

SB 907 is a good employee protection concept but void of clarity. Clearly, private sector employers would face state regulations but what about state employees. Questions asked to the agencies were less than clear. The Carrier read bill text that DCBS OSHA was solely responsible. This Senator was told something different in writing so there is confusion. Questions asked of the agencies in regard to applicability to legislative employees were less than clear. Though still waiting. OSHA pointed to BOLI as having employee protection responsibility but BOLI failed legislative employees in the past. OSHA cited federal authority over the Legislative Assembly. The Eleventh Amendment arguments by the Oregon Attorney General indicates something completely different. The Attorney General claims to represent all present and past state-legislative employees along with all the agencies that would be involved against a victimized government employee. The federal EEOC claimed support to legislative employees in the building, yet, abandoned employees as soon as challenged by the Senate President's Legislative Counsel and Legislative Administration backed by the Oregon Attorney General. Neither state agency could clarify whom had authority to deal with the Speaker or President of the Legislative Assembly should a legislative employee be impacted. Any avenue under LBPR 27 for an employee would be blocked by the politically elected conduct committees per historical records along with employees legally responsible to the presiding officers. Without clarity as to protecting legislative employees the bill is opposed.