have been had there not been an aggressive CSEA at the bargaining table? He said 20. I thought 20 was kinda high. I woulda said maybe 16 or 17 because, inevitably, notwithstanding the best intentions, if there's nobody pushing back and you have all

HARTNETT

these various competing demands and during the period of time that I'm talking about CSEA now you had the AIDS crisis, you had deinstitutionalization, you had pension increase costs, all these various competing factors, and with all those people pushing on the system, what's left on the table is usually not a great deal.

And if there's nobody pushin' for the work force, then what's left on the table is what you're gonna get, so that evolution of CSEA saying that I understand in the early seventies, for example, people would come and say, well, we've done our calculations and we're prepared to give you two percent and that was pretty much it, everybody could go home, to the point where now there's vigorous debate and negotiations and

□

36

the State comes and says this is as much as we're prepared to do and they also wound up doing probably double that.

And that doesn't happen by accident. It happens as a result of a sophisticated bargaining table, a sophisticated research department, a sophisticated parent union, and lastly a gutsy leader by the name of Danny Donohue, and a long, tough set of negotiations.

MR. MADARASZ: Is it going to continue, knowing the problems you're facing in

HARTNETT  
the next couple years?

MR. HARTNETT: Oh, sure. Yeah, I think so. I think unions are more and more important in today's times and I think, you know, CSEA has -- again plays a voice in so many issues. I mean CSEA is over there fighting for the minimum wage now. Now CSEA doesn't represent anyone that makes minimum wage. Everyone makes much more than minimum wage. I think there's much better benefits, but I think there's a sensitivity in this organization and in AFSCME to the fact that while the fights are important, they're part of a larger fight, and

□

37

the larger fight is to bring everybody up.

So just the idea that CSEA expends a lot of its capital, both intellectual and financial, on issues like minimum wage and health and safety, for people that they might not necessarily even represent says a lot about the organization and the social conscience it has.

MR. MADARASZ: Yeah. I think that was ingrained in it, too, even when it was a social organization more than a union.

MR. HARTNETT: Yeah.

MR. MADARASZ: I think that was there. They cared about each other then and they've grown.

HARTNETT

MR. HARTNETT: Yeah.

MR. MADARASZ: That's my opinion. I shouldn't be even saying it but I'm not trying to put words in your mouth. I've been talking to people from a hundred years old to sixty years old --

MR. HARTNETT: Yeah.

MR. MADARASZ: -- and they all tell me the same story about the union.

□

38

MR. HARTNETT: Yes. Yes.

MR. MADARASZ: Amazing. Amazing culture. That's the word somebody used, culture.

MR. HARTNETT: Yeah. And it's interesting that when we look now at magazines or Net Worth or -- Net Worth is not the name of the magazine. I'm trying to think of the name of it. But anyway they do the top ten employers in the country --

(Simultaneous conversation.)

MR. HARTNETT: -- perhaps Business week, and one of the things that they talk about is what are some of the things that make it appealing. What are the things that make it a terrific employer, and they'll go down this list. I don't have the list in front of me but my memory says (inaudible) about on-site day care. They talk about flex time. They talk

HARTNETT

about benefits for part-timers. They all talk about the ability to get leave time during the summer for working parents. They talk about flex time.

They don't talk necessarily about

□

39

money. You know, money's there, but it's these other things that make you a class employer.

Now, the State to some degree does all of those things. I would submit to you that the State would probably be doing half that list and probably just giving it lip service if it wasn't for CSEA. They're the ones that brought on-site day care to the bargaining table and to the State. As a result now I think there are 25 or 30 on-site day care centers around the state.

There's one that we built up at the Labor Department when I was up there as Commissioner with CSEA and there's 60 or 70 kids in there and parents come, drop the kids off in the morning, go to work, stop down have lunch with them. I mean it's a wonderful thing to see.

Flex time, a big issue, and that came to the State as a result of CSEA. Part-time benefits and the like, leave time in the summer when young parents have kids at home and the like, all those programs are the result of CSEA advocacy at the table.

HARTNETT  
MR. MADARASZ: Right.

□

40

MR. HARTNETT: So they've made their presence felt in a lot of different ways.

MR. MADARASZ: Well, I don't think we've left anything out. If you can think of anything else?

MR. HARTNETT: I don't think so.

MR. MADARASZ: You've given me pictures of the presidents and what CSEA has developed into. It's been a pleasure to talk to you.

MR. HARTNETT: Good.

MR. MADARASZ: Thank you very much.

MR. HARTNETT: My pleasure.

(Conclusion of interview of Tom Hartnett.)

□