



White House raises objections to union provision in military bill

The Hill Online, 6/01/2011

"The vast majority of contractors and their employees — more than 80 percent — have voluntarily opted against unionization," according to the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation. "Because most contractors and employees choose to refrain from unionization when they have the free choice, Big Labor turned to politicians to remove that choice and impose union representation on employees from the top down."

3 Boeing workers want suit role: Trio files request to intervene in case brought by NLRB

Post and Courier Online, 6/03/2011

Murray, Ramaker and Going are represented by the Virginia-based National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation.

Murray, a quality inspector who led the ouster of the machinists union from Boeing's local campus almost two years ago, said Thursday that he's getting involved in this latest labor dispute because he and his co-workers "should be protected under the law."

3 Boeing employees want to take part in NLRB suit

Seattle Times Online, 6/03/2011

"They are violating my right to work with a choice," Ramaker wrote. "Isn't that being an American is all about? That is MY right!"

Having helped organized a Machinists local when he worked at Lockheed Martin, Going said he fears having to draw unemployment but would not want to work in a unionized environment again.

"When I helped organize the union at Lockheed earlier in my career, I was young and naïve about unions, but I am neither young nor naïve any longer," Going said.

Murray, Ramaker and Going are represented by the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation. NLRB spokeswoman Nancy Cleeland said the agency had just received the filing and was reviewing it.

Three Boeing workers push back in NLRB case

Post & Courier, 6/2/2011

The trio is being represented by a group that works to protect right-to-work laws in states such as South Carolina.

The National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation said last month it was looking to recruit local Boeing employees so it could try to join the closely watched case.

North Charleston Boeing employees seek to intervene in NLRB case

Charleston Business News Online, 6/02/2011

The National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, based in Washington, D.C., today announced that the employees have filed a motion to intervene in the labor dispute, which is set for a hearing on June 14.

“They have a direct and tangible stake in the outcome of this case because their employment will almost self their employment is not terminated, the motion said, they would at best be given “the ‘option’ to transfer to the forced-unionism state of Washington where they would be represented by a union they have already rejected.”

Study reveals how right-to-work laws impact store openings

6/02/2011, Eureka alert.org

The study, which is featured in this month's American Sociological Review, flagship journal of the American Sociological Association (ASA), explored various states' right-to-work (RTW) laws and Walmart store openings between 1998 through 2005, and discovered that Walmart was more likely to propose and open new stores in RTW states located near the borders of non-RTW states, even in the face of protests.

"This is interesting because Walmart is not unionized," noted Professor Paul Ingram of Columbia Business School. "We take this as an indication that RTW states are perceived to have more business-friendly policies, and Walmart prefers to do business in these states."

Conservative backbenchers warned not to dredge up controversial bills or issues in majority government

The Hill Times Online, 6/02/2011

PARLIAMENT HILL—Government backbenchers have been warned to avoid dredging up “pet projects” in Private Members’ bills or motions that could stir controversy and

disrupt the steady course Prime Minister Stephen Harper is planning for his four-year majority term.

Another seeks so-called “right to work” law in areas of federal jurisdiction, where employees could not be compelled into joining workplace unions. Another calls for a Conservative government to designate free votes in Parliament for all motions and bills other than budget and spending measures, and another calls on the party to refuse support for any legislation legalizing assisted suicide.

Union Enthusiasm for Obama Re-Election Fades, AFL-CIO’s Chief Trumka Says

Bloomberg News Online, 6/01/2011

Trumka said the AFL-CIO will spend this summer “holding candidates on both sides accountable.” Candidates who have wavered -- those he called “acquaintances” -- won’t receive support, he said, declining to name such politicians.

Asked if Obama is a friend or an acquaintance, Trumka said, “He’s a friend. There’s a lot of things we disagree with him on. There’s far more things that we agree with him on.”

Republicans are using “outrageous and probably illegal” tactics in their defense of Boeing Co. (BA), the subject of an April 20 complaint by the National Labor Relations Board, Trumka said.

Trumka said he’d like to see the U.S. become more like a European nation that provides pensions and health care for all its citizens. He said he is accustomed to criticism and doesn’t mind if conservatives call that socialism.

“Being called a socialist is a step up for me,” he said.

Unions Push to Undo Ohio Law

Wall Street Journal Online, 6/03/2011

NILES, Ohio—Organized labor is bringing 10,000 volunteers and a \$25 million budget to the latest round of the union-rights fight in Ohio, pushing an effort to repeal a new state law reining in public-employee unions.

Volunteers—largely union members—are crisscrossing the state, setting up drive-through stations in parking lots and going door to door, to collect the 231,000 valid signatures needed to trigger a statewide referendum. So far, they have collected about 214,000 signatures, according to We Are Ohio, a labor-backed nonprofit running the petition campaign. The group said it hopes to collect as many as 500,000, because up to 40% are typically thrown out for various reasons, such as signing a petition twice. Ohio has eight million registered voters and 650,000 union members.



White House raises objections to union provision in military bill

By John T. Bennett - 06/01/11 06:22 PM ET

The White House is raising objections — but not a veto threat — to several provisions in a House panel’s 2012 military construction and Veterans Affairs spending measure, including one that could rile labor unions.

In a statement of administration policy released Wednesday, the Obama administration highlighted what it dubbed “a number of problematic policy and language issues.”

The White House said it “strongly opposes” a provision in the House Appropriations Committee’s military construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill that would block the administration from encouraging the use of so-called “project labor agreements” (PLAs). Such pacts allow government contracts to be awarded exclusively to unionized companies.

The Obama administration says the use of these arrangements “can provide structure and stability to large construction projects,” according to the policy statement. “The coordination achieved through PLAs can significantly enhance the economy and efficiency of Federal construction projects.”

That wording is similar to a February 2009 executive order stating it was the administration's policy to encourage "executive agencies to consider requiring the use of project labor agreements in connection with large-scale construction projects in order to promote economy and efficiency in federal procurement."

The House panel's language would prohibit future use of that order.

“The vast majority of contractors and their employees — more than 80 percent — have voluntarily opted against unionization,” according to the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation. “Because most contractors and employees choose to refrain from unionization when they have the free choice, Big Labor turned to politicians to remove that choice and impose union representation on employees from the top down.”

In an apparent shot across the committee’s bow, the White House added that it “strongly opposes inclusion of ideological and political provisions that are beyond the scope of funding legislation.”

If the provision is included in the final version of the legislation, the administration would oppose it — but the White House stopped short of threatening a veto.

The White House said it is “concerned” that the House Appropriations is proposing using incremental funding for a number of military construction projects.

“Incremental funding of military construction runs counter to sound budgeting principles and fiscal discipline,” according to the White State statement.

Defense officials typically oppose and seek to avoid incremental funding schemes.

The White House also said it opposes a section of the legislation that “could be construed” to require the executive branch inform lawmakers of “certain military exercises” 30 days in advance “without discretion.”

If enacted, this language would “intrude on the president's discharge of his constitutional authorities and duties to protect national security,” according to the administration’s policy statement.

In that section’s place, the White House would like Congress to “make explicit that 30 days advance notice to the Congress is required where feasible and consistent with the president's constitutional responsibilities to protect national security.”

Source:

<http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/budget/164295-white-house-raises-objections-to-union-provision-in-military-bill>

The contents of this site are © 2011 Capitol Hill Publishing Corp., a subsidiary of News Communications, Inc.

The Post and Courier

3 Boeing workers want suit role: Trio files request to intervene in case brought by NLRB

By [John McDermott](#)

jmcdermott@postandcourier.com
Friday, June 3, 2011

Boeing Co. could be getting a hand from its local rank-and-file in defending itself against a lawsuit filed by the National Labor Relations Board.

Three employees at the aerospace giant's North Charleston campus are seeking a formal role in fighting the complaint, saying they fear they will lose their jobs if the federal agency prevails.

Dennis Murray of Summerville, Cynthia Ramaker of Ladson and Meredith Going Sr. of North Charleston filed a request to intervene in the case against Boeing over union-busting allegations.



Provided

Boeing Co. plans to begin assembling 787 jetliners at its \$750 million North Charleston plant by July. Boeing already has hired more than 1,000 of the estimated 3,800 workers it will need to staff the factory.

They said in a legal document the NLRB has sought a "draconian remedy" on behalf of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers that would result in the closing of the 787 Dreamliner factory.

The \$750 million plant is gearing up to start making commercial jets at Charleston International Airport next month.

Murray, Ramaker and Going are represented by the Virginia-based National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation.

Murray, a quality inspector who led the ouster of the machinists union from Boeing's local campus almost two years ago, said Thursday that he's getting involved in this latest labor dispute because he and his co-workers "should be protected under the law."

"The union is using the NLRB to try to say that Boeing doesn't have the right to have a facility here," Murray said in an interview. "And us poor nonunion folks are saying that, according to the same labor laws they are citing, we have every right to work here."

NLRB spokeswoman Nancy Cleeland said Thursday that the agency was reviewing the request by the three employees to join the case. A judge employed by the labor board will decide whether to allow them to participate.

The federal agency sued Boeing in April, saying the company set up its secondary 787 plant South Carolina partly to retaliate against the machinists union for past strikes in Washington state.

The NLRB is seeking a court order that would require Boeing to move the local assembly line to the Pacific Northwest. If successful, that could stop the company from building the 787 in North Charleston.

Boeing has called the claims frivolous and has said it plans to "vigorously contest" the lawsuit. The machinists union got a brief foothold at the airport site in the spring of 2008, when it organized production workers at a 787 supplier that was later purchased by Boeing.

That election was decertified in September 2009, partly because of a poor labor contract. Murray said in a court filing that the local workers also realized that South Carolina "would be in a much better competitive position" to win the 787 line and the 3,800 jobs it would bring to the Charleston region if no unions were involved.

The company picked the airport for its new plant in October 2009.

Murray said the NLRB lawsuit has stirred up angst on the factory floor about the possibility of a shutdown and lost jobs. He also said most employees in his building are happy working for Boeing.

"A lot of them are feeling that the union is trying to retaliate against the workers in South Carolina because we disenfranchised the union here," Murray said.

The first hearing in the dispute has been scheduled for June 14 in Seattle.

The NLRB has said it is open to a settlement in the case, which has drawn national attention and no shortage of criticism from many South Carolina politicians, most notably Republican Sens. Lindsey Graham and Jim DeMint.



The Post and Courier's [Boeing Special Section.](#)

U.S. Rep. Jim Clyburn, the powerful South Carolina Democrat, reiterated his previously stated position on the issue Thursday.

"Boeing's decision to invest tens of millions of dollars to build the new 787 facility in North Charleston was based on economics and quality of life issues," Clyburn said in a statement. "South Carolina worked hard to bring the assembly line to the state through a competitive incentives package. And South Carolina's highly qualified workforce doubtlessly played a significant role. If upheld, the NLRB's decision, which I believe is without merit and will not survive a court challenge, would jeopardize thousands of jobs in our community. This would be an unacceptable outcome."

Copyright © 1995 - 2011 Evening Post Publishing Co..

Originally published June 2, 2011 at 10:59 AM | Page modified June 2, 2011 at 12:39 PM

3 Boeing employees file to take part in NLRB suit

Three employees at Boeing Co.'s North Charleston plant want roles in a lawsuit filed by the National Labor Relations Board

By MEG KINNARD

Associated Press

COLUMBIA, S.C. —

Three employees at Boeing Co.'s North Charleston plant want roles in a lawsuit filed by the National Labor Relations Board

Meredith Going Sr., Dennis Murray and Cynthia Ramaker say in a motion filed Wednesday that they are sure to lose their jobs if the federal agency is successful in its suit against Boeing and the plant shuts down.

The NLRB in April filed a complaint claiming Boeing located a new 787 passenger aircraft assembly line in South Carolina to retaliate against Washington state union workers who went on strike in 2008. The NLRB wants that work returned to Washington, even though the company has already built the South Carolina.

Boeing's lawyer has said NLRB misquotes officials and mischaracterizes the company's position. A hearing is scheduled for later this month.

Kinnard can be reached at <http://www.twitter.com/MegKinnardAP>

Top comments

[Hide / Show comments](#)

☞ Elmer.....these heres peps that b given theirs hardz earned money to those Libs and... (June 2, 2011, by beansNcornbread) [Read more](#)

[Read all 1 comments >](#)

[Post a comment >](#)

The Post and Courier

Three Boeing workers push back in NLRB case

By [John McDermott](#)
Thursday, June 2, 2011

Three employees at Boeing Co.'s North Charleston plant are seeking to contest a lawsuit filed by the National Labor Relations Board, saying they will lose their jobs if the federal agency prevails.

Dennis Murray, Cynthia Ramaker and Meredith Going Sr. have filed a request to intervene in the case against the aerospace company for alleged union busting.

Related document

[Copy of the request to intervene in the Boeing-NLRB case](#) (PDF)

They said in a court document the NLRB's top lawyer is seeking a "draconian remedy" that would result in the closure of the 787 Dreamliner factory at Charleston International Airport.

Murray led the movement to oust the International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers from the Boeing campus in 2009.

The trio is being represented by a group that works to protect right-to-work laws in states such as South Carolina.

The National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation said last month it was looking to recruit local Boeing employees so it could try to join the closely watched case.

The NLRB brought the lawsuit against Boeing in April, saying the company's decision to build its \$750 million 787 aircraft line in North Charleston was an illegal form of retaliation against the machinists union in Washington state for past strikes.

Boeing has denied that. It has said it picked South Carolina for the new assembly line based on numerous business factors, including a desire to offset the impact of future strikes at its unionized aircraft manufacturing hub near Seattle.

The NLRB is seeking a court order that would require Boeing to maintain the secondary 787 assembly line in the Pacific Northwest. If successful, that could stop the company from building the plane in North Charleston.

See Friday's editions of The Post and Courier or more details.

Copyright © 1995 - 2011 Evening Post Publishing Co..

North Charleston Boeing employees seek to intervene in NLRB case



The National Right to Work Foundation, based in Washington, D.C., Thursday announced that three employees have filed a motion to intervene in the labor dispute that is set for a hearing on June 14. Among them is the employee who led an effort to decertify the IAM union in 2009.

By Ashley Fletcher Frampton
aframpton@scbiznews.com

Published June 2, 2011

Three North Charleston-based employees of [The Boeing Co.](#), with the help a right-to-work advocacy group, are seeking to intervene in the legal fight between the aircraft manufacturer and the [National Labor Relations Board](#).



Dennis Murray

The [National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation](#), based in Washington, D.C., today announced that the employees have filed a motion to intervene in the labor dispute, which is set for a hearing on June 14.

The three employees are Dennis Murray, who led the effort to decertify the [International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers](#), or IAM union, from the Charleston plant; Cynthia Ramaker, former president with the IAM local union; and Meredith Going, a previous IAM member, according to legal filings.

The National Right to Work Foundation in May announced that it was seeking Boeing employees in South Carolina who were interested in its assistance. The judge in the case should consider their position, Patrick Semmens, director of legal information for the group, has said.

"They have a direct and tangible stake in the outcome of this case because their employment will almost certainly be terminated if the general counsel's proposed remedy is imposed," said the June 1 motion.

Previous coverage:

[Right-to-work advocacy group wants to represent Boeing employees](#)
[Boeing workers vote to kick out Machinists union](#)
[Union revote date set for Boeing Charleston](#)
[Washington official calls S.C. the 'No. 1 competitor'](#)
[New Boeing workers file to decertify Machinists union](#)

If their employment is not terminated, the motion said, they would at best be given "the 'option' to transfer to the forced-unionism state of Washington where they would be represented by a union they have already rejected."

The NLRB, the federal entity charged with protecting workers' rights, on April 20 filed a complaint against Boeing for its move to build a final assembly and delivery plant in North Charleston for the 787 Dreamliner.

According to the complaint, the expansion was an illegal retaliation against the union for strikes in Washington state, where it already operates a 787 final assembly facility that the company plans to keep open.

The complaint seeks to require Boeing to maintain a second 787 assembly line in Washington, though it does not ask for the line in South Carolina to be closed. Boeing officials have denied the claims in the NLRB's complaint. Company officials have said that union employment in Washington has increased by 2,000 since the company announced plans to expand to North Charleston.

They also have said that operating a second assembly line in Washington would force the company to close its Lowcountry operations.

Whether Boeing employees can intervene in the case is up to a judge, Semmens has said.

The motion says that if the employees are not allowed to intervene as parties in the case, they should be able to submit a post-hearing brief on behalf of all employees at Boeing's North Charleston plant.

The NLRB's complaint, if successful, would eliminate more than 1,000 existing jobs in South Carolina, along with several thousand more to be created once the Boeing plant reaches full production capacity, the advocacy group said today in a statement.

"Further, the case could set a dangerous precedent that allows union bosses to dictate where job providers locate their facilities," the group said.

Reach Ashley Fletcher Frampton at 843-849-3129.

Public release date: 2-Jun-2011

[[Print](#) | [E-mail](#) | [Share](#)] [[Close Window](#)]



Contact: Sona Rai
sr2763@columbia.edu
212-854-5955
[Columbia Business School](#)

Study reveals how right-to-work laws impact store openings

Walmart more likely to open stores in pro-business states that are near borders of less-friendly states

NEW YORK — June 2, 2011 — A new study by Columbia Business School Professor Paul Ingram, Kravis Professor Business, Management and senior scholar at the Jerome A. Chazen Institute for International Business at Columbia Business School; Hayagreeva Rao, Atholl McBean Professor of Organizational Behavior and Human Resources, Stanford Graduate School of Business; and Qingyuan (Lori) Yue, Assistant Professor of Management and Organization, USC Marshall School of Business, found evidence of how firms engage in regulatory arbitrage and make decisions based on a state's regulatory policies. The study, which is featured in this month's *American Sociological Review*, flagship journal of the American Sociological Association (ASA), explored various states' right-to-work (RTW) laws and Walmart store openings between 1998 through 2005, and discovered that Walmart was more likely to propose and open new stores in RTW states located near the borders of non-RTW states, even in the face of protests.

RTW laws prohibit unions and employers from entering agreements that make union membership a condition of employment. Twenty-two of 50 US states have variations of right-to-work laws. Under regulatory arbitrage, if regulatory polices do not suit business firms' interests, they will locate their operations in pro-business states, creating an incentive for other states to become pro-business.

In their study, the researchers aimed to explore if RTW policies can signal a pro-business environment for certain kinds of businesses, such as labor-intensive ones. In this case, from 1998 through 2005, Walmart proposed 102 store openings within 25 miles of borders between RTW and non-RTW states. The study followed each proposal to gauge the stores that eventually opened. The company's store proposals are protested often, but despite protests, the researchers found that Walmart was more likely to propose and open new stores in RTW states located near the borders of non-RTW states even in the face of protests.

"This is interesting because Walmart is not unionized," noted Professor Paul Ingram of Columbia Business School. "We take this as an indication that RTW states are perceived to have more business-friendly policies, and Walmart prefers to do business in these states."

The results provide evidence of how firms engage in regulatory arbitrage: Walmart can select stores in states friendlier to business because its stores can draw customers from about 50 miles away. The study has important implications for policymakers, as states and countries have to consider competition from nearby territories when drafting laws. "Neither employees nor companies are hostage to a location — or its regulations — anymore," Professor Ingram elaborated.

###

About Columbia Business School

Conservative backbenchers warned not to dredge up controversial bills or issues in majority government



Written by Administrator

Friday, 03 June 2011 09:40

Government backbenchers have been warned to avoid dredging up 'pet projects' in Private Members' bills or motions that could stir controversy and disrupt the steady course Prime Minister Stephen Harper is planning for his four-year majority term.

By TIM NAUMETZ

Published June 2, 2011 8:58 PM

PARLIAMENT HILL—Government backbenchers have been warned to avoid dredging up “pet projects” in Private Members' bills or motions that could stir controversy and disrupt the steady course Prime Minister Stephen Harper is planning for his four-year majority term.

Top levels of the government gave MPs a briefing this week on what is expected of them for the 41st Parliament, as Mr. Harper (Calgary Southwest, Alta.) keeps an eye on a second majority government in 2015 while avoiding hot-button issues that could flame up in his own ranks.

A Conservative source said the central theme of the pitch to backbenchers was a warning that Parliament was not a “venue for personal campaigns” on issues such as abortion and same-sex marriage.

Conservative MP James Lunney (Nanaimo-Alberni, B.C.) told The Hill Times he had not seen any advice to Conservative MPs on the topic, but indicated that, as long as backbench legislative proposals conform to party policy, it is up to MPs to determine what they want to bring forward.

“I haven't seen any indication of such an idea,” Mr. Lunney said. “Private members' business is for Members to determine, our measures, of course, want to be consistent with party policy.”

He added: “And Members, you know, we thrash it out at our policy convention, we're well advised to stick within that, but that's all I'm going to say on the subject.”

Private Members' bills are the chief avenue for MPs outside the ranks of Cabinet to make a name for themselves on Parliament Hill, or to espouse ideas they believe will be popular with constituents, and have popped up as irritants during the past Conservative and Liberal minority governments, perhaps even more so during the majority government days of Liberal prime minister Jean Chrétien.

A look at the 80 policy resolutions electoral district associations have submitted to the Conservative party in advance of its national convention in Ottawa, beginning next Thursday June 9, include a sprinkling of resolutions that could spark unwanted hints of conservative positions Mr. Harper has successfully kept out of the spotlight through his past two minority governments and three federal elections.

One calls on the party to recognize Parliament should determine the definition of marriage through a free vote, not the courts, and to support legislation defining marriage “as the union of one man and one woman.”

Another seeks so-called “right to work” law in areas of federal jurisdiction, where employees could not be compelled into joining workplace unions. Another calls for a Conservative government to designate free votes in Parliament for all motions and bills other than budget and spending measures, and another calls on the party to refuse support for any legislation legalizing assisted suicide.

The most controversial resolution to surface so far calls on the party to adopt a position stating that any Canadian citizen, by birth or by a claim of landed immigrant or refugee status, who commits treason by “taking up arms” against Canadian or allied armed forces should be stripped of citizenship and tried in Canada for high treason.

A government procedural and legal manual already gives Cabinet ministers responsibility for managing Private Member’s bills and other items that are covered by their cabinet portfolios, and instructs them to rally support for the government if it opposes a Private Member’s bill.

“Members who are responsible for the policy should ensure that Members of Parliament, including caucus members, are informed about the government’s position, and should seek the support of caucus members for the government’s position,” the manual states.

Liberal MP David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Ont.) said he is not surprised Conservative MPs were given the impression Mr. Harper wants smooth sailing over the next four years because he intends to seek a second majority.

“That’s as obvious as night following day,” Mr. McGuinty said.

“He is definitely setting out on an eight-year roll out here, everything he has done since he’s arrived has been about trying to consummate his relationship with the Canadian people in this sense,” he added. “He’s desperately been trying to re-invent himself as the leader of the united Conservative party. He has had to take the rough edges off, he’s had to deny his background, he’s had to deny a lot of what he has said and written over the last decade, he got away with it.”

Andrew MacDougall, Mr. Harper’s press secretary, said Mr. Harper has already made the government’s position clear on perhaps the biggest potential controversy—abortion.

“Our MPs were elected on a clear platform—our government will move forward to implement that platform,” Mr. MacDougall said in an email.

“As you note, the Prime Minister has made it crystal clear that the government will not introduce or support any legislation that seeks to reopen the abortion debate.”

tnaumetz@hilltimes.com

The Hill Times

Union Enthusiasm for Obama Re-Election Fades, AFL-CIO's Chief Trumka Says

By Holly Rosenkrantz and Stephanie Armour - Jun 1, 2011

President [Barack Obama](#) faces waning enthusiasm from union members as he prepares for his 2012 re-election bid, AFL-CIO President [Richard Trumka](#) said.

"It will be more challenging this time than it was last time to motivate our members," Trumka, 61, said in an interview today at Bloomberg's offices in Washington.

Trumka, head of the largest U.S. labor organization, said union members are frustrated by "wasted energy" in Washington on issues that he said don't help workers: "hysteria" about the federal deficit, a White House review of regulations and Obama's support for free-trade agreements.

Labor leaders said in recent weeks that they would withhold financial support in next year's election from candidates who haven't sided with unions consistently, a move that may hurt Democrats who have relied on labor backing. The International Association of Fire Fighters has vowed to withhold campaign money from federal races, throwing its money into state-level campaigns.

Trumka said the AFL-CIO will spend this summer "holding candidates on both sides accountable." Candidates who have wavered -- those he called "acquaintances" -- won't receive support, he said, declining to name such politicians.

"Those Democrats that are friends are going to get more" aid than in the past, he said.

Trumka was elected president of the AFL-CIO on Sept. 16, 2009. He served as its secretary-treasurer from 1995 to 2009 and previously was president of the United Mine Workers. The son and grandson of coal miners, he began working in Pennsylvania mines in 1968.

Obama a 'Friend'

Asked if Obama is a friend or an acquaintance, Trumka said, "He's a friend. There's a lot of things we disagree with him on. There's far more things that we agree with him on."

Obama's support for free-trade agreements with [South Korea](#), [Colombia](#) and [Panama](#) has disappointed his union supporters, Trumka said.

"During the campaign, he made significant promises to do an inventory of the trade agreements" to be certain they protected worker rights, Trumka said. "He's obviously forgotten that promise."

The results announced last week from Obama's review of regulations throughout the government that burden business produced little of substance, Trumka said.

Faulting politicians of both parties for pursuing "the corporate agenda," Trumka said more [government spending](#) to create jobs would revive the economy and lead to a reduction in the deficit.

'Outrageous, Illegal'

Republicans are using "outrageous and probably illegal" tactics in their defense of [Boeing Co. \(BA\)](#), the subject of an April 20 complaint by the [National Labor Relations Board](#), Trumka said.

"It's a strategy, it's not an accident," Trumka said. "It's a way for them to chill the NLRB."

Lawmakers have threatened to cut off the board's funds and demanded that the agency turn over documents related to its complaint that Boeing, the world's largest aerospace company, retaliated against its union employees in the Seattle area by building a non-union factory in [South Carolina](#) for its 787 Dreamliner.

"No company is beyond the law, and that includes Boeing," Trumka said. Chicago-based Boeing has denied an anti-union motivation for its decision to add the South Carolina line.

While business groups and Republicans say the NLRB, a five-member board, has tilted toward unions since Obama's nominees gained a majority, Trumka said the panel is doing too little to protect worker rights to form unions.

"Many unions have almost given up on the NLRB because it's so fraught with delays," he said. He called for the board to permit quicker union elections and redress for employees who are fired for organizing.

Trumka said he'd like to see the U.S. become more like a European nation that provides pensions and health care for all its citizens. He said he is accustomed to criticism and doesn't mind if conservatives call that socialism.

"Being called a socialist is a step up for me," he said.

To contact the reporters on this story: Holly Rosenkrantz in [Washington](#) at hrosenkrantz@bloomberg.net; Stephanie Armour in Washington at sarmour@bloomberg.net

To contact the editor responsible for this story: Larry Liebert at lliebert@bloomberg.net

 Dow Jones Reprints: This copy is for your personal, non-commercial use only. To order presentation-ready copies for distribution to your colleagues, clients or customers, use the Order Reprints tool at the bottom of any article or visit www.djreprints.com

• See a sample reprint in PDF format. • Order a reprint of this article now

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

WSJ.com

POLITICS | JUNE 3, 2011

Unions Push to Undo Ohio Law

Showdown Looms Over Referendum to Repeal Public-Employee Bargaining Limits

By KRIS MAHER

NILES, Ohio—Organized labor is bringing 10,000 volunteers and a \$25 million budget to the latest round of the union-rights fight in Ohio, pushing an effort to repeal a new state law reining in public-employee unions.

Collecting Signatures



Andrew Spear for The Wall Street Journal

Volunteers talked while collecting signatures at an Anti-Senate Bill 5 petition-signing drive in Niles, Ohio on May 25.

Unions argue that Republicans overreached this spring when they passed Senate Bill 5, boosting health-care and pension contributions for the state's 360,000 public employees and taking away most of their legislated collective-bargaining rights. The state and regional Democratic Party is offering technical assistance and support to the repeal effort, recruiting thousands of volunteers, providing voter lists for canvassers and helping with fund raising.

A Republican strategist on Tuesday launched a campaign of his own to support the law in the November election that aims to win financial support from businesses. Building a Better Ohio is expected to roll out television and radio ads, but it isn't clear how much the group will spend on its effort.

Republican Gov. John Kasich signed Senate Bill 5 into law in April and said it would help the state dig itself out of an \$8 billion budget gap over the next two years.

"We're very confident when people realize it's simply restoring some balance between public and private sector workers, they will understand how valuable Senate Bill 5 is," said Rob Nichols, a spokesman for the governor. "It is a tool that will enable localities to not have to raise taxes and kill more jobs."

Both sides say they will use the issue to rally support for the 2012 presidential race in the key swing state.



Andrew Spear for The Wall Street Journal

Roz Gadd, a retired teacher, watches George Raseta, center, sign a petition to overturn Senate Bill 5 at an event in Niles, Ohio, on May 25.

Volunteers—largely union members—are crisscrossing the state, setting up drive-through stations in parking lots and going door to door, to collect the 231,000 valid signatures needed to trigger a statewide referendum. So far, they have collected about 214,000 signatures, according to We Are Ohio, a labor-backed nonprofit running the petition campaign. The group said it hopes to collect as many as 500,000, because up to 40% are typically thrown out for various reasons, such as signing a petition twice. Ohio has eight million registered voters and 650,000 union members.

Michele Prater, a spokeswoman for the Ohio Education Association, which has 128,000 members in the state, said it would

raise more than \$5 million for the repeal effort by assessing teachers \$54 and support-staff members such as cafeteria workers

\$25. She said the union's 713 delegates representing locals unanimously approved the one-time assessment.

The Ohio Fraternal Order of Police asked its local lodges to collect \$50 from each active member.

Ms. Fazekas, the We Are Ohio spokeswoman, said that in addition to the 10,000 volunteers the group has hired 300 people to collect signatures, but she declined to say how much the workers were being paid.

Drivers lined up Wednesday outside McMenamy's Irish Pub & Restaurant in Niles, a heavily unionized area, to sign the referendum petition. After three hours, union members had collected 568 signatures from people like Ann McGeary, 61 years old, a registered nurse in Girard, Ohio. Ms. McGeary said she thinks the law goes too far.

"I don't even like unions, but what's fair is fair," said Ms. McGeary, a registered Democrat. She said she opposed taking away workers' right to negotiate benefits under the law.

But it is far from clear how the petition effort and repeal campaign will fare outside areas like Niles, the birthplace of President William McKinley where small metal-fabricating shops line the road between blue-collar Youngstown and Warren in the northeastern part of the state.

"It's awfully early. The average citizen is only hearing one side of the story now," said Mark Munroe, chairman of the Mahoning County Republican Party.

Gary Gergley, 51, a registered Republican who owns a financial-services company in Zoar, Ohio, said he supported Senate Bill 5 and declined to sign a petition when a teacher approached him recently at a restaurant.

"I don't think there should be public employee unions," he said, adding, "This is a difficult subject. All those teachers and workers are wonderful people."

A statewide poll conducted May 10-16 by Quinnipiac University in Hamden, Conn., found 54% of Ohioans said they think Senate Bill 5 should be repealed, while 36% said it should be kept. At the same time, 59% of respondents said they think public employees should be required to pay at least 15% of their health-insurance premiums, a provision of the law. The telephone survey of 1,379 registered voters had a 2.6-percentage-point margin of error.

Write to Kris Maher at kris.maher@wsj.com

Copyright 2011 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved

This copy is for your personal, non-commercial use only. Distribution and use of this material are governed by our [Subscriber Agreement](#) and by copyright law. For non-personal use or to order multiple copies, please contact Dow Jones Reprints at 1-800-843-0008 or visit

www.djreprints.com