

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 47, NUMBER 5

www.nrtwc.org

May 2001

Anti-Violence Bill Returning to U.S. Senate *Current Law Protects Thuggery For 'Legitimate Union Objectives'*

This month U.S. Senate President Pro Tempore Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) will reintroduce legislation that would close the union-violence loophole in federal anti-extortion law.

Under federal law as currently interpreted, union officials cannot be criminally prosecuted for committing or orchestrating extortionate violence in pursuit of so-called "legitimate" union objectives.

In other words, bombings, beatings and shootings designed to intimidate a business into forcing employees to accept unwanted union "representation" or to pay union dues as a job condition are granted a special, protected legal status.

Recent Study Shows Strikes Are Growing More Violent

Mr. Thurmond's bill, known as the Freedom from Union Violence Act, would close this infamous "lethal loophole" and hold union bosses accountable for violence that they foment or commit personally in their official capacity.

After it is reintroduced, the Thurmond bill will be reported to the Senate Judiciary Committee, chaired by Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah).

National Right to Work Committee Senior Vice President Mark Mix urged Mr. Hatch to hold prompt hearings on the measure.

"Union violence is a pervasive problem in America today," said Mr. Mix.

"A recent 500-page study by distinguished labor-relations scholars Armand Thieblot, Thomas Haggard, and Herbert Northrup showed that union boss-sponsored strikes became even more violent during the 1990's, even as the



Teamster czar Jim Hoffa (right) may have to dip into his forced-dues coffers to pay a civil penalty for Teamster

number of strikes declined.

"The study also found that, of the 146 American labor organizations with membership over 1000, 141 are associated with violence that has been reported in newspapers or other media!"

Judge Finds 55 Predicate Acts 'Related to Attempted Murder' In Ongoing Teamster Strike

Mr. Mix suggested that one key focus of Senate hearings should be the dozens of shootings and assaults with bricks and other heavy objects in the ongoing national Teamster-boss strike against the Richmond, Va.-based Overnite Transportation Co.

In February, U.S. District Court Judge Bernice Donald (Western District of Tennessee) ruled that these shootings and



AP / EDDIE ADAMS

henchmen's acts of "attempted murder;" such as hurling a brick at nonstriking Overnite driver James McCain.

assaults may be civilly actionable as "racketeering activity" under the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act.

Union lawyers claimed the shootings and assaults targeting nonstriking drivers are "minor" and not covered under RICO.

Judge Donald disagreed in simple, direct words:

"Firing a gun at a truck on the highway may support the conclusion that the person doing the firing acted with intent to kill.

"Similarly, dropping a cinderblock from an overpass while a truck is passing beneath at highway speed or throwing a brick or rock at a truck's windshield when it is traveling at highway speed may be found to constitute attempted murder"

See **Big Labor Power** page 6

Forced-Dues Repeal Builds Up U.S. House Support

List of Sponsors Grows as Right to Work Members Contact Capitol Hill

With freedom-loving citizens' hopes for congressional floor votes on repeal of federally-imposed forced union dues far higher this year than in the recent past, the National Right to Work Act (H.R.1109) is steadily gaining U.S. House sponsors.

Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) and 29 other original sponsors reintroduced this bill as H.R.1109 March 20.

By early this month, over a dozen other congressmen and women had signed on to the measure — and many more are expected to become H.R.1109 sponsors soon.

Utah Congressman Says 'Requests of Constituents' Helped Get Him on Board

As Rep. Chris Cannon (R-Utah) noted recently, House members are supporting H.R.1109 both "in response to the requests of constituents . . . and because of the bill's merits."

During the last two Congresses, National Right to Work Committee members and supporters inundated Capitol Hill with millions of petitions, letters, postcards, and phone calls in support of the National Right to Work Act.

Right to Work lobbying efforts recommenced at the beginning of this year as Committee President Reed Larson sent out a nationwide appeal urging members to ask their representatives and senators to cosponsor forced-dues repeal in the new Congress.

And this is a simple, logical and popular reform.

H.R.1109 would repeal six National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and Railway Labor Act (RLA) provisions under which workers can now be fired for refusal to pay dues or "fees" to union officials whom federal bureaucrats have certified as their "exclusive" (monopoly) bargaining agents.

The principle behind this bill is that Congress should not authorize a labor



Rep. Chris Cannon: House members sign on to H.R.1109 "in response to the requests of constituents . . ."

union or any other private organization to compel financial support from people who don't want to be members.

See Voters page 6

Big Labor-Appeasement Strategy Doesn't Work

Five GOP U.S. Senators Defeated in 2000 Are the Latest Examples

For decades, establishment Republican politicians in Washington, D.C., have employed a misguided appeasement strategy for dealing with the massive Big Labor political machine.

This strategy holds that, if you kill Right to Work by whatever means necessary, union bosses will dislike you less and let you win.

During his four years at the helm of the U.S. House, Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) adhered to this Big Labor-appeasement strategy.

Mr. Gingrich repeatedly rebuffed requests from his own party caucus members for roll-call votes on Right to Work legislation.

He clearly calculated that by burying the Right to Work issue, he would sap the AFL-CIO hierarchy's zeal to topple him.

Instead, union bosses' attacks on Mr. Gingrich and his caucus — financed overwhelmingly by union treasury funds derived from dues and "fees" workers are forced to pay as a

job condition — grew more intense.

Almost immediately after the union machine shocked Mr. Gingrich, who had been predicting big GOP gains, by nearly wiping out his House majority in the November 1998 elections, he announced his resignation from the speakership and the chamber.

A number of rank-and-file GOP U.S. senators fell into a similar trap in July 1996, when they joined with Big Labor Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) to kill the National Right to Work Act on the Senate floor.

Last year, five of these senators — Spencer Abraham (Mich.), John Ashcroft (Mo.), Slade Gorton (Wash.), Rod Grams (Minn.), and William Roth (Del.) — were defeated.

Not One Senator Who Had Voted For Right to Work Bill Was Defeated in 2000

In all five cases, "ungrateful" union bosses funneled millions of unreported forced-dues dollars into phone banks,

get-out-the-vote activities, and propaganda mailings designed to elect the senators' Democrat opponents.

So much for the former senators' strategy of appeasing the union bosses by stopping Right to Work legislation.

Meanwhile, every one of the eight senators on the 2000 ballot who had voted in favor of the Right to Work Bill won reelection.

National Right to Work Committee Vice President John Tate urged current House Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) to learn from Mr. Gingrich's and others' mistakes:

"The practical strategy for GOP politicians who aren't themselves slavish proponents of forced unionism is to confront the union bosses on the forced-unionism issue itself.

"That means breaking with the failed Gingrich precedent by bringing up national Right to Work legislation for recorded floor votes." 📣

Entrepreneurs Favor Right to Work States

Objective 'Growth Index' Shows How Freedom Benefits Employees, Firms

States with Right to Work laws, which protect more than 95% of their private-sector employees from the federal labor-law provisions that authorize forced union dues, hold a huge edge in attracting the firms that are creating high-wage jobs today.

This is the inescapable conclusion for anyone who reads the new edition of *Entrepreneurial Hot Spots* by Cognetics, Inc., a respected Cambridge, Mass., research firm, while referring to lists of the 21 Right to Work and 29 non-Right to Work states.

Cognetics concludes that nine of the 10 highest-ranked smaller metro areas are located entirely within Right to Work states, while the other (Fargo/Moorehead) is divided between Right to Work North Dakota and non-Right to Work Minnesota.

Furthermore, eight of the top 10 larger metropolitan areas for fast-growing companies are located wholly within Right to Work states, and the business hub of one more (Washington, D.C.) is in Right to Work Virginia.

Federal Policy Promotes Compulsory Unionism, Stifles Workplace Innovation

As authors David Birch, Anne Haggerty, and William Parsons point out, their rankings are not subjective: They measure "the actual, recorded frequency with which new firms start and young

firms grow in different places."

These firms typically offer "premium" pay that is "more than justified by the extra skill and productivity offered" by the employees they seek.

But productivity is suppressed under the federal labor-law provisions that authorize and promote the firing of employees who refuse to pay tribute to union officials who are certified as their monopoly-bargaining agents by federal bureaucrats.

Big Labor's use of rigid work rules and cultivation of the "hate the boss" mentality to cement its power over employees are the predictable results of federally-sanctioned union monopoly.

It's not surprising, therefore, that in the new Cognetics study all of the 10 small metro areas and nine of the 10 large metro areas with the lowest rankings for entrepreneurial companies are in compulsory-unionism states.

State Right to Work laws empower independent-minded employees to fight back against irresponsible and tyrannical union bosses by withholding their financial support.

"When the individual employee has freedom of choice, union bosses are forced to tone down their class warfare," explained John Tate, vice president of the National Right to Work Committee.

"Employees thus have a much better chance of reaching their full productive potential and reaping the benefits."

Cognetics is one in a long line of disinterested observers over the years who have furnished powerful evidence that forced unionism slows growth in jobs and employee pay.

More Political Pressure Needed Before Congress Will Pay Heed to Facts

And Right to Work representatives have made every effort to grant all members of Congress opportunities to review these facts on a regular basis.

Unfortunately, for many Capitol Hill politicians, the debate over Right to Work is not really about facts.

"The surest way for Congress to ensure that employees in all 50 states have good job opportunities in the 21st century is to repeal federally-imposed forced union dues by passing the National Right to Work Act [H.R.1109]," said Mr. Tate.

"Union-boss puppet politicians can pretend not to see the mountain of evidence in favor of Right to Work, but whom are they fooling?"

"The only reason they oppose Right to Work is special-interest politics.

"That's why, to win this battle, Right to Work forces are marshaling not just facts, but millions of citizens from every part of the country to combat the power of the Big Labor machine and the political status quo," concluded Mr. Tate. 📢

Best and Worst For Entrepreneurs

LARGE METRO AREAS

SMALL METRO AREAS

TEN BEST

1. **Phoenix, Ariz.**
2. **Salt Lake City-Provo, Utah**
3. **Atlanta, Ga.**
4. **Raleigh-Durham, N.C.**
5. **Indianapolis, Ind.**
6. **Dallas-Ft. Worth, Texas**
7. **Charlotte, N.C.-S.C.**
8. **Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.-Miss.**
9. **Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.**
10. **Orlando, Fla.**

TEN WORST

50. **Albny-Snctdy-Troy-G F, N.Y.**
49. **Rochester, N.Y.**
48. **Hartford, Conn.**
47. **Buffalo, N.Y.**
46. **New York, N.Y.-N.J.**
45. **Pittsburgh, Pa.**
44. **Bridgprt-Stmfrd-Nrwk, Conn.**
43. **Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.**
42. **Sacramento, Calif.**
41. **Greensboro-Wnsth-Slm, N.C.**

TEN BEST

1. **Las Vegas, Nev.**
2. **Fargo-Moorhead, N.D.-Minn.**
3. **Sioux Falls, S.D.**
4. **Reno, Nev.**
5. **Austin, Texas**
6. **Charleston, S.C.**
7. **Wilmington, Jcksnvl, N.C.**
8. **Montgomery, Ala.**
9. **Columbia, S.C.**
10. **Baton Rouge, La.**

TEN WORST

134. **Utica-Rome, N.Y.**
133. **Poughkeepsie, N.Y.**
132. **Scrtn-Wlks Br-Hzltn, Pa.**
131. **Pittsfield, Mass.**
130. **Yakima-Richlnd-Knwck, Wash.**
129. **Visalia-Tulare, Calif.**
128. **York, Pa.**
127. **New London-Norwich, Conn.**
126. **Syracuse, N.Y.**
125. **Harrisburg, Pa.**

Right to Work states, metro areas shown in blue.

Source: Cognetics, Inc. (Cambridge, Mass.)

As Cognetics' measurement of the actual, recorded frequency with which new firms start and young firms grow proves, good jobs flourish in states that protect workers from being fired for refusal to pay tribute to a union.

Senate Passes Phony Campaign-Finance ‘Reform’ *Would Limit Voluntary Donations, Not Forced-Dues Politicking*

Last month, pro-forced unionism U.S. senators, and other senators who seem to be simply misguided, rubber-stamped, 59–41, a phony campaign-finance “reform” measure that would tilt the electoral playing field even more steeply in Big Labor’s favor.

One key provision in this scheme (S.27) would ban voluntary, reported “soft” money donations to national political parties.

S.27 proponents bitterly denounce current election laws under which “soft” money can be used by a party committee to finance phone banks, get-out-the-vote drives, and other efforts designed to help federal candidates.

But it is neither logical nor fair to outlaw voluntary party “soft” money while protecting union bosses’ power to bankroll most electioneering activities that “soft” money now pays for with dues and “fees” confiscated from workers.

The fact is, in its current form, S.27 implicitly sanctions Big Labor’s commandeering of workers’ forced dues to provide hidden, “in-kind” support for union boss-favored candidates.

Weekly Standard Article By Two Up-and-Coming Journalists Exposes Fraud

Just before S.27 was rammed through the Senate April 2, the *Weekly Standard*, a highly influential political magazine based in Washington, D.C., published an article demonstrating why this “reform” is a fraud.

As journalists Jeff Jacoby and Michelle Malkin, each the author of a widely-circulated syndicated column, explain:

“In the last election cycle, unions funneled an estimated \$800 million into campaign activities ranging from phone banks and literature drops to . . . attack ads.

“Virtually every cent of that \$800 million came out of employees’ pockets . . .”

This slush fund is overwhelmingly derived from dues that federal and state labor laws authorize union bosses to exact as a condition of employment from roughly 12 million Americans.

According to the estimate cited by Mr. Jacoby and Mrs. Malkin, Big Labor’s forced-dues slush fund is 60% larger than all the reported 1999–2000 “soft”

One Cheer for Paycheck Protection

It won’t stop unions from political mischief.

BY JEFF JACOBY & MICHELLE MALKIN

BECK IS BACK, and so is talk of “paycheck protection.” On February 17, President Bush signed an executive order that will draw attention to the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Communication Workers of America v. Beck*. That 1988 case held that employees who choose not to join a union but are forced nonetheless to pay dues as a condition of employment have a right to withhold the portion of their payment used for anything unrelated to collective bargaining—most notably, Democratic politics.

Bush’s order—one of four dealing with workplace issues that were signed on the same day—doesn’t actually put teeth in the *Beck* ruling. It merely requires federal contractors to post signs notifying employees of their rights. But that was enough for AFL-CIO head John Sweeney to blast Bush’s action as “mean-spirited” and “anti-worker” and to accuse the presi-

dent as a condition of employment, and no non-member can be forced to subsidize a union’s political or ideological activities. Bush deserves credit for taking his first small step toward protecting voters’ paychecks from the grasp of union bosses.

To prove that he is as good as his word, however, the president will need to go considerably farther. During the campaign, Bush repeatedly called for a federal paycheck-protection law that would prohibit labor unions from spending any part of a member’s dues on political activities unless the member first consents in writing. He promised to veto any campaign-finance bill—such as the one co-authored by his primary opponent, senator John McCain—unless it were rewritten to include such a provision.

On its face, paycheck protection would seem to strengthen dramatically the rights of political minorities in

The influential Weekly Standard backs abolition, not regulation, of federally-imposed forced union dues.

donations to GOP and Democratic national party committees put together!

And most forced dues-paying employees don’t back the Tax, Spend & Regulate agenda pushed by union czars.

In fact, 72% of the union-“represented” workers interviewed by respected pollster John Zogby in a 1999 scientific survey said they disagree with official union positions more often than not!

Any genuine federal campaign-finance reform package must start by ensuring that such workers have a practicable right to refuse to bankroll Big Labor politicking they don’t support.

So-Called ‘Paycheck Protection’ That Maintains Forced Dues Won’t Work

Under *Beck* and related U.S. Supreme Court decisions won by National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation attorneys, workers who object to union political activities already have the formal right to stop their dues from being funneled into such activities.

However, when workers seek to exercise their rights under *Beck*, union bosses most often falsely insist that little or no forced dues are spent on electioneering, and threaten to get workers fired if they don’t keep forking over the money.

Typically, workers must go to court to exercise their *Beck* rights.

Even with free legal aid from the Foundation, this isn’t practical for the vast majority of employees.

And, as Mr. Jacoby and Mrs. Malkin point out, so-called “paycheck-protection” legislation that is now touted by some GOP members of Congress and White House advisors as the solution to forced-dues politicking would not make a substantive difference:

“Paycheck-protection schemes are well-intentioned but, like *Beck*, do nothing to address the fundamental injustice of the union shop — the fact that federal law allows unions to coerce dues out of nonmembers or unwilling members in the first place.

“With hundreds of millions of dollars and vast amounts of political clout at stake, unions will always be able to find a way to divert workers’ money into politics.”

‘Real Paycheck Protection Is . . . About Ending Compulsory Unionism’

Both to clean up American politics and to protect employees’ freedom, Mr. Jacoby and Mrs. Malkin recommend that President Bush undertake “a serious push for a national right-to-work law.”


“Real paycheck protection is not about permission slips and the definition of ‘political,’” they explain.

“It’s about ending compulsory unionism and preventing labor bosses from raiding workers’ paychecks in the first place.

“Employees who wish to join unions should always be free to do so, but no one should have to tithe to a union — or any other organization — as a condition of keeping his job.”

The legislation the two journalists endorse, known as the National Right to Work Act (H.R. 1109), would repeal all federal labor-law provisions that authorize Big Labor to get workers fired for refusal to bankroll a union.

“As more and more Americans are coming to understand, H.R.1109 is the basis for true campaign reform,” said Reed Larson, president of the National Right to Work Committee.

“I urge Right to Work members to continue contacting President Bush at 202-456-1111 to request that he promise to veto any so-called ‘reform’ that leaves out H.R.1109.” 

No Right to Quit Union — No Rights Within It

Forced Unionism Goes Hand in Hand With Rigged Contract ‘Votes’

Apologists for government-imposed forced unionism today still uphold a vision of “freedom” for employees reminiscent of the one once propagated by Soviet founder Vladimir Lenin.

After seizing control of Russia in 1917, Comrade Lenin almost immediately ordered the destruction of all political parties, from anarchists to democrats to monarchists, other than his own Communist Party.

Nonetheless, for a time the dictator continued to profess support for “freedom of debate” within the Communist Party.

Assisted by federal and state law, modern-day American union officials also create a kind of “one-party state” in the workplace.

No individual employee or rival employee group is permitted to challenge the “exclusive” (monopoly) privilege wielded by a government-certified union to speak for all employees.

NLRB: Union Bosses May Freely Ignore Members’ Lopsided Vote Against Workplace Contract

Like Comrade Lenin, forced-unionism apologists justify single-party rule over the workplace with claims that dissenting workers have “freedom” to advance their views within the union.

However, as the Clinton-appointed National Labor Relations Board recently reconfirmed, “freedom” within a union

that you aren’t free to leave is a fanciful notion with no more substance than Comrade Lenin’s version of “freedom.”

Late last year three Clinton NLRB appointees baldly stated that unionized workers who join a union so that they can have at least some influence over its actions have no legal right to vote on workplace contracts agreed upon by union bosses and employers.

This ruling (in *ILA, Local 1575*) applies to millions of employees who are forced under federal law to accept a union as their monopoly-bargaining agent and may also be forced, unless protected by a state Right to Work law, to bankroll the union.

The ruling tossed out a complaint filed by stevedore William De Jesus Ferrer against the bosses of the Puerto Rican subsidiary of the International Longshoremen’s Association (ILA).

In September 1997, Mr. Ferrer protested when ILA bosses cut a deal with shipper Navieras, NPR Inc. to take one day of work a week away from his crew and give it to a new crew whose members would include a son and two grandsons of a senior ILA boss.

To the apparent surprise of the local union hierarchy, roughly 80% of the ILA members present at an assembly called to get the new contract ratified stood up in support of Mr. Ferrer’s motion to modify it by removing this suspect provision.

Recouping, the local ILA president

hastily announced that all those in favor of ratifying the new contract should stand up.

He then declared that the entire contract had been ratified by the 80% of the members who were, in fact, standing in protest!

Committee Vice President: Freedom Can’t Be Doled Out In Bits and Pieces

Unlike many other Clinton NLRB decisions that rewrite federal statutes to tilt already biased labor laws even further in favor of forced unionism, *ILA, Local 1575* is right in line with previous NLRB and court decisions.

As NLRB Chairman John Truesdale pointed out, even if a union boss deigns to obligate himself contractually to seek employee ratification for future contracts, it is for the union “to construe and apply its internal regulations relating to what would be sufficient to amount to ratification.”


That means trickery and deceit are permitted.

However, as National Right to Work Committee Vice President Matthew Leen pointed out, the real scandal is not that Big Labor’s boasts about “democratic control” of unions have no basis either in labor law or in common practice.

“The real scandal is that so many members of Congress use so-called ‘union democracy’ as a rationalization for forcing workers who aren’t union members to accept unwanted union monopoly bargaining and to pay union tribute,” explained Mr. Leen.

“The fact is, Congress has no legitimate authority to grant union officials these monopoly powers over employees.

“Moreover, human experience all over the world, from the former U.S.S.R. to America today, shows that freedom can’t be doled out in bits and pieces. Without the freedom to quit or refuse to join a union, you won’t have freedom within the union, either.”

Committee members are urged to call their U.S. senators and representatives through the congressional switchboard, 202-224-3121 or 202-225-3121. Ask them to support the National Right to Work Act, which would repeal federally-imposed forced union dues. 



CORBIS.COM / CHRIS DANIELS

A crew of stevedores has learned that, while federal law forces them to pay union tribute as a job condition, they

have no right to vote on the contracts negotiated by their union monopoly-bargaining “agents.”

Big Labor Power May Stall Bill

Continued from page 1

Unfortunately, even if international Teamster czar Jim Hoffa and other union dons are found liable in the multimillion-dollar suit, which is now moving forward, it will be the overwhelmingly law-abiding Teamster rank-and-file who pay the price.

Mark Mix: Force Jim Hoffa To Explain Why He Deserves License to Foment Mayhem

“Jim Hoffa will just dip into the Teamster hierarchy’s vast treasuries, which are almost entirely derived from union dues workers are forced to pay under federal law as a job condition, to compensate the victims of union violence,” noted Mr. Mix.

“Mr. Hoffa could even raise Teamster-‘represented’ workers’ dues to replenish union coffers!”

The fact is, when Overnite strike violence was at its most intense in early 2000, Mr. Hoffa publicly gloated “I don’t know how long they [Overnite] can possibly go on with [the] expense,” reportedly a million dollars a week, of protecting nonstriking employees.

Yet because of the “lethal loophole” Mr. Hoffa cannot be held criminally responsible for rampant strike violence that he has unabashedly used as a bargaining tool.

“It’s long past time to force Jim Hoffa to live under the same laws as other Americans,” said Mr. Mix.

“But Big Labor’s power over the current Congress may be too great for the Freedom from Union Violence Act to be enacted this year.

“At the very least, Jim Hoffa and other union officials like him who talk publicly about how they intend to profit from union violence should be subpoenaed to testify before the Senate and explain why they deserve their special legal privileges.”

Right to Work Members Urged To Contact Orrin Hatch

Mr. Mix urged Right to Work members in Utah and across the country to contact Mr. Hatch right away and request that he hold a series of hearings on union violence.

For these hearings to be effective, Mr.



Will Senate Judiciary Chairman Hatch force union bosses to justify their “right” to commit extortion?

Hatch must be ready to subpoena high-ranking union officers like Jim Hoffa, and perhaps to immunize lower-level officers who invoke the Fifth Amendment.

Mr. Hatch’s Utah office can be reached at 801-524-4380. His office number in Washington, D.C., is 202-224-5251.

Voters Say ‘No’ to Forced Unionism

Continued from page 2

Congress has no business corralling employees into unions.

The individual worker is in a far better position than Congress to assess whether union monopoly rule results in more or less job security, a safe or shaky retirement plan, and pay and benefits that reflect or don’t reflect employees’ merits.

President, Congressional Majority Leadership Favor Forced-Dues Repeal

President Bush and the majority leadership in both chambers of Congress are all on the record in favor of national Right to Work legislation.

During last year’s presidential campaign, Mr. Bush vowed in writing that, if elected, he would “work with Congress to ensure that no worker is forced to join or support a union” unless he or she freely chooses to do so.

And House Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.), Majority Leader Dick Arme (R-

Texas), and Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Texas), as well as Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and Majority Whip Don Nickles (R-Okla.), all publicly back forced-dues repeal.

Why Miss Opportunity To Bring Up Politically Potent Right to Work Issue?

Poll after poll has shown that nearly eight out of 10 Americans agree that no one should be forced to pay union dues to get or keep a job.

And every time Congress has voted on a forced-unionism issue, going back more than 35 years, the result has been a gain in support for Right to Work after the next election cycle.

For example, in 1996 the Senate voted on the National Right to Work Act.

Although the measure was defeated and Big Labor went on to spend an estimated half-a-billion dollars or more trying to buy the 1996 elections, the end

result was a net gain of five Right to Work supporters in the Senate within less than a year.

“Votes on the Right to Work Bill in this Congress would likely prove even more effective at mobilizing freedom-loving citizens, because we now have a President who is publicly committed to signing such legislation,” noted Mr. Larson.

“Since Speaker Hastert and Majority Leader Lott both lead heavily pro-Right to Work legislative caucuses, they would miss a valuable opportunity if they refused to bring up forced-dues repeal for votes.”

Right to Work supporters around the country can help by contacting their own congressmen and women, urging them to cosponsor and seek roll-call votes on H.R.1109.

Every new cosponsor will reinforce the message to Mr. Hastert and Mr. Lott that Right to Work is a key issue that they need to address in this Congress.

Right to Work supporters may reach their representatives’ Capitol Hill offices through the Capitol switchboard, 202-225-3121.

Hawaii Public Education Brought to Its Knees

Teacher Union Monopolists Shut Down Schools and Universities Statewide

Last month teacher and professors union bosses wielded their government-granted monopoly over the teaching profession in Hawaii to shut down nearly all the state's public elementary and secondary schools and universities.

Thumbing their noses at elected officials and taxpayers alike, bosses of the Hawaii State Teachers Association (HSTA/NEA) union and the so-called University of Hawaii "Professional Assembly" professors union launched a statewide strike April 5.

A 31-year-old Hawaii law that hands teacher and other union officials monopoly power to bargain over public employees' wages, benefits, and working conditions helped ensure that nearly all educators would heed Big Labor demands to walk off their jobs.

Under Hawaii's unjust monopoly-bargaining laws, even teachers and professors who choose not to join a union must work under contract terms negotiated by HSTA and "Professional Assembly" union bosses — or quit their jobs.

Independent-minded teachers and professors are stripped of any freedom to negotiate on their own behalf with school boards or university officials.

Faculty union brass finally allowed professors to return to work April 18 and teacher union bosses followed suit April 24. The settlement will cost taxpayers dearly, but offer scant if any incentive pay for the outstanding professors and teachers who have long been shortchanged under the monopoly-bargaining system.

Though exact terms of the second deal were still undisclosed at press time, teacher union bosses had been refusing to call off their strike until legislators hit



A strike called by the power-hungry bosses of the National Education Association (NEA) teacher union's

Hawaii subsidiary shut down nearly every public school in the state for 21 days last month.

already heavily taxed Hawaiians with hikes in the state's excise and income taxes to bankroll HSTA demands.

'People Go Nuts Trying To Figure Out Where Our Money Is Being Spent'

As Hawaii freelance journalist Malia Zimmerman pointed out in a *Wall Street Journal* op-ed, most of the nearly \$100 million in additional tax revenue apparently obtained by the HSTA bosses in the new contract won't go into the classroom.

Because of Hawaii's sluggish economy, taxpayers already have to dig deep to cover per-pupil costs of \$7000.

Meanwhile, at schools such as Oahu's Radford High, wrote Ms. Zimmerman, "[r]estrooms . . . are so deplorable students are refusing to use them and are becoming ill."

With many schools failing to meet minimal health and safety requirements, "People go nuts trying to figure out where our money is being spent," admitted a former Hawaii Board of Education chairman last year.

Ms. Zimmerman offered one possibility in her op-ed: the HSTA headquarters "in a new, multimillion-dollar, state-of-the-art compound."

Freedom For Individual Teacher Key to True Reform

Appearing at a Honolulu rally to gloat about the first-ever statewide shutdown of a public school system, National Education Association teacher union czar Bob Chase refused to hold his HSTA lieutenants responsible for what he gingerly called the "quality issue."

"Monopoly-bargaining laws force honest teachers to allow self-serving union bosses like Bob Chase to present the only 'employee' perspective in contract negotiations," concluded Reed Larson, president of the National Right to Work Committee.

"Because of teacher union officials' political power, 34 state legislatures have enacted teacher monopoly-bargaining laws.

"Committee members are convinced that allowing conscientious teachers to negotiate on their own behalf is the key to true education reform.

"That's why we are fighting hard to stop enactment of new laws authorizing teacher monopoly bargaining and forced dues and, wherever possible, to repeal the laws that are already on the books."

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK NEWSLETTER

May 2001

Written and Distributed by:

National Right to Work Committee
8001 Braddock Road
Springfield, Va. 22160
Fax: (703) 321-7143
E-mail: Members@NRTW.org
www.nrtwc.org

Reed Larson President
Mark Mix Senior Vice President
Stephen Goodrick Vice President
John Tate Vice President
Matthew Leen Vice President
Stanley Greer Newsletter Editor

Contact the Membership Department by dialing 1-800-325-RTWC (7892) or (703) 321-9820 if you wish to:

- Report address changes or corrections
- Receive the NEWSLETTER or request, renew, or cancel Committee membership
- Obtain more information

Because of NRTWC's tax-exempt status under IRC Sec. 501 (C)(4) and its state and federal legislative activities, contributions are not tax deductible as charitable contributions (IRC § 170) or as business deductions (IRC § 162(e)(1)).

© 2001 by the National Right to Work Committee. Permission to reprint individual articles granted. Credit requested.

Bush Administration Blocks 'Blacklisting' Rule

Senior Right to Work Officer Commends 'Step in the Right Direction'

In a victory for National Right to Work Committee members, the Bush Administration has suspended the Big Labor-backed "blacklisting" rule for federal contractors instituted by lame-duck President Bill Clinton on his last full day in office.

After receiving countless phone calls and letters from Right to Work members opposing the blacklisting rule, the White House April 2 temporarily stopped it from taking effect and set the stage for its repeal after a 60-day public comment period.

Concocted by Clinton bureaucrats who were clearly working in close consultation with union lawyers, the now-suspended rule would put heavy pressure on federal agencies to blacklist many federal contractors who refuse to corral employees into unions.

As most Newsletter readers know, for decades federal labor law has authorized Big Labor to force private-sector employees to accept union officials as their "exclusive" bargaining agents.

In all 50 states, railroad and airline employees and employees on so-called "exclusive" federal enclaves may also be forced to pay union dues or "fees" as a condition of employment.

In non-Right to Work states, almost all private-sector workers may be forced to pay union tribute to keep their jobs.

Big Labor Would Exploit Rule To Grab Forced-Dues Powers

The blacklisting rule would authorize Big Labor barons to get firms that resist the forced unionization of employees barred from federal contracts with the help of pro-forced unionism National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) bureaucrats.

This would vastly increase union bosses' power to exploit so-called "unfair labor practice" charges as a means of intimidating employers into allowing

union bosses to collect forced tribute from their employees.

Under the blacklisting rule, NLRB bureaucrats' "findings," even though they might later be reversed in federal court, could be used by union lawyers to show a "pattern of illegality" that disqualifies an employer from bidding on federal contracts.

If the rule were implemented, thousands of businesses employing millions of Americans could be frozen out of federal contracts worth \$200 billion annually because of NLRB "findings" that have never been reviewed in a standard court proceeding.

But nonunion employers could protect themselves by handing employees over to Organized Labor without their consent.

Rule Would Harm Independent-Minded Employees, Even In Right to Work States

Of course, the principal reason union lobbyists were so eager to get the blacklisting rule in the *Federal Register* was that they calculated it would help them force millions of additional workers to pay union dues, or be fired.

But even in the 21 states with Right to Work laws, which protect most private-sector employees from federally-imposed forced dues, the blacklisting rule would have put countless workers under intense pressure to join a union.

By promoting union-boss monopoly control over pay, benefit, and work-rule negotiations, the rule would have forced thousands and thousands of independent-minded employees to make an unhappy choice between joining an unwanted union and being denied any input in how their workplace was run.

Right to Work Senior Vice President Mark Mix commended the White House's suspension of the Clinton



The Clinton rule would compress independent-minded employees' freedom — even in Right to Work states.

blacklisting rule as "a step in the right direction."

Committee Senior Official: It's Time to Advance National Right to Work Law

Mr. Mix also congratulated the Right to Work members and supporters who, in response to a Newsletter cover story early this year, had contacted the White House with letters, faxes, and phone calls opposing the rule.

(Further comments in favor of repeal of the blacklisting rule should be made in writing to Ms. Beverly Fayson, General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (MIRS), 18th & F Streets, NW, Room 4035, Washington, D.C., 20405. Ms. Fayson can also be reached at 202-501-1043.)

"The blacklisting rule suspension follows a February Bush executive order barring nearly all federal taxpayer funding for so-called 'project labor agreements' that discriminate against nonunion construction workers and firms," noted Mr. Mix.

"I urge the President to follow up on his promising start by prodding congressional leaders to hold votes in the near future on repeal of federally-imposed forced union dues, also known as the National Right to Work Act [H.R.1109]." 📌

The blacklisting rule would authorize Big Labor barons to get firms that resist the forced unionization of employees barred from federal contracts
