

## REPUBLICAN SENATE DEBATE

June 7, 2010

**MR. JOWERS:** Good evening. The Hinckley Institute of Politics at the University of Utah is pleased to join with KUED TV and Comcast in the presentation of tonight's debate between Republican candidates for the United States senate. While candidate debates are part of our nation's rich political history, they are becoming increasingly rare, so this broadcast has even greater significance. During the program we'll share a number of information resources to help you more fully participate in Utah's political process this year. The primary election is Tuesday, June 22nd.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Good evening, I'm Ken Verdoia, and welcome to the studios of KUED in Salt Lake City, for the first of our 2010 election year debates. Already this election season has produced headlines with major reversals of fortune for several high-profile elected leaders, and one of those reversals has played out in Utah, where the three-term incumbent, Senator Bob Bennett, was denied the nomination of his Republican party for a fourth term. Tonight our debate features two men who not only were willing to take on the incumbent, but face their challenge within Bennett's own party. They will face off on the Utah Republican party's primary ballot on June 22nd in their bid to be the next U.S. senator from Utah. I'll let the candidates introduce themselves through their opening statements.

Prior to air time, a coin toss determined that Mike Lee would deliver the first one-minute statement. Mr. Lee.

**MR. LEE:** My name is Mike Lee, I'm an across-the-board conservative. I believe in the Second Amendment right to bear arms, I'm staunchly pro life, I support the war on terror, and I oppose amnesty for illegal immigrants in any form. I decided to run for the United States senate because I've come to believe that our federal government's too big and too expensive. It is that way because congress has refused to follow, or even read the rule book for about the last 75 years. That rule book is the 75-year old document--the 223-year old document--created by our founding fathers that limits the power of the federal government. It says to the federal government that it can only do a few things. It is supposed to focus on things like national defense and immigration, and regulating interstate and foreign trade. It's not supposed to be all things to all people. It's not supposed to be everyone's rich uncle or best friend, it's not supposed to be our health care provider or first or last resort. Bad things happen when we try to pretend otherwise. I'm running to restore the rules, to restore the focus on the debate on that 223-year old document, and to restore order to our Constitutional government.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Thank you, Mike Lee. And now a one-minute opening statement from Tim Bridgewater. Mr. Bridgewater.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Thank you. I'm Tim Bridgewater, and those of you who haven't heard me speak before, this is my natural voice, it's a conservative Jack Kemp tax cutting voice. And I hope that it's a voice that's heard in Washington, D.C. I'm running for the United States senate because, like many Americans, I'm fed up with the direction of this government. We are spending ourselves into bankruptcy, we're taxing future generations in a way that is unsustainable. Most Americans get it. That's why we're going to turn out many incumbents, elected officials across this country, because we have to send fiscal conservatives back to Washington, D.C. It's insane what's happening right now in Washington. They are borrowing from the future to pay for today's spending, because we cannot live within our means. Our government must send a message of personal responsibility and self-reliance, we have to stop depending on government to solve all of our problems.

There are huge issues that we face in this country. Immigration is a big problem. We have to control our borders. I'm not anti-immigrant, we need to be fair with people, but the legal immigration system has to be changed. We also have to look at dramatically cutting spending, not only entitlements, but how the government spends its money. And if we do that then we can return to fiscal responsibility. I hope to be your next senator.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Our questions tonight will primarily come from our live studio audience. And a number of our audience members are from the summer academic programs for high school instructors administered by the Hinckley Institute of Politics at the University of Utah. Now, we screened the questions, just to avoid duplication. Other than that, what you see is what you get. Each candidate will get 90 seconds for an initial response to the question, and then if I determine there is a substantive disagreement, rebuttal time will be extended equally to each candidate.

Mike Lee, you can have the first opportunity to respond to a topic that you both addressed in your opening statements.

***Question:** My name is Michael Clara, and as a Hispanic Republican, and one who lives in a predominantly Hispanic neighborhood here in Salt Lake City, I have a question about immigration, but not so much about your policy, more about the language that you guys have used throughout the campaign when discussing immigration. And my question is, why do each of you find it necessary to embrace the anti-immigrant rhetoric that invokes racial slurs like "anchor babies"?*

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Lee, the first 90-second opportunity.

**MR. LEE:** I don't think it's necessary to use any type of rhetoric in doing this. I've chosen recently, upon discovering that some people find that language offensive, to refer to the problem as the birthright citizenship loophole. And I'd fight to close that. I think we need federal legislation that I would support. Federal legislation that's already been proposed in the form of HR 1868, which makes clear that a person born in the United States is a citizen of the United States automatically by virtue of having been born on U.S. soil, only if that person is born to at least one parent who, at the time of the birth, was either a U.S. citizen or a lawful permanent resident of the United States, or an immigrant who was engaged in active full-time military service to the United States government. I think this is an important step for us to take. I think it's important because we don't want to incentivize people coming into this country illegally in violation of our laws, and we don't want to create citizens out of those people as a reward for their parents who have broken our laws in coming here.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Bridgewater, your 90-second opportunity.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Thanks for the question, Michael. The big issue, I think, is having a policy that can address this issue. States are frustrated, the federal government is ignoring its responsibility. I think when we take on tough issues sometimes people's feelings on both sides get mixed up a little bit. I'm not anti-immigrant, I have a lot of friends who are not only Hispanic, but also come from all over the world. And I think that we have to, as Americans, get back to fundamental principles, following the rule of law. We have a system of legal immigration that doesn't work today, and if we fix that and we look at securing our borders and spending the resources we need to, to ensure that we defend our borders, then we're going to be on the right track. I also believe we have to change the incentive system. Today if you want to come into this country legally, we say, five years, \$5,000, and maybe we'll let you in. But if you want to come in illegally, the door's open all day long. There's a perverse incentive right now. And it's going to be tough to change it, because we've grown used to this system. So we've got to remove the

incentives for illegal immigration, and make it easier for people to follow the law.

Employers, as well. Because we punish employers who are following the law, and reward those who are willing to break the law. And I don't think that serves either side very well. States like Arizona, here in Utah, have to step up, because the federal government is ignoring its responsibility to effectively control the borders and make a coherent policy. I don't think it serves this country long term if we don't address this issue. And for too long the Senate has ignored it. So if I'm elected as the United States Senator, I want to take this on as one of the top issues that we need to resolve, and make sure that we come up with a policy that's fair, but also recognizes the rule of law.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Gentlemen, I find you in basic agreement. I'm not sure rebuttal time is necessary, but I do sense an aversion to this core issue that was raised in the question, which is in the fervor of the moment to do something about the problem of undocumented immigration, the blanket of that fervor gets thrown so broadly that it runs up against the ugly side of racial stereotyping, which undermines the work habits, the dedication, the presence, the citizenship of Hispanic Americans that are building communities. I think that's what the question was getting at. I don't think you gentlemen got at it so I'm going to give you a minute each to get at that. How do we address an issue without throwing the blanket upon many millions of Americans who are not to be indicted by the accusation? Mr. Lee.

**MR. LEE:** We're a nation of immigrants, each of us descends from immigrants. And we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to each other to treat each other with respect, regardless of where our ancestors may have come from, and regardless of when they might have arrived on this continent. So the point's well taken. And it's certainly something we need to take into account. That when addressing this problem--this very real problem--of people coming here, breaking our laws, we need to make clear that it's not about them, it's not about people from any particular part of the country or part of the world coming into our country. It's about the fact that we operate under the rule of law. Everything works better when we follow the law. We want immigrants to come here. Our economy, the continued vitality of our economy, I believe, depends on that. But in order to make that sustainable, in order to make this country a welcoming place for immigrants, we need to invite them to come through the front door, rather than through the back door, and I think that's an important part of why we focus on this issue.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Bridgewater, your one-minute opportunity.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, the federal government is doing a lot of things wrong, it's spending us into bankruptcy, and it's ignoring these fundamental roles and responsibilities. And when it ignores those responsibilities, what happens is the tensions on both sides of this issue are ignited. If you saw the problem in California, where on Cinco de Mayo they ended up throwing some kids out of school that were wearing American flags. The tension rises if we don't address these fundamental issues. I'm not sure we can get around some of the stereotypes that are going on outside of the policy makers, but as a policy maker, as a Senator, I'm not going to be afraid to shy away from real reform. It starts, in my mind, at securing the borders.

I know a lot of immigrants in this country who have come here legally, who feel like they are stereotyped as illegals just because of who they are as immigrants. And I think that's unfair to them, and they are, in many cases, opposed to illegal immigration. They want a fairer system as well. So I think we have to come together with common ground, it has to be based on the rule of law, it has to be based on a fundamental fairness and humane treatment of those who have come into this country illegally and are part of a system that's been broken, but that system relies on the federal government's role and responsibility as well. So it's a comprehensive approach to fix the problem, and as a Senator, I'll work on

that.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Back to the audience for our next question. Mr. Bridgewater, you'll have the first 90-second response to this one.

*Question: Gentlemen, how do you plan to reach out and work with Democrats and make our government work again?*

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Bridgewater, the first 90-second opportunity.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, as a senator from Utah, I believe my first responsibility is to take the core conservative principles that this state represents, and the country, back to Washington, D.C. What are those? Limited government, small business. We're very frugal in our state government, how we spend money. We have a strong Judeo-Christian tradition here, and we represent traditional family values. And I think that those values are missing in Washington, D.C., and I hope to be able to bring people to our way of thinking here in Utah, as opposed to move in the direction of where Washington is headed. But on issues like cutting the debt, and cutting deficit spending, on issues like immigration reform that we just talked about, I believe there are Democrats that will come to our side of the equation and look at addressing these issues. We can no longer kick the can down the road on entitlement reform. We have Medicare and Social Security programs that dramatically need reform or else we're going to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. And as a businessman, I've been in the business arena for 22 years. I will take the businessman's approach to one of cutting the budgets, and getting us back on sound financial footing.

One of the things that I believe that we get from both Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, is we are all Americans. We care about the future of this country. And that's why voters are sweeping a new generation of leaders into office to address these tough issues. And I think we'll find people on both sides of the aisle that want to have substantive, practical application of principles so we can solve these problems.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Lee, your 90-second opportunity to talk about reaching across that aisle.

**MR. LEE:** The crises facing our country right now are neither distinctively Republican nor distinctively Democrat in nature. And the solutions will also have to be bipartisan. That doesn't mean that we'll change the way we go about it. Whenever someone is prepared to reach across the aisle, so to speak, to the other party, that person needs to make sure that they're on firm footing so that they don't get pulled over to the other side. Now, the issue isn't so much about parties as it is, what are we going to leave to future generations? Are we going to leave them with debt, are we going to leave them with debt that's now approaching \$14.7 trillion? That's the current debt ceiling as approved by congress. Works out to about \$50,000 a head. That's not fair, and it's not fair to leave \$50,000 to each of our unborn grandchildren. The moment they take their first breath, that's their welcome gift into this country. And I don't think that's right. And I think Democrats and Republicans can both agree on that, and can agree with the fact that we have to cut spending.

The government has to stop acting like a business. The government isn't a business. Businesses create jobs, businesses create wealth, because people create wealth, because that's what they do naturally when they're allowed to. When they're given the promise, the assurance, that they will do so. Government doesn't create wealth, it never has, it never will. It's physically incapable of doing so. Which means that when government claims to be creating jobs, it's not doing that, it's instead transferring

wealth. I think both Democrats and Republicans alike can agree on this principle, and I think they'll have to. Because following the 2010 election cycle, Americans will be demanding something different, and that something different will result in less government rather than more.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Gentlemen, do you feel the need for rebuttal in that time? I don't either. But I do have a question that was sent in to KUED on our web site, [KUED.org/voteUtah](http://KUED.org/voteUtah) by a Republican who identified themselves from Davis County. They asked an interesting question, let me offer it to you, for, Mr. Lee, your first 90-second consideration.

*This question asks you to consider the climate in which you're running for the United States Senate. Political observers from around the nation consider it remarkable, if not shocking, that you two are meeting on this stage tonight. That a three-term Republican senator, in Bob Bennett, from arguably the most Republican state in the nation, gets turned out by his own party, emphasis added by the writer. How do you characterize this political climate, and how does your candidacy address it? Mr. Lee, the first 90-second opportunity.*

**MR. LEE:** I would characterize this political climate as one that focuses on the need for less government, rather than more. We have, for too long, operated under the idea that the government can create jobs, that the government can make us wealthy, when, in fact, it can't. And this is what happens when the government perpetuates a problem for too long, when it ignores a problem for too long, when it refuses to acknowledge the fact that it's been exceeding the authority granted the federal government by the Constitution for decade upon decade. And it has to stop somewhere. I think it's appropriate that the process of stopping this trend should begin in Utah, and should begin by replacing someone who was a good man, who is a good man, who was a good Republican, who served our state well in many, many respects. But Americans generally, and Utahns in particular, are ready for new leadership, they're ready for leaders who are willing to say, "I want something meaningfully different," meaning, "I want something less." Because less government enables each of us as citizens, as individuals, to do what we do best, which is earn wealth, which is to provide a nest egg for our families. And whenever you empower individuals, you empower the economy as a whole, because it's individuals who create wealth. That's what this election is about.

What I'm doing as a candidate to address it is to propose very specific responses to it. First, I think we need a balanced budget amendment. Telling congress that it can't spend more than it takes in, in any given year. And I still think we need to reform our tax code and replace it with a system in which everyone pays according to one rate. One rate.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Tim Bridgewater, your opportunity to make sense of this current political climate, and how your candidacy addresses that climate.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, I have been in the Republican party for a long time. I was a county party chair, I've been involved here in the state for many years. I went back and worked in the late eighties in Washington, D.C. when Reagan was president, I worked under the Treasury Department, and there has always been a tension between the grassroots of our party and elected officials. Are they responding enough? Are they listening to the core principles of the party? And I believe that during the latter part of this decade, that the problem became so acute that the grassroots exploded in opposition to our national leaders. Republicans had the White House, the senate, the congress, and yet we failed to lead on core conservative principles. And I believe the grassroots ignited in the Republican party, and say we need to take our country back and get back to limited government, which is one of the reasons that I believe I was successful, and Mike, as well, in winning at the convention. And the delegates responded

to that message, that we need to get out of the, this mentality that government can solve all of our problems. So not only here in Utah, but across this country, American citizens, not just Republicans, have risen up, tea party groups, 912 groups, to take back our country because they think Washington is out of control, it's getting more and more corrupt. You've seen recently they tried to buy off a congressman not to run against Arlen Specter, and there are problems that the American citizens feel inherently are, in Washington, D.C., that are just taking the country in the wrong direction. So we are sweeping across this nation. There will probably be anywhere from 14 to 20 new senators elected in this cycle, both Republican and Democrat, and I think the American people are ready for real change, and that's what this election and elections across this country mean for the future of the country. Better representation, a new generation of leaders.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Back to our studio audience for the next question. Mr. Bridgewater, you'll have the first opportunity for response.

***Question:** If elected to the U.S. senate, will you support a bill to allow each state to negotiate with the federal government for control of health policy within its borders, including elimination of ERISA restrictions, and state control of Medicaid, Medicare, and CHIP, with transfer of funding for these programs?*

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Absolutely. That's one of the platforms that I've run on. If you go to my web site at TimBridgewater.com, you can see delineated there each of the issues that, many of which you just discussed, and that is that the states have to take more power. For our nation to continue its greatness in the world, we have to move towards a new federalism. It's not new, it was enshrined in the Constitution, but it's been ignored. And that means states getting more power. It's not just health care, it's education, it's energy policy, it's interior. You can go down the list of all these things that government's trying to do today to manage and control our lives, and what we have to do is get back to a fundamental belief that the states have more power, that individuals can be trusted, instead of expecting the federal government to solve all of our problems, to bail out our automotive companies, our banks, to save AIG and the insurance arena, to mandate health care so that we're basically beholden to the federal government. It's a broken system.

I'll give you a good example. Today in education, we are 21st and 25th in, among 30 industrialized countries, in science and mathematics. The federal government controls a lot of the aspects of our education system, with unfunded mandates, and if we free ourselves up from federal control, we'll get a lot more autonomy, the states will have the ability to succeed or fail on their own, and ultimately it's a better model. It's not just a Constitutional and a philosophical model that I agree with, but it's also a strong economic model. You would not run a business here in Salt Lake City out of headquarters in New York. You'd run it right here, with accountability and managers here, and a profit center. Likewise, we are a stronger nation if the states gain more power on all of these issues, not just health care.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, your opportunity to respond, 90 seconds on that complicated topic of health care reform.

**MR. LEE:** I would certainly support such legislation. Anything that would give more control to the states, anything that would restore the sovereignty of the states is a good thing. The federal government has been assuming for far too long that it has the power to do just about anything, that it has the power to be our health care provider, and to take care of all of our problems. It was never supposed to be that way, and that's why we need to return power to the states. That is evident when you read the Constitution. The Constitution doesn't give congress the power to create a health care system. And in

any event, congress has shown itself to be a poor steward of our entitlement programs. Thomas Jefferson said that the states would need to be laboratories of Republican democracy. I think good things can happen when you allow states to experiment with things like health care, and they can figure out what works best. One state can emulate another.

So I agree with Mr. Bridgewater on this. I think it's interesting, as we're talking about health care reform, this is somewhat different than what my opponent said a few years ago when he was running for congress, when he indicated that he would support the Medicare modernization act of 2003, which contained an unfunded entitlement liability of about \$18 trillion. So this is a difference between this candidate, as he's running for U.S. senate today, and candidate Bridgewater as he was running just a few years ago for the U.S. house of representatives. At the end of the day, we have to focus on the fact that some roles belong to the states, because they're nowhere identified in the Constitution as having a federal role, as having some sort of a federal nature. And we need to return to that understanding by focusing on the Constitution.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Bridgewater, I sense the need for rebuttal time here. Would you like to take a 30-second opportunity?

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Sure. I think that the problem in this country today is that we no longer trust the states. We need to move towards a model where the federal government is out of the equation. Today there's \$150 billion of waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicare alone. And according to the center for health care transformation, tens of billions of dollars are going into the pocket of organized crime. So when you pay Medicare taxes, a sliver of it goes to organized crime. We've got to wean ourselves off of the federal government. It's incremental reform, it's moving in a direction that ultimately will turn power back to the states, just as you suggested.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, a need for 30 seconds of rebuttal time?

**MR. LEE:** No.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Okay, let's go back to our audience for another question. This time shifting our focus to public land.

*Question: Recently there's been a focus on the federal government taking greater control of Utah's public land. My question is, what are your thoughts on the federal government's role in controlling Utah's public lands? Specifically as an educator, Utah's trust lands.*

**MR. VERDOIA:** And Mike Lee, you'll have the first 90-second opportunity.

**MR. LEE:** Utah's 51st in the nation in terms of per-student school funding. I think that's unfortunate. I think one of the reasons for that is actually related to the fact that two thirds of our land in this state is owned and managed by the federal government. And as a result, the federal government has told us that we can't tax that land, that we can't regulate it, that we can't use it as we see fit. There's a part of the Constitution that I believe has been ignored for a couple hundred years, which I think, when read correctly, would actually give the power to tax at least most of that land. It says, in effect, that congress can be the sole sovereign lawmaking body with respect to federal public land within the boundaries of a state, if, and only if, that state's legislature has consented to that exclusive legislative arrangement.

Well, our legislature has never given that consent. And as I read that part of the Constitution, that

means the federal government may own that land, that two thirds of our land mass within our state, but they own it the same way you own your land, and I own my land, which means that the state can tax it, the state can regulate it, and where appropriate, the state can take it by eminent domain. The state needs to start assuming that it has this authority, asserting that authority, and I think the congress needs to recognize that states have that authority, as well.

If the state could tax that land, we would have a lot more revenue in our school system, and we would no longer be 51st in the nation in terms of per-student school funding. This is one of many examples of how the federal constitute, the U.S. Constitution isn't just a nice, abstract idea. It contains real, practical solutions that we need to follow.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Tim Bridgewater, your 90-second opportunity to respond to the subject of public lands.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, as it ties into education in particular, I was fortunate to have the opportunity to represent the state as a volunteer for a year as the deputy of education, and there are real problems in our funding for education. We produce a lot of kids in this state, and we don't have a strong enough tax base to cover the costs and the needs of our education system. One of the things that we do have is enormous wealth in this state of natural resources--coal, uranium, we have oil and gas--and we have opportunity to extract that and create wealth, and also create a lot of money for the education system, and create jobs in this state. And yet the federal government continues to lock us out of our own lands and create more wilderness and more barriers to be able to just utilize on a renewable basis timber and other resources that we have.

So we have to fight against that tendency to lock ourselves out of this natural wealth that we have, and the jobs that could be created if we were able to access those public lands. Chris Herrod just passed a bill recently on eminent domain. That bill in particular is going to fight back against federal control of our lands and give us more access if we can win in the court system. But as a senator, I will fight tooth and nail, whenever I can, to try and access, responsibly, those lands.

I work in the natural resource industry today, we access hot water for geothermal plants, we're looking at mining for coal, and I believe that if we exploit those natural resources appropriately that we'll create jobs, wealth, and also have an opportunity to fund education. There are a lot of problems in education, broadly speaking, and we need to address those. But funding is one of those sources and we have the wealth and the ability, if the federal government will back away from trying to control it in the near future.

**MR. VERDOIA:** I drop down to the front row for another question, this time we're going to shift gears pretty substantially, aren't we? Mr. Bridgewater, your first 90-second opportunity.

*Question: My name is Jesse, and I'm an education coordinator for a national non-profit organization that deals with families that have children that suffer with mental health challenges. So my question is, many Utah parents are seeking necessary mental health treatment for their children, but are being asked to give up custody of their child in order to receive that appropriate mental health care. What is your stand on custody relinquishment, and how do you propose to keep the families together during treatment?*

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** You know, we live in a nation where the nuclear family is disintegrating slowly in our culture. So I would fight to make sure that those families can stay together. I actually have an investment in a business that works with troubled teenage boys, for example, so we've worked right up front and center with a lot of these types of problems with parents and children trying to reconcile some

of those family problems.

You know, the government shouldn't be intervening in families. Parents have responsibilities, fathers and mothers have a shared responsibility over their children, and they need to be trusted at the end of the day. When the government intervenes, it breaks down the family. When government tax policy disadvantages marriage and nuclear families, it's the wrong direction, and we need to fight against that. And as a senator, and especially a senator from Utah, I think we have a unique voice in the debate nationally, representing traditional family values and ensuring that parents and children can be protected in terms of public policy. So you know, there are real problems out there in our culture, but government shouldn't add to those problems, and accelerate the disintegration of the nuclear family.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, you have a 90-second opportunity to respond. This is a complex issue, and I can't expect any candidate would come out against family. I mean broadly stated, this is an issue that begs for a fuller, deeper, more complex discussion, but I do want to afford you the 90 seconds to respond to the basic premise of the role of government, family custody, as part of treatment plans.

**MR. LEE:** I'm strongly opposed to any treatment plan that would allow the government to split up a family. That's simply wrong. And I would fight that with everything in me, and I would certainly fight that at a federal level. Of course the federal government has no business in that area anyway. But the states shouldn't either. This highlights, nevertheless, the importance of the constant balancing test that we need to undertake. Every time the government acts, every time the government is trying to provide us with some new good or service, we need to remember the fact that whenever government acts, it does so at the expense of individual liberty. And this is one of those areas where individual liberty can be threatened. Even when the government's trying to do something that it will tell us is a good thing. And certainly helping people is a good thing. But sometimes in the name of helping people the government will step in and say, "I'm helping you, but you have to live as I tell you to live. You have to live your life exactly as I want you to, and there's nothing you can do about it. Even if that means splitting up your family."

This is one of the many reasons why I think we need to take a good, hard look at what government in general does, and in particular in the things that the federal government does. So that we can make sure that individual liberty is being protected. And one of those things that is inextricably intertwined with individual liberty is the sanctity of the family, which I would fight tirelessly to protect as your U.S. senator.

**MR. VERDOIA:** As we near the mid point of our time, let me offer a few important reminders of additional information available on the 2010 election season. First, visit our online information site, [www.kued.org](http://www.kued.org) to watch repeat presentations of our programs, important voter information connections, and in the fall, additional information on each candidate in Utah's federal and statewide elections. Our partners at the Hinckley Institute of Politics also have an array of election resources available at their web site, [hinckley.utah.edu](http://hinckley.utah.edu). And if you're part of the Comcast cable family, visit your on-demand section for an array of candidate profiles, voter information, and repeat presentation of broadcast debates, made possible by our partners at Comcast.

It all starts tonight, and we'll be adding new information and messages each week as we progress through the November general election. So back to our debate between candidates in the Republican primary for the United States senate.

I got a question today from our friends at the Utah Log Cabin Republicans, we wanted to make sure this

question got asked. Mike Lee, you get the first 90-second opportunity. When an issue appears Constitutional but conflicts with your personal values, which wins?

**MR. LEE:** When an issue appears Constitutional but conflicts with my personal values, I would view my authority as unrestrained by the Constitution, and therefore I'd be free to act in the manner that I deemed most likely to promote principles of sound public policy. I think a closer question, and maybe part of what this might be getting at, would arise if my personal predilections would lead me in one direction, but that particular direction went contrary to my reading of the Constitution. Contrary to the text, and the history of the Constitution as I read it. In that circumstance, I would consider myself bound by the Constitution. Because sometimes you might have something that's a good idea, but that good idea might be something that the federal government has no business doing. And in those circumstances, I think it's incumbent upon each and every senator and each and every representative to say, "I could act, I might even be able to act in a way that would survive review in the courts, but I'm not going to act because my oath to the Constitution that I'm required to take under Article 6, requires more than that. It requires that I restrain my own power as a U.S. senator," and that's what I would do.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Tim Bridgewater, your 90-second opportunity. The question, if Constitutionality, personal values conflict, how would you resolve that?

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, I read the Constitution as a very limiting document. There are very few powers that are explicit in the Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution that say what congress can do, what the government should be doing. Most other things should be left to the states. I'm a big believer in states' rights. I believe that we have to let the states ultimately make the tougher decisions that may involve what this question is referring to. But at the end of the day, my conscience has to be clear. I've told my supporters that there are three initial criteria that I have to follow if I'm elected as your U.S. senator. Number one, is any policy or legislation Constitutional, according to the original intent of the Constitution? Number two, is it good for Utah and good for America? And number three, is it morally the right thing to do? If it doesn't meet those criteria, then I won't vote for it or support it. So it's got to meet those criteria for me to want to even engage in it.

In most cases, I want the states to get more power and more power, and have the federal government deciding less and less, and gaining less authority. Because I think that the federal government has overstepped its Constitutional powers in so many ways, the Supreme Court has interpreted the Constitution and especially the bill of rights in ways that I never thought imaginable. And when we get back to states having more power, our nation will thrive.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Let's go back to our studio audience. I guess the next substantive question will be whether I'm going to be able to get up from this position that I've assumed. But let's turn to you, your topic is education. Tim Bridgewater will have the first 90-second opportunity.

***Question:** Thank you, gentlemen. My younger brother has very severe autism, and relies on the public school system for his progress. Funding for communication devices and teaching days has been cut repeatedly over the years, which will cause his personal regression. What are your views on funding for the public school programs for disabled children?*

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** It's important that we have as much funding as possible. I was involved in the final passage of the Carson Smith scholarship bill that helped some parents who had special needs children to have alternatives that they could take their kids to, to supplement the cost of some private education, but the public schools are addressing a lot of these issues but struggling, because we're struggling across

the board in education. I believe that we have a real responsibility as Utahns to look at education and make sure that we are reforming every aspect of our education system. Money is tight in our state, but more importantly, we've got to push the envelope for more reform. We're not educating our kids with the best practices that we could possibly educate them with.

I'll give you an example. I helped start a curriculum company that teaches kids from different modalities, musical learners, kinesthetic learners, audio-visual, and it tries to bring that into a single curriculum. And that helps to touch on how kids learn more effectively. We need to absorb new technologies and new practices. That helps disabled kids, it helps all kids. I also helped start a charter school in Pleasant Grove, John Hancock Charter School, and that charter school system challenges the public education system to get better. They're starved for resources as well, and they take some disabled students in those systems.

But you know, it's never enough. And we need to depend on parents, we need to depend on other ways to challenge the education system to absorb best practices, and make sure that our kids get the best education they can. I'm troubled that, when we depend on the federal government to guide us, that we get off track of the very best system. States need to be more powerful in determining how an education system should work, here.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, responding to special needs children in our public school system, and the resources necessary to do that. Your 90-second opportunity.

**MR. LEE:** Like all questions facing public education, this is a question that needs to be addressed at the most local level possible, by parents, by local government officials, and by state government officials. It shouldn't get beyond that. I believe the federal government needs to stay out of the classroom. And the more that happens, the better off all of us will be. When the federal government stays within its own sphere, it allows states to do what they do best, which is run their education systems, run those systems that the states are in charge of, and education is certainly one of them. And when the federal government will do that, that will leave more money and more resources available to the states to do precisely that. In that respect, my opponent and I agree in many respects on the proper role of the federal government. I don't think that's always been the case.

A few years ago, when my opponent ran for congress, he indicated that he would have supported the No Child Left Behind law, which was a massive intrusion by the federal government into state-sovereign domain of public education. And while he's since repudiated that position, and I congratulate him for that, that's a difference of opinion that we at least once had, and something that I think reveals the differences in our backgrounds and the way that we approach questions. It's also my understanding that the software company that he owns, that he referred to, actually received funds through the No Child Left Behind program. So this refers to yet another difference between my opponent and myself as it relates to the role of the federal government.

I think we both agree, at least now, that the federal government ought to be staying out of this. But we need somebody in Washington who will never vacillate on this. No Child Left Behind would have never made it out of the starting gates with me. I would have gotten to the opening paragraph and said, "This bill is unconstitutional."

**MR. VERDOIA:** Tim Bridgewater, do you need some rebuttal time on that point?

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Sure. I'm proud of my 22-year business career, I've been out building businesses, helping create jobs right here in Utah. I've helped several businesses to access capital, raise equity. I've

been in the mezzanine and private equity businesses, working with a lot of companies. And I believe that's one of the problems we have right now, is our economy is on the ropes, and we need people who understand business. I'm a businessman with a long track record in that arena. The education policy of the country was originally Title I. And Title I restricted education in many ways. And what we had was a move towards more autonomy and more accountability for the states. That's the movement we need to go in.

If I'm elected as your senator, I will make sure that the state has more power in the education system, and that we wean ourselves from federal mandates. I was privileged to represent the state in going back to Washington and taking on the Republican presidency of George Bush on this issue, and fighting to end the mandates that have been pushed down into the states. We wrestled with the federal government, and we were able to get some accommodations, not a lot. But it was an opportunity to really represent the state of Utah in challenging that system.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Lee, I'll give you an additional minute, if you would choose to speak to this topic.

**MR. LEE:** Sure. The point is, I think one of the things that the people of Utah want is someone who won't vacillate, who won't waver. When it's time to look a bill up and down and say this is either Constitutional or it's not. This is either an appropriate role for the federal government to play, or it's not. This is something that I've spent a lifetime studying and a lifetime caring about, a lifetime fighting over in court. What is the appropriate role of the federal government? And what is the appropriate role of each state government? Education is not an appropriate role of the federal government, and it never has been. And we need to make that clear. We need to send a U.S. senator back to Washington who will never, never waver in making this kind of determination.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Back to our studio audience, changing subjects once again. Sir, your question. Mike Lee has the first opportunity for response.

*Question: Friends, would you oppose or support the importation of foreign nuclear waste into the United States and storage in Utah?*

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee.

**MR. LEE:** When we refer to nuclear waste, usually we're talking about spent nuclear fuel, perhaps the most toxic substance known to man. I fought, while serving as general counsel to Utah Governor Jon Huntsman, to keep nuclear waste out of Utah's west desert, and we won that battle after fighting it for many years in court.

There's another kind of material that's disposed of in Utah called class A material. It's nothing even close to the levels of contamination that you find in spent nuclear fuel. That's an issue for the states to decide, whether or not they're going to allow the disposal of this material within our state. Our state has made that determination to allow it. That ultimately is a question for the states, to be decided by the states, and I defend the states' rights to do that, as Utah has made that decision here. Once that decision is made, the decision whether to allow importation of foreign material rests, not with the state, but with the federal government. That's a decision for congress to make.

I think, in the long run, it serves no one to make Utah the world's dumping ground for any kind of material like this, including class A material. In the long run, I would support a ban to exclude the importation of foreign material. So long as it provides a moratorium, or a phase-in period to allow U.S.

disposal businesses to acquire disposal facilities outside the United States so that they can phase into this gradually. We don't want to be sending good business to foreign companies, when that business could otherwise go to U.S. companies.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Tim Bridgewater, your 90-second opportunity to speak to the importation of nuclear waste.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** I've been consistent on this issue for a long time. When Nevada was being forced to take nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, I believe that the federal government should not force nuclear waste on Nevadans. If Nevadans did not want it, they shouldn't have it. It's a states' rights issue. Likewise, Utah does not want to store foreign nuclear waste, and they have made that determination, and they've said that's our policy, and I support that.

My opponent, on the other hand, has been on all sides of this issue. He fought against, on a states' rights basis, Utah accepting nuclear waste when he was working in the Governor's office, and then he went to work for Energy Solutions, and sued the state to force them to take foreign nuclear waste. And now he's for a ban, or some limited ban. So he's been inconsistent, I think, on this issue. It's a big issue, because states have to live with this permanently. And if the state doesn't want it, the federal government or a court of law shouldn't be cramming it down a state's throat.

I believe that the Governor, the legislature has spoken on this issue, they fought against it. We're now in litigation over this issue. We may yet be forced to take it, but it will be against the state's will. Energy Solutions is a good company, it's regulated, we allow them to take a certain level of waste here. But foreign nuclear waste, and becoming the dumping ground of foreign nuclear waste, I think, is the wrong approach for our state. It would brand us in an inappropriate fashion, in my opinion, and I think we have to step very carefully in these arenas. I'm a proponent of nuclear energy. I think that's part of the solution for this country long term. We'll have to reprocess it on site and store it deep into the earth's crust, and that's the best way to deal with nuclear energy waste. But in terms of taking foreign nuclear waste, I would be against that.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, do you want some rebuttal time on this?

**MR. LEE:** Please.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Please.

**MR. LEE:** I lost my father to non-Hodgkin's lymphoma about 14 years ago. It's a type of cancer that was linked to his exposure to radiation as a downwinder. And I would never want any family to have to endure the kind of sadness that my family's gone through, since losing my dad. The issue that we face in Utah is nothing like that, and I would never allow anything to come into our state, nor would our state government allow that, anything to be disposed of in our state that would subject its citizens to that kind of harm. What we're dealing with, with that lawsuit involving Energy Solutions, simply involves the import-export authority. That authority belongs, appropriately, to congress, and not to the states.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Bridgewater, 30 seconds of rebuttal time if you need it.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, I just think that the state ought to decide this issue, and we shouldn't be either using the courts or some other mandate from outside of the state's interest to force it to take something that it has to have a permanent responsibility to. Companies come and go, but the state will

always be here. So the state leaders, elected by the citizens, ought to be in charge of making this decision.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Back to our studio audience, another question again changing topic. Sir?

*Question: There's been proposed the United Nations treaty on small arms, which is supported by the current administration. It's still in the negotiation stage. Have you followed this matter, first of all, and in light of the fact the treaties supersede the Constitution, would you, as a senator, support or oppose a ratification of such a treaty, and why?*

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Bridgewater, you have the first 90-second opportunity.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** I would definitely oppose it. Whenever we abdicate our sovereignty, when we give up our right to some international agency, that's a huge mistake. I believe that the U.N. is not serving this nation well, they often have anti-American interests, and I think we should wean ourselves off of any involvement that we have with the U.N. Except for the security council in avoiding wars, I think a lot of the agenda is anti-family, anti-American in many respects. I'm a gun owner. I'm a hunter. I've been hunting for most of my life. The right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed is not only something that I philosophically agree with, I want my guns to protect me. If we can't get our federal government in control, I at least have that one last source of protection.

And one of my favorite images is in the Rodney King riots when a little Korean store owner was on top of his shop with his rifle protecting his private property. I believe that is a right that we have to absolutely defend. I will fight against that.

And another point on international law. Barak Obama has recently put forward a new Supreme Court justice nominee that, while she was at Harvard, took away the requirement of students to study Constitutional law as a requirement in their education, and imposed a requirement to study international law. And there are a lot of people on the left that believe we have to ignore the Constitution's historical, original intent, and look towards something in the international arena. I fundamentally disagree with that perspective.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, your 90-second opportunity.

**MR. LEE:** I would be strongly opposed to any attempt to ratify the small arms treaty. I think it represents an affront to the sovereignty of the United States of America, and it also represents an attack on the sacred and important Second Amendment right to bear arms. I see no good reason, rooted in sound public policy, and no reason that I can reconcile with the text and history of the U.S. Constitution, why we would want to erode this right. This reflects, it reminds us of how important it is, when choosing a U.S. senator, to find who is willing and able to read the text and the history of the U.S. Constitution, to figure out whether or not a treaty is compatible with that text and history. Any time you have U.S. senators voting to ratify a treaty, they're making law. And that law could be very dangerous to our Constitutional system. If we're not very careful about how we wield that authority, then we could destroy the very Constitutional framework of our country. That framework which has fostered the development of the greatest civilization the world has ever known. So I would oppose any effort to ratify that treaty.

**MR. VERDOIA:** I'm going to--and forgive me--extend my boarding house reach for our next question.

Question: Yes, thank you. My name is Pat. I have heard both of you advocate pulling the United States out of the United Nations. Please give us your reasons, and also, would pulling the United States out of the United Nations make it more difficult for us to have positive good influential relations with the rest of the world?

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, you have the first 90-second opportunity.

**MR. LEE:** I don't believe that pulling the United States out of the United Nations would have any effect that would be detrimental to our national security or our ability to interact with other nations. We have to remember that United Nations was created in a very different era, an era that was very different than the one in which we now live. An era in which we needed a forum, perhaps, or some argued, anyway, that we needed a forum in which countries could interact, they could express their views openly and in person. But with modern telecommunication technology being what it now is, it's a lot easier to do a lot of that without that framework. In any event, that framework has proven very costly over time, it's proven very often to erode, however incrementally, the national sovereignty of the United States, and it has proven to be hostile in many instances to the Constitutional values that we hold near and dear in this country.

When I was in law school I worked with Professor Richard Wilkins at BYU law school to found an organization that would help advise representatives of various countries of the implications that U.N. policy statements were having on domestic family policy. In many instances these countries were being asked to sign agreements that they didn't realize, but that were eroding their family policy, and eroding the family law that had developed in those countries over the course of many decades. And so I think, in some ways, the nicest thing that one can say about our current involvement in the United Nations, is that it's a waste of money. We have national debt that's approaching \$14.7 trillion, and I don't think we should be throwing that after an international body that erodes our sovereignty, conflicts with our values in many instances, and in any event, isn't necessary.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mr. Bridgewater, your 90-second opportunity, please.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Sure. At the time when the United Nations was set up, the world was very different than it is today. We have a whole new approach to bilateral relations, we have summits that come together among various nations, and we have a lot of forums where countries can get together, diplomats from countries can get together and resolve differences. We have major problems right now in our policy with China, for example. We have to deal with those head on, directly with the Chinese leadership, and those are the bigger and more important relationships. When we move to a body that has many, many nations involved in making decisions, whether it's with Iran or other hot spots in the world, it dilutes our ability to effect our own agenda and our own interests. So I believe that if we look, first and foremost, at American interests, we have to move to a new approach to dealing with these other countries. That may be in the G-7 or the G-8 summits that come together for issues that specifically involve those nations. Whereas smaller nations, and maybe nations that are more hostile to us, there may be a forum. But it shouldn't be a forum where everybody is considered equals.

We are the greatest nation in the world. We have a unique responsibility to lead in the world. And often times those efforts are thwarted by opponents who have veto power, or have the ability to run an agenda that's contrary to American interests. And in particular contrary to Utah interests. They have a pro-abortion agenda in many respects, an anti-family agenda in many respects. And sometimes we join together with Muslim nations where we have a similar family agenda, in opposition to the United Nations. So I believe we have to explore, we have to have the discussion, and a high-level debate about

what is the proper mechanism to communicate with foreign nations and resolve issues of national and international importance.

**MR. VERDOIA:** We are running rapidly out of time. We have time for one final question, and it's a good one. Let's go back to the front row, and your question. Mr. Bridgewater, you'll have the first opportunity.

***Question:** Hello, my name is Danny. Bringing you back to Utah, as a first-year senator, expected to do nothing more than to follow the party line, how do you expect to work for Utah within those constraints?*

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, I believe that there is an enormous opportunity right now, because not only is Utah electing a new senator, but 12 to 14 more states, at least, will put a new senator in office in this cycle, because we are part of a movement sweeping this country. It's time to take back our country, it's time to stop the corruption, and the insanity that's going on in Washington, D.C. right now. And I will be a leader in this new class, to bring together more coherent, common sense approaches to government. Cutting spending dramatically is the number one priority that we will have in this new class. We've got to get ourselves back on track. We just passed \$13 trillion of debt, we're approaching \$14 trillion with no end in sight. Barak Obama has projected that we'll be at \$20 trillion of debt by the year 2020. It's unconscionable that congress is ignoring this problem. So we needed this new generation to come in and make tough, unpopular decisions on entitlement reform, on cutting spending, on getting government out of our lives more and more, and returning power back to the states. That's the message that's resonating.

I'll give you an example. The cornhusker kick back in Nebraska, Senator Ben Nelson brought home pork barrel spending for his state, for his vote on Obama care. The voters rejected it. They said, "Give it back, that's not who we are." That's where we should be as a nation. We need to send a message to take back our country, get back our freedoms, cut dramatically spending in Washington, reform the processes of earmarks and all of the out-of-control spending that's going on. And I believe that not only a junior senator from the state of Utah, but all of the junior senators coming in in this cycle will have a mandate to do just that.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Mike Lee, your opportunity.

**MR. LEE:** My job as a U.S. senator, even a junior U.S. senator, even a first-term, first-year junior U.S. senator, is not to toe the party line, it's not to answer to anyone just because they happen to be of the same party. Bad things happen when people just take that approach to governing. That's not governing, that's not leadership, that's followership, and that's not something I'm going to do. What we need in Washington right now is someone who's willing to stand up and say, "Let's do things differently than we've been doing them. Let's stop assuming that the federal government can be all things to all people. Let's stop assuming that the federal government can and should create jobs, or that it can and should create wealth." We have to remember that the government can't create wealth, it never has, it never will. It lacks the capacity to do so. All it can do is transfer wealth from one group of people to another. But it shouldn't be doing that. Because at least, in my copy of the Constitution, congress doesn't have that power, to rob Peter to pay Paul. You've always got Paul's support when you do that, but it doesn't make it right, and it doesn't make it Constitutional.

We have to elect men and women who are willing to stand up to this system of corrupt earmark spending, of corrupt entitlement spending, and of unsustainable spending generally of the sort that will spend us into bankruptcy, and that will turn us in the direction of Greece. We will fight that. I'm unique

in this race, in that I've never built a business, I've never made a living based on securing government funds--funds from the federal government. Much of my practice as a lawyer has been focused on limiting the power of the federal government, not in extending its influence, not in securing government funds.

**MR. VERDOIA:** Well, we've moved through our allotted time, and have just enough time for a final thought from each of our candidates. Prior to air time it was determined that the first 45-second opportunity, to honor our time commitment, would go to Tim Bridgewater. Forty-five seconds, sir.

**MR. BRIDGEWATER:** Well, it's an honor to have an opportunity to run for the United States senate. Mike and I have come through a convention process where at least I met over 2,700 of the 3,500 delegates, I won 57 percent of the vote of delegates who spent hours and hours researching the candidates, and deciding who should replace Senator Bennett in the U.S. senate. I'm a businessman, I've been in the business arena for 22 years. I'm proud of my career. Feels like we're winning. We've got grassroots across the state supporting my campaign, we're out knocking on doors, making phone calls. I hope to have the opportunity to represent this great state. I'm a native of Utah, I grew up in simple circumstances, my dad was a mechanic, a diesel mechanic, and I lived in a trailer that was 12 feet wide by 60 feet long. I have experienced the American dream ,not unlike thousands of Utahns, not unlike millions of Americans. And I hope to represent the great state of Utah.

**MR. VERDOIA:** And our final word tonight from Mike Lee.

**MR. LEE:** I'm a solid, life-long, committed Constitutional conservative. And I think in the history of our republic, it's never been more important to elect someone like that to the United States senate, and I think Utahns are ready for that kind of leadership. It's what I provide. I focus on limiting the power of government, limiting its reach, limiting its cost. I'm the only candidate in this race who has never earned a living by securing federal funds, who has never supported federal government intrusion into states' sovereign interests through supporting laws like No Child Left Behind, who has never supported expanding Medicare to an irresponsible degree with an \$18 trillion unfunded entitlement liability price tag. We need less government, not more. We need to focus on the Constitution. I'm the man who will do that, please vote for me on June 22nd.

**MR. VERDOIA:** A reminder that the primary election for Republicans and Democrats will be held June 22nd in Utah. Also municipal elections, so check your party or your local county recorder's web site for additional information, or visit our web site at [kued.org](http://kued.org), for links to more information on the primary election. After Labor Day we'll return with more candidate debates in Utah's federal and statewide political campaigns. Thanks for joining us, and good night.