



**National Right to Work Committee®**

# **Fact Sheet**

The National Right to Work Committee, 8001 Braddock Rd., Springfield, Virginia 22160, (703) 321-9820, (800) 325-7892, [www.nrtwc.org](http://www.nrtwc.org)

**A COALITION OF EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS**

## **The So-Called Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 is Anti-Federalist, Anti-Worker, and Anti-Taxpayer**

The misnamed Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007 (H.R. 980) has already passed the U.S. House and is expected to come up for a vote in the U.S. Senate in mid-September. This bill would usurp the authority of all states to determine their own public sector labor relations schemes; preempt laws in 26 states; impose on those states an unfunded mandate of unknown cost; force police officers, firefighters and emergency medical technicians into monopoly bargaining contracts – taking away their rights to bargain individually; empower union officials to shut down volunteer fire departments in many communities; and increase the likelihood of strikes that shut down police and fire departments.

For these reasons and more, the following state legislatures are among those that since 1996 have rejected – either by vote or inaction – legislation akin to that required by H.R. 980. Bill numbers, subject and year introduced are listed.

<b>Arizona</b>			
H. 2508	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2004	Rejected
H. 2413	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2004	Rejected
H. 2330	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
S. 1209	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
H. 2850	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining & Binding Arbitration	2006	Rejected
<b>Arkansas</b>			
S. 596	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
<b>Georgia</b>			
H. 1462	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1998	Rejected
S. 668	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1998	Rejected
<b>Indiana</b>			
H. 1249	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected

S. 399	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
H. 1108	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2000	Rejected
S. 238	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2000	Rejected
H. 1407	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
S. 100	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
S. 167	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
S. 128	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
S. 64	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2006	Rejected
H. 1113	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2007	Rejected
<b>Kentucky</b>			
H. 831	Local Employee Collective Bargaining	2000	Rejected
<b>Louisiana</b>			
S. 141	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
<b>Maryland</b>			
H. 1167	Binding Arbitration - Baltimore Police	2007	Rejected
S. 509	Binding Arbitration - Baltimore Police	2007	Rejected
<b>Mississippi</b>			
H. 687	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1998	Rejected
H. 966	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
<b>Missouri</b>			
H. 93	Police Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
H. 1736	Police Monopoly Bargaining	2006	Rejected
<b>North Carolina</b>			
H. 1095	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2003	Rejected
S. 1543	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2007	Rejected
<b>North Dakota</b>			
H. 1381	Municipal Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
H. 1372	Municipal Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
H. 1371	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
S. 2241	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
<b>South Carolina</b>			
H. 4250	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1996	Rejected
S. 1079	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1996	Rejected
<b>Tennessee</b>			
H. 980	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1997	Rejected
S. 1832	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1997	Rejected
H. 224	Firefighter Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
S. 196	Firefighter Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
H. 1099	Municipal Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
H. 1602	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected

S. 768	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
H. 1601	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2003	Rejected
H. 708	Police Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
H. 2035	Firefighter Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
S. 1116	Firefighter Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
<b>Texas</b>			
H. 1099	Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	1999	Rejected
H. 1345	Municipal Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
S. 729	Municipal Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2001	Rejected
<b>Virginia</b>			
H. 145	Comprehensive Meet & Confer	2002	Rejected
<b>West Virginia</b>			
H. 2278	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2005	Rejected
H. 2295	Comprehensive Binding Arbitration	2005	Rejected
S. 80	Comprehensive Binding Arbitration	2005	Rejected
H. 2278	Comprehensive Monopoly Bargaining	2006	Rejected
H. 2811	Municipal Police/Fire Monopoly Bargaining	2007	Rejected

In full, there are 26 states that have rejected – either by vote or inaction – H.R. 980’s insistence on public safety monopoly unionism. Thus, this bill would force governors and legislatures in each of the states below to rewrite their laws in accordance with Big Labor’s will.

### **Alabama**

Alabama legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Alabama’s state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Arizona**

Arizona legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Arizona’s state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Arkansas**

Arkansas legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Arkansas’ state, county and

local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Colorado**

Colorado legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Colorado's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Delaware**

Delaware legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would force arbitration procedures upon Delaware's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians.

### **Georgia**

Georgia legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Georgia's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that the employers of all police officers and local firefighters meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Idaho**

Idaho legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Idaho's state, county and local police and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employer and force collective bargaining upon them. State legislators would also have to pass laws requiring arbitration procedures for every police officer, firefighter and emergency medical technician across the state. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that employers of police and emergency medical technicians meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Indiana**

Indiana legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Indiana's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them.

## **Iowa**

Iowa legislators have previously passed legislation that forces monopoly bargaining upon all public sector employees at every subdivision of the state. This legislation, however, specifically states that the union bosses and public employers may not bargain over the particular terms and conditions of employment – as H.R. 980 would force them to do. That means that Iowa legislators would be forced to pass a law repealing the section of state law that makes this practice illegal.

## **Kansas**

Kansas legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Kansas' state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them.

## **Kentucky**

Kentucky legislators have previously passed legislation that forces monopoly bargaining on all police officers across the state and on firefighters that are employed by the state. Localities are able to opt out of the sections that apply to firefighters, and the laws regarding arbitration procedures do not apply to Kentucky's police. The state legislature would, therefore, be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Kentucky's county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that arbitration procedures be used when an impasse occurs during the bargaining of police contracts.

## **Louisiana**

Louisiana legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Louisiana's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

## **Maryland**

Maryland legislators have previously passed laws that force monopoly bargaining on all police officers, firefighters and emergency medical technicians employed by the state, as well as police employed in specified localities. Maryland legislators would be forced to pass laws that would take away the rights of Maryland's county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that arbitration procedures be used when an impasse occurs during the bargaining of any firefighter contracts, and that county and local public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

## **Mississippi**

Mississippi legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Mississippi's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Missouri**

Missouri legislators have already passed laws that force monopoly bargaining on all firefighters and emergency medical technicians across the state. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Missouri's state, county and local police to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that arbitration procedures be used when an impasse occurs during the bargaining of the contracts of any state, county or local police or emergency medical technicians.

### **North Carolina**

North Carolina legislators would be forced to repeal the state ban on all public sector monopoly bargaining in regard to all state, county and local police officers, firefighters and emergency medical technicians and write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of North Carolina's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **North Dakota**

North Dakota legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of North Dakota's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Oklahoma**

Oklahoma legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Oklahoma's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them.

### **South Carolina**

South Carolina legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of South Carolina's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employer and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **South Dakota**

South Dakota legislators have previously passed legislation that forces monopoly bargaining upon all public sector employees at every subdivision of the state. This legislation, however, specifically states that the union bosses and public employers may not bargain over the particular terms of employment – as H.R. 980 would force them to do. That means that South Dakota legislators would be forced to pass a law repealing the section of state law that makes this practice illegal.

### **Tennessee**

Tennessee legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Tennessee's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Texas**

Texas legislators have previously passed laws that force monopoly bargaining on all police officers and firefighters employed by the state. Texas legislators would be forced to pass laws that would take away the rights of Texas county and local police, firefighters and all state, county and local emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that arbitration procedures be used when an impasse occurs during the bargaining of any firefighter contracts, and that county and local public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Utah**

Utah legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Utah's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Virginia**

Virginia legislators would be forced to repeal the state ban on all public sector monopoly bargaining in regard to all state, county and local police officers, firefighters and emergency medical technicians and write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Virginia's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **West Virginia**

West Virginia legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding public safety employees in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of West Virginia's state, county and local police, firefighters and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that public safety employers meet and confer with the union bosses.

### **Wyoming**

Wyoming legislators would be forced to write entirely new state laws regarding police officers and firefighters in order to comply with the demands of the federal government. The state legislature would be required to pass laws that would take away the rights of Wyoming's state, county and local police and emergency medical technicians to bargain one-on-one with their employers and force collective bargaining and arbitration procedures upon them. Laws would also have to be passed requiring that the employers of all police officers and emergency medical technicians meet and confer with the union bosses.