

AFL-CIO

2024 CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

First Name	Middle Name	Last Name
State	District	Party
<input type="checkbox"/> Incumbent <input type="checkbox"/> Challenger <input type="checkbox"/> Open		
Do you currently hold or have you previously held public office(s)? Describe.		
Have you received an AFL-CIO endorsement in the past? If so, for which office(s)?		
Official Campaign Committee Name		
Campaign Address		
City	State	ZIP
Campaign Manager	Email	Cellphone
Are you now or have you ever been a union member? Which union(s) and local(s)?		

Please return this questionnaire to:

AFL-CIO OVERVIEW

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) works tirelessly to improve the lives of working people. We are the democratic, voluntary federation of 62 national and international labor unions that represent over 12.5 million working people.

We strive to ensure all working people are treated fairly, with decent paychecks and benefits, safe jobs, dignity and equal opportunities. We help people acquire valuable skills and job readiness for the 21st-century economy. Our work is anchored in making sure everyone who works for a living has family-supporting wages and benefits, the ability to retire with dignity and access to join a union. This is the path to creating better communities and building a stronger, more equitable and just society and an economy that works for everyone.

Thank you for participating in the AFL-CIO's Congressional Candidate Questionnaire. We look forward to getting to know you better and working with you throughout the endorsement process and beyond.

REWRITING THE RULES OF THE ECONOMY TO BUILD A BETTER FUTURE FOR WORKERS

The AFL-CIO is committed to ensuring that the U.S. economic system works to the benefit of all, not only the rich. Working people are the backbone of the U.S. economy and deserve a fair share of the wealth that they help create. We believe that strengthening worker bargaining power is the key to ensuring a stronger economy that will support families and communities in the future. The four building blocks of worker bargaining power are collective bargaining and strong unions, full employment, strong worker protections and robust public investment. President Biden's historic commitment to public investment and union jobs is essential for building a better future for workers.

Would you support and advocate for President Biden's proposal to make big corporations and the wealthy pay their fair share of taxes so we can raise significant revenue and make the investments we need in infrastructure, health care, Social Security, education and well-paying jobs for working people?

Congress should pass the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act so that all working people have the freedom to join together and negotiate with their employers for better wages and working conditions. Research shows that falling union density has been a direct cause of rising economic inequality over the past five decades. Unions reduce inequality during times of high density by bringing workers into our ranks and by raising standards for nonunion workers as well. When unions are strong, they set wage standards for entire industries and occupations. They make wages more equal within occupations. They close pay gaps between White workers and workers of color. They bring living wages to low-wage jobs. They raise wages for women overall and in female-dominated occupations. Unions turn bad jobs into good jobs.

Yet for too long, employers have been able to violate the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) with impunity, routinely denying workers their basic right to join with co-workers for fairness on the job. On March 9, 2021, during the 117th Congress, the House passed the PRO Act (H.R. 842) to guarantee that workers have the freedom to form unions and negotiate for better pay and working conditions under a modernized and strengthened NLRA. During the 118th Congress, Sen. Bernie Sanders introduced the PRO Act (S. 567), and Rep. Bobby Scott, along with Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick, introduced the bill on a bipartisan basis in the House (H.R. 20).

In addition to imposing penalties on companies and individual corporate officers who violate the law, bringing the NLRA's remedies in line with other workplace laws, the PRO Act guarantees bargaining rights for employees who are misclassified as independent contractors and establishes a process for helping newly organized workers achieve a first contract. It also ends "right to work" laws and protects the right to engage in secondary picketing and to strike without being "permanently replaced," i.e., fired.

A bill to protect the freedom of public sector workers to join together in a union—the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act—will be introduced in the House and Senate. The bill was previously introduced in the 117th Congress (H.R. 5727).

Would you co-sponsor and vote for the PRO Act in the 119th Congress?

Would you co-sponsor and vote for the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act in the 119th Congress?

Public Sector

Would you support targeting federal workforce development funding for high-quality jobs and high-road employers?

Would you support efforts to ensure that the labor protections contained in Section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act and other applicable rail labor standards apply to all federal programs, including all "innovative finance initiatives"?

- Would you oppose efforts to undermine the use of these standards?

Would you protect public sector employees' pay, rights and benefits when special interests push privatization and contracting-out schemes?

Would you oppose further federal pay freezes and benefit cuts for federal employees?

Would you oppose legislation to take away just-cause protections, support restoration of just-cause protections for Veterans Affairs employees, and support an enduring and objective civil service system with fair pay, benefits and working conditions for federal employees?

Would you oppose efforts to move a wide range of federal service jobs from merit-based to at-will employment?

Would you oppose efforts to weaken the Jones Act, which allows only U.S.-flagged, -built and -crewed ships to transport goods between U.S. ports?

Would you support enforcement of the terms and conditions of our open-skies agreements, including labor protections? Would you support legislation to prevent the spread of flag of convenience air carriers and would you support administration efforts to ensure current and future entrant air carriers do not violate open-skies agreements or public interest requirements as provided for under the Fly America Act (Title 49 of the U.S. Code)?

Buy America

Another building block of worker bargaining power is full employment, or tight labor markets that produce jobs for almost everyone who wants to work. Full employment puts upward pressure on wages for all workers, especially workers of color. It makes it easier for workers to organize unions and for unions to grow and reach bargaining agreements. Full employment makes it easier for workers who lose their jobs to transition to other good jobs. Yet full employment does not just happen; it is a policy choice. It depends on the Federal Reserve, the institution that sets monetary policy, allowing unemployment to fall and wages to rise without deliberately slowing down the economy and putting people out of work in order to prevent unemployment from falling “too low” and wages from rising “too high.”

Full employment also requires public investment that boosts demand and creates jobs. Yet America’s infrastructure continues to crumble, falling to 25th in the world, according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, costing millions of jobs and hindering economic growth.

Would you support efforts to expand Buy America coverage, eliminate waivers and exemptions, insist on a domestic supply chain for national defense production, and strengthen local procurement standards?

Trade

Congress should help rewrite the rules of the global economy. U.S. global economic policies have promoted the economic interests of multinational corporations over those of working people in the United States and overseas, contributed to the deindustrialization of America and put downward pressure on wages. America’s workers have repeatedly raised their voices against poorly designed trade rules, such as those enshrined in the original North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement. The United

States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) addressed many of the flaws that made NAFTA a disaster for working people. The USMCA included for the first time:

1. Labor standards that are fully enforceable, on par with commercial terms.
2. A new facility-specific enforcement mechanism with rapid timelines, inspections and meaningful penalties that include stopping goods at the border.
3. The presumption that labor violations are trade related and a shift of the burden of proof to the defendant to show otherwise.
4. A requirement that Mexico adopt labor reforms to protect the right to organize and bargain.
5. Restrictions on the use of the investor-state dispute settlement mechanism.

Would you demand that the labor standards and enforcement provisions included in the USMCA be treated as a floor in any future trade deal?

Would you support efforts to further strengthen and expand enforcement of trade agreements?

Would you support legislation allowing for the application of countervailing duties to address currency manipulation?

Would you defend workers' rights globally and work to raise labor standards in global supply chains?

Would you vote to make corporations pay the same taxes on offshore profits as they pay on domestic profits so that they no longer have a tax incentive to send jobs overseas?

Would you support budget and tax policies that promote the creation and retention of good jobs in the United States, including investment in domestic manufacturing, production and employment?

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transformative technology with applications in many areas of our workforce, economy and society. However, the unfettered development of AI and digital technology in the workplace may displace or deskill jobs, affect physical health and safety, and impinge on workers' basic rights and freedoms. In the public sphere, AI has the potential to spread disinformation, threatening individuals' privacy and data security, while also impacting democracy and national security on a larger scale. Despite this, national laws and regulations governing the responsible use of AI in workplaces and for public consumption do not currently exist.

According to a recent poll conducted by the Artificial Intelligence Policy Institute, the majority of American voters from both parties are worried about AI risks, supporting federal regulations to control those risks. The responsible, equitable and transparent design, development and deployment of AI (by federal agencies and other entities) can have many benefits to the economy, while ensuring that workers' and consumers' rights, data and privacy remain protected, secure and above corporate profit and exploitation.

What are your views on supporting laws and governance regulating AI?

Would you endorse AI legislation that protects workers' rights to organize and bargain with their employers around AI tech in the workplace?

Would you endorse an AI policy agenda that includes the following:

- a rights-based approach that focuses on the fundamental rights and privacy of both workers and consumers?
- comprehensive workforce development programs and place-based strategies that center labor unions for workers impacted by digital tech that goes beyond training and upskilling?
- worker input on AI systems design for workforce use, from research to design/development to implementation?
- protection of workers from unfair algorithmic management, providing human review and adjudication of performance issues?

RETIREMENT SECURITY

Retirement income security is beyond the reach of most Americans. Our retirement income crisis is the flip side of our wage crisis. While worker productivity is on the rise, worker wages have stagnated. A worker without adequate income for today is in no position to save for retirement tomorrow.

One clear path to higher wages is enacting the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act. Because of the power of collective bargaining, unionized workers disproportionately enjoy the benefits of a traditional pension plan, whether it be a single- or multiemployer plan. Too often, however, threats beyond workers' control jeopardize these benefits. In particular, corporate bankruptcies leave pensions decimated when employers use the law to eschew their pension obligations; pension de-risking, when employers offload their pension obligations to an insurance company, leaves workers without the benefit of insurance protection provided by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

As currently constructed, retirement savings plans such as 401(k) plans and individual retirement accounts cannot compensate for the loss of traditional pensions. They require workers to bear all of the risk; often are insufficiently diversified, resulting in poor returns; and typically carry heavy fees and expenses. As of 2019, half of American households had no retirement savings whatsoever, average household savings was \$65,000, and those closest to retirement (ages 55 to 64) had only \$134,000.

Social Security is the foundation of retirement income security for working families and the principal insurance against family impoverishment due to death or disability. The Social Security system is extremely well crafted, with a progressive benefits structure that delivers higher returns to lower-wage workers and ensures that workers and beneficiaries will not outlive their benefits. But as important as they are, Social Security benefits are too low—only \$1,694 a month for the average retired worker.

With a nearly \$2.8 trillion trust fund, our Social Security system remains strong and fully affordable. Even absent congressional action, Social Security can pay all benefits until 2034. It is 89% funded for the next quarter century, 83% for the next half-century and 83% for the next three-quarters of a century. Congress can address this manageable funding shortfall over the next 75 years without any benefit cuts to current or future retirees.

Do you support corporate bankruptcy reform to protect workers' pensions?

Do you support new guardrails on corporate de-risking to ensure that workers' pensions are fully protected?

Should employers that don't offer a traditional pension be required to contribute to employees' 401(k) accounts?

Should financial professionals who provide retirement investment advice be required to put their clients' best interests ahead of their own financial interests and take affirmative measures to mitigate possible financial conflicts?

Do you support increasing Social Security benefits for all beneficiaries?

Do you oppose reducing Social Security's guaranteed benefits under current law, including by increasing the retirement age, changing the calculation for the annual cost-of-living adjustment, altering the benefit formula or instituting means testing?

Do you oppose replacing any part of Social Security's guaranteed benefits with individual investment accounts?

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Workers in the United States have the right to return home after a day at work free from harm. In 1970, Congress enacted the Occupational Safety and Health Act in response to a national crisis of workers being killed, seriously injured or made ill on the job. While progress has since been made, the nationwide toll of workplace fatalities, injuries and illnesses remains unacceptably high: Each year, tens of thousands of workers are killed and millions more injured or made sick because of their jobs. Some groups, including Latino, Black and immigrant workers, are at greater risk due to dangerous conditions, lack of workplace protections and job security vulnerability for raising safety concerns. And millions of workers still are not covered by the law.

Job safety and health agencies, most notably the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), are severely under-resourced, and the regulatory process for issuing critical worker protections has become more onerous. Job safety agency budgets have been reduced, leaving agencies with fewer resources to enforce current standards, continue work on lifesaving protections, and provide safety and health training. Business groups and many congressional Republicans are also pushing “regulatory reform” legislation that would make it impossible for OSHA, the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) and other agencies to issue needed safeguards. Implementation of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) has not adequately addressed worker exposures to chemicals.

Ensuring a safe job for all workers requires new policy to strengthen workers’ rights during safety inspections and worker protections from retaliation for reporting workplace injuries—areas weakened under the Trump administration. In recent history, OSHA has moved at a glacial pace to issue lifesaving protections from such substances as silica and beryllium; regulatory action on heat illness prevention, workplace violence and infectious diseases is still pending.

Would you support legislation to strengthen the OSH Act and extend OSHA coverage to all workers, strengthen whistleblower protections and enhance OSHA’s enforcement programs?

Would you support increases in the job safety budget to strengthen standard setting, enforcement, and worker safety and health training programs?

Would you support legislation to ensure agencies fulfill their missions and require OSHA and MSHA to issue comprehensive and timely standards?

Would you oppose efforts to weaken or defund the regulatory and enforcement programs of OSHA and MSHA?

Would you support efforts that adequately address worker exposures to toxic chemicals during implementation of the amended TSCA law?

Would you oppose legislation making it more difficult or impossible for government agencies to develop and issue necessary safeguards to protect workers, the public and consumers?

Would you support an OSHA standard that protects workers from the spread of infectious diseases in their workplaces?

Would you support legislation to address the problems of workplace violence and workplace heat illness prevention?

IMMIGRATION

Immigration reform must reflect America's democratic ideals and not create a second class of workers. The AFL-CIO believes a broad path to citizenship for the 11 million aspiring Americans must be the centerpiece of any serious immigration reform proposal. We also must remain true to our history as a welcoming nation, provide safe harbor to refugees and asylum seekers, and allow families to build a future here together.

Our immigration system should not be redesigned to meet the purported needs of employers. Successive waves of immigrants and refugees have always helped to build, serve and feed our nation. Enhancement of our family and humanitarian pathways will continue to spur economic growth, and we must reform—rather than expand—work visa programs fraught with abuse.

The right way to use immigration policy to boost wages is by expanding workers' rights and ensuring that all working people—regardless of immigration status—have access to the full protection of our labor and employment laws. Immigration enforcement must complement, rather than conflict with, a strong, well-resourced and effective system of labor standards enforcement.

A more just immigration system is possible, and we urge Congress to advance policies that will help create better jobs, build a stronger economic future, and support the basic rights and dignity of all working people.

Would you support a road map to citizenship for all those whose labor helps our country to prosper, including workers with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals and temporary protected status?

Would you oppose enforcement-only immigration policies that increase fear in our workplaces and communities?

Would you support efforts to reform temporary work visa programs by strengthening worker protections and employer accountability?

Would you support expansion of our refugee and asylum systems, including resources to help newcomers safely integrate into our communities and workplaces?

Would you support policies that provide status protections to immigrant workers who are organizing and taking action to enforce our labor laws?

WORK AND FAMILY POLICIES

Care Economy

The COVID-19 pandemic made clear that our current work and family policies are not supportive of working families. Workers lack paid leave to recover from illness or injury and to care for sick or injured family members or loved ones. The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993, requiring employers to provide up to 12 weeks of unpaid job-protected family or medical leave, was a major step in helping Americans balance the demands of work and family. But its limited coverage—only 59% of workers are eligible to take FMLA—and the inability of millions of workers to afford leave without pay constrains the FMLA’s effectiveness. According to the March 2020 National Compensation Survey, only 20% of private sector workers had access to paid leave to care for a new child or family members. Black, Hispanic and low-wage workers are less likely to have access to paid family and medical leave benefits than other workers.

President Biden’s proposed American Families Plan provides a national standard for paid leave that, over 10 years, phases in 12 weeks of paid leave for the serious illness of the worker, a family member or a loved one; to care for a new child; during a family member’s deployment or service-related injury; to address issues arising from domestic violence or sexual assault; or while grieving the loss of a loved one.

Would you support legislation to provide universal paid family and medical leave benefits?

Workers should not have to choose between coming to work sick or staying home without pay—and perhaps risking their job as well. Yet about 3 in 10 private sector workers do not have access to paid job-protected sick days. Low-wage workers are especially vulnerable: 78% of the lowest-wage workers—the majority of whom are women—do not have a single paid sick day. When workers cannot access paid sick time, their economic and job security suffers. Just 3.5 days without pay jeopardizes a typical family’s ability to afford groceries. The Healthy Families Act (H.R. 3409/S. 1664) provides seven sick days a year (paid for employers with 15 or more employees; unpaid for employers with fewer than 15 employees) to be used for a worker’s own illness, caring for a sick family member or safe leave in the case of sexual assault or domestic violence.

Would you support legislation setting a national paid sick days standard that guarantees at least seven sick days per year?

Workers are unable to do their jobs if the care needs of a family member are unmet. Working parents entrust their children’s care to child care centers and home-based providers. Moreover, a growing number of workers are informal caregivers who assist older and disabled adults with the activities of daily living in addition to working a full-time job. A 2021 study by the Administration for Children and Families found that working families with young children spent an annual average of \$13,000 on child care. Those working second and third shifts and weekends or whose children have special needs lack access to child care. Studies conducted by the AARP and the National Alliance for Caregiving found that more than 34 million family caregivers provide care to an adult. The care workforce, mostly women and people of color, is chronically underpaid and often lacks paid leave and medical benefits.

Would you support legislation that limits the cost of child care for most working parents, addresses child care access issues and provides a living wage to child care workers?

Would you support legislation that expands Medicaid long-term care eligibility?

Would you support legislation to provide a \$15 minimum wage and union rights for the care workforce?
Prevailing Wage Laws

Congress should update and strengthen worker protections and defend them from attack. The failure to do so has been a significant factor in the undermining of worker bargaining power and the lowering of working families' standard of living in recent decades. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requires employers to pay a time-and-a-half cash premium for work performed in excess of 40 hours per week. Under the guise of helping families balance work and family, some in Congress have proposed giving employers the option of offering compensatory time off (instead of a cash premium) for overtime work. While supporters claim this legislation would give workers more flexibility and control over their schedules, compensatory time proposals, in fact, would undermine the 40-hour workweek—resulting in more workers working longer hours for less pay—and provide employers, rather than workers, with more flexibility and control.

Would you oppose legislation that would excuse employers from their obligation under the FLSA to pay a cash premium for overtime work if they were to offer compensatory time off?

Would you support federal and state legislation to guarantee overtime eligibility for all workers making less than \$51,000 per year?

Prevailing wage laws, which have helped maintain wage standards and guarantee high-quality work on taxpayer-funded projects, have come under greater attack as corporate interests have increased their power in Congress.

Would you oppose efforts to weaken or repeal the Davis-Bacon Act?

Would you oppose efforts to weaken or repeal the Service Contract Act?

HEALTH CARE

Health care is a basic human right. This is why the American labor movement has fought for more than a century for a health care system that guarantees all of us high-quality health care without financial barriers. Our long-standing goal is to move toward a single-payer system, such as Medicare for All, that provides universal coverage using a social insurance model, while retaining a role for worker health plans. We can advance toward affordable care for all by lowering Medicare's eligibility age from 65 to 50; reducing drug and provider prices; and improving benefits in Medicare, Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act (ACA) marketplaces. Quality of care and the quality of health care jobs should be enhanced through staffing ratios and staffing standards in acute and long-term health care settings.

Would you support enabling Medicare to negotiate lower drug prices for individuals in private plans in addition to seniors?

Would you support lowering the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 50?

Would you support improving current Medicare benefits by adding dental, vision and hearing coverage and establishing an annual out-of-pocket limit?

Would you support making ACA coverage more comprehensive, raising benchmark coverage from the silver level to platinum?

Would you support policies to unwind monopolistic integration of hospitals and outpatient providers and to address high provider prices?

Would you oppose any proposal to tax or impose fees on employment-based health coverage?

Would you oppose efforts to restrict access to Food and Drug Administration-approved birth control or limit access to reproductive care?

Would you support slowing the substance abuse epidemic by dramatically expanding access to effective treatment?

Would you support federal minimum staffing standards for nursing homes and nursing ratios for acute care hospitals?

Would you support single-payer proposals that recognize the important role that unions play in securing comprehensive coverage for working people?

EDUCATION

More than 50 million students currently attend our country's public schools. The teachers, paraprofessionals and other school employees who work with these students each day care deeply about the quality of our public schools and the education their students receive. Since 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) has represented the federal government's largest investment in K-12 education, and it is a crucial mechanism both in funding and in guiding policy for all public schools.

Do you think the federal government has a role in elementary and secondary education? Should Congress fully fund the ESEA?

Many states still spend less on K–12 education than they did before the 2007–2009 recession. Despite this, some in Congress want to use taxpayer money to support private and religious schools by expanding the use of vouchers, opportunity scholarships and tuition tax credits. Decades of experiments with voucher programs have led to the same conclusion: Vouchers fail most of the children they intend to benefit.

Do you oppose vouchers and other proposals that allow taxpayer dollars to be used for private and religious schools at the K–12 level, whether as a limited experiment or a full-scale program?

When states cut funding for higher education, the bulk of college costs is shifted to students—and few can afford the rising price tag. That means that many who would benefit from attending college—and, in turn, benefit all of society—choose not to go. Others take on student loans. Their post-graduation paycheck—if there is anything left after paying for basic needs—then goes toward paying off debt rather than generating more demand in the economy, let alone saving for a home or retirement.

What will you do to help achieve the goal of high-quality, debt-free higher education?

What will you do to help the millions of young Americans struggling with student loan payments?

CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Today, more than 200 years since our Constitution was ratified, voting rights are not assured for all American citizens. As Chief Justice John Roberts wrote in the 2013 *Shelby County v. Holder* decision, “Voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that.” In that case, however, Chief Justice Roberts, writing for a five-vote majority, invalidated key provisions of the Voting Rights Act that required jurisdictions with a long history of voting discrimination to seek federal preapproval of proposed changes to their voting laws. Almost immediately after that decision, states and localities no longer under federal oversight began imposing new obstacles to voting, shortening early voting periods and closing polling places. Then, in the 2021 *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee* decision, a 6–3 majority of the Supreme Court weakened another provision of the Voting Rights Act, making it more difficult to challenge voting laws and procedures that disproportionately affect minority voters.

States also have enacted laws to allow partisan government officials to manipulate election administration procedures and overturn election results. Experienced state, county and municipal election officials who disagree with such partisan election interference have been threatened, harassed and removed from their positions. These changes threaten not only to suppress votes but also to subvert our democracy.

Meanwhile, in another affront to democratic principles, more than 500,000 U.S. citizens live in our nation’s capital and have no voting representation in Congress.

Voting Rights

The right to vote is fundamental to full democratic participation. The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4/S. 4) would restore the fundamental protections of the 1965 Voting Rights Act undermined by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2013. The For the People Act (H.R. 1/S. 1) would protect and expand early voting, voting by mail and automatic voter registration, as well as eliminate partisan gerrymandering and dark money from our elections. Both bills were last introduced in the 117th Congress.

Would you co-sponsor the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act?

Would you co-sponsor the For the People Act?

Would you oppose efforts to erect obstacles to voting, including those based on an individual's race and/or economic status?

Would you support legislation to allow the delegate elected by District of Columbia residents to vote in the U.S. House of Representatives?

Criminal Justice Reform

Nearly 1 in 100 American adults is incarcerated. America's prison population, which has increased 500% over the past 30 years, is the largest in the world. Mass incarceration has affected individuals and families across the nation but has had a disproportionate impact on communities of color and people in poverty. Providing training, apprenticeships and education leading to good union jobs, for both at-risk youth prior to incarceration and for returning citizens upon release, is the best prevention and release strategy.

Would you support legislation to reduce the three-strike penalty—which mandates life sentences for certain individuals—to a term of 25 years and to shorten a previously mandated 20-year sentence for certain individuals to 15 years?

Would you support giving judges more discretion to sentence below prescribed mandatory minimums by expanding the existing "safety valve" and creating new authority for judges to depart from certain mandatory minimums?

Would you support ending the disparity between powder and crack cocaine?

Do you oppose criminalizing women for seeking reproductive care and the acts of medical personnel who provide reproductive care?

Do you support legislation that would ban questions regarding prior convictions on employment applications?

Would you support restoration of the right to vote after incarceration?

Equal Pay

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 made it illegal for employers to pay unequal wages to male and female employees doing the same work. Yet wage disparities between men and women are still evident today in both the private and public sectors and at every educational level. The Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 17/S. 728) would require employers to demonstrate that wage gaps between men and women performing the same work are truly a result of factors other than gender and would prohibit retaliation against workers who share salary information or inquire about their employer's wage practices.

Would you support the Paycheck Fairness Act?

Equality Act

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ+) people need basic protections from discrimination—in securing consumer credit, education, employment, housing and public accommodations. While significant progress has been made in recent years—through expansion of hate crimes legislation, open participation in military service and marriage equality—LGBTQ+ people remain vulnerable to discrimination in many spheres of life absent comprehensive federal protection.

Would you support the Equality Act, legislation that prohibits discrimination against LGBTQ+ people?