




Written by [Wallis W. Wood](#) on March 1, 2013

Beware the Unions' Idea of Immigration Reform

Barack Obama and his union buddies have made it clear what they mean by "immigration reform." That is, a clear path to citizenship for the 11 million people who are in this country illegally.

If they get their way, guess how many of those new citizens will become Democratic voters?

And guess how many will be targets for union membership?



So it should come as no surprise that when the President gave a major speech on immigration reform in Las Vegas earlier this year, AFL-CIO head Richard Trumka was invited to sit in the front row. Afterward, Trumka said it was clear what the top priority of any such program must be: citizenship and all of its privileges for anyone who is in this country illegally.

For "privileges," read "voting Democratic." Oh, and "paying union dues."

The Services Employees International Union says that it will spend millions of dollars to rally support for such legislation. Top officials of the SEIU have made it clear that passage of such a bill is their top priority this year.

No wonder. In recent years, Hispanics have comprised the fastest-growing segment of union membership. According to the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics, their numbers jumped by 21 percent over the past decade and now make up one-quarter of SEIU membership. Meanwhile, over the same 10-year period, white union membership declined by 13 percent.

One of the biggest problems the unions are facing is that when workers aren't forced to join a union, many won't. For example, after Indiana passed a right-to-work law last year, union membership in the state declined by 18 percent.

No wonder the unions are licking their chops at the thought of organizing a substantial chunk of the 11 million immigrants who are in this country illegally. They will be satisfied with nothing less than a quick and easy path to citizenship. Hopefully, Republicans in Congress will stand fast and make sure they don't get it.

By the way, one thing the unions definitely don't want included in any immigration reform is an effective guest worker program. While Big Labor likes to claim that temporary workers would "steal American jobs," that's a bunch of hooey. Granting citizenship to 11 million illegal aliens would enable them to "steal" a lot more jobs than guest workers could ever dream of filling.

No, the reality is that temporary workers don't join unions or pay union dues. Is it any surprise that the unions don't want them here? No wonder Barack Obama omitted any mention of a guest worker program in his immigration speech. Nor did it appear in the White House's paper on immigration principles.

Senator Marco Rubio, the son of Cuban immigrants who has emerged as a leading Republican spokesman for a compromise solution, has said: "The bottom line is that if we can't convince people of



Written by [Wallis W. Wood](#) on March 1, 2013

all backgrounds, including Americans of Hispanic descent, that limited government and free enterprise is a better way, not just for them, but for the country, not only is the conservative movement doomed, but ultimately I think America is doomed, in terms of us continuing being an exceptional nation.”

That’s pretty optimistic, don’t you think?

Another Battle Big Labor Wants to Win

Remember the brouhaha that erupted a year ago, when Obama appointed three new members to the National Labor Relations Board without allowing the Senate to “advise and consent”? The President said he could do so because they were “recess” appointments when the Senate was not in session.

The problem was that the Senate said it was in session. The chamber met every day, even if just for a few moments, precisely to stop the President from doing what he did. The dispute soon moved to the courts.

Last month, a federal appeals court in Washington ruled unanimously that Obama violated the Constitution by making the appointments. As a result, the NLRB lacked a legal quorum since January 2012, which means that every decision it issued in the past 13 months could be thrown out.

Two weeks ago, the President re-nominated two of the people he appointed: former Labor Department official Sharon Block and former union lawyer Richard F. Griffin Jr., both pro-union stalwarts. (Obama’s third nominee had previously resigned and did not seek reappointment.)

This time around, Obama did submit the nominations to the Senate, so the upper chamber can fulfill its traditional role to “advise and consent.” Look for a lively battle over their confirmations.

But you can expect even more fireworks — and lawsuits — over the activities of the NLRB. Chairman Mark Pearce has announced that he disagrees with the Federal court ruling and is going to carry on as though nothing happened.

As a result, one critic (Home Depot co-founder and former chairman Bernie Marcus) declared in an opinion piece in [The Wall Street Journal](#): “After making hundreds of decisions that killed jobs and increased economic uncertainty, the board is set up to decide a hundred more.”

Marcus issued his statement in his new role as head of a new nonprofit organization he helped found, the Job Creators Alliance. He explained: “Today, many job creators are being punished for doing business. Confiscatory taxes. Suffocating regulations. Stifling energy costs. Businesses that have joined the Job Creators Alliance face these challenges every day. Now they must also endure a rogue agency thumbing its nose at an unambiguous and unanimous court ruling. How are they supposed to have the confidence to invest and create jobs?”

How indeed?

Legislation has been introduced in Congress that will bar the NLRB from enforcing any decisions until it has a quorum that has been approved by the Senate. But don’t expect it to be passed anytime soon, and don’t expect the NLRB chairman to pay attention if it is passed.

Marcus got it right when he wrote: “Worried business owners don’t invest, expand and create jobs. They hunker down and try to survive.”

That’s a pretty good description of what all of us will have to do as long as Obama sits in the White House and Democrats control the Senate. The next two years will require every Constitutionalist to “hunker down and try to survive.”



Written by [Wallis W. Wood](#) on March 1, 2013

Until next time, keep some powder dry.

Chip Wood was the first news editor of The Review of the News and also wrote for American Opinion, our two predecessor publications. He is now the geopolitical editor of Personal Liberty Digest, where his Straight Talk column appears weekly. This article first appeared in [PersonalLiberty.com](#) and has been reprinted with permission.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.