

# McQueen Congress

**Transcript of Lee McQueen's October 29, 2017**

**Q&A with Green Party of Arkansas**

**McQueen:** Okay, how's the sound level? Am I too loud or is that good?

**Green Party:** That's good.

**McQueen:** Well, thank you everyone, for coming out today. I appreciate it and I definitely appreciate the invitation from the Green Party to have a moment to speak to you about my candidacy for the 4th District of Arkansas as an Independent. And I communicated with the Green Party to see what their plans were because I knew based on my political outlook and my philosophy that my platform would be very similar. And so, what would be the point? And then I learned that there were plans for 2020 with the Green Party and not 2018. And I said, maybe we can work something out. So that's part of what brought me here today. Also, I'm gonna give ar a little brief history myself so you can know a little more about me and my background and then, of course, my platform. And then finish up with what's going on in District 4, how the mechanics and strategies look for 2018.

And so, my background is librarianship. I studied librarianship, I have a degree, so I do a little research, organization of information, data, things like that. It's not a burden, to me, and so, sometimes I do that for myself and I enjoy it. And others who do not enjoy it. I do a lot of writing, again for myself. I was at a festival yesterday hustling my books. Great success. And then also, I write for others too. And I've been a substitute teacher. So, literacy, education, research, things like that. And then I also have an undergraduate degree in Political Science. So, that's my background. I've been involved with politics since, I would

say, 1988. I volunteered for Jesse Jackson's campaign. He was the progressive that year in the race. I volunteered for that campaign. Then I went on to school and got educated and got very involved with that.

I was introduced to the Green Party via Ralph Nader's campaign in 2000. To this day, when people say, "Well, Nader brought us Bush," my response always is, "Well, what do you think the 1994 Crime Bill brought you? It brought you disenfranchisement of a key voter base that was lost. And that brought you Bush, along with many other strategic mistakes." And so history informs us of what narratives are, whether they're false or whether they're true. It's very important to know that political history. And so, I try to stay informed and then inform others too, as well, to readjust those narratives. To this day, that voter base is still lost. So many people have been disenfranchised as a result of the Crime Bill that Florida is still struggling to become what it once was, reflective and representative of the actual total population. And not just Florida. States like Iowa where there's permanent disenfranchisement even for people who have paid their debt to society. And so, electoral reform. And many issues relevant today that I want to address in Arkansas, where there are so many issues that we're told false narratives about. And I intend to use my campaign to address those, as well.

Let's see. More about my background. I decided to run for very specific reasons. I've got a website up. I've got videos out explaining my candidacy. I've got a YouTube channel that has videos from about nine years ago holding forth on many issues that were important to me and that I felt were important to the community, in general. Things that we're talking about today. Infrastructure. Renewable energy. Jobs, good jobs with quality good wages and benefits. There's me on my YouTube channel pretending that I'm *C-SPAN*, which inspired me. I wanted to have my own show talking about what was going on in my community that maybe wasn't being addressed. And what was true then is true now.

I decided to come off the Internet and actually enter into the fray and see if the skills I developed through the years would assist me to assist my community in saving itself from the very real harm that's being done by, I would say, the elevation of corporations over humans beings. Certainly before, it was trending that way. But now that there's official recognition of corporations as persons, as humans, that it's displaced humans. To my view, that while corporations are

being treated as humans, humans, in some respects, are being treated like animals. I don't like it. I don't accept it. I plan to fight against that. We must recover our economy, and our communities, and even our life spans from corporate interests. We're in trouble. We're in trouble, but it's not lost if we stand up and fight back. I wanted to participate in that

And so, that's also what encouraged me to run.

I spoke directly to my opponent in Arkansas's District 4. This is a Republican incumbent who votes along the party line, votes in a very conservative, well, it's called conservative. But what it is, is a corporatist manner. And very right wing. Going so far as to imply that people in District 4 don't want to work and that they cannot pass drug tests. And so, that's why they don't get the wage that they feel that they deserve. And I'm offended and I think that's a lie. Because I've door-knocked and canvassed in District 4 for various ballot measures, for various issues, on other campaigns. And I've spoken face-to-face with people. The very people he claims don't want to work and don't deserve a living wage and can't pass a drug are desperate for work. That's what they tell me over and over.

And, I'm saying that it's time for there to be a speak-back against these false narratives. And so, that's also why I'm in the race. I wanted to mention, it's okay if you have questions in the meantime. I can pivot and readjust. Right here.

**Green Party:** You said that you've been on other campaigns. You mentioned the Jesse Jackson campaigns in 88. Could you go over some of your other previous campaign work?

**McQueen:** Of course. I've also worked on Ralph Nader's campaign. Not officially. I was a volunteer, I wasn't staff or anything. That really informed me of a lot of issues. Progressive issues. Things that he revealed that I felt were possible, that people kept saying, "It's not possible." There were very reasonable arguments about how this could happen. And then locally, I've worked as a volunteer. So, never as staff, but on a volunteer basis, as I worked in my own life full-time at other things, I would volunteer on local campaigns. Any other questions?

**Green Party:** We actually have a question from Kathryn Morse.

**McQueen:** Okay.

**Green Party:** Apparently, she is in El Dorado, which is the district your from. And her comment/question is, "I've visited your website and found things we have in common. You worked on the Jesse Jackson campaign in 1988 and I voted for him in the Virginia primary. I'm envious that you have met Barbara Jordan, as I believe that she's brilliant. I'm wondering, if elected, will you caucus with the Democrats. That's what I would do."

**McQueen:** Her last statement is, "That's what I would do?" Oh, okay. That's actually a very good question. I'm not entirely convinced that that is what I will do. It depends upon the co-hort that comes into Congress with me. The entire make-up of the freshman class for the 116th Congress. What the population will be. It's likely that I may end up caucusing with the Democrats, but I can't say for sure that's what I'll do. I know that Bernie Sanders, who I pattern myself after, has chosen to do that. And that he's made that work for him, in some respects. I am modelling myself and my campaign after Bernie Sanders. But, he represents the state of Vermont. I would be representing a district in SW Arkansas. So there might be differences in the choices he makes for Vermont which is very different from where I would be representing. SW Arkansas is actually very conservative. While there are many issues that I represent that I feel are just very common sense issues that cross party lines, and that I can actually bring that to the people, like the \$15 minimum wage. Very common sense. Single payer healthcare. Do you feel that your life is worthy of saving? Most people would say, "yes." And so, I don't see that as a partisan issue. So, short answer to that is, I'm not entirely clear. It depends on several things. Any other questions?

**Green Party:** What are your plans to motivate these disenfranchised people to register to vote, to get to the polls and vote?

**McQueen:** Part of it is actually a legal issue. I've been out in the community canvassing, and talking to people about ballot measures. Even if there's not any person on the ballot this year that you feel you can support, at least come out for the ballot measure. Some of them flat out told me that they couldn't because of a legal reason. They're under supervision. Or they felt like they could not register to vote and have their vote counted. But again, I do plan to approach people with questions. Do you feel that your children should have healthcare, even as it's

being targeted by the current administration? Do you feel that you should be incarcerated for abusing only yourself with drugs and no one else and have your life ruined? Things like this. Very basic questions. Some people have given up. It's too much. They've won and we've lost. But I feel that there's always a chance.

I do have a high hill to climb against the current incumbent, who's known in some respects. Well, the business leaders in the community know the incumbent. The people on the ground that I speak with don't really know him because he doesn't talk to them. He talks to the business leaders. As long as he continues to be on the wrong side of the issues, and I feel that on many issues he is on the wrong side of history, that I do have a chance. If he suddenly flips and says, you know what, I'm gonna support single payer healthcare. I might have to re-think my strategy. He might do that. I've asked him to his face and he has no intentions.

I've even asked him about supporting renewable energy over fossil fuels and, again, he's said that he's not really going to do that. In my mind, I feel that he is not only on the wrong side of the issues, but he's on the wrong side of history. He's holding our state, I was going to say district, but he votes on a federal level. So our state, and maybe even the entire United States back. He's on the Natural Resources Committee. He's a member of the Natural Resources Committee. It is the Natural Resources Committee in the House where John Conyers's HR 676 bill, the Expanded & Improved Medicare for All Act is stalled. It's been there since February, in his committee. Wrong side of the issues. Any other questions?

**Green Party:** This is, I guess a question about your analysis of your prospects for doing well. In terms of your district, what's the guy's name? The Republican? In terms of that. *[unintelligible]* Republican votes *[unintelligible]* who typically vote Republican. Sort of your own analysis of your chances, a bit of your strategy in terms of how you would proceed with your campaign in terms of garnering independent votes and swing votes *[unintelligible]*.

**McQueen:** Well, I don't make predictions. And that's a statement that I have on my YouTube channel. I don't make predictions. So I cannot say for sure that a Republican would not vote for me. They might. If I present my issues and platform in a way that they can relate to and that it makes sense for them to say, rather than this, I'll do this. Again, as long as the Republican incumbent

continues to be on the wrong side of the issues, I have a chance.

We'll even take the opioid epidemic which is a serious problem that's gotten quite a bit of news coverage, that it needed to get years ago, before people had already died. It's not a partisan issue, the opioid crisis. It has cut across class. Because it was largely driven by the pharmaceutical industry. So people who trusted their doctors and trusted Big Pharma, went in and took their prescriptions, as directed and found that they couldn't stop because it was addictive. They were told that it wasn't really. People who were in pain, who were suffering, that had anxiety or depression, or something that they needed to fix and the problem became more than they could handle. There have been deaths. This has been cutting across class and across party lines. The incumbent is pretty much a law and order type who seemed unresponsive to this issue. And seemed unconcerned that people were being criminalized. It seemed all right with him. People have seen their families broken, lives ruined, and then, of course, deaths.

On the opposite side of Texarkana in Miller County, Arkansas, we have Texarkana, Texas which is Bowie County, Texas. Bowie County, Texas has joined with other towns and cities across the nation to actually sue Big Pharma because of what has been done to their people via the opioid crisis. Miller County, I hope catches up to that and gets on the right side of history. It would be nice if our congressman were on the right side of history.

I recognize it as a health concern, as a crisis that should not be criminalized. It should be treated as a health crisis. This is only one issue that cuts across. I present the case: Do your children deserve to live? Do they deserve to go back to work, go back to school, go back to their families, go back to their lives? Do they deserve a second chance? Most parents would say, yes, of course, my child does.

There was someone I knew personally who hung himself. He was on anti-anxiety medication. And he hung himself. Fortunately, what he intended to do, he failed at. He was cut down and his life was saved. He was sent to treatment instead of to prison. And then his employer held his job for him. That was the best-case scenario of recovery of his life. I would like to see that happen more across the state, people given a second chance. Whether its a Republican or an Independent or a Libertarian or a Green, I would hope that people realize that

people deserve second chances. And that's only one issue. Any other questions?

**Green Party:** Can I follow up?

**McQueen:** Yes, of course.

**Green Party:** The point of what I was wanting to know was whether you would be getting any interfering challengers. *[unintelligible]* Democratic candidate *[unintelligible]* interventionist *[unintelligible]* the primaries *[unintelligible]*

**McQueen:** The information that I've accumulated so far of people who declared is that there is someone who declared themselves in the race back in April of this year. I believe from his background that he is relatively conservative. That seems to be the type of Democrat that emerges in that district, relatively conservative. I have attended meetings where I've heard whispers that there may be another Democrat.

**Green Party:** She announced.

**McQueen:** Oh, she did? Okay. So, apparently, there is going to be a Democratic primary. We'll have to see what the playing field looks like after the primary. There's two Libertarians. There was one Libertarian that bowed out and then two additional emerged. So the playing field is still changing at this time. We'll have to see who comes out of the Libertarian primary. I don't even know if there will be a Republican challenger. At this time it's moving. Moving. Any other questions?

**Green Party:** I wanted to know what your position is on abortion. Abortion for many people, especially in our state, is the issue. They'll make their decision based on that. They're pro-life. So what is your position on that. And how do you counter people who are just a one-issue voter like that?

**McQueen:** Well, I've seen that in action. When it was time for the bathroom bill voting, there was a run on our courthouse. It may be the same case for that, as well. People do vote their issues. Sometimes, it's a matter of how you present things to them. I do feel that abortion is a part of healthcare. It's not a social issue. It's not a religious issue. It's not a culture issue. It's not an identity politics issue. It's a part of reproductive healthcare. It's healthcare. Banning that, is actually eliminating healthcare.

I do feel that there are serious policy concerns surrounding that. Do we want people who don't have a medical license, who do not have medical training, or a medical degree, actually limiting or making decisions about healthcare for people they don't even know, that they never met, that are not qualified to make. In some cases, practicing medicine without a license is considered a crime. So there's a qualification issue and the fact that it actually is healthcare. I would explain it like that and it seems to be more reasonable once people realize that it's not a pleasant part of healthcare, but it happens. And that sometimes, it has to happen. While there's a lot of inflammatory talk about right or wrong, or killing, or murder, oh, my mic just went out on me. Sometimes it does have to happen. I support access to healthcare whether it's for a man or for a woman or a child.

*[27:00 unintelligible until 29:50]*

**Green Party:** Some of them are identified as non-binary. In public schools, they have to go to the restroom of the gender they are assigned at birth, which is similar to the bathroom bill. What would you do *[unintelligible]* current age *[unintelligible]*

**McQueen:** Well, apparently, it appears to be still not settled entirely. At least not at the state and local level. There's still volatility around the issue. Based on my district, which, again, is really conservative, SW Arkansas, I would probably, actually need to learn more about the full range of issues surrounding that than I have already. *[unintelligible]*

**Green Party:** Okay, we'll talk about that later.

**McQueen:** Okay. I have to do that. Any other questions? Okay, over here.

**Green Party:** One question, that people always dance around is, would you be willing to stand up to the military industrial complex? Lockheed Martin *[unintelligible]* entire state of Arkansas. *[unintelligible]* You need to send more troops to die. If you don't do that, you're not patriotic. And while we don't have any money for any education or roads or taking care of people, both parties just handed out *[unintelligible]* billion dollars more for *[unintelligible]* and it seems no matter which part I ask, I can't get a politician who will say they will actually stand up to the military industrial complex. Would you be willing to, or?

**McQueen:** As far as that issue, we were discussing Republican, Democrat, or Independent. Finally, many people on the ground regardless of party are finally starting to see the very real repercussions of the imbalance of our budget and what it has done to other sectors. We're off balance, way off balance. We're headed over a cliff. That's my position on this. We can look back in history. Rome, or Spain, or Portugal. England or Germany that once ruled a mighty empire on which the sun never set. And the sun never sets on our empire. We're everywhere. They over-extended and then those nation states declined. We're at a serious point where we have to make some decisions because we're in danger of following in those footsteps. We've been taught by history of how this story ends. We need to decide a new ending and beginning.

OpenSecrets is a website that I visit every now and again. It does appear that there's defense contractors such as Raytheon, Lockheed Martin that have decided that they would contribute to everyone. A little something here. A little something there. And that might explain the reason why there is bipartisan agreement to not to address this. But the people on the ground, I think, it's starting to break through. The reason why the streets look like they do is because of this. The reason why your schools are not up to par is because of this. The reason why you can't afford higher education is because of this. The reason why our coast line has been devaasted and not built back better than before is because of this. People are starting to see the pattern of what is happening.

It's a matter of, again, getting the narrative out there and making sure people understand that supporting our troops means not abusing our troops. Abusing our troops is sending them out to do actions for unrighteous causes. That's an abuse of our troops. Now, we're in Niger. Was Niger anywhere near our towers on 9/11? And yet the Authorization for Military Force goes into effect wherever, apparently, the executive administration decides we want to be. And that Congress has been derelict. Yes, that body that I'm attempting to join. I can say, forthrightly, that they have been derelict. That the United States Constitution outlines that it is their duty to declare war or to not declare war. They are the check on the president and they have failed to do that. They have failed to protect our troops. They have failed. And so, again, our troops are coming home and are not the people that they were. They've been abused. They've been broken in body and spirit because our Congress has not protected them. I do plan to

follow the U.S. Constitution. It's constitutional. Any other questions?

**Green Party:** I just want to know what your position is on refugees. The world's changing not only due to war, but due to climate change [unintelligible] droughts. People are seeking refuge not only from war, but droughts. And the United States is not really willing to participate in accepting these refugees, even though they are one of the primary causes of their need to leave their community and their home country. So, what's your position on refugees?

**McQueen:** We've got refugees from climate. Refugees from war. Based on our own carbon footprint, we've contributed to that. Based on our warmaking, we've contributed to that. But then also economic refugees because of our NAFTA. We've seen an influx of people seeking better opportunities, because we've gone into their countries and invaded their economies and devastated their jobs outlook. All of that is our own cause. And that we are paying the cost, to be the boss. And this is what that looks like.

My position on refugees, I feel that there needs to be some type of control. There needs to be some type of system to organize it. To make sure that it is in our national interest. We do have a population to protect here at home. Despite the fact that our national or federal administration is causing a lot of problems, the people on the ground, citizens are being harmed, as well. There has to be a balance to the point where we are not harming citizens at home, even as we're being reasonable in extending humanitarian, an open humanitarian type of policy towards the refugees. Whether it's political, war, climate, or even economic. We've done a lot of bad. We're seeing repercussions coming home to roost. It's problems that we've made. We need to be part of the solution. Not create more problems. Anyone else? Yes!

**Green Party:** There's been over quite a while, [unintelligible] threats to constitutional rights of various sorts [unintelligible] basically the right to freedom of assembly and protest that many forces [unintelligible] they're trying to basically, criminalize protest. We've seen this most recently [unintelligible] at the inauguration [unintelligible] basically where 900 people have been charged who didn't have any evidence against them that they did anything. [unintelligible] Merely at the scene. [unintelligible] And the second one, I'll mention is a bit more recent. [unintelligible] Is that there are moves against

journalists, and journalism outlets [unintelligible] independent news [unintelligible] I'll mention one [unintelligible] Google now has an algorithm, basically that targets Russiagate [unintelligible] equivocating [unintelligible] independent news outlets [unintelligible] Google ads that they won't allow [unintelligible] essentially undermines [unintelligible] they're not subscription, but they're dependent on ads. They're not able to get their ads through Google ads, so to speak [unintelligible] Examples of this would be Truthdig, Alternet, Truthout. Intercept, and other really good outlets. They're having this problem. And they're losing revenue. So, this is one example. There are quite a few others [unintelligible] So, what is your view about

*[Sound is unintelligible 41:33-49:27]*

**McQueen:** A lot of times it is economic, the reasoning behind it. There's profits to be made. And that means we'll force these people to work for free. And we make profit that way, we'll do that. If it means we'll take things that don't belong to us, we'll make our profits that way. If it means that we see members of our very own population who are citizens harmed by Mother Nature, rather than help them, well, let's just wait. Let it play out. Let it ride. Because there's profits to be made.

I do feel that racial justice and economic justice are intertwined. For some people it's actually a hatred of actual race. And that it is a racial issue. But then, there are other people who are actually very cynical. And they say, well, I don't really hate them, but, you know, I might be able to make money off this situation. So, let's let it play out. And see who's left standing at the end. And that's pretty sad. And that describes our prison industrial complex which has been targeted primarily at people of color, based on the demographic that's being held in proportion to their demographic of the overall population. There are profits to be made. There's an amount of cynicism here. There's also an amount of mental illness where people have said, they're of that race, so it's okay. It's demoralizing to the person who feels that way. Because what does it say about you. It's centuries in the making.

We probably don't have the ability to force people to treat each other the way they should be treated. We do have our laws. People have their thoughts. It's a matter of making sure people know what a thought crime is. You can think

whatever you like. It's what you do that's actionable. And so there needs to be enforcement. Unfortunately we have our police force and are even they held to account for their actions? There's a big permeation of bent, bentness at all levels of our enforcement. We do have our U.S. Constitution, so we know what's supposed to happen. But is it happening?

It's a matter of making a grassroots effort to start replacing one by one, or some by some, the people who are allowing this to happen and encouraging it to happen. We just had an election in Alabama. It just makes your head spin that something like this could happen today. And it did. It's a matter of people being being forced to confront what they've allowed to happen. What's been happening under the radar and now we are forced to look in the mirror at what we've allowed to happen. And it's in the White House. Some of its in the Senate. Some of it's in our judiciary. Some is in our police force. Some of it's our next door neighbors. And we can't hide anymore. We can't say it's okay. That's them, or they should be allowed to think what they want to because look at what's happening all around us. Anyone else?

**Green Party:** Are you already on the ballot for congressional district 4?

**McQueen:** No. Ballot petitioning doesn't happen until November, December, January. No. December, January, February. And then March 1st is the deadline to actually petition. So, it takes 2000 valid signatures to get on the ballot as an independent candidate. That means, likely, I should have about 4000 by March 1st. And then sign the paperwork. And if all goes well, by March 1st I should be officially listed on the ballot. There's been some changes in Arkansas's rules.

**Green Party:** We know. [laughter]

**McQueen:** Who am I telling? [laughter]

**Green Party:** To follow up, would you be willing to tell us how much you've raised for your campaign so far? If you'd be willing to disclose that?

**McQueen:** Well, basically, it's all public information. We are in the process of filing. We had our deadline. For October 15th, I hadn't yet really started my campaign. You won't see hardly anything. At this time, I'm finding fundraising is a lot harder than it appears. Who am I telling? That's one of my biggest hurdles.

Learning how to do that. To maximize contributions. I have a strategic plan of how to allocate those and it changes based on how much is actually fund-raised. We are in the process of using various online methods. Setting up structures so people can send their contributions in. Some we're still setting up. And we definitely need more contributions. I set a goal, and have not met it. Still working on it. Definitely have to get up to speed. There's an art and there's a science to making that work and I'm actually learning along the way.

**Green Party:** I'm nervous. Is your campaign going to be open to accepting donations from political action committees. I'm assuming from previous answers, like super PACs like Koch Industries, you've made your stance on corporate money rather clear. What other sources other than small donations are you willing to accept, is my question.

**McQueen:** Well, I'm definitely looking for small donations. I prefer that so they can't feel that they rule the agenda, the platform, or the issues. Legally, it is \$2700, that's the limit from any individual. Looking for small, up to the legal limit, and no further than that *[unintelligible]* campaign.

**Green Party:** That does answer my question.

**McQueen:** Okay. Yes?

**Green Party:** This is a personal question. So how thick is your skin? Assuming that your Republican incumbent would want to throw dirt *[unintelligible]*.

**McQueen:** Well, it would be interesting if he had to resort to that. It would be an indication of his own policy positions that he doesn't feel secure in. That would be an indication to me of an opening. Maybe I hit a sore spot and he's worried. And for all we know, maybe he's right to be worried. But yes, *[unintelligible]*. We have a long history in the United States of mudslinging. People saying things and trying this. I have been warned. Someone said, we're gonna pray for you. And I said, thank you! I appreciate that. Then they said, no, I mean I'm really gonna pray for you. I have been warned. I've seen it. I haven't been in the hotseat myself. This is my first campaign as a candidate. And so, there are some things that I know may happen. Or maybe they won't. First they ignore you. Then they laugh at you. And then they fight you. I believe right now I'm in the ignore stage. Maybe he's got some other things on his mind like the

Libertarians. Maybe even the Democrats he's gonna face. And then me he's gonna face after the primaries. After all the primaries are done. Hopefully, I'll be even more up to speed. More adept. Making sure I know what the true narrative is and getting the narrative out there.

It's fun to talk about this thing. But let's talk about what you did or didn't do when you had a chance to vote in Congress. How did you vote when the Transpacific Partnership was being fast-tracked. Let's talk about that? What are you going to tell your Republican base about that? Let's hear it. But, yeah. Things that we have to refocus to what the facts are. They'll hurt my feelings. I'll just have to say, you know what? I'm not out here for me. I'm out here for a pupose. The purpose is single payer healthcare. Why am I out here? Because people in my family have been harmed by a lack of healthcare. Do I feel that their lives are worth saving? Do I feel that its worth getting up and standing up for? Are they worth me standing up for? Do I feel education is worth standing up for? Do I feel that our troops, who I do feel even now, are being abused by these ridiculous notions of being flung out into the world like toys. To go out there and fight and make me look good. Those are lives that are being destroyed because someone wants to control the six o'clock news. It's a problem. Do I feel that is worth fighting for? Many members of my family are military. Are their lives worth saving?

I've actually sat and watched a veteran cry in front of me. It was awful. The reason being that he served his country. He tried to get in touch with the VA for an issue that he wanted to resolve and they were just giving him the runaround on voice mail. He sat in front of me and cried. It was the worst thing I ever saw. That's not the only story that's happening out there. People are being hurt. So I have to ask myself. Yeah, you know, they said this about me. But, you know, there are lives at stake here. There are futures at stake. We have an entire generation who can't get educated beyond high school and even their high school is questionable as regards to privatization. They can't go on to succeed and be somebody. They are looking for jobs and the jobs aren't there. The jobs they find are part-time, they're gigs, they're temporary. They have no benefits. Can they raise a family? Can they buy a house? Can they buy a car? Can they have anything? What's going to happen to them? What is the current congressman doing about that? Seriously. What is he doing? Is he doing

anything at all about that? *[unintelligible]* So these are concerns to think about.

**Green Party:** We have time for two more questions.

**Green Party:** This is easy. You can say yes, or no. Do you have a campaign manager yet?

**McQueen:** I don't have a manager. I have a committee. It's early days yet. We're over a year in advance. So right now, I'm getting some basic structures in place around the campaign. That's one thing I might look at in the future. But, at the moment, no. Anyone else?

**Green Party:** *[unintelligible]* last night. But companies like Amazon and Google, have been able to skirt antitrust laws. They went on to dominate markets and push out small businesses. Are you willing to beef up those laws so that they don't get to manhandle their way around markets?.

**McQueen:** Yes, I am. Because, I have a beef with some of the corporate mergers. And some of the votes that have been happening lately to encourage those mergers and to soften consumer protection. It's been done in a Republican-dominated Congress that these regulations and oversights are being loosened. And it is a problem that competition is one of the ways that benefits the consumer. And it should be encouraged because it means *[better]* goods and services, rather than a corporation saying it's gonna be what I say it is.

That's why I have an issue with those who describe themselves as conservative, or even a fiscal conservative. You're not a fiscal conservative if you're sending public tax money to these corporations. You're a corporatist. You're not a fiscal conservative. Nor a conservative in general. The original conservative was Teddy Roosevelt. He was a trust buster. What are you talking about? So I confront people about that. You're not really a conservative. You're a corporatist. Teddy Roosevelt saw himself as the arbiter of how far a corporation could go in terms of how it treated workers and how it treated citizens and consumers. He saw that as the role of government. That's what I lead with. They're telling you they're this, they're not really trying to save money. What they're doing, is choosing to put your money with a large corporation rather than the government. So, they'll take your money. I agree with Teddy Roosevelt, the original conservative, the original conservative Republican, that it is the role of government to protect

consumers and workers against over-reach by corporations.

We're seeing that right now where these corporations have grown monstrous, into monsters actually, some of them. The profit motive has put everything secondary. All other priorities rescinded, including our lives, our health, and our communities. Human rights, that those priorities are rescinded in terms of profit motive. And there needs to be another look at the corporate structure which says, profit at all cost. There's a legal motivation behind that. Profit at all cost. There needs to be a restructuring. Profit, yes. But not at the cost of human rights. Of the environment. Of the abuse of the public good. Water. Soil. Air. All those priorities are rescinded to profit. We've seen that with the Dakota Access Pipeline. And healthcare. Did that answer your question?

**Green Party:** Yes. Also, real quick. What is your stance on net neutrality?

**McQueen:** Net neutrality. I support net neutrality. I made a joke about Al Gore. But he brought us really great. The internet. It should not be carved up into pieces for corporate control. Just like our streets and our roads and our bridges, our utilities, and the education system, the internet is a public good. And our public airwaves where we send our television and radio signals. Public goods. We've seen what the FCC has done to those and what the intention is for the internet. I support net neutrality, definitely. And I will vote and lobby in support of net neutrality.

**Green Party:** All right.

**McQueen:** Thank you again.