In recent months, millions of Americans across the country have looked on with outrage as Lafe Solomon, the man President Obama selected to be the top lawyer for the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), sought to block Boeing from initiating a new aircraft production line in Right to Work South Carolina.

Nearly two years ago, after being hit by a series of very costly strikes at its Washington State and Oregon facilities, and failing to secure a no-strike agreement to avoid future shutdowns, Boeing decided to locate a new, billion-dollar 787 Dreamliner plant in North Charleston, S.C.

Several Boeing executives publicly stated the obvious: Their decision to expand production in a Right to Work state was motivated in significant part by their desire to cut the cost to customers, employees and shareholders of disruptive strikes.

Enraged International Association of Machinists (IAM/AFL-CIO) union bosses, who had instigated strikes costing Boeing and its customers billions of dollars, filed an NLRB complaint shortly after the decision was announced, claiming it was motivated by "anti-union animus" and illegal. But for more than a year-and-a-half the case went nowhere.

Mr. Solomon personally sat on the IAM complaint for 10 months after his appointment as acting NLRB general counsel. His hesitation suggests he knew full well the complaint was legally far-fetched.

But on April 20 Mr. Solomon came through for the union hierarchy, announcing that he would take up the IAM complaint and seek to block production of 787 Dreamliners in South Carolina, unless and until the company first met his extraordinarily costly and economically absurd demands.

"Freedom-loving citizens are understandably concerned about the Obama NLRB's assault on Boeing employees in South Carolina, which has been aptly described as an attempt to lay the foundation of a 'union Berlin Wall,'" commented National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix.

"For decades, states with Right to Work laws barring forced-union-dues provisions from federal labor statutes. But current Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) can change that.

The Boeing case, in which 1000 good jobs in the North Charleston plant alone, jobs America really needs, are at stake, is now in the hands of NLRB Administrative Law Judge Clifford Anderson in Seattle. Years may pass before it is resolved.

"Freedom-loving citizens are understandably concerned about the Obama NLRB's assault on Boeing employees in South Carolina, which has been aptly described as an attempt to lay the foundation of a 'union Berlin Wall,'" commented National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix.

"For decades, states with Right to Work laws banning forced union dues and fees, now 22 in number, have served as a refuge for employees and businesses from the detrimental impact of federal labor policies that authorize and encourage the firing of employees for refusal to bankroll an unwanted union.

"The Committee and its 2.6 million members are determined to thwart the Obama NLRB's bid to prevent independent-minded workers and their employers from seeking protection in Right to Work states." (For more about Right to Work advocates' response to...
Compulsory Unionism a Job Killer
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the Boeing complaint, see page six of this Newsletter issue.)

Mr. Mix added that there is at least one silver lining to this bureaucratic power grab:

"The threat of a 'union Berlin Wall' has raised public attention on the importance of Right to Work protections to an unusually high level.

"And that gives Right to Work supporters everywhere an opportunity, if only we can take advantage of it, to attack the scourge of compulsory unionism at its source."

Forced Dues Enshrined In Federal Labor Law

The National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), which Congress first adopted in 1935 and has since only modified, not fundamentally changed, actually contains specific language protecting employee rights to join or refrain from joining a union.

"But," Mr. Mix explained, "it's just a cruel joke.

"Why? Congress gutted its pious proclamations of worker freedom with 'exceptions' such as the one tacked on to NLRA Section 7. Section 7's conclusion has trampled workers' freedom for three-quarters of a century, and is one of the most cynical exercises in legislative deception on record.

"Employees, Congress says, shall have full freedom to refrain from joining (or financially supporting) a union, except 'to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring union membership as a condition of employment . . .'"

"Simply by repealing this and a handful of other exemptions in the NLRA and the Railway Labor Act [RLA], Congress can reinstate a fundamental freedom for workers across the entire country.

"And that is exactly what the National Right to Work Act [H.R.2040/S.504] would do.

"It does not add a single word to federal law. It simply repeals the provisions that authorize the forced payment of union dues."

Time and again, in industry after industry, compulsory unionism has spawned productivity-killing Big Labor work rules and workplace strife. These in turn have resulted in fewer jobs and less real income growth for employees.

Legislation That Would Restore Right to Work Now Pending in House and Senate

"The experience of Right to Work states that already circumvent the NLRA by banning forced union dues and fees indicates strongly that national compulsory-dues repeal will benefit employees economically, in addition to protecting their liberty," said Mr. Mix.

"But protecting employees' liberty is Right to Work laws' primary aim."

In the 2011-2012 Congress, federal forced-dues repeal legislation has been introduced in the House as H.R.2040 by Congressman Steve King (R-Iowa), and in the Senate as S.504 by Sens. Jim DeMint (R-S.C.) and Rand Paul (R-Ky.).

Mr. Mix and other Right to Work leaders are now deploying the Committee's mail, e-mail and telecommunications operations to mobilize its members in support of recorded votes on both these measures.

Time and again, in industry after industry, compulsory unionism has spawned productivity-killing Big Labor work rules and workplace strife. These in turn have resulted in fewer jobs and less real income growth for employees.
A quarter century ago, pro-Right to Work Americans won a modest, but significant victory at the U.S. Supreme Court in the Patternmakers case.

In the 1985 decision, a 5-4 High Court majority upheld a ruling by then-President Ronald Reagan’s National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). Patternmakers makes it clear that it is illegal for union bosses to slap fines on employees who resign their union membership and subsequently return to work during a strike with which they disagree.

The day after the decision came down, the Associated Press quoted Harvard professor Robert Reich’s reaction. Mr. Reich worried that the Supreme Court and the NLRB were "deemphasiz[ing] the need for coercion [in unionism]."

After all, Mr. Reich insisted, the idea that union officials "have got to have some ability to strap their members to the mast" and "hold their members' feet to the fire" is "woven into U.S. labor laws."

As U.S. Labor Department secretary from 1993 to 1997, during Bill Clinton’s first term as President, Robert Reich continued to see an enormous "need for coercion" in unionism, and strove again and again to use his power and influence to expand Big Labor’s coercive privileges.

Mr. Reich returned to private life years ago, but he is still carrying water for compulsory unionism.

Mr. Reich Regurgitates Dubious Assertions of Big Labor-Funded ‘Think Tank’

In recent years, the media-seeking former labor secretary has publicly suggested, again and again in newspaper op-eds and magazine articles, in TV panel discussions and in congressional testimony, that adding millions of workers to Big Labor’s forced dues-paying ranks would be a tonic for America’s ailments.

And this summer Mr. Reich bluntly acknowledged, in response to a query from U.S. Sen. Mike Enzi (R-Wyo.), that he favors repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which would eviscerate the 22 state Right to Work laws now on the books and impose nationwide forced union dues in the private sector.

"If Robert Reich were really interested in securing higher wages, salaries and benefits for employees, he would support enactment of a national Right to Work law, not 14(b) repeal," noted National Right to Work Committee Vice President Greg Mourad.

"From 2000 to 2010, the inflation-adjusted outlays of private-sector businesses for employee compensation (including wages, salaries, bonuses and benefits) increased by an average of 11.8% in Right to Work states. That increase is nine times as great as forced-unionism states’ 1.3% rise over the same period.

"Moreover, data from the nonpartisan Missouri Economic Research and Information Center show that in 2010 the average cost of living in forced-unionism states was nearly 19% higher than in Right to Work states.

"When cost of living is taken into account, the average wage and salary income per private sector worker in Right to Work states last year was $46,941, about $1100 above the average for non-Right to Work states.

"But in his response to Sen. Enzi, Mr. Reich ignored all such objective data and instead relied on materials from the Big Labor-funded Economic Policy Institute [EPI], materials full of dubious assertions based on unstated assumptions, to ‘prove’ that forced unionism is good for employees.”

‘Laughably Off Target’

Mr. Reich’s abject dependence on the EPI in his statement in support of 14(b) repeal caused him to make several assertions concerning Oklahoma, the most recent state to enact a Right to Work law, that were "laughably off target," Mr. Mourad continued.

"Since Big Labor’s legal campaign to block implementation of Oklahoma’s Right to Work law was halted by the state Supreme Court in 2003, Oklahoma’s real manufacturing GDP has grown by 22.1%, an increase roughly double the national average.

"But Mr. Reich, who counts on the EPI to get things right and can’t be bothered to check the facts for himself, told Mr. Enzi that Oklahoma’s 'manufacturing sector shrank dramatically' after the law’s adoption!"

"It’s too bad Robert Reich still doesn’t trust the American worker to make personal decisions about unionism for himself or herself. Does he really want to go down in history as ‘Strap ‘Em to the Mast Reich’?"
State After State Rejects Union-Only PLAs

But Obama Administration Continues to Back Anti-Taxpayer Schemes

Right to Work advocates, along with taxpayers and independent building-trades employees and their employers, have scored a series of victories in state capitals this year over union-only hiring discrimination in taxpayer-funded construction.

Last month, Maine, Louisiana and Michigan became the three latest states to pass laws rolling back so-called "project labor agreements” (PLAs) on public works funded with state or local tax dollars.

Earlier this year, Arizona, Idaho and Tennessee adopted measures prohibiting state and local entities from requiring contractors to sign a PLA as a condition of performing taxpayer-funded construction.

And pro-Right to Work Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad (R) issued an executive order reversing a pro-PLA edict sent down by Chet Culver (D), the Big Labor governor Mr. Branstad had defeated in November 2010.

"Under union-only PLAs, nonunion companies wishing to participate in public works are forced to impose union monopoly bargaining on their employees and hire new workers through discriminatory union hiring halls,” explained National Right to Work Committee Vice President Mary King.

"Independent workers who already have their own retirement funds are nevertheless forced to contribute to Big Labor-manipulated pension funds.

"Even in Right to Work states, PLAs seriously undermine employees’ freedom not to join an unwanted union. Elsewhere, PLAs exacerbate the ills of compulsory unionism.

"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.”

Crackdowns on PLAs Possible In Part Because of Right To Work Electoral Gains

"Since roughly 86% of construction workers across the country today aren't unionized, hamstringing their ability to compete on projects inevitably jacks up taxpayer costs for public works,” Ms. King continued.

She specified: "The nonpartisan, Boston-based Beacon Hill Institute estimates PLAs inflate construction costs by at least 12% to 18%, after controlling for project size and complexity, location, and other extraneous factors.”

Public opposition to union-only PLAs is intense and longstanding, but the multiple successes this year of citizen lobbying efforts to stop this form of discrimination are due to several factors.

One, as a Wall Street Journal editorial observed last month, is that politicians in fiscally squeezed states and localities "are finally having to confront their sweetheart deals with labor unions.”

Another is the enormous success in 2010 of state candidate survey programs administered by National Right to Work and allied state and regional groups.

For years, these programs have mobilized citizens across the country, in Right to Work and non-Right to Work states alike, to put the heat on their state legislative and executive candidates to oppose government-promoted union monopoly bargaining and forced union dues.

"State politicians who will vote to force workers to pay dues or fees to an unwanted union and to corral public servants under union monopoly bargaining will also, in the vast majority of cases, support Big Labor PLAs for taxpayer-funded construction,” Ms. King noted.

"In Maine and Michigan, for example, PLA crackdowns enacted this year show the growing strength of Right to Work supporters, even though union lobbyists so far have thwarted passage of Right to Work legislation in these states.”

Obama Administration Still Not Getting the Message

Even as elected officials from Michigan to Arizona have taken on PLAs this year, President Barack Obama and his administration seem determined to keep coddling construction union kingpins.

One of Mr. Obama’s first acts as President was to issue Executive Order 13502, which promotes PLAs on federal taxpayer-funded public works worth more than $25 million.

"Incredibly, as the 2012 elections approach, President Obama’s next move may be to extend the competition-quashing E.O.13502 to all federally funded construction,” Ms. King commented.

"How much more of his political capital will the President expend promoting forced unionism?”

On July 13, pro-Right to Work Maine Gov. Paul LePage (R) signed legislation prohibiting union-only PLAs. The new law will allow all qualified workers and employers to compete for projects funded by state taxpayers.
Recent Right to Work Victories Under Fire

Big Labor Campaigning For Reinstatement of Forced Union Dues

Since the 1960's, Big Labor lobbyists in 21 states have successfully pressured elected officials to pass statutes explicitly authorizing union bosses to get independent-minded public servants fired for refusal to pay dues or fees to a union the employees would never voluntarily join.

Until this year, despite the growing success of the Right to Work movement with regard to the private sector, not a single state legislature had ever revoked government union bosses' forced-dues privileges after previously granting them by statute.

But this March two states, Ohio and Wisconsin, made history by restoring the Right to Work of public servants.

The Buckeye State reform, though it has received far less media attention than Wisconsin's, is the more comprehensive of the two. Commonly referred to as Senate Bill 5, the Ohio measure includes provisions protecting the Right to Work of all categories of state and local government employees.

Wisconsin's Budget Repair Act of 2011 has similar provisions protecting the freedom of teachers and many other public employees to refuse to bankroll an unwanted union, but leaves untouched the forced-dues privileges of public-safety and public-transportation union bosses.

National Right to Work Helped Mobilize Public Support For Reforms

"Grass-roots support for the public-sector Right to Work measures in Ohio and in Wisconsin was mobilized, in significant part, by the National Right to Work Committee's e-mail and telecommunications activities," noted Committee President Mark Mix.

"Both these laws represent important advances for the Right to Work cause -- especially the Ohio statute, because it protects all state and local public servants from forced union dues. But both laws are also in danger of being reversed."

The more immediate threat to Right to Work is in the Buckeye State. On July 21, Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted certified the petitions collected by Organized Labor to get S.B.5 repeal on a statewide ballot this fall.

Union strategists successfully collected the number of signed petitions needed to block implementation of S.B.5 and put their forced-dues reinstatement referendum before voters on November 8.

In Wisconsin, a Big Labor-inspired court challenge that had kept the Budget Repair Act in limbo for months was rebuffed by the state Supreme Court in late June. However, a second legal bid to invalidate the law, filed by lawyers representing a host of government unions, is now pending in federal court.

Right to Work Leader Hopeful Big Labor Blitzes Can Be Repelled

"The National Committee is offering our advice and counsel, as well as financial resources, to Ohio citizens who are battling to keep their new public-sector Right to Work law on the books."

"If the motion succeeds, these independent-minded employees will be able to present their own arguments to the court for why their Right to Work should continue to be legally protected.

"Given the millions and millions of dollars in forced-dues money union bosses are pouring into Ohio and Wisconsin, these will be difficult fights.

"But Right to Work supporters have countervailing advantages. First and foremost, Midwesterners, like other Americans, have a visceral dislike for compulsory unionism.

"Second, hard, objective data show that, over the past decade, real private-sector compensation in states that protect public employees' Right to Work grew 10 times as fast as it did in states with public-sector forced-unionism statutes.

"Third, a long line of legal precedents indicates that, contrary to union bosses' claims, states have broad authority to rescind their forced-dues privileges.

"All in all, I am hopeful the new public-sector Right to Work measures in Ohio and Wisconsin will withstand all union-boss assaults."
House Jousts With Obama NLRB's Top Lawyer

**But Congress Needs to Do Much More to Curtail Board Abuses**

The U.S. House may soon vote to rebuke Acting National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) General Counsel Lafe Solomon for trying to dictate where businesses may or may not expand.

By passing H.R.2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act, the House would send a message that NLRB bureaucrats like Mr. Solomon should not have the power to order an employer to relocate jobs from one site to another.

H.R.2587 responds specifically to Mr. Solomon's decision in April to file a complaint against Boeing for initiating a new aircraft production line in Right to Work South Carolina.

In several public statements, Boeing executives had made no bones about the fact that their decision to expand in a Right to Work state was prompted largely by their desire to avoid or at least mitigate multi-billion-dollar revenue losses stemming from disruptive strikes.

**As Politics, the NLRB Issue 'Is a Doozy' For Big Labor Politicians**

Agreeing with International Association of Machinists (IAM/AFL-CIO) union kingpins who have repeatedly ordered employees at Boeing’s Washington State and Oregon facilities out on strike, Mr. Solomon claims these statements show Boeing was motivated by “anti-union animus.” Consequently, the South Carolina expansion is illegal, declares Mr. Solomon.

The Boeing case is currently before an NLRB administrative law judge and could potentially drag on for years.

Sponsored by pro-Right to Work freshman South Carolina Congressman Tim Scott (R), H.R.2587 addresses Mr. Solomon's conflation of an employer's legitimate concern about strikes that disrupt production and alienate customers with a discriminatory "animus" toward unions.

H.R.2587 would modestly reduce the NLRB's current extraordinary power, barring it "from ordering any employer to relocate, shut down, or transfer employment under any circumstance."

**Forced-unionism ideologue Lafe Solomon was handpicked by President Barack Obama to be the NLRB's top lawyer.**

This legislation is expected to pass the House with the support of many members who normally kowtow to the union bosses. That's a sign, as a recent Wall Street Journal editorial put it, that "a policy of punishing business for building plants and creating jobs in their states . . . is a doozy" for Big Labor politicians.

**Other Countermeasures House Could Take Have Greater Potential**

However, in the U.S. Senate union-label Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) will very likely be able to muster sufficient votes to stall H.R.2587, despite the reform's popularity.

Moreover, the White House announced just before the House recessed in August that President Obama opposes H.R.2587.

Because the President now unambiguously agrees with the man he unilaterally installed as NLRB general counsel about the Boeing complaint, an H.R.2587 veto can be expected should the bill somehow pass the Senate.

"The National Right to Work Committee supports H.R.2587 and commends the House for bringing up this legislation," said Committee Vice President Matthew Leen.

"However, this legislation is quite unlikely to become law in the near future, and the Boeing power grab is only one of an array of ways in which the Obama NLRB is now threatening to eviscerate employees' Right to Work."

"In light of these facts, Speaker John Boehner [R-Ohio] and other House leaders must pursue additional means of reining in this rogue agency."

"At a minimum, the House should consider appropriations amendments cutting off funds for pursuing the Boeing case and for implementing several other ongoing NLRB power grabs."

"By refusing to vote for an NLRB budget unless it curtails Obama bureaucrats' worst excesses, the House can actually stop abuses like the Boeing complaint without the cooperation of Harry Reid's Senate or the White House."

"But that will require intestinal fortitude on the part of Speaker Boehner and other House leaders, and ever-intensifying mobilization of Right to Work supporters nationwide."
of a union election from 38 days to 10-14 days."

Even with the current median timeframe, "many if not most employers have a difficult time communicating their positions to their employees," Mr. Kirsanow explained last month.

But the changes "will utterly and completely deprive employers of the ability to communicate vital information to their employees regarding their rights and the effects of unionization."

Of course, once employers are denied enough time to make their case, employees will ipso facto be denied the opportunity to hear both sides of the story before voting on unionization.

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

"The ex-union lawyers on Barack Obama's NLRB brazenly claim that the 'ambush' election scheme they are proposing represents only a few modest changes to current practice," noted National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix.

"But this is nothing other than an underhanded means of realizing the very objective Craig Becker lauded in his published writings before his NLRB appointment: Workers' 'choice to remain unrepresented' would be rendered almost meaningless.

"The new rules would stack the deck against independent-minded employees so thoroughly that many employers would choose, to quote Mr. Kirsanow, 'not even to go through the expense' of a rigged election, but 'simply recognize the union upon showing of authorization cards.'"

In addition to effectively denying employees information that would help them sort through union organizers' claims, the NLRB's proposed new rules mandate that the employer hand over employee phone numbers and e-mail addresses to union organizers at the outset of each "ambush" election campaign.

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

Committee Vows Support For Legislation Countering New 'Card Check' Threat

Mr. Mix continued: "The bottom-line impact of the Obama NLRB's 'ambush' election scheme would be very similar to that of the 'card-check' forced-unionism legislation union lobbyists tried unsuccessfully to ram through Congress from 2007 to 2010.

"The American people resoundingly rejected this legislative effort to hand union bosses more power over workers and help funnel more forced dues into union coffers. In the November 2010 elections, 31 House and Senate incumbents who had voted for the card-check scheme went down to defeat."

"Unfortunately, the forced-unionism zealots who now hold all but one of the four occupied seats on the NLRB don't seem to have noticed. They are now poised, in rules that could take effect as soon as September, to foist 'card check' on American workplaces bureaucratically."

He vowed that the Committee would work closely with Capitol Hill allies to craft one or more measures blocking implementation of the "ambush" election scheme now on the verge of being implemented by the NLRB.

"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 pass federal forced-dues repeal and other much-needed labor law reforms, we have to stop the union hierarchy from seizing even more monopolistic power over American business employees and employers.

"The Committee is now prepared to consider all appropriate means, including both a congressional cut-off of funds for implementation of the 'ambush' election scheme and defunding the NLRB entirely, to protect independent employees and firms."
'Choice to Remain Unrepresented' Under Attack
Extremist Vision of Obama NLRB Appointee Moves Toward Realization

"At first blush it might seem fair to give workers the choice to remain unrepresented. But, in providing workers this option, U.S. labor law grants employers a powerful incentive to campaign for a vote of no representation."

With these words, published in a 1998 "labor studies" journal article, radical union lawyer Craig Becker dismissed the notion that workers should have any say whatsoever, whether as individuals or collectively by secret ballot or "card check," over whether or not they are unionized.

To try to justify his extremist position, Mr. Becker, then associate general counsel for the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) and the AFL-CIO, resorted to an extraordinary analogy:

Just as U.S. citizens cannot opt against having a congressman, he posited, workers should not be able to choose against having a union as their monopoly-bargaining agent.

It's Very 'Peculiar' Not to 'Require Employees in a Plant To Select a Bargaining Agent'!

Quoting with approval a leading union lawyer from the New Deal era, Mr. Becker bemoaned a "peculiar" feature of U.S. labor law: the fact that it "does not require employees in a plant to select a bargaining agent, if they do not want to."

Employees' only choice, proposed Mr. Becker, should be over which set of union officials get "exclusive" power to negotiate their wages, benefits, and work rules.

"Nearly 90 percent" of private-sector workers "lack [union monopoly] representation because the law does not mandate [it]," he complained.

Since most union bosses and Big Labor politicians today at least pay lip service to the notion that employees should have the right to make a choice against unionization of their workplace, one might be tempted to dismiss the 1998 rantings of Mr. Becker, despite his prestigious jobs, as crazy and unimportant.

One might, except that Mr. Becker, along with two other ex-union lawyers, is now part of the dominant faction on the powerful National Labor Relations Board (NLRB)!

The five-member NLRB, which has just four currently occupied seats, interprets and administers federal labor laws covering over 90% of businesses and private-sector employees.

This agency has for decades displayed a strong bias to expand Big Labor's power under federal law to force workers to pay union dues, or be fired.

But even so, the NLRB has taken a dramatic turn for the worse since March 27, 2010, when President Obama did the bidding of the union hierarchy by "recess" appointing Mr. Becker, along with another union lawyer he had nominated to the NLRB, New Yorker Mark Pearce.

Craig Becker has publicly lamented the fact that U.S. labor law does not "mandate" union monopoly bargaining.

Now Mr. Becker and other members of President Obama's NLRB are seeking to "fix" the law bureaucratically.

'Choice to Remain Unrepresented' Under Attack
Extremist Vision of Obama NLRB Appointee Moves Toward Realization

'Choice to Remain Unrepresented' Under Attack
Extremist Vision of Obama NLRB Appointee Moves Toward Realization

Craig Becker has publicly lamented the fact that U.S. labor law does not "mandate" union monopoly bargaining.

Now Mr. Becker and other members of President Obama's NLRB are seeking to "fix" the law bureaucratically.

The President had to resort to a recess appointment in Mr. Becker's case because the latter had turned out to be too radical even for a number of normally pro-forced unionism members of the Big Labor-controlled Senate.

Because of several union-label senators' defections, union lobbyists and the White House fell eight Senate votes short in February 2010 of the 60 they needed to cut off Right to Work debate and bring the Becker nomination up for final consideration.

Once on the NLRB, Mr. Becker and Mr. Pearce quickly found another soul mate in ex-union lawyer Wilma Liebman, originally appointed to the Board by union-label President Bill Clinton and elevated to the chairmanship by Barack Obama in early 2009.

And now Mr. Becker, Mr. Pearce, and Ms. Liebman are poised to impose sweeping changes to the current procedures through which Big Labor may obtain monopoly-bargaining privileges over workers.

In practice, these changes would eviscerate workers' right to choose against monopolistic union representation -- a right Craig Becker has openly suggested he doesn't think workers should ever have had.

According to Peter Kirsanow, a former NLRB member and a Right to Work supporter, the rules proposed by the Obama NLRB June 22 would have the effect of reducing "the median timeframe between the filing of a representation petition and the conduct