



 Signature of Candidate		Please Print or Type Name		Date Signed
State	Congressional District #	Political Party	Contact Person	Phone Number
Name of Campaign Committee			Campaign Website	
Campaign Address				
Email Address			Mobile Phone	

## 2022 CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

### ABORTION

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) believes that unborn children should be protected by law, and that abortion should be permitted only when necessary to prevent the death of the mother. Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe that abortion should be legal?

- (a) \_\_\_ Only to prevent the death of the mother (the NRLC position).
- (b) \_\_\_ To prevent the death of the mother, or in cases of rape reported to a law enforcement agency, or incest against a minor reported to a child abuse agency.
- (c) Other (please explain): \_\_\_\_\_

***PLEASE NOTE: In every question (1-35), a "yes" response indicates a pro-life response in agreement with the position of NRLC.***

### ROE v. WADE and PLANNED PARENTHOOD v. CASEY

In its 1973 rulings in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, the U.S. Supreme Court created a "right to abortion" for any reason until "viability" (into the sixth month), and for any "health"

reasons – including "emotional" health – even during the final three months of pregnancy. This ruling invalidated the abortion laws that were in effect in all 50 states at that time. In the 1992 ruling of *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the "core holdings" of *Roe v. Wade* and said that any law placing an "undue burden" on access to abortion would be struck down.

**(1) Do you advocate reversing and/or changing the *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* decisions, so that elected legislative bodies (the state legislatures and Congress) may once again protect unborn children by limiting and/or prohibiting abortion?**

YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

### ABORTION POLICIES

**(2) Would you vote against any legislation that would weaken any pro-life law or policy that is in effect on the day that you are elected?**

YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

**(3) Would you vote against any federal legislation that would place new limits on the ability of states to regulate abortion – for example, the so-called "Women's Health Protection Act" (S. 1975, H.R. 3755 in the 117th Congress), sometimes referred to by critics as the "Abortion Without Limits Until Birth Act," which is**

successor to the so-called “Freedom of Choice Act”?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT**

There is now compelling scientific evidence that, at least by 20 weeks fetal age the unborn child is capable of experiencing pain when subjected to abortion. On this basis, in 2010, Nebraska enacted the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act to prohibit abortions after that point (with narrow exceptions), and a number of other states subsequently passed bills based on the same model. On October 3, 2017, similar national legislation (H.R. 36) was approved by the U.S. House of Representatives. On February 25, 2020, the legislation was voted on in the U.S. Senate, but fell short of the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture.

**(4) Would you vote for the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, to strictly limit abortion from 20 weeks fetal age, the point in development at which evidence currently suggests an unborn child has the capacity to feel pain?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**DISMEMBERMENT ABORTION BAN ACT**

The Dismemberment Abortion Ban Act of 2021 (H.R. 558) has been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Congresswoman Debbie Lesko (R-AZ).

This bill is based on a model state bill proposed by National Right to Life, which was enacted in 2015 in Kansas and Oklahoma, and a number of other states subsequently passed bills based on the same model. The bill defines “dismemberment abortion” as “knowingly dismembering a living unborn child and extracting such unborn child one piece at a time from the uterus through the use of clamps, grasping forceps, tongs, scissors or similar instruments that, through the convergence of two rigid levers, slice, crush or grasp a portion of the unborn child’s body in order to cut or rip it off . . .” This definition largely overlaps with what those in the abortion trade currently refer to as “dilation and evacuation” or “dilation and extraction” (D&E) abortions. This brutal method is commonly used starting at about 14 weeks of pregnancy and extending into the third trimester.

**(5) Would you vote for the Dismemberment Abortion Ban Act, to place a national ban on the use of dismemberment abortion?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**HEARTBEAT LEGISLATION**

The Heartbeat Protection Act (H.R. 705) would prohibit

abortions when an unborn child’s heartbeat is detected (with exceptions for the life of the mother). The Heartbeat Protection Act requires doctors to check for a fetal heartbeat before performing an abortion. As with all of NRLC’s legislation, women who obtain an abortion that violates this law would not be subject to prosecution.

A number of states have passed bills based on protecting a child once a heartbeat is detected.

**(6) Would you vote for legislation to limit abortion from the point in development at which an unborn child has a detectable heartbeat?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT**

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (S. 123/H.R. 619) would enact an explicit requirement that a baby born alive during an abortion must be afforded “the same degree” of care that would apply “to any other child born alive at the same gestational age,” including transportation to a hospital. In addition, the bill applies the existing penalties of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1111 (the federal murder statute) to anyone who performs “an overt act that kills a child born alive.” The bill also empowers women with a right to sue their abortionists and others for harm caused by violations of the act.

**(7) Would you vote for the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to protect babies born alive in an attempted abortion?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES FOR ABORTION**

On January 24, 2017, the U.S. House of Representatives approved the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act (H.R. 7). This bill would establish a permanent policy against funding abortions and health plans that cover abortions, consistent with the principles of the Hyde Amendment, to all federal programs, including those created by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (Pub. L. No. 111-148) (“Obamacare,” or ACA).

**(8) Would you vote for the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Congress votes from time to time on the “Hyde Amendment,” a law that prohibits federal Medicaid money from being used to pay for abortions or for health care plans that include abortion, except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest. Other similar provisions of law restrict federal subsidies for abortion in certain other federal

health programs, including those covering the military and federal employees, but, regrettably, not major components of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 ("Obamacare").

**(9) Would you oppose any legislation that would weaken the Hyde Amendment, or other current laws that restrict federal subsidies for abortion; and would you support measures to ensure the fullest possible enforcement of such laws and application, wherever appropriate, of their underlying principles?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

The District of Columbia is an exclusively federal jurisdiction. Article I of the Constitution provides that Congress must exercise "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District.

In December 2009, at the urging of President Obama, Congress effectively repealed a longstanding ban on government funding of abortions in the District. However, in April 2011, at the insistence of congressional Republican leaders, a prohibition was restored to prohibit any use of government funds for abortion in the District, whether designated as "federal" funds or so-called "local" funds (except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest). This issue will continue to arise during future congressional appropriations cycles.

**(10) Would you vote to preserve the prohibition on public funding of abortion in the District of Columbia, applicable to all government funds however they are labeled?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

The federal government annually provides many millions of dollars to organizations that operate abortion clinics. For example, affiliates of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) provide over one-third of all the abortions performed in the U.S., yet PPFA also receives over a half-billion dollars annually from government sources, mostly federal (including Medicaid and the Title X "family planning" program).

**(11) Would you vote for legislation that would make organizations that perform abortions (other than bona fide hospitals), including Planned Parenthood, ineligible to receive federal funding, including federal Medicaid funds?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### FOREIGN AID FOR ABORTION

The U.S. spends about \$600 million annually for birth control programs overseas. Under Presidents Ronald Reagan,

George H.W. Bush, George W. Bush, and Donald Trump, executive orders collectively referred to as the "Mexico City Policy" (renamed and expanded under the Trump Administration as the "Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance" program) established that, in order to be eligible for U.S. population control funds, a private overseas organization must agree not to perform abortions (except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest) or to "actively promote abortion as a method of family planning." However, during the administrations of Presidents Clinton, Obama, and Biden, this pro-life policy was overturned by executive order.

**(12) Would you vote for legislation to codify (enact into permanent law) the principles of the "Mexico City Policy," that U.S. funds should not go to overseas organizations that perform or promote abortion?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has participated in China's population control program, which relies heavily on coerced abortion. The UNFPA has also promoted expanded access to abortion in developing nations, and has promoted the abortion pill, RU 486. The administrations of Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, George W. Bush, and Donald Trump cut off U.S. funding to the UNFPA because of its role in China.

**(13) Would you vote for legislation to prevent U.S. funding of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and to prevent any weakening or repeal of the 1985 Kemp-Kasten anti-coercion law, which prohibits U.S. funding of any agency that supports a program of coercive abortion?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### PARENTAL NOTIFICATION/CONSENT FOR MINORS' ABORTIONS

Laws are already in effect in about half the states that require notification or consent of at least one parent (or authorization by a judge) before an abortion can be performed on a minor. However, these laws are often circumvented by minors who cross state lines in order to evade parental notification requirements (often with the aid of older boyfriends, abortion clinic staff, or other adults lacking parental authority).

The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA) (S. 109, H.R. 2223 in the 117th Congress) would require any abortionist, encountering a minor client from another state, to notify one parent before performing an abortion, unless presented with authorization from a court, or in cases of life endangerment, or in cases of sexual or physical abuse, or neglect by a parent, in which case the appropriate state agency must be notified instead of a parent. The bill would

also make it an offense to transport a minor across state lines to evade a parental involvement requirement.

**(14) Would you oppose weakening amendments to the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA), and vote for the bill?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### CONSCIENCE PROTECTION

For many years, pro-abortion officials and advocacy groups have sought to use the compulsory powers of government to compel health care providers to participate in abortion. The Obama Administration broadened the assault on conscience rights by issuing “ObamaCare” regulations that require employers (including religious schools and hospitals) to provide health coverage that will provide drugs and procedures to which the employers have religious or moral objections. In response, pro-life members of Congress have proposed the Conscience Protection Act (S. 401 in the 117th Congress), which would greatly strengthen the rights of private individuals and employers to refuse to participate in abortion or other procedures that violate their deeply held beliefs. Among other things, the bill would prohibit any government agency – federal, state, or local – from penalizing health care providers for refusing to participate in providing abortions and would allow health care providers to sue when subjected to such attacks from government entities.

**(15) Would you vote for legislation, such as the Conscience Protection Act, to protect the conscience rights of pro-life health care providers and others, and advocate for vigorous enforcement of existing laws to protect conscience rights?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT (ERA)

In 1972, Congress proposed to the states an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, known as the “Equal Rights Amendment” (ERA), that would nullify any law or government policy that is deemed to discriminate “on account of sex.” NRLC has long opposed the 1972 ERA because of its predictable use as a powerful pro-abortion legal weapon – an intended effect that is now openly proclaimed by pro-abortion members of Congress and by activist groups such as NARAL, Planned Parenthood, NOW, and the Women’s Law Project. Although the 1972 ERA resolution contained a ratification deadline of March, 1979, and it failed to achieve ratification, pro-ERA activists and lawmakers continue to insist that it can be resuscitated by “removing the deadline” retroactively, and proposals that purport to do this were passed by the House of Representatives in 2020 and 2021.

**(16) Will you oppose any attempt to retroactively nullify**

**the ratification deadline on the 1972 ERA?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Aside from attempts to resuscitate the long-expired 1972 ERA, there have also been proposals to re-start the process, by Congress submitting a new ERA to the states for consideration. NRLC opposes any new ERA unless it contains an “abortion-neutralization amendment,” first proposed in 1982-83: “Nothing in this article [the ERA] shall be construed to grant, secure, or deny any right relating to abortion or the funding thereof.”

**(17) Will you vote against Congress submitting any new ERA-like constitutional amendment to the states, unless it at least contains “abortion-neutralization” language to ensure that it will not change abortion policy?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**(18) Will you also require such “abortion-neutral” language in other legislative proposals that deal with discrimination on the basis of “sex” or gender, to ensure that they cannot be misused to invalidate pro-life laws or policies?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### THE EQUALITY ACT

In 2021, the House of Representatives passed the Equality Act, a bill that would add “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” as protected classes under federal civil rights law. Note: NRLC takes no position on these provisions. However, an additional provision of the Equality Act changes the definition of “sex” to include “pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.”

This language, along with other provisions, could be construed to create a right to demand abortion from health care providers and would destroy conscience protections for health care providers. Historically, when Congress has addressed discrimination based on sex, rules of construction have been added to ensure that any efforts do not require funding of abortion or preempt conscience laws.

**(19) Will you oppose the Equality Act or any similar legislation unless it contains explicit language to ensure that it will not affect abortion policy?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### PROTECTION OF HUMAN EMBRYOS

The right to life of human beings must be respected at every stage of their biological development. Human individuals who are at the embryonic stage of development should not

be used for harmful or lethal medical experimentation. This applies equally to human beings whether their lives were begun by in vitro fertilization, by somatic cell nuclear transfer (human cloning), or by any other laboratory techniques.

NRLC opposes harvesting "stem cells" from living human embryos, since this kills the embryos. This includes any human embryos who might be created by somatic cell nuclear transfer (human cloning) or other laboratory manipulations. Note: NRLC is NOT opposed to other research on "stem cells" that are obtained without killing embryos – for example, stem cells harvested from umbilical cord blood and from adult tissue.

**(20) Would you vote for legislation to prevent Federal support of research or treatments that harm or destroy human embryos, or that use cells or tissues that are obtained by harming or killing human embryos (including any human embryos created by human cloning or other laboratory manipulations)?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### HEALTH CARE RESTRUCTURING LEGISLATION

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed into law the "Affordable Care Act" ("ObamaCare") (Pub. L. No. 111-148), which passed Congress over the objections of NRLC. When the government rations health care in a way that makes it illegal or impossible for Americans to choose life-saving medical treatment, food, and fluids, it imposes a type of involuntary euthanasia.

Through objectionable features separately described in questions 22-25 below, this legislation can result in unacceptable involuntary denial of life-saving medical treatment through rationing. It also provides subsidies for private health plans that cover elective abortion and contains provisions that are likely to result in further expansions of abortion through administrative actions by various federal agencies.

**(21) Would you actively support repeal and replacement of the ACA ("ObamaCare")?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

*Regardless of your answer to question 21, please answer the following additional questions about the ACA as well.*

### ABORTION IN HEALTH INSURANCE

The ACA ("ObamaCare") established a new program to assist tens of millions of Americans to purchase private health insurance, including plans that cover elective abortions. The law also created a program under which a federal agency, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), administers

private plans that are offered across the nation, but fails to prohibit the agency from including in the program health plans that cover elective abortion.

**(22) Would you support legislation to revise ObamaCare to permanently prohibit federal premium subsidies from being spent on plans that cover elective abortions, prohibit federal agencies from administering plans that cover elective abortions, and prohibit federal mandates requiring private health plans to cover or provide access to abortions?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**(23) Would you oppose any new health care legislation intended to comprehensively revise or replace ObamaCare, unless it contains explicit language covering all provisions of the legislation, prohibiting federal subsidies for elective abortion and for insurance plans that cover abortion, and preventing federal pro-abortion regulatory mandates, on a permanent basis?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### RATIONING IN HEALTH CARE

ObamaCare, as well as proposals to create so-called Medicare for All, has made Americans increasingly concerned about denial of life-saving medical treatment for themselves or their family members resulting from its implementation.

**(24) As a general principle, do you agree with this statement?: "Federal law ought not to limit what private citizens can choose, out of their own funds, to spend on medical treatment to save the lives of their own family."** See generally [www.nrlc.org/medethics/healthcarerationing/](http://www.nrlc.org/medethics/healthcarerationing/)

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Single-payer health care, similar to what is being proposed in many of the Medicare for All proposals, would eliminate privately funded health plans, will lead to government price setting, and will lessen access to healthcare.

**(25) Would you oppose any Medicare for All plan that did not allow the option of private health insurance (both individual or employer sponsored) as an alternative?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DRUG PRICE-FIXING

Under current law, drug prices in both Medicare and the private market are negotiated by competing private insurers, not simply accepted at a level set by the drug companies. However, there are checks and balances on these negotiations by private parties that help prevent them from

driving prices so low as to result in rationing and harm to new drug development – checks and balances not present when the government steps in to set prices.

While we understand the goal of reducing drug costs for the Medicare program, we believe that government “negotiation,” which is in reality fixing of prices for covered drugs, will deter drug innovation and reduce access to lifesaving medication for patients. In 2019, the House voted on H.R. 3, the so-called “Lower Drug Costs Now Act”, which would prevent people from accessing current life-saving medication and deter new innovative medications from coming to market. H.R. 3 would effectively impose rationing of lifesaving drugs through drug price controls, not only in Medicare, but in the entire U.S. health market. Key portions of this legislation have been incorporated into other pieces of legislation in 2020 and 2021 but have not become law.

**(26) Would you vote against legislation that would impose government price-fixing or “negotiation” on prescription drugs in either Medicare or the private market?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Health insurers can be excluded from the state-based insurance exchanges whenever government officials think plans offered by the insurers inside or outside the exchange allow private citizens to choose to spend whatever the government officials, in their standardless discretion, think is an “excessive or unjustified” amount on their own health insurance.

**(27) Would you vote for legislation that would remove the authority of state-based insurance exchange officials to exclude health insurers from competing within the exchange on the basis of how much the insurers permit private citizens to choose to spend on health insurance?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### **ADVANCE CARE PLANNING**

In 2016, the Obama Administration directed that Medicare funds pay health care professionals to provide “advance care planning” to senior citizens in which they are asked if they want to execute advance directives that limit or reject the life-preserving health care they will be provided.

As documented in National Right to Life’s report, “The Bias Against Life-Preserving Treatment in Advance Care Planning,” available at <http://www.nrlc.org/uploads/advancecareplanning/advanceplanningbias2015.pdf>, in practice, advanced care planning typically uses unbalanced, distorted, and often inaccurate information in an acknowledged effort to “nudge” those subjected to it

to reduce health care spending on them by getting them to agree to forego life-preserving treatment and assisted feeding and fluids.

**(28) Would you support legislation to require the Department of Health and Human Services to take steps to assist beneficiaries to implement their own values and health care choices, rather than using unbalanced information and counseling that pressures them into agreeing to reject life-preserving treatment and assisted feeding?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### **ASSISTING SUICIDE**

Nine states and the District of Columbia have adopted laws affirmatively legalizing prescription of lethal drugs to assist suicide in certain cases.

**(29) Would you oppose the Federal legalization of assisting suicide through lethal prescription?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**(30) Would you support Federal law to strengthen policy against “assisting suicide,” including overturning the D.C. law?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### **POLITICAL SPEECH, GRASSROOTS ADVOCACY, and RIGHT TO PETITION**

Some members of Congress have pushed for enactment of legislation (such as the so-called “For the People Act,” H.R. 1, S. 2093 or the DISCLOSE Act, H.R. 1334, S. 2671 in the 117th Congress) that attempts to discourage donations to organizations (such as NRLC) that comment on the actions of elected federal officials, by requiring the publication of the identities of donors to such organizations. Such restrictions would harm organizations engaged in advocacy on contentious issues, including pro-life issues, because many businessmen and others would be deterred from supporting advocacy organizations for fear of harassment, abuse, or boycotts by people who do not share their political opinions.

**(31) Would you oppose enactment of any legislation that would curb the right of private citizens to support advocacy organizations without being “outed” by the government?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

In its January 2010 ruling in *Citizens United v. FEC*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution protects the right of corporations (which includes nonprofit corporations, such as NRLC) to spend money to express viewpoints regarding those who hold or seek political office. Subsequently, some members of Congress have advocated adoption of new restrictions to discourage corporations from exercising this right – for example, by telling corporations that if they engage in constitutionally protected speech on political matters, they will lose other rights.

**(32) Would you oppose any legislation that would penalize corporations, including nonprofit corporations such as NRLC, for engaging in the types of free speech that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled are protected by the First Amendment?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

The federal Lobbying Disclosure Act is a law that already requires organizations that lobby Congress to report, on a quarterly basis, all of the legislative matters on which they contacted members of Congress or Executive Branch agencies, but the law does not require the reporting of the names of specific lawmakers or officials with whom they communicated. In January 2010, President Obama urged Congress to adopt legislation under which every contact between lobbying organizations and lawmakers would be reported into a publicly accessible database. NRLC believes that such “contact reporting” is an infringement on the First Amendment right to petition government officials, is exceedingly burdensome, and serves no legitimate public policy purpose.

**(33) Would you oppose any legislation that would require members of Congress or Executive Branch officials to report, into a public database, contacts they receive from an advocacy organization such as NRLC, or that would require an advocacy organization such as NRLC to report its contacts with individual elected officials?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Under the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (McCain-Feingold), the Federal Election Commission promulgated new rules on defining what constitutes illegal “coordination” between candidates (including incumbent members of Congress and incumbent presidents) and citizen groups. The rules specifically do not require that there be “formal agreement or collaboration” with a member of Congress or other candidate in order for an expenditure by a citizen group or political action committee to be a “coordinated expenditure” and thus a campaign “contribution.”

Under the loose new definition of “coordination,” citizen groups and PACs that communicate with Congress on legislative matters and conduct independent expenditures are at risk of being unintentionally “coordinated,” thereby making their independent expenditures illegal campaign “contributions.”

**(34) Would you support regulatory reforms and/or new legislation to reestablish that “coordination” means only a formal agreement or collaboration on a specific project between a candidate and a citizen group or PAC?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

*PLEASE NOTE: The following question is for Senate candidates only:*

### **NOMINATIONS TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT**

The fundamental documents of American democracy and freedom, the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, have given us essential principles such as the “unalienable” right to life which must be respected by the courts.

**(35) Will you advocate for and support nominations to the U.S. Supreme Court of only well-qualified persons who will respect the sanctity of innocent human life, who will interpret the Constitution according to its text, and who will be willing to reconsider precedents inconsistent with the text of the Constitution?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

INITIAL 