

IVI-IPO 2004 US SENATE QUESTIONNAIRE – Section 1

DATE 1/03/04 PARTY: Democrat

NAME: Nancy Skinner

VOTING ADDRESS: 1617 W. Barry #1W Chicago, IL 60657

HOME PHONE: 773-472-7363 BUSINESS PHONE: 773-472-7365

CAMPAIGN ADDRESS: 3614 N. Ashland Chicago, IL 60657

CAMPAIGN PHONE: 773-348-2773 FAX: 773-348-3171

EMAIL: nskinner@aol.com WEBSITE: www.SkinnerTheWinner.com

CAMPAIGN MANAGER: Renee Schaeffer

NUMBER OF PETITION SIGNATURES FILED: 9,990 NUMBER REQUIRED: 10,000

Please use an additional sheet to complete the following background information:

A) Elective or appointive public or party offices previously held including dates. **None**

B) Other elective offices for which you have been a candidate. **None**

C) Principal business, education, professional and civic activities of the past ten years. **Environmental Consultant. Nationally-syndicated political radio and television host.**

D) What subjects have you studied and what experience have you had which will be most helpful to you in the office you seek?

In my capacity as a political radio host, I have studied at length and debated with the best and brightest, most of the issues that will confront a US Senator. Some of those include national security & foreign policy, the economy, monetary and trade policy, global environmental issues such as global warming, water scarcity, deforestation, nuclear proliferation, energy security and independence, woman's reproductive rights and family planning in the US and abroad, healthcare and insurance, medical ethics, farm and agribusiness policy, first amendment and civil liberty issues, media consolidation, campaign finance and election reform.

Because I have spent many years working in the field of sustainable development, I developed a wide knowledge base on many environmental issues, especially global warming; from the science of it to the policies needed to confront the greatest environmental threat facing mankind.

E) Activities for other candidates. Please be specific.

2002 Kevin Kelly – Democratic Candidate for Congress, 11th District Michigan

My brother-in-law, Kevin Kelley, ran for an open congressional seat as a result of redistricting in 2002. I assisted the campaign in many areas; from planning to fundraising, media and public relations to retail outreach and field work.

1984 Chuck Skinner – Democratic Candidate for State Representative, Michigan

My father also ran for state representative and I assisted the campaign in a wide range of activities.

F) Please list all endorsements you have received so far. **Women's Campaign Fund**

G) As concisely as possible, please state why you feel you should be endorsed over the other candidate(s). What goals for the office you seek are most important to you personally?

I am the only candidate in this race who has had extensive experience in the crucible of the national media-where political success is won or lost these days. As a student of national politics, I have come to understand this: communication skills are the most important for any candidate. When it comes to framing the issues for public opinion support or inspiring voters to action, the greatest communicators (JFK, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton etc) have has the most political success. Traditional campaign strategies have not been serving Democratic candidates for national office well. We keep sending well-meaning, honorable people to bat and have lost all political power as a result; the White House, Congress, the Supreme Court and in my view, an increasingly concentrated conservative media.

*I am running for the US Senate because I have heard from my listeners in Illinois and across the country a common refrain: **Democrats need more courage**. They need to stand up to the right wing extremists in the Republican Party and defend progressive Democratic values. Too many Democrats voted for a war for fear of being labeled unpatriotic; too many Democrats voted for the Bush tax cuts for fear of being labeled a tax and spend liberal and too many voted for a so-called Partial Birth Abortion ban rather than confront the factual distortions and defend women's reproductive rights. Democrats need leaders who will act out courage, not fear; hope and not despair. As a rare liberal voice on conservative talk radio, I have succeeded by being courageous and offering hope to progressives.*

The most important issues to me personally include media reform; ensuring a wide variety of ownership and access to the airwaves is vital to a vibrant democracy; and advancing toward the hydrogen/solar economy, where clean energy technologies like fuel cells will free us from our dependence on Mid-East oil and help address our most pressing environmental problem, global warming.

H) Please outline the place of patronage, personnel codes, race, gender, and sexual orientation in establishing criteria for hiring and promoting public employees.

I fully support a diversity policy in the hiring of public employees that rewards hard work and achievement and provides that opportunity to all Americans.

I) What is your campaign budget? How much have you raised to date?

Budget: \$1.5 million

Raised to Date: TBA

It should be noted that our most successful fundraising technique to date is over the Internet. Two new fundraising campaigns were launched right before the December 31st filing and will not show up in that report. I am the only candidate who has received donations from all 50 states.

J) How many people are on your campaign staff? How many volunteers are on your list?

Staff numbers: 5 paid staff

Volunteer List: 700 statewide

Foreign and Military

1. a. What should be the US role in multi-national alliances such as the UN, NATO and the International Criminal Court?

It is vital to the national and economic security of the US, that the US provide leaders to advance the institutions that improve on the model of global cooperative security.

Hegemony vs. Global Cooperation?: A Fateful Choice

Much of the anti-US sentiment, which is now at extraordinarily high levels, began well before 9/11. The Bush administration first angered our allies by rejecting the Kyoto Protocol. They proceeded to back out or otherwise undermine several important international agreements including the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, The ABM Treaty, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Protocol to the Biological Weapons Convention, The International Criminal Court, and the Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons. Although 9/11 produced an outpouring of sympathy which masked the discontent, the unilateralism and arrogance of the US in pressing for war in Iraq, over more extensive inspections, refocused the ire.

As a consequence, requests for additional troops and financial contributions for reconstruction have largely gone unanswered. American involvement is viewed by many in the region as an “occupying force” rather than a liberating force. The CIA has reported that recruitment of Al Qaeda has increased sharply as a result of the war in Iraq. In short, unilateralism backfired.

Democrats need to do more though than offer criticism of the Bush unilateralist policies though. They need to offer up approaches, based on international cooperation and expertise. In the Iraq situation, for example, we need to transfer political authority to the UN, which has extensive nation-building expertise, and military authority to NATO, which executed the war in Afghanistan. In general, the US should push for building a more robust international security/peace-keeping force under the UN. Having a diverse combat-ready military force will provide flexibility in ethnically sensitive conflicts. Challenges to the building such a force are many; from standardization and logistics, to communications and cost support, but these should not derail what could be a real deterrent to rogue regimes and demonstrate a unified world commitment to peace.

The International Criminal Court is another example of how multi-lateral organizations confer legitimacy on international law. Although safe-guards were built in to prevent political prosecutions, the Bush administration’s penchant for isolation and unilateralism won the day and brought to a new level the disconnect between the US and our traditional allies.

In summary, the world is well-served by global security institutions and the United States leadership is required to make those institutions work.

- b. What should be the policy of the IMF and World Bank toward countries that are essentially bankrupt?

B) The IMF and the World Bank are two institutions that were created with the best of intentions but have experienced a hijacking of their original mission to meet the goals of free traders and multi-national corporations. Many of the policies have further impoverished people in developing nations as a result. The IMF has come to the aid of developing countries only with conditions, called structural reforms, like trade liberalization, which often work against the poorest in developing countries and the privatization of state assets and utilities, which in many cases, have raised the cost of the utility services to those who can afford it least. The IMF encourages export oriented production policies to produce

quick cash and pay down national debt but often have the result of stripping a country of its natural resources, forcing them to import the basic goods and adding to the national debt.

The World Bank has until very recently, given top priority to colossal development projects that too often are a windfall for multinational corporations and the government elites of developing countries- who profit tremendously from them- and not enough effort and funds into smaller increment education, healthcare and micro-industry projects that have been shown to have the most beneficial development results.

As the largest funder and most influential party to the IMF and World Bank, The US has a responsibility to ensure that these organizations are responsive to the needs of the world's poorest populations and sensitive to protecting the natural resource base that sustains them. Some progress has been made in recent years but more extensive reforms are needed, such as better representation by those in the developing countries in policy-making positions and more transparency in selecting officials and in policy-making altogether.

2. What should be Congress' role in formulating foreign policy?

The primary role of Congress in formulating foreign policy is one of oversight and the granting war authority should it come to that. With oversight powers however, Congress can help shape direction of policy and hold the executive branch and the military accountable to US and international law. Individual members of Congress have a duty to use their platform and speak out when foreign policy is at odds with their beliefs.

? *Too few spoke out against the war in Iraq before it took place for fear of being labeled unpatriotic.*

? *All but one Senator had the courage to reject the Patriotic Act for the same reason.*

? *Not a single US Senator had the courage to vote to proceed with the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in advance of the participation of developing nations; a vote that has killed any chance of near-term ratification of the treaty.*

? *Too many Democrats give lip service to strengthening the labor and environmental requirements of international trade agreements but have yet to put forward the tough language and teeth needed to accomplish that.*

The truth is that Democrats, being out of power, have a greater responsibility now to speak up loudly and echo the concerns of their constituents, rather than passively watch a powerful executive branch manufacture consent for policies that are not in the best long-term interests of America.

3. Should the US wage war without a declaration from Congress?

The Constitution is quite clear on that point that it should not.

4. a. Do you support funding to assist conversion of the defense industry to civilian applications?

Only where those applications are no longer necessary for modern defense and military requirements.

b. Do you agree with the current proposed level of funding for the military? If you agree, explain. If you disagree, how would you distribute the funds?

With so little transparency, it is hard to put a dollar figure on what the military budget should be. In consultation with the Pentagon and civilian experts, I will make that assessment as a US Senator. I do believe that the budget is replete with programs that have been rendered obsolete but remain for political/pork reasons. Others like missile defense are a black hole for US tax dollars. The program has fatal flaws that make deployment impossible, namely that decoys accompanying incoming missiles could always trip the system and without 100% success, the value of the investment is questionable. Government critics of the program have been shut down in the past when voicing such concerns.

On the other hand, I believe we need to increase the most expensive military resource – troop levels. Given the increased demands in Iraq, Afghanistan and other hot spots, it has become clear that our troops are stretched too thin. In addition, as we move toward peace-keeping operations in brokered deals vs. pre-emptive strikes and invasions as a security model, the troop requirements actually go up.

5. Do you support
- continued funding for WHISC (the re-named Army School of the Americas)? *No*
 - fast-track authority? *No*

6. Do you support the way the drug war is being carried on, both abroad and at home? What would you change?

I would place far more emphasis on education and treatment of drug addiction and less on interdiction than is current policy. Anti-drug education should be a part of the curriculum in our schools from day one.

7. Do you support
- normalization of relations with Cuba?

I believe that it high time we began that process by opening up trade (other than agriculture) and tourism. Political progress was made, albeit at a snail's pace, with China under the engagement approach. We value our "friendship" and alliance with a Saudi Arabian dictatorship and flew Bin Laden's family members out of the US on September 12th, even though it is a kingdom run by dictators who often use brutal forms of political repression. It's hard to square the disparate approaches.

- the Helms-Burton Act?

No – it was another example of the US trying to bully our allies and it aggravated trade and other diplomatic relations needlessly.

Environment

8. Do you support the environmental policies of the current administration?

I would need to write a book to fully answer this one but I can sum it in one word– NO!

As a professional environmentalist for many years, I developed a comprehensive understanding of just how severe our environmental problems are, from global warming to mercury poisoning caused by coal-burning power plants, from species extinction to suburban sprawl – the challenges are enormous.

The Bush administration has mastered an Orwellian technique of naming something just the opposite of what it is.

The Clear Skies Act – The Bush philosophy is “If it ain’t broke – break it”. The Clean Air Act and its amendments have provided a significant reduction in deadly air pollution and if the law was enforced properly, would significantly improve air quality. The Bush administration, in its endless special interest catering, has weakened the Act itself and offered up a replacement plan that actually increases air pollution.

The Clean Air Act required older dirty power plants (some 30-50 years old and responsible for the lion’s share of the nation’s pollution) to upgrade pollution control equipment when making major renovations to plant and equipment under a program called “New Source Review”. Flagrant violations of multi-million dollar upgrades caused the EPA to initiate lawsuits against the power companies. The enforcement team at the EPA was very close to achieving settlements with those companies, which would have resulted in major air quality improvements, until the eve of the Bush election when the word was put out that the companies should not settle. They were told that if Bush were elected the enforcement action would cease, according to chief enforcement council for the EPA, Eric Schmidt, who resigned in protest. The lawsuits were dropped and the New Source Review requirement put on ice – and a result thousands more Americans will die (some estimates as high 64,000 a year currently) and suffer chronic illness like asthma and lung disease.

The Healthy Forest Initiative- The philosophy here is that you have cut the trees down so they will respect you. This bill uses the guise of “fuel reduction” as a wildfire suppression tool to allow logging companies (indeed even pay them with trees) to log out old-growth fire-resistant trees and to stop any public participation in the forest management process. Far from making communities safe from wildfires, it does nothing to thin and manage fires within the ¼ mile of communities that is the danger zone. Logging commercially valuable trees (that serve as fire stalls) located far from communities is a “Healthy Timber Companies Initiative” not a “Healthy Forest Initiative”.

Global Warming – President Bush stunned some during the election 2000 campaign when he promised to regulate CO2 emissions from power plants, the second largest source next to transportation. Upon taking office, he immediately backed off that promise and went further by rejecting the Kyoto Protocol, landmark legislation to address the enormous threat posed by global warming that the world community had worked so long and hard to produce.

The Bush Energy Bill- is a great big giveaway to the fossil fuel industry, which will exacerbate the problem of global warming.

One of the major platforms of my campaign is to make massive investments in advancing the country’s energy infrastructure to the next stage of development, the solar/hydrogen economy. The fuel cell is one technology that holds great promise in freeing us from our addiction to Mid-East oil and improving our environmental quality. A zero-polluting electro-chemical technology, it can be used to run our cars and heat our buildings and homes. With an investment of just \$4 billion, which is what we spend in Iraq in one week, we could equip 10-20% of the nation’s fueling stations with a hydrogen fuel cell appliance which would allow the fuel cell car to penetrate the market and become commercially viable.

9. How do we balance the need to protect the environment with our need for economic development? Your comments should include water resources, air quality, wetlands, coastline development, and deforestation, use of public lands, and pesticides and herbicides.

I reject the premise that it is a balancing act. As a finance major who worked in the environmental world for many years, I became a leading advocate of “sustainable development”, which means meeting our current needs without jeopardizing the ability of future generation’s to meet theirs. And as it turns out, reducing the use of resources is just good business sense too.

Air quality - Energy reduction programs undertaken by some leading companies have saved millions in costs and reduced tons of pollution.

Wetlands – The economic and ecosystem value of wetlands, including water purification, flood control, the support of wildlife, to name just a few, have been calculated by economists to far outweigh the value of filling and developing them. I worked to relocate and rebuild communities stricken by the floods of 1993. I worked closely with experts in floodplain management – and the verdict is in: restoring wetlands other non-structural measures is the most cost-efficient way to protect communities from flood damage.

Coastline development – Another area where the economic value of tourism often outweighs any property tax benefits of coastal development. Many of the recurring FEMA bailouts go to owners of luxurious beachside homes who have chosen to build in harm's way.

Deforestation – The economic damage due to deforestation, when properly assessed is enormous. The trees are more than logs for building homes. They act as lungs to the planet and sequester great amounts of carbon dioxide and emit oxygen, counteracting our increasing CO₂ output, which is jeopardizing the planet. Economic damages suffered by insurance companies in recent years are exponentially higher than in the past, because of the increase in natural weather extremes and associated losses.

10. Do you support oil drilling in Alaska and other protected wilderness?

No. I support drilling in Detroit – for fuel efficiency and new technologies like fuel cell vehicles.

11. So you support pollution credit schemes?

I do believe that emissions trading can be a workable approach to reducing pollution. In fact, with 1990 Clean Air Amendments, it was put to the test and has significantly reduced SO₂ emitted by the nation's utilities. I helped launch a voluntary trading market in Chicago to apply the same principle to CO₂ and other greenhouse gases called the Chicago Climate Exchange. The key is that the cap of the "cap and trade" strategy must be tight enough to result in technological innovations that otherwise would not be adopted. No pain, no gain. There is also a profit motive inserted into the dynamic and now some companies have a market for which to develop and sell less polluting plant and equipment. When it comes to toxic chemicals like mercury, the trading theory is flawed. The urgency of reducing mercury requires that economic considerations take a back seat and immediate reductions take place.

Transportation

12. What transportation policy do you favor regarding

- a. infrastructure improvements?
- b. highways?
- c. mass transit?
- d. high-speed rail?
- e. Amtrak?
- f. Air transportation, particularly the proposed O'Hare expansion and third airport?

With crumbling roads and bridges across the US, more focus should be on rebuilding critical infrastructure, but unfortunately, an excessive percentage of funding for highways and infrastructure gets allocated to new road building activities, encourages more urban sprawl. The results are longer commutes, more auto pollution, loss of valuable farmland and green space, unsustainable tax pressures,

and social consequences in which neighbors no longer know each other, separated by 20 foot setbacks and 3 car garages. Improving the public school system and other urban redevelopment schemes would slow the exodus to the suburbs and increase the property values in the cities, bringing more jobs and economic activity where they are desperately needed.

I don't think you can address each mode of transportation separately here. Planning sustainable communities means incorporating all modes in a pedestrian-friendly approach. Bike paths should accompany surface roads and green spaces must be made part of any housing developments. Yes we need airports in a modern economy and we need O'Hare expansion (I'm just happy something's expanding in the Bush economy) but we should require full funding of the Mid-Western High Speed Rail System, a multi-city network hubbed in Chicago, as the price of O'Hare expansion. The Rail System needs \$4 billion for completion – a week of our expenditures in Iraq – and would significantly ease the pressure on air and auto travel, which are so destructive environmentally.

During my work rebuilding flood communities downstate, we showed residents pictures of the post WWII model of development – with cul-de-sacs and strip malls, huge front yards, where garage doors replace the traditional front porches where they had spent so much of their time connecting with neighbors. We showed them how they could actually design the street layouts so as to take advantage of passive solar design principles- where having your glazing facing the Southern exposure and your trees and landscaping facing north to stop prevailing northern winds, and by insulating properly a new home could reduce and even eliminate all HVAC (Heating Venting, Air-Conditioning) costs. Think about the money an average family would save each year!

Fortunately for these residents, they had the ability to make these choices (and they did) before the development process. We need this sustainability planning to be part of the planning process in how we develop our communities; all these considerations, the mix of transportation, mixed income housing and green spaces – determine the livability of communities.

Taxes and Economic Policy

13. Do you favor

a. a more progressive income tax?

YES – the tax reforms of the Reagan/Bush administration have been moving in the opposite direction, shifting more of the burden on middle and working class Americans. The reductions in taxes and stock dividends and the repeal of the estate taxes are the most egregious examples of regressively in practice.

b. a flat tax? *No – it is a regressive tax*

c. a national sales tax? *No – it is a regressive and unworkable tax.*

d. reduction of the capital gains tax?

No, most Americans rely on wages and salary for their income. Why should someone who lives on their assets pay a lower tax on investment income? The Republicans use the ruse that most Americans have stock investments, and indeed over half do. The share of the entire bottom 90% is still far less than the top 10%, which results in shifting the tax burden downward.

e. reduction or elimination of the estate tax?

No – A tax that gets all its revenues from the wealthiest 1.4%--and two thirds of it from the top 0.2%--is obviously very progressive, but I would raise the exemption limit to \$3,500,000 per estate. This

completely eliminates the Republican argument that the tax (which affects less than 2000 estates) is forcing family farms and small businesses into bankruptcy.

Only .5% of total estate taxes are attributable to assets and the typical tax is \$5,000. The code actually offers incentives to keep small family farms in production. Non-farm family businesses account for less than 3% of taxable estates. The facts never supported that rhetoric – but the crafty political operatives that they are – by naming the estate tax the death tax, and screaming about family farms, won the public opinion and the debate.

The financial implications are enormous. This according to a leading expert on the estate tax Bill Gates Sr.:

The real costs of estate tax repeal would surface years from now. That drop of \$294 billion in federal revenue in the first 10 years would balloon to a \$750 billion loss in the second.

The estate tax currently brings in revenue- some \$28 billion in 1999- equal to the entire federal expenditure for housing and urban development (That's more than double the total amount of federal income taxes paid by the bottom half of all taxpayers.) . Federal revenues lost through estate tax repeal would have to be made up by increasing taxes on others or by cuts in Social Security, Medicare, environmental protection or other government programs important to our nation's well being.

Estate tax repeal would also squeeze state treasuries. About one-fifth of all estate tax revenues go to states through what is called a "pick-up tax." Repeal would cost states some \$5.5 billion a year, and when it was fully in effect, costs would approach \$9 billion. California is projected to lose \$937 million in 2000, and my home state of Washington would lose \$87 million.

Besides the loss of revenues, the repeal of the tax could discourage as much as 40% of all charitable giving from taxable estates and increase income inequality and poverty, which is already approaching the levels of the gilded age.

f. elimination of the corporate alternative tax?

No - It is the only way that we are able to make sure that endless loopholes don't free the wealthiest Americans from their fair share of taxes. The Bush tax cuts however will force more middle-income Americans to be subject to this tax for the first time – and there will be enormous pressure to reduce it.

g. tax cuts on stock dividends?

President Bush called his dividend reduction tax – a stimulus package (which it clearly is not) and railed against the unfairness of double taxation. He may as well call them the "Taxes of Evil". The facts are just the opposite.

The tax reduction of dividends encourages companies to pay out retained earnings in dividends rather than re-investing in the company's plant, equipment and production – an anti-stimulus effect.

Bush says, "About half of all dividend income goes to America's seniors, and they rely on those checks for a steady source of income in their retirement...So today, for the good of our senior citizens, I'm asking the US Congress to abolish the double taxation on dividends.

But since most seniors make less than \$50,000 a year, 2/3rds of older Americans would get little or nothing. Most seniors depend on social security income and he is spending every red penny of that surplus to mask the size of the true deficit.

h. any other changes in our tax structure? Please explain.

14. Do you favor a roll-back of the Bush tax cuts?

Yes for people making \$200,000 and above.

15. Do you support total or partial privatization of the Social Security fund? Please explain.

NO

*I propose the **Social Security “Promise Protection Bill (PPB)”** that will require the US Treasury Secretary each year to estimate the Present Value Payment that will be required to meet our future social security obligations and transfer that sum to a separate fund that will be used for no other purpose. The Budget Office must then report separately the status of the General Fund and the Social Security Fund each year.*

In addition, the PPB legislation will require the Secretary of Health and Human Service to project the healthcare needs of an aging population and make appropriate investments today so that healthcare will be available. There is a critical nursing shortage which will only compound with time, given that the average nurse today is 50 years old. Investments must be made in nursing education and incentives as well other critical aspects of healthcare to ensure that the promise we made to the American worker to be there for them in their retirement will be kept.

16. What is your position on federal deficit spending vs. balanced budget?

Contrary to Republican wishful thinking, deficits do matter. We have had a \$9 trillion reversal in economic position since Bush took office. Small deficits at times may be acceptable if they are a result of real stimulus efforts – not tax cuts to the wealthy (who don’t need a tax break to buy a washing machine) and corporate pork (that ends up as excessive executive pay and in tax-sheltered income). The Bush deficits are a double whammy – running up the debt and interest burdens without the “jobs & growth” effect. The real tragedy is that instead of going deeper in the red, the federal government should be setting aside the monies that will be owed to our seniors as they retiree. We know what that burden is and when it will need to be met but nothing is being done to secure that obligation. (See Social Security “Promise Protection Bill” above).

17. Do you support unfunded mandates to local government?

NO – with the No Child Left Behind Act the latest perpetrator.

Consumer Rights

18. Do you support

a. granting consumers the right to an annual free copy of their consolidated credit report, including credit score?

I believe that information should be made accessible “at cost” to the consumer.

b. banning the use of Social Security numbers as identification in consumer transactions?

YES

c. federal legislation to cap interest rates on consumer loans?

YES

d. federal legislation to regulate ATM fees and service charges on credit cards and other consumer loans?

YES

e. federal legislation to give banks and finance companies priority over other unsecured lenders in bankruptcy proceedings?

NO – this risks having child support payments come after bank debts along with other social disadvantages.

f. allowing states to enact consumer laws which go beyond the protection of federal legislation?

YES – Under the 10th Amendment, states have the right to enact their own laws, including consumer protections, as long as those laws are not in violation of federal law or the constitution.

Government and Ethics

19. Do you support term limits? Describe briefly.

No we already have them – they are called elections.

20. Do you support

a. public financing of Congressional campaigns?

YES, YES YES – I have long said that when private interests finance elections, private interests are served. Not until the public finances campaigns will the public interest truly be served. Our campaign financing is badly in need of reform, so that intelligent and thoughtful candidates of modest personal wealth have a chance to compete with the big moneyed candidates.

b. spending limits? *YES*

c. abolition of PACs? *YES - They wouldn't be needed under clean election system.*

21. Would you support increased Congressional oversight of federal contracting? Why or why not?

YES – the taxpayers of this country must have confidence that those dollars are being used in the public's best interest and that patronage, waste, fraud and abuse do not come into play. The system of checks and balances is designed to do that but is too often thwarted by executive branch maneuvering. Halliburton was under investigation by the Pentagon for fraud and had set up foreign subsidiaries to do business with Iraq when it was prohibited by American companies, and they were still rewarded with a no-bid \$3 billion (at this writing) open-ended contract. Congress must be able to step in and stop this nonsense.

Health & Human Services

22. Do you support comprehensive, universal, single-payer health care? If not, how would you address the

need for healthcare for the uninsured and underinsured?

I support it as an end, but my means of getting there would be different. The fact is the Republicans have been able to demonize and kill proposals such as this by labeling them “socialized medicine” and telling people they will be arrested if they seek healthcare outside the “Government system” – witness the fall of Hillary Clinton’s Healthcare initiative.

I believe that we need to think out of the box and present ideas to the American public that can withstand the inevitable attacks. I believe that names matter.

My plan is called “US Choice for Healthcare”, a completely voluntary program that allows the federal government to offer affordable health care insurance in competition with private industry. How can Republicans demonize an entirely voluntary plan that relies on competition and free markets to meet the needs of the American public? The government does not have the extraordinary profit margins of private industry and can pool huge risks to lower the cost of providing insurance. Social security and Medicare run around 3% in administrative costs whereas private insurance is as high as 25% administration costs. This is a way to expand coverage to the uninsured who can afford modest premiums. I would subsidize the children and working poor who cannot afford it through Medicare.

23. Do you favor funding changes for the following:

- a. supplemental food programs for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)? *No – the current level of \$4.645 seems to meet existing needs according to organizations serving that population.*
- b. food stamp allowances? *No – but I would create information and educational programs for families that qualify but do not utilize the benefit.*
- c. Head Start? *Yes – It’s the most successful educational program of the federal government.*
- d. school lunch programs? *YES- As I believe that proper nutrition is essential to the educational process. I would also make changes to eliminate junk food and sodas, which interfere with attention and disorder and lead to childhood obesity.*

24. Do you support

- a. increased funding to develop affordable housing? *Yes*
- b. restrictions to ensure development of low-income rather than market rate housing? *Yes*
- c. a National Affordable Housing Trust Fund to build, rehabilitate and preserve at least 1.5 million units of primarily rental, primarily deeply targeted housing? *Yes*
- d. Protection against housing discrimination based on source of income? *Yes*

25. What services, if any, should be offered to those whose time on Welfare has run out and do not have adequate income to support themselves and their families? *There has to be a safety net to protect the most vulnerable, families with children. States need a cushion to deal with basic human needs, especially in rocky economic times. Block grants to states for such rainy day emergency services may allow them flexibility in dealing with the situation.*

26. Do you favor

- a. increased federal aid to public education? *Yes*
- b. vouchers, tuition tax-credits or other any direct public support for parochial or private schools? *No*

27. Are the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act the appropriate way to advance student achievement? *No- its implementation in Illinois is proof enough. Mandatory testing which pools student populations labeling way too many schools as failures. Grossly insufficient slots available for transfers, no money for tutoring, what does it advance? Local property taxes!*

28. Do you support
- a. the Human Life Amendment? *No*
 - b. parental or spousal notification or consent to obtain an abortion? *No*
 - c. restoration of Medicaid coverage of abortion? *Yes*
 - d. a ban on so-called partial birth abortions? *No*
 - e. insurance coverage for abortions for federal and military employees and their dependents? *Yes*

29. Do you support increased funding for HIV/AIDS research, education, prevention, and services? Please discuss compulsory licensing of essential drugs where needed, in the US, Africa, Asia and elsewhere.

Yes

30. Do you support
- a. federal funding for stem cell research? *Yes*
 - b. legislation prohibiting stem cell research? *No – unless it is limited to a ban on reproductive cloning, known as human cloning, as opposed to therapeutic cloning, which allows the use of embryos that will be discarded to be used for valuable research.*

Law, Justice, and Correctional System

31. Do you support:
- a. admissibility of illegally obtained evidence? *No*
 - b. electronic eavesdropping? *Only where proper subpoenas have been obtained.*
 - c. roving wiretaps? *Only where proper subpoenas have been obtained.*
 - d. capital punishment? *No – I lived through the Illinois experience!*
 - e. criminal prosecution of juveniles as adults? *Generally No*
 - f. mandatory sentencing? *Generally No – especially for non-violent crimes like drugs. Judicial discretion must be maintained.*
 - g. criminalization of hate crimes? *Yes*

32. Do you support legislation prohibiting racial profiling in law enforcement? *Yes*

33. Do you favor detention of suspects and material witnesses without charges and/or probable cause? Do you favor giving such detainees access to counsel? *No/Yes*

34. Would you support legislation authorizing or prohibiting secret military tribunals? Please explain your position. *Yes – it's a constitutional issue – US Citizens have a guaranteed right to due process.*

35. Do you support legislation to ban the manufacture, sale and possession of
- a. handguns? *I think that should be up to states and local governments.*
 - b. assault weapons? *Yes*
 - c. ammunition for handguns and assault weapons? *No/Yes*

36. Do you support legislation
- a. mandating background checks of purchasers of weapons at gun shows, through the internet and through print advertisements? *Yes*
 - b. increasing penalties for illegal resale of weapons? *Yes*

37. a. Should funding for the Legal Services Corporation be increased? *Yes*
b. What restrictions, if any, should Congress enact or repeal regarding the scope of federally funded legal services for the poor? *No*

Civil Liberties and Civil Rights

38. a. Do you favor repeal of the Patriot Act or any of its provisions? *Yes*
b. Would you vote for Patriot Act II? *No*
39. Do you support
a. federal legislation to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation in housing, employment and education? *Yes*
b. repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act? *Yes*
c. a Constitutional amendment prohibiting states from recognizing gay civil unions or same sex unions? *No- you would have to repeal the 14th Amendment guaranteeing equal protections of the laws to do that.*
40. What is your position on gays and lesbians in the military? *Don't ask, Don't Tell – Don't Work!*
41. a. Do you support prior government restraint of the press? *No*
b. Do you support State censorship of the arts? *No*
c. What should be the guidelines in determining government support for the arts?
d. Should funding for the NEA be increased, decreased or stay the same? *Same*
42. Do you support
a. prayer in public schools? *No –if is initiated by teachers or school representatives. The Constitution prohibits government establishment of religion. If students initiate or wish to pray, the same amendment protects their right to do so.*
b. moment of silence? *That's OK – In fact we should teach kids how to be more reflective and less reactive.*
43. Do you support mandatory drug testing in private and public employment? Briefly state the reasons for your answers. *Private businesses have that right – although I do think it is an intrusion of privacy. Public thresholds for testing should be much higher, for example, where public safety is involved.*
44. Do you support mandatory AIDS testing for insurance or employment? *No*
45. Do you support legislation to redress inequities in pension benefits for women? *Yes*
46. Would you support the acceptance of completed ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment? *Yes*

Labor

47. What changes, if any, in the Taft-Hartley Act would you work for? *Repeal. With union membership at a 60 year low (at 10%) and flagrant violations of labor laws commonplace, it is time to strengthen the hand of union organizers. Globalization (including NAFTA, GATT, etc) has aggravated the situation and made it that much difficult for working Americans to maintain their standard of living.*
48. Do you support a prohibition on permanent replacement of strikers? *Yes*
49. Do you favor giving federal employees the right to strike? *Yes – if it does not endanger national security or public health. There would be a higher standard here the employees to meet in order to strike. For example, when HHS workers strike, does the delay in the payment of social security checks harm public health? – I think so.*

50. What is your position on Affirmative Action with specific goals, targets and timetables for federal employment, grants and contracts and as a requirement for federal contractors and grantees?

51. a. Do you support comparable worth legislation? *Yes*

b. What steps, if any, should the government take to monitor pay equity between men and women?

52. Do you support a federal living wage law? Please explain why or why not.

No – because a one size fits all approach doesn't work. The minimum wage was originally tied to access to housing. One solution is the indexing of the living wage to local housing costs but that would radically raise the rate. We do need to raise the wage floor which has a beneficial effect on all wage earners. The most important argument is that globalization (cheap labor abroad) has caused an oversupply situation, a glut of cheap goods, with not enough demand from consumers to buy them, so putting more money in the pockets of working Americans who have experienced stagnant wage growth for decades, will help address the oversupply/deflationary situation.

But it cannot be done in a vacuum. Raising the federal minimum wage must also be a part of a wider effort to reform our trade agreements, so it is not a race to the bottom and to prevent the acceleration of US jobs overseas. Free Trade has proven to be a colossal failure that threatens to undermine the middle class in America. But it is based on trade rules and they can be changed to serve people.