



KENTUCKY STATE AFL-CIO

140 Kings Daughter Drive
Suites 100 – 200
Frankfort, KY 40601
Phone: 502.696.9002 Fax: 502.696.9030

Dear Candidate,

Thank you for your willingness to seek public office. If you are interested in seeking the endorsement of the Kentucky State AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education (COPE), please complete our enclosed candidate questionnaire.

Please complete and return the attached candidate questionnaire by January 21st via mail or email.

KY State AFL-CIO
140 Kings Daughter Drive
Suites 100-200
Frankfort, KY 40601

Email: Endorsements@kyafcio.org

Sincerely,

Dustin Reinstedler
President
Kentucky State AFL-CIO

Dustin Reinstedler, President
dreinstedler@kyafcio.org
502.401.8555

Jeff Wiggins, Secretary/Treasurer
jwiggins@kyafcio.org
270.217.6235

AFL-CIO

2026 CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE

First Name	Middle Name	Last Name	
State	District	Party	
Indicate if you are running as an:	Incumbent	Challenger	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	Cell phone	
Are you now or have you ever been a union member? 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 63 national and international labor unions representing 15 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 the right to join a union and collectively bargain. 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 Survey. 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 US economic system works to the benefit of all, not just the rich. Working people are the backbone of the US 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.

- Would you support and advocate for proposals 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, healthcare, Social Security, education and well-paying jobs for working people?
- Do you support policies that raise the national minimum wage and index that wage to inflation?
- Are you in favor of allowing more people to be eligible for overtime pay based on how low their salary is?
- Would you support efforts to require corporations to accurately designate workers as contractors or employees?
- Do you support the independent and bipartisan nature of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), Federal Reserve, Merit Service Protection Board (MSPB and other congressionally designated independent agencies?

PRO Act

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 within 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 fairer 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.

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, protects the right to engage in secondary picketing, and to strike without being "permanently replaced," i.e., fired.

- Would you co-sponsor and vote for the PRO Act in the 120th Congress?

Protect Public Sector

A bill to protect the freedom of public sector workers—the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act—to join together in a union will be introduced in the House and Senate. Efforts are underway to restore collective bargaining for federal workers – that right stripped away from them by President Trump in the single biggest act of union busting in American history.

- Would you co-sponsor and vote for the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act in the 120th Congress?
- Would you support efforts to ensure the right of federal workers to collectively bargain?
- If it is not already enacted, will you support the Protect America's Workforce Act or similar legislation to reverse Trump's Executive Order which stripped federal workers of the right to collectively bargain and to restore those workers' union contracts?
- 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 funding cuts aimed at reducing the number of 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 change a wide range of federal service jobs from merit-based civil service to at-will, politically-based employment?
- Would you oppose efforts to weaken the Jones Act, which requires the U.S.-flagged, -built and -crewed ships 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)?
- Would you support Federal OSHA coverage for public sector workers by supporting the Public Service Worker Protection Act?

Buy America

Domestic preference policies, also known as Buy America or Buy American, help ensure the U.S. government maximizes the impact of taxpayer dollars by reinvesting those dollars in American workers, producers and communities. These policies give preferences to U.S. producers of the steel, iron, construction materials, safety equipment and other manufactured goods for direct government purchases and when the federal government supports state and local infrastructure investments. These preferences support good jobs, incentivize domestic investment and strengthen critical supply chains. Not only is this good policy, but polling regularly shows that American taxpayers support giving American manufacturing workers the first chance at supplying the products and materials needed to rebuild our nation’s infrastructure. Unfortunately, there are still products and materials not covered by domestic preference policies, and loopholes in coverage remain that squander the ability to put these dollars to work for American workers, weaken our national security and threaten the safety of American workers and the public.

- Would you support efforts to expand “Buy America” coverage, eliminate waivers and exemptions, insist on a domestic supply chain for national defense production and products needed to address worker/public health threats, and strengthen local procurement standards?

Trade

For decades, our trade model has put corporate interests first at the expense of workers, communities, the environment and our own security. The credible threat of offshoring has given anti-union employers dramatically more leverage to undermine worker power at the bargaining table and to bust union organizing drives. Gains made by union members who bargain collectively for fair pay, benefits and working conditions have been stolen by multinational corporations that violate trade laws and outsource to countries with low or nonexistent environmental and labor

standards. Efforts by union members to prevent occupational disease, and ensure clean air and water, safe working conditions and a good job were told countless times at the bargaining table by companies to not ask for too much or they will ship jobs overseas because global trade practices put profits above all other considerations. Previous administrations from both parties have failed to heed legitimate concerns of working people about the ramifications of globalization and trade policies that put near-term profits over American jobs. Responsible domestic companies, workers and unions were left to spend millions of dollars on trade enforcement cases to protect communities hollowed out by dumped and illegally subsidized goods.

- Would you commit to oppose free trade agreements based on the outdated and corporate model of trade – a model where agreements are negotiated without workers at the table, without enforceable labor standards and without safeguards to prevent a race to the bottom that pits workers in different countries against each other?
- Would you support efforts to further strengthen and expand enforcement of existing trade agreements?
- Would you support U.S. government funding for projects to support workers' rights in global supply chains, including programs to end the use of child and forced [labor](#)[1]?

While the AFL-CIO does not support a chaotic, on-again off-again approach to tariffs for non-trade purposes, thoughtfully designed and implemented tariff measures are a key component of a worker-centered trade and economic policy.

- Would you support the use of targeted and strategically applied tariffs as part of a broader industrial policy to support family- and community-sustaining jobs, reshore critical supply chains and grow our economy?

In 1994 the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) came into effect despite tremendous opposition from organized labor and civil society. The negative outcomes surpassed the labor movement's most dire predictions. NAFTA led to the outsourcing of over a million good manufacturing jobs, cost workers billions in wages, undermined worker power at the bargaining table, and hollowed out entire communities. In 2019, the AFL-CIO endorsed the United States-Canada-Mexico Agreement (USMCA) after working with Congressional allies to secure significant improvements over the deeply flawed NAFTA. The last five years have shown that the USMCA is not delivering on its promise to address systemic labor exploitation in Mexico and end the corporate offshoring of good, union jobs. Since 2019, the last year before the USMCA came into force, the bilateral trade deficit with Mexico has ballooned by 74 percent to \$172 billion. Major multinationals like Stellantis, John Deere, Nabisco and Case New Holland have continued to offshore production to Mexico where manufacturing workers' wages remain just a tenth of their American counterparts.

- Would you support a renegotiation of USMCA that includes provisions to address the continued offshoring of good jobs and strengthens labor and environmental standards and enforcement across North America?

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

AI is transformative technology with applications in many areas of our workforce, economy, public service, and society. However, the unfettered development of AI and digital technology in the workplace has the ability to displace or de-skill 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 the privacy and data security of individuals, while also impacting democracy and national security on a larger scale. In spite of this, national laws and regulations governing the responsible use of AI in workplaces and for public consumption do not currently exist.

According to a poll conducted in early 2025 conducted by the [University of Massachusetts Amherst](#), the majority of American voters from both parties are worried about [AI risks, supporting federal actions](#) 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 worker and consumer rights, data and privacy remain protected and secure, and above corporate profit and exploitation.

- Do you support centering worker voice and rights in workplace AI governance, including pre-decisional worker consultation and consent, transparency, the right to human review, opt-out/override options, whistleblower protections, liability shields for workers and other pro-worker requirements?
- Do you support legislation that bans AI systems that undercut US labor and health and safety standards?
- Do you oppose federal preemption laws blocking states' and cities' authority to safeguard their communities against harmful AI applications?
- Do you support legislation that establishes strong guardrails to protect the data privacy of workers and safeguard against the harms of AI, including workplace surveillance and algorithmic management?
- Do you support requiring employers to give notice to workers displaced by AI and provide funding for income supports and retraining programs for affected workers?
- Do you support increased federal investments in workforce development programs centering unions and guaranteeing workers can access the training, wraparound support, and career pathways needed for success, including partnerships between labor?
- Do you support copyright and intellectual property protections that safeguard the livelihoods of union professionals who rely more than ever on effective intellectual property rights to earn compensation and benefits, as well as to ensure future career opportunities in today's digital era?

- Do you support strengthening worker voice in our laws explicitly to direct federal AI research and development (R&D) programs to incorporate unions as mandatory stakeholders?
- Do you support explicit bans on dangerous experimentation and harmful AI applications in high-risk fields such as, for example, healthcare and transportation?
- Do you support robust transparency and accountability standards ensuring that automatic decision systems comply with civil, labor, employment, and competition laws, and require employers, vendors, and developers to carry liability insurance for harms to workers caused by automated decision systems?

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 by enacting the “Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act.” Because of the power of collective bargaining, unionized workers disproportionately also 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 insurance protection provided by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC).

As currently constructed, retirement savings plans, such as 401(k) plans and individual retirement accounts (IRAs), 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; households working for an employer had a median of \$5,800 in retirement accounts (including IRA, Keogh, or pensions), self-employed households had a median of \$1,100.

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 workers and beneficiaries will not outlive their benefits. But as important as they are, Social Security benefits are too low—only \$2,006.69 a month for the average retired worker.

With a nearly \$2.7 trillion trust fund, our Social Security system remains strong and fully affordable. Even absent Congressional action, Social Security can pay all benefits until 2033. At that point, if nothing else is done, the program could pay about 81 percent of scheduled benefits, mostly out of

workers' ongoing contributions, and that figure that would slip to 72 percent in 75 years. Expressed as a share of the nation's economy, the 75-year shortfall equals 1.3 percent of GDP.

- 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, who 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?

WORKER SAFETY AND HEALTH

While workers in the United States have the right to return home after a day at work free from harm, that right in practice has been severely diminished. In 1970, Congress enacted the Occupational Safety and Health Act in response to a national crisis of workers being killed, seriously injured and given permanent diseases from their jobs. While progress has been made, the nation's workers are in a renewed crisis where decades-long foundational standards have been weakened or eliminated and enforcement has plummeted. The toll of workplace fatalities, injuries and illnesses is now unacceptably high: Each year, tens of thousands of workers are killed and millions more injured or made sick. Some groups—including Latino, Black and immigrant workers—are dying at higher rates than others due to dangerous industries with little oversight and lack of anti-retaliation protections for raising safety concerns. Millions of public sector workers still are not covered by the law.

Job safety and health agencies, most notably the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), are severely understaffed, underresourced, and the regulatory process for issuing critical worker safety protections has become too burdensome. Job safety agencies face extreme challenges enforcing current standards, issuing new lifesaving protections, and providing safety and health training to those who need it the most. 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. The chemical industry is dismantling the implementation of the Toxic Substances

Control Act (TSCA), which is the most significant chemical reform directly affecting occupational exposures inside the workplace and in workers' communities.

Ensuring a safe job for all workers requires new, targeted, and smart policies to strengthen worker rights at every stage of assessing and managing workplace health and safety risks.

- Would you support legislation to strengthen the OSH Act and extend OSHA coverage to all public sector 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 responsibilities 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 the restoration and expansion of NIOSH research funding and programs so that workers, employers and states have access to the best available science to protect workers?
- Would you defend the TSCA law from attack and so-called "reform" so that EPA can still adequately address worker exposures to toxic chemicals through its implementation?
- Would you oppose legislation making it more difficult or impossible for government agencies to develop and issue necessary regulations to protect workers, the public and consumers?
- Would you support comprehensive legislation to address the problems of workplace violence and workplace heat illness prevention?
- Would you support improved targeting and punishment for businesses who repeatedly and egregiously violate workplace health and safety laws?
- Would you support improved federal oversight of state OSHA plans as required under the OSH Act?

REGULATORY REFORM

Working people rely on regulations every day to require employers to fix safety hazards, pay workers and provide benefits. However, over time, large corporations have been allowed to make it increasingly difficult and complicated to issue and keep regulations, made the process burdensome and carved out special opportunities for their interests that workers and the public do not have.

Under the guise of regulatory “reform,” different forms of legislation promote unnecessary and redundant red tape to the regulatory process that prevent agencies from issuing protections. Attacks on the administrative state have only made the situation worse. There are moves underway to give big corporations an even more outsized voice in the regulatory process, and further drown out the voices of workers and experts focused on the public's interest.

- Would you oppose all so-called regulatory “reform” bills that create onerous obligations on agencies and help big businesses slow down the rulemaking process?
- Would you support the EXPERTS Act that would help level the playing field for working people, so that the regulations we need to protect our lives and rights on the job can move forward and be enforced?
- Would you support federal workers as key experts in their fields and support their findings?
- Would you oppose efforts to limit and weaken transparency, scientific credibility and accountability in the rulemaking process?

IMMIGRATION

Immigration reform must reflect America's democratic ideals and not create a second class of workers. The AFL-CIO thinks a broad path to citizenship for the 14 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 worker 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 roadmap to citizenship for all those whose labor helps our country to prosper, including workers with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Temporary Protected Status (TPS)?

- 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?
- Would you support community trust policies that promote public safety by maintaining a separation between local law enforcement and federal immigration enforcement?

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. The ability of working women to remain connected to employment remains precarious. Workers lack paid leave to recover from illness or injury and to care for sick or injured family 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 27% of private sector employees are eligible to take FMLA—and the inability of millions of workers to afford leave without pay constrains the FMLA's effectiveness. The US is the only Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development member country that does not provide for paid leave to near mothers working in the private sector. Black, Hispanic and low-wage workers are less likely to have access to paid family and medical leave benefits than other workers.

Universal paid leave legislation should include 12 weeks of paid leave for the serious illness of the worker or a family member or 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. Workers who take paid family and medical leave should have job protections to ensure they are able to return to their job without employer retaliation.

- 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 three in 10 private sector workers do not have access to paid job-protected sick days. Women—especially women of color-, service industry workers and low-wage workers benefit the most for the economic and job security offered by paid sick leave. *The Healthy Families Act* 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, to care for a sick family member and safe leave for 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. Working families with young children spent a monthly average in excess of \$1,000 on child care, more than the average cost of college tuition. Those working second and third shifts and weekends or whose children have special needs lack access to child care. Studies conducted by the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Alliance for Caregivers found that more than 34 million family caregivers provide care to an adult. The care workforce, mostly women and workers 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 access issues and provides a living wage and the right to organize to child care workers? Would you support legislation that expands Medicaid long-term care eligibility?

Prevailing Wage Laws

Congress should protect and strengthen worker protections. The failure to update and strengthen worker protections, and to defend them from attack, 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. In 2025, with enactment of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, more than a trillion dollars in funding was cut from major sources of coverage, including Medicaid, Medicare, and the Affordable Care Act (ACA). As a result, 15 million people will become uninsured and 607,000 health care workers will lose their jobs. We are committed to restoring the health care system to full capacity and ensuring affordable access to care for all Americans. Our longstanding goal is to move toward a single-payer system, like 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 reducing drug and provider prices; lowering Medicare's eligibility age from 65 to 50; and improving benefits in Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act 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 care health care settings.

- Would you support a repeal of the Medicaid, ACA, and Medicare cuts in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act?
- Would you support a permanent, clean extension of ACA enhanced premium tax credits?
- 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 Affordable Care Act (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 FDA-approved birth control or limit access to reproductive care?

- 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

Currently, more than 50 million students 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) – most recently reauthorized as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) – 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 ESSA?

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 shift 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?
- Will you support policies to help the millions of young Americans struggling with student loan payments?

At the same time, not every student will pursue a traditional four-year degree. Apprenticeships, and high-quality career and technical education programs provide alternative pathways to good-paying jobs without lifelong debt.

- Do you support expanding federal investment in registered apprenticeship programs and high-quality career and technical education as pathways to good-paying jobs without student debt?

Teacher shortages are worsening across the country, leaving classrooms understaffed and students without the support they need to thrive.

- Do you support increased federal funding to raise teacher and school staff pay, strengthen benefits, and expand professional development opportunities so public schools can recruit, retain, and respect the educators who are the backbone of our public school?

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 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 pre-approval 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. DNC* 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 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 to suppress votes, and 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* 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* 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.

- 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 are 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, and has a disproportionate impact on communities of color and people in poverty. Providing opportunities prior to incarceration and upon release, including training, apprenticeships, and education leading to a good union jobs for both at-risk youth and returning citizens 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 shorten a previously mandated 20-year sentence for certain individuals to 15 years?
- Would you support giving judges 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?
- Do you oppose criminalizing women for seeking reproductive care, or the acts of medical personnel who provide reproductive care?
- Do you support a ban on 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 requires employers to demonstrate that wage gaps between men and women, performing the same work, are truly a result of factors other than gender. It prohibits 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 to ensure that it prohibits discrimination against LGBTQ+ people?