



NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 57, NUMBER 7

www.nrtwc.org

July 2011

Obama NLRB Unveils New 'Card-Check' Scheme *President's Handpicked Bureaucrats Ignore 2010 Election Results*

In the 2007-2008 and 2009-2010 Congresses, Big Labor's top objective was a rewrite of federal labor law making it even easier for union bosses to seize monopoly-bargaining power over millions of employees in the American private sector.

Union strategists' legislative vehicle was the cynically mislabeled "Employee Free Choice Act," introduced by pro-forced unionism Congressman George Miller (D-Calif.) and Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.). After Mr. Kennedy died in 2009, union-label Iowa Democrat Tom Harkin took over as the lead Senate sponsor.

The Miller-Kennedy-Harkin measure was more accurately called the "Card-Check" Forced-Unionism Bill.

Even without a federal card-check mandate, union bosses have long been able to acquire "exclusive" (monopoly) power to negotiate employees' pay, benefits, and work rules solely through the acquisition of signed "union authorization cards."

Consequently, individual workers under the peering eyes of union organizers may be intimidated into signing not just themselves, but all of their nonunion fellow employees, over to union-boss control.

However, as stacked as current law is in favor of Big Labor's monopoly-bargaining power, employers nevertheless retain the right to stand up for their employees against union-boss intimidation tactics.

But Miller-Kennedy-Harkin would have empowered union officials to impose monopoly bargaining through card checks automatically, with no recourse for any pro-Right to Work employee or employer.



CREDIT: RADARIS.COM

Chairman Wilma Liebman and other Big Labor members of President Obama's NLRB have proposed radical new rules for

union organizing campaigns that would drastically curtail independent-minded employees' ability to resist unionization.

This legislation was totally contrary to the policy views of the vast majority of citizens, including union members.

Last November 2, 31 Card-Check Bill Supporters Lost Their Re-Election Bids

"Over the years, polls have shown Americans overwhelmingly oppose union monopoly bargaining, period," explained National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix.

"The public certainly has no interest in backing policies designed to help Big Labor grab monopoly-bargaining privileges over millions of additional workers."

On Election Day, 2010, the American people had their say about whether

Washington, D.C., should be handing union bosses more power over workers and helping funnel more forced dues into union coffers.

"Last November 2," noted Mr. Mix, "31 House and Senate incumbents who had voted for the card-check scheme lost their re-election bids. This was about as clear an electoral repudiation as any bill ever gets."

"Unfortunately, the forced-unionism zealots who now hold all but one of the four occupied seats on the National Labor Relations Board don't seem to have noticed."

"Despite the fact that voters in last fall's elections sent a clear message they oppose the imposition of new federal policies to help Organized Labor increase

See 'Card Check' page 2

'Card Check' by Bureaucratic Decree

Continued from page 1

the share of workers who are under union monopoly-bargaining control, the Obama NLRB last month unveiled its plan to achieve precisely that goal."

'Ambush' Elections Would Deny Workers a Meaningful Vote

On June 22, Wilma Liebman, the ex-Teamster lawyer whom President Obama elevated to the NLRB chairmanship in 2009, and two other ex-union lawyers appointed by Mr. Obama to sit on the NLRB proposed sweeping changes to the current procedures through which Big Labor may obtain monopoly-bargaining privileges.

According to Peter Kirsanow, a former NLRB member and a Right to Work supporter, the proposed rules "would substantially shorten the time period between the filing of a petition for a union-representation election and the actual conduct of an election."

Currently, the NLRB allows an average of 38-40 days from the time an employer is notified that a union is seeking monopoly-bargaining privileges over his or her employees to the time the workplace election occurs.

Employers often use that relatively brief period of time to make the case to their employees that unionization isn't in their best interest.

But the "ambush" election rules proposed by the Obama NLRB would "shorten the time frame to a mere 10-20 days," by Mr. Kirsanow's assessment.

Mr. Mix charged: "Effectively, employees would be denied the opportunity to hear both sides of the story before voting on unionization, because employers would be denied enough time to make their case.

"The bottom-line impact of this bureaucratic sop to Big Labor would be very similar to that of the Miller-Kennedy-Harkin card-check mandate that union lobbyists tried unsuccessfully to ram through Congress from 2007 to 2010."

Employee Phone Numbers, E-Mail Addresses Would Be Handed Over to Union Organizers

"In fact, as Mr. Kirsanow has correctly observed, the new rules would stack the deck against independent-minded employees so thoroughly that

many employers would choose 'not even to go through the expense' of a rigged election, but 'simply . . . recognize the union upon showing of authorization cards,'" Mr. Mix added.

In addition to effectively denying business owners and managers the opportunity to counter union organizers' claims, the NLRB's proposed new rules mandate that employee phone numbers and e-mail addresses be handed over to union organizers at the outset of each "ambush" election campaign.

"Current NLRB rules already seriously infringe on employees' privacy by requiring their employers to hand over their names and physical addresses to union officials," said Mr. Mix.

"But the new scheme would expose employees who don't want to sign a union card or promise to vote for a union to even more intense Big Labor intimidation.

"And the new rules would also make it even more difficult for independent-minded employees and businesses to challenge election misconduct by union bosses and their henchmen."

The NLRB's proposed overhaul of union organizing campaign procedures wasn't the only bad news for American employees and business owners who prefer to remain union-free to come out the week of June 19. The day before that plan went public, U.S. Labor Secretary Hilda Solis announced through her staff a reinterpretation of the 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act.

This proposal would force employers to file federal reports whenever they seek outside help during union organizing campaigns, even if the consultants never communicate with any employees. Meanwhile, union organizers would continue to be exempt from reporting any hiring of consultants or lawyers.

In practice, the new Labor Department policy will, once it takes effect, encourage employers to capitulate to union organizing drives.

Committee President Vows to Back Legislation Thwarting New 'Card Check' Threat

"Thumbing their noses at the 2010 election results, President Barack Obama's NLRB and Labor Department bureaucrats are now in the process of foisting 'card check' on American workplaces," said Mr. Mix.

He vowed that the Committee would work closely with Capitol Hill allies to craft measures blocking implementation of the "card check" schemes introduced by the NLRB and the Labor Department last month.

"Enactment of legislation reining in such abuses will be a tall order in 2011 and 2012, due to the all but inevitable opposition of Big Labor Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid [D-Nev.] and President Obama's veto power," Mr. Mix acknowledged.

"But it's a battle Right to Work supporters can't afford to pass up. Before we can make things better, we have to stop them from getting even worse." 📞



Just before the NLRB struck last month, Labor Secretary Hilda Solis (shown here with AFL-CIO czar Richard Trumka)

proposed a new, one-sided "disclosure" rule designed to pressure employers into submitting to union organization drives.

CREDIT: AP PHOTO/CHARLES DHARAPAK

Boeing Workers Battle Big Labor, Obama NLRB

Right to Work Offers Legislative as Well as Legal Assistance

In 2008, Dennis Murray went to work at Vought Aircraft Industries' facility in North Charleston, S.C. The facility built a key structure, aft fuselage, for Boeing's 787 Dreamliner airplane.

At that time, International Association of Machinists (IAM/AFL-CIO) union bosses had recently acquired monopoly-bargaining privileges over Vought's North Charleston employees, but no union contract was yet in place.

Later that year, IAM union chiefs obtained a contract that cemented their power, but excluded important medical, dental, short-term disability, and other benefits Vought workers had had when they were union-free.

Union officers sneakily secured approval of this contract, Mr. Murray charges, by notifying just a dozen of the facility's 200 union members about the meeting at which it was to be considered. The union contract ended up getting ratified by a vote of 12-1!

Not surprisingly, Vought employees were angry about what the IAM brass had done. Their anger was soon exacerbated by layoffs lasting from three weeks to five months.

In July 2009, Boeing purchased Vought's South Carolina operations for roughly a billion dollars.

Shortly afterward, Mr. Murray led, with advice and council from National Right to Work attorneys, a successful decertification campaign in which a 199-68 majority of workers, including many union members as well as nonmembers, voted out the IAM union.

Suit Charges IAM Bigwigs With Illegal Retaliation Against South Carolina Employees

In late 2009, Boeing decided to invest an additional billion dollars in North Charleston in order to build a new Dreamliner assembly plant there.

Boeing decisionmakers were undoubtedly motivated in part by the fact that a majority of their current employees in Right to Work South Carolina had rejected IAM monopoly bargaining, and thus would not participate in IAM union-instigated strikes. Over the years, such strikes have cost the company billions of dollars.

Infuriated IAM union officials quickly sought to retaliate against



CREDIT: WCBF-TV (CHARLESTON, S.C.)

South Carolina Boeing employee Dennis Murray, a quality assurance inspector, doesn't mince words regarding IAM

union bosses' aims: "[T]hey're trying to spank us like unruly children, by having all of our jobs taken away."

Boeing and, even more so, the South Carolina employees who had spurned their counterproductive "representation" by filing a legally groundless complaint with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB).

For well over a year, the IAM complaint went nowhere.

But, in a sign of the Obama Administration's eagerness to do *anything* to intensify its Big Labor support as the 2012 presidential campaign approaches, in April the NLRB's top lawyer backed up the IAM hierarchy, charging Boeing with commission of an "unfair labor practice." He also moved to block Dreamliner production in North Charleston.

If President Obama-appointed NLRB Acting General Counsel Lfe Solomon prevails in the case he instigated at IAM bosses' behest, North Charleston Boeing workers like Dennis Murray will, in all likelihood, lose their jobs. But the workers are fighting back on several fronts.

One counterattack is an NLRB case filed June 15 by Mr. Murray, again with the assistance of National Right to Work Foundation attorneys.

The suit charges officials of the IAM union and Seattle-based IAM Local 751 with abusing the legal process to deprive Boeing's South Carolina employees of their jobs in retaliation for their decertifying their IAM local.


Mr. Murray put it this way to a reporter for WCBF-TV in Charleston: "[T]hey've looked down on us from day one, and now they're trying to spank us like unruly children, by having all of our jobs taken away."

Pending Legislation Would Rein in Abuses of Agenda-Driven NLRB Bureaucrats

In addition to Mr. Murray's countersuit, he and two other South Carolina Boeing employees have with Right to Work attorneys' help successfully filed for status as "intervenor" in the IAM/NLRB complaint against Boeing.

The Obama NLRB's grudging admission that South Carolina employees have a direct stake in the outcome of the case is clearly a setback for Mr. Solomon's efforts to bludgeon Boeing into submission.

In yet another effort to protect Boeing employees' jobs, National Right to Work Committee lobbyists are now pushing for votes on legislation (S.964/H.R.1976) that would explicitly prohibit NLRB bureaucrats from ordering an employer to relocate jobs from one site to another.

Known as the Job Protection Act, this legislation now has 64 congressional sponsors. 

'Systematically Biased' Against Schoolchildren

Stanford Professor Lambastes Monopolistic Teacher Unionism

On June 1, Tennessee achieved a legislative milestone when its elected officials effectively repealed a 33-year-old state statute authorizing and promoting union monopoly-bargaining control over teachers and other K-12 public school instructional employees.

Under the new K-12 reform law approved by the Legislature and signed by Gov. Bill Haslam (R), no union or other organization will be handed a legally protected monopoly over all "employee" input in discussions with school boards over working conditions.

Once this law, known as the Collaborative Conferencing Act, takes effect, teachers who choose not to join any union will, for the first time in decades, have a voice in discussions throughout Tennessee regarding salaries, benefits and grievances.

Tennessee revoked teacher union bosses' monopoly-bargaining privileges last month largely thanks to persistent lobbying by the roughly 46,000 National Right to Work Committee members and supporters in the Volunteer State.

And, according to Stanford University political scientist and education specialist Terry Moe, the Tennesseans who helped pass the Collaborative Conferencing Act have done an enormous favor for their state's schoolchildren.

From Children's Standpoint, Union Boss-Perpetuated Salary Rules 'Make No Sense at All'

In his new book *Special Interest: Teachers Unions and America's Public Schools* (Brookings Institution Press), Dr. Moe documents how teacher union monopoly bargaining, still statutorily enshrined in more than 30 states, impairs school outcomes while sharply raising the cost to taxpayers.

In practice, charges Dr. Moe, "exclusive" union bargaining routinely produces "key decisions that depart from -- and are systematically biased against -- what is best for kids and effective organization."

One example among many are so-called "single salary schedules" that furnish teachers with extra pay for additional degrees and course taking, even though "research has consistently shown" that simply accumulating degrees and/or additional course credits, "does not make teachers more effective."



CREDIT: REASON.COM

Dr. Moe: As long as monopolistic teacher unions "remain powerful," effective schools "will be short-changed."

From "the standpoint of what is best for children," such Big Labor-perpetuated salary rules "*make no sense at all*" (emphasis Dr. Moe's). But teacher union officials ferociously defend "single salary schedule" rules, because they keep educators dependent on the union for securing better pay and career advancement.

Monopolistic Unionism Can Never Be 'Reform Unionism'

In today's America, *Special Interest* goes on to point out, many education policymakers and other leaders "recognize that teacher unions are standing in the way of effective schools," but mistakenly believe that union officials "can be persuaded to do good things with their [monopolistic] power."

This is the false hope of what is commonly called "reform unionism."

Of course, in the current political environment, with millions of Americans demanding major changes in schools that consume a higher and higher share of taxpayers' incomes even as school enrollments and standardized test scores stagnate, it often behooves teacher union bosses to feign openness to reform.

But "when the details are ultimately hashed out," supposedly "reformist" teacher union bosses like American Federation of Teachers (AFT/AFL-CIO) union czarina Randi Weingarten "will ultimately weaken, limit, and dissipate reform" to protect core teacher union institutional interests.

"National Right to Work Committee members and supporters have long known that eliminating teacher union monopoly bargaining and forced union dues is an indispensable precondition for achieving genuine, significant education reform," commented Committee Vice President Mary King.

"But Terry Moe is to be commended for thoroughly explaining how monopolistic teacher unions are destroying educational opportunities for millions and millions of schoolchildren and ripping off taxpayers.

"I'm hopeful that *Special Interest* will receive a wide distribution, and inspire even more freedom-loving Americans to press their state legislators to emulate their counterparts in Tennessee by prohibiting union monopoly bargaining in public education." 📌

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK NEWSLETTER

www.nrtwc.org

July 2011

Written and Distributed by:

National Right to Work Committee®

8001 Braddock Road

Springfield, Va. 22160

E-mail: Members@NRTW.org

Stanley Greer Newsletter Editor

Greg Mourad Vice President

Mary King Vice President

Matthew Leen Vice President

Stephen Goodrick Vice President

Mark Mix President

Editorial comments only: stg@nrtw.org

Contact the Membership Department by phoning

1-800-325-RTWC (7892) or (703) 321-9820, or faxing (703) 321-7143, 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)).

© 2011 by the National Right to Work Committee®. Permission to reprint individual articles granted. Credit requested.

House Narrowly Okays Union-Only PLAs

Handful of Big Labor-Appeasing Republicans Make the Difference

Back in February 2009, one of the first actions President Barack Obama took after settling in at the White House was to issue Executive Order 13502, which promotes union-only "project labor agreements" (PLAs) on federally funded public works. In April 2010, the Obama Administration issued a "final rule" implementing the order.

"E.O.13502 now pressures federal agencies to acquiesce to PLAs on all large public works," noted Greg Mourad, vice president of the National Right to Work Committee.

"In practice, it is designed to force nonunion companies wishing to participate in public works using \$25 million or more in federal funds to impose union monopoly bargaining on their employees and hire new workers through discriminatory union hiring halls.

"Under union-only PLAs, independent workers who already have their own retirement funds are nevertheless forced to contribute to Big Labor-manipulated pension funds.

"Rather than compromise the freedom of their employees and the efficiency of their operations, most independent construction firms simply refuse to submit bids on PLA projects."

Results of 2010 Elections Raised Hopes of Pro- Right to Work Citizens

Efforts to roll back E.O.13502 legislatively began almost as soon as this edict was issued. And the shellacking voters in state after state gave to Big Labor politicians in the 2010 elections spurred hope among National Right to Work Committee members and other PLA opponents that they were gaining momentum.

However, since the beginning of this year, Right to Work attempts to pass appropriations amendments in the now GOP-controlled U.S. House prohibiting the use of taxpayer funds to enforce E.O.13502 have repeatedly been thwarted by a handful of Big Labor-appeasing GOP congressmen.

The most recent setback for independent hardhats and construction firms occurred last month, as the House considered H.R.2055, the Military Construction/Veterans Affairs

Appropriations (MilCon) Bill for the Fiscal Year 2012.

In May, pro-Right to Work members of the House Appropriations Committee had attached to H.R.2055 an amendment prohibiting imposition of union-only PLAs on military, VA, and other construction funded through this measure.

But on June 13 a clique of 27 GOP congressmen, led by habitual forced-unionism apologist Steven LaTourette (Ohio), joined with 177 Big Labor Democrats to strip the pro-Right to Work provision from H.R.2055.

Although fewer than 12% of the 229 Republicans present and voting on the anti-Right to Work, pro-PLA LaTourette Amendment sided with Big Labor, that was enough for union lobbyists to grab a 204-203 victory.

House Speaker Urged to Hold Big Labor Appeasers' Feet to the Fire

Mr. Mourad pointed out that ringleader Steven LaTourette and two of the other GOP House members voting for his union-label amendment hail from Ohio, the home state of Republican House Speaker John Boehner.

"As a self-styled foe of PLAs and wasteful government spending in general,

Speaker Boehner should be doing everything possible to get appropriations legislation defunding PLAs approved by his chamber," said Mr. Mourad.

"Public opposition to union-only PLAs is already intense, and growing more so. Ultimately, President Obama and [U.S. Senate Democratic] Majority Leader Harry Reid [Nev.] may decide they don't want to expend any more of their political capital defending these special-interest schemes.

"But Mr. Obama and Mr. Reid will feel relatively little pressure to end their love affair with PLAs as long as the GOP-controlled House remains incapable of passing anti-PLA legislation!

"I strongly urge the speaker to advise all members of his House caucus, including especially his fellow Ohioans, that there will be significant intra-party repercussions for them if they continue providing cover for Barack Obama, Harry Reid, and other union-label Democrats on the PLA issue."

Mr. Mourad added that National Right to Work members in Ohio and around the country may want to call Speaker Boehner's office in Washington, D.C., at 202-225-0600 to reinforce the message that a "hands off" approach toward pro-forced unionism GOP congressmen is unacceptable. 📌

Pro-PLA House Republicans

Joe Barton (Texas)*
Judy Biggert (Ill.)
Mario Diaz-Balart (Fla.)*
Robert Dold (Ill.)
Jo Ann Emerson (Mo.)
Michael Grimm (N.Y.)
Nan Hayworth (N.Y.)
Tim Johnson (Ill.)
Peter King (N.Y.)
Leonard Lance (N.J.)
Steven LaTourette (Ohio)
Frank LoBiondo (N.J.)
Thaddeus McCotter (Mich.)
David McKinley (W.Va.)

Tim Murphy (Pa.)
Tom Petri (Wisc.)
Dave Reichert (Wash.)
Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (Fla.)*
Peter Roskam (Ill.)
Jon Runyan (N.J.)
Jean Schmidt (Ohio)
Aaron Schock (Ill.)
Chris Smith (N.J.)
Michael Turner (Ohio)
Joe Walsh (Ill.)
Ed Whitfield (Ky.)
Don Young (Alaska)

*U.S. representative from a Right to Work state

Although fewer than 12% of the 229 Republicans present and voting on the anti-Right to Work, pro-PLA

LaTourette Amendment sided with Big Labor, that was enough for union lobbyists to grab a 204-203 victory.

Right to Work State Economies Grow Faster

Private-Sector Employees and Employers Alike Reap Major Benefits

Today, American employees and employers across the country are working hard and using their ingenuity to help their businesses recover from the severe 2008-2009 recession.

Unfortunately, an array of laws and regulations imposed by the U.S. Congress and federal bureaucrats are hindering the efforts of workers, managers, and business owners.

And the federal policies that authorize the firing of roughly 6.3 million private-sector employees should they refuse to pay union dues or fees as a job condition are among the very worst, if not the worst, obstacles to economic recovery.

One indication of the damage wrought by the pro-forced unionism provisions in the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and the Railway Labor Act (RLA) is the state-by-state gross domestic product (GDP) data reported by the U.S. Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis.

According to BEA data, from 2000 to 2010, the combined real output of the 22 states with Right to Work laws protecting employees from the forced-union-dues provisions in the NLRA grew by 21.8%.

That percentage gain is well over half again as large as the combined real 2000-2010 growth of the 28 states that still do not protect employees from forced union dues.



CREDIT: AP

Speaker Boehner can and should put every House member on the record concerning Right to Work.

To put it another way, had the entire country grown by as much as current Right to Work states did over just this ten-year period, by 2010 our national GDP would have been \$13.674 trillion in constant, "chained" 2005 dollars, roughly \$575 billion above the actual figure.

Forced Dues Not Justified, Morally or Economically

National Right to Work Committee Vice President Matthew Leen said that the BEA data, which were updated just last month, should embolden the 33 U.S. House and Senate sponsors of

national Right to Work legislation in their respective chambers to push for action on these measures.

"The House and Senate Right to Work Bills [H.R.2040 and S.504] would abolish the federal labor-law provisions that force workers to pay dues to an unwanted union, or be fired," noted Mr. Leen.

"To be genuine, the right to do something must be accompanied by a corresponding right to refrain. As long as the law of the land explicitly denies employees the right not to associate with or financially support a union, all Americans' freedom will be threatened.

"Even most forced-unionism apologists recognize the strength of this moral argument. That's why they typically try to change the subject to economics.

"But BEA and other government data keep undercutting this gambit."

Mr. Leen added that Right to Work states' growth advantage is even wider when it comes to private-sector employees' wages and salaries than it is with regard to GDP:

"From 2000 to 2010, inflation-adjusted BEA statistics show wage and salary disbursements to employees by private businesses increased by 8.6% in Right to Work states.

"Meanwhile, real private-sector wage and salary disbursements in forced-unionism states fell by 1.8%."

House Speaker Urged to Allow Roll-Call Floor Vote

Mr. Leen pointed out that, unlike the U.S. Senate, which has voted on federal forced-dues repeal a couple of times, most recently just two-and-a-half years ago, the U.S. House has never held a floor vote on national Right to Work legislation.

"A recorded vote on H.R.2040 would require every current House member to take a stand, either with the nearly 80% of Americans who support Right to Work, or with Big Labor," he said.

"Even if union lobbyists muster sufficient votes to defeat H.R.2040, getting the whole chamber on the record for or against compulsory unionism will pave the way for federal force-dues repeal in a future Congress.

"I urge House Speaker John Boehner [R-Ohio] to allow a floor vote on H.R.2040 before the end of this year." 📞

Bottom-Ranking States For Real GDP Growth, 2000-2010

35. Connecticut	41. New Jersey	47. Illinois
36. Massachusetts	42. Wisconsin	48. Missouri
37. West Virginia	43. South Carolina	49. Ohio
38. Kentucky	44. Indiana	50. Michigan
39. New Hampshire	45. Maine	
40. Pennsylvania	46. Georgia	

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis,
U.S. Commerce Department

Forced-unionism states are **in bold**.

Fourteen of the 16 slowest-growing states from 2000-2010 lack Right to Work protections for private-sector

employees. Overall, Right to Work states' real GDP growth was 59% faster than that of forced-unionism states.

Employees Flee Forced Unionism

Continued from page 8

From 2000 to 2010, the inflation-adjusted outlays of private-sector businesses for employee compensation (including wages, salaries, benefits and bonuses) increased by an average of 11.8% in Right to Work states.

That increase is nine times as great as forced-unionism states' combined 1.3% gain over the same period.

Twenty of the 22 Right to Work states experienced a real compensation increase greater than the national average of 4.9%. And 14 of the 15 states with the lowest real compensation growth lack a Right to Work law.

Because they offer superior opportunities for employees and entrepreneurs, Right to Work states "attract the most productive members of society," as economist Arthur Laffer, Wall Street Journal senior economics writer Stephen Moore, and tax policy expert Jonathan Williams note in a new report.

Even Right to Work States Are Hurt by Federal Pro-Forced Unionism Policies

From 1998 to 2008, as Dr. Laffer, Mr. Moore, and Mr. Williams point out in the just-published fourth edition of *Rich States, Poor States*, which they prepared for the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC):

"[T]he population of 25-34 year olds in right-to-work states increased by

16.0 percent (from 14,361 million to 16,654 million), while the population in that age bracket for forced union states fell by 0.6 percent (from 24.32 million to 24.17 million)."

"While the 28 states that still fail to shield employees from federal pro-forced unionism labor policies naturally suffer the most as a consequence of those policies, the whole country is harmed," noted Mr. Mix.

"Union bosses funnel a huge chunk of the forced dues and fees they collect with federal labor law's abetment into politics. And the union-label politicians who routinely get elected and reelected because of Big Labor's forced dues-funded support overwhelmingly favor higher taxes and more red-tape regulation of businesses.

"This is true at the federal, state and local levels. Private-sector job growth in all 50 states, including Right to Work states, is hindered by the actions of Big Labor federal politicians.

"Moreover, in today's globalized economy, when union-boss militancy squashes job-creating business in a state, some investment is likely to go overseas. Then no American workers end up getting the jobs or income.

"For economic reasons as well as for moral reasons, Committee members are fighting to repeal all federal labor law provisions that authorize compulsory union dues and fee

payments as a job condition, as well as to pass more state Right to Work laws.


"The two federal forced-dues repeal measures now pending in Congress, H.R. 2040 and S.504, would spur job growth in all 50 states. Businesses in current Right to Work states would share the benefits as their out-of-state customers and suppliers were freed from the burden of compulsory unionism."

Right to Work Movement Strong, Growing in Early 2012 Presidential Battlegrounds

Mr. Mix said he was "optimistic" that several more 2012 hopefuls would soon join Ms. Bachmann, Mr. Pawlenty, Mr. Johnson, and Dr. Paul in endorsing a federal Right to Work law.

"The fact is, the three first battleground states in the presidential primaries -- Iowa, New Hampshire, and South Carolina -- are all home to extraordinarily vibrant, growing Right to Work movements," Mr. Mix explained.

"All the 2012 candidates, whether they are already in the race or enter some time in the next few months, will have to take into account the large numbers of Iowans, New Hampshireites, and South Carolinians who regard Right to Work as a critical issue.

"Those who are savvy politicians, and aren't so deep in hock to Big Labor that their freedom of action is constrained, should logically respond to the reality on the ground by coming out in favor of a national Right to Work law." 



CREDIT: NNDB.COM



CREDIT: EN.NKFCU.COM



CREDIT: AP



CREDIT: GETTY IMAGES



CREDIT: NNDB.COM



CREDIT: NNDB.COM



CREDIT: URBALTING.COM



CREDIT: NNDB.COM



CREDIT: AP

So far, declared GOP presidential hopefuls Michele Bachmann, Ron Paul, Tim Pawlenty, and Gary Johnson have

publicly stood with pro-Right to Work Americans by calling for repeal of all the forced-unionism provisions in federal

labor law. In the coming months, Right to Work leaders expect other candidates to follow suit.

Forced-Unionism Issue Looms Large For 2012

Right to Work Committee Begins Lobbying Presidential Hopefuls

This summer, New Hampshire is the site of an extended battle over the Right to Work issue, as pro-Right to Work citizens seek to secure two-thirds majority votes in the state House and Senate to override Big Labor Gov. John Lynch's veto of legislation (H.B.474) prohibiting compulsory union dues and fees.

Because Right to Work has been in the New Hampshire news since both chambers of the state's General Court approved H.B.474 earlier this year, WMUR-TV (ABC) news anchor Josh McElveen decided to bring up the issue at the June 13 GOP presidential debate at St. Anselm College in Manchester, N.H.

Mr. McElveen asked former Minnesota Gov. Tim Pawlenty, one of the seven 2012 presidential hopefuls participating in the debate, whether he would, if elected, support "a federal Right to Work law."

Mr. Pawlenty ignited the debate's longest and most enthusiastic round of applause with his response:

"We live in the United States of America, and people shouldn't be forced to belong [to] or be a member in any organization, and the government has no business telling people what group you have to be a member of or not."

"I support strongly Right to Work legislation."

Mr. Pawlenty thus became the fourth major-party White House aspirant in the 2012 race to endorse repeal of all current provisions in federal labor law that authorize the firing of employees for refusal to join or pay dues or fees to an unwanted union.

Previously, the two sitting U.S. representatives seeking the GOP nomination, Michele Bachmann (Minn.) and Ron Paul (Texas), had pledged to support a national Right to Work law. Former New Mexico Gov. Gary Johnson is yet another candidate who has gone on record for forced-dues repeal.

Millions of Citizens Want 'a Clear Alternative' to Pro-Forced Unionism Obama Administration

The enthusiastic response for Mr. Pawlenty's principled stance, evident in a CNN "dial test" of Republicans and



For the past two-and-a-half years, President Barack Obama has relentlessly wielded his power as the

nation's chief executive to promote compulsory unionism. Americans overwhelmingly oppose his stance.

Independents watching on TV as well as in the auditorium itself, is something to which all the candidates should pay heed, said National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix.

"Millions of Americans want a clear alternative to the Obama Administration's relentless promotion of compulsory unionism," Mr. Mix explained.

"Ever since he became President two-and-a-half years ago, Barack Obama has repeatedly championed Big Labor power grabs in Congress and appointed forced-unionism zealots to leadership positions at the National Labor Relations Board, the Labor Department, and other federal bureaucracies.

"Polls show the vast majority of Americans who regularly vote in federal elections believe the Obama Administration is just plain wrong to favor forcing workers to pay union dues to get a job.

"Freedom-loving Americans don't favor a federal policy of 'neutrality' on the question of whether or not workers should be corralled into unions.

"Instead, they believe all federal labor laws should either protect the individual worker's right to join or not join a union, or be scrapped completely.

"So far, Michele Bachmann, Tim Pawlenty, Gary Johnson, and Ron Paul have grasped this point. Over the coming months, Committee members in key primary states will be doing everything they can to ensure all the other candidates reach the same conclusion."

Right to Work States 'Attract the Most Productive Members of Society'

In addition to the fact that it is repugnant for the government, as Mr. Pawlenty succinctly put it, to tell people "what group you have to be a member of or not," pro-forced unionism federal labor policies put the brakes on job and income growth. This effect is especially harmful as employees and businesses strive to recover from the severe 2008-2009 recession.

The disparate economic performance of the 22 states with Right to Work laws (explicitly permitted under Section 14(b) of the federal Taft-Hartley Act), which ban forced union dues and fees, and the 28 states without such laws provides a telling, though incomplete, gauge of the damage wrought by forced unionism.

See Employees page 7