

Jarrett Skorup
Research Associate
Mackinac Center for Public Policy
140 W. Main St., P.O. Box 568
Midland, MI 48640
Phone: [989-631-0900](tel:989-631-0900)
www.MichiganCapitolConfidential.com

Answers to survey questions submitted late by Peter Konetchy, Candidate for Michigan's 4th district in the U.S. House of Representatives.

1. Would you support gradually ending the deductibility of health insurance premiums by employers as part of a comprehensive health care reform that seeks to return market incentives to this sector?

I want to decrease the tax burden as much as possible for both employers and individuals. I would not support ending the deductibility of health insurance premiums by employers, but would insist that the corresponding deduction also be passed onto individuals who purchase their own policies. I will insist upon every tax cut possible resulting in the people keeping and reinvesting money they earn as they deem proper.

2. Would you support replacing current Medicaid with block grants to the states?

I do not support the concept of block grants from the federal government. Grants from Washington always have restrictions which effectively result in federal control over the operations of the states. The federal government collects an immense amount of money from the entities within the states, funds a huge bureaucracy, then doles whatever remains back to the states with strict conditions attached. Several congressmen have stated to me that upwards of 70% of what is collected by Washington for social programs, including Medicaid, ends up funding the federal bureaucracy with just 30% reaching the intended recipients.

I support having the state, instead of the federal government, collect whatever funds it deems necessary to provide healthcare to the poor within their jurisdiction, and then implement the desired programs as the state deems proper without associated federal regulation. The immense amount of money which won't be sent to Washington to fund the bureaucracy would be kept by those earning it and could be invested as they deemed proper, truly creating wealth, maintaining self sufficiently, and decreasing dependency on government.

3. Do you support reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank?

I do not support reauthorization of the Export-Import bank. As with any government entity, it is fraught with dysfunction, mismanagement, and crony-capitalistic, policies. According to the Heritage Foundation, 98% of all exports are financed privately, without need of this organization. The free market fills voids efficiently whereas the federal bureaucracy, when working outside of its authority, always results in waste, duplication, and fraud.

4. Do you support an 'all of the above' energy policy that continues subsidies and mandates for 'renewables' including wind, solar, electric cars, etc., or would you support ending these subsidies and mandates?

I support ending all energy subsidies and mandates for all 'renewables'. The people never delegated authority for development of renewable energy to the federal government, and unless an amendment is passed by the people authorizing such, the government is prohibited from either subsidizing or mandating the same. I support the private sector development, using private investment, of conventional energy such as oil, coal, gas, and nuclear, as well as renewable energy as the market demands. Therefore, if there is a venue with which renewable energy is attractive, such as on an island in Lake Michigan, then I support having the private sector best meet that need. Energy subsidies encourage waste, and mandates artificially drive up the cost of energy.

5. Do you bills like the Johnson-Crapo proposal that continue a major federal role in the home loan industry, or alternatives like the one proposed by Rep. Jeb Hensarling that would greatly reduce the federal government's role in mortgage lending?

I do not support the federal government having anything to do with the home loan industry, nor do I want the federal government to bail out banks which make poor decisions. The Community Investment Act is a prime example of federal interference in the home mortgage market which had disastrous consequences resulting in the 2008 collapse of the housing market. As it had always been, banks should be able to evaluate worthiness of the borrower and offer a loan accordingly. I do not support the Johnson-Crapo proposal, and would support moving the responsibility for home loans away from government as is the direction of the Hensarling alternative.

6. Do you support ending all ethanol subsidies and mandates, or would you vote to leave these in place with or without modification?

I support ending all ethanol subsidies. The people never delegated responsibility for energy development to Washington, and therefore, according to numerous provisions within the Constitution, topped off by the 10th amendment, the federal government is prohibited from funding this program. Unless an amendment is passed by the people authorizing the federal government to address energy development, Washington cannot do so. The responsibility for ethanol development falls to the people, to be addressed by the free market — free of federal interference.