Microsoft Outlook

From: Farrell, Ellen
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:51 PM
To: Kearney, Barry J.; Sophir, Jayme; Szapiro, Miriam; Willen, Debra L
Subject: RE: question for daily story
Attachments: image001.jpg

Exemption 5

Ellen

Ellen Farrell
Deputy Associate General Counsel
Division of Advice, NLRB
202-273-3810
Ellen.Farrell@nlrb.gov

From: Kearney, Barry J.
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:39 PM
To: Farrell, Ellen; Sophir, Jayme; Szapiro, Miriam; Willen, Debra L
Subject: FW: question for daily story

From: Ahearn, Richard L.
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:23 PM
To: Kearney, Barry J.
Subject: FW: question for daily story

From: Cleeland, Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 12:18 PM
To: Ahearn, Richard L.
Subject: FW: question for daily story

From a Congressional Quarterly reporter, in case this sheds any light on the amendment

---

From: Lauren Smith [LaurenSmith@cqrollcall.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:12 PM
To: Cleeland, Nancy
Subject: RE: question for daily story

Here is a copy of the amendment:

They say it: "Strengthen the existing protection in the National Labor relations Act of state right-to-work law to ensure that state laws cannot be pre-empted by union contracts or the NLRB. It provides necessary clarity to prevent the NLRB from moving forward in their case against Boeing or attempting a similar strategy against other companies. It updates the current law with the following:

NLRB-FOIA-U00003711

Nothing in the Act shall be construed to limit the application of any State law that prohibits, or otherwise places restraints upon, agreements between labor organizations and employers, or that require the payment of dues or fees to such organizations, a condition of employment either before or after hiring."

From: Cleeland, Nancy [mailto:Nancy.Cleeland@nlrb.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:05 PM
To: Lauren Smith
Subject: RE: question for daily story

Hi Lauren,

I realize I was mistaken. I'd gotten the idea that this was a national right to work bill from another reporter; it turns out that's not what this is. We're trying to figure out exactly what it would do.

From: Lauren Smith [LaurenSmith@cqrollcall.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:03 PM
To: Cleeland, Nancy
Subject: question for daily story

Hey Nancy -- Thanks for helping me out with this. I really appreciate it!

For the daily story about Sens. Alexander and Graham's right-to-work legislation, I'd love to get a comment on the ramifications of the language, both for labor and for the NLRB. Something similar to what we talked about over the phone: That this is an attempt to mandate all states adopt right-to-work policies. That this legislation is really nothing new and has been introduced by the GOP many times before.

To give you a better sense of what I'm looking into for my feature story: I'm writing about the natural oscillation of the board and it's pro-union vs. pro-business decisions depending on which party is controlling the White House. My argument is that the Boeing case provides ammunition to those that are trying to prove the NLRB has an activist agenda, but in reality, the NLRB under Obama is no more pro-union than it was pro-business under the previous Bush administration. The NLRB is also under much greater scrutiny on the whole due to the larger labor environment. I would love to get a comment about the natural progression of the board becoming politicized, and how it's historically seesawed between pro-union and pro-business decisions based on the administration.

Thanks so much and please let me know if you have any questions! I'm on my cell today: 617-633-0425

Best,
Lauren

Lauren Smith
Staff Writer
lsmith@cq.com
(o): 202-650-6604 **please note new number!
(m): 617-633-0425

Congressional Quarterly
77 K St., NE
Washington, DC 20002

This e-mail may contain confidential material. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. It may also contain personal views which are not the views of CQ Roll Call or its owner, The Economist Group. We may monitor e-mail to and from our network. For company information go to http://legal.economistgroup.com.

CQ
ROLL
CALL