



DELAWARE DEBATES 2018

Candidates for U.S. Senate

PRESENTED BY Delaware First Media and University of Delaware Center for Political Communication and supported by the American Cancer Society's Cancer Action Network, and by the University of Delaware

MODERATOR RALPH BEGLEITER

CANDIDATES

Tom Carper (D) Candidate for U.S. Senate

Rob Arlett (R) Candidate for U.S. Senate

Transcript of Event

Date: October 17, 2018

Place: Mitchell Hall, University of Delaware, Newark, DE

MR. BEGLEITER: Good evening. On behalf of Delaware Public Media and the University of Delaware's Center for Political Communication welcome to Delaware Debates 2018. I'm Ralph Begleiter. Delaware Debates is also supported by the American Cancer Society's Cancer Action Network, and the University of Delaware. This debate features candidates in the race for one of Delaware's seats in the United States Senate. The Democratic Party's nominee is incumbent Senator Tom Carper. Running as the Republican candidate for Senate is Robert Arnet (sic), Arlett, an incumbent county councilmember in Sussex County, Delaware. Welcome to both of you.

MR. CARPER: Thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER: We're conducting tonight's debate as a conversation and both candidates have agreed to rules for the occasion. There will be no opening statements. I'll begin with a question for both candidates, and they have agreed to hold themselves to 90 second answers. We'll also include in this debate questions recorded by students at Delaware State University and at the University of Delaware. Now, although we're not having opening statements we will welcome a formal closing statement from each candidate. The candidates on stage have also agreed to participate in this debate with some rules for the live audience here at the University of Delaware campus. Audience members have entered Mitchell Hall understanding that this is not a pep rally. There will be no cheering or applause. This debate is about the candidates, not about the audience. I'll keep my questions short and I'll ask the candidates to answer concisely so we can cover a lot more ground tonight. The candidates will answer

in the order they determined backstage with a pre-debate coin toss. So, the first question goes now to Senator Carper. It goes to both candidates, but I'll ask Senator Carper to answer first. Do you see the 2018 midterm elections as a referendum on President Donald Trump?

MR. CARPER: I suppose in, in part it is a, a referendum but, um, I think as much as anything its an answer to a question, do we believe in checks and balances in this country? The Constitution, the framers of our constitution put together this intricate system of checks and balances, Executive Branch and Legislative Branch, Judicial branch with the, the idea that we would not end up with any one person being king. And they disagreed on a lot of things. Should there be one or two, ah, units within the Legislative Branch, who's going to appoint the judges, would there be lifetime terms, roles of women, rights of women, slaves. But, I think the, the, the, sort of the key ingredient for why our country's, country's survived in and been successful for all these years is checks and balances. And I think as much as anything when people vote this year they're going to be voting on checks and balances because they know they're likely to have this president for a while longer and the question is do they want to have someone who's able and, as I am, work with Republicans and with Democrats but also to try to make sure that this, this president doesn't end up being royalty or a king with almost endless powers.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett, is it a referendum on Donald Trump?

MR. ARLETT: I, I think it's a referendum of the voice of the American people and specifically I think in our race it's a referendum I think on Senator Carper's career as a public official. A, a 42-year career politician, 18 years in the

US Senate. And, and I think ultimately that's what Delawareans are seeking. They want change. I think that's what this election is about. President Trump won with a significant amount of success just two years ago. And the American people wanted change in America. That's what's great about this, this representative republic that we have. The voice of the people is what matters. He had gone to work. He is not a career politician. He is focused on results. He's actually a president who says what he means and does what he, and, and, and does what he's (sic) means. And, and means what he does. I think that's critical that we have elected officials who are focused on results and not the partisanship and the party politics that exists in Washington, D.C. So, we are very excited about this election cycle because I'm hearing change everywhere we go in the great state of Delaware. People want change. They want their voice heard and that's what's most important about this very election and why we're running today.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. I'd like to ask you a question that for one of you is a hypothetical, for the other it isn't. But, I'd like you both to respond. I want to ask you both how did you vote, or would you have vote on the nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh to be a Justice of the Supreme Court? Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: Well, I voted both ways. I voted for him and the reason why I voted for him 12 years ago is he was pretty much a blank slate. We, I knew a number of people for whom he had worked, with whom he had worked including some of our most cherished and respected judges, ah, in this state. If I had known 12 years ago how he would turn out as a, as a judge I would not have voted for him. I've been very disappointed. He has perhaps the worst record on

environmental issues of any judge that, that I know of. In 90 percent of the cases where there was an environmental issue for, for the environment or against the environment, 90 percent of the time he voted the wrong way. He believes it's okay for upwind states -- think Pennsylvania, think West Virginia, think Ohio -- it's all right for them to spew filth up into the air and it blows down on downwind states and we have no recourse to that. He doesn't believe that the, this country should have the authority to regulate carbon dioxide which leads to climate change, climate warming, extreme weather; he thinks that's all right. He doesn't believe the EPA should have the right to regulate, ah, mercury or, or methane. And the, the list goes on and on and on. In fact, in 90 percent of the cases where there's an environmental issue at, at stake, 90 percent of the cases, he chose the wrong side rather than the right side. That's why I voted against him.

MR. BEGLEITER: And, and you voted against him --

MR. CARPER: Yeah.

MR. BEGLEITER: -- most recently. Okay, Mr. Arlett, how about you? How would you have voted --

MR. ARLETT: Well, I certainly would have voted yes and, and I think Senator Carper is, is a little off track slightly because he already made his decision before the hearings. You had stated publicly that you were already against whoever really that nominee was. Your decision was all against the President of America. No matter who the nominee was you were going to vote against him. And, I think that's what's broken in Washington, D.C. That's why people are upset because this partisanship -- let's, let's respect the process. That poor man and his family went under a tremendous amount of a, of

discourse and it was, it was appalling for Americans, it was appalling as Delawareans to see that happen. I have to tell you, it was unbelievable what happened and what occurred, and it was shameful of the Democratic Party. I say that because they held onto to that letter for weeks and ah, and, and she wanted to be held anonymous. That's a fact now. They brought it our for political gain at the very last moment (sic), at the very moment, excuse me. So, to me it was a political games, game to the Democrats and, and I was focused on, only on the facts of the hearing and I would have voted yes.

MR. BEGLEITER: And since we're in the hypothetical range with you, how would you have voted two years ago when you spoke about respecting the process when the Democratic president nominated a Justice to the Supreme Court?

MR. ARLETT: I would have, I would have wanted the hearing.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MR. ARLETT: I would have, have wanted the vote. I think the Republicans were wrong. Again, respect the process and, and again, we're not a party guy, we're a principled guy. So, two years ago I am already on record, and I'll say it here publicly, the Republicans should have allowed that up and down vote and they did not. I think that was a mistake.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Going to move on to a question --

MR. CARPER: I'm Tom Carper and I approve this message.

MR. BEGLEITER: [Laughter.]

MR. ARLETT: Thank you.

MR. CARPER: [Laughter.]

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: Moving on to a question from a student. This is a senior political science and technology double major here at the University of Delaware

--

MR. ARLETT: Way to go.

MR. BEGLEITER: -- with a question for both of you.

Q: With the growing concern about partisanship on the judiciary, what could be done to alleviate that worry?

MR. BEGLEITER: Partisanship on the judiciary. Mr. Arlett, you answer first.

MR. ARLETT: I guess on all levels I'm going to assume perhaps but, but the judiciary is not to be a legislative arm of the government. They don't make laws. And, and I think the partisanship is, is, is unfortunate. That's why its important that we have senate candidates who understand the Constitution and will nominate those who will apply the Constitution as written. That's what's most important. When you apply that litmus test it, the politics are staying out of it. It's all about interpreting the, the Constitution as written, very simple, and, and I think that's what needs to be done.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: Yeah. The, when the founding fathers were meeting up the road, um, all those years ago working on the Constitution, 231 years ago, they grappled with a lot of issues. I mentioned earlier right of women; slaves; how many branches of government; ah, ah, by or would there be one or two unicameral or bicameral legislature; um, age you'd have to have lived in this country, born in this country to be president; ages and so forth. The toughest

issue that they debated, ah, ah, Ralph, was judges. Should they have them? Should they serve lifetime terms? Who would appoint them? And they battled on that for weeks, weeks. And finally, they voted up and down on the idea that the president would appoint with the advice and consent of the Senate and it was defeated. They went back to the drawing board. Prayed some more. And they voted on it again. Same compromise. The president will nominate with the advice and consent of the Senate. Voted on it, they approved it. That's 231 years ago. For all those years we've been trying to figure what does advice and consent mean. And I think what, maybe what we need to do is take a look at a state like Delaware. I was a, a governor here for eight years. For every Republican I nominated to be a judge I had to nominate a Republican. For every Democrat I had to nominate a Republican. When equal balance across the, the, the, the spectrum. And, we have one of the most respected judiciaries in the country and they do not, they do not serve lifetime terms. They serve 12-year terms. And I think maybe what we should do is find out what works and do more of that. And I would suggest that we take a long hard look at the way we do business here in Delaware and we may have something here that could be a model for the country.

MR. BEGLEITER: Now, both of you have talked about the advise and consent requirement, so I want to follow up on that and just ask you both whether you think the Senate ought to be required to advise and consent on presidential judge nominations during, during the legislative session in which those nominations are made regardless of the national election calendar. Mr. Arlett first.

MR. ARLETT: I, I, I think, ah, I would be open to the idea. I think again, I

think that what, ah, what we have to do is, is have a transparency with the process. And, and the back, the backdoor conversations and the backdoor deals, the games, if you would, I think America is fed up with the politics of Washington, D.C. So, if it allows for the process to be more transparent so the public can understand the process and be more involved in the process, ah, ah, I would be supportive of that. So, I would be open to that idea.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper? Should the Senate be required to, to act --

MR. CARPER: Yeah, I, I have no aspirations to be president, but I was governor and, ah, one of the -- if I were president what I would want to do is reach out, especially to the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee and say these are a couple of people that I'm thinking about. What do you think? I would. And say, I wouldn't give them veto authority, but I'd say I'm thinking about this person, this person, that person what do you think? And, ask for their, ah, their, ah, their, their response. Barack Obama essentially did that, and he asked among other people Orrin Hatch, what do you think about Merrick Garland, and he asked several other Republicans on the Judiciary Committee who had lavished praise and who voted for Merrick Garland years before to make him a Chief Judge of the, ah, the strongest, the highest Districts Court of Appeals in the country. And they all said they thought he was great, they thought he was terrific. That's why a big reason Barack nominated him. And then for the most part, they wouldn't meet with him, they certainly didn't give him a hearing. I thought the way he was treated was shameful. And, ah, my hope is that we don't have to relive that, that chapter in the history of our country.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. A student from Delaware State University is going

to move us in a different direction now. She's a senior political science major at DSU. Let's listen.

Q: Due to multiple mass shootings in the country do you think gun restrictions are needed? And how do you plan on addressing what seems to be an epidemic of mass shootings?

MR. BEGLEITER: The topic is mass shootings and, and whether gun restrictions are needed. Mr. Arlett first.

MR. ARLETT: You know, I think that it is horrific, and I'll be very clear, anybody who does another, does harm to another human being I believe is mentally ill. Let's just be clear. I don't care what gun or what type of gun that you're using, it is a person who is doing harm to another person. Whether it be a gun, or be it using a vehicle, be it using a knife. When somebody intentionally does harm to somebody else you have a mental issue there in my opinion. So, to me, again, we are a, we are a constitutional republic in this country. We do have a second amendment, so I think that is the guiding light with respect to any gun regulations or rules. I; so, to me, again, it's not necessarily the gun, it's the person and I think we do have rules that we have to enforce that are not necessarily being enforced today. Again, I don't think we need more. I think we have to enforce what we have today. And, I think we also have to take a focus on mental care in this nation and stop playing around with that game because we all know the epidemic, ah, of the opioids and other issues. There's a lot of mental illness that we have in our nation. So, I think we need to go down that path as well.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper, gun restrictions?

MR. CARPER: Um, I just happen to have a copy of the Constitution here.

MR. ARLETT: All right.

MR. CARPER: And, I'm looking at Amendment 2 and I'll just read it, briefly read it. It says, a well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. It doesn't say anything about assault weapons. It doesn't say anything about bump stocks. It doesn't say anything about armor piercing bullets. It doesn't say anything about, ah, ah, background checks. It doesn't say anything about those things, but, but my, my dad -- I come from a, a, a family of hunters and fisherman. The only thing that the Carper family is famous for in West Virginia was the Carper Rifle. One of the first things I bought with, as a little boy with money from my paper route was a BB gun. One of my treasured um, um, holdings is, is my grandfather's shotgun. My dad was, he would buy and sell weapons and but, but, you know, he, he was a guy who believed in common sense. He believed that, ah, people who were trying to buy weapons should go through a, a background check. He believed that, ah, armored piercing bullets were not for killing, you know, birds and, and animals and, and so forth and they shouldn't be used because they kill people. He believed that there, there, he believed that if, if you're on a no-fly list you shouldn't be able to buy weapons. And we ought to be able to, to just better ensure that ought to know who's buying these weapons. That's, those are common sense. Those are common sense ideas and I think when we vote in the Congress we should vote and use some common sense while, while still preserving and, and --

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator, no props allowed in the debate --

MR. CARPER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. BEGLEITER: Please put down your --

MR. CARPER: Not even the Constitution.

MR. BEGLEITER: You quoted from it, so --

MR. CARPER: We're, all right. thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. All right.

MR. ARLETT: May I have one comment to make.

MR. BEGLEITER: Go ahead.

MR. ARLETT: And, and I would like to remind the Senator that assault weapons are already against the law and, and so are arming (sic) piercing bullets. Those are military issues and again it gets back down, back down to my point of enforcing the current laws.

MR. CARPER: [Indiscernible].

MR. BEGLEITER: So, let me ask you the follow-up, the obvious follow-up to this. Would you support repeal of the Second Amendment? Mr. Arlett?

MR. ARLETT: Absolutely not. Absolutely not. This is America. Absolutely -- it is we the people to defend ourselves against the government. Absolutely not.

MR. BEGLEITER: Does this is America mean no amendments would ever be repealed or changed or --

MR. ARLETT: I didn't say that. You [indiscernible] --

MR. BEGLEITER: Well, I'm, I'm just asking --

MR. ARLETT: -- you referenced to the Second --

MR. BEGLEITER: -- you.

MR. ARLETT: -- Amendment.

MR. BEGLEITER: Right, okay.

MR. ARLETT: So, I'm listening very well, Ralph.

MR. BEGLEITER: Gottcha, all right.

MR. ARLETT: Yes, sir.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper, Second Amendment, should it be repealed?

MR. CARPER: No, it shouldn't be, ah, shouldn't be repealed and I think we ought to use some common sense in the way we interpret it, and, and, and today. The, ah, we, we get to devote, or, it's funny Rob says there's, there's, that it is perfectly, it's already illegal to have assault weapons. I'm cosponsor of a bill that actually outlaws assault weapons and I'm not sure why we'd be offering that legislation if they're already outlawed?

MR. ARLETT: It won't be the first --

MR. CARPER: No, I don't, I don't think, ah, I don't they, ah, they are outlawed. I --

MR. ARLETT: Yeah.

MR. CARPER: -- I think, and I think there needs to be a provision. I think we need to close the, make sure the background checks are, are, are, are put in place when people try to buy weapons whether they're buying at a gun show or over the, the internet. I think the idea of bump stocks, the idea of these, having these, ah, ah, ability to turn a semiautomatic weapon into a, an automatic weapon. That's the kind of stuff we ought to stop.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MR. CARPER: And, I think most people agree with that.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right, I'm going to ask you each, ah, another, one of those questions that's hypothetical for one of you. I'm going to ask how did you vote or how would you have voted on the federal tax overhaul of December 2017 and why did you vote that way? Senator Carper, first.

MR. CARPER: Yeah. I was governor for, for eight years of this, this state. We balanced our budget eight years in a row. We cut taxes seven out of eight years, but we always balanced the budget. And the tax cuts that we had largely benefited middle, ah, middle income people. We, ah, enhanced the economic growth rather than diminished it. And, we always balanced the budget. We always balanced the budget. And when I consider tax proposals as a member of the finance committee I always consider those four issues. I always consider those four issues. This tax cut that was signed into law entirely with Republican votes, sadly with no Democratic votes and we could have had a bipartisan compromise too. But, ah, it was not fair. I think something like 80 or 90 percent of the benefit goes to like ten, fewer than ten percent of the people. The, ah, economic, has the, the economy been enhanced? What do we have, we have a president who was born on third base and thinks he hit a triple. He became, became president eight years into the longest running economic expansion in the history of the country. We passed his tax bill, throws all kinds of money into the arms, arms of rich people. Most of that money is being used for stock buybacks. It pushes up the, the stock market and it continues to make it look like we're being prosperous. But, I will tell you, when you look down deep in, inside the tax cuts that were passed, in terms of their ability to foster economic growth, R and D, infrastructure, manufacturing, it's not there.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator, you're out of time on that one. Mr. Arlett, would, how would you have voted on the tax bill --

MR. ARLETT: I, ah --

MR. BEGLEITER: -- in 2017?

MR. ARLETT: -- I would have absolutely voted yes because the focus is not the Washington swamp, the focus is Delawareans. And, Delaware families needed the money and they desired the money and it helped their, their dollars. As a matter of fact, I recall when the Democratic leader said, I can't remember whether the number was 1,000 dollars, it was chump change. It was a comment I think from Nancy Pelosi if I'm not mistaken. Well, that's why she's out of touch to the American people. That's the problem with Washington, D.C. They make decisions not through the lens of the American people, but through the lens of, that they live in and that is called a bubble. That's the problem with Washington, D.C. And Senator, for, for God's sake, I'll tell you, the President of the United States, we've got the best economy. It is growing at a faster rate today that all of Barack Obama. So, for, for you to make the statement that he was, things he made a triple and he's standing on third, well if that's the case I think he's right because this economy is growing at an, an, at a tremendous rate much more so than previously. And I think it's because of the decisions and the policies that he has set forth and again, it's putting people back in their pockets because ultimately, let us not forget, it's not Washington's money, it's the American people's money. They know what's best for their dollars. I would encourage more tax cuts in the future. If we have the ability to do so I would encourage it. They know best and Washington is horrible at spending American tax

[indiscernible].

MR. BEGLEITER: Follow-up --

MR. CARPER: [Indiscernible] say --

MR. BEGLEITER: Follow-up for a little --

MR. CARPER: Yeah.

MR. BEGLEITER: -- discussion on this topic.

MR. CARPER: Yeah.

MR. BEGLEITER: -- it is widely predicted that this tax bill and this is a, across partisan lines, that the tax law that was enacted will raise the national debt by about a trillion dollars. Do you see that as a problem, if so why, if not, why not? And, if it is a problem how would you address it? Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: The, the nation's debt last year, about 550 billion dollars. We just learned that the, the, the debt this year, the year that just ended is about 750 billion dollars. The forecast to the debt next year is about 950 billion dollars. The; Barack Obama and Joe Biden became President and Vice President of this country in the worst economic recession since the Great Depression. They started at the very bottom. Banks were closed. People couldn't get loans. It was a terrible time. Terrible time. And, what they had to do was to fight without the help, frankly, of the Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate to help lift us out of that for the next eight years. We; they turned over to this administration the longest running expansion in the history of this country. We passed this tax cut bill which is like a sugar high for the stock market and the money is being used to buy back stock pushes up the value of the stocks which inures mostly to wealthy people.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett, how about you? The question of the national debt being raised as a result of the passage --

MR. ARLETT: Well, I, I --

MR. BEGLEITER: -- of this Act?

MR. ARLETT: We have a, a major issue in this, in this country with regard to 22 trillion-dollar deficit as it stands and so, I understand what he's doing. He's, you know, trying to, ah, energize the economy and give the money back to the American people whereas they will turn around and spend it. So, again, I am concerned with the deficit as all Americans should be. The government has got to focus on being better with the tax dollars. They have to learn how to be more efficient, more effective, and learn to do more with less. Just like the regular Americans. And to you point, Senator, you know, as far it helped to the stock market and helped the wealthy, well, that's you. I mean, the reality is that's not the average necessary Americans, but the reality is that's most of those in Washington, D.C. that are making these various decisions. And, and again, I think the focus has got to be on the American people and how to empower them, so they can move forward and prosper and that's what my desire is.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. I want to turn to, ah, healthcare which is obviously another major national issue. I'd like to ask whether either of you or both of you think Congress should take action to stop the administrative cuts to the Affordable Care law that's now, that are now being implemented by the Trump administration. So, ah, should there be some congressional action at this point? Mr. Arlett first.

MR. ARLETT: Well, you know, the, the Affordable Care Act, ah, is not

affordable. You know, it, it is, it is absolutely irresponsible of Congress, um, and, and really ultimately the Democrats, you know who, who had to, um, um, ah, approve of the bill so they could read the bill. If we all recall that. And just ten years ago, the average, um, insurance premium was just over 300 dollars. Today it's over 1,300 dollars, over 1,300 dollars. People's incomes have not quadrupled in ten years. It is unsustainable for most families. That is the number one issue I believe in, in, not only in America but I believe right here in Delaware. And again, I, I, I will ensure that we repeal the ACA because it does not work. I have a big problem also with regard to the healthcare is the pharmaceutical drug industry. Politics has gotten too much into it. On day one I will, I will, ah, offer a bill that will repeal the, um, um, the, the bill that allows the legalized kickbacks from the pharmaceutical companies. And again, my opponent here has received over 550,000 dollars from big pharma at the cost and the expense of the American people and Delaware families. Delaware families are starving to be able to, to afford their pharmaceutical drugs, yet they are out of control with the expense.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MR. ARLETT: And its Congress's fault for, for this.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. Senator Carper, I wanted to ask the question about the administrative cuts and congressional action but because of a direct attack you get an opportunity to respond to that. So, should Congress take action to prevent the, to stop the administrative cuts to the Affordable Care Act that are being currently ah, ah, implemented by the Trump Administration?

MR. CARPER: I, I'm going to ask everyone to use their imagination.

Imagine a pie, a pie chart. Inside a pie chart is 300 million people. Half the people in that pie chart get their healthcare from a large employer group health plans. About 20 to 25 percent in the pie chart get their healthcare from Medicaid. Another 15 to 20 percent get their healthcare from Medicare. And the rest down here either get their healthcare through the, through an exchange or they pay for it themselves largely, or they don't get healthcare at all. The debate here has always been not so much on large employer healthcare, not on Medicare, not on Medicaid, but do we do about this five or ten percent down here at the bottom? We use an idea that actually was introduced by Republicans in 1993, 1993 it was taken by a guy named Mitt Romney and he installed it as Romney Care in Massachusetts in 2006. And it had five principles. One, every state would have a, a, a, um, gosh, exchange. Every state would have an exchange where they could go for, people without healthcare could get the coverage. Every state not in the exchange you'd have to, everybody would have to get coverage through the sliding-scale tax cut it to basically say poor people get more help in affording their, their coverage. There'd be an employer mandate and you couldn't deny people coverage for preexisting conditions. What the Republicans want to do is attack and kill their own baby because what we did with the Affordable Care Act is we took Mitt Romney's idea and made it the exchanges in part of the ACA. And we should let it actually find out if it works. It worked in Massachusetts, it would work for our country. And the, this administration, because its named Obamacare, this president, because he, of his enmity towards Barack Obama wants to make sure it fails.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator, do you want to say anything briefly about the direct

reference of the 150,000 dollars from --

MR. ARLETT: 550,000.

MR. BEGLEITER: 550,000 dollars.

MR. ARLETT: That's a big difference.

MR. CARPER: Well, we have, we have a real problem in this country and the problem is not those of us who receive contributions that are fully disclosed, fully disclosed --

MR. ARLETT: Um-hum.

MR. CARPER: -- for, forever. Fully disclosed. People have any questions about monies that I received or Rob Arlett [indiscernible] will understand and see where the money comes from. Except for the fact that dark money, who we don't have any idea where it comes from, can seep into campaigns. We don't know who donated the money. We don't know how it's been spending. And, it, it makes miniscule the money that we raise on our own. What I think is, is the better thing to do is change the Constitution, frankly, to say that ah, Citizens United is going to be basically thrown out. We're going to, and corporations are not people, they shouldn't be able to give enormous amounts of money to campaigns. And, we should know where every dime comes from and for whom, by whom it's being spent.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. One, one more follow-up on healthcare. I want to ask both of you for a brief answer on this please. Would you favor healthcare for all, a plan of healthcare for all in the United States? Mr. Arlett?

MR. ARLETT: Absolutely not. I think the government should get out of the healthcare business. I've had two healthcare townhall's in the state of Delaware

because I don't have all the answers. I listen to the professionals. Those that are in the field, right? The professionals and the doctors and the patients. They know what's best. They live it each and every single day. They have said the government needs to get out of the healthcare business. Let's get it back in the private sector. Let's get more competition. Let's get it across state lines. And it does not work. We don't need to keep going because when you go from 300 dollars to, to over 1,300 dollars I think everybody that's here, that's listening and watching at home, it doesn't work. So, I would suggest we get the government out of the healthcare business and get it back to where it belongs in the private sector.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: There's a committee in the Senate called the HELP Committee, health, education, labor and pension committee. And they spent, a, I'm not on the committee but I joined them and spent a lot of time about a year ago to figure out what we needed to do to execute a stabilize the exchanges in all 50 states, and to bring down the cost of healthcare coverage in the exchanges. They brought in governors, insurance commissioners, doctors, all kinds of people who had a, a view on this. And they came up with a consensus. There are three things that we needed to do. Three things that we needed to do with agreement among Democrats and Republicans that if we do things we'd reduce the cost of insurance in the exchanges and outside the exchanges by 30 to 35 percent. The Republican, God, God bless him, the Republicans in the Senate would not allow us to do that. If we had done those three things we would have brought, we would have stabilized the exchanges, we'd have had more

competition, more insurance companies, and we would frankly drop the cost by about a third.

MR. BEGLEITER: Just as a point of interest to both of you, the Center for Political Communication here at the University has just released a public opinion poll in Delaware that shows that 64 percent of Delawareans favor a healthcare for all plan.

MR. CARPER: Um-hum.

MR. BEGLEITER: But let's focus on some civil rights issues now. I want to ask you whether you support laws or regulations that protect LGBT students in schools? The question is about laws or regulations protecting LGBT students in schools. Senator Carper, first please?

MR. CARPER: I do. Thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett?

MR. ARLETT: I would say that we probably already do, it's called the U.S. Constitution. There's already rules and regulations involved if somebody does something to somebody else there's already something in place to do that. I, I think, again, I think let's enforce the laws that already exist. One should not matter if they're gay, or not, or, or black or white, or Asian like my wife is. In my mind we are all creatures of God. We are truly all miracles. And I think the Constitution protects all Americans as written. The question is are we enforcing. That's the question, are we enforcing.

MR. BEGLEITER: In the primary election you raised the issue with your primary opponent --

MR. ARLETT: Um-hum.

MR. BEGLEITER: -- who is obviously not running anymore.

MR. ARLETT: Right.

MR. BEGLEITER: Ah, did that, does that, does that fit with what you just said about we're all Americans and --

MR. ARLETT: Sure.

MR. BEGLEITER: It does?

MR. ARLETT: Sure.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. All right.

MR. ARLETT: I, I, I will share with you. I mean --

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MR. ARLETT: -- with regard to the, to the gays, my father-in-law was gay. I own a real estate business downstate and I have a realtor who works for me who is gay. None of that doesn't, I see, I don't see that. What I see are creatures of God and I believe we, we are all very, all created in the image of him and we are all very unique and very special.

MR. BEGLEITER: And Senator, you were governor once as you've mentioned of the state of Delaware. The current governor withdrew such regulations protecting LGBT students in school after they received, ah, some detailed opposition in public comment. Ah, how do you feel about the governor's decision to withdraw those regulations? Would you have stuck with it?

MR. CARPER: The ah, I don't know that I'm particularly familiar with, with what the governor or what the legislature did on this, on this particular issue. Let me just say, I, I believe that, ah, the folks who are transgender, trans, transgender in our school, transgender is our schools, they deserve equal

protection under the law. And, my hope and expectation is that's what the governor and legislature are trying to do.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. The same CPC poll by the way found that 75 percent of Delawareans support such laws protecting LGBT students in schools. Um, let's go to a question now from a Delaware State University student. This one focuses on immigration. Ah, this student is a bio, is a junior, a biology major from Delaware State. Let's listen.

Q: So financial aid is a big part of going to college however there are still many states in the U.S. that do not offer financial to DACA students. So, how do you plan on helping making college more affordable for DACA recipients?

MR. BEGLEITER: So, the student is talking about the dreamers, the students of dreamers. Um, ah, I'm going to ask, ah, Mr. Arlett first to respond to that question.

MR. ARLETT: Well, you know, I, I will tell you that we are a nation of immigrants. My wife and her family came to this country many years ago, legally and lawfully. They followed the rules. And others who do not I would question they're ability be in this country and why they're in this country. Specifically, to answer the question directly, why would I want to give an extra benefit to a DACA student when other students that are American citizens don't receive that same benefit. That would be called discrimination, would it not? So, to me, a, are we, it just doesn't make any sense to me. Ah, so, if, if you are here in this country I think we need to know who you are and why you are here. Let's get them documented, right? And then we can move forward accordingly. But, to give

them an extra benefit at the expense of the American people who do not, I would not support that.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: Yeah, I don't know what we're talking about is an extra benefit. We live in a country where there are about 200 million jobs, 200 million people who go to work tomorrow and tomorrow there are three million jobs where nobody's going to show up because, ah, they don't have the, the interest, they don't have the skills, they don't have the education to a particular job. Three million jobs. Meanwhile, we've got about 700,000 people here who were born in other countries, brought here by their presence (sic), parents at early ages and they've been educated here, they want to serve here, they love this country and it's the only country they've ever known. And we're going to say to you, at a time when we have three million jobs we can't fill we're going to send you home to the place you came from. I think that's economic insanity. That's insanity. And, ah, I, I'm in favor of comprehensive immigration reform not that gives the people that are here illegally amnesty. I'm not interested in doing that. But I want us to find a way that we, the people who are from other countries can come here and work, a, a worker visitor program. I want to make sure that, that folks who are maybe here undocumented have the opportunity to, to gain a legal status if they're willing to do all kinds of things. Speak English. Stay out of trouble. Work. You know, be a, be a, be a good citizen. If they're willing to those things then they can work their way to a, a, a legal status. But they need to get behind the folks, get behind the folks that are here legally trying to become legally work their way to citizenship. That's the way it should work.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Here's a question from a University of Delaware student, a junior in public policy and women and gender studies that focuses on the #Me Too movement broadly speaking. Let's listen.

Q: Should Congress and the courts hold President Trump to the same standard regarding sexual misconduct and the treatment of women as the #Me Too movement has held other politicians, government leaders, and business leaders?

MR. BEGLEITER: All right, Senator Carper, do you want to tackle that one first?

MR. CARPER: I, none of us are above the law and, and I think we, ah, ah, if we commit crimes, you know, we should, ah, be, be held responsible. I think one of the great concerns we had, a lot of us had with the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh was, ah, his views of the President being above the law. And that was certainly one of the things that concerned me because he may be in a position to see, be able to see where the Mueller investigation goes. But he may be in a position, he may be the, somebody said the get out of jail card for the, for the President in a five - four Supreme Court. Um, I don't think presidents are above the law, I don't think any of us are above the law. I think we need to be held accountable for, for our decisions. I think one of the worst things that folks who, who would make a, a, a mistake and I, I've learned this as a new governor and try to teach this to other governors and others who followed me, if you make a mistake admit it. Acknowledge it, don't hide it, admit it. And, ah, and say I'm not going to make that mistake again, apologize, don't make that mistake again. And I've my whole life tried to do that. And, my guess is that, ah, ah, if we do

that then we'll be better off, and our country will be too.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett, should Congress and the courts hold the President accountable to the same standards that the, the industries, the various industries are doing in the #Me Too movement?

MR. ARLETT: Absolutely. Again, no one, no one is above the law. The issue and problems with Congress is that many of them think they are. We all now know that there is a, a slush fund funded by the taxpayers of this very country that has gone to payoff victims of sexual assault and abuse from Congress. That's a now known fact. Why is that, this not revealed? The American taxpayers owe that. And also, I would like to add, that this is domestic violence awareness month. That's this month. I'm in office today because I defended a young girl and her family when she was assaulted and nobody else would. There was an elected official downstate and I went to the aide and I was asked to run for that office because nobody else would hold him accountable. We stepped up when nobody else would. I defend women in this country. And, I would also like ask the Senator, ah, a, a question if I could, and that would be that there, I do know that there was a group of, of, ah, of women that stormed the office, your office in Washington, D.C. this last week demanding your resignation because of your past history of assault against women. So, I'm wondering if you are not above the, the law do you agree with that women's group?

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper, [indiscernible].

MR. CARPER: The woman that probably came to our office -- I heard about it, I didn't see her -- I was told that she was just really bizarre, and I think she brought a television camera with her. She was looking for some kind of, ah,

episode and ah, she was disappointed when she left. I don't feel like I'm above the law. And when people show up that is, excuse my French, bonkers as this lady was, she was not going to get the time of, of my day.

MR. ARLETT: But that doesn't address the question. The question is if, right?

MR. BEGLEITER: What's your question?

MR. ARLETT: Again, I'll go back to the, to the question and that is one has stated that they're not above the law, it is, it is --

MR. BEGLEITER: Both of you said that.

MR. CARPER: This lady's not the law; this lady was like over the top --

MR. ARLETT: Sure.

MR. CARPER: -- out of control.

MR. ARLETT: I, I, I --

MR. CARPER: And you know when people are like that do we, do we need to honor them as we would the law?

MR. ARLETT: Yeah.

MR. CARPER: I don't think so.

MR. ARLETT: I, I guess the ultimate question would be is you, you are now on record, it is now public information, that you had abused your former wife. And it was, there was a lie for 19 years about that. It was a big coverup. It was big collusion --

MR. CARPER: That is baloney.

MR. ARLETT: -- [indiscernible].

MR. CARPER: That is baloney. Let's, lets, set the record straight okay, my

friend?

MR. ARLETT: [Indiscernible]

MR. CARPER: Let's set the record straight, okay?

MR. ARLETT: Okay.

MR. CARPER: Everyone of us makes mistakes. God knows I've made my share of mistakes. And 40 years ago, I made a mistake. I owned it. I didn't hide it. It was public knowledge. My wife at the time publicly on television, radio, newspapers said this is the kind of man I married; this is the kind of man that raised my children. She died a number of years ago. Her son, my stepson that I raised for five years he's like my third son. He loves me as much as I love him. I'm his only parent that's left. And his grandmother, who still is alive in Greenwood, Delaware, I'll be with her on her birthday. It's October 23rd. And again, I will bring her flowers as I do for her birthday, for Valentine's Day, and for Christmas. She thinks I'm he second son. She has a little dementia now. But this is, this is, this is the kind of husband I've been with Martha for 32 years. This is the kind of father I was for my stepson Greg. This is the kind of father I am for Christopher and [indiscernible]. Every year, every other year for 40 years people like you my friend have just dredged this up to try to create mischief for me. And political mischief for me. And let me just say, it doesn't work.

MR. ARLETT: Yeah.

MR. CARPER: It doesn't work. It didn't work six, it didn't work 30 years ago. It didn't work 20 years ago. And it didn't work ten years ago, and you know what? It's not going to work this time either.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay, I'm going to --

MR. CARPER: -- and the reason why is because voters have actually voted on this. They've considered it and they say we're not going there, we're not going there. And they didn't, and I think before this year is over they won't go there again.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right, we're going to --

MR. ARLETT: [Indiscernible]

MR. BEGLEITER: I'm going to call a halt to that --

MR. ARLETT: I have to ask [indiscernible] --

MR. BEGLEITER: -- so I'm going to ask a halt to that --

MR. ARLETT: Okay.

MR. BEGLEITER: -- topic --

AUDIENCE: [Indiscernible shouted comments.]

MR. BEGLEITER: -- I think we've covered it adequately.

MR. ARLETT: Sure.

MR. BEGLEITER: Ah, there are some questions about social media that I'd like to move to at this point. First, I'd like to ask you, do you think social media in this country has played a positive or a negative role on the democratic process both in the United States and in the world? Mr. Arlett?

MR. ARLETT: I, I think it's played a, a process I, I think is what it has played. I think, ah, I, I believe that social media is, is gone on to a whole other sphere as far as the First Amendment and people having the opportunity to have a voice. There's a lot of warriors behind those keyboards. They're not so much so in person as we all know. Ah, and I think that in the end I think social media is a good thing. I would call, call into question the companies that are trying to filter

people from having that voice who have their own ideology issues. And I know Congress is addressing that very issue right now but again, I think in, in general I think it's a very, very good thing.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Senator Carper, the question is positive or negative role by social media in the democratic process?

MR. CARPER: Largely a good thing. We communicate whether its candidates, we communicate as office holders to constituents through social media in many ways. The, ah, where we get in trouble, a couple of ways: one, we get in trouble when the folks that, the Facebooks of, of the world where they're not doing a very good job policing the, the, the entities that are using Facebook or some other platform to fabricate, to lie and to distort. And they have to do a better job of making sure that does, does, does not happen. Thomas Jefferson used to say, if the American people know the truth they won't make a mistake. And one of the problems and challenges we face today is the American people don't know the truth anymore. And certainly, with this president he has a, a loose association with the truth. And, ah, that is not a good thing and its not a good way for a leader to provide leadership by example.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. Now, both of you have mentioned this, and one of the students actually wanted to follow-up on this topic as well. It's a senior political science major here at the University of Delaware who wants to ask a question about social media companies. Let's listen.

Q: Should social media companies like Google, Twitter, Facebook and others be held accountable for the affects on society and politics of the content of their users?

MR. BEGLEITER: Should they be held accountable and how should they be held accountable? Mr. Arlett?

MR. ARLETT: That's a great question. I, I think again, you know, I think should they be held accountable for somebody else's actions? I would say probably not. It is a platform. However, I think there is a role and responsibility when we're talking about terrorists and other, other things I think they do have a role that can help, help to augment and keep our communities and, and our country safe. So, in general, I would say no to that but again, I think that there is a, a, an opportunity to do somethings to safeguard the people.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: Would you please paraphrase that question again for me?

MR. BEGLEITER: Yeah. Should the social media companies, the Google's, the Twitter's, the Redits and so on, be held accountable in some way for the affects of their, of, of what their users do in the, in the democratic process?

MR. CARPER: Yeah. I think, um, one of, one of the things we do in the Congress we ought to be doing in this case, and we have been doing in these cases, is holding oversight hearings in the House and in the Senate. Bring these people, bring the leaders of these companies, ah, platforms, before us and have them publicly explain what they're doing and, and bring witnesses both for and against the positions they're taking. And the other thing in the Executive Branch, there are Executive Branch, ah, ah agencies that have some responsibility over, over these entities as well. And they have their own responsibilities for doing oversight and making sure that, ah, what, what these platforms are doing is consistent with the, the better, ah, betterment of our country and, and, and state.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Another student question now on a different topic entirely talking about the environment. This is a junior political science major here at the University of Delaware.

Q: Should the United States adhere to the global climate change treaty that it signed?

MR. BEGLEITER: All right, should the United States adhere to the climate change treaty? Mr. Arlett?

MR. ARLETT: I, I think that we should not be the, the police agencies of the world when it comes to the environment especially when we're the biggest bulk of the expense. And so, to me, I would, to answer the question, and I don't know the details, okay? I've not read it specifically. But in generic terms I would not be supportive of that. That does not mean that we should not be working with others, it does not mean -- I don't know the details as far as how much we've got in it as far as the financial aspect of that as compared to other countries around the nation. And, and again, I think that we all have to be good stewards of God's gift. That is this environment. That's not a, a political thing, it's not even a partisan thing, I think it's a principled thing. We all need to be good caretakers of our environment and I certainly am supportive of that.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. I'm still a little confused though. We had a treaty. It was; the United States signed a treaty --

MR. ARLETT: Okay.

MR. BEGLEITER: -- on climate change. It's, the President has said we're not in it anymore. Are you suggesting yes, we should be, or not, no we shouldn't be?

MR. ARLETT: Well, again, I don't know the details and --

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MR. ARLETT: -- and, does he have the ability to just at will make the decision to pull out of a treaty. I think that would be up to a judge or a court to make that decision.

MR. BEGLEITER: Or Congress, maybe.

MR. ARLETT: Or, or perhaps Congress. But I don't know the details but I'm speaking, what I just shared is in, in general thought. And --

MR. BEGLEITER: All right.

MR. ARLETT: -- I'm sure perhaps the, the, the President might seem to think very similar.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper? Global climate change treaty -- should the U.S. adhere to it?

MR. CARPER: Ah, yes. Ah, ah, Tom Friedman has something called the Trump Doctrine, he says, it goes something like this: Barack built it, Trump broke it, you fix it. And, ah, one thing after the other that Barack Obama was involved in establishing this President has seen clear to, to destroy it. He thinks he makes himself bigger by making others in, including Barack Obama and Joe Biden smaller. We, we ah, we live in, in a place where I've never seen the kind of extreme energy that's facing us these days. Extreme, extreme weather. Um, ah, thousand-year floods every two years. And a Category 5 hurricanes like we've never seen before. Wildfires in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, California bigger than the state of Delaware. We spent 300 billion dollars last year responding to extreme weather events. 300 billion dollars. And what we, and the seas are rising. We live in the lowest lying state in America. The seas are rising and

we're sinking. That ain't (sic) a good combination. Something, something's happening here and just what it is, is pretty clear. In other words, we have too much carbon in the air, we're the primary cause of that. We can do something about it and we can do something about it in a way that creates jobs by addressing the need for reducing carbon from mobile sources like cars, trucks and vans, and from our stationary sources. We had actually plans laid out, clearly laid out in regulation and the, the administration, and the industries accepted them and now they've been repealed which is a shame.

MR. BEGLEITER: Would you favor imposing new taxes to reduce carbon emissions?

MR. CARPER: I, that I, the Republicans have been suggesting for a long time that we do a carbon tax. The one's that are suggesting it don't get to vote. So, none of the Republicans are willing to vote for it. So, when there's more of a bipartisan, bipartisan contingent I think there'd be a whole lot of interest in that. But you know what, there is huge interest in right now is making sure that fuel efficiency standards for cars, trucks and vans continues to ramp up. Near term flexibility but it continues to ramp up so that when 2030 rolls around we'll have a heck of a lot of electric powered, battery powered vehicles and a bunch powered by hydrogen and fuel cells. And, that will reduce dramatically the largest source of emissions from our biggest source and that's our mobile sources.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett?

MR. CARPER: And we can do that and the, and the same time create jobs along [indiscernible].

MR. BEGLEITER: Carbon emissions tax? Would you vote for that?

MR. ARLETT: Um, not likely. Ah, you know, I think I'm not a big person on taxes but again, um, never not saying [indiscernible] not against it. You better, you better convince me real well. I, I think I'll get back down to a point earlier. We already have rules and regulations in place. We need to enforce it. I do know the EPA under Barack Obama, President Obama, there were 56 regulations put forward. And I want people to understand what that number means. 56 in eight years. Under Clinton and Bush totality there were five. They were rolling these regulations out like never before. At the same time, the quality, um, of our environment decreased. Why? Because they were not focused on the enforcement and the results. Just rolling out regulations. The President's put the focus back on results and I think that's what needs to be done. Focus on the results, not just regulations which hamper the private industry and costs to the American people without confirming any results. Let's focus on results.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Here's a simple question for both of you. Do you favor the legalization of marijuana? Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: Yeah, I think we should pass a federal law -- I think I cosponsored one, actually -- that says it's not a federal crime, ah, to, ah, to have or possess marijuana. It's not a, a, not a federal crime. The, ah, I think we ought to use -- I'm an old governor, recovering governor -- and I think the states can be laboratories of democracy here. And we've got states like Colorado that are experimenting with this. And a country like Canada apparently is going to experiment with this. And my view is we should let them if they want to, ah, ah, try it out, try out recreational marijuana and make that legal. They them try it, let

them do it and let us before we do change the whole, our whole country's approach. Let's let a couple of states, ah, lead the way and we'll learn from, from, from them.

MR. BEGLEITER: Should the federal government play a role in that or is that a state issue?

MR. CARPER: I think for now it's a state issue. There is a role for the federal government. I don't think there should be a federal law that says people could be arrested and convicted for, for possessing marijuana.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett?

MR. ARLETT: Yeah.

MR. BEGLEITER: Both of those questions.

MR. ARLETT: I, I --

MR. BEGLEITER: Are you in favor --

MR. ARLETT: -- I ah, I would very much like to see that the federal government declassify, ah, the class one classification currently for marijuana because it prevents our veterans from going out and getting a natural source of pain relief. They have no choice. Our veterans do not have the ability to get medicinal marijuana to be able to make them feel better when they, when need be because of that federal law. So, I would totally support that to ensure that not only that our veterans are able to have more options, but also so that more testing can be done to ensure that we know what we got when it comes to medicinal use. I do believe it, it, it should be a state's rights issue. This is a natural plant and, and again, I think, ah, ah, I think the government has, has a tendency to do too much for much for all. That's not really what the federal

government's role is. The power truly lies with the states. So, to me, I would be just fine with pushing it over to the states. I'm not saying I would be supportive of it in Delaware or not. That would be a state's issue. I think there are as, as, as Tom had stated that there are some states experimenting with it. I think it's too early to say. But I think ultimately, I think the government should at minimum declassify it, so our veterans can get cared for --

MR. BEGLEITER: All right.

MR. ARLETT: -- with other options.

MR. BEGLEITER: Point of information, that same Center for Political Communication Poll shows that 61 percent of Delawareans favor the legalization of marijuana. Now a question for both of you on federal government office holders. I'd like to ask both of you whether you favor term limits for federal office holders, elected office holders and for federal judges. Senator Carper?

MR. CARPER: I, I, I mentioned earlier I think the idea of, of a, what we do here in Delaware on judges is, a, governors nominate people to serve on the, the judiciary. For every; when I was governor for every Democrat the vacancy I had I had to replace that person with a Democrat. For every Republican vacancy I had to replace that person with a, a Republican. I had a judicial nominating commission that received names of people interested in those positions and they, I considered, they would send me a handful of names; I'd consider them up or down. Submit one name to the executive committee in the, the state senate and they would vote for them up or down. They voted for actually, as it turned out, eight years they voted for everyone. And, ah, they serve 12-year terms and after 12 years and they want to serve again they can reapply and go through the,

the system again. I think it's a good, good system. And it's one given the kind of, um, the situation we face in Washington these days it's one that as we think of alternatives I think we might want to consider this one.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett? Term limits?

MR. ARLETT: So, is that a, is that a yes? I would love to [laughter] --

MR. CARPER: Well, on with respect to terms limits --

MR. ARLETT: To term limits?

MR. CARPER: -- for, for members --

MR. ARLETT: Judges?

MR. CARPER: -- of Congress and --

MR. BEGLEITER: Members of Congress and --

MR. CARPER: -- [indiscernible] and members of the House and Senate.

When I was in the House of Representatives I cosponsored legislation, actually a constitutional amendment with a Republican from, from Florida that says 12 years in the House, 12 years in the Senate and that should be it. Nobody else really liked the idea. And I cosponsored it [indiscernible] Congress and finally it just like went away.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MR. CARPER: And now I decided, well hey, let the voters decide. Let them decide and if they get tired of me or Rob or anybody else they'll, they'll send us a message.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett, term limits?

MR. ARLETT: Absolutely. I, if it's good enough for eight years for the President two terms that should be good, good enough for all others because

when they stay in office for career, career politicians I believe are, is the biggest problem we have in this nation. They become bought and sold by corporations and donors and they are no longer focused on the American people. They become focused on one thing and that's getting reelected and padding their pockets. So, I am absolutely supportive of term limits and I think its responsibility to ensure that they focus on the American people versus padding their own pockets and getting reelected.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. We have another question from a student now here at the University of Delaware. A sophomore political science major who wants to ask a sort of big picture question about Washington. Let's listen.

Q: In an increasingly politically polarized nation, how would you promote bipartisanship?

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Bipartisanship. How would you promote it at this point? Mr. Arlett, you're first --

MR. ARLETT: Ah, it's --

MR. BEGLEITER: -- [indiscernible]

MR. ARLETT: -- it's called what you do speaks so loud that what you say I cannot hear. It's all based on what your actions are. We are a proven bipartisan person. I'm not a party guy, ask the Republicans. [Laughter.] I don't, I don't drink all their Kool-Aids, if you would. And, and I've always put a focus back on the people and the constituents. I think that's what's most important. Again, my opponent over here has stated he's running for reelection for one purpose. That is to obstruct and resist the President of the United States. How is that forming bipartisanship? Out of the gate. We need to get back to the Delaware way. The

Delaware way historically means that we as Delawareans focus on serving the, the American people or the Delaware people by working across the aisle. We need a statesman in Washington, D.C. We don't need a partisan politician. We need a statesman that will work across the aisle because of their actions and not because of their words.

MR. BEGLEITER: Senator Carper, bipartisanship?

MR. CARPER: Yeah, it would be interesting if you had the opportunity to have a, a real conversation with my Republican colleagues in the United States Senate about ah, ah, about working with me. There used to be a guy named Ted Kennedy in the, the Senate and there's still a guy named Mike Enzi, a Republican from, from, from Wyoming. And Ted, Ted Kennedy was the most well-respected Democrat the Republicans loved to work with. And I once asked him why is that? He said, because I believe, you know, I'm not going to change my principles, but I'm willing to compromise on my policy. I took that to, that advice and I took it to heart. And that's what I do. Last week we passed by 99 to 1 vote the Water Resource and Development Act. The first infrastructure bill of this Congress. It's a huge bill with huge advantages to Delaware for the Port of Wilmington, for our beaches, for quality drinking water and, and ah, and ah waste water. And when we go back into session, and I did it with a Republican, John Barrasso from Wyoming. And when we go back in, the day after we come back after the election the first of that legislation we're going to take up is the reauthorization of the Coast Guard which I've helped to write as well with a couple of Republicans and, and another Democrat. The, one of the things I've loved to do is, and I've done it ever since I was governor, orientation for new

governors when people were elected, Democrats or Republicans, I used to run that as governor, when I was chairman of the national governor's association. I do the same thing for new senators. Every two years right after the election we have orientation for new senators and spouses. I help run that. I've done that for 17, 18 years. And I'll do it again this year. And maybe Rob will be one of the people coming in as a new senator. Who knows. But, if he is I'll make sure that he gets a, a good start. I love doing that. And I, it gives me a chance to get to know people, new people, Democrats and Republicans, and make them feel welcome and at home.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. I'm --

MR. ARLETT: [Indiscernible] your vote. [Laughter.] I'd love to earn your vote, Tom.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. CARPER: Well --

MR. BEGLEITER: I'm afraid -- [laughter.]

MR. CARPER: [Laughter.]

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: [Laughter.]

MR. ARLETT: [Laughter.] [Indiscernible].

MR. CARPER: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: I'm afraid that concludes our time available for Q and A during this debate and I do want to give both of you the opportunity to offer some voters, the voters some concluding thoughts of yours. So, we'll start, and again, the order of this, these statements were chosen by the candidates in the coin

toss. We'll start with Senator Tom Carper for a closing statement limited to two minutes please.

MR. CARPER: Yeah. I, I want to thank the University of Delaware for hosting us tonight and for everybody for showing up. And, ah, this is a tough issue, this is a tough issue that we face this year. It's a huge issue that we face this issue and who's going to lead our country. My opponent seems to support Donald Trump's plans to sabotage, sabotage, further sabotage our healthcare system, to add to the debt largely through tax cuts that benefit the wealthier people, to ignore the existence of climate change despite very clear evidence that it's happening and we're contributing to it. My vision for America is a far different one. I'm running for, for reelection to extend quality and affordable healthcare to all Americans and to do so by improving the Affordable Care Act, not repealing it and by protecting 400,000 Delawareans who have a preexisting condition. I'm running for reelection to protect the Robert Mueller's investigation and to restore checks and balances that have helped make this nation great over the last 230 years. I'm running for election to ensure that workers get a raise, not just shareholders, workers get a raise and that we don't somehow derail the longest running economic expansion in the history of the country now nine years, nine years long with foolish economic policies and trade wars that sometimes make no sense. I'm running for reelection to ensure that America's moral obligation to the least of these in our society remain strong and that we meet that moral obligation in fiscally sustainable ways. I'm running for reelection to make sure that, that we take, or that we combat and take on climate change and global warming and that we, we do so in ways that create jobs. I'm making a, I'm going

to make sure that we choose windmills over oil wells and create jobs at the same time. I love this little state. I love to serve of the people of this little state. And more than ever I think we need leaders in Washington who can work with people on both sides, Democrat and Republican -- I just gave you some examples -- I will do that. We do have a shared vision of economic opportunity and I guess equal justice for everybody. And I hope other people share that vision and if you do I hope you'll see fit to support me on November the 6th and if they do let's seize the day. Carpe Diem. Thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Arlett, your closing statement, also limited to two minutes please.

MR. ARLETT: Yeah, I want to thank you, Ralph. I want to thank the University of Delaware and the audience specifically also my wife and my elder son who is here today with us. Our younger son of course is at the Naval Academy and, and we wish he was here but he's not able to be here. We have a choice. We have a choice in 20 days. We have a choice of looking to the past -- partisanship, politics, career politician, what's wrong with Washington, D.C. I think we need to focus on the future and I agree with my opponent when he said 18 years ago that it was time for a generational change. I am stepping up to be that next generation in Delaware to lead the families of this great state and ultimately the, of this great nation. We must focus on the people and not this barta (sic), partisan bickering that's going on that we are all so fed up with. My vision is of one of greatness. My vision is to ensure that we put the First State first again putting a focus on jobs. We need real opportunities in this state yet again. We need a real affordable healthcare and not what it exists today. We

need a great education for our kids and for our families. So, when the opportunities come back for these jobs they have new ways. I want to educate our kids and then keep them here. That's my goal as a father and as a husband and, and, and a, somebody who just cares about our families. We have got to put a focus there. So, as we move forward in just 20 days I am asking you to get to RobArlett.com. Learn more about the vision. Learn more about the excitement everywhere we go is changing in this state. People are ready for change in this great state of Delaware. I implore you to do so. Get involved and I look forward to earn (sic) your vote come November the 6th. God bless you and thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER: Councilman Rob Arlett, thank you very much. Senator Tom Carper, thank you very much both for participating in Delaware Debates 2018. On behalf of Delaware Public Media and the University of Delaware Center for Political Communication, I'm Ralph Begleiter thanking you for joining us on Delaware Debates 2018 and encouraging you to cast your vote on Tuesday, November 6th.

#