



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®  
OF UTAH

## 2017 VOTERS GUIDE DISTRICT 3 US HOUSE

### **NAME**

**Jim Bennett**

### **PARTY**

**United Utah**

### **WEBSITE**

[jimbennettforcongress.com](http://jimbennettforcongress.com)

### *How would you dislodge the stalemate in Congress over healthcare?*

I'm in a unique position to break the stalemate, because I can serve as an honest broker between the two parties. Currently, there is too great a stigma for Republicans and Democrats to compromise on this issue, and both are sitting around waiting for the other side to fail. Since I will have no allegiance to either party, I can serve as the catalyst for a workable compromise.

The Affordable Care Act is likely to collapse under its own weight, but Republicans seem to forget that the pre-Obamacare status quo was unacceptable, too. I'm all for tearing down a bad law, but not until we've built something better in its place.

Real reform requires a practical approach that includes a mixture of catastrophic coverage and health savings accounts. Insurance should cover catastrophes, not maintenance. Car insurance will replace an engine and an auto body that are destroyed in a wreck, but it doesn't pay for gasoline and oil changes. Health insurance should follow the same model. In addition, tax incentives need to be shifted in order to separate medical benefits from the employer, and insurance companies need to be given the freedom to do business across state lines.

*Should current campaign finance laws be revised? Why or why not?*

Some should and some shouldn't. The federal campaign finance system has strict limits and disclosure requirements on candidates, and that part of the system functions reasonably well. Where the whole thing falls down is in the lack of transparency for independent organizations, notably 527s that can raise unlimited amounts of money with no disclosure requirements. This proved problematic here in Utah, where out-of-state attack ads dominated the media landscape during the Republican primary for the special election.

The Citizens United Supreme Court decision found that campaign spending is a form of free speech, which makes it impossible to limit the amount of money these groups can raise and spend. But Congress should require that these groups disclose where the money is coming from in order to hold these groups accountable.

There's nothing wrong with free speech and political advocacy, but transparency is essential in order to preserve confidence in the system. I would support revising campaign finance laws to require all participants in the political arena to be up front about their finances and their support.

*What can Congress do to ensure that all children, regardless of economic status, have access to quality education? What is the proper role of the federal government in education?*

Education is primarily a state issue, and Congress's role should primarily be one of support, not heavy-handed micromanagement. Laws like No Child Left Behind may be well-intentioned, but they inflict a one-size-fits-all approach that gets in the way of effective education.

Congress should instead provide supplemental education funding to help students in rural or otherwise impoverished areas where the local tax base isn't sufficient to fund neighborhood schools at the same level of more affluent neighborhoods. In addition, Utah has unique education needs because of our large under-18 population, and I favor additional federal funding to give those students the resources they need to succeed.

I also believe that money should come with no strings attached. Utah is much better equipped to create an educational system for Utah's schoolchildren than Washington DC is. I would support an increase in the amount of federal education funding for Utah schools, and I would do everything in my power to give Utah educators the freedom to determine how that money is spent.

*Tax reform will be brought before Congress. What are your priorities?*

The top priority for tax reform is simplification. The current complexity of the tax code is overwhelming for individuals and small businesses that spend far too much money hiring others to do taxes that they should easily be able to handle themselves. Consequently, income taxes should have fewer deductions, fewer loopholes, fewer brackets, and lower rates. That would increase economic activity and likely increase overall government revenue.

In addition, our corporate income tax is one of the highest in the industrialized world, and it encourages companies to relocate overseas. I would support lowering that rate to match the median corporate income tax rate across the globe. I would also support cutting the capital gains tax rate to spur greater investment.

*A draft report produced by 13 federal agencies calls the long-term evidence that global warming is being driven by human activities "unambiguous." What are the most effective ways to meet the challenges of climate change?*

I have no quarrel with that draft report. Yes, the climate is changing, and human activity is having a significant impact. The question we should be asking, then, is whether any of the solutions being proposed to fight climate change would actually accomplish anything. Because the sad answer to that is, more often than not, "no, they wouldn't."

Even if every nation were to fully abide by the principles of the Paris

Climate Accords, the agreement would have no discernible impact on the climate. EPA director Gina McCarthy appeared before the House Energy and Commerce Committee in 2016 and was forced to admit that the Obama administration's regulations to fight climate change would slow the rise of global temperatures by an immeasurably tiny 1/100 of a degree while raising energy prices by up to 30%.

That's bad policy.

It's not acceptable when the "solutions" being proposed to solve the problem act as a regressive tax on the poorest of the poor, who disproportionately shoulder higher energy costs. Instead, tax incentives for alternative energy and natural carbon sequestration practices ought to be on the agenda. Empty and economically devastating symbolism doesn't do anyone any good.

*How do you balance concerns about voting security against limiting the right to vote?*

I assume this question has reference to voter ID laws, which seem to be a solution in search of a problem. In order to affect an election by means of voters voting in behalf of other people, a would-be fraudster would have to mobilize large numbers of people to go the ballot box using fake names. Such efforts would be a logistical nightmare and would undoubtedly attract a great deal of attention. Despite wild accusations and urban legends, no such efforts have yet been discovered.

That's not to say fraud is not a concern, but only that if it happens, it happens after the voting is over. Stuffing a ballot box, either by hand or electronically, is not an activity that is in any way thwarted by voter ID laws. The best way to secure the integrity of an election is transparency and supervision of how votes are counted, not how they are cast.