

1. Do you support the re-election of President Donald Trump? Please explain.

Yes, for several reasons: first, President Trump has re-established “America first” leadership in the White House, both:

- Domestically by restoring a strong economy that is lifting incomes and quality of life for ALL segments of American society with stimulative monetary policy (Jawboning the Federal Reserve to appropriately reduce interest rates) and fiscal policy (reducing taxes with the December 2017 tax bill and reducing regulatory burdens on businesses); and
- Internationally by initiating improved economics (ie, trade relations with China that are resulting in better trade balances and enforcement of intellectual property laws and defense posture (compelling members of NATO to pay their fair share, challenging Iran’s mischief in the middle-east (a huge subject with long-term gains resulting negating the flawed Obama JPCOA, and from last week’s bombing in Iraq), etc.

With these initiatives and others, he is making good on virtually all his campaign promises and making changes that will have long-term benefits to the American economy and America’s position in the world.

President Trump has achieved these accomplishments despite overwhelming resistance from the media establishment and the Democratic Members of Congress who deeply resent his election and leadership style. The recent impeachment attempt and the Congressional challenges to his authority via the War Powers Act legislation are only the most recent examples.

I support President Trump’s re-election for another reason as well: Texas must hold its position as the largest conservative state in the Electoral College. If Texas votes Democratic in 2020, it is very unlikely that there will ever be another conservative President elected in a very long time. If that occurs, we will likely never see balanced budgets or conservative appointments to the Supreme Court; we will likely see further erosion of the rule of law (such as the further growth of “Sanctuary” cities and states).

2. If elected, how would you reduce tensions between conservatives and liberals, and between supporters and critics of President Trump?

I grew up a Republican in Northern California. President Reagan’s eight years as Governor were my four years in high school and four years in college. Mr. Reagan’s lasting legacy was his combined:

- Personal style – to lead by example, tell the truth, operate transparently, and to disagree (as inevitable in politics) without being disagreeable. He was always willing to listen to others’ perspectives and opinions (often saying that he learned from them) and also willing to compromise if and when he had achieved his own objectives as well.
- Consistent adherence to his basic values – peace through strength, based upon a strong economy leading to strong defense, leadership by appointment of the best people with appropriate delegation (James Baker, George Schultz, Ed Meese, etc.).

My goal in Congress will be to put President Reagan’s behavior back into practice – to listen before talking, to respect others’ positions, to reduce the rhetoric and volume, to do homework based on facts before making decisions – and most of all, injecting humor back into our political discourse.

I come to this conclusion regarding “lead by example” behavior based on my own continuous leadership experience in both the public and private sectors. I have led major organizations such as:

- Prestigious professional services -- National Director of Real Estate for Price Waterhouse from its New York headquarters.
- Fortune 500 Corporation -- Maxxam Property Companies -- nationwide real estate developer within corporate conglomerate.
- Large public agencies – accepted the invitation of two big-City mayors to turn around and then grow deeply troubled government organizations – the National Capital Revitalization Corporation in Washington, DC and the Housing and Community Development Department of Houston, Texas.

In each case, my appointments were subject to confirmation by the organizations’ Boards of Directors, and required strict compliance with investors’ and regulators’ requirements. The solutions for turn-around and then growth required understanding of complex existing and anticipated future conditions and the support of numerous constituencies.

For instance, in the case of Mayor Tony Williams’s appointment of me to head the NCRC in DC, I had to receive confirmation from the “W” White House. I worked with numerous community groups throughout the underserved minority neighborhoods in Washington, and achieved great success in creating new – and lasting – value by initiating new projects to clean up neighborhoods that provided new economic development (Anacostia Riverfront, Washington Navy Yard, Mount Vernon Triangle, etc., etc.) and enhanced social services such as schools, health facilities, etc. My board was composed of five Democrats and Four Republicans, and my challenge was to conceive new strategies and forge new solutions that, nearly always, resulted in

unanimous decisions to proceed. Fifteen years later, the results are readily visible and understandable!

3. Do you support extending physical barriers on the US-Mexico border? Please explain.

Yes, extending physical barriers on the US-Mexico border such as “building the wall” are an important first step in securing the border. But, they are only the first step in both reforming our immigration laws and restoring our national security. Other elements of border protection must include surveillance and drones and enforcement of our existing laws (such as supervision of overstay of visas and better data processing of entrants through the border, appointment of more immigration and asylum judges to more quickly process immigrants seeking asylum and entry for economic purposes).

4. Do you support ending criminal penalties for people apprehended while crossing the border? Please explain.

No – quite to the contrary. I support stricter enforcement of our existing immigration and criminal laws. For instance, we should:

- Strengthen the physical barriers along the border in order to force people to enter the country through established “Points of Entry” rather than open desert or crossing the dangerous river.
- Appoint additional judges to more quickly evaluate the peoples’ cases, and if and when warranted, accelerate the deportation process and timing.
- Work with the countries of origin of the people seeking entry – not just Mexico, but primarily Central American and now parts of Africa and the Middle-East.
- Understand that the increasing volume of people seeking entry are part of larger changes that reflect the role of international organized crime – the drug cartels now manage significant human trafficking that delivers increasing numbers of people seeking entry. This has elevated the danger and violence on all sides.

5. Do you support detaining asylum seeking families, or, except in unusual cases of heightened risk, should they be released into the country while awaiting decision from a court? Please explain.

The families seeking asylum should NEVER be released into the country while awaiting decisions from the court. Nearly all the people so released NEVER show up for their court date and immediately become additions to the inventory of undocumented/illegal aliens.

To solve the problem, as I have written before, we should both increase the number of judges and courts to immediately adjudicate and decide the asylum seekers' cases; and then immediately deport those people not accepted.

I understand that my position may be controversial in some quarters, including Members of Congress. But if these Members of Congress do not like the current laws, they should change them as part of the larger quest to update our overall immigration laws. Only Congress can change the laws. Not changing the law but relying on poor enforcement is a dereliction of Congress's duty and its primary responsibility in the US system of checks and balances.

6. Do you support increased border security funding? How should that money be spent?

Yes, of course. The measures that I propose in my answers to the questions above will require enhanced funding. I think I have been pretty clear on the basics – more rapid adjudication of the immigrants' cases and more rapid deportation. Other realistic factors would include Federal reimbursement of certain expenses to local governments along the border that are simply overwhelmed by the influx of additional asylum seekers and other immigrants. These border cities and counties are suffering from dramatically increased expenses for law enforcement and health care as well as housing, for example.

7. Under what circumstances would you support a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million immigrants now living in the country without permission?

I do NOT support a path to citizenship for the immigrants now living in the country without permission (some define these people as “illegal aliens”). I do support a path to permanent residence -- a permanent “green card” for these people, however, if they have been law-abiding (no criminal record) and tax-paying and they have a record of long-term employment. Several of my friends and colleagues are deeply involved in the immigration issue (immigration attorneys, government officials, social service agency leaders, etc.) Together, they have created the proposed “Family Stabilization Act”, in which they have articulated a comprehensive solution to the path to permanent residence.

This program would require each person living in the country without permission prior to President Trump's election to seek participation. If accepted, they would receive permanent resident status and the ability to participate in US social services. They would, however, not be given a path to citizenship (they broke the law by staying here illegally, that is without permission); without citizenship, they would not be given the right to vote.

8. Do you support Medicare-for-all? Please explain.

No. The reality is several-fold:

- Medicare for All would not be Medicare – it would by fiscal necessity become Medicaid for All – a lower standard of care made necessary by the implied lack of payment or required premiums. The current level of Medicaid reimbursements is approximately 80% of costs of the providers – hence the gradual deterioration of both care and access to care in Medicaid.
- 40% of the country’s health care dollars are now spent directly by the Federal and State governments: 20% for Medicaid; 15% for Medicare and 5% for Military (VA and Tri-Care). Expanding to Medicare for All or even to Medicaid for all would require ending the 50% of health care expenditures made by insurance companies on behalf of employers. These plans provide reimbursements approximately 20% above providers’ costs, thereby subsidizing the costs of Medicaid. Removing this layer of the health care market would eliminate this 50% that are satisfied, even happy, with their current conditions. This change would reduce their level of care.
- The costs of Medicare of Medicaid for all would be overwhelming and thus the proposal has been proven as naïve and discredited in the Elizabeth Warren presidential campaign.

Conservatives should concentrate on leading by example and proposing realistic, market based solutions that emphasize competition and innovation as well as cost control and increased access to care. Leading this discussion and providing examples are beyond the scope of this answer, but I am ready, willing and able to participate in this discussion at a later time.

9. Do you support the Affordable Care Act? Please explain.

No, definitely not. The ACA, popularly known as “Obama-Care” was a legislative blunder (Nancy Pelosi: “ we must pass it learn what’s in it”) with many components forced on the new Obama Administration by the rapacious insurance and pharmaceutical industries. The “individual mandates” have been controversial if not illegal, and many unanswered questions remain – such as coverage for pre-existing conditions. Since its passage in late 2009 (by 100% partisan votes!) and “implementation” in 2010, health care costs have rising in the US from 14% to 18% of GDP. Perhaps the best part of Obama-Care is that it applies to only 10% of the market place, after the 50% of employer provided insurance and the 40% of direct government programs noted above.

This situation represents a perfect opportunity for conservatives to lead by example and propose alternatives to the ACA – proposals that focus on market based solutions that stimulate competition and innovation. I offer several examples – permit and encourage sale of insurance across state lines, require full transparency in pricing and prohibit surprise-billing by providers; expand the use of Health Savings Accounts to better balance the tax equity between tax-deductible premiums by employers and after-tax premium payments by individuals in the ACA exchanges. The new initiative of the

Texas Medical Center called TMC-X is a perfect example of the focus on new medical innovation – in surgical techniques, therapy, devices, pharmaceuticals, etc., etc.

The reforms created by these proposals will have the compounding benefits of gradually changing the economics of the other 50% + 40% of the health care market.

10. How would you ensure that people with pre-existing conditions can receive affordable health care?

As I noted earlier, how to treat insurance for people with pre-existing conditions is one of the challenges remaining for the ACA. The solution I favor has four parts:

- First, we must recognize that coverage for pre-existing conditions is very popular among the American people – not just for people with pre-existing conditions but for most voters, in part because the concept of “health care as a right” is growing and also because many voters fear that they too may one day have a pre-existing condition that might preclude them from receiving affordable coverage.
- Second, if this coverage is popular throughout the country’s voters, then a national program should cover it. Since Medicare is paid by the Federal Government (Medicaid by the states), and since many over-65 people that participate in Medicare have pre-existing conditions, these pre-existing conditions are already priced into the Federal Medicare premiums. And, since most health care professionals agree that Medicare reimbursements reflect approximate costs for procedures, the coverage is both satisfactory to the patients and economically appropriate.
- Third, this Medicare insurance coverage could be extended to younger-than-65 people with pre-existing conditions, say for a 38 year-old person with cancer. If the costs of coverage for the pre-existing conditions are higher than premiums collected, the difference (or subsidy) would be borne by the Federal government, which is appropriate.
- Fourth, if and when the pre-existing conditions are no longer a condition of the patient covered, the patient should return to the normal insurance coverage for its group – say, as provided by his/her employer, or purchased on the ACA exchange.

One final thought: in my proposal, this Medicare coverage of pre-existing conditions should only be extended to US citizens and permanent residents, not to undocumented aliens or others in the US illegally.

11. Should government take action to reduce fossil fuel consumption to address climate change.

No, absolutely not. Rather, the Government should encourage the consumption of (Liquefied) Natural Gas worldwide, but at market terms with no subsidies, for several reasons:

- First, it appears that this question is based upon the presumption that fossil fuel consumption creates carbon emission, which is the primary cause of climate change. Thus the implied proposal to reduce fossil fuel consumption results from a desire to reduce carbon emissions in order to minimize climate change.
- Second, fossil fuels are the lifeblood of the United States economy. If the US economy were to cease consumption of all fossil fuels, and therefore dramatically reduce its own carbon emissions, its influence on the total level of global emissions would be negligible. The reason is that most carbon emissions occur from burning coal, wood and other inefficient energy sources in the under-developed, high growth countries like China, India and Brazil, and throughout Africa. Thus, we in the US could virtually stop our own economy – at great cost and pain to ourselves -- without a significant impact on overall carbon emissions and global warming.
- Third, energy consumption as well as the emission of air pollutants and carbon decrease as economic development increases. So, a solution to global warming is to accelerate the rate of economic development of the largest emerging countries.
- Fourth, Natural Gas is the least expensive and least polluting fossil fuel and thus the energy source that should be the most attractive to the emerging high growth countries. The US, for the benefit of these countries as well as its own, should grow its LNG exports as quickly as possible. As LNG replaces and augments other energy sources in these emerging countries, carbon emissions will decline because of lower emissions and the gradual reduction of energy consumption as economic development delivers progressively higher standards of living across the globe.
- Fifth, the US will benefit from the export of LNG on a private sector profit basis as well as improving the country's balance of payments. This morning's Houston Chronicle (Friday, January 10, 2020) features an article on how the Trump Administration is working hard to build additional pipelines that will transport LNG from the Permian basin to the ports along the Texas Gulf Coast for the export of LNG. In doing so, the Administration is reducing the regulatory barriers to economic growth as well as accelerating private profit and public tax revenue, as well as improving our balance of trade.

Therefore, US public policy should encourage economic growth, both domestically and internationally, as a means of improving both global standards of living and carbon emissions. And, if the US wants to further reduce carbon emissions, it can encourage the use of sequestration methods, beginning with planting more trees and reducing the harvesting of existing forests.

12. Would you support new limits on fracking?

No. Fracking is the technique that spawned the Texas shale revolution that has to date totally changed the structure of the worldwide petrochemical industry -- which is arguably the most important industry in the world. The two lasting benefits of this change have been:

- US energy self-sufficiency that has removed our reliance on oil from the middle-east, with of course all the geo-political benefits (a subject for another place and time).
- The transition of the US economy from an energy importer to an energy exporter. This improves our balance of payments and generates additional profits and tax revenues for the US and its companies.

While there are still some controversies about the practice of fracking, the benefits received to date are overwhelmingly positive. The economic transition of energy exports, particularly LNG, is only in the early stages of creating positive impacts.

Limiting fracking would be absolutely foolish.

13. Should government provide subsidies for the advancement of renewable energy?

No, with one possible exception. For all my adult life, the US government has provided subsidies for the advancement of renewable energy sources. These subsidies were proposed in the 1970's when energy was considered a short-term finite resource and energy supplies, mostly from the middle-east, were increasingly expensive, undependable and dangerous politically. That time has passed, of course, in part because of the excess supplies created by the use of fracking that have created the shale revolution.

The time has also passed because after 50 years of subsidies, renewable energy is still not self-sustaining or even practical. More importantly, one renewable resource, wind energy relies on the creation and installation of gigantic wind turbines. These turbines require massive amounts of energy to fabricate, transport and assemble – so the energy payback is very long indeed. Moreover, they create their own environmental problem, like endangering birds that are killed by the propellers.

So, if renewable energy is to progress, let private investment take the risk and manage the process as the result of market forces. Meanwhile, back on the fossil fuel front, worldwide energy demand is likely to fall as more countries become more prosperous and energy supplies increase. Both of these effects should serve to drive down prices, making it progressively more difficult for renewable energy sources to compete in the private marketplace.

The one area that I could see would benefit from some government assistance might be battery or energy storage technology. But, with companies like Tesla and Apple undertaking their own research, it is likely that further gains will occur at an accelerating rate within the private sector.

**14. What additional restrictions on gun ownership do you support, if any?
Please explain.**

None, for several reasons:

- First, if I thought that restricting gun ownership would reduce gun violence, I might be willing to consider further restrictions. But, the evidence clearly shows: “if guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns.” In legal terms, this means that the US cities that have the toughest gun regulations have the highest level of gun related murders and violence – look at Chicago and Baltimore as examples.
- Second, as a society, with multiple levels of government and a fractured Federal system of law enforcement (neighboring states and city-suburb proximity), we do not adequately and consistently enforce the laws we now have (background checks for purchases at gun show, etc.). So, before I would consider legislation to create new restrictions, I would want to see evidence of effective enforcement of existing laws.
- Third, gun ownership is NOT the problem, gun possession by the wrong people is. For example, I could buy a gun because I have a clean record – no problem there. But, my gun could be stolen or I could sell it in the after-market or give it to someone who could abuse it. There is simply no way, other than a Federal inventory – and verification -- of gun ownership. This would be impractical and unconstitutional.
- Fourth, while gun control laws are highly controversial, nearly all observers agree that mass violence is related to mental illness and routine violence is caused by social and demographic factors. I see very little practical initiative to either address social ills or mental illness or to enforce existing gun laws. Thus, I conclude that the proposals for further gun restriction are both a rush to create a politically appealing but ineffective “solution,” or are an effort to exert government control over the very citizens it represents.

This brings me to my defense of the Second Amendment – I believe that the Founding Fathers created the second amendment that grants “the right to bear arms” because they knew that citizens did not trust their government. 250 years later, citizens still do not trust their government.

And, recent performance indicates that government is not doing much to re-establish that trust. This credibility gap is one of the reasons I have decided to run for Congress.

15. Would you accept campaign contributions from the NRA? Please explain.

Probably not. The NRA is the public symbol of the controversy surrounding gun control. While I am a defender of the Second Amendment and sympathetic to the NRA’s goals, I think my acceptance of campaign contributions would become divisive within my constituency (see my answer to question #2), when our goals should be to remove or at least reduce the friction of the issues that separate us.

Moreover, I do not intend to accept contributions from other powerful and well-funded groups that lobby for narrow issues, including the NRA. I feel similarly about AARP (economic benefits for seniors that may affect young people); the Mortgage Bankers, Realtors and Home Builders (home mortgage deductions), and health providers (the AMA, insurance and pharmaceutical industries that work to keep health care prices high). The list could go on.

16. Do you agree with banning the sale and purchase of assault-style rifles? Please explain.

No. While I agree that assault style rifles are used only to kill people (not for hunting or other peaceful purpose), I do not favor banning them because while this might make practical sense by itself, it opens the door to further gun restrictions. Once that door is open, I cannot answer the question: how far will future restrictions go?

17. Do you support additional restrictions on abortion rights in Texas? Please explain.

No. I am pro-life but believe that existing regulations in Texas are adequate to protect unborn children once conceived. Again, if there are abuses in the system (later term abortions, for instance), law enforcement should deal with these examples and punish the crimes.

The larger issue, however, is to recognize the context of when, where and for whom abortions are now performed. I suggest that young mothers considering abortions have better education, better prenatal care, better access to information on alternatives, and more robust social services such as expanded adoption agencies.