LAW OFFICES
WEBSTER, CHAMBERLAIN & BEAN
1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
(202) 785-9500
FAX: (202) 835-0243

ARTHUR L. HEROLD
ALAN P. DYE
EDWARD D. COLEMAN
KENT MASTERSON BROWN
BURKETT VAN KIRK
FRANK M. NORTHAM
JOHN W. HAZARD, JR.
CHARLES M. WATKINS
HUGH K. WEBSTER
DAVID P. GOCH
BRENLEY LOCKE ELIAS
DAVID L. FINCH*
*NOT ADMITTED IN D.C.

GEORGE D. WEBSTER (1921-1996)
OF COUNSEL
J. COLEMAN BEAN
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

November 21, 1997

Dawn M. Odrowski, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
Sixth Floor
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: MUR 3774
National Right to Work Committee

Dear Ms. Odrowski:

The National Right to Work Committee recently discovered additional documents that are responsive to the requests contained in your letter of September 4, 1997.

The documents have been organized in accordance with the separate numbered paragraphs in your September 4 letter and each batch of documents is accompanied by a cover sheet identifying the paragraphs of your letter to which that group of documents is responsive.

Sincerely,

Frank M. Northam

Frank M. Northam

Enclosures
FMN/ctb

cc: National Right to Work Committee

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
Witness Subpoena to	)	MUR 3774
The National Right to	)	
Work Committee	)	

DOCUMENTS FROM NRTWC

Supplemental Submission in Response to
Letter from FEC dated 9/4/97

Item 1.a.

PRODUCTION APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(Attach to FINAL copy)

DATE: 10/13/92

PACKAGE: (SC) '92 FED Surv. Res. Senate Post

FROM: Pbls x264

HAVE ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES BEEN MADE? ☒ YES ☐ NO

PROOFING:

1ST PB/SMZ 10/13 REVISION NEEDED no

2ND SMZ/PB 10/13 REVISION NEEDED no

3RD SDK/PB 10/14 REVISION NEEDED No

4TH _____ REVISION NEEDED _____

5TH _____ REVISION NEEDED _____

6TH _____ REVISION NEEDED _____

FINAL COPY APPROVED? ☑ YES ☐ NO DATE: 10/13

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fritz Hollings-D (803) 723-0700	- - - - - - - - -
Tommy Hartnett-R (803) 720-8860	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

District 1	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Bill Oberst-D (803) 527-4946	- - - - - - - - -
Arthur Ravenel, Jr.-R (803) 722-0174	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y

District 2	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Floyd Spence-R (803) 254-5120	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y

District 3	
James Bland-R (803) 641-1408	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Butler Derrick-D (803) 225-5301	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y

District 4	
Liz Patterson-D (803) 582-3650	- - - - - - - - -
Bob Inglis-R (803) 242-6440	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

District 5	
John Spratt-D (803) 327-1114	- - - - - - - - -
William Horne-R (803) 494-2641	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y

District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D (803) 929-0208	- - - - - - - - -
John Chase-R (803) 669-8787	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

SC

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fritz Hollings-D (803) 779-8400	- - - - - - - - -
Tommy Hartnett-R (803) 884-4244	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Bill Oberst-D (803) 527-4946	- - - - - - - - -
Arthur Ravenel, Jr.-R (803) 722-0174	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 2	
Floyd Spence-R (803) 254-5120	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
District 3	
James Bland-R (803) 641-1408	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Butler Derrick-D (803) 225-5301	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y
District 4	
Liz Patterson-D (803) 582-3650	- - - - - - - - -
Bob Inglis-R (803) 242-6440	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
John Spratt-D (803) 327-1114	- - - - - - - - -
William Horne-R (803) 494-2641	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y
District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D (803) 929-0208	- - - - - - - - -
John Chase-R (803) 669-8787	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

PRODUCTION APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(Attach to FINAL copy)

DATE: 10/13/92

PACKAGE: (UT) '92 FED Surv. Results Senate Roster

FROM: Bls x 264

HAVE ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES BEEN MADE? ☐ YES ☐ NO

PROOFING:

1ST PB/SMZ 10/13 REVISION NEEDED no

2ND SMZ/PB 10/13 REVISION NEEDED no

3RD SDK/PB 10/14 REVISION NEEDED no

4TH _____ REVISION NEEDED _____

5TH _____ REVISION NEEDED _____

6TH _____ REVISION NEEDED _____

FINAL COPY APPROVED? ☑ YES ☐ NO DATE: 10/13/92

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 486-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 521-9534	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 524-4394	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 583-2635	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

26048

730-17 46796.72

DMC - Postage for Fed. Survey Senate Target Specials

COST ANALYSIS SHEET

MAILING Federal Senate Target + Special Results - General Election-

CODES/COUNTS CO, ID, NC, NH, NV, SC, VT Q20908 / U20538

DROP DATE CLASS TOTAL DROPPED 161,372

PACKAGE:

		Overage	Cost Per M	Cost
Printing	Letter } See Mailing			
	Roster			
	Reply			
	Carrier #10			
Envelopes				
	BRE 6 3/4-RL	#27	6.95	1,121.54
Mailing	DMC	#17	258.77	41,758.23
Postage		#17	290.32	46,848.68
Wiland		#17	7.11	1,147.85
List Company				
Typesetting				
Misc.				

Total For #17 = 89,754.76
Total For #27 = 1,121.54
90,876.30

SUB TOTAL
COST PER PKG.
PLUS OVERAGE
TOTAL COST

PRINTED BY THE STANDARD REGISTER COMPANY U.S.A. ZIPSET

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

P.O. No. C 12214

THIS ORDER NO. MUST APPEAR ON ALL INVOICES

PURCHASE ORDER

☐ STATE ACTIVITIES ☐ PUBLIC RELATIONS ☐ MEMBERSHIP ☐ GENERAL PROGRAMS ☒ SPECIAL PROJECTS

TO
Neodata
Attn: May Haddad

SHIP TO
Tape to DMC no later than Fri. 10/16/92

DATE	DATE REQUIRED	RE:
10/13/92	10/16/92	Fed. Target Specials

QUANTITY	DESCRIPTION	PER M	
	May, attached is a grid for the target specials we will be doing for Fed. Survey. Select only the states on this grid as indicated. Repull the Active records using the current D/A file. Use the Exp., Supp., Poli-donors, CO MIST & CO D&B from the Sept. NL tapes. (Use the NH D&B file after the deletes (we used it in the Oct. NL). The Exp., Supporters, Poli, D&B (except NH) and CO MIST will be cross checked against the deletes & xxxxxxxxxxxx and address change program. (D&B & MIST will only have deletes.) Omit flags A,M,N,O,J,2 from new active selects and old expire selects. Assign mail keys as indicated. Provide 2 tapes for DMC, each in zip sequence - one for Act., Exp., Supp. & Poli, and one for D&B & MIST. Include name and address, mail key and newly applied sequence numbers. IMPORTANT: EACH OF THE TWO TAPES MUST HAVE DIFFERENT SEQUENCE NUMBERS. Provide counts by mail key by state ASAP - Thur. if at all possible. Tapes must be correct & at DMC by FRI. 10/16/92. Mail Key — Select A — Active D/A targets. Omit flags A,M,N,O,J,2. B — Inactive D/A targets. Omit flags A,M,N,O,J,2. C — Supporter targets. D — Poli-Donor targets. Omit flags E,D,P,R,S. E — MIST targets. F — D&B targets.		

INCLUDE SC SUPPORTERS from state files or Oct. NL - whichever is cheaper.

PLEASE INVOICE IN DUPLICATE

PRINTERS: PLEASE SEND ONE SAMPLE

Federal Target Special Counts

STATE/CD	ACTIVE NL	Cost $	ACTIVE BAL	Cost $	INACTIVE	Cost $	SUPPORTER	Cost $	MIST	Cost $	POLIDONER	Cost $	D&B	Cost $	GRAND TOTAL	Cost $
CO	1,999	$1,099	637	$350	10,539	$5,796	20,418	$11,230	5,919	$3,255			8,897	$4,893	49,344 ~~49,409~~	$26,625
ID	724	$398	329	$181	4,067	$2,237	5,924	$3,258			2,443	$1,344			13,785 ~~10,487~~	$7,418
NC	2,535	$1,394	1,013	$557	9,660	$5,313	19,236	$10,580							31,833 32,444	$17,844
~~ND~~	~~550~~	~~$303~~	~~237~~	~~$130~~	~~8,290~~	~~$1,780~~	~~6,140~~	~~$3,377~~							~~10,169~~	~~$5,590~~
NH	905	$498	245	$135	2,778	$1,528	7,313	$4,022	~~20,000~~	~~$11,000~~			19,088	$10,498	29,956 ~~[illegible]~~	$27,691
NV	592	$326	238	$131	2,196	$1,208	3,281	$1,805							6,670 ~~6,889~~	$3,469
SC	1,240	$682	483	$266	5,676	$3,122	9,396	$5,168							16,666 ~~16,795~~	$9,237
UT	762	$419	286	$157	5,106	$2,808	9,088	$4,998			934	$514			15,947 ~~16,176~~	$8,897
Total Survey	*9,307*	*$5,119*	*3,468*	*$1,907*	*43,258*	*$23,792*	*80,796*	*$44,438*	*25,919*	*$14,255*	*3,377*	*$1,857*	*27,985*	*$15,392*	*194,110*	*$106,761*

161,476

90,

BE

DAK/ARL- Final Fed Survey
Body t. PROCEED!

165m

AR
WA
SD
ND

SMS -

Sketchy instructions for Fed Sup Senate Special Results -

Follow Grid - CO, ID, NC, [redacted] NH, NV, SC, UT



NEODATA
1101 INTERNATIONAL PARKWAY
FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA 22403-5445
(703) 752-2541

REMIT CHECKS TO:
NEODATA DATABASE MARKETING SERVICES,
P.O. BOX 25504
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23260-5504

FEIN: 54-0888925

INVOICE NO. 111654

WORK ORDER NUMBER	ACCOUNT NO.	CUSTOMER P.O.	DATE
74771	00101	12214	OCTOBER 31, 1992

SOLD TO:

NRTWC
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD VA 22160
ATTN: GINA GUNN

734 - $34.80
736 - $1093.08

SHIPPED TO:

C 593 F ____ I ____
ROUTE TO: ~~SMS~~
APPROVED: SMS
DEPT# 14 ACCT# ____

INVOICE

FUNCTION PERFORMED - DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	EXTENSION	ACC'T CODE
NRTW XC SELECT				
SORT NL MIST CO	5,919	MIN CHG	30.00	
SORT NL DB CO	8,897	MIN CHG	30.00	
SORT FOREIGH REELS 3232	393	MIN CHG	30.00	
SORT FOREIGN REEL 3231	762	MIN CHG	30.00	
CROSS CHECKS:				
NL MIST CO VS 3232 DELETES				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	5,919	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	393	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS NO MATCH	5,527	MIN CHG	21.50	
NL DB CO VS 3231 DELETES				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	8,897	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	762	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS NO MATCH	8,142	MIN CHG	21.50	
PASS MIST CO NO MATCH TO PLUG E				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	5,527	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS	5,527	MIN CHG	21.50	
PASS D@B CO NO MATCH TO PLUG F				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	8,142	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	19,088	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS	27,230	MIN CHG	21.50	
SORT TO APPLY SEQUENCE # DB MIST	32,757	1.35/M	44.22	
SORT ON ZIP	32,757	1.35/M	44.22	
REFORMAT FOR MAIL OUT TAPE	32,757	MIN CHG	35.00	
SELECT FROM MF 9*92				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	156,506 ~~192,373~~	.35/M	54.77 ~~67.33~~	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS ACT SELA	15,112	MIN CHG	21.50	

PAGE 1 OF 2

TERMS NET 30

TOTAL→ ~~1160.41~~ 1147.85

Charged 11 ... per Max ...

NEODATA
1101 INTERNATIONAL PARKWAY
FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA 22403-5445
(703) 752-2541

REMIT CHECKS TO:
NEODATA DATABASE MARKETING SERVICES, IN
P.O. BOX 25504
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23260-5504

FEIN: 54-0888925

INVOICE NO. 111655

WORK ORDER NUMBER	ACCOUNT NO.	CUSTOMER P.O.	DATE
74771	00101	12214	OCTOBER 31, 1992

SOLD TO:

NRTWC
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD VA 22160
ATTN: GINA GUNN

SHIPPED TO:

INVOICE

FUNCTION PERFORMED - DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	EXTENSION	ACC'T CODE
CROSS CHECKS:				
POLI VS POLI CHANGES & DELETES				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	3,631	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	633	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS	3,341	MIN CHG	21.50	
SUPPORTERS VS SUPPORTERS CHANGES & DELETES				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	74,656	.35/M	26.13	
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	5,982	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS	72,565	.35/M	25.40	
INACTIVES VS INACTIVES CHANGES & DELETES				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	39,763	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	4,349	MIN CHG	21.50	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS	37,993	MIN CHG	21.50	
SORT ON ZIP	129,002	1.35/M	174.15	
PASS TO APPLY SEQ#'S				
PROCESS INPUT RECORDS	129,002	.35/M	45.15	
PROCESS OUTPUT RECORDS	129,002	.35/M	45.15	
REFORMAT FOR MAILOUT TAPE	129,002	.70/M	90.30	
SHIPPING AND HANDLING CHARGES				
FED EX WAYBILL #'S DATE				
9103324425 10-16			745 34.86	

PAGE 2 OF 2

TERMS NET 30

TOTAL→ 1,160.41

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

P.O. No. C 18880

THIS ORDER NO. MUST APPEAR ON ALL INVOICES

PURCHASE ORDER

☐ STATE ACTIVITIES ☐ PUBLIC RELATIONS ☐ MEMBERSHIP ☐ GENERAL PROGRAMS ☐ SPECIAL PROJECTS

TO

DMC

ATTN: DOUG ACHILLES

SHIP TO Dup 10/23/92

DATE	DATE REQUIRED	RE:
10/13/92	10/23/92	FEDERAL SURVEY SENATE SPECIALS

QUANTITY	DESCRIPTION	PER M	PRICE
	Doug, please process the following:		
165m	Overview: Approx. 165m to drop 1st class. 7 states. 7 Letter versions. 7 rosters. 1 Generic reply. Letter copy to come via fax 10/14. Reply, Letterhead & signature to come 10/14 via Fed Ex. Roster art to come 10/15 & 10/16 via Fed Ex. Fax sign offs okay for all. See package specs. Detailed P.O. to come. Sequence # Okay on carrier, Pg. 1 & 2.	258.77	42,697.05
	States: CO, ID, NC, NH, NV, SC, UT		
	Package: LETTER - 2 pg/2 sheet 60# white offset 9 1/2 x 11 w/pinfeeds. 1/0 & 1/0 (Note: NH might be 1/1 & 1/0. We'll know by 10/14 am). Letterhead & sig. PMS 288 blue. Laser pg. 1 & 2. Various signature placements based on state. REPLY - Generic 8 1/2 x 5 1/2. Blue 50#, 1/1 black. ROSTER - 8 1/2 x 10 (if possible, TBD). 50# or 60# yellow. Prints 1/1 black. BRE - 6 3/4 uncoded. CARRIER - #10 Closed face 60# white offset. Diagonal seams; gum for live. Laser cornercard & name & address on carrier style font.		
	Please call with any questions or problems.		
	Thank you.		

PLEASE INVOICE IN DUPLICATE

PRINTERS: PLEASE SEND ONE SAMPLE WITH EACH INVOICE.

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DESK

DIRECT MAIL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
FOREST SQUARE
P.O. BOX 143 PH. 804-525-0155
FOREST, VA 24551

INVOICE
02946

SALESPERSON	DATE OF INVOICE
	10-28-92

SHIP TO
DMC JOB # 4116

NRTW Survey Target Speciale

TO: National Right to Work
8001 Braddock Road
Springfield, Virginia 22151

CCOUNT NO.	DATE SHIPPED	SHIPPED VIA	COL	P.P.	F.O.B. POINT	TERMS	YOUR ORDER NUMBER
							18880

QUANTITY	DESCRIPTION	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT
161,372	Names	$258.77/m	$41,758.23
	Postage In: Client #26048 $46,796.72		
	Less Postage Used: - 46,848.68		
	$ 51.96		51.96
	720=40% $16,703.29		
	734=26% $10,857.14		
	737=34% $14,197.80		
	C 506 F 1		
	ROUTE TO: ARL		
	APPROVED: gaf		
	DEPT# 170 ACCT# XI		
		TOTAL	$41,810.19

Thank You

1024921742

1/1 & 1/0. We'll know by 10/14 am).
Letterhead & sig. PMS 288 blue. Laser
pg. 1 & 2. Various signature placements
based on state.
REPLY - Generic 8 1/2 x 5 1/2. Blue 50#, 1/1 black.
ROSTER - 8 1/2 x 10 (if possible, TBD). 50# or 60#
yellow. Prints 1/1 black.
BRE - 6 3/4 uncoded.
CARRIER - #10 Closed face 60# white offset. Diagonal
seams; gum for live. Laser cornercard &
name & address on carrier style font.

Please call with any questions or problems.

Thank you.

PLEASE INVOICE IN DUPLICATE

PRINTERS: PLEASE SEND ONE SAMPLE WITH EACH INVOICE.

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

BOOKKEEPING

FEDERAL EXPRESS

AIRBILL

USE THIS AIRBILL FOR DOMESTIC SHIPMENTS WITHIN THE CONTINENTAL U.S.A., ALASKA AND HAWAII.
USE THE INTERNATIONAL AIR WAYBILL FOR SHIPMENTS TO PUERTO RICO.
QUESTIONS? CALL 800-238-5355 TOLL FREE.

PACKAGE TRACKING NUMBER 3858500030

9172N 3858500030

SENDER'S COPY

Sender's Federal Express Account Number: 0200-1271-4
Date: 10/19/92

1 From (Your Name) Please Print: Morgan Birge
Your Phone Number (Very Important): (703) 321-9820
Company: NATL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE
Department/Floor No.:
Street Address: 8001 BRADDOCK RD SUITE 500
City: SPRINGFIELD State: VA ZIP Required: 22151

2 To (Recipient's Name) Please Print: Doug Achilles
Recipient's Phone Number (Very Important): (804) 525-0155
Company: Direct Mail Communications
Department/Floor No.:
Exact Street Address (We Cannot Deliver to P.O. Boxes or P.O. Zip Codes.): Rt. 221 Forest Square Plaza
City: Forest State: VA ZIP Required: 24551

3 YOUR BILLING REFERENCE INFORMATION (FIRST 24 CHARACTERS WILL APPEAR ON INVOICE.): Fed Special Targets

5 IF HOLD FOR PICK-UP, Print FEDEX Address Here
Street Address:
City: State: ZIP Required:

PAYMENT [X] Bill Sender [ ] Bill Recipient's FedEx Acct. No. [ ] Bill 3rd Party FedEx Acct. No. [ ] Bill Credit Card [ ] Cash
Expiration Date

4 SERVICES

1 [X] PRIORITY 1 Overnight Delivery
2 [ ] COURIER-PAK OVERNIGHT ENVELOPE*
3 [ ] OVERNIGHT BOX
4 [ ] OVERNIGHT TUBE
5 [ ] STANDARD AIR Delivery not later than second business day
6 [ ] OVERNIGHT LETTER*
7 [ ]
8 [ ]
9 [ ]
10 [ ]
* Declared Value Limit $100.

DELIVERY AND SPECIAL HANDLING

1 [ ] HOLD FOR PICK-UP (Fill in Box 5)
2 [X] DELIVER WEEKDAY
3 DELIVER SATURDAY (Extra charge) [ ]
4 [ ] DANGEROUS GOODS (Extra charge)
5 [ ] CONSTANT SURVEILLANCE SERVICE (CSS) (Extra charge) (Release Signature Not Applicable)
6 [ ] DRY ICE ____ Lbs.
7 [ ] OTHER SPECIAL SERVICE ____
8 [ ]
9 [ ] SATURDAY PICK-UP (Extra charge)
10 [ ]
11 [ ]
12 [ ] HOLIDAY DELIVERY (If offered) (Extra charge)

PACKAGES	WEIGHT IN POUNDS ONLY	YOUR DECLARED VALUE (See right)	OVER SIZE
Total	Total	Total	

Received At
1 [ ] Regular Stop
2 [ ] On-Call Stop
3 [ ] Drop Box 4 [ ] B.S.C. 5 [ ] Station

FEDEX Corp. Employee No.

Date/Time for FEDEX Use

SERVICE CONDITIONS, DECLARED VALUE AND LIMIT OF LIABILITY

Use of this airbill constitutes your agreement to the service conditions in our current Service Guide which is available upon request. See back of sender's copy of this airbill for further information.

We will not be responsible for any claim in excess of $100 per package, whether the result of loss, damage, delay or non-delivery, unless you specify a higher amount in the space to the left, pay 40¢ per additional $100 specified and document your actual loss in the event of a claim. Maximum amount limitations found in the current Federal Express Service Guide apply. Your rights to recover from Federal Express for loss of the intrinsic value of the package, as well as for loss of sales, income, interest, profit, attorneys fees, costs and any other form of damage whether direct, incidental, consequential or special is limited to the greater of $100 or the declared value specified to the left. In no event shall your recovery exceed your actual loss.

In the event of untimely delivery, Federal Express will at your request and with some limitations, refund all transportation charges paid. See Service Guide for further information.

6 Sender authorizes Federal Express to deliver this shipment without obtaining a delivery signature and shall indemnify and hold harmless Federal Express from any claims resulting therefrom.

Release Signature:

Federal Express Use
Base Charges
Declared Value Charge
Other 1
Other 2
Total Charges

PART 111800
REVISION DATE 10/89
PRINTED IN U.S.A. NCREC
009
© 1988 FEC

SENDER'S COPY

TOSE' 4SE' 10' 02

FEDERAL EXPRESS

AIRBILL

USE THIS AIRBILL FOR DOMESTIC SHIPMENTS WITHIN THE CONTINENTAL U.S.A., ALASKA AND HAWAII.
USE THE INTERNATIONAL AIR WAYBILL FOR SHIPMENTS TO PUERTO RICO.
QUESTIONS? CALL 800-238-5355 TOLL FREE.

PACKAGE TRACKING NUMBER 3858500052

9172N 3858500052

SENDER'S COPY

Sender's Federal Express Account Number: 0200-1271-4
Date: 10/22/92

1 From (Your Name) Please Print: Morgan Birge
Your Phone Number (Very Important): (703) 32109820
Company: NATL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE
Department/Floor No.:
Street Address: 8001 BRADDOCK RD SUITE 500
City: SPRINGFIELD State: VA ZIP Required: 22151

2 To (Recipient's Name) Please Print: Clyde Sisk
Recipient's Phone Number (Very Important): (301) 643-7900
Company: Sisk Mailing Service
Department/Floor No.:
Exact Street Address (We Cannot Deliver to P.O. Boxes or P.O. Zip Codes.): 7 Chesapeake Bay Business Park
City: Stevensville, State: MD ZIP Required: 21666

3 YOUR BILLING REFERENCE INFORMATION (FIRST 24 CHARACTERS WILL APPEAR ON INVOICE.)
Fed. Survey Special Targets

4 PAYMENT: [X] Bill Sender [ ] Bill Recipient's FedEx Acct. No. [ ] Bill 3rd Party FedEx Acct. No. [ ] Bill Credit Card [ ] Cash
Expiration Date

IF HOLD FOR PICK-UP, Print FEDEX Address Here
Street Address
City State ZIP Required

4 SERVICES

1 [X] PRIORITY 1 Overnight Delivery
2 [ ] COURIER-PAK OVERNIGHT ENVELOPE*
3 [ ] OVERNIGHT BOX
4 [ ] OVERNIGHT TUBE
5 [ ] STANDARD AIR Delivery not later than second business day
6 [ ] OVERNIGHT LETTER*
7 [ ]
8 [ ]
9 [ ]
10 [ ]

* Declared Value Limit $100.

DELIVERY AND SPECIAL HANDLING

1 [ ] HOLD FOR PICK-UP (Fill in Box 4)
2 [X] DELIVER WEEKDAY
3 DELIVER SATURDAY (Extra charge) [ ]
4 [ ] DANGEROUS GOODS (Extra charge)
5 [ ] CONSTANT SURVEILLANCE SERVICE (CSS) (Extra charge) (Release Signature Not Applicable)
6 [ ] DRY ICE _____ Lbs.
7 [ ] OTHER SPECIAL SERVICE _____
8 [ ]
9 [ ] SATURDAY PICK-UP (Extra charge)
10 [ ]
11 [ ]
12 [ ] HOLIDAY DELIVERY (If offered) (Extra charge)

PACKAGES	WEIGHT IN POUNDS ONLY	YOUR DECLARED VALUE (See right)	OTHER SIZE
Total	Total	Total	

Received At
1 [ ] Regular Stop
2 [ ] On-Call Stop
3 [ ] Drop Box 4 [ ] B.S.C. 5 [ ] Station

FEDEX Corp. Employee No.

Date/Time for FEDEX Use

SERVICE CONDITIONS, DECLARED VALUE AND LIMIT OF LIABILITY

Use of this airbill constitutes your agreement to the service conditions in our current Service Guide which is available upon request. See back of sender's copy of this airbill for further information.

We will not be responsible for any claim in excess of $100 per package, whether the result of loss, damage, delay or non-delivery, unless you specify a higher amount in the space to the left, pay 40¢ per additional $100 specified and document your actual loss in the event of a claim. Maximum amount limitations found in the current Federal Express Service Guide apply. Your rights to recover from Federal Express for loss of the intrinsic value of the package, as well as for loss of sales, income, interest, profit, attorneys fees, costs and any other form of damage whether direct, incidental, consequential or special is limited to the greater of $100 or the declared value specified to the left. In no event shall your recovery exceed your actual loss.

In the event of untimely delivery, Federal Express will at your request and with some limitations, refund all transportation charges paid. See Service Guide for further information.

5 Sender authorizes Federal Express to deliver this shipment without obtaining a delivery signature and shall indemnify and hold harmless Federal Express from any claims resulting therefrom.

Release Signature: _____

Federal Express Use
Base Charges
Declared Value Charge
Other 1
Other 2
Total Charges

PART 111800
REVISION DATE 10/88
PRINTED IN U.S.A. NCREC
009
© 1988 F.E.C.

SENDER'S COPY

3858 485 40 03

FEDERAL EXPRESS

AIRBILL

USE THIS AIRBILL FOR DOMESTIC SHIPMENTS WITHIN THE CONTINENTAL U.S.A., ALASKA AND HAWAII.
USE THE INTERNATIONAL AIR WAYBILL FOR SHIPMENTS TO PUERTO RICO.
QUESTIONS? CALL 800-238-5355 TOLL FREE.

PACKAGE TRACKING NUMBER 3858500026

9172N 3858500026

SENDER'S COPY

Sender's Federal Express Account Number	Date
0200-1271-4	10/15/92

1 From (Your Name) Please Print: Morgan Birge
Your Phone Number (Very Important): (703) 321-9820
Company: NATL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE
Department/Floor No.:
Street Address: 8001 BRADDOCK RD SUITE 500
City: SPRINGFIELD State: VA ZIP Required: 22151

2 To (Recipient's Name) Please Print: Doug Achilles
Recipient's Phone Number (Very Important): (804) 525-0155
Company: Direct Mail Communications
Department/Floor No.:
Exact Street Address (We Cannot Deliver to P.O. Boxes or P.O. Zip Codes.): Rt. 221 Forest Square
City: Forest State: VA ZIP Required: 24551

3 YOUR BILLING REFERENCE INFORMATION (FIRST 24 CHARACTERS WILL APPEAR ON INVOICE.)
Federal Survey Special Targets

PAYMENT [X] Bill Sender [ ] Bill Recipient's FedEx Acct. No. [ ] Bill 3rd Party FedEx Acct. No. [ ] Bill Credit Card [ ] Cash
Expiration Date ___/___

IF HOLD FOR PICK-UP, Print FEDEX Address Here
Street Address:
City: State: ZIP Required:

4 SERVICES

1 [X] PRIORITY 1 Overnight Delivery
2 [ ] COURIER-PAK OVERNIGHT ENVELOPE*
3 [ ] OVERNIGHT BOX
4 [ ] OVERNIGHT TUBE
5 [ ] STANDARD AIR Delivery not later than second business day
6 [X] OVERNIGHT LETTER*
7 [ ]
8 [ ]
9 [ ]
10 [ ]

*Declared Value Limit $100

DELIVERY AND SPECIAL HANDLING

1 [ ] HOLD FOR PICK-UP (Fill in Box 4)
2 [X] DELIVER WEEKDAY
3 DELIVER SATURDAY (Extra charge) [ ]
4 DANGEROUS GOODS (Extra charge)
5 CONSTANT SURVEILLANCE SERVICE (CSS) (Extra charge) (Release Signature Not Applicable)
6 DRY ICE _____ Lbs.
7 OTHER SPECIAL SERVICE _____
8
9 SATURDAY PICK-UP (Extra charge)
10
11
12 HOLIDAY DELIVERY (If offered) (Extra charge)

PACKAGES	WEIGHT IN POUNDS ONLY	FEDEX DECLARED VALUE (See right)	OVER SIZE
Total	Total	Total	

Received At
1 [ ] Regular Stop
2 [ ] On-Call Stop
3 [ ] Drop Box 4 [ ] B.S.C. 5 [ ] Station

FEDEX Corp. Employee No.

Date/Time for FEDEX Use

SERVICE CONDITIONS, DECLARED VALUE AND LIMIT OF LIABILITY

Use of this airbill constitutes your agreement to the service conditions in our current Service Guide which is available upon request. See back of sender's copy of this airbill for further information.

We will not be responsible for any claim in excess of $100 per package, whether the result of loss, damage, delay or non-delivery, unless you specify a higher amount in the space to the left, pay 40¢ per additional $100 specified and document your actual loss in the event of a claim. Maximum amount limitations found in the current Federal Express Service Guide apply. Your rights to recover from Federal Express for loss of the intrinsic value of the package, as well as for loss of sales, income, interest, profit, attorney's fees, costs and any other form of damage whether direct, incidental, consequential or special is limited to the greater of $100 or the declared value specified to the left. In no event shall your recovery exceed your actual loss.

In the event of untimely delivery, Federal Express will at your request and with some limitations, refund all transportation charges paid. See Service Guide for further information.

5 Sender authorizes Federal Express to deliver this shipment without obtaining a delivery signature and shall indemnify and hold harmless Federal Express from any claims resulting therefrom.

Release Signature: _____

Federal Express Use
Base Charges
Declared Value Charge
Other 1
Other 2
Total Charges

PART 111600 REVISED DATE 10/89
PRINTED IN U.S.A. NCREC
009
© 1988 F.E.C.

SENDER'S COPY

5052 465 10 02

MEMO

To:

From:

Date:

Q20908-

U20538

WILLIAMS
PRINTERS & PUBLISHERS

RAY WOLFF

(703) 550-1200

FAX: (703) 550-1232 TDD: (703) 550-8430
8533-B Terminal Road • Lorton, Virginia 22079

| PRICE QUOTE |

DIRECT MAIL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
P.O. Box 143 Forest, Va. 24551
(804) 525-0155

| PRICE QUOTE |

DATE: 10/15/92
QUOTE NO.: 0208-NW
SALES REP: TIM PEARSON

DROP DATE: 10/23/92
PAGE: 1/1
PREPARED BY: KDW

QUOTATION FOR: NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK

JOB TITLE: FEDERAL SURVEY SENATE SPECIALS
QUANTITY: 165,000

DESCRIPTION AND PRICING

CARRIER: #10 CF, NO PRINTING, 60# WO, PERSONALIZED

BRE/RE: #6 3/4, SUPPLIED

LETTER: 8 1/2 X 11, 2SHT/2PG, 1/0, 60# WO, 1 & 2 PERSONALIZED

REPLY: 5 1/2 X 8 1/2, 1/1, 50# BLUE OFFSET, GENERIC

OTHER: ROSTER- 8 1/2 X 10, 1/1, 60# CANARY, GENERIC

OTHER:

OTHER: N/A

MAILSHOP: BURST/TRIM/FOLD/INSERT(2-WAY MATCH)
APPLY POSTAGE/BAG/TAG/MAIL

COMPUTER/PERSONALIZATION: CONVERT/SORT/SPLIT/CODE/SUPRESS
LASER CARRIER, AND PGS 1 & 2 OF LETTER

OUR PRICING: 258.77/M PLUS POSTAGE

NOTES TO BID:

This estimate is based on the above specifications. Any changes may affect the price. We will bill any plate changes at a flat rate. If 4/color seps are not provided, DMC will bill client at cost for seps. Before the drop date can be confirmed, a ready date for art and tapes should be agreed upon. Any changes in these dates may affect drop date.

2053 '262 '80 '02

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸ 1

To Amos Lock	From Doug Achilles
Co. NRTW	Co. DMC
Dept.	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

NRTW #416

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

SENDER'S STATEMENT AND CERTIFICATE OF BULK MAILING OF MATTER PAID WITH STAMPS OR METER POSTAGE

(Part 931 Domestic Mail Manual)

MAILER: Prepare this statement in ink. Affix in block to right uncanceled postage stamps covering fee. Present for certification.

Postage (stamps ... in payment of fee to be affixed here and canc...

FEE FOR CERTIFICATE

Up to 1,000 pieces *(1 certificate for total number)*

For each additional 1,000 pieces, or fraction

Duplicate copy

TO: Postmaster, *(City and State)* FOREST, VA 24551

Presented herewith is the mail described below.

NUMBER OF IDENTICAL PIECES	WHAT CLASS OF MAIL	POSTAGE EACH SUBJECT TO	NUMBER OF PIECES TO THE POUND	TOTAL NUMBER OF POUNDS	TOTAL POSTAGE PAID	FEE PAID
161,372	F/C	.29¢			46,797.88	50.80

MAILED FOR	MAILED BY	PER
NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK	DMC P. O. BOX 143 FOREST, VA 24551	D. Collins

POSTMASTER'S CERTIFICATE

It is hereby certified that the above-described mailing has been received and number of pieces and postage verified.

M. INGRAM *(Postmaster)* By E. Miller

PS Form 3606
Sep. 1981

☆ U.S.G.P.O. 1980 262-474/05532

9055 "685" 10" 02

FAX
COVER SHEET

Direct Mail Communications
Rt. 221 P.O. Box 143 Forest, VA 24551
Phone: (804) 525-0155
Fax: (804) 525-5450

TO: NRTW DATE: 10-22-92
ATTENTION: Amos Loch
FROM: Doug Achilles PAGE 1 OF 1
SUBJECT: Smary Target Special Job

COMMENTS: Amos - We'll be off the insertion and in the mail by 2pm. today. Everything has gone fine.

I've lost my voice so if you need anything a fax might be our best means of communication.

Thanks!

Doug

20.04.2097.3051

WORK ORDER NUMBER: 074771 PREPARED BY NEODATA SERVICES, INC. PAGE 22
ACCOUNT NUMBER : 00101 FILE LAYOUT INFORMATION 15:13 10/15/92
TEAM ID : 1A4
DSN : COC.A2D00101.WC74771.P555035.D8.MST.MIO A3562LS0

DICTIONARY NAME: Z1W43B4A BRTW BP 6-91 SATURN
INPUT QUANTITY: 32,757

NEODATA KEYWORD	DESCRIPTION	POS	LEN	FMT	DECIMAL	DATE FMT	# RECS WITH DATA PRESENT	% RECS WITH DATA PRESENT
PREFIX	PREFIX	1	15	C	C		26,367	80.49
NAME	BASE	16	30	C	C		32,742	99.95
SUFFIX	SUFFIX	46	15	C	C		1,057	3.22
FUNCTTL	FUNCTIONAL TITLE	61	30	C	C		25,957	79.24
COMPANY	COMPANY	91	30	C	C		25,373	77.44
XLINE	XLINE	121	30	C	C		8,334	25.44
STREET	STREET	151	30	C	C		32,717	99.87
CITY	CITY	181	15	C	C		32,757	100.00
STATE	STATE	196	2	C	C		32,757	100.00
POSTCD		198	9	C	C			
ZIP	5 DIGIT ZIP	198	5	C	C		32,757	100.00
PLUS4	PLUS4 CODE	203	4	C	C		0	0.00
USER2	SEQUENCE NUMBER	207	7	C	C		32,757	100.00
USER1	KEYLINE	214	14	C	C		32,757	100.00
SALUTE	SALUTATION W/DEFAULT	228	48	C	C		32,757	100.00
LALOC	SURNAME LOC	276	1	F	C		32,742	99.95
LELNG	SURNAME LENGTH	277	1	F	C		32,742	99.95
MAILKEY	MAILKEY	278	6	C	C		32,757	100.00

FORMAT KEY - C=CHARACTER Z=ZONED DECIMAL (NUMERIC) F=FIXED POINT BINARY (HEXADECIMAL) B=BINARY P=PACKED

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 16, 1992 11:48AM P.03

WORK ORDER NUMBER: 074771
SUBJECT NUMBER : 00101
DRAM ID : 1A4
DSN : CDC.NEDC0101.W074771.P555039.F-D.TC

PREPARED BY NEODATA SERVICES, INC.
FILE LAYOUT INFORMATION

A3962LSG

DICTIONARY NAME: E1351000 NEW DICTIONARY
INPUT QUANTITY: 129,002

NEODATA KEYWORD	DESCRIPTION	POS	LEN	FMT	DECIMAL	DATE FMT	# RECS WITH DATA PRESENT	% RECS WITH DATA PRESENT
POSTCD	5 DIGIT POSTAL CODE	1	5	C	0		129,002	100.00
FILL1	FILLER	6	8	C	0		0	0.00
PREFIX	PERSONAL PREFIX	14	11	C	0		109,517	84.89
NAME	NAME FIELD	25	27	C	0		129,002	100.00
SUFFIX	PERSONAL SUFFIX	52	3	C	0		5,106	3.95
COMPANY	2ND LINE - ADDRESS (Co)	55	30	C	0		25,976	20.13
STREET	STREET	85	30	C	0		126,638	98.16
CITY	CITY	115	20	C	0		129,002	100.00
STATE	2 CHARACTER STATE	135	2	C	0		129,002	100.00
SALUTE	SALUTATION OR DEFAULT	137	48	C	0		129,002	100.00
HPC	HPC 2ND S5 EDITED W/O CENTS	185	7	C	0		129,002	100.00
HPC2	2 TIMES HPC EDITTED	192	7	C	0		129,002	100.00
HPC3	3 TIMES HPC EDITTED	199	7	C	0		129,002	100.00
HPC4	4 TIMES HPC LEFT JUST W/COMMA	206	7	C	0		129,002	100.00
FILL2	FILLER	213	2	C	0		0	0.00
FILL3	FILLER	215	2	C	0		0	0.00
KEYLINE	KEYLINE	217	15	C	0		129,002	100.00
MAILKEY	MAILKEY	232	5	C	0		129,002	100.00
SEQSUF	SEQUENCE #	237	6	C	0		129,002	100.00
PGSNAME	PFX LASTNAME OR PERSAL	243	30	C	0		109,522	84.89
HPC75	.75 X HPC EDITTED	273	7	C	0		129,002	100.00
HPC15	1.5 X HPC EDITTED	280	7	C	0		129,002	100.00
HPC3YR	LRGST LAST 3 YEARS NOT 0 FLG	287	7	C	0		129,002	100.00
LRGMOS	MONTH OF HPC	294	2	C	0		87,802	68.06
LRGYR	YEAR OF HPC	296	4	C	0		87,802	68.06

FORMAT KEY - C=CHARACTER Z=ZONED DECIMAL (NUMERIC) F=FIXED POINT BINARY (HEXADECIMAL) B=BINARY P=PACKED

To: Denise Koff (NRTW)
(DMC)
Fr: Doug Achilles
10/16/92
4 pages

Federal Target Special Counts

STATE/CD	ACTIVE	Cost $	INACTIVE	Cost $	SUPPORTER	Cost $	MIST	Cost $	POLIDONER	Cost $	D&B	Cost $	GRAND TOTAL	Cost $
CO	3,215	$1,768	9,855	$5,420	19,772	$10,875	5,527	$3,040			8,142	$4,478	46,511	$25,561
ID	1,683	$926	3,937	$2,165	5,779	$3,178			2,386	$1,312			13,785	$7,58[illegible]
NC	4,178	$2,298	9,237	$5,080	18,418	$10,130							31,833	$17,508
NH	1,309	$720	2,541	$1,398	7,018	$3,860					19,088	$10,498	29,956	$16,476
NV	1,317	$724	2,169	$1,193	3,184	$1,751							6,670	$3,669
SC	2,083	$1,146	5,176	$2,847	9,407	$5,174							16,666	$9,166
UT	1,327	$730	4,988	$2,743	8,727	$4,800			905	$498			15,947	$8,771
Total Survey	*15,112*	*$8,312*	*37,903*	*$20,847*	*72,305*	*$39,768*	*5,527*	*$3,040*	*3,291*	*$1,810*	*27,230*	*$14,977*	*161,368*	*$88,752*

Federal Target Special Counts

STATE/CD	ACTIVE	Cost $	INACTIVE	Cost $	SUPPORTER	Cost $	MIST *	Cost $	POLIDONER	Cost $	D&B *	Cost $	GRAND TOTAL	Cost $
CO	3,215	$1,768	9,855	$5,420	19,772	$10,875	5,527	$3,040			8,142	$4,478	46,511	$25,581
ID	1,683	$926	3,937	$2,165	5,779	$3,178			2,386	$1,312			13,785	$7,58[illegible]
NC	4,178	$2,298	9,237	$5,080	18,418	$10,130							31,833	$17,50[illegible]
NH	1,309	$720	2,541	$1,398	7,018	$3,860					19,088	$10,498	29,956	$16,476
NV	1,317	$724	2,169	$1,193	3,184	$1,751							6,670	$3,669
SC	2,083	$1,146	5,176	$2,847	9,407	$5,174							16,666	$9,166
UT	1,327	$730	4,988	$2,743	8,727	$4,800			905	$498			15,947	$8,771
Total Survey	15,112	$8,312	37,903	$20,847	72,305	$39,768	5,527	$3,040	3,291	$1,810	27,230	$14,977	161,368	$88,752

16,1759

* Mist + D + B on 1 tape.. qty = 32,759

Active, Inactive, Supporter & Polidoner on another file of 129,002

Note qty won't match sum of qty for 129m tape due to addition charges when moved out of target states.

Federal Target Special Counts

STATE/CD	ACTIVE	Cost $	INACTIVE	Cost $	SUPPORTER	Cost $	MIST	Cost $	POLIDONER	Cost $	D&B	Cost $	GRAND TOTAL	Cost $
CO	2,636	$1,450	10,539	$5,796	20,418	$11,230	5,919	$3,255			8,897	$4,893	48,409	$26,625
ID	1,053	$579	4,067	$2,237	5,924	$3,258			2,443	$1,344			13,487	$7,418
NC	3,548	$1,951	9,660	$5,313	19,236	$10,580							32,444	$17,8[illegible]
NH	1,150	$633	2,778	$1,528	7,313	$4,022					19,088	$10,498	30,329	$16,68[illegible]
NV	830	$457	2,196	$1,208	3,281	$1,805							6,307	$3,469
SC	1,723	$948	5,676	$3,122	9,396	$5,168							16,795	$9,237
UT	1,048	$576	5,106	$2,808	9,088	$4,998			934	$514			16,176	$8,897
Total Survey	*11,988*	*$6,593*	*40,022*	*$22,012*	*74,656*	*$41,061*	*5,919*	*$3,255*	*3,377*	*$1,857*	*27,985*	*$15,392*	*163,947*	*$90,171*
	15,112		37,903		72,305		5,527		3,271		27,230		162,368	

Federal Target Special Counts

STATE/CD	ACTIVE NL	Cost $	ACTIVE BAL	Cost $	INACTIVE	Cost $	SUPPORTER	Cost $	MIST	Cost $	POLIDONER	Cost $	D&B	Cost $	GRAND TOTAL	Cost $
CO	1,999	$1,099	637	$350	10,539	$5,796	20,418	$11,230	5,919	$3,255			8,897	$4,893	48,409	$26,625
ID	724	$398	329	$181	4,067	$2,237	5,924	$3,258			2,443	$1,344			13,487	$7,418
NC	2,535	$1,394	1,013	$557	9,660	$5,313	19,236	$10,580							32,444	$17,844
~~ND~~	~~550~~	~~$303~~	~~297~~	~~$190~~	~~3,298~~	~~$1,780~~	~~6,140~~	~~$3,377~~							~~10,189~~	~~$5,590~~
NH	905	$498	245	$135	2,778	$1,528	7,313	$4,022	~~20,000~~	~~$11,000~~			19,088	$10,498	50,329	~~$27,681~~ 17K
NV	592	$326	238	$131	2,196	$1,208	3,281	$1,805							6,307	$3,469
SC	1,240	$682	483	$266	5,676	$3,122	9,396	$5,168							16,795	$9,237
UT	762	$419	286	$157	5,106	$2,808	9,088	$4,998			934	$514			16,176	$8,897
Total Survey	*9,307*	*$5,119*	*3,468*	*$1,907*	*43,258*	*$23,792*	*80,796*	*$44,438*	*25,919*	*$14,255*	*3,377*	*$1,857*	*27,985*	*$15,392*	*194,110*	*$106,761*

90,

BE

DAK/ARL- Final Fed Survey Budget. PROCEED!

165M

AR
WA ?
SD ?No.
ND

16 3940

Mailing / State counts for Federal Special Targets

ACT / INACT / SUPP / POLI

Senate Special 10/27 drop first count

A -	CO	3,215
	ID	1,683
	NC	4,178
	NH	1,309
	NV	1,317
	SC	2,083
	UT	1,327

15,112

B -	AK	2
	AZ	12
	CA	7
	CO	9,855
	CT	1
	FL	18
	GA	3
	IA	3
	ID	3,937
	IL	1
	IN	1
	KS	2
	MN	2
	MO	3
	MS	1
	MT	1
	NC	9,237
	NE	1
	NH	2,541
	NJ	1
	NV	2,169
	NY	1
	OK	3

B -	PA	2
	SC	5,176
	TN	3
	TX	2
	UT	4,988
	VA	4
	WA	4
	WV	2
	WY	4

Totals = 37,903

Support

C -

AK	2
AL	1
AR	3
AZ	20
CA	20
CO	19,772
CT	7
DE	2
FL	36
GA	8
HI	1
IA	2
ID	5,779
IL	2
IN	1
KS	4
KY	2
MA	12
MD	9
ME	3
MI	4
MN	4
MO	6
MS	1
MT	3
NC	18,418
NE	1
NH	7,018
NJ	1
NM	8
NV	3,184
NY	7

C -

OK	4
OR	7
PA	4
SC	9,407
SD	1
TN	6
TX	9
UT	8,727
VA	16
VT	5
WA	11
WI	7
WY	1

higher than 1,7 [illegible]

5152 7 2 3 4 0 . 0 2

D - AK 2 Pd

CA	2
CO	2
CT	1
FL	6
GA	2
HI	1
ID	2,386
IL	1
MA	6
MD	2
ME	4
NC	2
NM	1
NY	2
OH	1
OR	1
RI	1
SC	1
SD	1
TX	1
UT	905
VA	5
VT	2
WA	2
WY	1

3,291

9152 '207 '10 '02

mailing / state counts D & B / mist

E - CO	5,527	mist
F - CO	8,142	D&B
NH	19,088	D&B
	32,757	

20 '04 '2'2 '2'3'7

BACK OFF SCHEDULE

DMC
DIRECT MAIL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Customer Svc. Rep. Doug

Project Name Fed. Survey Senate Specials

Package Components
1. #10 PF Carrier
2. 6¾ BRE
3. Reply
4. Roster
5. Letter
6.

Master Job Number 4116

Quantity 165 M

Number/Up

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	October					
11	12	13	14	15	16 C04 C05 C06 C07 C11	17
			C01	C02 C03		
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
	C08 C09	C10 C12 C13 C14			C15	
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

EVENT CHECK LIST

SCHEDULED DATE	DATE OF OCCURANCE	EVENT CODE	EVENT DESCRIPTION
10-14	10-14	C01	P.O. In
10-15	10-15	C02	Copy In NH out
10-15	LTR-10/14	C03	Art In Rosters late
10-16		C04	B/L Out
10-16		C05	B/L In
10-16		C06	Tapes In
10-16		C07	[illegible] first In
10-19		C08	[illegible] Count Approve
10-19		[illegible]	Postage Out
10-20		C[illegible]	Postage In
10-16		C11	L[illegible] (Laser) first In
10-20		C12	Laser Test Out
10-20		C13	Laser Approval In
10-20		C14	Outside Material In
10-23		C15	Drop Date
		C16	
		C17	
		C18	

In order to meet the desired mail date, all events should occur on the specified dates. Any alterations to this schedule will require rescheduling of production.

Thank you

To: JNH
From: LS

Telephone Numbers for Target Senatorial Campaigns

Arkansas		
Dale Bumbers-D	Campaign Office	501-375-1992*
Mike Huckabee-R	Campaign Office	501-772-6755*
Colorado		
Ben Campbell-D	Campaign Office	303-837-0565*
Terry Considine-R	Campaign Office	303-757-2567*
Idaho		
Richard Stallings-D	Campaign Office	208-336-1992*
Dirk Kempthorne-R	Campaign Office	208-336-0092*
Nevada		
Harry Reid-D	Campaign Office	702-598-1992*
Demar Dahl-R	Campaign Office	702-737-8800*
New Hampshire		
John Rauh-D	Campaign Office	603-595-9353*
Judd Gregg-R	Campaign Office	603-626-1212*
Larry Brady-I	Campaign Office	603-641-5900+
North Carolina		
Terry Sanford-D	Campaign Office	800-722-1992*
Lauch Faircloth-R	Campaign Office	919-790-1111*
North Dakota		
Byron Dorgan-D	Campaign Office	701-223-3970*
Steve Sydness-R	Campaign Office	701-234-0121*
South Carolina		
Fritz Hollings-D	Campaign Office	803-723-0700*
Tommy Hartnett-R	Campaign Office	803-720-8860*
South Dakota		
Tom Daschle-D	Campaign Office	605-225-1991*
Charlene Haar-R	Campaign Office	605-256-2868*
Utah		
Wayne Owens-D	Campaign Office	801-486-1992*
Robert Bennett-R	Campaign Office	801-521-9534*
Washington		
Patty Murray-D	Campaign Office	206-621-0611*
Rod Chandler-R	Campaign Office	206-454-1166*

* Called 10/13/92 to confirm correct number.
\+ No one ever answered this number but it is correct per Manchester information and Mr. Brady's son Lawrence. Lawrence said his father could usually be reached at home [redacted] after 4 in the evening. He said no one was in the office right now.

MISSISSIPPI

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Jamie Whitten-D	- - - - - - - - -
(202) 225-4306	
Clyde Whitaker-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(601) 842-8191	
District 2	
Mike Espy-D	- - - - - - - - -
(601) 746-1400	
Dorothy Benford-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 3	
G. V. "Sonny" Montgomery-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
(601) 693-6681	
Michael Williams-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 4	
Mike Parker-D	- - - - - - - - -
(601) 965-4085	
Jack McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(601) 875-1291	
District 5	
Gene Taylor-D	- - - - - - - - -
(601) 582-3246	
Paul Harvey-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

NORTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Terry Sanford-D	- - - - - - - - -
Lauch Faircloth-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Eva Clayton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ted Tyler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Tim Valentine, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
Don Davis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
H. Martin Lancaster-D	Y Y Y Y Y - Y N Y
Tommy Pollard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
David Price-D	- - - - - - - - -
Vicky Goudie-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Stephen Neal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Richard Burr-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Robin Hood-D	- - - - - - - - -

North Carolina cont.

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
J. Howard Coble-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Charlie Rose-D	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Anderson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
W. G. Hefner-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Coy Privette-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Rory Blake-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Alex McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 10	
Ben Neill-D	- - - - - - - - -
T. Cass Ballenger-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
John Stevens-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Charles Taylor-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Melvin Watt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Gore	
Washington-R	- - - - - - - - -

SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fritz Hollings-D	- - - - - - - - -
(803) 779-8400	
Tommy Hartnett-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(803) 884-4244	

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Bill Oberst-D	- - - - - - - - -
(803) 527-4946	
Arthur Ravenel, Jr.-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
(803) 722-0174	
District 2	
Floyd Spence-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
(803) 254-5120	
District 3	
James Bland-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(803) 641-1408	
Butler Derrick-D	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y
(803) 225-5301	
District 4	
Liz Patterson-D	- - - - - - - - -
(803) 582-3650	
Bob ~~Robert~~ Inglis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(803) 242-6440	

South Carolina cont.

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 5	
John Spratt-D	- - - - - - - - -
(803) 327-1114	
William Horne-R	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y
(803) 494-2641	
District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D	- - - - - - - - -
(803) 929-0208	
John Chase-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(803) 669-8787	

TENNESSEE

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
J. Carr Christian-D	- - - - - - - - -
James Quillen-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Troy Goodale-D	N N Y Y Y Y N Y N
John Duncan, Jr.-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 3	
Marilyn Lloyd-D	- - - - - - - - -
Zach Wamp-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 4	
Jim Cooper-D	- - - - - - - - -
Dale Johnson-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 5	
Bob Clement-D	- - - - - - - - -
Tom Stone-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Bart Gordon-D	- - - - - - - - -
Marsha Blackburn-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
David Davis-D	- - - - - - - - -
Don Sundquist-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
John Tanner-D	- - - - - - - - -
District 9	
Harold Ford-D	- - - - - - - - -
Charles Black-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:

Y = Yes
N = No
\- = No Response
** = Runoff in District

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — *including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."*

   This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet *they complain they are "unfairly burdened* by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

   Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues *and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned* by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

   Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership *in a labor organization as a condition of* employment."

   The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — *are shielded* from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

   The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

   The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and *irrevocable dues* check-off clauses.

   While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that *they should be covered by federal statutes.*

   As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms *offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.*

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

   Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which *shield public employees from union coercion.*

   Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization *Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back* to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

   The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union *officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly* to a candidate for federal office.

   At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

   These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — *if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.*

   No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, *union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.*

7. *In recent years,* legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

   Even though the nonunionized *and the unionized companies each perform separate and* distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine *worker support.*

   This "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to *loosen the 50-year-old Hatch* Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

   Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

   Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent *replacement workers during a strike.*

   The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

   Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be *forced to cave in to every demand* by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF FEDERAL CANDIDATES

ALABAMA

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Shelby-D	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Sellers-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
William Brewer-D	- - - - - - - - -
Sonny Callahan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
George Wallace, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Everett-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Glen Browder-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Don Sledge-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 4	
Tom Bevill-D	- - - - - - - - -
Mickey Strickland-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 5	
Bud Cramer-D	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Smith-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Ben Erdreich-D	- - - - - - - - -
Spencer Bachus-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Earl Hilliard-D	- - - - - - - - -
Kervin Jones-R	- - - - - - - - -

ARKANSAS

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Dale Bumpers-D	Y - Y Y Y Y - -
Mike Huckabee-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Blanche Lambert-D	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Hayes-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Ray Thorton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Dennis Scott-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
John VanWinkle-D	N - - - - - - - -
Tim Hutchinson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 4	
Bill McCuen-D	- - - - - - - - -
Jay Dickey-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

FLORIDA

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Bob Graham-D	- - - - - - - - -
Bill Grant-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Earl Hutto-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Terry Ketchel-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Florida cont.

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 2	
Pete Peterson-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ray Wagner-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Corrine Brown-D**	- - - - - - - - -
Andrew Johnson-D**	- - - - - - - - -
Steve Kelley-R**	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Don Weidner-R**	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 4	
Mattox Hair-D	- - - - - - - - -
(904) 398-0900	
Tillie Fowler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Karen Thurman-D	- - - - - - - - -
Tom Hogan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Phil Denton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Clifford Stearns-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Dan Webster-D	- - - - - - - - -
John Mica-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
Chuck Kovaleski-D	- - - - - - - - -
Bill McCollum-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Michael Bilirakis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Cheryl Knapp-D	- - - - - - - - -
District 10	
Karen Moffitt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Bill Young-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 11	
Sam Gibbons-D	- - - - - - - - -
Mark Sharpe-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Charles Canady-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Tom Mims-D	- - - - - - - - -
District 13	
Rand Snell-D	- - - - - - - - -
Brad Baker-R**	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Dan Miller-R**	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 14	
Porter Goss-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 15	
Jim Bacchus-D	N - Y - - N - N N
Bill Tolley-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 16	
John Comerford-D	- - - - - - - - -
Tom Lewis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 17	
Carrie Meek-D	- - - - - - - - -
District 18	
Magda Davis-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ileana Ros-Lehtinen-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 19	
Harry Johnston-D	- - - - - - - - -
Larry Metz-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 20	
Peter Deutsch-D	- - - - - - - - -
Marilyn Bonilla-R**	- - - - - - - - -
Beverly Kennedy-R**	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Florida cont.

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 21	
Lincoln Diaz-Balart-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 22	
Gwen Margolis-D	- - - - - - - - -
Clay Shaw-R	- - - - - - - - -
District 23	
Lois Frankel-D**	- - - - - - - - -
Alcee Hastings-D**	N N N N N N N N N
Oliver Parker-R**	- - - - - - - - -
Ed Fielding-R**	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

GEORGIA

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wyche Fowler, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
(404) 331-0697	
Paul Coverdell-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Barbara Christmas-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(912) 882-4839	
Jack Kingston-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Sanford Bishop-D	- - - - - - - - -
(404) 324-3531	
Jim Dudley-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Richard Ray-D	- - - - - - - - -
(404) 561-3764	
Mac Collins-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 4	
Cathey Steinberg-D	- - - - - - - - -
(404) 636-5110	
John Linder-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
John Lewis-D	- - - - - - - - -
(202) 225-3801	
Paul Stabler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Tony Center-D	- - - - - - - - -
Newt Gingrich-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
George Darden-D	- - - - - - - - -
(404) 425-2820	
Al Beverly-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
J. Roy Rowland-D	- - - - - - - - -
(202) 225-6531	
Robert Cunningham-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Nathan Deal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(706) 287-1992	
Daniel Becker-R	N N Y N Y Y N N N
District 10	
Don Johnson-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(404) 245-9293	
Ralph Hudgens-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
Cynthia McKinney-D	- - - - - - - - -
(404) 243-5574	
Woodrow Lovett-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

   This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

   Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

   Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

   The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

   The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

   The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

   While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

   As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

   Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

   Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

   The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

   At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

   These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

   No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

   Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

   The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

   Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

   Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

   The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

   Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

✓ 10/13/92 ec

ROSTER OF FEDERAL CANDIDATES

COLORADO

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Ben Campbell-D (303) 837-0565	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Considine-R (303) 757-2567	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Pat Schroeder-D (303) 866-1230	- - - - - - - - -
Raymond Diaz Aragon-R (303) 320-6607	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
David Skaggs-D (303) 650-7886	- - - - - - - - -
Bryan Day-R (303) 422-8692	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Mike Calihan-D (303) 320-3918	- - - - - - - - -
Scott McInnis-R (303) 242-4623	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
Tom Redder-D (303) 224-9767	- - - - - - - - -
Wayne Allard-R (303) 226-2226	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Charles Oriez-D (303) 798-3236	- - - - - - - - -
Joel Hefley-R (303) 933-0044	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Colorado cont.

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 6	
Tom Kolbe-D (303) 850-9867	N - - N - N Y N -
Dan Schaefer-R (303) 989-2100	- - - - - - - - -

✓ 10/13 ec

IDAHO

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Stallings-D	- - - - - - - - -
Dirk Kempthorne-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Larry LaRocco-D	- - - - - - - - -
Rachel Gilbert-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
J.D. Williams-D	- - - - - - - - -
Michael Crapo-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

✓ 10/13 ec

UTAH

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 524-4394	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 583-2635	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Utah cont.

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 486-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 521-9534	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 486-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 521-9534	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to epresent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining nit — including employees who oppose the union and don't vant its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as 'exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right o bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power nd refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly urdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling inancial support from so-called "free riders" for representation hey do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or ees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that mployees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in nion activities "except to the extent that such right may be ffected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor rganization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the xisting federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory nionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The ight of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on ccount of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or abor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is eaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to he National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union fficials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues heck-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local evel, some criminal activities (including extortion), which bstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to e so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have nique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to ommit or committing felonies — such as murder, anslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, xplosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective argaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by ills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public nployees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and unicipal employees and would nullify existing state laws hich shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal nployees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal eorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 486-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 521-9534	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

202-347-4653

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 486-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 521-9534	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

0552 "202 "40 "02

~~RBF/~~ ARL/SG 10/10

Thanks for the info. We'll shoot for #1 + settle for #2 if we must. AH

SOF -
Fed Svy Specials -

Here's what I think we could get from DMC (one of the few vendors we could trust with such quick turnaround)

I'd like to do either #1 or #2, if time available. AH

1) Laser pg 1 + 2; checkface center, reply, BRE
2 way match mail 11 versions 180m -
$258 + 290 postage = $548/m 98,640

2) Laser checkface; 11 generic letters; reply, BRE. 11 versions 180m -
$187 + 290 postage = 477/m 85,860

ARL + I figure that to do a 11 versions generic letters will run in the
$165-175/m + postage 465 83,700

MEF - Can we have "final" versions next Tuesday? Probably. Only problem is RL's OK, since he's out this week.

Let us know what you think of us. As we go w/ #1 I'd really like to get some letters going to 10/19 because all will have to be keyed by vendor + reproofed + we only have 5 days to get in mail.

ARL

STATE	CANDIDATE	1986	1987-88	1989-90	1992	Total
Colorado	Campbell	140,150	148,520	77,142	139,600	505,412
Idaho	Stallings	19,600	70,163	60,769	119,977	270,509
N. Carolina	Sanford	245,250	72,750	34,250	103,336	455,586
Nevada	Reid	253,000	17,125	18,000	118,953	407,078
S. Carolina	Hollings	96,000	22,000	20,000	71,250	209,250
Utah	Owens	198,792	197,451	225,872	181,000	803,105

Sources:

86-90 — RL Data base derived from FEC reports

FAX
COVER SHEET

Direct Mail Communications
Rt. 221 P.O. Box 143 Forest, VA 24551
Phone: (804) 525-0155
Fax: (804) 525-5450

TO: NRTW DATE: 10-19-92
ATTENTION: Amos Lock
FROM: Doug Achilles PAGE 1 OF 10
SUBJECT: Roster Art for sign-off

COMMENTS: Please fax back approval as soon as possible.

Thanks!

Doug

20 '04 '40 '292 2

* Copy Black

CO

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF COLORADO

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Ben Campbell-D	- - - - - - - - -
(303) 837-0565	
Jerry Considine-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 757-2567	

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Pat Schrooder-D	- - - - - - - - -
(303) 866-1230	
Raymond Diaz Aragon-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 320-6607	
District 2	
David Skaggs-D	- - - - - - - - -
(303) 650-7886	
Bryan Day R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 422-8692	
District 3	
Mike Callihan-D	- - - - - - - - -
(303) 320-3918	
Scott McInnis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
(303) 242-4623	
District 4	
Tom Redder-D	- - - - - - - - -
(303) 224-9767	
Wayne Allard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 226-2226	
District 5	
Charles Orlos-D	- - - - - - - - -
(303) 798-3236	
Joel Hefley-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 000 0044	
District 6	
Tom Kolbe-D	N - - N - N Y N -
(303) 850-9867	
Dan Schaefer-R	- - - - - - - - -
(303) 989-2100	

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 19, 1992 12:43PM P.02

* Copy Black

ID

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF IDAHO

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Stallings-D (208) 336-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Dirk Kempthorne-R (208) 336-0092	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Larry LaRocco-D	- - - - - - - - -
Rachel Gilbert-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
J.D. Williams-D	- - - - - - - - -
Michael Crapo-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 19, 1992 12:44PM P.03

* Copy Black

NC

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Terry Sanford-D (800) 722-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Lauch Faircloth-R (919) 790-1111	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Eva Clayton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ted Tyler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Tim Valentine, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
Don Davis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
H. Martin Lancaster-D	Y Y Y Y Y - Y N Y
Tommy Pollard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 4	
David Price-D	- - - - - - - - -
Vicky Goudie-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Stephen Neal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Richard Burr-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Robin Hood-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Howard Coble-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Charlie Rose-D	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Anderson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
W. G. Hefner-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Coy Privette-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Rory Blake-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Alex McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 10	
Ben Neill-D	- - - - - - - - -
T. Cass Ballenger-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
John Stevens-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Charles Taylor-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Melvin Watt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Gore Washington-R	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 19, 1992 12:45PM P.04

* copy Black

NV

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEVADA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Harry Reid-D (702) 598-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Demar Dahl-R (702) 737-8800	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
J. Coy Pettyjohn-R (702) 259-8683	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
James Bilbray-D (702) 369-8155	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Pete Sferrazza-D (702) 324-7383	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Vucanovich-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 19, 1992 12:46PM P.05

* Copy Black

SC

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fritz Hollings-D (803) 723-0700	- - - - - - - - -
Tommy Hartnett-R (803) 720-8860	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Bill Oberst-D (803) 527-4946	- - - - - - - - -
Arthur Ravenel, Jr.-R (803) 722-0174	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 2	
Floyd Spence-R (803) 254-5120	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
District 3	
James Bland-R (803) 641-1408	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Butler Derrick-D (803) 225-5301	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y
District 4	
Liz Patterson-D (803) 582-3650	- - - - - - - - -
Bob Inglis-R (803) 242-6440	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
John Spratt-D (803) 327-1114	- - - - - - - - -
William Horne-R (803) 494-2641	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y
District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D (803) 929-0208	- - - - - - - - -
John Chase-R (803) 669-8787	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

* Copy Black

UT

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 486-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 521-9534	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 19, 1992 12:47PM P.07

* BLACK - BACK - ID, CO, NC, SC, NV, UT

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

OCT 19, 1992 12:48PM P.08 FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW

* Copy Black

NH

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Judd Gregg-R* (603) 626-1212	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
John Rauh-D (603) 595-9353	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N
Larry Brady-I (603) 641-5900	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
District 1									
Bill Zeliff-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bob Preston-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
District 2									
Dick Swett-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bill Hatch-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

* Governor Judd Gregg's actual survey response has still not been received by the Committee. However, these responses are derived from the survey he is distributing to New Hampshire Right to Work Supporters and is claiming to have sent to us.

Candidates for Governor on back

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 19, 1992 12:50PM P.09

* BLACK - BACK - NH

Survey Questions for Gubernatorial Candidates

1. Will you support enactment of a state Right to Work law by the New Hampshire Legislature?
2. Will you support the repeal of monopoly bargaining privileges union officials currently have over public employees?
3. Will you oppose so-called "agency shop" legislation in the public sector?

Candidates for Governor

	#1	#2	#3
Mervin Newton- R 16 Grove Street Milford 03055	Y	Y	Y
Livius Fisteag- R P.O. Box 1233 Amherst 03031	-	-	-
Edward Dupont, Jr.- R 5 Westview Drive Rochester 03867	-	-	-
Elizabeth Hager- R 5 Auburn Street Concord 03301	-	-	-
Steve Merrill- R 50 Phillippe Cote St. Manchester 03101	-	-	-
Deborah Arnesen- D RR 1, Box 42 Orford 03777	B	B	B
Norman D'Amours- D 135 Chase Way Manchester 03104	-	-	-
Ned Helms- D P.O. Box 1780 Manchester 03105	N	N	N
Calvin Warburton- L P.O. Box 365 Raymond 03077	-	-	-
Miriam Luce- L 110 Londonderry Road Windham 03087	Y	Y	Y

Key:
- N Negative Response
- Y Positive Response
- B Blank Response
- - Refused to Respond

FROM:DIRECT MAIL TO:NRTW OCT 19, 1992 12:50PM P.10

Sign offs OK DAK
Per letterhead & sig.
Not final proofed copy.

SC

REED LARSON
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

PMS 288

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

FPO

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Ernest Hollings will vote on compulsory unionism legislation if South Carolinians vote him another term.

If Senator Hollings continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, South Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Hollings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Senator Hollings has not exactly been a Right to Work advocate in the Senate.

Just recently, he voted to block enforcement of the 1988 Supreme Court Beck ban on the use of forced d· ·s for politics.

And in 1990, Mr. Hollings voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Hollings's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps South Carolina and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Hollings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy South Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Hollings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry South Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Hollings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ernest Hollings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of South Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Holling's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Hollings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way; they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Hollings now at (803) 723-0700 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Hollings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Hollings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls South Carolina citizens. Tell him he's not fooling, anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Holling's opponent, Tommy Hartnett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Hartnett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Hartnett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Hartnett not to back down. Please call him at (803) 720-8860 and tell him South Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson - PMS 288

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Ernest Hollings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

FPO

REED LARSON
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

- PMS 288

NC

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

FPO

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Terry Sanford will vote on compulsory unionism legislation is North Carolinians vote him another term.

If Senator Sanford continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, North Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Sanford has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Terry Sanford is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. In 1990 and 1992, Senator Sandford voted to overturn the 1988 Supreme Court Beck decision, which forbids the use of forced dues for politics. Again and again, Senator Sandford has voted to force workers to pay for political causes they don't agree with.

And in 1990, Mr. Sanford voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Sanford's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps North Carolina and just two other Senate states into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the Whito House as well), Mr. Sanford could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy North Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Sanford with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry North

202 457 3254

(NC)

Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Sanford continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Terry Sanford ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of North Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Sanford's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

GPO

So while Senator Sanford is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way, they bankroll his campaigns with forced union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Sanford now at (XXX) XXX-XXXX and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Sanford renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Sanford you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls North Carolina citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Sanfords's opponent, Lauch Faircloth, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Faircloth has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Faircloth is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Faircloth not to back down. Please call him at (XXX) XXX-XXXX and tell him North Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson DMS 288

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Terry Sanford must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

(ID)

REED LARSON
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

PLUS 288

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Richard Stallings will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Idaho's next U.S Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Richard Stallings continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Idaho will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Stallings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Stallings helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.S / S.55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Stallings voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Stalling's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Idaho and just two other Senate states into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Stallings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Idaho's hard won Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Stallings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Idaho citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

ID

But Congressman Stallings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Richard Stallings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Idaho citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Stallings's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers".

So while Congressman Stallings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way; they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Stallings now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Stallings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Stallings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Idaho citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Stalling's opponent, Dirk Kempthorne, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Kempthorne has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Kempthorne is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Kempthorne not to back down. Please call him at (XXX) XXX-XXXX and tell him the people of Idaho support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson PMS 288

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Richard Stallings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

(UT)

REED LARSON
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

PUS 288

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

EDO

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Wayne Owens will vote on compulsory unionism legislation if he becomes Utah's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Wayne Owens continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, Utah will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Owens has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Owens helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.5 / S.55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Owens voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Owens's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Utah and just two other Senate states into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Owens could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Utah's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Owens with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Utah citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Owens continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Wayne Owens ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Utah citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Owens's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers".

So while Congressman Owens is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way, they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Owens now at (XXX) XXX-XXXX and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Owens renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Owens you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Utah citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Owens opponent, Bob Bennett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Bennett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Bennett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Bennett not to back down. Please call him at (XXX) XXX-XXXX and tell him the people of Utah support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson — PMS 288

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Wayne Owens must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

(CO)

REED LARSON
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

PUS 288

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

FPO

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Colorado's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Ben Campbell continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Colorado will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Campbell has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Campbell helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Campbell voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Campbell's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Colorado and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Campbell could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy all state Right to Work laws by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Campbell with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Colorado citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

703-560-2760

But Congressman Campbell continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ben Campbell ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Colorado citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Campbell's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers."

So while Congressman Campbell is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way; they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Campbell now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Campbell renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Campbell you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Colorado citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Campbell's opponent, Terry Considine, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Considine has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Considine is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Considine not to back down. Please call him at (303) 757-2567 and tell him the people of Colorado support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson DHS 288

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

REED LARSON
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

PLUS 288

NV

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

FDO

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Harry Reid will vote on compulsory unionism legislation if Nevada citizens vote him another term.

If Senator Reid continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, Nevada will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Reid has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Harry Reid is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. This past June, Mr. Reid helped Ted Kennedy try to ram his Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.5 / S.55) through the Senate. The bill failed with only one vote to spare.

And in 1990, Mr. Reid voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act.
Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Reid's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Nevada and just two other Senate states into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Reid could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Nevada's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Reid with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Nevada citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

NV

But Senator Reid continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Harry Reid ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Nevada citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Reid's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Reid is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way; they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Reid now at (XXX) XXX-XXXX and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Reid renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Reid you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Nevada citizens. Tell him he's not fooling, anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Reid's opponent, Demar Dahl, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Dahl has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Courts's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Dahl is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Dahl not to back down. Please call him at (XXX) XXX-XXXX and tell him Nevada citizens support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Harry Reid must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

3M6

COPY APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(ATTACH TO FINAL DRAFT COPY WITH DISK)

ROUTE TO:
ARL

DATE 10/16/92

PACKAGE: ID

FROM: ARL

CHECK OFF IF . . .	ROUTED TO:	APPROVED BY:
HLW		
SOG		
RL		
RJC		

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES MADE: YES NO

TO PROOFING: CHANGES MADE BY:

1ST SDK/PB 10/16/92 yes

2ND

3RD

WLP/FACT CHECK
(PROOFING SEND SEPARATE COPY)

REC'D: APPROVED:

9512120140.02

FAX
COVER SHEET

Direct Mail Communications
Rt. 221 P.O. Box 143 Forest, VA 24551
Phone: (804) 525-0155
Fax: (804) 525-5450

TO: NRTW
DATE: 10-22-92
ATTENTION: Anna-Lou
FROM: Doug
PAGE 1 OF 2
SUBJECT:

COMMENTS: Please give me a go-ahead as soon as possible.

Thanks!
Doug

20 '04 '22 '92 15:55

But Congressman Stallings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Richard Stallings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Idaho citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $270,500 into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Stallings's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "voluntoors".

So while Congressman Stallings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way -- they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Stallings now at (208) 336-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Stallings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Stallings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Idaho citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Stalling's opponent, Dirk Kempthorne, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Kempthorne has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Kempthorne is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Kempthorne not to back down. Please call him at (208) 336-0092 and tell him the people of Idaho support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Richard Stallings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

REED LARSON
8001 BRADDOCK ROAD
SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160

Final

October 23, 1992

[redacted]

Dear [redacted]:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Richard Stallings will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Idaho's next U.S Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Richard Stallings continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Idaho will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Stallings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Stallings helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Stallings voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Stalling's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Idaho and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Stallings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Idaho's hard-won Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Stallings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Idaho citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Stallings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Richard Stallings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Idaho citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $270,500 into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Stallings's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers".

So while Congressman Stallings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way -- they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

208 336-1992

Please call Congressman Stallings now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Stallings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Stallings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Idaho citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Stalling's opponent, Dirk Kempthorne, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Kempthorne has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Kempthorne is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Kempthorne not to back down. Please call him at (208) 336-0092 and tell him the people of Idaho support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Richard Stallings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

DMC
1st proof

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Richard Stallings will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Idaho's next U.S Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Richard Stalli ontinues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big L r, Idaho will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Stallings has voted with he unic hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Stallings helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.5/ S.55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Stallings voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Stalling's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Idaho and just two other Senate ~~states~~ seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Stallings cou cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Idaho's hard-won Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Stallings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Idaho citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Stallings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Richard Stallings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Idaho citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $270,500 ~~$XXXXXXXXX~~ into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Stallings's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers".

So while Congressman Stallings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way -- they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Stallings now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Stallings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Stallings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Idaho citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Stalling's opponent, Dirk Kempthorne, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Kempthorne has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Kempthorne is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Kempthorne not to back down. Please call him at ~~(XXX) XXX-XXXX~~ (208) 336-0092 and tell him the people of Idaho support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Richard Stallings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX XXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Richard Stallings will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Idaho's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Richard Stallings continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Idaho will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Stallings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Stallings helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Stallings voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Stallings's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Idaho and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Stallings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

States on FAX

He could vote to destroy Idaho's hard-won Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Stallings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Idaho citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Stallings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Richard Stallings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Idaho citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX $270,500 into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Stallings' campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers."

So while Congressman Stallings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way; they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers. not ?

Please call Congressman Stallings now at (~~208~~) ~~336-1992~~ 303 837-0565 ? and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Stallings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor. Check list from Linda S

Tell Congressman Stallings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Idaho citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Stallings' opponent, Dirk Kempthorne, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Kempthorne has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Kempthorne is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Kempthorne not to back down. Please call him at (208) 336-0092 and tell him the people of Idaho support his pledge. check list.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Richard Stallings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

National Right To Work Committee

A COALITION OF EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS

HEADQUARTERS AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

WASHINGTON D.C. HEADQUARTERS: 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD, SUITE 500 • SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160 • TEL. (703) 321-9820

"Americans must have the right but not be compelled to join labor unions"

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF IDAHO

folder copy

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Stallings-D (208) 336-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Dirk Kempthorne-R (208) 336-0092	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Larry LaRocco-D	- - - - - - - - -
Rachel Gilbert-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
J.D. Williams-D	- - - - - - - - -
Michael Crapo-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF IDAHO

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Stallings-D (208) 336-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Dirk Kempthorne-R (208) 336-0092	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Larry LaRocco-D	- - - - - - - - -
Rachel Gilbert-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
J.D. Williams-D	- - - - - - - - -
Michael Crapo-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF IDAHO

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Stallings-D (208) 336-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Dirk Kempthorne-R (208) 336-0092	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Larry LaRocco-D	- - - - - - - - -
Rachel Gilbert-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
J.D. Williams-D	- - - - - - - - -
Michael Crapo-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF IDAHO

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Stallings-D (208) 336-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Dirk Kempthorne-R (208) 336-0092	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Larry LaRocco-D	- - - - - - - - -
Rachel Gilbert-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
J.D. Williams-D	- - - - - - - - -
Michael Crapo-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
\- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF IDAHO

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Richard Stallings-D (208) 336-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Dirk Kempthorne-R (208) 336-0092	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Larry LaRocco-D	- - - - - - - - -
Rachel Gilbert-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
J.D. Williams-D	- - - - - - - - -
Michael Crapo-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

NRL4227 PG1&2 "NH" SURVEY TARGET SPECIAL JOB#NRL4227 CEOO CINDI 10-19-92 3:00
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

What do Democrat John Rauh and Republican Judd Gregg -- who are both vying to be your next U.S Senator -- have in common?

They have both actively opposed Right to Work this year.

At least John Rauh has the honesty to admit it. He endorsed compulsory unionism on his 1992 Right to Work Candidate Survey.

But Judd Gregg may be trying to snow you about his past record on Right to Work -- and even about his current position.

Of the major candidates for the New Hampshire Senate seat, only Independent Larry Brady has had the guts to consistently stand up against Organized Labor's political machine.

Just 8 months ago, Governor Gregg almost single-handedly quashed the New Hampshire Right to Work bill pending at that time in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. To kill the bill, he twisted the arms of dozens of Republican representatives who had previously supported Right to Work.

Since Mr. Gregg is favored to win the Senate race, and Big Labor is only a vote or two shy of enacting its entire political agenda, his track record on Right to Work is of especially grave concern.

If Governor Gregg supports compulsory unionism in the Senate as he did this past year as governor, our nation could face economy-paralyzing strikes, and higher inflation and taxes.

Way back on July 17, I sent Governor Gregg a Right to Work Candidate Survey to nail down his position on specific pieces of forced-unionism legislation -- Governor Gregg refused to answer.

So I sent Judd Gregg a copy of the survey July 31. And you and thousands of New Hampshire citizens deluged his office with postcards and phone calls urging him to support Right to Work.

Again, he refused to respond.

I sent a second copy of the survey September 10, and reported Mr. Gregg's actions again. You put so much heat on Governor Gregg for his arrogant refusal to level with you about his Right to Work record, he was forced to respond.

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671	# of pages ▸ 2
To Amos Lock	From Doug Ackiles
Co. NRTW	Co. DNC
Dept.	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

Governor Gregg started mailing out copies of his survey answers to our members, who sent them on to me. In an accompanying letter, he implied he returned his survey weeks ago, and claimed he has always supported Right to Work. He even accused me of "grossly misrepresenting" his position on forced unionism.

Just the opposite. Everything I reported to you about Governor Gregg was 100% correct.

According to the Manchester Union Leader, the New Hampshire AFL-CIO Political Director has been crowing all year about how Mr. Gregg did the union bosses' dirty work for them by killing the Right to Work bill (H.B. 1432) 211-134.

And in 1989 he assured the New Hampshire AFL-CIO convention that he would veto any Right to Work bill that came to his desk.

Even on his tardy survey response (which I still have not received from him), Mr. Gregg endorses the root of compulsory unionism -- Big Labor's monopoly bargaining privileges, which force union-boss "representation" on workers who don't want it.

And he also claims he'll support a National Right to Work law. If so, why did he kill a Right to Work law for New Hampshire? Why would he vote to give out-of-state workers the rights he denied to his own constituents? Very curious indeed.

One thing's for sure. If Judd Gregg becomes a U.S. Senator, he needs to remember that his past support for compulsory unionism sparked a firestorm of constituent anger. That's the only way to stop him from doing it again, if he wins his campaign.

That's why I'm asking you to take three actions immediately.

First, call Governor Gregg at 626-1212 and urge him to publicly apologize for killing your Right to Work law. If you put enough heat on Governor Gregg, you can force him to prove his professed conversion is genuine by opposing forced unionism in the Senate.

Then, call John Rauh at 644-5552 and insist he change his anti-Right to Work position. And, don't leave out Independent Larry Brady. He's under major pressure to back off from his support for Right to Work. Call him at 641-5900 and encourage him not to buckle.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Also call leading gubernatorial candidate Steve Merrill at 627-9292. He says he supports Right to Work "in principle." Urge him to support it in practice next year, if elected. Tell him not to kill the New Hampshire Right to Work bill the way Governor Gregg did this year.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Judd Gregg-R* (603) 626-1212	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
John Rauh-D (603) 595-9353	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N
Larry Brady-I (603) 641-5900	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
District 1									
Bill Zeliff-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bob Preston-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
District 2									
Dick Swett-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bill Hatch-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

* Governor Judd Gregg's actual survey response has still not been received by the Committee. However, these responses are derived from the survey he is distributing to New Hampshire Right to Work Supporters and is claiming to have sent to us.

Candidates for Governor on back

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

Survey Questions for Gubernatorial Candidates

1. Will you support enactment of a state Right to Work law by the New Hampshire Legislature?
2. Will you support the repeal of monopoly bargaining privileges union officials currently have over public employees?
3. Will you oppose so-called "agency shop" legislation in the public sector?

Candidates for Governor

	#1	#2	#3
Mervin Newton- R 16 Grove Street Milford 03055	Y	Y	Y
Livius Fisteag- R P.O. Box 1233 Amherst 03031	-	-	-
Edward Dupont, Jr.- R 5 Westview Drive Rochester 03867	-	-	-
Elizabeth Hager- R 5 Auburn Street Concord 03301	-	-	-
Steve Merrill- R 50 Phillippe Cote St. Manchester 03101	-	-	-
Deborah Arnesen- D RR 1, Box 42 Orford 03777	B	B	B
Norman D'Amours- D 135 Chase Way Manchester 03104	-	-	-
Ned Helms- D P.O. Box 1780 Manchester 03105	N	N	N
Calvin Warburton- L P.O. Box 365 Raymond 03077	-	-	-
Miriam Luce- L 110 Londonderry Road Windham 03087	Y	Y	Y

Key:
- N Negative Response
- Y Positive Response
- B Blank Response
- \- Refused to Respond

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Judd Gregg-R* (603) 626-1212	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
John Rauh-D (603) 595-9353	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N
Larry Brady-I (603) 641-5900	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
District 1									
Bill Zeliff-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bob Preston-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
District 2									
Dick Swett-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bill Hatch-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

* Governor Judd Gregg's actual survey response has still not been received by the Committee. However, these responses are derived from the survey he is distributing to New Hampshire Right to Work Supporters and is claiming to have sent to us.

Candidates for Governor on back

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

Survey Questions for Gubernatorial Candidates

1. Will you support enactment of a state Right to Work law by the New Hampshire Legislature?
2. Will you support the repeal of monopoly bargaining privileges union officials currently have over public employees?
3. Will you oppose so-called "agency shop" legislation in the public sector?

Candidates for Governor

	#1	#2	#3
Mervin Newton- R 16 Grove Street Milford 03055	Y	Y	Y
Livius Fisteag- R P.O. Box 1233 Amherst 03031	-	-	-
Edward Dupont, Jr.- R 5 Westview Drive Rochester 03867	-	-	-
Elizabeth Hager- R 5 Auburn Street Concord 03301	-	-	-
Steve Merrill- R 50 Phillippe Cote St. Manchester 03101	-	-	-
Deborah Arnesen- D RR 1, Box 42 Orford 03777	B	B	B
Norman D'Amours- D 135 Chase Way Manchester 03104	-	-	-
Ned Helms- D P.O. Box 1780 Manchester 03105	N	N	N
Calvin Warburton- L P.O. Box 365 Raymond 03077	-	-	-
Miriam Luce- L 110 Londonderry Road Windham 03087	Y	Y	Y

Key:
- N Negative Response
- Y Positive Response
- B Blank Response
- \- Refused to Respond

Survey Questions for Gubernatorial Candidates

1. Will you support enactment of a state Right to Work law by the New Hampshire Legislature?
2. Will you support the repeal of monopoly bargaining privileges union officials currently have over public employees?
3. Will you oppose so-called "agency shop" legislation in the public sector?

Candidates for Governor

	#1	#2	#3		#1	#2	#3		#1	#2	#3
vin Newton- R Grove Street ford 03055	Y	Y	Y	Steve Merrill- R 50 Phillippe Cote St. Manchester 03101	-	-	-	Calvin Warburton- L P.O. Box 365 Raymond 03077	-	-	-
ius Fisteag- R . Box 1233 hurst 03031	-	-	-	Deborah Arnesen- D RR 1, Box 42 Orford 03777	B	B	B	Miriam Luce- L 110 Londonderry Road Windham 03087	Y	Y	Y
ard Dupont, Jr.- R estview Drive hester 03867	-	-	-	Norman D'Amours- D 135 Chase Way Manchester 03104	-	-	-				
abeth Hager- R ubrn Street ncord 03301	-	-	-	Ned Helms- D P.O. Box 1780 Manchester 03105	N	N	N				

Key:
- N Negative Response
- Y Positive Response
- B Blank Response
- \- Refused to Respond

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Judd Gregg-R* (603) 626-1212	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
John Rauh-D (603) 595-9353	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N
Larry Brady-I (603) 641-5900	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
District 1									
Bill Zeliff-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bob Preston-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
District 2									
Dick Swett-D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bill Hatch-R	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
\- = No Response

* Governor Judd Gregg's actual survey response has still not been received by the Committee. However, these responses are derived from the survey he is distributing to New Hampshire Right to Work Supporters and is claiming to have sent to us.

Candidates for Governor on back

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

Survey Questions for Gubernatorial Candidates

1. Will you support enactment of a state Right to Work law by the New Hampshire Legislature?
2. Will you support the repeal of monopoly bargaining privileges union officials currently have over public employees?
3. Will you oppose so-called "agency shop" legislation in the public sector?

Candidates for Governor

	#1	#2	#3
Mervin Newton- R 16 Grove Street Milford 03055	Y	Y	Y
Livius Fisteag- R P.O. Box 1233 Amherst 03031	-	-	-
Edward Dupont, Jr.- R 5 Westview Drive Rochester 03867	-	-	-
Elizabeth Hager- R 5 Auburn Street Concord 03301	-	-	-
Steve Merrill- R 50 Phillippe Cote St. Manchester 03101	-	-	-
Deborah Arnesen- D RR 1, Box 42 Orford 03777	B	B	B
Norman D'Amours- D 135 Chase Way Manchester 03104	-	-	-
Ned Helms- D P.O. Box 1780 Manchester 03105	N	N	N
Calvin Warburton- L P.O. Box 365 Raymond 03077	-	-	-
Miriam Luce- L 110 Londonderry Road Windham 03087	Y	Y	Y

Key:
- N Negative Response
- Y Positive Response
- B Blank Response
- \- Refused to Respond

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Judd Gregg-R* (603) 626-1212	- Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
~~John Rauh-D~~ (603) 595-9353	N N N - N N N N N
~~Larry Brady-I~~ (603) 641-5900	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Bill Zeliff-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Bob Preston-D	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Dick Swett-D	- - - - - - - - -
Bill Hatch-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

* Governor Judd Gregg's actual survey response has still not been received by the Committee. However, these responses are derived from the survey he is distributing to New Hampshire Right to Work Supporters and is claiming to have sent to us.

Candidates for Governor on back

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

Comments on Fed Svy Specials Camera/Laser copy

UT - Pg 1

A1: insert a hyphen in line 3

A2: insert a hyphen in line 2

A4: copy change → for UT only

As the second biggest recipient of union-boss political cash in the entire U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Owens helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

A7: change dates to seats (line 3)

UT: Pg 2

A3: $803,000 for X's and copy needs insert in line 2 → see fax

A4: transpose ". please

A5: line 4 insert semi colon
line 5 insert hyphen

A6: Why isn't phone # in? See original copy

A8: Make Owens possessive ('s)

A10: Put in phone # see sig.

P5: line 3 delete comma. Line 5 insert space

20.04.1997 25:52

NV - Pg. 1

#1 : Insert hyphen at end of line 2.
Line 3 should say Nevadans
#2 : Insert hyphen at end of line 1.
#4 : Line 3 parentheses should read (H.R. #5/S. #55).
Line 4 - Insert copy : should read "The strike bill failed...
#5 : Move beginning of line 5 up to fit properly on line 4.
#7 : Copy change → seats

NV : Pg. 2

#3 : $407,000 for x's.
#5 : Line 4 insert Dash between way and they.
#6 : Phone # for x's : (702) 598-1992 - line 1
#7 : Delete space ; Insert comma on line 3
#9 : Delete s on line 2.
#10 : Put in phone # - (702) 737-8800

CO - Pg. 1

NONE

CO Pg. 2

#3 : $505,000 for x's.
#5 : Line 5 insert dash (--)

ID -Pg. 1

#4: Line 3 Parentheses should read (H.R. #5 / S. #55).
#7: Change states to seats
#8: Insert —

ID -Pg. 2

#3: $270,500 for x's
#5: Line 4 change ; to --
#10: Phone # is (208) 336-0092

SC -Pg. 1

#1: Insert hyphen on line 3
#2: Insert hyphen at end of line 1
#7: Line 1 delete s

SC -Pg. 2

#3: $209,000 For x's
#4: Line 3 Transpose 's please.
#5: Line 4 Replace ; with --
#8: Line 1 Transpose 's please.

NC-Pg. 1

#1: Insert hyphen; change is to iF. Line 3

#2: Insert hyphen at end of line 1.

#4: Line 2 Delete d

Line 5 Delete d

#5: Move copy on line 5 up to end of line 4.

#7: Change states to seats

NC-Pg. 2

#2: Line 2 should read: seem to be falling on deaf ears.

#4: $455,000 for x's.

#6: Line 3 add space.

Line 4 change ; to --

#7: Phone # is (800) 722-1992

#9: should read Sanford's (Line 1)

#10: Insert and at end of line 4.

#11: Phone # is (919) 790-1111

Fax

National Right to Work Committee • 8001 Braddock Road • Springfield, Virginia 22160 • (800) 325-7892 • FAX (703) 321-7342

Telecopier Information Sheet

The following pages are for:

Individual: Doug Achilles

Firm: Direct Mail Communications

Telephone: (804) 525-0155 Telecopier: (804) 525-5450

From: Morgan Birge / Denise Koff

Total number of pages (including information sheet): 17

Date transmitted: 10/19/92

Comments:

Doug -

Here are the corrections for the letters.

Morgan

This fax message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the addressee(s) or the designated recipient(s) named above. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any use, review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us by U.S. mail at the address above. Thank you.

NRL4224 PG1&2 "UT" SURVEY TARGET SPECIAL JOB#4116 CEO CINDI 10-16 9:38

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Wayne Owens will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Utah's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Wayne Owens continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Utah will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Owens has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As ~~one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the~~ the second biggest recipient of union-boss political cash in the entire U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Owens helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.5/S.55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Owens voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Owens's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Utah and just two other Senate states into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Owens could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Utah's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Owens with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Utah citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

(UT)

But Congressman Owens continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Wayne Owens ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Utah citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX $803,000 into his campaigns for the Senate. U.S. House and now the on other copy

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Owens's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers".

So while Congressman Owens is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way; they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers. OK

Please call Congressman Owens now at (XXX) XXX-XXXX 801 486-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Owens renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor. another copy

Tell Congressman Owens you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Utah citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Owens's opponent, Bob Bennett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Bennett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Bennett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Bennett not to back down. Please call him at ~~(XXX) XXX-XXXX~~ 801-521-9534 and tell him the people of Utah support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Wayne Owens must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today. delete #

#

UT

Comments on Fed Svy Specials Camera/Laser copy

UT - Pg 1

#1: insert a hyphen in line 3

#2: insert a hyphen in line 2

#4: copy change → for UT only

As the second biggest recipient of union-boss political cash in the entire U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Owens helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

#7: change states to seats (line 3)

UT: Pg 2

#3: $803,000 for X's and copy needs inserting line 2 → see fax

#4: transpose ". please

#5: line 4 insert semi colon
line 5 insert hyphen

#6: Why isn't phone #in? See original copy

#8: Make Owens possessive ('s)

#10: Put in phone # see orig.

P5: line 3 delete comma. Line 5 insert space

NRL4223 PG1&2 "NV" SURVEY TARGET SPECIAL JOB#4116 CE CINDI 10-16 9:30
October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Harry Reid will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if Nevada vote him another term.

If Senator Reid continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Nevada will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Reid has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Harry Reid is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. This past June, Mr. Reid helped Ted Kennedy try to ram his Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.5/S.55) through the Senate. The bill failed with only one vote to spare.

And in 1990, Mr. Reid voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Reid's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Nevada and just two other Senate into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Reid could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Nevada's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Reid with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Nevada citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

NV

But Senator Reid continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Harry Reid ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Nevada citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX $407,000 into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Reid's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Reid is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way -- they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers. O.K. ~~not~~ dash

Please call Senator Reid now at (~~XXX~~) ~~XXX~~-~~XXXX~~ 702 598-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Reid renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Reid you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Nevada citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Reid's opponent, Demar Dahl, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Dahl has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Dahl is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Dahl not to back down. Please call him at (~~XXX~~) ~~XXX~~-~~XXXX~~ 702 737-8800 and tell him Nevada citizens support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Harry Reid must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

(CO)

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Colorado's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Ben Campbell continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Colorado will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Campbell has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Campbell helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S, 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Campbell voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Campbell's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Colorado and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Campbell could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy all state Right to Work laws by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Campbell with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Colorado citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

(CO)

But Congressman Campbell continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ben Campbell ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Colorado citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $505,000 ~~$XXXXXXXXX~~ into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Campbell's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers."

OK AS IT

So while Congressman Campbell is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way, they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

DLDS's

Please call Congressman Campbell now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Campbell renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Campbell you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Colorado citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Campbell's opponent, Terry Considine, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Considine has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Considine is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Considine not to back down. Please call him at (303) 757-2567 and tell him the people of Colorado support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

(ID)

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Richard Stallings will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Idaho's next U.S Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Richard Stallings continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Idaho will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Stallings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Stallings helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.5 /S.55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Stallings voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Stalling's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Idaho and just two other Senate ~~states~~ seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Stallings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Idaho's hard-won Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Stallings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Idaho citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

(ID)

But Congressman Stallings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Richard Stallings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Idaho citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $270,500 ~~$XXXXXXXXX~~ into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Stallings's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers".

So while Congressman Stallings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way--they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers. OK dash

Please call Congressman Stallings now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Stallings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Stallings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Idaho citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Stalling's opponent, Dirk Kempthorne, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Kempthorne has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Kempthorne is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Kempthorne not to back down. Please call him at ~~(XXX) XXX-XXXX~~ (208) 336-0092 and tell him the people of Idaho support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Richard Stallings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

OCT-16-92 FRI 9:41 DIRECT MAIL

NRL4222 PG1&2 "SC" SURVEY TARGET SPECIAL JOB#4116 CEO CINDI 10-16 9:30

October XX, 1992

SC

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Ernest Hollings will vote on compulsory unionism legislation if South Carolinians vote him another term.

If Senator Hollings continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, South Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Hollings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Senator Hollings has not exactly been a Right to Work advocate in the Senate.

Just recently, he voted to block enforcement of the 1988 Supreme Court Beck ban on the use of forced dues for politics.

And in 1990, Mr. Hollings voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Hollings's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps South Carolina and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Hollings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy South Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Hollings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry South Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Hollings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ernest Hollings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of South Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Hollings's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Hollings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way -- they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Hollings now at (803) 723-0700 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Hollings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Hollings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls South Carolina citizens. Tell him he's not fooling, anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Hollings's opponent, Tommy Hartnett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Hartnett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Hartnett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Hartnett not to back down. Please call him at (803) 720-8860 and tell him South Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Ernest Hollings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

NC

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Terry Sanford will vote on compulsory unionism legislation ~~is~~ if North Carolinians vote him another term.

If Senator Sanford continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, North Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Sanford has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Terry Sanford is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. In 1990 and 1992, Senator Sanford voted to overturn the 1988 Supreme Court Beck decision, which forbids the use of forced dues for politics. Again and again, Senator Sanford has voted to force workers to pay for political causes they don't agree with.

And in 1990, Mr. Sanford voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Sanford's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps North Carolina and just two other Senate ~~states~~ seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Sanford could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy North Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Sanford with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry North

Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Sanford continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Terry Sanford ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of North Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $455,000 ~~$XXXXXXXXX~~ into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Sanford's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Sanford is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way, they bankroll his campaigns with forced union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Sanford now at (800) 722-1992 ~~(XXX) XXX-XXXX~~ and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Sanford renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Sanford you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls North Carolina citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Sanford's opponent, Lauch Faircloth, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Faircloth has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Faircloth is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Faircloth not to back down. Please call him at ~~(XXX)~~ (919) 890-1111 ~~XXX-XXXX~~ and tell him North Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Terry Sanford must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

NV - Pg. 1

#1 : Insert hyphen at end of line 2.
Line 3 should say Nevadans
#2 : Insert hyphen at end of line 1.
#4 : Line 3 parentheses should read (H.R. #5/S. #55).
Line 4 - Insert copy : should read "The strike bill failed...
#5 : Move beginning of line 5 up to fit properly on line 4.
#7 : Copy change → seats

NV : Pg. 2

#3 : $407,000 for X's.
#5 : Line 4 insert Dash between way and they
#6 : Phone # for X's : (702) 598-1992 - line 1
#7 : Delete space ; Insert comma on line 3
#9 : Delete s on line 2.
#10 : Put in phone # - (702) 737-8800

CO - Pg. 1

NONE

CO Pg. 2

#3 : $505,000 for X's.
#5 : Line 5 insert dash (--).

ID Pg. 1

#4: Line 3 Parentheses should read (H.R. #5 / S. #55).
#7: Change states to seats
#8: Insert —

ID - Pg. 2

#3: $270,500 for x's
#5: Line 4 change ; to --
#10: Phone # is (208) 336-0092

SC - Pg. 1

#1: Insert hyphen on line 3
#2: Insert hyphen at end of line 1
#7: Line 1 delete s

SC - Pg. 2

#3: $209,000 For x's
#4: Line 3 Transpose 's please.
#5: Line 4 Replace ; with --
#8: Line 1 Transpose 's please.

NC-Pg. 1

#1: Insert hyphen; change is to iF. Line 3

#2: Insert hyphen at end of line 1.

#4: Line 2 Delete d

Line 5 Delete d

#5: Move copy on line 5 up to end of line 4.

#7: Change states to seats

NC-Pg. 2

#2: Line 2 should read: seem to be falling on deaf ears.

#4: $455,000 for x's

#6: Line 3 add space.

Line 4 change; to --

#7: Phone # is (800) 722-1992

#9: Should read Sanford's (Line 1)

#10: Insert and at end of line 4.

#11: Phone # is (919) 790-1111

DP Instructions

Overview: 2 files sorted in zip sequence. Types & layouts already provided. Each state will have to be extracted due to different letter copy (& extraneous records in different states which we discussed) We only want to mail the 7 states listed on grid. This means blocks of sequence numbers won't be used. Quantity for each state should match grid.

Carrier:

Face 100's of corner cards in standard courier typewriter font

8001 Braddock Rd.
Springfield, VA 22160

Face name & address also in same font as corner card. Sequence number in smallest font available.

Letter: Versions of pg 1 & pg 2. Unique for each state. Letter date October 23, 1992 Courier font. Personalize name & address & print salutation from salute field. Default is in record (Dear Member for large file & Dear Fellow American for small file) Face sequence number upper right on both pg 1 & pg 2.
Ensure that we have good quality laser. Sign off (flat ok) needed for each state.
Try to ensure standard left hand margin on pg 1 & 2

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF COLORADO

U.S. Senate

Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Ben Campbell-D - - - - - - - - -
(303) 837-0565
Terry Considine-R . . Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 757-2567

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

District 1
Ed Pfleeger-D - - - - - - - - -
(303) 866-1230
Raymond Diaz Aragon- . . . . Y Y Y Y
(303) 320-6607

District 2
David Skaggs-D - - - - - - - - -
(303) 650-7886
Brian Day-R Y Y . . . Y Y Y Y
(303) 422-8692

Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

District 3
Mike Caliban-D - - - - - - - - -
(303) 320-3918
Scott McInnis-R Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
(303) 242-4623

District 4
Tom Redder-D - - - - - - - - -
(303) 224-9767
Wayne Allard-R Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 226-2726

District 5
Charles Orler-D - - - - - - - - -
(303) 798-3236
Joel Hefley-R Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(303) 933-0044

Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

District 6
Tom Kolbe-D N - - N - N Y N -
(303) 850-9867
Dan Schaefer-R - - - - - - - - -
(303) 989-2100

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
. = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

#4116 - NW Survey Target Specials - Rosters (7 ver.)

Fax

National Right to Work Committee • 8001 Braddock Road • Springfield, Virginia 22160 • (800) 325-7892 • FAX (703) 321-7342

Telecopier Information Sheet

The following pages are for:

Individual: DOUG Achilles

Firm: DMC

Telephone: _____ Telecopier: (804) 525-5450

From: D. KOFF

Total number of pages (including information sheet): 3

Date transmitted: 10/16/92

Comments: Doug - will fax copy of DP instructions. Can't find anyone to fax now. Call with questions.

Signature pages are fine

This fax message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the addressee(s) or the designated recipient(s) named above. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any use, review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us by U.S. mail at the address above. Thank you.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

   This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

   Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

   Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

   The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

   The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

   The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

   While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

   As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

   Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

   Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

   The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

   At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

   These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

   No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

   Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

   The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

   Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

   Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

   The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

   Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ritz Hollings-D 303) 723-0700	- - - - - - - - -
ommy Hartnett-R 303) 720-8860	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

J.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
istrict 1	
ill Oberst-D 303) 527-4946	- - - - - - - - -
rthur Ravenel, Jr.-R 303) 722-0174	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 2	
Floyd Spence-R (803) 254-5120	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
District 3	
James Bland-R (803) 641-1408	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Butler Derrick-D (803) 225-5301	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y
District 4	
Liz Patterson-D (803) 582-3650	- - - - - - - - -
Bob Inglis-R (803) 242-6440	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
John Spratt-D (803) 327-1114	- - - - - - - - -
William Horne-R (803) 494-2641	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y
District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D (803) 929-0208	- - - - - - - - -
John Chase-R (803) 669-8787	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?

. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?

. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?

. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?

. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?

6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?

7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?

8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?

9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

   This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

   Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

   Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

   The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

   The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

   The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

   While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

   As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

   Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

   Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

   The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

   At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

   These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

   No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

   Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

   The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

   Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

   Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

   The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

   Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fritz Hollings-D (803) 723-0700	- - - - - - - - -
Tommy Hartnett-R (803) 720-8860	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Bill Oberst-D (803) 527-4946	- - - - - - - - -
Arthur Ravenel, Jr.-R (803) 722-0174	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 2	
Floyd Spence-R (803) 254-5120	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
District 3	
James Bland-R (803) 641-1408	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Butler Derrick-D (803) 225-5301	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y
District 4	
Liz Patterson-D (803) 582-3650	- - - - - - - - -
Bob Inglis-R (803) 242-6440	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
John Spratt-D (803) 327-1114	- - - - - - - - -
William Horne-R (803) 494-2641	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y
District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D (803) 929-0208	- - - - - - - - -
John Chase-R (803) 669-8787	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, *which federal law now* forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "*anti-double breasting*" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. *Will you oppose legislation* that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the *questions on the reverse side of this form.*

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fritz Hollings-D (803) 723-0700	- - - - - - - - -
Tommy Hartnett-R (803) 720-8860	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Bill Oberst-D (803) 527-4946	- - - - - - - - -
Arthur Ravenel, Jr.-R (803) 722-0174	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 2	
Floyd Spence-R (803) 254-5120	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
District 3	
James Bland-R (803) 641-1408	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Butler Derrick-D (803) 225-5301	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y
District 4	
Liz Patterson-D (803) 582-3650	- - - - - - - - -
Bob Inglis-R (803) 242-6440	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
John Spratt-D (803) 327-1114	- - - - - - - - -
William Horne-R (803) 494-2641	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y
District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D (803) 929-0208	- - - - - - - - -
John Chase-R (803) 669-8787	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

SMZ

COPY APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(ATTACH TO FINAL DRAFT COPY WITH DISK)

ROUTE TO:
ARL

DATE 10/16/92

PACKAGE: NC

FROM: ARL

CHECK OFF IF . . .	ROUTED TO:	APPROVED BY:
HLW		
SOG		
RL		
RJC		

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES MADE: YES NO

TO PROOFING:		CHANGES MADE BY:
1ST	SMZ/DAJ 10-16-92	Yes
2ND		
3RD		

WLP/FACT CHECK
(PROOFING SEND SEPARATE COPY)

REC'D: _____ APPROVED: _____

9103.04.203.3154

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Terry Sanford will vote on compulsory unionism legislation ~~is~~ it North Carolinians vote him another term.

If Senator Sanford continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, North Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Sanford has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Terry Sanford is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. In 1990 and 1992, Senator Sanford voted to overturn the 1988 Supreme Court Beck decision, which forbids the use of forced dues for politics. Again and again, Senator Sanford has voted to force workers to pay for political causes they don't agree with.

And in 1990, Mr. Sanford voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Sanford's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps North Carolina and just two other Senate ~~states~~ seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Sanford could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy North Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I'm [illegible] you to inundate Senator Sanford with phone calls, letters [illegible] postcards. Thousands of angry North

Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Sanford continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Terry Sanford ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of North Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $455,000 ~~$XXXXXXXXX~~ into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Sanford's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Sanford is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way, they bankroll his campaigns with forced union dues stolen from American workers. OK

Please call Senator Sanford now at (800) 722-1992 ~~(XXX) XXX-XXXX~~ and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Sanford renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Sanford you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls North Carolina citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Sanford's opponent, Lauch Faircloth, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Faircloth has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Faircloth is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Faircloth not to back down. Please call him at ~~(XXX)~~ (919) ~~XXX-XXXX~~ and tell him North Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Terry Sanford must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX XXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Terry Sanford will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if North Carolinians vote him another term.

If Senator Sanford continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, North Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Sanford has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Terry Sanford is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. In 1990 and 1992, Senator Sanford voted to overturn the 1988 Supreme Court Beck decision, which forbids the use of forced dues for politics. Again and again, Senator Sanford has voted to force workers to pay for political causes they don't agree with.

And in 1990, Mr. Sanford voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Sanford's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps North Carolina and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Sanford could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy North Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Sanford with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry North

Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Sanford continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Terry Sanford ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of North Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Sanford's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Sanford is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way, they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Sanford now at (800) 722-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Sanford renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Sanford you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls North Carolina citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Sanford's opponent, Lauch Faircloth, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Faircloth has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Faircloth is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Faircloth not to back down. Please call him at (919) 790-1111 and tell him North Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Terry Sanford must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Terry Sanford-D (800) 722-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Lauch Faircloth-R (919) 790-1111	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Eva Clayton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ted Tyler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Tim Valentine, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
Don Davis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
H. Martin Lancaster-D	Y Y Y Y Y - Y N Y
Tommy Pollard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
David Price-D	- - - - - - - - -
Vicky Goudie-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Stephen Neal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Richard Burr-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Robin Hood-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Howard Coble-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Charlie Rose-D	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Anderson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
W. G. Hefner-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Coy Privette-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Rory Blake-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Alex McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 10	
Ben Neill-D	- - - - - - - - -
T. Cass Ballenger-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
John Stevens-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Charles Taylor-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Melvin Watt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Gore Washington-R	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
rry Sanford-D 00) 722-1992	- - - - - - - - -
uch Faircloth-R 19) 790-1111	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
strict 1	
a Clayton-D	- - - - - - - - -
d Tyler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
strict 2	
m Valentine, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
n Davis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
strict 3	
Martin Lancaster-D	Y Y Y Y Y - Y N Y
mmy Pollard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 4	
David Price-D	- - - - - - - - -
Vicky Goudie-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Stephen Neal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Richard Burr-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Robin Hood-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Howard Coble-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Charlie Rose-D	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Anderson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
W. G. Hefner-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Coy Privette-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Rory Blake-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Alex McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 10	
Ben Neill-D	- - - - - - - - -
T. Cass Ballenger-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
John Stevens-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Charles Taylor-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Melvin Watt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Gore Washington-R	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?

. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?

. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?

. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?

. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?

6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?

7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?

8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?

9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U which can legally force individuals to pay dues into th treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits uni officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to u workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" politic spending on goods and services to elect candidates for feder offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PA contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditure are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated th this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more tha what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on tha yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congres to automatically impose union representation upon workers o nonunionized companies which have even the slightes economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companie each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory unior contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunior workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Terry Sanford-D (800) 722-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Lauch Faircloth-R (919) 790-1111	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Eva Clayton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ted Tyler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Tim Valentine, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
Don Davis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
H. Martin Lancaster-D	Y Y Y Y Y - Y N Y
Tommy Pollard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
David Price-D	- - - - - - - - -
Vicky Goudie-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Stephen Neal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Richard Burr-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Robin Hood-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Howard Coble-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Charlie Rose-D	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Anderson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
W. G. Hefner-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Coy Privette-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Rory Blake-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Alex McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 10	
Ben Neill-D	- - - - - - - - -
T. Cass Ballenger-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
John Stevens-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Charles Taylor-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Melvin Watt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Gore Washington-R	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Terry Sanford-D	- - - - - - - - -
(800) 722-1992	
Lauch Faircloth-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
(919) 790-1111	

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Eva Clayton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ted Tyler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Tim Valentine, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
Don Davis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
H. Martin Lancaster-D	Y Y Y Y Y - Y N Y
Tommy Pollard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 4	
David Price-D	- - - - - - - - -
Vicky Goudie-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Stephen Neal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Richard Burr-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Robin Hood-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Howard Coble-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Charlie Rose-D	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Anderson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
W. G. Hefner-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Coy Privette-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Rory Blake-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Alex McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 10	
Ben Neill-D	- - - - - - - - -
T. Cass Ballenger-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
John Stevens-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Charles Taylor-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Melvin Watt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Gore Washington-R	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

   The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

   At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

   These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

   No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

   Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

   The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

   Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

   Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

   The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

   Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Terry Sanford-D (800) 722-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Lauch Faircloth-R (919) 790-1111	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Eva Clayton-D	- - - - - - - - -
Ted Tyler-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
Tim Valentine, Jr.-D	- - - - - - - - -
Don Davis-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
H. Martin Lancaster-D	Y Y Y Y Y - Y N Y
Tommy Pollard-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
David Price-D	- - - - - - - - -
Vicky Goudie-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Stephen Neal-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
Richard Burr-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Robin Hood-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Howard Coble-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 7	
Charlie Rose-D	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Anderson-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 8	
W. G. Hefner-D	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Coy Privette-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 9	
Rory Blake-D	- - - - - - - - -
J. Alex McMillan-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 10	
Ben Neill-D	- - - - - - - - -
T. Cass Ballenger-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 11	
John Stevens-D	- - Y - - - - - -
Charles Taylor-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 12	
Melvin Watt-D	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Gore Washington-R	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

COPY APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(ATTACH TO FINAL DRAFT COPY WITH DISK)

ROUTE TO:
ARL

DATE 10/16/92

PACKAGE: UT

FROM: ARL

CHECK OFF IF . . .	ROUTED TO:	APPROVED BY:
HLW		
SOG		
RL		
RJC		

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES MADE: YES NO

TO PROOFING: CHANGES MADE BY:

1ST PA/SDK 10/16/92 Yes

2ND

3RD

WLP/FACT CHECK
(PROOFING SEND SEPARATE COPY)

REC'D: APPROVED:

1392.003.10.02

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Wayne Owens will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Utah's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Wayne Owens continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Utah will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Owens has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As ~~one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the~~ the second biggest recipient of union-boss political cash in the entire U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Owens helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R.5/S.55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Owens voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Owens's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Utah and just two other Senate states into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Owens could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Utah's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Owens with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Utah citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Owens continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Wayne Owens ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Utah citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate. $803,000 U.S. House and now the on other copy

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Owens's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers".

So while Congressman Owens is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way, they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers. OK [3]

Please call Congressman Owens now at (XXX) XXX-XXXX 801 486-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Owens renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor. another copy

Tell Congressman Owens you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Utah citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Owens's opponent, Bob Bennett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Bennett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Bennett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Bennett not to back down. Please call him at (XXX) XXX-XXXX 801-521-9534 and tell him the people of Utah support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Wayne Owens must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today. delete [2] #

#

new clean

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX XXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Wayne Owens will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Utah's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Wayne Owens continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Utah will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Owens has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As the second biggest recipient of union-boss political cash in the entire U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Owens helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Owens voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Owens's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Utah and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Owens could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Utah's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Owens with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Utah citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Owens continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Wayne Owens ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Utah citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $803,000 into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Owens's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers."

So while Congressman Owens is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way; they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Owens now at (801) 486-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Owens renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Owens you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Utah citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Owens's opponent, Bob Bennett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Bennett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Bennett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Bennett not to back down. Please call him at (801) 521-9534 and tell him the people of Utah support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Wayne Owens must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX XXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Wayne Owens will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Utah's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Wayne Owens continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Utah will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Owens has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

the 2nd biggest recipient of union-boss political cash in the entire House of Reps

~~As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives,~~ Congressman Owens helped pass Ted Kennedy's ~~Pushbutton Strike~~ bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

not on FAX copy

And in 1990, Mr. Owens voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Owens's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Utah and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Owens could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

"States" on fax copy

He could vote to destroy Utah's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Owens with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Utah citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Owens continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Wayne Owens ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Utah citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $803,000 into his campaigns for the U.S. House, and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Owens's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers."

So while Congressman Owens is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way; they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Owens now at (801) 486-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Owens renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Owens you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Utah citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Owens's opponent, Bob Bennett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Bennett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Bennett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Bennett not to back down. Please call him at (801) 521-9534 and tell him the people of Utah support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Wayne Owens must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF UTAH

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Wayne Owens-D (801) 486-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Robert Bennett-R (801) 521-9534	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
James Hansen-R (801) 451-5218	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
Ron Holt-D (801) 544-0963	- - Y - - - - - -
District 2	
Karen Shepherd-D (801) 532-5241	- - - - - - - - -
Enid Greene-R (801) 521-2808	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Bill Orton-D (801) 226-1112	- - - - - - - - -
Richard Harrington-R (801) 324-6102	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

kw

COPY APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(ATTACH TO FINAL DRAFT COPY WITH DISK)

ROUTE TO:
ARL

DATE 10/16/92

PACKAGE: SC

FROM: ARL

CHECK OFF IF . . .	ROUTED TO:	APPROVED BY:
HLW		
SOG		
RL		
RJC		

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES MADE: YES NO

TO PROOFING:	CHANGES MADE BY:
1ST DAT/SME 10/16 YES	
2ND	
3RD	

WLP/FACT CHECK
(PROOFING SEND SEPARATE COPY)

REC'D: APPROVED:

9403.282.10.02

NRL4222 PG1&2 "SC" SURVEY TARGET SPECIAL JOB#4116 CEOO CINDI 10-16 9:30
October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Ernest Hollings will vote on compulsory unionism legislation if South Carolinians vote him another term.

(per SOG) Ernest "Fritz" Hollings

If Senator Hollings continues to vote to hand compulsory unionism powers to Big Labor, South Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Hollings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Senator Hollings has not exactly been a Right to Work advocate in the Senate.

Just recently, he voted to block enforcement of the 1988 Supreme Court Beck ban on the use of forced dues for politics.

And in 1990, Mr. Hollings voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Hollings' vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps South Carolina and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Hollings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy South Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Hollings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry South Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Hollings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ernest Hollings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of South Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Hollings's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Hollings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way -- they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Hollings now at (803) 723-0700 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Hollings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Hollings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big [illegible] or backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls South Carol[illegible] [illegible]tizens. Tell him he's not fooling, anybody, and urge him [illegible]p voting to force workers to pay [illegible]nion dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Hollings's opponent, Tommy Hartnett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Hartnett has pr[illegible] to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, [illegible] for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Hartnett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Hartnett not to back down. Please call him at (803) 720-8860 and tell him South Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Ernest Hollings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX XXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Ernest Hollings will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if South Carolinians vote him another term.

If Senator Hollings continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, South Carolina will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Hollings has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Senator Hollings has not exactly been a Right to Work advocate in the Senate.

Just recently, he voted to block enforcement of the 1988 Supreme Court Beck ban on the use of forced dues for politics.

And in 1990, Mr. Hollings voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Hollings's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps South Carolina and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Hollings could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy South Carolina's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Hollings with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry South Carolina citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Hollings continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ernest Hollings ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of South Carolina citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Hollings' campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Hollings is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way, they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Senator Hollings now at (803) 723-0700 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Hollings renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Hollings you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls South Carolina citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Hollings' opponent, Tommy Hartnett, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Hartnett has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Hartnett is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Hartnett not to back down. Please call him at (803) 720-8860 and tell him South Carolinians support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Ernest Hollings must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

folder copy

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fritz Hollings-D (803) 723-0700	- - - - - - - - -
Tommy Hartnett-R (803) 720-8860	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Bill Oberst-D (803) 527-4946	- - - - - - - - -
Arthur Ravenel, Jr.-R (803) 722-0174	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 2	
Floyd Spence-R (803) 254-5120	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y - Y
District 3	
James Bland-R (803) 641-1408	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Butler Derrick-D (803) 225-5301	Y Y Y - Y N Y - Y
District 4	
Liz Patterson-D (803) 582-3650	- - - - - - - - -
Bob Inglis-R (803) 242-6440	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
John Spratt-D (803) 327-1114	- - - - - - - - -
William Horne-R (803) 494-2641	Y Y Y Y Y - Y Y Y
District 6	
Jim Clyburn-D (803) 929-0208	- - - - - - - - -
John Chase-R (803) 669-8787	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But *we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter* are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

kar

COPY APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(ATTACH TO FINAL DRAFT COPY WITH DISK)

ROUTE TO:
ARL

DATE 10/16/92

PACKAGE: NV

FROM: ARL

CHECK OFF IF . . .	ROUTED TO:	APPROVED BY:
HLW		
SOG		
RL		
RJC		

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES MADE: YES NO

TO PROOFING: CHANGES MADE BY:

1ST SDK/PB 10/16/92 yes

2ND

3RD

WLP/FACT CHECK
(PROOFING SEND SEPARATE COPY)

REC'D: APPROVED:

7432.203.40.02

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Harry Reid will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if Nevada ~~[illegible]~~ vote him another term. hyphen

If Senator Reid continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Nevada will suffer. And so will the entire nation. hyphen

Until now, Senator Reid has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Harry Reid is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. This past June, Mr. Reid helped Ted Kennedy try to ram his Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5 or S. 55) through the Senate. The bill failed with only one vote to spare. # (#) Strike

And in 1990, Mr. Reid voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Reid's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Nevada and just two other Senate ~~states~~ into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Reid could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law. seats

He could vote to destroy Nevada's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Reid with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Nevada citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Reid continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Harry Reid ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Nevada citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX $407,000 into his campaigns for the Senate.

And the cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Reid's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Reid is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way -- they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers. O.K. cash

Please call Senator Reid now at (XXX) XXX-XXXX 702 598-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Reid renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Reid you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Nevada citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Reid's opponent, Demar Dahl, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Dahl has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Dahl is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Dahl not to back down. Please call him at (XXX) XXX-XXXX 702 737-9800 and tell him Nevada citizens support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Harry Reid must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX XXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Senator Harry Reid will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if Nevadans vote him another term.

If Senator Reid continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Nevada will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Senator Reid has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

Harry Reid is one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the Senate. This past June, Mr. Reid helped Ted Kennedy try to ram his Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55) through the Senate. The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare.

And in 1990, Mr. Reid voted twice to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Reid's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Nevada and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Reid could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy Nevada's cherished Right to Work law by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Senator Reid with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Nevada citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Senator Reid continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Harry Reid ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Nevada citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX $407,000 into his campaigns for the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Senator Reid's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and paid "volunteers."

So while Senator Reid is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) deal. He votes their way; they bankroll his campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers. not?

Please call Senator Reid now at (702) 598-1992 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Senator Reid renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Senator Reid you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Nevada citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Reid's opponent, Demar Dahl, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Dahl has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Dahl is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Dahl not to back down. Please call him at (702) 737-8800 and tell him Nevada citizens support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Senator Harry Reid must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, is when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEVADA

folder copy

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Harry Reid-D (702) 598-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Demar Dahl-R (702) 737-8800	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
J. Coy Pettyjohn-R (702) 259-8683	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
James Bilbray-D (702) 369-8155	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Pete Sferrazza-D (702) 324-7383	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Vucanovich-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEVADA

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Harry Reid-D (702) 598-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Demar Dahl-R (702) 737-8800	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
J. Coy Pettyjohn-R (702) 259-8683	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
James Bilbray-D (702) 369-8155	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Pete Sferrazza-D (702) 324-7383	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Vucanovich-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

20.04.1997.3593

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEVADA

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Harry Reid-D (702) 598-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Demar Dahl-R (702) 737-8800	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
J. Coy Pettyjohn-R (702) 259-8683	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
James Bilbray-D (702) 369-8155	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Pete Sferrazza-D (702) 324-7383	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Vucanovich-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — *including employees who oppose the union and don't* want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEVADA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Harry Reid-D (702) 598-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Demar Dahl-R (702) 737-8800	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
J. Coy Pettyjohn-R (702) 259-8683	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
James Bilbray-D (702) 369-8155	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Pete Sferrazza-D (702) 324-7383	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Vucanovich-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF NEVADA

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Harry Reid-D (702) 598-1992	- - - - - - - - -
Demar Dahl-R (702) 737-8800	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
J. Coy Pettyjohn-R (702) 259-8683	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
James Bilbray-D (702) 369-8155	- - - - - - - - -
District 2	
Pete Sferrazza-D (702) 324-7383	- - - - - - - - -
Barbara Vucanovich-R	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

OK 10/22

Sm

COPY APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(ATTACH TO FINAL DRAFT COPY WITH DISK)

ROUTE TO:

DATE 10/15/92

PACKAGE: CD

FROM: ARL

CHECK OFF IF . . .	ROUTED TO:	APPROVED BY:
HLW		
SOG		
RL		
RJC		

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES MADE: YES NO

TO PROOFING:		CHANGES MADE BY:
1ST SDK/SMZ	yes	
2ND		
3RD		

WLP/FACT CHECK
(PROOFING SEND SEPARATE COPY)

REC'D: APPROVED:

2592.4693.40.02

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Colorado's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Ben Campbell continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Colorado will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Campbell has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Campbell helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S, 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Campbell voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Campbell's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Colorado and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Campbell could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy all state Right to Work laws by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Campbell with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Colorado citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Campbell continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ben Campbell ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Colorado citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Campbell's campaigns in the form of "soft" money -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers."

So while Congressman Campbell is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way, they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Campbell now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Campbell renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Campbell you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Colorado citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anyb , and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Campbell's opponent, Terry Considine, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Considine has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Considine is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Considine not to back down. Please call him at (303) 757-2567 and tell him the people of Colorado support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Fred Lar n

P.S. Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely to mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX XXXXXXXX:

I'm writing you a personal letter today because I'm very concerned about how Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell will vote on compulsory-unionism legislation if he becomes Colorado's next U.S. Senator.

If, as a U.S. Senator, Ben Campbell continues to vote to hand compulsory-unionism powers to Big Labor, Colorado will suffer. And so will the entire nation.

Until now, Congressman Campbell has voted with the union hierarchy and against individual freedom for workers and small businesses almost every time.

As one of Big Labor's most reliable water carriers in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Campbell helped pass Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill (H.R. 5/S. 55). The Strike bill failed with only one vote to spare in the Senate.

And in 1990, Mr. Campbell voted twice in the House to allow government union chieftains to declare open season on harassing 2.9 million federal employees and thousands of U.S. taxpayers to support the union political machine by repealing the Hatch Act. Big Labor came just two votes shy of corralling enough senators to override President Bush's veto and gut the 53-year-old law.

Mr. Campbell's vote in the Senate could put Big Labor over the top on these and countless other union-boss power grabs.

Organized Labor is within a whisker of total control over our federal government. If the union political machine sweeps Colorado and just two other Senate seats into Big Labor's vote column (and possibly the White House as well), Mr. Campbell could cast the key Senate vote to enact the entire union-boss political agenda into law.

He could vote to destroy all state Right to Work laws by abolishing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, enact the Pushbutton Strike bill, repeal the Hatch Act, and force all government employees to pay union dues to swell Big Labor's political and organizing coffers.

That's why I've urged you to inundate Congressman Campbell with phone calls, letters and postcards. Thousands of angry Colorado citizens are urging him to support Right to Work.

But Congressman Campbell continues to stonewall. Your protests seem to be falling on deaf ears.

Why is Ben Campbell ignoring you and the rest of the huge majority of Colorado citizens who oppose compulsory unionism?

Union operatives have stuffed $XXXXXXXXX into his campaigns for the U.S. House and now the Senate.

And that cash is only the tip of the iceberg. Union political pros have probably dumped ten times that into Congressman Campbell's campaigns in the form of "soft money" -- partisan get-out-the-vote drives, phone banks, and full-time paid "volunteers."

So while Congressman Campbell is refusing to tell Right to Work supporters his position on forced unionism, union lobbyists know he'll vote any way they say. It's a simple (if sleazy) arrangement. He votes their way; they bankroll his congressional and senate campaigns with forced-union dues stolen from American workers.

Please call Congressman Campbell now at (303) 837-0565 and urge him to repudiate his support for forced unionism. Only your howls and screams can make Congressman Campbell renounce his cozy relationship with Big Labor.

Tell Congressman Campbell you won't stand for his political dirty pool of taking Big Labor backroom payoffs -- while he stonewalls Colorado citizens. Tell him he's not fooling anybody, and urge him to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues.

On the other hand, Mr. Campbell's opponent, Terry Considine, did respond to his survey 100% for Right to Work.

Mr. Considine has promised to help stop Ted Kennedy's Pushbutton Strike bill, fight for tougher enforcement of the Supreme Court's ban on the use of forced dues for politics, oppose efforts to require public servants to pay union dues, and crack down on strike violence.

However, Mr. Considine is under intense pressure from union goons to renounce his Right to Work support. It's vital that you tell Mr. Considine not to back down. Please call him at (303) 757-2567 and tell him the people of Colorado support his pledge.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell must feel the heat from concerned citizens like you to stop voting to force workers to pay union dues. Now is the time, in the face of a tough U.S. Senate battle, when he is most likely mend his Washington ways. Please call him today.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF COLORADO

U.S. Senate

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Ben Campbell-D (303) 837-0565	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Considine-R (303) 757-2567	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

Questions #:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Pat Schroeder-D (303) 866-1230	- - - - - - - - -
Raymond Diaz Aragon-R (303) 320-6607	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
David Skaggs-D (303) 650-7886	- - - - - - - - -
Bryan Day-R (303) 422-8692	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Mike Calihan-D (303) 320-3918	- - - - - - - - -
Scott McInnis-R (303) 242-4623	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
Tom Redder-D (303) 224-9767	- - - - - - - - -
Wayne Allard-R (303) 226-2226	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Charles Oriez-D (303) 798-3236	- - - - - - - - -
Joel Hefley-R (303) 933-0044	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Tom Kolbe-D (303) 850-9867	N - - N - N Y N -
Dan Schaefer-R (303) 989-2100	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF COLORADO

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ampbell-D 837-0565	- - - - - - - - -
Considine-R 757-2567	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ict 1	
chroeder-D 866-1230	- - - - - - - - -
nd Diaz Aragon-R 320-6607	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
ict 2	
Skaggs-D 650-7886	- - - - - - - - -
Day-R 422-8692	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 3	
Mike Calihan-D (303) 320-3918	- - - - - - - - -
Scott McInnis-R (303) 242-4623	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
Tom Redder-D (303) 224-9767	- - - - - - - - -
Wayne Allard-R (303) 226-2226	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Charles Oriez-D (303) 798-3236	- - - - - - - - -
Joel Hefley-R (303) 933-0044	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 6	
Tom Kolbe-D (303) 850-9867	N - - N - N Y N -
Dan Schaefer-R (303) 989-2100	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?

Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?

Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?

Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?

Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?

6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?

7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?

8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?

9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF COLORADO

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Ben Campbell-D (303) 837-0565	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Considine-R (303) 757-2567	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Pat Schroeder-D (303) 866-1230	- - - - - - - - -
Raymond Diaz Aragon-R (303) 320-6607	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
David Skaggs-D (303) 650-7886	- - - - - - - - -
Bryan Day-R (303) 422-8692	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Mike Calihan-D (303) 320-3918	- - - - - - - - -
Scott McInnis-R (303) 242-4623	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
Tom Redder-D (303) 224-9767	- - - - - - - - -
Wayne Allard-R (303) 226-2226	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Charles Oriez-D (303) 798-3236	- - - - - - - - -
Joel Hefley-R (303) 933-0044	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Tom Kolbe-D (303) 850-9867	N - - N - N Y N -
Dan Schaefer-R (303) 989-2100	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

1. A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

2. The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

3. In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

4. Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

5. For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF COLORADO

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Ben Campbell-D (303) 837-0565	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Considine-R (303) 757-2567	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Pat Schroeder-D (303) 866-1230	- - - - - - - - -
Raymond Diaz Aragon-R (303) 320-6607	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
David Skaggs-D (303) 650-7886	- - - - - - - - -
Bryan Day-R (303) 422-8692	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Mike Callihan-D (303) 320-3918	- - - - - - - - -
Scott McInnis-R (303) 242-4623	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
Tom Redder-D (303) 224-9767	- - - - - - - - -
Wayne Allard-R (303) 226-2226	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Charles Oriez-D (303) 798-3236	- - - - - - - - -
Joel Hefley-R (303) 933-0044	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Tom Kolbe-D (303) 850-9867	N - - N - N Y N -
Dan Schaefer-R (303) 989-2100	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

BACKGROUNDER

The information below is helpful in explaining the questions on the reverse side of this form.

A union, under present federal laws, is empowered to represent and bind all employees in a company's bargaining unit — including employees who oppose the union and don't want its "services."

This monopoly bargaining power, generally described as "exclusive bargaining rights," deprives employees of their right to bargain for themselves. Union officials fought for this power and refuse to give it up; yet they complain they are "unfairly burdened by the legal obligation" to represent nonmembers.

Such complaints are intended to pave the way for compelling financial support from so-called "free riders" for representation they do not want.

The firing of workers who refuse to pay union dues and/or fees is explicitly sanctioned by both the National Labor Relations Act and the National Railway Labor Act.

Section 7 of the NLRA, for example, stipulates that employees shall have "the right to refrain" from participating in union activities "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

The problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress. It will not be solved until Congress repeals the existing federal authorizations of compulsory unionism.

In 21 states, wage earners — except those covered by the National Railway Labor Act — are shielded from compulsory unionism by Right to Work laws.

The Florida guarantee is typical of these laws, saying, "The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization."

The authority of states to adopt and enforce such laws is reaffirmed by Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Extortion, as a technique, is extremely useful to union officials in obtaining such demands as compulsory union shops, "agency" shops, compulsory hiring halls and irrevocable dues check-off clauses.

While most criminal law is administered at the state and local level, some criminal activities (including extortion), which obstruct interstate commerce, have been deemed by Congress to be so important that they should be covered by federal statutes.

As the federal law currently stands, union officials have unique special immunities from prosecution for threatening to commit or committing felonies — such as murder, manslaughter, maiming, arson, aggravated property destruction, explosives or firearms offenses, etc. — to obtain collective bargaining demands.

For the past several years, Congress has been confronted by bills designed to authorize the forced unionization of public employees at various levels of government.

Several of these proposals are aimed at state, county and municipal employees and would nullify existing state laws which shield public employees from union coercion.

Other bills would strip postal workers and other federal employees of the freedom of choice guaranteed by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and executive orders dating back to the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

6. Labor unions are the only private organization in the U.S. which can legally force individuals to pay dues into their treasuries.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) prohibits union officials from giving any of these dues dollars directly to a candidate for federal office.

At the same time, FECA permits union officials to use workers' compulsory dues dollars for "in-kind" political spending on goods and services to elect candidates for federal offices.

These "in-kind" expenditures are in addition to union PAC contributions; they are seldom — if ever — documented or reported to the Federal Election Commission.

No official statistics for total union "in-kind" expenditures are available. But Labor columnist Victor Riesel estimated that this so-called "soft money" amounted to 10 times more than what union PACs gave in cash contributions. Based on that yardstick, union "soft money" in 1990 exceeded $350 million.

7. In recent years, legislation has been introduced in Congress to automatically impose union representation upon workers of nonunionized companies which have even the slightest economic links to unionized companies.

Even though the nonunionized and the unionized companies each perform separate and distinct work, the compulsory union contract would be automatically imposed upon the nonunion workers, without even the show of an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board to determine worker support.

The "anti-double breasting" legislation would also encourage Common Situs picketing by permitting union organizers to use a dispute with a single subcontractor as an excuse to picket and shut down all the other subcontractors at a job site.

8. Legislation has been introduced repeatedly in Congress to loosen the 50-year-old Hatch Act's restrictions against partisan political activity by federal employees.

Federal union officials now wield monopoly bargaining power over federal employees, which makes union officials the sole conduit for civil servants in collective bargaining and grievance situations.

Current proposals to weaken the Hatch Act lack explicit prohibitions against the use of monopoly bargaining power to coerce civil servants into supporting federal union officials' political agenda.

9. Legislation has been introduced in Congress that would prevent employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during a strike.

The bill's provisions would also penalize workers who choose not to strike by giving preferential, post-strike hiring privileges to strikers.

Since an employer is unlikely to find employees who will work during a violent strike under these conditions, employers would be forced to cave in to every demand by union officials — including the demand that workers who refuse to pay union dues be fired.

ROSTER OF CANDIDATES • STATE OF COLORADO

U.S. Senate

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Ben Campbell-D (303) 837-0565	- - - - - - - - -
Terry Considine-R (303) 757-2567	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y

U.S. House of Representatives

	Questions #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
District 1	
Pat Schroeder-D (303) 866-1230	- - - - - - - - -
Raymond Diaz Aragon-R (303) 320-6607	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 2	
David Skaggs-D (303) 650-7886	- - - - - - - - -
Bryan Day-R (303) 422-8692	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 3	
Mike Callihan-D (303) 320-3918	- - - - - - - - -
Scott McInnis-R (303) 242-4623	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y
District 4	
Tom Redder-D (303) 224-9767	- - - - - - - - -
Wayne Allard-R (303) 226-2226	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 5	
Charles Oriez-D (303) 798-3236	- - - - - - - - -
Joel Hefley-R (303) 933-0044	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
District 6	
Tom Kolbe-D (303) 850-9867	N - - N - N Y N -
Dan Schaefer-R (303) 989-2100	- - - - - - - - -

Key:
Y = Yes
N = No
- = No Response

Survey Questions

1. Do you believe an employee who does not want the "services" of a labor union should have the right to refuse to accept that union as his exclusive representative, which federal law now forces him to accept?
2. Will you support repeal of the provisions in federal laws which authorize compulsory unionism?
3. Do you favor preservation of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes state Right to Work laws?
4. Would you support legislation to end the special immunity union officials presently enjoy from prosecution under the federal anti-extortion statute?
5. Will you oppose the forced unionization of federal, state, county and municipal employees?
6. Will you support amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act to prohibit the use of compulsory union dues and fees for political causes and candidates opposed by union members?
7. Will you oppose so-called "anti-double breasting" legislation that has, as its primary goal, to forcibly unionize employees of construction companies?
8. Will you oppose legislation to weaken or destroy the Hatch Act, which protects federal employees from union political coercion?
9. Will you oppose legislation that would punish or require the firing of employees who choose to work during a strike, and give union officials the power to shut down businesses that refuse to force their employees to pay union dues?

Note: The National Right to Work Committee, of course, endorses no candidates. We are a nonpartisan organization. But we believe that you as a Right to Work supporter are entitled to know which candidates will support the right of every American to earn a living — without having to pay union bosses for the privilege.

COPY APPROVAL/PROOFING CHECK-OFF

(ATTACH TO FINAL DRAFT COPY WITH DISK)

DATE: 10/15

PACKAGE: NH 2nd Res SOG

ORIGINATOR: JNH

CHECK OFF IF . . .	ROUTED TO:	APPROVED BY:
MEF	X	X
SG	X	X
MAM		
KG	X	X
RL	X	X
RJC		
HLW		

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES MADE: YES NO

FACT CHECK COMPLETED: 10/16 (DATE) APPROVED: [signature] (SIGNATURE)

TO PROOFING:	CHANGES NEEDED:	CHANGES MADE:
1ST PB/SMZ 10/16/92	Yes - changes marked	SMZ
2ND SMZ/KAR 10/16/92	Yes	SMZ
3RD KAR/SMZ 10/16/92	NO	

RETURN THIS FORM (WITH COPY ATTACHED) TO ORIGINATOR.

20.04.2397.2657



HEADQUARTERS AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXX XXXXXXXXXX:

What do Democrat John Rauh and Republican Judd Gregg -- who are both vying to be your next U.S. Senator -- have in common?

They have both actively opposed Right to Work this year.

At least John Rauh has the honesty to admit it. He endorsed compulsory unionism on his 1992 Right to Work Candidate Survey.

But Judd Gregg may be trying to snow you about his past record on Right to Work -- and even about his current position.

Of the major candidates for the New Hampshire Senate seat, only Independent Larry Brady has had the guts to consistently stand up against Organized Labor's political machine.

Just 8 months ago, Governor Gregg almost single-handedly quashed the New Hampshire Right to Work bill pending at that time in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. To kill the bill, he twisted the arms of dozens of Republican representatives who had previously supported Right to Work.

Since Mr. Gregg is favored to win the Senate race, and Big Labor is only a vote or two shy of enacting its entire political agenda, his track record on Right to Work is of especially grave concern.

If Governor Gregg supports compulsory unionism in the Senate as he did this past year as governor, our nation could face economy-paralyzing strikes, and higher inflation and taxes.

Way back on July 17, I sent Governor Gregg a Right to Work Candidate Survey to nail down his position on specific pieces of forced-unionism legislation -- Governor Gregg refused to answer.

So I sent Judd Gregg a copy of the survey July 31. And you and thousands of New Hampshire citizens deluged his office with postcards and phone calls urging him to support Right to Work.

Again, he refused to respond.

I sent a second copy of the survey September 10, and reported Mr. Gregg's actions again. You put so much heat on Governor Gregg for his arrogant refusal to level with you about his Right to Work record, he was <u>forced</u> to respond.

WASHINGTON D.C. HEADQUARTERS: 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD, SUITE 500 • SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160 • TEL. (703) 321-9820

"Americans must have the right but not be compelled to join labor unions"

Governor Gregg started mailing out copies of his survey answers to our members, who sent them on to me. In an accompanying letter, he implied he returned his survey weeks ago, and claimed he has always supported Right to Work. He even accused me of "grossly misrepresenting" his position on forced unionism.

Just the opposite. Everything I reported to you about Governor Gregg was 100% correct.

According to the Manchester Union Leader, the New Hampshire AFL-CIO Political Director has been crowing all year about how Mr. Gregg did the union bosses' dirty work for them by killing the Right to Work bill (H.B. 1432) 211-134.

And in 1989 he assured the New Hampshire AFL-CIO convention that he would veto any Right to Work bill that came to his desk.

Even on his tardy survey response (which I still have not received from him), Mr. Gregg endorses the root of compulsory unionism -- Big Labor's monopoly bargaining privileges, which force union-boss "representation" on workers who don't want it.

And he also claims he'll support a National Right to Work law. If so, why did he kill a Right to Work law for New Hampshire? Why would he vote to give out-of-state workers the rights he denied to his own constituents? Very curious indeed.

One thing's for sure. If Judd Gregg becomes a U.S. Senator, he needs to remember that his past support for compulsory unionism sparked a firestorm of constituent anger. That's the only way to stop him from doing it again, if he wins his campaign.

That's why I'm asking you to take three actions immediately.

First, call Governor Gregg at 626-1212 and urge him to publicly apologize for killing your Right to Work law. If you put enough heat on Governor Gregg, you can force him to prove his professed conversion is genuine by opposing forced unionism in the Senate.

Then, call John Rauh at 644-5552 and insist he change his anti-Right to Work position. And, don't leave out Independent Larry Brady. He's under major pressure to back off from his support for Right to Work. Call him at 641-5900 and encourage him not to buckle.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Also call leading gubernatorial candidate Steve Merrill at 627-9292. He says he supports Right to Work "in principle." Urge him to support it in practice next year, if elected. Tell him not to kill the New Hampshire Right to Work bill the way Governor Gregg did this year.

National Right To Work Committee

A COALITION OF EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS

HEADQUARTERS AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXX XXXXXXXXXX:

What do Democrat John Rauh and Republican Judd Gregg -- who are both vying to be your next U.S. Senator -- have in common?

They have both actively opposed Right to Work this year.

At least John Rauh has the honesty to admit it. He endorsed compulsory unionism on his 1992 Right to Work Candidate Survey.

But Judd Gregg may be trying to snow you about his past record on Right to Work -- and even about his current position.

Of the major candidates for the New Hampshire Senate seat, only Independent Larry Brady has had the guts to consistently stand up against Organized Labor's political machine.

Just 8 months ago, Governor Gregg almost single-handedly quashed the New Hampshire Right to Work bill pending at that time in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. To kill the bill, he twisted the arms of dozens of Republican representatives who had previously supported Right to Work.

Since Mr. Gregg is favored to win the Senate race, and Big Labor is only a vote or two shy of enacting its entire political agenda, his track record on Right to Work is of especially grave concern.

If Governor Gregg supports compulsory unionism in the Senate as he did this past year as governor, our nation could face economy-paralyzing, strikes, and higher inflation and taxes.

Way back on July 17, I sent Governor Gregg a Right to Work Candidate Survey to nail down his position on specific pieces of forced-unionism legislation -- Governor Gregg refused to answer.

So I sent Judd Gregg a copy of the survey July 31. And you and thousands of New Hampshire citizens deluged his office with postcards and phone calls urging him to support Right to Work.

Again, he refused to respond.

I sent a second copy of the survey September 10, and reported Mr. Gregg's actions again. You put so much heat on Governor Gregg for his arrogant refusal to level with you about his Right to Work record, he was forced to respond.

WASHINGTON D.C. HEADQUARTERS: 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD, SUITE 500 • SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160 • TEL. (703) 321-9820

"Americans must have the right but not be compelled to join labor unions"

0883-3047-40-02

Governor Gregg started mailing out copies of his survey answers to our members, who sent them on to me. In an accompanying letter, he implied he returned his survey weeks ago, and claimed he has always supported Right to Work. He even accused me of "grossly misrepresenting" his position on forced unionism.

Just the opposite. Everything I reported to you about Governor Gregg was 100% correct.

According to the Manchester Union Leader, the New Hampshire AFL-CIO Political Director has been crowing all year about how Mr. Gregg did the union bosses' dirty work for them by killing the Right to Work bill (H.B. 1432) 211-134.

And in 1989 he assured the New Hampshire AFL-CIO convention that he would veto any Right to Work bill that came to his desk.

Even on his tardy survey response (which I still have not received from him), Mr. Gregg endorses the root of compulsory unionism -- Big Labor's monopoly bargaining privileges, which force union-boss "representation" on workers who don't want it.

And he also claims he'll support a National Right to Work law. If so, why did he kill a Right to Work law for New Hampshire? Why would he vote to give out-of-state workers the rights he denied to his own constituents? Very curious indeed.

One thing's for sure. If Judd Gregg becomes a U.S. Senator, he needs to remember that his past support for compulsory unionism sparked a firestorm of constituent anger. That's the only way to stop him from doing it again, if he wins his campaign.

That's why I'm asking you to take three actions immediately.

First, call Governor Gregg at 626-1212 and urge him to publicly apologize for killing your Right to Work law. If you put enough heat on Governor Gregg, you can force him to prove his professed conversion is genuine by opposing forced unionism in the Senate.

Then, call John Rauh at 644-5552 and insist he change his anti-Right to Work position. And, don't leave out Independent Larry Brady. He's under major pressure to back off from his support for Right to Work. Call him at 641-5900 and encourage him not to buckle.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Also call leading gubernatorial candidate Steve Merrill at 627-9292. He says he supports Right to Work "in principle." Urge him to support it in practice next year, if elected. Tell him not to kill the New Hampshire Right to Work bill the way Governor Gregg did this year.

National Right To Work Committee

A COALITION OF EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS

HEADQUARTERS AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXX XXXXXXXXXX:

What do Democrat John Rauh and Republican Judd Gregg -- who are both vying to be your next U.S. Senator -- have in common?

They have both actively opposed Right to Work this year.

At least John Rauh has the honesty to admit it. He endorsed compulsory unionism on his 1992 Right to Work Candidate Survey.

But Judd Gregg may be trying to snow you about his past record on Right to Work -- and even about his current position.

Of the major candidates for the New Hampshire Senate seat, only Independent Larry Brady has had the guts to consistently stand up against Organized Labor's political machine.

Less than 7 months ago, Governor Gregg almost singlehandedly quashed the New Hampshire Right to Work bill pending at that time in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. To kill the bill, he twisted the arms of dozens of Republican representatives who had previously supported Right to Work.

Since ~~Governor~~ Mr. Gregg is favored to win the Senate race, and ~~because~~ Big Labor is only a vote or two shy of enacting its entire political agenda, his track record on Right to Work is of especially grave concern.

If Governor Gregg supports compulsory unionism in the Senate as he did this past year as governor, our nation could face economic upheaval, paralyzing strikes, inflation, and taxes.

Way back on July 17, I sent Governor Gregg a Right to Work Candidate Survey to nail down his position on specific pieces of forced unionism legislation -- Governor Gregg refused to answer.

So I sent Governor Gregg another survey on July 31. And you and thousands of New Hampshire citizens deluged his office with postcards and phone calls urging him to support Right to Work.

Again, he refused to respond.

I sent a third survey on September 10, and reported Mr. Gregg's actions again, and you put so much heat on Governor Gregg for his

WASHINGTON D.C. HEADQUARTERS: 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD, SUITE 500 • SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA 22160 • TEL. (703) 321-9820

"Americans must have the right but not be compelled to join labor unions"

arrogant refusal to come clean and level with you about his Right to Work record, he was forced to respond.

Governor Gregg started mailing out copies of his survey answers to our members, who sent them on to me. In an accompanying letter, he implied he returned his survey weeks ago, and claimed he has always supported Right to Work. He even accused me of "grossly misrepresenting" his position on forced unionism.

Just the opposite. Everything I reported to you about Governor Gregg was 100% correct.

~~Mr. Gregg says he has supported Right to Work all along. But~~ According to the Manchester Union Leader, the New Hampshire AFL-CIO Political Director has been crowing all year about how Mr. Gregg did the union bosses' dirty work for them by killing the Right to Work bill (H.B. 1432) 211-134.

And in 1989 he assured the New Hampshire AFL-CIO convention that he would veto any Right to Work bill that came to his desk.

Even on his tardy survey response, (which I still have not received from him) Mr. Gregg endorses the root of ~~compulsory~~ forced unionism -- Big Labor's monopoly bargaining privileges, which ~~force~~ foist union-boss "representation" on workers who don't want it.

And he also claims he'll support a National Right to Work law. If so, why did he kill a Right to Work law for New Hampshire? Why would he vote to give out-of-state workers the rights he denied to his own constituents? Very curious indeed.

One thing's for sure. If Judd Gregg becomes a U.S. Senator, he needs to remember that his past support for compulsory unionism sparked a firestorm of constituent anger. That's the only way to stop him from doing it again if he wins his campaign.

That's why I'm asking you to take three actions immediately.

First, call Governor Gregg at XXX-XXXX and urge him to publicly apologize for killing your Right to Work law. If you put enough heat on Governor Gregg, you can force him to prove his professed conversion is genuine by opposing forced unionism in the Senate.

~~Second~~ Then call John Rauh at XXX-XXXX and insist he change his anti-Right to Work position. And ~~[redacted]~~ don't leave out independent Larry Brady. He's under major pressure to back off from his support for Right to Work. Call him at XXX-XXXX and encourage him not to buckle.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Also, call leading gubernatorial candidate Steve Merrill at XXX-XXXX. He says he supports Right to Work "in principle." Urge him to support it in practice next year if elected. Tell him not to kill the New Hampshire Right to Work bill like Governor Gregg did this year.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXX XXXXXXXXXX:

What do Democrat John Rauh and Republican Judd Gregg -- who are both vying to be your next U.S. Senator -- have in common?

They have both actively opposed Right to Work this year.

At least John Rauh has the honesty to admit it. He endorsed compulsory unionism on his 1992 Right to Work Candidate Survey.

But Judd Gregg may be trying to snow you about his past record on Right to Work -- and even about his current position.

Of the major candidates for the New Hampshire Senate seat, only Independent Larry Brady has had the guts to consistently stand up against Organized Labor's political machine.

Less than 7 months ago, Governor Gregg almost singlehandedly quashed the New Hampshire Right to Work bill pending at that time in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. To kill the bill, he twisted the arms of dozens of Republican representatives who had previously supported Right to Work.

Since Governor Gregg is favored to win the U.S. Senate race, and because Big Labor is only a vote or two shy of enacting its entire political agenda, his track record on Right to Work is of especially grave concern.

If Governor Gregg supports compulsory unionism in the Senate as he did this past year as governor, our nation could face economic upheaval, paralyzing strikes, inflation, and increased taxes.

Way back on July 17, I sent Governor Gregg a Right to Work Candidate Survey to nail down his position on specific pieces of forced-unionism legislation -- Governor Gregg refused to answer.

So I sent Governor Gregg another survey on July 31. And you and thousands of New Hampshire citizens deluged his office with postcards and phone calls urging him to support Right to Work.

Again, he refused to respond. Same survey?

I sent a third survey on September 10, and reported Mr. Gregg's actions again. ~~and~~ You put so much heat on Governor Gregg for his arrogant refusal to come clean and level with you about his Right to Work record, he was <u>forced</u> to respond.

Governor Gregg started mailing out copies of his "[illegible]"

survey answers to our members, who sent them on to me. In an accompanying letter, he implied he returned his survey weeks ago, and claims he has always supported Right to Work. He even accused me of "grossly misrepresenting" his position on forced unionism.

Just the opposite. Everything I reported to you about Governor Gregg was 100% correct.

Mr. Gregg says he has supported Right to Work all along. But according to the Manchester Union Leader, the New Hampshire AFL-CIO Political Director has been crowing all year about how Mr. Gregg did the union bosses' dirty work for them by killing the Right to Work bill (H.B. 1432) 211-134.

And in 1989 he assured the New Hampshire AFL-CIO convention that he would veto any Right to Work bill that came to his desk.

Even on his tardy survey response, (which I still have not received from him) Mr. Gregg endorses the root of compulsory unionism -- Big Labor's monopoly bargaining privileges, which force union-boss "representation" on workers who don't want it.

And he also claims he'll support a National Right to Work law. If so, why did he kill a Right to Work law for New Hampshire? Why would he vote to give out-of-state workers the rights he denied to his own constituents? Very curious indeed.

One thing's for sure. If Judd Gregg becomes a U.S. Senator, he needs to remember that his past support for compulsory unionism sparked a firestorm of constituent anger. That's the only way to stop him from doing it again, if he wins his campaign.

That's why I'm asking you to take three actions immediately.

First, call Governor Gregg at XXX-XXXX and urge him to publicly apologize for killing your Right to Work law. If you put enough heat on Governor Gregg, you can force him to prove his professed conversion is genuine by opposing forced unionism in the Senate.

Second, call John Rauh at XXX-XXXX and insist he change his anti-Right to Work position. And third, don't leave out Independent Larry Brady. He's under major pressure to back off from his support for Right to Work. Call him at XXX-XXXX and encourage him not to buckle.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Also call leading gubernatorial candidate Steve Merrill at XXX-XXXX. He says he supports Right to Work "in principle." Urge him to support it in practice next year, if elected. Tell him not to kill the New Hampshire Right to Work bill the way Governor Gregg did this year.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXX XXXXXXXXXX:

What do Democrat John Rauh and Republican Judd Gregg -- who are both vying to be your next U.S. Senator -- have in common?

They have both actively opposed Right to Work this year.

At least John Rauh has the honesty to admit it. He endorsed compulsory unionism on his 1992 Right to Work Candidate Survey.

But Judd Gregg may be trying to snow you about his past record on Right to Work -- and even about his current position.

Of the major candidates for the New Hampshire Senate seat, only Independent Larry Brady has had the guts to consistently stand up against Organized Labor's political machine.

Less than 7 months ago, Governor Gregg almost singlehandedly quashed the New Hampshire Right to Work bill pending at that time in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. To kill the bill, he twisted the arms of dozens of Republican representatives who had previously supported Right to Work.

Since Governor Gregg is favored to win the Senate race, and because Big Labor is only a vote or two shy of enacting its entire political agenda, his track record on Right to Work is of especially grave concern.

If Governor Gregg supports compulsory unionism in the Senate as he did this past year as governor, our nation could face economic upheaval, paralyzing strikes, inflation, and taxes.

Way back on July 17, I sent Governor Gregg a Right to Work Candidate Survey to nail down his position on specific pieces of forced unionism legislation -- Governor Gregg refused to answer.

So I sent Governor Gregg another survey on July 31. And you and thousands of New Hampshire citizens deluged his office with postcards and phone calls urging him to support Right to Work.

Again, he refused to respond.

I sent a third survey on September 10, and reported Mr. Gregg's actions again, and you put so much heat on Governor Gregg for his arrogant refusal to come clean and level with you about his Right to Work record, he was <u>forced</u> to respond.

Governor Gregg started mailing out copies of his "completed"

survey to our members, who sent them on to me. In an accompanying letter, he implied he returned his survey weeks ago, and claims has always supported Right to Work. He even accused me of "grossly misrepresenting" his position on forced unionism.

Just the opposite. Everything I reported to you about Governor Gregg was 100% correct.

Mr. Gregg says he has supported Right to Work all along. But according to the Manchester Union Leader, the New Hampshire AFL-CIO Political Director has been crowing all year about how Mr. Gregg did the union bosses' dirty work for them by killing the Right to Work bill (H.B. 1432) 211-134.

And in 1989 he assured the New Hampshire AFL-CIO convention that he would veto any Right to Work bill that came to his desk.

Even on his tardy survey response, (which I still have not received from him) Mr. Gregg endorses the root of compulsory unionism -- Big Labor's monopoly bargaining privileges, which force union-boss "representation" on workers who don't want it.

And he also claims he'll support a National Right to Work law. If so, why did he kill a Right to Work law for New Hampshire? Why would he vote to give out-of-state workers the rights he denied to his own constituents? Very curious indeed.

One thing's for sure. If Judd Gregg becomes a U.S. Senator, he needs to remember that his past support for compulsory unionism sparked a firestorm of constituent anger. That's the only way to stop him from doing it again if he wins his campaign.

That's why I'm asking you to take three actions immediately.

First, call Governor Gregg at XXX-XXXX and urge him to publicly apologize for killing your Right to Work law. If you put enough heat on Governor Gregg, you can force him to prove his professed conversion is genuine by opposing forced unionism in the Senate.

Second, call John Rauh at XXX-XXXX and insist he change his anti-Right to Work position. And third, don't leave out independent Larry Brady. He's under major pressure to back off from his support for Right to Work. Call him at XXX-XXXX and encourage him not to buckle.

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Also call leading gubernatorial candidate Steve Merrill at XXX-XXXX. He says he supports Right to Work "in principle." Urge him to support it in practice next year if elected. Tell him not to kill the New Hampshire Right to Work bill like Governor Gregg did this year.

October XX, 1992

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear XXXX XXXXXXXXXX:

What do Democrat John Rauh and Republican Judd Gregg -- who are both vying to be your next U.S. Senator -- have in common?

They have both actively opposed Right to Work this year.

At least John Rauh has the honesty to admit it. He endorsed compulsory unionism on his 1992 Right to Work Candidate Survey.

But Judd Gregg may be trying to snow you about his past record on Right to Work -- and even about his current position.

Of the major candidates for the New Hampshire Senate seat, only Independent Larry Brady has had the guts to consistently stand up against Organized Labor's political machine.

~~Less than~~ Just 8 months ago, Governor Gregg almost single-handedly quashed the New Hampshire Right to Work bill pending at that time in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. To kill the bill, he twisted the arms of dozens of Republican representatives who had previously supported Right to Work.

Since ~~Governor~~ Mr. Gregg is favored to win the U.S. Senate race, and ~~because~~ Big Labor is only a vote or two shy of enacting its entire ~~political~~ agenda, his track record on Right to Work is of especially grave concern.

If Governor Gregg supports compulsory unionism in the Senate as he did this past year as governor, our nation could face economy-paralyzing strikes, and inflation and taxes.

Way back on July 17, I sent Governor Gregg a Right to Work Candidate Survey to nail down his position on specific pieces of forced-unionism legislation -- Governor Gregg refused to answer.

So I sent ~~Governor~~ Judd Gregg a ~~another~~ copy of the survey ~~on~~ July 31. And you and thousands of New Hampshire citizens deluged his office with postcards and phone calls urging him to support Right to Work.

Again, he refused to respond.

I sent a ~~third~~ second copy of the survey ~~on~~ September 10, and reported Mr. Gregg's actions again. ~~and~~ you put so much heat on Governor Gregg for his arrogant refusal to ~~come clean and~~ level with you about his Right to Work record, he was forced to respond.

Governor Gregg started mailing out copies of his survey

widow right, margin

answers to our members, who sent them on to me. In an accompanying letter, he implied he returned his survey weeks ago, and claimed he has always supported Right to Work. He even accused me of "grossly misrepresenting" his position on forced unionism.

Just the opposite. Everything I reported to you about Governor Gregg was 100% correct.

~~Mr. Gregg says he has supported Right to Work all along~~. ~~But~~ According to the Manchester Union Leader, the New Hampshire AFL-CIO Political Director has been crowing all year about how Mr. Gregg did the union bosses' dirty work for them by killing the Right to Work bill (H.B. 1432) 211-134. OK connect

And in 1989 he assured the New Hampshire AFL-CIO convention that he would veto any Right to Work bill that came to his desk. OK

Even on his tardy survey response (which I still have not received from him), Mr. Gregg endorses the root of compulsory unionism -- Big Labor's monopoly bargaining privileges, which force union-boss "representation" on workers who don't want it. OK

And he also claims he'll support a National Right to Work law. If so, why did he kill a Right to Work law for New Hampshire? Why would he vote to give out-of-state workers the rights he denied to his own constituents? Very curious indeed.

One thing's for sure. If Judd Gregg becomes a U.S. Senator, he needs to remember that his past support for compulsory unionism sparked a firestorm of constituent anger. That's the only way to stop him from doing it again, if he wins his campaign. OK

That's why I'm asking you to take three actions immediately.

First, call Governor Gregg at ~~XXX-XXXX~~ 626-1212 and urge him to publicly apologize for killing your Right to Work law. If you put enough heat on Governor Gregg, you can force him to prove his professed conversion is genuine by opposing forced unionism in the Senate. #?

~~Second~~ Then, call John Rauh at ~~XXX-XXXX~~ 644-5552 and insist he change his anti-Right to Work position. And ~~also~~ don't leave out Independent Larry Brady. He's under major pressure to back off from his support for Right to Work. Call him at ~~XXX-XXXX~~ 641-5900 and encourage him not to buckle. #? OK #?

Sincerely,

Reed Larson

P.S. Also call ~~XXX-XXXX~~ 627-9292 leading gubernatorial candidate Steve Merrill at ~~XXX-XXXX~~. He says he supports Right to Work "in principle." Urge him to support it in practice next year if elected. Tell him not to kill the New Hampshire Right to Work bill #? OK OK

the way ~~like~~ Governor Gregg did this year.

0692.202.40.02