



Paid for by Friends of Mike Heavey  
2348 Alki Ave SW #206 • Seattle, WA 98116 • (206) 938-0325  
info@mikeheavey.com • www.mikeheavey.com

Dear Ms. Deal & Mr. Brown,

I appreciate your contacting me. I am more than happy to help you understand my positions on matters relating to the economy. Although you have endorsed my opponent in this race and your letter might be cynically perceived as an attempt to boost his chances by embarrassing me so close to the ballot drop this week, I believe we both share the same goal of putting more people back to work and jumpstarting our economy again.

I believe Business and Occupation taxes are too high. We are far too dependent on them in this state, much as we are too dependent on our regressive sales tax. This has been a consistent position I have held since the beginning of the campaign. It is also one of the reasons I am strongly in support of I-1098 – and, I notice both of your organizations support this much-needed tax reform as well, so that is good to see we agree on that point. We can both agree that our state has one of the most regressive tax structures in the country – with the burden disproportionately placed on low-income folks and small businesses. This needs to change. Since small businesses have been job creators in our state, historically, I am in strong support of “keeping their taxes low.”

Regarding the expansion of unemployment benefits, the key point you are missing in your claim is the statement “*voluntarily* leave their jobs.” This is very explicit in the questionnaire so I am surprised you overlooked this point in your letter to me. I do not support expanding unemployment benefits to employees who voluntarily leave their jobs. This is not a sustainable option for our state budget at this time; and, if I were given the option, I would much rather add benefits to existing laid off workers than those employees who leave of their own accord. If this is a position inconsistent with your organization, I would have enjoyed your meeting with me during your endorsement process, Ms. Deal, so I could have heard the counter argument. I might be persuaded to re-consider this position if you were willing to meet with me.

One thing I would note, however. I don’t recall this specific issue on the Machinist’s or UFCW Local 21’s questionnaire (attached), so it is my hope this means it is either not a high priority for either of your organizations or our positions on that point aren’t inconsistent with each other. Ms. Deal, I see specific references to part-time employees receiving unemployment insurance, which I still support and have been consistent, but nowhere on your questionnaire does it address your position or concern about expanding UI to employees who leave jobs voluntarily.

I agree with you on your point regarding pandering to the endorsing organizations and giving straight answers. The voters have definitely tired of it. As I am sure you’re all too aware, interest groups can often paint you with broad strokes, desperately trying to put candidates they don’t support in the most embarrassing of lights. It’s so very easy to pluck certain statements out of context and try and make an argument that scores you some cheap political points. For example, my opponent claimed on October 6<sup>th</sup> at a Disability Candidate’s Forum that the insurance companies were desperately trying to defeat his election and then the very next day interviewed



with the state's largest health insurance company for support. I don't believe he's pandering to insurance companies. It's ludicrous to claim he would need to come clean about his positions on things like universal health care or denying claims based on pre-existing conditions just because he aggressively solicits their support. I have every confidence you would agree.

Thank you again for contacting my campaign.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'MH', followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Mike Heavey