Jewish News has been publishing Voter’s Guide articles about the 2014 campaign since the Sept. 12 issue. Each article poses questions to the candidates for state or federal office that we believe are of interest to our readers. We collect them here in a handy format for last-minute reference.

**Election Day is Tuesday, Nov. 4.**

More information is available at the Arizona secretary of state’s website: azsos.gov.

- U.S. House candidates offer timelines for lifting Iran sanctions (Oct. 31)
- U.S. House candidates define bottom line for Iran nuclear pact (Oct. 24)
- “U.S. House hopefuls offer ideas on boosting the economy” (Oct. 17)
- “U.S. House hopefuls discuss military aid to Israel, immigration” (Oct. 10)
- “Congressional candidates discuss foreign aid to the P.A.” (Oct. 3)
- “Candidates for state’s top offices answer questions” (Oct. 3)
- “Legislative candidates talk about border security” (Sept. 26)
- “Secretary of state hopefuls talk about elections” (Sept. 19)
- “Legislative hopefuls talk about tuition tax credits for private schools” (Sept. 17, online only)
- “Legislative hopefuls talk about investing in Israel” (Sept. 12)
U.S. House candidates offer timelines for lifting Iran sanctions

This week's question is:

**If an agreement limiting Iran's nuclear program is reached, over what period should the various sanctions be lifted?**

- **CD 1**
  
  **Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D):** I will only ever agree to lift sanctions when Iran proves conclusively that they are using nuclear power peacefully. Their government must be fully transparent in any future process, because the stakes are too high, and I will not risk the future of our country or the region over hollow promises.

  **Andy Tobin (R):** The sanctions should only be lifted if Iran ends their support of terrorist organizations throughout the Middle East, recognizes Israel's right to exist, cooperates fully with United Nations and IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] weapons inspectors and ends its nuclear program altogether. Those demands need to be met first before we begin to talk about rolling back sanctions.

- **CD 4**
  
  **Rep. Paul Gosar (R):** When the Iranian regime agrees to drop its nuclear ambitions, voluntarily or involuntarily, sanctions can be lifted. Alternatively, if the Iranians ever agree to let Israel live in peaceful coexistence and recognize and respect its sovereignty then nuclear energy could be discussed. Until then, Iran should not have such technology and sanctions should remain and other more severe alternatives considered.

- **CD 5**
  
  **Rep. Matt Salmon (R):** When the administration entered into these negotiations with Iran, they proactively lifted a portion of the sanctions that had successfully brought Iran to the table in the first place. Unfortunately, in my view, far from encouraging the Iranian regime to negotiate terms favorable to global and regional security, our negotiating position was weakened and Iran was only emboldened to demand an increase in their nuclear enrichment capabilities. As a result, I will not support one more sanction being lifted or mitigated until Iran has completely and verifiably dismantled their nuclear capabilities.

  **James Woods (D):** Historically, sanctions have a miserable record of achieving policy aims – and from a humanitarian perspective, they remain one of the least ethical approaches due to the disproportionate harm they cause to vulnerable people. I do not support continued sanctions against Iran.

- **CD 6**

  **Rep. David Schweikert (R):** We must be very careful in rolling back any of the sanctions placed on Iran. The only reason that Iran has come to the table is out of desperation, illustrating that our sanctions are working. Iran has consistently deceived the international community regarding their nuclear programs and its military dimensions. New secret facilities built deep inside of mountains have been brought to light in recent years, and still much of their nuclear program might be unknown. The Iranians often refuse to cooperate with requests from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to provide comprehensive information, especially regarding military activities. As long as leaders in Tehran continue to deceive the international community, no sanctions should be lifted.

  **John Williamson (D):** The sanctions should be lifted over a period of five years, as it becomes clear, through empirical verification, that the agreement is being followed. There is very little, if any, room for trust in this agreement; the terms of the agreement must be subject to empirical scrutiny at any time.

- **CD 7**

  **Ruben Gallego (D):** We’ve seen from past examples that the best way to bring Western reforms is to build economic and cultural ties. Iran has committed egregious violations in the past, but the only way to move forward – after reaching terms on an acceptable nuclear deal – is to open trade relations. We may also need to continue to work with Iran in order to defeat the Islamic State and address other security concerns.

- **CD 9**

  **Rep. Kyrsten Sinema (D):** In July of 2013, I voted for strong sanctions against Iran. This pressure brought Iran to the table and, for the first time, we have the chance to end this threat to the world. Effective sanctions regimes are difficult to establish and should not be lifted without achieving their goals. If sanctions are lifted, it should occur along an agreed-upon timeline that verifies Iranian compliance, builds trust and demonstrates Iran’s commitment to nonproliferation.

  **Wendy Rogers (R):** We should only lift sanctions once Iran’s entire nuclear program has been dismantled. Lifting sanctions before the goal is completed would only be seen as a sign of weakness. For an instructive example of what not to do, I look at how we have dealt with North Korea – every time we ease sanctions, the regime lashes out at the first opportunity. The same will happen with Iran if we do not remain firm.
U.S. House candidates define bottom line for Iran nuclear pact

This week’s question is:

In your opinion, what terms would be acceptable for an agreement with Iran on limiting its nuclear program?

• CD 1

**Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D):** I have been clear in my belief that a nuclear Iran would be a threat to the United States, Israel, the entire Middle East and the world. That's why I have also often stated that any agreement must ensure that Iran does not have nuclear arms capability. I understand their desire for a reliable power source, but given Iran’s history of violations I am skeptical that they will adhere fully to an agreement and I remain prepared to support stronger sanctions.

**Andy Tobin (R):** The only acceptable agreement on Iran’s nuclear program is stopping their nuclear program altogether. We cannot trust the Iranians when they say that they only desire nuclear technology for peaceful, civilian purposes – not when they continue to threaten Israel and export terrorism throughout the Middle East.

• CD 4

**Rep. Paul Gosar (R):** Iran is an irresponsible and rogue nation that cannot be trusted with any nuclear weapons. Accordingly, the only acceptable agreement is its agreement to drop the pursuit of nuclear technology entirely.

• CD 5

**Rep. Matt Salmon (R):** The only acceptable agreement will ensure that Iran has permanently given up their ambitions to a nuclear weapon. As a result, the U.S. must stand firm and require that Iran does not maintain uranium enrichment capabilities going forward. Failure to do so will guarantee that Iran is a threat to regional and global stability.

**James Woods (D):** The goal of stability and prosperity in the Middle East cannot be achieved without a peaceful and cooperative relationship with Iran. The U.S. has unique culpability in the current state of affairs because of wrongheaded foreign policy regarding Iran over the last several decades. A successful nuclear nonproliferation approach would need to include full transparency on the part of Iran – but the U.S. has shaky credibility as a moral leader on nonproliferation. The U.S. and our allies must take bold leadership ourselves toward achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. Further, support for and collaboration in Iran’s scientific and technological progress might put us on better footing for negotiations.

• CD 6

**Rep. David Schweikert (R):** Any agreement that does not entirely dismantle the military dimensions of Iran’s nuclear program is not acceptable. A credible agreement is one which ensures that Iran is not left with a path towards a nuclear weapon. Further, Iran must finally be fully transparent and cooperate with a rigorous nuclear inspection regime. No Iranian facilities or aspects of their nuclear program can be off limits from inspectors.

**John Williamson (D):** The terms would be that the nuclear power sites must be open for inspection on a monthly basis and that inspectors would be able to go anywhere on the site. Of course, any nuclear development must be for peaceful purposes only. The monthly inspections would continue indefinitely and only be subject to change after the agreement is renegotiated. The terms of the agreement must be subject to empirical verification at any time.

• CD 7

**Ruben Gallego (D):** Given Iran’s past actions, acceptable terms for an agreement limiting Iran’s nuclear power must include international monitors. These monitors will need to be granted full access to Iranian nuclear facilities to ensure Iran is holding up its end of the deal. Anything less than that is a nonstarter.

• CD 9

**Rep. Kyrsten Sinema (D):** A nuclear Iran is one of the most significant threats to global stability and security. Iran should not be allowed to obtain or develop the capacity to create a nuclear weapon. An agreement must prevent Iran from developing the capability to rapidly develop nuclear arms, and must allow for continuous monitoring and verification of Iranian compliance. We must also be ready to immediately impose stronger sanctions if Iran fails to meet its obligations or negotiations fail to produce an acceptable agreement.

**Wendy Rogers (R):** The only acceptable agreement is for Iran to agree to give up its nuclear program in its entirety. Iran’s government can keep claiming that they are pursuing peaceful nuclear technology, but to believe that is naive. The Iranian government’s past actions prove that weaponization is at the top of their agenda and, even without centrifuges to refine it, the nuclear waste produced by an allegedly “peaceful” reactor can be made into a dangerous weapon.
U.S. House hopefuls offer ideas on boosting the economy

This week’s question is:
Are there any steps left untaken that could help the American economy grow more robustly than it has in the past five years?

CD 1

Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D): My vision for this district and for Arizona is that of a stable, diversified economy. Arizona’s Congressional District One is large and mostly rural, where investments in infrastructure, education and small business drive the economy. That’s why it is so crucial that we keep working to create a business-friendly environment that creates jobs. And by investing in good roads, stronger schools, broadband capabilities and reliable water and energy supplies, we empower our residents and communities to build the foundation for a stronger future.

Andy Tobin (R): We face a real challenge here in Arizona from the Obama administration’s EPA, which has created and enforced regulations on our energy and mining industries that have killed jobs and will result in further job losses. Just two weeks ago, my opponent voted against a bill that would have stripped the EPA of their ability to levy job-killing regulations against coal-powered generating stations — like the Cholla and Navajo generating stations, which have both been forced to shut down a generator due to EPA regulations. Reducing the tax burden on working families and cutting regulations for small businesses are two things that I will fight for in Washington.

CD 4

Rep. Paul Gosar (R): Yes! Tax reform, with a flatter, fairer tax, would bring tax certainty and greater business investment. We need to lower our corporate tax rates. We are not competitive globally. It is no mystery why American companies have gone overseas. When our tax policies force them to take such action it is time to reform these punitive tax policies. We need lower taxes in general so people can keep more of their own money. They will then invest in businesses or in consumption and help the economy directly. We also need to repeal and reduce the stranglehold of bureaucratic regulations. The EPA, the IRS and many other agencies are attacking American businesses directly and indirectly with regulations. The last five years demonstrates this clearly, with little to no growth, high unemployment, stagflation and a morose economy. In short, the policies of big deficit spending, big taxes and high unemployment have failed – again – as they did under Jimmy Carter and everyone else who tried this.

Mikel Weissner (D): The legalization of cannabis and dismantling the prison industrial complex.

CD 5

Rep. Matt Salmon (R): There remains much that Congress can still do to help the U.S. economy grow and create jobs. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, small employers face a regulatory burden in excess of $35,000 a year. There is no question that over-regulation is a drag on our economy, and we can do more to release the innovation and productivity of our job creators by streamlining regulations and lifting that burden that is taking both time and money away from true economic activity. In addition, we need to address our tax code. Conservative estimates suggest that U.S. companies have over $2 trillion in foreign profits held overseas, yet because the U.S. has the highest tax bracket in the world, these companies are investing their profits in foreign markets rather than bringing them home to create jobs and grow the U.S. economy. We need to reform the tax code and make the U.S. economy competitive and should incentivize U.S. companies to bring their profits home to create U.S. jobs. And finally, we need a U.S. energy renaissance that promotes an all-the-above energy strategy that makes the U.S. energy-independent. We have the resources and the technology, now we need to get government out of the way so production can take place.

CD 6

Rep. David Schweikert (R): We must unleash the American energy industry. The federal government has done everything it can to slow down the energy boom. Fortunately, the revolution in hydraulic fracturing on private land has essentially carried our limping economy over the last several years. We must also realize that the economy is currently going through a paradigm shift. Modern communication technology has put the keys of commerce into everyday Americans’ hands. Washington must resist the temptation to boost incumbent companies through regulation, and allow this modern economy to thrive.
**John Williamson (D):** I think it is important for a minimum-wage law to be passed that would give all workers a wage of at least $10.10 per hour. I believe, along with John Maynard Keynes, that spending is a key to economic health and vitality. We cannot rely on the wealthy to spend, as this cannot be depended upon. We must let those in the middle and working class have the opportunity to earn more so that they can spend more. Also, we must continue to promote the full implementation of the Affordable Care Act. This government-facilitated program stimulates private capital growth in the state insurance exchanges, where private insurance companies may compete and sell their products. Those who manage their companies best will be the winners as well as the American people who will continue now with Obamacare to have lower health insurance premiums than ever before.

**Rep. Trent Franks (R):** This administration has done for spending and bloated government bureaucracy what Stonehenge did for rocks. One could almost develop a platform for economic growth by simply doing the opposite of what Mr. Obama has done at every turn. As the number one National Taxpayer Union rated spending cutter in Congress, I obviously believe we must get our spending under control. I support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and believe we must simplify our tax code. And the secret to kick-starting our economy is encouraging individual and business enterprises, not overburdening them.

**Rep. Kyrsten Sinema (D):** Before I even took office, I released a 12-point jobs plan and I am working on implementing those policies for Arizona families. I have also visited over 30 businesses in our district – learning firsthand about the challenges small and large businesses face and hearing directly from employees. My Kyrsten Means Business program has given me new insight into the economic development and regulatory changes Arizona businesses need. I know that many families are still hurting. I am working every day to help them get ahead by helping local businesses succeed, ensuring college remains affordable, and protecting Medicare and Social Security.

**Wendy Rogers (R):** President Obama has stifled job creation. Kyrsten Sinema has affirmed everything President Obama has promulgated. This current administration embraces an ever-increasing role for government, which has resulted in over-regulation and over-taxation. Big government has never been the right answer. We must get government out of the way of job creators. By cutting red tape to lowering our tax rate (which is among the highest in the world), we can revitalize our economy to enable American innovators once again to lead the way. We still have a strong workforce and abundant natural resources. We have been the global economic leader for decades. By reducing government interference, we can remain the most vibrant, vital economy in the world.
U.S. House hopefuls discuss military aid to Israel, immigration

We have two questions for the candidates this week.

The first is:

Are you in favor of increasing military cooperation with Israel as well as increased military aid, and why?

- CD 1

**Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D):** Yes. I support a strong partnership between our two countries and Israel’s right to defend itself. That’s why I sponsored the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013, which would strengthen our relationship in defense, cyber-security and energy, among other issues. Ensuring Israel’s safety and security is about defense as well as about developing a thriving and innovative economy.

**Andy Tobin (R):** I strongly favor increased cooperation and military aid to the nation of Israel. As our strongest ally and one of the few democracies in the Middle East, we are obligated to help ensure their safety and security against terror organizations like Hamas and against Iran. I was pleased to see joint military exercises between the United States and Israeli militaries and I would encourage further cooperation and training between the two nations.

- CD 4

**Rep. Paul Gosar (R):** If the security of Israel requires an increase in military cooperation, then I will support that. Israel is on the front line in the war against Islamic terrorism and if it needs more assistance, I will support such a request.

**Mikel Weiss (D):** I oppose any increase in military aid to any country on religious grounds.

- CD 5

**Rep. Matt Salmon (R):** Yes, I support increased military cooperation with and aid to Israel. Israel is our closest and most faithful ally in the region. As security throughout the region becomes more and more compromised, it is critical that Israel has the means to defend itself from the hostile regimes that make no secret of their goal to eliminate the Jewish state. As we take on the fight to confront, degrade and eliminate the terrorist organization ISIS, it is more important than ever that Israel remain vigilant to their security and that they are assured of the continued peaceful existence.

**James Woods (D):** Implicit in discussions about military aid is the assumption that militarized, violent intervention has greater efficacy than nonviolent intervention. The history of volatile regions simply does not support that assumption. Vulnerable regions, and more importantly, vulnerable people, are not helped by the perpetual destabilization caused by escalating militarization. A progressive foreign aid platform must include stopping funds and weapons to violently engaged parties.

- CD 6

**Rep. David Schweikert (R):** I believe it is absolutely critical that the United States stands with Israel, economically and militarily. As our strongest ally in the region, Israel is a nation with whom we share a common set of values. Israel has stood as a symbol of freedom in a region plagued by violence and dictatorships. Any perceived division between the United States and Israel will only embolden radical elements throughout the Middle East and threaten Israeli and American security.

**John Williamson (D):** I’m in favor of supporting military cooperation with Israel to a reasonable extent. That is, I support helping Israel to secure its borders and keep its civilian population safe in the same way I would support the same thing for the Palestinians.

- CD 8

**Rep. Trent Franks (R):** As chairman of the Israel Allies Caucus in Congress, I truly believe that Israel is the best friend America has in the world. Recognizing that the world is safer when Israel is safe and strong, I have led initiatives in Congress to successfully increase funding to Israel’s general military aid, especially its impressive and necessary missile defense systems.

- CD 9

**Rep. Kyrsten Sinema (D):** Yes, I support full collaboration between the United States and Israel on all matters of national security and military intelligence. I also support increased military aid for programs such as the Iron Dome, which saved countless Israeli lives during the conflict this summer.

**Wendy Rogers (R):** Israel is one of our nation’s most important allies. the United States should make every effort to increase military cooperation and military aid. Israel is surrounded by countries that make war upon it. America must do everything it can to defend the Israeli people.

Our second question to the candidates is:

What elements would an immigration reform bill need to contain in order for it to get your vote?

- CD 1

**Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D):** I fully support the comprehensive immigration reform bill passed by the U.S. Senate, led by Arizona Sens. John McCain and Jeff Flake. This legislation provides the resources to secure the border and to overhaul our broken immigration system. It’s inexcusable – and downright pathetic – that House leaders are stonewalling...
on an issue so important to Arizona and our nation. The House needs to vote on reform – now.

**Andy Tobin (R):** Immigration reform must begin with securing our border. We cannot begin to debate other aspects of immigration reform until we know the border is secure. Then, we can talk about more comprehensive steps to reforming our system. I believe the most recent immigration reform bill would have received broader support if citizenship was not part of the package – this means the Senate and House must work closer together to ensure a bill is passed that addresses the concerns of both parties.

- **CD 4**

**Rep. Paul Gosar (R):** Above all, we have to secure the border. This is not a difficult concept. The administration simply lacks the will to strengthen border security. I see no reason to address illegal aliens today, if millions more will flood across our border unhindered tomorrow, next week or next year. The problem is an open border. We have the money and technology to stop the border influx. We have drug cartels, sex traffickers and terrorists who can and have crossed over. This is a national security risk. It is also fundamentally unfair and immoral to grant amnesty and access to people from Central America simply because of their geographic proximity when there are millions of people in Africa, Asia, Europe and elsewhere who want to immigrate and will do so lawfully. Cheating and breaking the law should not be rewarded with the gift of citizenship.

**Mikel Weisser (D):** I would need to see preparations for immigrant processing at borders and an outreach program for resident immigrants to enroll them in the system. I want to see a streamlining of the process to the point professionals aren’t caught in the system for decades and the refugee class has access to immigrating into America.

- **CD 5**

**Rep. Matt Salmon (R):** Our immigration system is broken. Every year, hundreds of thousands of people stream illegally across our borders and into our communities, compromising our security and our nation’s inherent right to determine who and what enters our country. Meanwhile, those seeking visas must go through a long, opaque and uncertain process to lawfully enter the country. The system needs to be fixed. I support the following principles for immigration reform: First, before any other steps are taken, we must secure our borders and implement increased interior enforcement measures including mandatory E-verify, which will also give employers certainty in the hiring process; second, we must create a robust guest-worker program that does not provide a special path to citizenship, but does allow those who want to fill a job, for which there is not a willing American, the means to do so lawfully; and third, we need to streamline, clarify and enforce the law. I do, however, support many of the common-sense solutions that have come out of the House Judiciary Committee. As someone who is married to an immigrant, I realize all too well that we are a nation of immigrants. We need to streamline, clarify and enforce an American immigration policy to encourage legal immigration while halting illegal immigration.

- **CD 6**

**Rep. David Schweikert (R):** Any immigration bill must first and foremost secure the border and strictly enforce our interior laws. Without stemming the flow of illegal immigration and addressing the factors drawing illegal immigrants to America, we will not solve the illegal immigration problem.

**John Williamson (D):** An immigration reform bill would need to be like Senate Bill 744, which passed the U.S. Senate but never got to the floor – because of members of Congress like David Schweikert – of the House. It should have a pathway to citizenship and allow undocumented workers to obtain provisional status as guest workers while, if they wish, pursuing employment with a view, possibly, to becoming citizens. I favor the Dream Act. I favor allowing Dreamers to obtain driver’s licenses in our state.

- **CD 8**

**Rep. Trent Franks (R):** I don’t support so-called comprehensive immigration reform and believe the Senate’s proposed bill is a nonstarter. Our solution to the immigration issue cannot be to encourage and reward breaking the law. I do, however, support many of the common-sense solutions that have come out of the House Judiciary Committee. As someone who is married to an immigrant, I realize all too well that we are a nation of immigrants. We need to streamline, clarify and enforce an American immigration policy to encourage legal immigration while halting illegal immigration.

- **CD 9**

**Rep. Kyrsten Sinema (D):** Our current immigration system is broken. That’s why I support comprehensive immigration reform that secures our border, settles the status of the millions of immigrants currently living in the shadows, and expands and grows our economy for the future. I also support several bipartisan measures that invest in smart border security technology, account for increased needs for highly skilled worker visas, and account for future flow. It is time for Congress to have an open debate on these critical issues facing our country.

**Wendy Rogers (R):** Border security is absolutely paramount. It must be our Number One priority of any immigration reform bill. Without securing our porous borders, we would be sending the wrong message by adopting any other changes to the immigration system.
Congressional candidates discuss foreign aid to the P.A.

This week’s question is:
Should foreign aid continue to go to the Palestinian Authority, and why?

• CD 1

Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D): First and foremost, we must keep Israel safe, secure and strong. We must recognize that during the recent conflict, it was Israel that provided humanitarian and health-care assistance to Palestinians in need. I am disappointed that the media did not recognize this. In the past, foreign aid was diverted from its intended purposes and was instead used to build tunnels and provide assistance to terrorist activities. Future aid must be tied to strict accountability standards to make sure this aid is spent only on humanitarian needs. There must be a system put in place to monitor the spending and to cease funding if any funds are spent on terrorist activities.

Andy Tobin (R): I do not believe we should be sending foreign aid to anyone who takes it and instead of helping their citizens, puts it into secret tunnels and weapons used to kill innocent civilians. We saw in the most recent actions in the Gaza Strip where hundreds of millions of dollars’ worth of aid had gone — building an infrastructure that protects and abets Hamas and other terrorist organizations. U.S. tax dollars should not be subsidizing terrorist activity.

• CD 4

Rep. Paul Gosar (R): The Palestinian Authority is not a legitimate or good-faith partner in peace. American taxpayer money in the form of foreign aid should not go to any government, NGO or similar organization that does not recognize Israel’s right to exist. I am the author of the FAULT Act, the Foreign Assistance Under Limitation and Transparency Act. This legislation is intended to limit foreign aid to five countries that undermine U.S. foreign policy objectives: Iran, North Korea, Syria, Egypt and Pakistan. In addition, starting in 2011, I successfully passed budget amendments that prohibit foreign aid to the Palestinian Authority and the Muslim Brotherhood or any organization of which they were a part. My comments proved prescient later when the brotherhood took over Egypt briefly during the so-called Arab Spring, which has proven a disaster for the West and the Middle East now.

The bottom line for me: If an organization cannot respect the rule of law and Israel’s essential right to exist peacefully, then we should not send one dime in aid. I believe the money we have sent to the P.A. has been a colossal waste of money and likely caused real harm to Israel, in that every dollar the P.A. gets from American taxpayers is a dollar it can use for tunnels, weapons, hate-filled propaganda and payment to proxies.

Mikel Weisser (D): While I believe that there is a need for humanitarian support in a war-torn area such as Gaza, there is obviously abuse going on in Gaza with the commingling of combatants and civilians.

• CD 5

Rep. Matt Salmon (R): As long as the Palestinian Authority (P.A.) is in partnership with Hamas as part of the Palestinian unity government, I will not support additional funding to the P.A. U.S. taxpayer funds should not go to support terrorism and as such, until the Palestinian Authority rejects the terrorist organization of Hamas, no U.S. aid should be made available to them.

James Woods (D): Foreign aid is one of the most promising tools for stabilizing volatile regions and enhancing the quality of life for vulnerable groups of people. However, our current models of aid are too susceptible to corruption and waste. We can and must re-examine how to most efficiently and ethically support people who suffer in perpetually unstable areas of the world.

• CD 6

Rep. David Schweikert (R): The formation of a unity government between the Palestinian Authority and Hamas is very troubling and a setback for the peace process. The unity government will allow Hamas, a designated terrorist organization which has not accepted the Quartet principles, to actively participate in the P.A. government. This is very troubling and needs very close scrutiny by the administration and Congress. The United States should conduct a thorough review of continued U.S. assistance to ensure that U.S. law, which prohibits funds to a Palestinian government in which Hamas participates or has undue influence, is completely followed and implemented.

John Williamson (D): To try to look at the Palestinian/Israeli conflict objectively, I would ask this: What is in the best interest of the children and families of the Palestinians and the Israelis? Certainly not more military conflict. There should be a lessening of what I see as the choke hold Israel has put on travel and trade for Palestinians. An international inspection team, including both Israelis and Palestinians should be created and dispatched to the Gaza Strip, for example. This international team would see to it that no more tunnels are built in Gaza, nor more missiles embedded in the civilian population. In return, Benjamin Netanyahu’s government in Israel must allow the establishment of a Palestinian state forthwith. This will defuse the Palestinian extremists who will no longer have a reason to hate Israel and therefore attack Israeli territory. This will create a situation where the two countries can wage peace against each other and not war. If foreign aid to the Palestinian Authority is used to create the international inspection team and fund its activities; if such aid is used to rebuild schools and promote education; if such aid is used to rebuild hospitals that were destroyed in war activities; then, yes, I support aid to the Palestinian Authority.
• CD 8

**Rep. Trent Franks (R):** I have supported legislation in favor of cutting all funding to the Palestinian Authority, which openly courts terrorist groups. The P.A. is a failed experiment that can never work so long as it continues to sabotage Israel's good-faith efforts to secure peace.

• CD 9

**Rep. Kyrsten Sinema (D):** I oppose any U.S. taxpayer dollars going, directly or indirectly, to terrorist organizations like Hamas, and I have serious concerns about providing aid to the Palestinian Authority because of Hamas’ position in a unity government. On Jan. 15, 2014, I voted for the Fiscal Year 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act, which places strict restrictions on funds to the Palestinian Authority and requires the U.S. administration to certify that funds go to peaceful purposes that are in America’s national interest. On June 19 and 20 of 2014, I supported two amendments to the Fiscal Year 2015 Defense Appropriations Act, which prohibit the transfer of weapons to the Palestinian Authority and prevent funds from being used to support a foreign terrorist organization like Hamas.

**Wendy Rogers (R):** Absolutely no foreign aid should continue to the Palestinian Authority, which continuously makes war on Israel and demands Israel to cede territory. Yet nations around the world continue to fund the Palestinian Authority under the euphemism of “humanitarian aid,” which really just props up a terrorist government. This is wrong. I will work to stop the flow of foreign aid to the Palestinian Authority until it follows through on meaningful peace talks with Israel.
Candidates for state’s top offices answer questions

Jewish News sent out questionnaires to major party candidates for four of the five top offices in Arizona after the outcome of the Aug. 26 primary election became clear. The treasurer’s race was apparently decided by the primary, so we reached out to the candidates for governor, secretary of state, attorney general and superintendent of public instruction.

**Governor**

**Question: Should Arizona strengthen its business connections and trade with Israel? If so, how would you promote that goal?**

**Fred DuVal (D):** As Arizona’s next governor, I would work to improve our trade relationship with Israel. Our neighbors to the east in New Mexico have set an excellent template to follow. New Mexico was able to capitalize on trade with Israel, exporting nearly $1.3 billion in 2012. We can replicate the New Mexico-Israel business exchange, connecting Israeli businesses to companies in Arizona, align our trade relationship along shared economic interests and strengths, and we can send trade missions to Israel.

**Doug Ducey (R):** Absolutely I want to strengthen Arizona’s relationship with Israel. With the similarities in the economy — technology, defense and aerospace, and energy — there is a clear nexus for strengthening business connections and trade with Israel. We should be looking for ways to improve our relationship on economic, educational and cultural levels. As governor, I would look for increased opportunities to work with business, academic, and tourism leaders to find ways to strengthen our relationship.

**Q: What are the steps we should pursue to improve the performance of public education in Arizona and how should we measure that performance?**

**DuVal:** For years we have made it known that education is not Arizona’s top priority. When times got tough and the economy took a hit, education bore the brunt of damaging cuts. As governor, I will stop the cuts to our children’s schools – not another dollar; not another dime. My opponent supports the cuts and wants to delay reinvestment in our children’s schools with endless appeals. Education needs to be our number one priority if we are going to compete in the 21st-century economy.

**Ducey:** Improving our K-12 education system is one of the themes that animate my campaign. I want to invest in what we know works — third grade reading requirements, dollars in the classroom supporting our teachers, and eliminating the wait lists at our highest performing schools. Measurable outcomes are incredibly important for improving our schools, which is why I want to invest in what we know is working and bring all schools to that level.

**Q: What strategy would you pursue to secure the border with Mexico?**

**DuVal:** Washington’s failure to address our broken immigration system hurts families, our economy, and costs Arizona money. In the absence of a comprehensive solution, there are steps that we can take as a state to secure our border. As governor, I will crack down on drug cartels and organized crime, enforce our employer sanctions law so it’s not just a photo op for Joe Arpaio, launch binational enforcement efforts, and demand that the federal government solve our border security problem.

**Ducey:** The federal government has failed us on its duty to protect its citizens. Immigration policy is a responsibility and duty of the federal government, but a governor — especially a border governor — has the responsibility to protect their citizens, including border security. I also want to focus on maximizing and improving our trade relationship with Mexico. I believe that better infrastructure at our ports will help to better facilitate commerce, while also helping with security.
**Attorney General**

**Question:** If there were a surge in hate crimes here, what tools would you use to respond to the situation?

**Felecia Rotellini (D):** As Arizona’s top law enforcement officer, I will work diligently with local, county, state and federal agencies to protect our citizens from hate crimes. I will establish a culture of collaboration, cooperation and communication between law enforcement agencies to address these crimes. It is also imperative that victims of crime be informed throughout the criminal process.

**Q: What strategy would you pursue to secure the border with Mexico?**

**Rotellini:** Border security is a top priority. In dealing with specific law-enforcement issues, I will focus on prosecuting criminal syndicates, drug cartels, human smugglers and money-laundering activities. As attorney general, I will work with my counterparts in other states and our state’s congressional delegation to press for a sensible solution to the immigration problem. The status quo is not acceptable.

---

**Superintendent of Public Instruction**

**Question:** What steps can this office take to ensure the separation of church and state in public education?

**David García (D):** I respect and will uphold the separation between church and state. Unlike my opponent, I will focus on academics, not ideology. My number one goal and responsibility will be strengthening and improving our public schools, and I will be a strong advocate, both in the community and at the Legislature, for policies that forward this goal.

**Q: What are the steps we should pursue to improve the performance of public education in Arizona and how should we measure that performance?**

**Garcia:** The state superintendent should ensure all students, regardless of background or ZIP code, are offered an exceptional education that prepares them for the demands of college and career. Currently, 96 percent of a school’s letter grade is based on standardized test score results. Instead, we should measure real world indicators of success, such as completing a rigorous high school curriculum, Advanced Placement courses, career and technical education certifications, and academic proficiency in multiple world languages.
Legislative candidates talk about border security

Jewish News sent out questionnaires to 43 candidates in nine Legislative Districts for seats in the Arizona House of Representatives and Senate after the dust of the Aug. 26 primary election cleared. Each district elects one senator and two representatives to the State Legislature.

We begin with the responses from the House race in LD 28 and proceed in descending numeral order.

This week’s question is:

What measures should the state take to enhance border security, and why?

House races

• LD 28

Eric Meyer (D): I have worked with our congressional delegation to implement change along Arizona’s border. At the state level, I have supported legislation that attacked human smugglers, drug and gun traffickers and criminal cartels. Ultimately, the federal government and Congress have the responsibility to secure our borders. We need a comprehensive solution that secures the border and allows needed workers into the country.

Shawnna Bolick (R): Border security is primarily a federal responsibility, and I would work with our congressional delegation to ensure stronger border security, particularly to halt the drug cartels and human smugglers that harm people on both sides of the border. I would consider all of the options the state has at its disposal to strengthen that effort.

Kate Brophy McGee (R): The current administration has made a secure border a top priority. It is imperative that this continue with the new administration and that the incoming governor and Legislature work with our congressional delegation to immediately and effectively secure our borders. With a secure border, long-term solutions to reform our broken immigration system can be determined and put in place and we can focus on developing profitable trade relationships with our neighbors to the south.

• LD 22

Bonnie Boyce-Wilson (D): As a border state, Arizona is significantly impacted by border security. The state should comply with existing laws such as eVerify and cooperate with the federal government efforts to secure the border. Arizona residents should demand that our national leaders and our congressional representatives deal immediately with immigration reform.

• LD 21

Esther Durán Lumm (D): The State of Arizona has already taken extreme measures to enhance border security: the fence (which doesn’t work, they just dig tunnels under it), the addition of Border Patrol (which has sadly resulted in dishonest and mean-spirited agents raping and beating many of the migrants). If any more money is spent on securing the border, it should be to install more technology that aids in detecting the illegal crossings, and on training of the agents on how to treat the migrants humanely when they are caught and detained for deportation.

• LD 18

Mitzi Epstein (D): We must crack down on organized crime, drug cartels and human traffickers. Public safety is a paramount issue. Sweeping funding away from cities is dangerous. I support local control so that our cities can keep our neighborhoods safe.

Jill Norgaard (R): Technological advances such as underground cabling, physical barriers such as a fence, which statistically has been proven to be effective in western Arizona, and drones that can fly over the border and track movement. Why? We must secure our borders in order to protect our state from individuals entering illegally with criminal intent. Arizonans send a large number of dollars to the federal government to do this job and, sadly, this effort has been ineffective. I will work to not abdicate local responsibility and defend Arizonans’ safety.

• LD 17

Jeff Weninger (R): A fence is the most important thing needed to secure the border. Beyond that, more technology and more border control agents will be essential.

• LD 16

Kate Brophy McGee (R): What should the federal government do to enhance border security?

Senate races

• LD 28

Kelli Butler (D): Ensuring the security of the United States border is the job of the federal government. Arizona should work in cooperation with federal government agencies to enhance our state’s and our nation’s border security.

• LD 23

Paula Pennypacker (D): The Supreme Court has made it clear that responsibility for border security belongs to the federal government and has greatly restricted what states can and cannot do. Where Arizona needs to spend its efforts is to focus not only on punitive responses to our broken immigration system, but must pressure our congressional delegation to pass reforms that modernize our immigration laws so border security can be enhanced in ways that work,
businesses can get the workers they need legally without having to rely on the underground economy and we can develop humane ways of helping those who are already here come out of the shadows and get right with the laws.

John Kavanagh (R): The state is limited in its legal powers and resources, but we must do what we can. Changing the policy in Washington so it secures the border and enforces immigration laws is one strategy. Once done, our police should be reminded of their legal responsibility to partner with federal immigration authorities in apprehending illegal immigrants when they come upon them in the course of their duties. In cases of extreme breaches of the border, allowing the National Guard to assist the Border Patrol is also a viable option.

• LD 22

Arky Muscato (D): Arizona officials must work together with the federal government to secure the border. Arizona does not have the power, authority, expertise or the money to do so without cooperation from the federal government – which has been substantiated in the court system.

• LD 18

Jeff Dial (R): Investments in new technology to secure our border should be priority No. 1. There are few countries around the world doing a better job of monitoring and securing their borders than the Jewish State of Israel. Representing a region that is home to Intel, which operates both in Chandler, Arizona, and Israel, I would be interested in exploring ways to leverage lessons learned in Israel to enhance security along our U.S. borders.

• LD 17

Kristie O’Brien (D): As a border state, border security encompasses economic, humanitarian, international and national security concerns. Arizona should address those issues that fall within the power of the state. The federal government, however, should carry the burden of maintaining safe and secure international borders. I would weigh the practicality and costs associated with any proposed measure against the economic, humanitarian, international and national security impact on Arizona.

Steve Yarbrough (R): Because of the federal supremacy clause [of the U.S. Constitution], there are real limits in play. It is unfortunate that the administration has chosen not to carry out its constitutional duty in this arena. We can and should fully enforce our state employer sanctions and identity-theft laws. We should do everything reasonably possible to resist illegal immigration because of its social cost and before a greater disaster strikes due to Islamic terrorism via our porous border.

• LD 12

Scott Glover (D): Border security is first and foremost a federal responsibility. My campaign for State Senate is focused on public education, providing opportunities for the middle class so that the economy grows and fighting corruption.
Secretary of state hopefuls talk about elections

The Arizona Constitution established five executive officers: the governor, secretary of state, treasurer, attorney general and superintendent of public instruction. Jewish News sent questionnaires to the candidates running for those offices in the Nov. 4 general election.

This week, we present responses we received from the candidates for secretary of state. Our two questions were aimed at the secretary of state’s role as Arizona’s chief elections officer.


The Republican Party candidate, Michele Reagan, who has served in both houses of the State Legislature, is the state senator from Legislative District 23. She won a three-way race with State Rep. Justin Pierce (who came in second) and Will Cardon to become the GOP nominee.

Should religious facilities continue to be used as polling sites in Arizona?

Terry Goddard (D): I support using secular facilities for polling places whenever possible. As more Arizonans take advantage of mail-in voting, the demand for alternative sites is diminishing dramatically.

Michele Reagan (R): If religious facilities consent to being used as polling sites I do not have a problem, but if we are forcing religious sites to open up, then I completely disagree. Any site that is willing to open its doors to the political process should be embraced.

Should voter identification rules be tightened, loosened or remain as they are now?

Michele Reagan (R): Arizona voters unanimously supported providing ID to vote, and I stand behind that law. Compared to other countries, our voting laws are lenient. In Mexico, you are fingerprinted at the polling location. We must safeguard our elections and providing ID to vote is common sense.

Terry Goddard (D): The original Prop 200 language was far too restrictive as to the types of identification required at the polls. I think it was very appropriate to add Military and Tribal Identification to the list of acceptable identification at the polls, and I support adding University and College identification (provided they have a photo and address) for voting purposes.
Jewish News sent out questionnaires to 43 candidates in nine Legislative Districts for seats in the Arizona House of Representatives and Senate after the dust of the Aug. 26 primary election cleared. Each district elects one senator and two representatives to the State Legislature.

We begin with the responses from the House race in Legislative District 28 (and proceed in descending numeral order).

This week’s question is:
Are you in favor of increasing the tuition tax credits for taxpayers who support scholarships to private schools and why?

House races

• LD 28

**Eric Meyer (D):** Arizona has made the largest cuts to its public schools on a per student basis of any state in the country. Until we restore the lost funding for our public schools we should not increase the tax credit for private schools.

**Shawnna Bolick (R):** Yes. Education is my top priority. As a whole, Arizona’s K-12 education system lags the rest of the country. We should care more about whether children are educated than where they are educated. I favor giving all parents greater choices over where to spend their children’s educational dollars.

• LD 22

**Bonnie Boyce-Wilson (D):** No, I am a supporter of public education and believe taxpayer dollars should support public schools.

• LD 21

**Esther Durán Lumm (D):** I am not in favor of increasing the tuition tax credit for taxpayers who support scholarships to private schools because the tuition funds are often not used for that purpose and are “banked” for the students’ future use in college or otherwise; there is no accountability as to how those funds might actually be used. Moreover, these tax credits are taken from funds for public education. I believe that public education funds should be used for public education, and private funds should be used for private schools. Doing away with public school funding results in weakening that public school system that was originally developed to give EVERY child an opportunity to succeed, not just the elite that can afford to attend private schools.

• LD 18

**Mitzi Epstein (D):** District and charter schools, private schools and home schooling are all important parts of school choice in Arizona. Open enrollment — meaning parents can choose to send their children to any public school, charter or district — has been fantastic for families and for improving the quality of all our schools. I will fight for the children and families of Arizona to make No More Cuts to Our Schools. Funding for schools has been cut badly. The taxpayers of Arizona deserve accountability and transparency. The new private school vouchers, “ESAs,” need to have accountability measures added. If families are using them well, we need to provide for them to continue, while also adding enforcements to guard for children’s safety, children’s rights, and children’s quality of education.

**Jill Norgaard (R):** Yes. The problems that have plagued the K–12 systems for years are due in part to a lack of incentive for the public schools. The existing system funds public schools instead of children and leaves parents with little choice when their child’s school fails to meet their needs. With a steady stream of dollars with no incentive related to outcome, public schools have no reason to change the way they do business. Scholarship-granting organizations depend on the generosity of individuals who want all students to succeed. The tax credit program gives Arizonans the opportunity to give all students, not just the wealthy, and a chance at a bright future.

• LD 17

**Jeff Weninger (R):** Yes. I am supportive of creating more competition and choices for education in Arizona. Private schools are a big part of that.
Senate races

• LD 28

**Kelli Butler (D):** Arizona’s public schools are in crisis due to lack of funding by the State Legislature. 93 percent of Arizona’s children attend public schools. We must ensure that our public schools are adequately funded, with appropriate student-to-teacher ratios and properly compensated teachers. I do not favor further reduction of state revenue by increasing tuition tax credits for private schools until our public schools are receiving adequate funding.

• LD 23

**Paula Pennypacker (D):** I am not in favor of increasing the tuition tax credit at this time. When the state has restored the $1.2 billion in funding it falsely withheld from our public schools, then we can consider increases in tax credits. But I believe it would not be fiscally responsible to do so at this time.

**John Kavanagh (R):** I support expanding the program. Increasing school choice creates competition and improves education overall. I also believe that students should be able to choose between traditional public, public charter, private and religious schools.

• LD 22

**Arky Muscato (D):** No. I am not in favor of increasing tuition tax credits to support private schools. This practice has led to greatly diminished funding for public schools and can no longer be tolerated by taxpayers, 90 percent of whom have only the choice of their neighborhood public school as a viable option for their children.

• LD 18

**Jeff Dial (R):** Yes. With the success of the Jewish Tuition Organization, JETCO down in Southern Arizona, and other credit organizations creating opportunity for students across the state, as our economic recovery continues, we should continue to identify creative ways to enhance both our private and public schools.

• LD 17

**Kristie O’Brien (D):** The issue is not one of school choice, but of fiscal responsibility and the fiduciary duty owed to public taxpayers. I am not in favor of increasing tuition tax credits for scholarships to private schools. Taxpayer funds should not be diverted to private for-profit entities at taxpayer expense with very little accountability or oversight. Public funds should go to public interests, including our currently under-funded public schools. Further, I trust businesses, organizations, faith-based communities and private schools to continue to successfully provide private scholarships for students.

**Steve Yarbrough (R):** Yes. As the one called the “architect of school choice in Arizona” by The Arizona Republic, I am clearly supportive of school choice including district open enrollment, charters, scholarship tax credits, ESA’s, and online and home-schooling options. The scholarship tax credits are clearly budget-positive and lead to improved student academic achievement both for students exercising choice and students in schools competing with them.

• LD 12

**Scott Glover (D):** I am against increasing tuition tax credits for private schools. The obligation of the state is to provide a decent, quality public education for students. Too many entities are draining resources from our public schools, which should be a number one priority, but too often, isn’t.
Legislative hopefuls talk about investing in Israel

Jewish News sent out questionnaires to 43 candidates in nine Legislative Districts for seats in the Arizona House of Representatives and Senate after the dust of the Aug. 26 primary election cleared. Each district elects one senator and two representatives to the State Legislature.

We begin with the responses from the House race in Legislative District 28 (and proceed in descending numeral order).

This week’s question is:

Should the state’s treasury invest in Israeli companies and other companies that do business in Israel and why?

House races

• LD 28

**Eric Meyer (D):** The State Treasury should make sound investment decisions with our tax dollars to ensure that it maximizes its return on investment. Israeli companies in the biosciences, technology and pharmaceutical industries are some of the most innovative in the world. These companies should be considered in Arizona’s investment portfolio if they meet the criteria that have been established by the state.

**Shawnna Bolick (R):** Our state’s financial investments should be made following a single principle: prudent investments that provide the highest safe return for our citizens. Investment of taxpayer funds is a fiduciary rather than a political role. That said, given Israel’s vibrant economy and highly productive workforce, any sound investment portfolio is likely to include Israeli companies and businesses doing business in Israel.

**Kate Brophy McGee (R):** The state’s treasury should invest in all prudent and profitable investments allowed under Arizona and federal law in order to maximize benefits to taxpayers.

• LD 22

**Bonnie Boyce-Wilson (D):** I do support investment in Israeli companies and other companies that do business in Israel because Israel is an important ally to the U.S. Supporting the economy there helps keep Israel strong, and Arizona would benefit from the returns on investments.

• LD 21

**Esther Durán Lumm (D):** I regard Israel as an ally of the United States, and as the permanent example of the horrendous Holocaust that we must protect from ever happening again. Therefore, on the federal level we should do everything to protect it from invaders who seek to do harm to its citizens. Also on the federal level, we should invest in Israeli companies and other companies that do business in Israel as long as they are taxed at an appropriate level. At the state level, however, I would have to see how investing in Israeli and other companies would benefit the economy of the State of Arizona and its residents. Why? Because the legislative bodies and the governor are always cutting funding to public education and some very necessary social programs with the excuse that there are insufficient funds to maintain those entities. If the state can’t take care of its own responsibilities, why should we invest in companies in another country? If you can show me why we should and how doing so results in a reasonable return on Arizona’s investment, then I am open to changing my mind.

• LD 18

**Mitzi Epstein (D):** Intel has an impactful presence in Arizona and in Israel. I am focused on the “Innovation Economy” and investing in the technology sector to make great jobs, with high pay and a ladder for advancement, as well as to make great products for our quality of life.

**Jill Norgaard (R):** Yes. The United States and Israel are friends and allies, rooted in the shared values of the two nations. The United States has a special appreciation to Israel for its successful efforts to follow the democratic tradition, its dynamic economic development and its quest to pursue liberty and freedoms for its people, despite its location in the midst of our enemies. Israel looks to us for political inspiration and military assistance. An investment in Israel is an investment in promoting liberty.

• LD 17

**Jeff Weninger (R):** Yes. Arizona should invest in Israeli companies. Israel is first and foremost our friend and ally. Secondly, Israel resembles Arizona in many ways physically and with emerging tech companies. It is a great fit for Arizona and Israel to support each other.
Senate races

• LD 28

**Kelli Butler (D):** The goal of the state’s treasury is to make prudent investments that maximize return. If Israeli companies are determined to meet these standards, they should be considered worthy investments. It is not the job of the state treasury to make political statements through investment or denial of investment of public funds.

• LD 23

**Paula Pennypacker (D):** The decision on where to invest state dollars is the job of the state treasurer, not the Legislature. That said, if asked by the treasurer my opinion, I would support investing state funds wisely, fiscally responsibly and legally, including Israeli companies and those who do business with Israel provided they provide a rate of return comparable to other investments.

**John Kavanagh (R):** So long as the company’s returns were competitive, I fully support investment in Israeli companies. Israel is a solid friend and ally of the United States, our partner in the war on terrorism and one of the only tolerant democracies in the region. Investing in Israel is also an investment in American security and common decency.

• LD 22

**Arky Muscato (D):** The state’s treasury should invest in any companies which will benefit Arizona – including those in, or doing business with, Israel.

• LD 18

**Jeff Dial (R):** Yes. As chair of the Higher Education Committee for the State House of Representatives, I was thrilled with the recent collaboration formed between Arizona State University and Ben-Gurion University. As one of America’s strongest allies, the Jewish State of Israel has a spectacular track record of innovation and developing new technologies. I look forward to [ASU] President Crow’s keynote address at the 2015 Jewish National Fund Breakfast being chaired by my close friends Sasha and Rodney Glassman.

• LD 17

**Kristie O’Brien (D):** Israel has a number of leading innovative technology and pharmaceutical companies. I would support Arizona’s investment, as long as it remains in the best interests of the Arizona taxpayer. Regardless of the company’s locale, it is encouraged that Arizona engage in socially responsible investment decisions.

**Steve Yarbrough (R):** Absolutely. There is no good reason not to do so. Israel is America’s great ally and should be treated as such. Israel has a special relationship to the U.S. and that fact should be reflected in our trade relationship and by our state’s investment policy. Any attempt to prevent such investment should be vigorously opposed.

• LD 12

**Scott Glover (D):** The state should invest wisely and have a diverse portfolio that provides solid returns. In an age where the world is so interconnected and many corporations are multinational, it is important to have a wide range of investments and investment strategies.