

Watchmen Voter Guide for Idaho Attorney General

** Click on each candidate's name to see their completed questionnaire **

	Raúl R. Labrador	Arthur ("Art") Macomber	Steven Scanlin	Lawrence Wasden
<p>1. What is your name, what office are you running for and why are you running for this position?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>My name is Art Macomber, and I am running for State Attorney General. I am running because Idaho is in trouble, and needs a practicing, aggressive, private sector litigator to set a new tone of leadership and practice in the Attorney General's Office.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>My name is Lawrence Wasden. I am running to be re-elected as Idaho Attorney General. I am running because I believe in the Rule of Law. That means that everyone, including the Attorney General is subject to the law.</p> <p>I have taken an oath to uphold the United States and Idaho Constitutions and to perform the duties of my office. Idaho Code § 59-401. The Idaho Constitution requires me to perform the duties "prescribed by this Constitution and as may be prescribed by law." Idaho Constitution Art. IV, Sec. 1. The Constitutional duties assigned to the Attorney General are to be a member of the State Board of Land Commissioners, Idaho Constitution Art. IX, Sec. 7, and the Board of Examiners. Idaho Constitution Art. IV, Sec. 18. The Idaho Constitution</p> <p>Duties "prescribed by law" are those duties assigned to me by laws passed by the legislature or citizen's initiative. The legislature has, "prescribed by law" a number of duties, primarily found in Idaho Title 67, Chapter 14. I will mention two code sections specifically. First, "it is the duty of the attorney general: . . . to perform all legal services for the state and to <u>represent the state</u> and all departments, agencies, offices, officers, boards, commissions institutions and other state entities. . . . and to <u>advise all</u> departments, agencies, offices, officers, boards, commissions, institutions and other state entities in all matters involving questions of law." Idaho Code § 67-1401 (1) and (2). (Emphasis added.) Second, "the governor" . . . "may upon request, utilize the attorney general's legal services." Idaho Code § 67-1406(1). That means that if the Governor requests my services, I am required to be the attorney for the Governor.</p> <p>I am running for office to continue upholding the Constitutions and the Rule of Law.</p> <p>I urge you to read the following laws and constitutional provisions for yourself. (The Remainder of Mr. Wasden's Answer can be seen in his Questionnaire)</p>
<p>2. Under what circumstances should the Attorney General bring charges against county officials?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>The process is that if County Officials do not obey Idaho law, then the Local Prosecutor is notified for investigation and enforcement, by lawsuit if needed. If the Local Prosecutor does not take the case, recuses him or herself for a conflict of interest, or otherwise does not prosecute, then a neighboring County Prosecutor is supposed to undertake the enforcement task. If this cannot or will not be done, then the Attorney General must step in to investigate and bring charges if warranted against County Officials. If that process is followed, the State Attorney General has an obligation to intervene.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>Under the law there are three circumstances that give the Attorney General authority to bring charges against county officials.</p> <p>First, it is the Attorney General's duty, "to respond to allegations of state law by <u>elected county officers</u>, to investigate such claims, to issue appropriate findings and to refer such cases for further investigation and prosecution pursuant to section 31-2002." Idaho Code § 67-1401(17). (Emphasis added). Idaho Code § 31-2002 provides that upon the completion of the investigation of a county elected official, the Attorney General shall, "(a) issue a finding of no further action necessary; (b) suggest training or other nonjudicial remedies; or (c) determine that further investigation or prosecution is warranted <u>and retain the matter and act as a special prosecutor.</u>" (Emphasis added).</p>


			<p>The means that if the Attorney General receives an allegation of misconduct by an elected county official, conducts a preliminary investigation and makes the determination that further investigation or prosecution is warranted, then, by operation of law, the Attorney General is appointed as the special prosecutor in the matter. This would be an occasion when the Attorney General would prosecute a county official. My office has handled numerous complaints against county elected officials.</p> <p>Second, Idaho Code § 31-2603 provides for the appointment of a special prosecutor when the elected prosecutor has a legal conflict of interest or, “is unable to attend to his duties.” The statute provides that, “the district court may, <u>upon petition of the prosecuting attorney or the board of county commissioners</u>, by an order entered in its minutes, stating the cause therefore, appoint some suitable person to perform for the time being or for the trial of such accused person, the duties of such prosecuting attorney.” It is important to note that only the prosecuting attorney or the board of county commissioners can file a petition for the appointment of a special prosecutor. The Attorney General cannot file such petition. Under this law, my office handles about 100 to 150 special prosecutions each year. Currently, I am prosecuting at least one elected county official. To be certain, I have spent 20 years holding government officials accountable for misconduct. Sometimes people have gotten upset when I have filed criminal charges against their mayor, prosecutor or sheriff. But it is necessary to uphold the Rule of Law. The law applies to everyone.</p> <p>Third, Idaho Code § 31-2227 provides that, “when in the judgement of the governor the penal laws of this state are not being enforced as written, in any county or counties, in this state, he may direct the director of the Idaho state police to act independently of the sheriff and prosecuting attorney in such county or counties, to execute and enforce such penal laws. In such an instance, the attorney general shall exclusively exercise all duties, rights and responsibilities of the prosecuting attorney.”</p> <p>This authority rests with the Governor, not the Attorney General. If the Governor directs the director of the Idaho State Police to fulfill his or her duty under this statute, then, by operation of law, the Attorney General assumes the duties of the prosecuting attorney. This authority has never been exercised in our state’s history. But it is an occasion when the Attorney General would have authority to prosecute county officials, if the facts establish their legal culpability. (The Remainder of Mr. Wasden’s Answer can be seen in his Questionnaire)</p>
<p>3. Have you signed the Manhattan Declaration (which defines marriage as</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>I never heard of these two documents until today. I read the Manhattan Declaration, and the four or five tenets of the Families First Pledge. I would sign them if I had a better internet connection and the time to reflect on all they say. I am inclined to sign them, but in the heat and schedule of this campaign there is no time.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p> <p>No, I have not signed the Manhattan Declaration or the Families First pledge. As Attorney General, usually it is not appropriate for me to state my policy views because it undermines my ability to render unbiased legal opinions. However, my personal and religious beliefs are that marriage is between one man and one woman and that the family is the foundation of our nation. I defended the Idaho Constitutional definition</p>

<p>between one man and one woman) or the Families First pledge? Why or why not?</p>				<p>of marriage all the way to the United States Supreme Court. See Obergefell v. Hodges, 576 U.S. 644 (2015) (Docket 14-556, Westlaw document 44).</p>
<p>4. Where should the line be in defending agencies in Idaho vs. protecting the citizens of Idaho from constitutional violations by government agencies?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>The line is Article 1 of the Idaho Constitution, and secondarily the federal constitutional limits. If advice to or defense of a government agency conflicts with Article 1, or other parts of the Idaho or federal Constitutions, then the advice or defense must conform with the Constitutions.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>My answer may be difficult for some, but it is truthful and in strict accordance with the law. As mentioned in my answer to question number one, the constitutional and statutory duty of the Attorney General (my lawful duty) is to provide legal advice to the state and its agencies and to represent them in court. The Rule of Law precludes me from shirking that duty whether I agree with my clients' decisions or not.</p> <p>However, I am required to and do advise my clients of the constitutional and legal limits on their authority. The principles of limited government and separation of powers prohibit me from usurping the authority of other public officials. I cannot undermine the decisions made by my clients, including the Governor. That is the law. Either we believe in the Rule of Law or we don't. I believe in the Rule of Law.</p> <p>Some in this race will tell you that the constitutional duty of the Attorney General is to represent the people against the state government. That is not true. Nowhere, does the Idaho Constitution say the Attorney General's duty is to represent the people against the state. I represent the people collectively <u>not personally</u> or individually. Article 1 of the Idaho Constitution declares <u>personal rights</u> of Idaho's citizens <u>not collective rights</u>. I represent the citizens collectively by respecting and honoring these rights and as I advise my statutory clients. But as discussed above, the law very clearly says that my duty is to legally represent the state. Idaho Code § 67-1401. I am elected as the state's attorney. To do otherwise, would be a violation of my oath of office, my duty under the law and my duty as an attorney. In the instance where I cannot make a legitimate legal argument in defense of my client's decisions, I am obligated to confess error. In such instances, I have done so to the anger and chagrin of some of my clients. But I am obligated to fulfill my lawful duties whether it is politically convenient or not. I have taken an oath to uphold the law and I do so. Some have said that I choose to represent the bureaucracy. That is incorrect. I choose to obey the law, which means that I am elected as the attorney for the state.</p> <p>(The Remainder of Mr. Wasden's Answer can be seen in his Questionnaire)</p>
<p>5. Do you interpret the Idaho Constitution as a living document?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>No. The interpretation of the Idaho Constitution is frozen as of the date the document was created or amended. Thus, the people of the State of Idaho had certain public definitions for the words in that document when it was ratified or amended, and those definitions must be used until changed by the people.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>I suspect that by, "living document" you mean that a court is authorized to alter the interpretation of the Constitution based on changes in society. I do not hold that view. I believe the language of the Constitution has meaning as it is written. If the Constitution were a "living document" in that sense, it would undermine the specific provisions and processes for amending the Constitution. The Constitution, itself, provides a process for amendment and until that process is followed, the language and meaning of the Constitution remains the same.</p> <p>(The Remainder of Mr. Wasden's Answer can be seen in his Questionnaire)</p>

<p>6. How would you utilize the budget that you manage while being fiscally responsible?</p>	<p>Raúl R. Labrador Declined to Respond</p>	<p>Arthur ("Art") Macomber I plan to give several attorney positions back to the legislature to reverse the conflicts of interest that were instigated in 1997 when all State attorneys were centralized in the Attorney General's Office. I also plan to have a strike force team of attorneys to monitor and assess State and federal cases to make sure Idaho's State sovereignty is advanced and protected. There are ebbs and flows to corporate-sized budgets, and analysis of past budgets will assist, but zero-based budgeting is my preference.</p>	<p>Steven Scanlin Declined to Respond</p>	<p>Lawrence Wasden A good example of how I utilize my budget while being fiscally responsible is my budget from last year. In 2021, the legislature appropriated (gave a budget of) \$26.6 million to my office for our operations. With that \$26.6 million, I recovered \$44 million for the state. That means that for every dollar the legislature appropriated to my office we returned \$1.66. That is a pretty good return on the taxpayer's dollar. That is the 19th consecutive year I have returned more money that was appropriated for office operations. In addition, in 2021, I obtained over \$7 million in restitution for Idaho consumers that have been defrauded. That amounts to \$7.25 for each dollar appropriated for consumer operations. I received \$22 million from tobacco companies stemming from the 1998 Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement and the litigation to enforce that agreement. I expect a similar payment this year. To date, Idaho's Master Settlement Agreement payments total more than a half billion dollars, all of which has been deposited into Idaho Millennium fund. Through my Consumer Protection Division, we settled three cases against opioid manufacturers and distributors for their participation in the opioid crisis in our state and recovered approximately \$120 million to be distributed among state, regional and local governments for opioid abatement.</p>
<p>7. When do you believe life begins and how does this belief affect your executive decision making?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>Life begins at conception. This fact causes executive decision-making to concentrate on employing lawyers who have such an understanding, to be able to effectuate health and safety measures that better reflect Idaho pro-life values. When the U.S. Supreme Court changes <i>Roe v. Wade</i> and its progeny, Idaho must step up with State laws that protect life from conception, punish rapists and incestuous violators harshly, and educate people about making better choices to protect their abilities to bring life safely into our world.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>Human life is a sacred gift from God. Elective abortion for personal or social convenience is contrary to the will and the commandments of God. In today's society, abortion has become a common practice, defended by deceptive arguments that try to justify taking a human life. There may be exceptional circumstances that may justify an abortion, such as when pregnancy is the result of incest or rape, when the life or health of the mother is judged by competent medical authority to be in serious jeopardy, or when the fetus is known by competent medical authority to have severe defects that will not allow the baby to survive beyond birth. But even these circumstances do not automatically justify an abortion. As Attorney General, however, I am not a policy maker and, therefore, do not make the law concerning abortion. Further, I am bound by the law to render legal opinions about the constitutionality of a proposed statute not based on my personal view, but instead based on the law as enunciated by the United States Supreme Court. I disagree with the Court's decisions on abortion. My personal view is that regulation of abortion is among the powers reserved to the states in the 10th Amendment. We will soon see how the United States Supreme Court treats this issue and whether it sustains or overturns <i>Roe v. Wade</i>. I have joined other states in an amicus brief urging the Court to overturn <i>Roe v. Wade</i>. (The Remainder of Mr. Wasden's Answer can be seen in his Questionnaire)</p>

<p>8. Under what circumstances would you consider taking legal action against another state?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>There are federal constitutional provisions which the States agreed to when ratifying that document. For example, if Washington State tries to move forward to tax gasoline exported from Washington to Idaho, then such an action should trigger a lawsuit from Idaho based on Article 1, section 9, clause 5: “No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State,” or Article 1, section 10, clause 2.</p> <p>Section 10 of Article 1 has many provisions which, if done by another State and which threatened Idaho State sovereignty would justify a lawsuit against that State. Finally, we have <i>Texas v. Pennsylvania</i>, the election integrity lawsuit filed under Article 1, section 4, clause 1. The aggrieved party was the Texas legislature, and the offending parties were the executive and judicial branches (in different combinations) of the four defendant States. The problem I think the U.S. Supreme Court ran into was that <i>all three branches</i> of Texas sued <i>all three branches</i> of Pennsylvania, and so that Court found no standing. If the legislatures, the proper parties, had sued the correct offending parties (the other two branches), then the case may have moved forward. Only practicing litigators see this simple approach.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>United States Constitution, Article III, Sec. 1, vests the judicial power in the United States Supreme Court and, “such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time establish.” Article III, Sec. 2, extends the judicial power United States Supreme Court to, “controversies between two or more states.” What that means is that when one state sues another state, it does so by filing an original action in the United States Supreme Court. However, there are some limitations on whether a state can file an action against another state and whether that state can sustain a cause of action. I would file a lawsuit against another state, if we had standing. That means that we have a legally protectable interest in the matter.</p> <p>For example, recently Texas attempted to file an original action in the United States Supreme Court. There were many people who failed to understand the real nature of <i>Texas v. Pennsylvania</i>. They thought this was a push back on federal overreach and a challenge to the propriety of the 2020 presidential election. It was not a lawsuit against the federal government nor was it about the integrity of the 2020 election. Instead, it was a lawsuit challenging the sovereignty of a sister state.</p> <p>Texas, a sovereign state, sued Pennsylvania, a sovereign state, for Pennsylvania’s exercise of its sovereign power over Pennsylvania’s own election. Texas made similar claims against the sovereignty of Georgia, Wisconsin and Michigan.</p> <p>Think about that for a moment. If Texas can sue Pennsylvania for its exercise of its sovereign power, then California can sue Idaho when we exercise our sovereign power. Do you think California or Washington should control Idaho? I don’t. That’s why I didn’t join Texas. Nearly alone, I stood up for your sovereignty. All nine members of the United States Supreme Court, <u>including the three appointed by President Trump</u>, said I was <u>right</u>. Texas did not have standing to sue Pennsylvania over Pennsylvania’s exercise of its sovereign power over its own election.</p> <p>California would love to sue us over exercising our sovereign power concerning water, abortion, the Fairness in Women’s Sports Act and a myriad of other things. The Governor of Washington would love to sue us over COVID-19. He has already said that Idaho is filling Washington hospitals with Covid-19 patients. Many people refuse to acknowledge the terrible precedent the Texas case would have set had the Supreme Court allowed Texas to proceed.</p> <p>The action by Texas violated the constitutional doctrine of federalism. Federalism means that we have a sovereign national government and 50 sovereign state governments. What that means is that the federal government is separate from the states and each state is separate independent of the other states. No state can dictate the policy or law of another state.</p> <p>(The Remainder of Mr. Wasden’s Answer can be seen in his Questionnaire)</p>
--	-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---

<p>9. What is your opinion regarding freedom of choice for parents for the education of their children, for example School choice?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>This is a policy question. Even so, the law of Idaho recognizes the parents as the ones who have superseding interests beyond society and thus freedom of choice as to the methods, times, and places of their children’s education. The interests of society are parallel to the parents’ interests: both want to see the children educated in the basics. However, the interests of the parents are more important, and so the parents have the final say over their children’s education. I agree with the policy prescription that the money supplied by the State should follow the child, especially in an educational system where Idaho’s grade-level scores in the fundamentals are so laggard.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>This is a policy question to be answered by policy makers. A policy question asks what should the law be? The law is what the law actually is. Legislators make the policy choices for the state by passing laws. The law in Idaho allows school choice. That is the law I uphold.</p>
<p>10. Do you believe the ARPA funds come with Federal requirements that might conflict with Idaho values? Why or why not? How will you advocate for the funds to be used?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>Federal funds always come with nooses attached. Rarely do federal requirements attached to federal funding coincide with Idaho values, except perhaps at the proclaimed “bumper sticker” level. I would advocate federal funds allocated to Idaho be returned to make payments on the national debt. Idaho needs to support itself, else the federal nooses will choke Idaho and its values. Idaho should not be so easily fooled by money.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>APRA funds do have federal strings attached. Often, federal strings are at odds with Idaho values. How those funds are spent and whether to meet the federal requirements, however, is a policy question for policy makers. I am not a policy maker and, therefore, it is not appropriate for me to advocate for how these funds will be used. That is for legislators and local officials to decide. My job is to give the state advice about legal issues surrounding these funds and not how the funds themselves should be used.</p>

	Raúl R. Labrador	Arthur ("Art") Macomber	Steven Scanlin	Lawrence Wasden
11. In your opinion, as an elected official, who do you see yourself accountable to and why?	Declined to Respond	As Attorney General, I am accountable to the State and federal Constitutions, in that order and only where the latter may apply by its plain language. Secondly, I am accountable to the voters. Therefore, when advising a State entity, I must account for the State Constitution with a particular focus on the Article 1 rights of the people, because the State Constitution is a limitation on State power. If the Idaho Constitution conflicts with an exercise of State power, then my advice must accord with the Constitutional limits.	Declined to Respond	As an independently elected constitutional officer, I am accountable to the voters. I am not employed by the Governor nor my other clients. I am duty bound to give them legal representation as required by the law, but I am elected by the voters.
12. The 10th amendment states: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people. What does this mean to you?	Declined to Respond	This confirms the federal constitution is a document of limited powers. It also means the States have agreed to constrain their own powers to some extent, see for example Article 1, section 9 and 10. Otherwise, all political powers remain with the State, or the people. The provisions related to State power are necessarily limited by the respective State constitutions. Overall, the States are the more powerful sovereigns, even with the further restraints on State power found in the 14th Amendment, specifically those added to protect the rights of the people to due process, equal protection of the laws, and of their privileges and immunities, however the latter may be defined.	Declined to Respond	<p>There are four buckets of power identified in the 10th Amendment. The “federal” power bucket, the “prohibited to the states” bucket, the “reserved to the states respectively” bucket and the “reserved to the people” bucket.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;">  </div> <p style="text-align: center;"> Delegated to the United States Prohibited to the States Reserved to the States Reserved to the People </p> <p>These buckets are mutually exclusive, meaning that if the power is in one of the buckets it cannot be in another bucket. For example, the U.S. Constitution delegates power to Congress to declare war. U.S. Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, cl. 11. Because that power is delegated to Congress it is not a power reserved to the states or to the people. The 14th Amendment provides that, “no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.” This is a power prohibited to the states and fits in that bucket. One of the powers not identified in the Constitution but reserved to the states is called the police power. It is the power to regulate the health, safety, welfare and morals of the people. <i>Smith v. Turner</i>, 48 U.S. 283, 400 (1849). Because it is a power reserved to the states, it is not a power possessed by the federal government. If a power does not fall into any of the other buckets, then it is a power reserved to the people. Generally, those powers are not identified in the Constitution.</p>
13. In recent years some groups have advocated for legalizing marijuana in our state, do you	Declined to Respond	I oppose its legalization. Even though there are reasonable criticisms of the criminal punishments to be levied for violations of the law, societal remedies have not been fully explored. Perhaps there are civil alternatives to prison for offenders? In the end, society is not benefited by recreational drug use of any type, and drug use for medicinal purposes is usually the path for the former to eventually appear in the law, see Colorado, California, or Washington. Idaho has enough trouble with various dependencies, such as dependency on federal	Declined to Respond	<p>This is a policy question (what should the law be)? Although I am not a policy maker, I deal directly with the effects of drugs and addiction because of the crimes that I prosecute as a special prosecutor and the many criminal cases we defend on appeal each year.</p> <p>I oppose the legalization of marijuana. It leads to addiction and destructive personal behavior. It is particularly destructive on the developing brains of young children.</p>

<p>support or oppose the legalization of marijuana? Why or why not?</p>		<p>money, and drug dependencies in our society can only work against the health and safety of Idahoans.</p>		<p>Legalizing marijuana does not reduce criminal activity. In states that have decriminalized marijuana the illegal marijuana trade has not disappeared but has been strengthened because it is not taxed and law enforcement has a very difficult time trying to distinguish between legal and illegal marijuana. My wife teaches tobacco cessation and has learned that many Idaho children believe that tobacco is more dangerous than marijuana. Marijuana is a dangerous drug. At some future point, medical science may establish some medical uses for elements of marijuana, but there is not yet a consensus among medical professionals on this issue. Until medical appropriateness (standards for method and amounts of prescriptions for medical uses) is established by proper facts, I oppose the legalization of marijuana.</p>
<p>14. Do you believe the Attorney General should defend Idaho state laws based on principle or whether you believe the state can win in court?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>Principles are always the best reason for defense of State laws. This is because the State government has a moral obligation to defend the will of its people as enacted into law. Therefore, the Attorney General who believes in prosecutorial discretion is misguided, unless the case is patently unreasonable or unsupportable by the specific facts of a case. Even so, the past eighty years have resulted in a dramatic deterioration of State power in favor of the federal power, and so a principled stand for State sovereignty is a minimum requirement if the States are to push the federal power back into its originally designed enumerated powers structure.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>My duty is to make the legal arguments in defense of the state laws made by the legislature or by citizens' initiative. It is irrelevant whether I agree or disagree with the law and most importantly, it is irrelevant whether I believe we can win in court. What I think doesn't matter. The limitation is whether I can make a legitimate legal argument in defense of the law. If I can, I am duty bound to make that argument. If I can't, I am duty bound not to make a frivolous argument. This is an extreme example but illustrates my point. If the legislature passed a law allowing slavery, there is no legitimate legal argument that can be made to sustain that law. I would, therefore, have to confess error to the court. I am obligated not to make a frivolous argument. If such a law was passed, I may have other duties as well. However, I am obligated to make good faith arguments in favor of laws passed by the Idaho legislature or by citizens' initiative.</p>
<p>15. What is your background and why do you believe it qualifies you for this position?</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>was not a lawyer for the first forty-five years of life, so I have a non-legal adult perspective as a worker and manager in several industries, and as a concerned citizen. Now, through perseverance, I'm a lawyer. I can speak and translate the law to non-lawyers. I'm not a career-politician and I'm not beholden to any special-interests. Second, I'm a proven fighter. The AG's job is a law job, not a policy job. I am a professional litigator and problem-solver. My legal skills are sharp, and I can take a punch as well as give one. I've practiced in the Idaho courts for fifteen years arguing before the State Supreme Court six times. I grew my law firm from a solo practice to six attorneys practicing in three States. I taught law at Gonzaga Law School and North Idaho College. I have published legal articles and taught dozens of legal seminars to educate non-lawyers and legal professionals alike. I have mentored new and experienced attorneys. Finally, I wrote the 2018 Idaho constitutional amendment limiting Brad Little's executive overreach. I've been fighting for Idaho already! I have fidelity to the law and know what that means in practice both for those I represent and the stability of Idaho's Republic.</p>	<p>Declined to Respond</p>	<p>I was born in Idaho and this is my home. I graduated from the University of Idaho College of Law in 1985 and have practiced law in this state for nearly 37 years. I have served as a Canyon County Deputy Prosecutor Attorney and as the Owyhee County Prosecutor. In fact, I am the only prosecutor in this race for Attorney General. I have also had a private practice as an associate in Hamilton, Clark and Michaelson in Nampa. I have served in the office of the Attorney General for over 30 years as a deputy assigned to the Idaho State Tax Commission, the deputy Chief of Staff, the Chief of Staff and as Attorney General. I have the necessary background and experience.</p> <p>I have been married for nearly 42 years and have four grown and married children and 13 grandchildren. I serve in my church and in my community. All of these things qualify me for this position. It is important to give you an example of what I have accomplished. In 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. My office recovered \$44 Million. The legislature appropriated my office \$26.6 million. That means that for every dollar appropriated to my office, we returned \$1.66 for Idaho Citizens. B. This the 19th consecutive year my office has returned more money to the state than the legislature has appropriated to us.

			<p>C. The Consumer Protection Division obtained over \$7 Million in consumer restitution. That amounts to \$7.25 for each taxpayer dollar appropriated for consumer operations.</p> <p>D. We recovered \$22 Million from tobacco companies stemming from the 1998 Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement and we expect a similar payment this year.</p> <p>E. To date, Idaho’s Master Settlement Agreement payments total more than a half-billion dollars all of which have been deposited into Idaho Millennium fund.</p> <p>F. We settled three opioid cases that will result in \$120 Million that will fund opioid abatement for state, regional and local governments in Idaho.</p> <p>G. As mentioned above, we filed three lawsuits over the Biden Administrations vaccine mandates.</p> <p>H. We were one of five states to file a lawsuit challenging the Biden Administration’s executive order to change the minimum wage for federal contractors.</p> <p>I. We continue to litigate one lawsuit against Facebook and two against Google that allege anti-competitive conduct by those companies.</p> <p>J. We recouped nearly \$15.3 Million in Medicaid estate recovery.</p> <p>K. This year alone, our Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) unit received 1500 cybertips, opened 815 investigations and made 58 arrests. That is more than one arrest each week. (The numbers previously cited were for four years not just 2021).</p> <p>L. Our ICAC unit, trained more than 100 law enforcement officers in Nampa, Pocatello, Meridian and Coeur d’Alene.</p> <p>M. This year trainings are planned in Moscow, Caldwell and Idaho Falls.</p> <p>N. Most recently, the Governor and I sent a letter to the Governor of Washington opposing Washington’s proposed tax on gasoline exports. Such move by Washington would have been a violation of the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. Washington has withdrawn its proposed legislation.</p>
--	--	--	--

				This is only a partial discussion of the things I do to protect Idaho citizens. These accomplishments also qualify me for this position. I ask for your vote on May 17, 2022.
--	--	--	--	---