



What the Nation's Editorial Pages are Saying about the So-Called "Employee Free Choice Act"

From the conservative *National Review* to more liberal papers like the Washington Post, editorial boards across the country seem to agree on one thing: Workers deserve the right to a private ballot election when deciding whether to join a union.

- "Unions once supported the secret ballot for organization elections. They were right then and are wrong now." (*The Los Angeles Times*, 03/01/07)
- "Employees who are skeptical of or opposed to bringing a union into the workplace deserve the protections of a secret-ballot election rather than having to face pressures from colleagues pushing them to sign unionization cards." (*Washington Post*, 3/12/07)
- "The unions aren't asking for fair play here. They want to corner the market on bullying." (*St. Petersburg Times*, 02/28/07)
- "A secret-ballot election allows the employee to make an uncoerced choice, and it should be preserved." (*Chicago Tribune*, 03/06/07)
- "Workers sign cards for all kinds of reasons, including peer pressure and intimidation." (*Wall Street Journal*, 3/1/07)
- "The proposal is plainly undemocratic. By not protecting workers from the public declaration of their unionization votes, it would expose them to intimidation and peer pressure." (*National Review Online*, 02/28/07)
- "The Senate should reject the Employee Free Choice Act, which would replace free, anonymous choice with strong-arm tactics." (*The Janesville (Wisconsin) Gazette*, 03/16/07)
- "What the unions are asking for is an invitation to use intimidation." (*The Wilson (North Carolina) Times*, 03/06/07)
- "Workers often sign cards not because they intend to vote for the union, but to avoid offending the person who asks them to sign up." (*Tampa Tribune*, 03/21/07)
- "Would Congress consider doing away with formal elections and secret ballots for other democratic decisions? Of course not." (*The Missoulian News*, 02/21/07 (Montana))
- "By the way, the bill would preserve secret-ballot elections when a union is to be decertified. How's that for fairness?" (*The Oklahoman*, 02/20/07)