#### AFL-CIO Government Affairs State Government Relations



#### Collective Bargaining, Payroll Deduction for Union Dues, and So-Called "Paycheck Protection" / Paycheck Deception

Monday, 4/15/13

#### **Speakers**

- Steve Kreisberg, AFSCME
- Larry Gold, AFL-CIO
- Cathy Sherwin, AFL-CIO

### 2013 Attacks on Public Sector Rights



- "Paycheck protection" is the close cousin of "right to work":
- A virtuous label and a deceptive policy to render unions ineffectual
- Seeks to pit unions against their members and the other workers they represent
- Depends upon appeals to short-sighted individual interests over solidarity with others

First conceived in the mid-1990s as ballot measures and state and federal legislation

Prominent initial supporters included:

- Americans for Tax Reform (Grover Norquist)
- Educational Alliance (CA Christian activist group)
- Chambers of Commerce
- National Federation of Independent Business
- Wealthy individual conservatives/Republicans

- California Proposition 226 in 1998 the first significant state ballot measure fight over "paycheck protection"
- Measure would condition union spending on political contributions and expenditures on specific individual advance written permission
- Applied to dues whether paid via payroll deduction or otherwise
- Labor movement spent over \$25 million for come-frombehind 52%-48% victory

- Similar Oregon ballot measures defeated after expensive campaigns in 1998 and 2000
- Proposed Nevada measure in 2000 invalidated by union lawsuit before election
- Unsuccessful public sector measure was among 2005
  Schwarzennegger ballot propositions, all defeated
- Otherwise, 2000s saw many legislative proposals but none of substance were enacted, and "paycheck protection" waned as anti-union cause

- Resurgence of "paycheck protection" in wake of midterm election debacle for Democrats and progressives
- American Legislative Exchange Council and other rightwing groups reactivate the tactic
- With Congress gridlocked, Republicans and conservatives again focus on state legislatures to impose "paycheck protection" on private and public sector workers

- "Paycheck protection" proposals apply to private or public sector workplaces, or both
- Almost always one-sided: restrictions imposed on unions, and on payroll deductions that unions use, but not other groups or payroll deductions that they receive
- Variations include:
  - Direct restrictions on union political, legislative and other advocacy and contributions to other groups
  - Indirect restrictions by conditioning that spending on advance individual employee approval

- Individuals given authority to approve or block uses of their own dues or fees
- Particular union spending subject to special member votes
- Prohibition of use of payroll-deducted funds for broad range of "political" purposes
- In all cases, ordinary democratic procedures overridden and significant administrative costs imposed on Labor

- Meanwhile, ALEC opposes proposals to condition business political and lobbying spending on prior shareholder approval; after all, they:
- "...place an onerous burden on these organizations..."
- "...deter [corporations] from participating in public debate ... "
- "..undermine the very purpose of the First Amendment.."

- Dozens of "paycheck protection" proposals introduced in states since 2011
- None have yet qualified for the ballot in any state
- Three have been enacted by legislatures, in Alabama, Arizona and Puerto Rico, but lawsuits are succeeding
- Wisconsin has outlawed public employee payroll deduction of dues, period – and a lawsuit failed

- Alabama statute enacted at end of 2010
- Applies to public sector in this RTW state
- Bars payroll-deducted dues to any group that engages in "political activity," including contributions, "political advertising," polling and other vaguely defined activities
- Federal court enjoined statute on First Amendment grounds
- Has also denied motion to dismiss union claims that state Republican legislators and governors unlawfully retaliated against public sector unions' opposition to their election
- Appeals court has asked state Supreme Court to determine several state law issues

- Arizona statute enacted in 2011
- Applies to both private and public sectors
- Bars wage deductions for "political purposes," including candidate elections, ballot measures and "political issue advocacy"
- Exempts "public safety" employees, as well as charitable groups and health benefits providers that receive payroll deductions
- Federal court issued injunction in 2011 on First Amendment "viewpoint discrimination" ground; not appealed
- In March 2013, same court issued final judgment invalidating law on same ground, plus federal preemption in private sector

- Puerto Rico statute enacted in 2011
- Require unions and corporations to secure secret ballot votes of majority of entire membership, at simultaneous meetings of members, inn order to approve very independent political expenditure
- Although not payroll-deduction-based, statute implicates same "advance authorization" concerns as other paycheck protection laws
- Federal appeals court in 2012 enjoined law on First Amendment grounds

- Wisconsin "Act 10" was enacted in 2011, and sparked huge demonstrations and now, ultimately unsuccessful litigation
- One provision bans payroll deduction of union dues and agency fees by employees, but exempts certain "public safety" employees
- In January 2013 federal appeals court upheld this provision against First Amendment and Equal protection Clause claims, concluding that it is viewpoint-neutral and the public-safety exemption is rationally supported by "labor peace" concerns

- New "paycheck protection" bills loom in 2013
- Most immediately, two Missouri bills:
- HB 64, passed by the House, would apply in the private and public sectors and condition union political spending of payroll-deducted funds on annual written advance authorization, while exempting first responders and trade associations
- SB 29 would condition public sector union spending on political contributions and expenditures on prior annual written employee authorization using a specific form

# A Message Frame that Works

**Clear, simple value-based messaging** 

Counter opposition attempts to marginalize unions and divide non-union voters from union workers

Make a unique and effective case in each state

Define and undermine the credibility of political opposition by exposing their true motives and corporate-backed funders – define the "bad guys" in your state.



# Our opposition attempts to marginalize unions and divide non-union voters from union workers



Connecting with and winning the support of voters is key. We need to expose who's behind these laws and what's their motivation.

We must not play on our opponent's ground or get into the weeds of the policy attacks on worker rights.

#### Protecting Collective Bargaining Key Takeaways From Successful Fights :

- Where voters are concerned, "It's all about me." Focus on their safety, wellbeing, economic interests.
- *Make everyday heroes (nurses, teachers, firefighters) the allies of voters.* Make them the face, avoid the "us versus them" dynamic.
- Refuse to be defensive & don't take the bait. Avoid spending time refuting union-bashing. Stick to bigger principles.
- Values-laden language wins. Voters understand the world and frame political choices through their values.
- Don't get bogged down in policy details, facts & figures.
- **Tell powerful stories.** Voters connect with real people whose stories they can relate to.



#### THE MESSAGE

This is about politics

**Not economics** 

Our legislative leaders should be coming together to balance the budget, improve our schools, and create jobs.

Instead, some politicians are pushing unnecessary and irresponsible legislation that attacks collective bargaining rights – including paycheck deception bills

Attacks

#### Talking to Members Attacks and the Public Middle Class

Paycheck deception and About the similar bills take away the professional voice of firefighters, nurses and police and make it harder for them to bargain for equipment and safe staffing level.

Impact

on public

Protect workers who are critical to our community and safety (Nurses, Teachers, Fire)

**Motivations** for Attack

**Politicians give their** wealthy donors and CEOs tax breaks while those same CEOs outsource jobs, and cut wages and benefits for middle class workers

Politicians want to give CEOs more power over middle class workers by stripping them of their right to collectively bargain.

Define the Situation from the perspective of the public

> Source of the Problem (same)

#### **Good Messengers**



Workers

# Firefighters, nurses, and teachers

#### **Small business owners**

These attacks on public service workers are unfair – unsafe and unnecessary

#### We Are Missouri Coalition Launches Online Story Collection Showcasing Workers Responses to Jefferson City Attacks

\*\* WorkingVoices.Tumblr.com \*\*



# **Use Social Media**



Wisconsin State AFL-CIO shared SEIU's photo. Sunday

The truth is, right-to-work-for-less laws DON'T help state economies. States with these laws DO have lower wages and fewer people with health insurance.

Michigan can't afford that.

Please LIKE and SHARE.



"WHAT WE SHOULDN'T BE DOING IS TRYING TO TAKE AWAY YOUR RIGHTS TO BARGAIN FOR BETTER WAGES AND WORKING CONDITIONS. WE SHOULDN'T BE DOING THAT. You know, these so-called right to work laws they don't have anything to do with economics, they have everything to do with politics.

WHAT THEY'RE REALLY TALKING ABOUT IS GIVING You the right to work for less money."





Like - Comment - Share Edit Maggie Tessen, Carton Andy Shoemoe and 2 others like this. Write a comment...

Sponsored #1

#### THRIVE Home Furnishings threefurniture.com



Clck to vew our vanety of American-made, high quaity and functional home furnishings

Create an Ad

#### Top videos





Occupy Chicago @OccupyChicago 2m CCUP RT @WeAreMichigan: We're hearing word that voting will be taking HICAG place shortly in the House. Let's keep the pressure up! #savemi Followed by Andy Richards Expand



#McDProBowl 🔽 Promoted

Pandora

#finalsweek

#AddictingSongs

Instagram

#Texans

Michigan

Twitter

Starbucks

#photography

© 2012 Twitter About Help Terms Privacy Blog Status Apps Resources Jobs Advertisers Businesses Media Developers



John @JohnSerwach Call gov. Snyder at 888-979-7646 and ask him to veto Right to work legislation... And RT! Thanks!! #savemi #RTW4Less Followed by Todd Cook Expand Emily Heffling @emilyheffling 3m "@ocsea: Dems offer amendment to take out fiscal note so bill can be repealed. No vote just gavelled down. Shame on them. #savemi #miunion." Expand Kitty @KRansome83 3m

2m



Word has it that voting will be taking place shortly in the #MI House. Let's keep the pressure up! #savemi Followed by R.Saddler and 15 others Expand



Zaid Jilani @ZaidJilani 3m Why can't we have a "Right To Invest" law that allows investors to opt funds out of corporate political spending? #RTW #SaveMI Retweeted by Doug Foote

Expand

# **Questions and Discussion**



For more information:

Peggy Shorey, Director, State Government Relations pshorey@aflcio.org

Christine Silvia-DeGennaro, State Legislative Issues Coordinator csilvia@aflcio.org