

ALLISON EID ON UNIONS

Highlights:

- Allison Eid fought against unions.

Eid Fought Against Unions

EID ARGUED TO RESTRICT UNIONS' COMMUNICATION EFFORTS

The Colorado Supreme Court Held That Teachers' Union Staff Communications Did Not Violate Colorado's Ban On Unions Making Campaign Contributions And Expenditures. According to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado Opinion in "Colorado Education Association v. Rutt," "We hold that the membership communication exception to expenditures must be construed broadly to reflect the plain language of this constitutional provision and to satisfy the demands of the First Amendment. We also hold that the membership communication exception as construed applies to most of the unions' activities in this case. To the extent that the challenged union activities are not embraced by this membership communication exception — creating postcards intended to be sent to nonmembers, and sending letters and making phone calls to nonmembers to recruit nonmembers for the walks supporting Bacon — we affirm the ALJ's factual findings that Rutt failed to prove facts that demonstrate that an expenditure was made. Accordingly, we hold that the unions did not make prohibited expenditures in violation of section 3(4)(a)." [184 P.3d 65 (2008), "Colorado Education Association v. Rutt," The Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, No. 06SC559, Filed [2/27/12](#)]

Eid Dissented From The Colorado Supreme Court, Arguing To Limit Unions' Communication Efforts

Eid Dissented Against The Colorado Supreme Court Decision, Arguing That Teachers' Union Staff Political Communications Did Violate Colorado's Ban On Unions Making Campaign Contributions And Expenditures. According to Justice Eid's Dissent of the Colorado Supreme Court Decision in "Colorado Education Association v. Rutt," "Justice EID, dissenting. [...] By refusing to apply the membership communication exception as written to the union's campaign activities, today's opinion essentially finds Colorado's segregated-funds scheme to be unconstitutional as applied to the facts of this case. Yet, as noted above, the United States Supreme Court has found that the federal segregated-funds scheme, upon which Colorado's scheme is based, provides constitutionally adequate alternatives for union-sponsored campaign speech. While the majority suggests that the Colorado Constitution provides for greater free speech protection than the federal constitution, maj. op. at 77 n. 11, article XXVIII amends, and is now part of, the Colorado Constitution. I can see no reason to question the constitutionality of Colorado's segregated-funds scheme, and thus no reason to read the membership communication exception so broadly that it swallows the prohibition on union contributions and expenditures. Accordingly, I respectfully dissent." [184 P.3d 65 (2008), "Colorado Education Association v. Rutt," The Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, No. 06SC559, Filed [2/27/12](#)]