

July 21, 2011

After the Boeing Company moved production of its 787 Dreamliner airplane out of Washington State to South Carolina, it publicly stated that its reason for doing so was to avoid work stoppages (strikes) by unionized Boeing employees asserting their fundamental right to collectively bargain. Unionized Boeing workers then filed a complaint with the National Labor Relations Board, whose Acting General Counsel spent months trying to get the parties to settle. When no settlement was reached, the Acting General Counsel issued a complaint charging the Boeing Company with violating the National Labor Relations Act by engaging in illegal retaliation against Boeing employees in the Puget Sound area. The case is currently being heard before an Administrative Law Judge.

Today, the Committee on Education and Workforce held a hearing to consider a bill to specifically obliterate one of remedies the National Labor Relations Board might apply in the case between Boeing and its workers. The legislation is controversial because if the Administrative Law Judge hearing the case between Boeing and its workers finds that Boeing's motive in moving the work from Puget Sound to South Carolina was in fact to avoid workers exercising their right to strike, one of the possible outcomes is that Boeing could be forced to move the production back to Puget Sound. If the bill in question today were to become law, it would not only affect the outcome of the pending case between Boeing and its workers while the case is still pending, but it would undermine the ongoing ability of the NLRB to safeguard both employers and workers from violations of labor law.