

[image removed]

Thank you for taking the time to fill out our questionnaire and run for office. Please answer all questions, sign on the last page, and consider signing the supplemental Statement of Principles. You are welcome to mail, email or drop off your completed questionnaire, but please make sure it is signed even if it is returned by email. You may add as much additional space as you need to answer the questions. The Oregon AFL-CIO represents over 300,000 workers across the state in every sector of Oregon's economy. We do not expect any candidate to be an expert on all of the issues affecting working people, and we are always willing to discuss what's presented on the questionnaire. If you have any questions, please reach out to Jess Giannettino Villatoro, **Oregon AFL-CIO Political and Legislative Director** at Jess@orafcio.org.

Questionnaires should be returned to Chelsea Watson at Chelsea@orafcio.org or at 3645 SE 32nd Avenue, Portland, OR 97202. You may also contact the Oregon AFL-CIO at 503-232-1195.

First Name Reed	Middle Name K	Last Name Christensen
State Oregon	District Governor	Party Republican
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incumbent• Challenger• Open		
Do you currently hold, or have you previously held public office(s)? Describe: No		
Have you received an Oregon AFL-CIO endorsement in the past? If so, for which office(s), years? No		

Official Campaign Committee Name:

Save the Kid Committee

Campaign Address:

PO Box 987

City

Cornelius

State

OR

Zip

97113

Campaign manager

N/A

Email

reed@savethekid.com

Cell Phone

971-727-5976

Are you now or have you ever been a union member?

No

Please list union(s) and local(s):

Workers Voice on the Job

1. Union members advocate for change in a myriad of ways. Often, they will engage you in public policy decisions that affect their work and their families and sometimes they'll also want you to help in contract bargaining or when they are on strike. Both actions and inactions are equally meaningful to them.

Would you be willing to support union members on strike lines or at pickets?

No. Public officials should not be showing favor to management and they should not be showing favor to labor. Both sides should negotiate on the strength of their own positions without political influence.

Are you willing to call employers to support union members during contract negotiations, or to support workers who are trying to form a union?

No. I am willing to talk policy positions with anyone at anytime. But I would not get involved in negotiations in any way.

Under what conditions would you, or would you not, be comfortable being called on in this way?

None. See previous.

What would you need to feel comfortable engaging in this way?

I want labor/management negotiations to be conducted on a even field with fair rules. If there are State laws or regulations that give political power to one side over the other, I would want to know about it.

If you have supported workers in this way, please share your experience.

N/A

2. Choosing to organize a union is a key step workers take to gain a voice in their workplace. Some employers see their employees forming a union as a threat. They will try to persuade workers not to form a union and, if that is unsuccessful, will refuse to negotiate in good faith, leaving it nearly impossible for workers to secure a first contract. These deliberate union-busting strategies will effectively negate the organizing effort altogether.

Do you support workers' right to form a union free from influence from their employer? Would you support legislation that creates a more level playing field for workers attempting to form a union, and that ensures that once a union is formed workers and their employer are able to write a reasonable first contract?

If a union is free to talk about the advantages of a union to employees, than a fair and even playing field would allow employers to freely talk about the disadvantages. The freedom to discuss and talk is not union-busting. Trying to silence the voice of one side is an attempt to use political power to gain unfair advantage and neither side should be given that power.

Workers should be able to listen to both sides without fear of retaliation or firing, or fear of threats or coercion from fellow workers.

3. Increasingly unions are being attacked by organizations which purport to extend workers rights or protect public dollars, but their underlying intention is to encourage workers to leave their union, thus decreasing their coworkers' power. These organizations are often classified as 501(c)(3)s but frequently engage in partisan politics.

Do you support or oppose these efforts? Would you seek out union members or leaders to learn more about organizations or efforts that you thought might be an attempt to weaken Oregonians' ability to form or maintain unions?

I assume the question is about "right to work" laws. I believe in the American value of freedom of speech. If you don't like what a person or organization is saying, you come up with better arguments to make in the public square. Trying to buy off politicians to give power to you over your opponents is not how things should be done in America.

The issue of "right to work" deserves some serious thought. It is evident by looking at wages since the 1970s that workers have had very little pricing power for their labor. I believe one of the chief causes of this is Federal policy that each year allows millions of people from outside of America to enter as workers – both legally and illegally.

Both parties allow this to happen. The Democrats because they want to replace the middle class conservative voter, and the Republicans who kowtow to big business. Meanwhile American workers watch their standard of living continue to fall. One thing that can be done at the state level is to require E-Verify for all new employment to restrict the employment of people without a legal right to work.

The answer is not making America more like an all-powerful fascist state where the government is given control over management and labor relations, who is allowed to talk, and who has the power to allow employment.

The answer is to remove the conditions that give business unfair advantage, and to increase the pricing power of labor so that the two sides are equally matched. Allowing both sides to operate in a fair free market system would yield the best result for both.

My thoughts on right to work is based on the American principles of equality and fairness. Given the unfair advantage that politicians on both sides have given to business, workers should have some way of organizing.

If a majority at a workplace votes for a union in a free and transparently honest election, then it seems fair under current conditions that management should have to negotiate a contract with the union. On the other hand, forcing someone to join a union as a condition of work is coercion and is not American. At such a workplace, a person could reasonably be charged only a fee that the union spends on actual contract negotiation. State political power should be used to ensure the above conditions.

4. The Janus Supreme Court case was the latest attack on public workers' ability to stand together.

Will you stand up for the rights of educators, firefighters, nurses, and other public employees to maintain a viable voice in policy venues and negotiations across this state by opposing further attacks at the state level?

No government at any level, Federal, state, or local should ever allow public employee unions. Doing this is a surefire recipe for ripping off the tax payer as the free market brakes on union power are non-existent.

What do I mean by this? A government is unique in that it must always exist. If a business is burdened with a union that gets too greedy, the business goes bankrupt and disappears. This puts a market limit on union power. But a government simply raises taxes to satisfy union demands, and usually they are happy to do this in return for political support.

Usually the tax increase is in the form of promising exorbitant retirement packages. They do it this way because it is less visible to the public, and they know they will be gone by the time the unsustainability becomes apparent. (Examples are public retirement systems in Illinois, California, and Oregon.)

t is likely that as a result of some of these types of court cases, unions will need to seek changes to state law to ensure their personal information is protected from third-party influences. Are you willing to support those changes to the Public Employee Collective Bargaining Act?

See above.

Safety Nets for Oregon's Working Families

1. As wealth continues to concentrate and inequality grows, workers in public and private sector workplaces and industries are taking unprecedented action and authorizing strikes across the country. One of the key factors workers consider when contemplating the difficult decision of authorizing a strike is whether they can afford to be without wages during an unknown period of time.

Would you support extending unemployment insurance benefits to both private and public workers when they are on strike? Why or why not?

No. The government has no role in supporting a strike. A large part of union dues should be saved for a strike fund to support this action.

On the other hand, given the current national situation where Federal politicians are allowing foreigners almost uncontrolled access to the American workplace, I think that employers should not be allowed to fire striking workers or replace them during a strike.

2. Oregon passed the most progressive paid family and medical leave program in the country in 2019. For too long, Oregonians who would have benefited from this policy went without, then the pandemic hit. As a result of record joblessness and stress on the agency, the Oregon Employment Department asked the legislature to delay implementation.

How will you ensure that implementation of this vital program stays on track?

In an American free market, government has no role in dictating wages and benefits to an employer. Any business that does not offer the maximum pay and benefits it can afford to attract good workers is run by a fool and will be out of business soon enough.

How will you ensure that the agency administers a program that is equally as accessible and responsive to employees as it is to employers?

See above.

3. Oregon's workers' compensation system is often heralded as one of the best in the nation for having "generous benefits and declining costs for employers year after year." This is often attributed to increasing safety in the workplace and a decline in dangerous sectors. The pandemic gave unique insight into the workers' compensation system due to transparency in data that we haven't seen before. This data points to stark discrepancies in the experience of workers based on the type of workers compensation carrier they happen to have through no choice of their own. The private and self-insured carriers (employer and insurer are one in the same) *denied COVID-19 worker compensation claims at twenty times that of SAIF*, the quasi-public sector carrier. Workers' compensation is an outlier among state agencies that engage workers. In order to appeal a denied claim, a worker is essentially required to retain a private attorney because the system is incredibly difficult to navigate and arcane, and then ultimately ends up before a board of individuals that are employed to adjudicate these claims.

How will you guarantee that the Management Labor Advisory Committee is making policy recommendations to the legislature that help workers to the level needed given that the board is equally split between management and labor representatives with no mechanism to break a tie?

Having management and labor equally represented on the Committee seems correct to me.

Are you willing to require that the Workers' Compensation Division continue to produce weekly claims reporting should there be a continuance in the current pandemic or a new pandemic?

I have no problem with government agencies being transparent in all that they do.

What ideas do you have to make the appeal process less burdensome on the average worker?

I do not have enough insight into the current process to have recommendations. It seems possible to me to construct a system where one could present a case to the adjudication board without the process being so arcane that it requires an expensive specialist lawyer.

Do you support increasing the wage replacement for an injured worker from 2/3 of their wages to a tiered system based on income like what is found in paid family and medical leave, while 2/3 wage replacement would remain the least amount of wage replacement?

Payment of 2/3 sounds right to me. Why would you consider it fair to pay someone for not working the same or close to the same as someone who works?

Transparency and Accountability with Public Resources

1. Privatization is an increasingly common way to address budget deficits and decreased delivery of services due to chronic divestment. Often these cost savings come at the expense of workers in those sectors who readily experience slashed wages and benefits, and often the loss of union representation. Meanwhile, the public loses the ability to hold elected officials accountable for the outcomes previously generated by the service.

Will you publicly oppose current and future efforts to privatize liquor sales in Oregon?

The State and local communities could reasonably regulate liquor sales, as it is a substance like illegal drugs that can have a substantial negative impact on families and community livability. I see no need for the State to be in the liquor business.

Will you oppose the privatization of government agencies to the private sector when workers would be negatively impacted by loss of employment, wages, benefits, and their union?

I would be in favor of government being the most cost efficient for the taxpayer. As long as unions are allowed in government employment I see very little chance of government employees being the most cost efficient. See my comments on public employee unions above.

What is your general position on privatization?

In favor. See above.

2. Tax credits for construction development are often utilized with the expectation of creating an influx of economic vitality. In some cases that happens, and in some cases the likelihood of long-term gains to communities impacted seems to be less convincing. Some projects continue to utilize public resources while the employers operating in them violate a myriad of labor laws, including discrimination and harassment, wage and hour, and safety and health violations. The employment requirements for both the construction project and that of the jobs inside the facility after completion are minimal to non-existent, along with reporting criteria. This effectively creates a scenario in which millions of dollars in tax revenue are forfeited with little to no transparency, leaving stakeholders and local governments unable to ascertain the net benefit or loss the programs provide to the workers or the community.

How will you judge tax credits to ensure they are worth the dollars invested?

Politicians do not use economic reasons to make "investments", they use politics. Governments should only ensure an environment conducive to development and free enterprise. Let business people make the investment decisions.

Will you support increased transparency from Business Oregon to both the legislature and stakeholders regarding the amount of tax deferral generated in the programs they support across the state? Under what timeline do you believe that is feasible?

Politicians should not be making tax deferral or tax credit decisions at all. See above.

Do you support a prevailing wage requirement on projects located in enterprise zones? Do you support a project labor agreement requirement on projects located in enterprise zones?

No. Government should not be dictating wages or benefits. Why can't every part of the city or state be an enterprise zone that is conducive to free market development? The existence of such a zone indicates either how bad the development environment is, or that politicians are funneling tax money to their crony supporters.

How do you plan to ensure the agencies tasked with enforcing the labor laws mentioned above coordinate with Business Oregon to flag bad actors and hold them accountable as they apply for other abatements?

N/A

3. Often, state agencies procure goods and services using the lowest responsible bidder process, frequently interpreted by agency staff as the lowest cost. Oregon has made some modest improvements to ensure we look at the long-term effects of procurement choices on our economy. While there are some limits placed on our state by trade agreements, there is more we could be doing to support local and union jobs in our procurement processes.

Would you support efforts to improve public procurement/purchasing to reward High Road Contractors and Suppliers? (note: High Road- defined as those who invest in good wages, pension, health, training/apprenticeship, and history of compliance with current laws)?

Government should make its bids solely dependent on cost and *quality of services*. This includes having a track record of quality services. It must come with a system that ensures competition by allowing new operators without a track record yet to establish themselves. I believe that companies that hire quality people and who pay higher wages and benefits can compete on terms of quality.

I am okay with adding criteria that include compliance with law to weed out fly-by-night or shady operators.

How will you help promote best value contracting and ensure public dollars are used to promote responsible contractors and businesses?

This shouldn't be rocket science. Private companies bid contracts all the time. The problem is cronyism in the public sector. The difference is in the private sector one loses a job or the business goes under if cronyism is allowed to choose a sub-standard contractor.

This seems a logical way to handle government contracts. If a sub-standard bid results in shoddy work (ex: a few years ago, repaving of Hwy 217 near Portland had ruts again after just a few months) the government employee and/or supervisors in the department should be fired. A criminal investigation should also be opened for detection of cronyism.

How will you promote and/or incentivize Oregon and domestic manufacturing and union jobs?

Eliminate personal income taxes and all business income taxes. They would be replaced by a 2% retail non-food sales tax. It goes without saying that the economically ignorant revenue (not profit) taxes need to be junked.

Just as important is the regulatory and licensing environment. Too often these, perhaps well intentioned, mechanisms become obstacles and gate keepers preventing new business creation,

Do you believe that state transportation projects should have core high-road contracting requirements that support a fair return on investment?

Government bids must be made on cost and quality of services only.

Would you support efforts to evaluate and assess the process for contracts that require lowest-responsible-bidders, ensuring bids are being awarded to responsible and responsive bidders?

No. See above.

Would you support efforts for the utilization of best value contracting that promotes and gives preference to bidders providing good quality products and services that pay good wages, benefits, workforce equity, and demonstration of compliance with state, federal, and local laws?

No. See above.

4. The Labor Education and Research Center at the University of Oregon researches issues related to workers, working conditions, and our economy. It is funded through and housed at the University of Oregon. In recent years the university has become increasingly hostile towards this program.

How could you ensure this important asset remains a stable resource for workers and legislators alike?

No State funds at all should be given to any university. They need to provide an educational service that is worth the cost to student customers, If they cannot do that, they should disappear.

A Worker Centered Climate Transition

1. As our state looks for ways to address climate change, we are faced with important decisions about balancing environmental and economic sustainability. Unfortunately, many of the jobs that we create through green initiatives don't pay living wages or provide benefits. Often worker advocates hear that greening the economy needs to happen so quickly that there isn't the time or resources to create livable economies. This is a notion we strongly reject.

How should Oregon balance our environmental needs with our economic needs? How can we ensure that "greening our economy" leads to new high wage jobs across the state, and that workers see a just transition from their previous employment?

Using carbon based fuels with current burning technology that only releases the trace gas carbon-dioxide, which is an essential part of nature, is not a problem.

On the other hand, having politicians lead hysterical non-scientific attacks against carbon-dioxide and use government power to force our civilization's power grid to intermittent costly wind and solar is a road to disaster.

In analyzing climate-related policy, how will you ensure that workers in affected industries are re-trained and made whole during the transition to a clean energy economy? And how would you ensure jobs created through investments from any revenue generated by a carbon pricing program are high wage, family-supporting jobs?

Energy production is a business that should be left to business decisions and engineering, not politicians looking for ways to spend tax dollars on cronyism.

Would you support a mandate on industry and the state to fund a program that would allow for bridges to retirement if a job is lost as a result of climate policy?

N/A

2. Oregon can be a leader in supporting efforts to manufacture, procure and incentivize the transition to cost-effective electric vehicles, e-buses, and other key technology to reduce our transportation emissions, while prioritizing training, investment and labor standards in these sectors.

How will you ensure our state's investments and potential in-state production (assembly, supply-chain) are done by fair and responsible employers (see [California Fair and Responsible](#)), promote apprenticeship in manufacturing (see [BYD/SMART Apprenticeship](#)), and protect drivers/operators (see [UC Berkeley Truck Driver Misclassification](#))

The State vehicle fleet decisions should be based on price and quality of service only.

3. Often there are attempts to divert money from the Unemployment Insurance trust fund for other purposes – job training, programs to subsidize workers' wages, or even filling budget holes.

Is there any situation in which you would support taking money out of the unemployment trust fund for purposes other than providing benefits to workers? Do you support extending unemployment insurance programs during recessions and pandemics? Do you believe the economy is strong enough to end the current extensions?

Money collected for Unemployment Insurance should only be used for that purpose. Unemployment benefits should be of limited time as a short term bridge only. (Regardless of the current flu season.)

State Land Board

1. In becoming Governor, you will be one of the three members of the Oregon State Land Board which oversees a land base that includes nearly 1.6 million acres of state land and resource assets. How you will balance the need for economic development in areas of the state that are often left behind, and ensuring Oregon's state lands are accessible to all

How will you prioritize labor stakeholder involvement and input with important decisions before the Board?

All State lands should be given to the respective counties. This allows the land and resources to benefit the local residents.

The State should only keep and maintain State parks.

Basic Worker Rights Not Yet Afforded

1. In some workplaces a person can get fired without any warning and for no reason – these “at will” employees can be let go without “just cause.”

Do you believe workers should have warnings and progressive discipline before they are laid off? Should a manager be required to tell a person why they are being laid off? How will you address this?

What is good for the goose, is good for the gander. If a person can quit with no notice, he can be fired with no notice. If there is a two week notice for quitting, a two work notice for firing seems fair.

Given my current position on strikes and union organizing (freely allowed, see above), firing a person also engaged in these activities would require documentation of warnings and/or progressive discipline to avoid accusation of retaliation.

2. Farmworkers and domestic workers were excluded from the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, primarily due to racism. To this date, both categories of workers are not afforded time and half when they work beyond 40 hours in one calendar week.

Do you support Oregon's effort to extend overtime at 40 hours to both categories of workers?

No. The accusation of “racism” is an ignorant and disgraceful statement of someone who cannot make a cognizant argument. If you have ever run a farm or run a household, the notion that it can be “run on the clock” is just as ignorant. It is my judgement that lawmakers did the exclusion correctly.

3. Oregon's public defense system needs immediate support and investment. Caseloads continue to grow and turnover rates in public defense offices have increased to crisis levels in the last year. While the work to move away from the constitutionally problematic flat case rate contracting model began in 2019, it has been stunted by the lack of investment.

Would you support investing in the reforms that have been recommended by numerous studies - modern caseload caps, adequate support staff, case managers for clients, and training and accountability at all levels - that would ensure all accused of a crime in Oregon have their constitutionally guaranteed right to adequate representation?

The legal system in America is an appalling mess. I was not impressed with my experience with a public defender. The goal seemed more to throw a person into the system than to actually defend.

I do not yet have the knowledge to comment on possible legal system fixes.

Refusing to Leave Workers Behind

1. The legislature has made significant strides to improve access to quality childcare. However, there has been very little done to support increasing the supply of childcare. Home childcare is often the most flexible and useful for families who can't afford large, expensive childcare centers. Home childcare is also more likely to have 24-hour care, culturally specific care and rural care, all of which are lacking in Oregon. Without sufficient childcare slots for kids our economy cannot get back on track.

Will you prioritize investments in building the supply of home childcare?

The more government regulates and controls, the more expensive and less available something becomes. Let parents make the childcare decisions, including paying for it. Provide maximum availability by keeping the State out of it.

2. A recent report investigating Oregon Health and Science University found systemic problems with racism, sexual harassment, bullying, and retaliation.

As Governor, how will you ensure workers at OHSU can work without having to encounter unlawful, dangerous, and degrading activity?

Are there no managers or supervisors at OHSU? Or are you saying they can't do their jobs because the State is preventing them? Every other business in the State can handle this. Perhaps all government funding should be removed so OHSU can learn to operate like every other private business in the State.

3. As the federal debate around immigration draws on, over 100,000 workers living in Oregon today are undocumented. We know it's easy to take advantage of workers who are afraid to lose their job because of their immigration status. Farmworkers are intentionally excluded from the National Labor Relations Act, stripping from them many rights that other workers have.

Should Oregon allow farmworkers the right to organize a union?

So how does this work? People in the country without a legal right to work, need to have a legal system that forces other people to give them rights? Not sure I follow that logic.

The State should require E-verify to only allow employment with those with a legal right to work.

Would you support legislation that prohibits employers from contacting ICE as retaliation for organizing?

No. Any citizen should be free to contact a government enforcement agency.

4. Over the course of the past few years, we've seen an incredible number of women tell their stories about sexual harassment in the workplace. Almost one half of the Oregon AFL-CIO's membership identify as women. In order to enable women to gain ground economically, we must take bold steps to ensure when they're harassed or assaulted that they have access to culture-changing remedies.

Would you support clarification in statute to hold management personally liable when they are found to have committed the act of harassment or discrimination, or they were alerted to the discrimination or harassment and did not take action to remedy it? Why or why not?

I've been a manger. This already exists.

Do you support ensuring that employers cannot request a non-disclosure agreement when a worker has experienced discrimination, harassment or sexual assault on the job?

If someone wants to sign an NDA in return for something, that is their choice. However, using coercion to pressure someone into a decision is illegal, as it should be for any contract negotiation.

5. Increasingly – and particularly in the gig-economy – the use of independent contractors to do work historically done by employees has become a significant trend in our economy. While there are instances where independent contractors are essential to the work of a business, there are also troubling trends used by employers to erode the relationship between themselves and their employees by misclassifying their workers as independent contractors to avoid basic worker protections that employees are guaranteed, like the right to a minimum wage and basic civil rights protections.

Do you believe this trend is problematic in Oregon's economy? Would you support legislation aimed at ensuring workers are appropriately classified as employees rather than independent contractors and curbing misclassification abuses by some employers? Would you support legislation based off of California's AB 5 from 2019 that does each of the following things?

Apply a strict "ABC test" to determine workers' employment status and puts the burden of proof on employers:

(A) that the worker is free from the control and direction of the hirer in connection with the performance of the work, both under the contract for the performance of such work

(B) that the worker performs work that is outside the usual course of the hiring entity's business

(C) that the worker is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as the work performed for the hiring entity.

Limiting workers' choices by the government "helping" them is nonsense. There are lots of reasons why a person might be best served by a gig-economy – including independence and freedom from the "boss". Heaven help Americans from all the politicians and social do-gooders that want to "help" them.

6. COVID-19 presented unprecedented challenges to all workers, but particularly those at the epicenter of the pandemic: health care workers, educational service workers, farmworkers and retail workers to name a few. When we come out of the pandemic, we can't go back to an economy that undervalues these workers and their critical labor in our society.

As Governor, how would you address inadequate staffing particularly in healthcare, to ensure that Oregonian's health care needs are being met?

The State should have zero involvement with funding healthcare. A legal climate of freedom in healthcare, where patients directly purchase their healthcare needs, is the fastest and surest way to foster innovation and lower costs via competition. Ensuring a legal climate of freedom is the limit of what the State should be doing.

What funding or policy decisions would you like to see made so that our economy values and better protects these impacted workers going forward?

If the State had not decided to implement the same "health" mandates as used by the Communist party of China, there would not have been unprecedented economic challenges.

Retirement Security

1. Oregon's Public Employee Retirement System is one of the most solvent in the nation. It was established to ensure that public employees are able to count on a quality pension when they retire, as was once the case for most workers. As private pensions have been eroded in many parts of the economy, our state has been left with a choice: erode our public pension system as well, or maintain a public pension system that is as strong as those private pensions once were. A strong, solvent, pension system helps us attract the best employees we can. It keeps more retirees out of poverty – and off of expensive public services. And it's part of a negotiated package through which workers have forgone pay raises and other benefits to ensure they'll have a secure retirement.

Would you oppose attempts to reduce PERS retirement benefits for public employees? Under what conditions would you support any deduction in PERS benefits, and what types of deductions would you support or oppose?

The only way you can claim Oregon's PERS is the "most solvent in the nation" is you believe that the public is a tax cow that can be infinitely milked.

The public retirement promised by politicians to government employees is unsustainable and the people who built that tower of crap knew it would be exactly that. They made those decisions confident in the fact they would be long gone when it blew up.

Every private employer figured out decades ago that you cannot fund a person from your business who is not working. Thus every private employer has worker 401k plans. They often help fund the retirement plan as a benefit. When the worker leaves, he takes the 401k plan with him. There is no funding of someone who is not working for the company. The same system must be used in government, no exceptions.

No government should be in the investment and guaranteed retirement pay business. The State needs to get completely out of that business. The solution I see for existing obligations is to divide the existing PERS investment portfolio among those being paid retirement by the State. Let the retirees manage their own funds like every other private worker retiree.

As part of a pay and benefit package a government can pay match some percentage of wages paid to a 401k, like is done in the private sector.

I stand by these answers, and commit to upholding the values displayed in my answers in my votes if elected.

Reed K. Christensen

Signature

March 15, 2022

Date

Statement of Principles for Public Officials

The Freedom to Choose a Union

~~As an elected official or candidate for office, I understand that our economy has left too many behind, namely women and historically and currently marginalized communities. I believe that unions are a key factor in balancing the economy in the favor of workers and their families.~~

I respect the right of every working person to pursue equality, opportunity, a voice on the job and a better life by forming a union. I understand that the decision to join or form a union should be a free choice of an employee, absent employer coercion **or intimidation by fellow workers**. I believe that employers **or unions** who interfere with, harass, threaten, or fire workers ~~for trying~~ **deciding** to form a union – or who deliberately manipulate the legal system to prevent or delay organizing – are harming not only their employees but our entire community. Such tactics have the effect of denying workers their basic human right to organize and bargain collectively, and drive down standards for the community as a whole.

- I fully support the principle that all workers are entitled to freedom of association at work, and I support the right of workers to form a union and bargain collectively – in an environment free of interference, intimidation, coercion, harassment, reprisals, or delay.
- **I fully support the principle that employers are entitled to communicate to their workers the disadvantages of a union in a spirit of free and open debate.**
- ~~• I will publicly support workers who are forming unions by reaffirming the importance of unions to our communities and by taking actions such as issuing public statements, attending rallies supporting organizing, sponsoring public forums, and the like.~~
- I will urge employers to respect their employees' right to form a union, ~~to remain neutral during union organizing campaigns,~~ to recognize a union voluntarily when a majority of their employees choose to form one, and to bargain in good faith and reach an agreement.

Name (print): _____ Reed K. Christensen _____

Signed: _____

Office Held/Sought: _____ Oregon Governor _____

Date: _____ March 15, 2022 _____