**U.S. Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act (H.R.4603/S. 2409)**

- With the decimation of U.S. manufacturing, many communities have focused on creating customer service/call center jobs through the offering of tax incentives, grants and loans.
- These can be good family supporting jobs, especially when they are union jobs. Unfortunately, these jobs are now increasingly shipped overseas, devastating communities.
- These jobs are often offshored to countries where workers are exploited through very low pay and dangerous working conditions. Companies offshore work to companies with weak data privacy laws, putting U.S. consumers at risk for identity theft and fraudulent transactions.
- Offshoring customer service jobs is bad for taxpayers, consumers and, especially, US workers.
- U.S. taxpayer money should not be awarded to companies that make a practice of sending U.S. jobs overseas and instead should go to companies focused on creating U.S. jobs.
- The bipartisan U.S. Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act has been introduced to tackle these issues. The legislation:
  - Requires the relocated overseas call center agent to disclose their name and physical location of their operation and give U.S. consumers the right to request the call be transferred to a customer service agent who is physically located in the United States.
  - Creates a publicly available ‘bad actor’ list of U.S. companies that send U.S. call center or customer service jobs overseas. These companies would be ineligible for federal grants or guaranteed loans. Preference would be given to U.S. employers that do not appear on the list when awarding civilian or defense-related contracts. If a company relocates an offshore call center to the U.S. and brings jobs back, they will be removed from the bad actor list.

**OUR ASK:** Will the Senator/Representative cosponsor The U.S. Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act, H.R. 4603 / S. 2409?

- _____ Supports
- _____ Opposes
- _____ Undecided

Comments/Follow-up Information Needed:

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Protecting the Right to Organize Act (S. 420)

- The growing inequality we see around our country is the result of a loss of bargaining power and constant attacks on workers’ ability to exercise their right to join a union. Although nearly half of nonunion workers reported that, given the opportunity, they would vote to join a union, the attacks on union organizing has led to a fear of retaliation among many workers.
- The attack on our rights has not only slowed down unionization, but has also resulted in stagnant wages for workers across the economy.
- Although income has stagnated for workers, it has, and continues to skyrocket for CEOs and the wealthiest 1%. The existing wealth disparities leave the rich 75 times more wealthy than hard working lower-income families.
- Weak laws protecting workers’ rights to organize and negotiate for better wages have played a major role in increasing inequality and decreasing wages for average workers.
- We believe that it is time for those laws to change which is why we are here today, to advocate on behalf of the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act.

- The PRO Act would:
  - Enact meaningful penalties for violations of workers’ rights
  - End undemocratic “captive audience” meetings, in which executives and anti-union consultants threaten and intimidate workers seeking to organize into opposing a union—a practice that is generally completely legal.
  - Allow workers to engage in peaceful protest with workers at other companies and prevent companies from permanently replacing workers who have gone on strike.
  - Helps workers who have organized get a fair first contract, by creating a process of mediation and arbitration to resolve disputes.

- We need our allies in the Senate to act now and push Senate leadership for a floor vote on the PRO Act.

OUR ASK: Will the Senator advocate for leadership to bring the PRO Act (S. 420) to the Senate floor for a vote, vote in favor of its passage, and oppose any actions or amendments that would undermine its protections?

_____ Supports      _____ Opposes      _____ Undecided

Comments/Follow-up Information Needed:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
No Tax Breaks for Union Busting (S. 4192)

- With the recent wave of union organizing across the country, anti-union activity has exploded in popularity, and employers now routinely resist workers' rights to organize.
- At CWA, employers like Google Fiber, CenturyLink, Verizon Wireless, Apple, and Activision Blizzard all spend money to intimidate, coerce and hold meetings with workers to dissuade them from union organizing.
- Companies spend at least $340 million a year on anti-union activities such as:
  - Holding mandatory “captive audience” meetings in which employees are pressured to stop unionizing
  - Hiring anti-union consulting firms
  - Developing and distributing materials opposing the union to employees
  - Preventing union organizers from communicating with workers at their worksites
- Current tax law allows companies to deduct ordinary and necessary business expenses, including money spent on anti-union campaigns.
- In effect, the tax code rewards companies for opposing workers’ labor rights.
- American taxpayers are subsidizing employer intimidation and bullying tactics of union organizing.
- The No Tax Breaks for Union Busting Act could end the taxpayer subsidization of anti-union activity as it would:
  - Classify business’ interference in worker organization campaigns like political speech under the tax code, making it non tax deductible.
  - Establish an IRS reporting requirement for employers who intervene in protected labor activities
  - Disallow deductions for employer expenses used to deter workers from organizing a union.

OUR ASK: Will the Senator/Representative cosponsor the No Tax Breaks for Union Busting Act (S. 4192)?

_____ Supports  _____ Opposes  _____ Undecided

Comments/Follow-up Information Needed:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________