



## DELAWARE DEBATES 2022

### Candidates for U.S. House of Representatives

PRESENTED BY Delaware First Media and University of Delaware  
Center for Political Communication and

MODERATOR  
Ralph Begleiter Founding Director of University of Delaware Center  
for Political Communications

PANELIST  
Meg Roessler University of Delaware senior and Executive  
Producer, Student Television Network at the  
University of Delaware

#### CANDIDATES

Lisa Blunt Rochester Incumbent and Democratic candidate for U.S.  
House of Representatives, Blunt Rochester is the  
first Black representative in Delaware elected to  
Congress in 2016. She is the first woman to  
represent Delaware in Washington, D.C.

Lee Murphy Former teacher, railroad conductor and manager,  
Murphy is running as the Republican candidate for  
U.S. House of Representatives. After retiring,  
Murphy pursued an acting career appearing in film,  
TV and commercials.

Transcript of Event

Date: October 20, 2022

Place: Virtual  
Newark, DE



[Musical interlude to 0:00:18.1]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tonight, live from the University of Delaware, Delaware Debates featuring the candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives.

MR. BEGLEITER: Hello everyone, on behalf of Delaware Public Media and the University of Delaware Center for Political Communication welcome to Delaware Debates 2022. I'm Ralph Begleiter. Delaware Debates is supported by the University of Delaware's College of Arts and Sciences and the Offices of the Provost and the President. This debate includes candidates in the race for Delaware's sole seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. The Democratic Party's nominee for Congress is Lisa Blunt Rochester, the incumbent. The Republican candidate for Congress is Lee Murphy. Welcome to you both. We are very glad to have your participation in the debates this year.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER: Now both candidates have agreed in advance to rules for this 90 minute debate. I'll begin with a question for each of them and they've agreed to hold their answers to specific time limits. We'll also have some questions posed by a student, Meg Roessler, Executive Producer for Student Television Network at the University of Delaware. Although the candidates have agreed that there will be no opening statements you will hear closing statements from both candidates later in the program. The candidates will answer in the order they themselves determined with a pre-debate coin toss. We'll try to keep our questions concise and ask the candidates to answer succinctly as well so we can cover as much ground together as possible. We'll focus first on the nation's economy which is at the top of most voters minds. My first question goes to Lisa Blunt Rochester. Congresswoman, you voted for something

called the Inflation Reduction Act which was the name Congress gave to a big bill including a lot of Democratic priorities. Does the Act actually reduce inflation and what does it do to the national deficit?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Well first of all I want to thank the University of Delaware for having me and thank you, Ralph, and thank you to Delaware for the opportunity to serve. The Inflation Reduction Act, which we passed, really to me is about Delaware families and the things that I've heard up and down this state, everything from lowering our prescription drug prices for our seniors, to making sure that our energy costs are lowered. And it is actually paid for by really taxing those businesses and those individuals that are at that top tier percent; some businesses that have never paid taxes. And so, for us the Inflation Reduction Act for the seniors, one of the things that it does is allow us to negotiate cost prices through Medicare for which we've never been able to do before. We can negotiate for planes through the Pentagon but we can't negotiate for drug prices? It also caps at \$2,000.00 a, a, the amount that a senior would pay for their prescription drugs. I literally had to tell a town hall meeting where I had to repeat it three times because they could not believe that this was something that was possible; and also capping the price of insulin to \$35.00. Again, it's paid for but it also is meant to touch people's kitchen table issues; energy, prescription drugs, making sure we invest in our climate as well. So, that's really the first of its kind, a massive bill that we were able to pass that really will have an impact on families in Delaware.

MR. BEGLEITER: Now, a related question to you, Mr. Murphy. You have criticized the Bigen (sic), Biden administration for not doing enough to fight inflation. Many economists say that Presidents actually have very few tools that they can use to fight the underlying course (sic), causes and forces of inflation. But, regardless of whether you agree that's true or not, please suggest three additional ways that you think

a President could, could act to have a moderating an effect on inflation over let's say the next six to twelve months.

MR. MURRAY: Well, Ralph, it's a pleasure to be here and hi to the audience listening and watching this evening. You know, inflation as I travel up and down the state of Delaware and talk to Delawareans it's the number one concern of the people in this state. And we're facing the highest inflation in over 50 years in our country right now. Now, inflation, how do we curb it? How do we fix it? It's when supply; when demand outstrips supply. And let's face it; the government is spending money, printing money, trillions of dollars in unnecessary spending. We have to get the foot off the neck of our small businesses in this state. We have to let them do what they do best and that is to create jobs. We have to get a rid, rid of unnecessary regulations, lower taxes, make it easier for people to do business in this state. You know, it doesn't take a lot to get inflation under control. The government just has to use a little discipline in how they spend our money and we can get this problem in a relatively short time under control.

MR. BEGLEITER: Now I'd like to ask a question of both of you that is related to the inflation question you've both just addressed. Do you each support continuing the U.S. pressure on Russia to end its unprovoked war against Ukraine even if it means continued economic hardship for Americans including things like higher gas prices, higher grocery prices. Mr. Murphy, first shot?

MR. MURRAY: Let's talk about energy independence, ladies and gentlemen. This country just two years ago was energy independent. We used our natural resources in this country; our gas, our oil, our coal. What did this President do day one? Shut down the Keystone Pipeline. Shut off leases in this country for oil and gas exploration. We need to put the people back to work on the Keystone Pipelione, open that pipeline, get that oil into our refineries and back into American's cars at \$2.00

a gallon which it was just two years ago. Our energy independence is so important, not only economically but for our national defense. As we see overseas in Ukraine the crisis that faces the people of Ukraine, how is Putin funding that war? He is funding that war by selling his oil to our friends in Europe and all over the world. We were just two years ago a net exporter of oil to our friends in Europe. The bottom line, that war right now financed by oil, Russian oil, would not be happening if the United States was energy independent and we could help our friends and cutoff that supply of Russian oil.

MR. BEGLEITER: The question was about whether you would continue to support Ukraine even if it meant a continued stress on, on the inflation rate in the United States on gas prices and other things. Would you vote to continue supporting Ukraine?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, I support Ukraine. It's a humanitarian crisis, okay? And I just want to get back to the energy independence and now that we have the energy dependence. This war, first of all, would not be happening if we were energy independent. Russia would not have the finances to finance this war. So, yes, the predicament we are in was, is a result of one decision made by this President day one in office to cut off our energy independence. This; elections have consequences and this is one of the tragic consequences that we face.

MR. BEGLEITER: Congresswoman Blunt Rochester, your response to the question of whether you would continue to support fighting the, Ukraine fighting the war against Russia even if it means stress on the inflation in the United States?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Well, first of all, let's be clear. This war was because Putin, unprovoked, was the aggressor to the Ukraine, to, to the Ukrainian people. I mean, let's be clear about that. This was not a Joe Biden war. This was a Putin War. Secondly, to your question, what is disappointing about the answer is that in my time in Congress this has been a bipartisan issue. This hasn't been something we've, you

know, politicized. It has been a bipartisan issue because there are consequences to what Putin is doing. There are global consequences, there are consequences to democracy; there are consequences to our safety and security. And so to your question, you know, I think this is one of the reasons why we run. The American people have stood up and said that this is a tough time. We understand that inflation is a challenge. As a matter of fact, I actually went and put forth supply chain provisions to make sure that people understood why it's difficult to get some of the products that we've gotten. We were in a pandemic. This is a pandemic; once in a lifetime. And so, we are feeling a different effect. Again, to me, our support for Ukraine has been strong, it has been bipartisan and I hope it continues to be bipartisan.

MR. BEGLEITER: I'll get to –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: It's about democracies around the world as well.

MR. MURRAY: Can I –

MR. BEGLEITER: You had a follow-up answer to your, to the first question. I'm going to move on. But sticking –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Can I get a follow up then to supply chain?

MR. BEGLEITER: To supply chain?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: The, the –

MR. BEGLEITER: Go for it.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Yes. And I, and I'm glad that Mr. Murphy brought up supply chains because one of the things I've had a chance to do is actually go around the state and talk to business owners, talk to individuals and it started with the pandemic when being on the Health Subcommittee in Congress I was able to see that we were not able to get PPE. We were not able to get vials. Things were made in other parts of the world. And so what we did was we focused on how can we bring our supply chains back

home? How can we make things in America? And so I authored provisions that are in legislation and now we are able to see, even with the chips and science bill, that we're bringing those jobs back home. We're making sure that we're strong. Even our car dealerships; I went to a car dealership, they had no cars. I went to a company here that makes mammogram machines, they didn't have the chips. That's the kind of work that you have to do to solve difficult problems in Congress and I'm glad that I've been able to work on that.

MR. BEGLEITER: Sticking with the national economy and an issue both of you would have to vote on as a member of Congress if, if you're elected to Congress this time. The national debt has ballooned over the last two Presidential administrations caused by several things including huge tax cuts and huge stimulus spending during the pandemic. After voting to spend money Congress routinely engages in political brinksmanship about raising the debt ceiling and then usually reigns, always raises the debt ceiling anyway. My question to you is; should Congress stop pretending there is a debt limit? Congresswoman Blunt Rochester, you take that one first?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: No, I don't think we should stop. I, I think, I think it is important for us to be fiscally responsible, that's why I even shared with the last bill in terms of the Inflation Reduction Act looking for ways to pay for that as opposed to the Trump tax cuts that there was no way to pay for that. I do think we have to be responsible and I do think it's something that we need to do together. Again, I come from a background of governing. I come from a background of bringing people together. And so for me it's important that we sit down together and talk about how do we deal with these issues that sometimes seem simple but they're not. They're more complex. And so, no, I think we, we must be responsible and that's important to me as well.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy, on the debt limit? Would you support



essentially stopping to prevent, to pretend that there is a debt limit, just keep approving it?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, as your congressman one, one duty that I have is your checkbook. I have to have; I have to be able to justify what Congress spends. It's your tax dollars. And quite frankly this current Congress has spent trillions and trillions in dollars in wasteful spending in programs that really have no end. And the; the accountability of Congress, where's the accountability? We need to account for every single dollar of taxpayers' money. And the debt is out of control, 31 trillion dollars and growing. This is unsustainable. We cannot continue to print money. We cannot continue to spend trillions and trillions of dollars in government programs. We have to rein in spending. We have to incentivize business. How do we get back to 0.0 inflation? How do we get back to a vibrant economy? Let's get the foot of government off the neck of small businesses, manufacturing, create jobs. People pay taxes, the debt goes down and we have once again a healthy economy. That's the way I see getting us back on track in this country economically.

MR. BEGLEITER: So, if you're elected to Congress would you vote to raise the debt, debt limit or not, or would you vote against raising the debt limit?

MR. MURRAY: I would vote to get our spending under control, to again incentivize small business, small manufacturing. Bring jobs back to the United States. We talk about the supply chain crisis? Well, this administration created this supply chain crisis. We need to once again make things in the United States. And why has it taken the Congresswoman six years to address this issue? We need to make things in this country; our lifesaving pharmaceuticals, computer chips. We need to once again make things in the United States so we don't have these supply chain issues that this administration has given us.



MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Your next question –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: So –

MR. BEGLEITER: – for both of you comes from UD –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: – do we get –

MR. BEGLEITER: – Student –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: – to –

MR. BEGLEITER: – Television Executive Producer Meg Roessler. I’m going to ask Meg to ask the next question.

MS. ROESSLER: Thank you, Ralph. So, many young people in the United States often talk about skepticism in their futures compared to their parents or their grandparents. They see that owning a home in the future is unforeseeable. They see a planet that’s been ravaged by climate change going largely unaddressed. And they see the Supreme Court stripping their personal rights from them about personal family planning and being handed to state governments. So what should Congress do to reassure young people of the reliability of our national institutions?

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. According to the rules, Mr. Murphy you speak first on this question.

MR. MURRAY: Well, that, that’s a great question and I have many young people involved in my campaign and quite frankly, you know, I am running for Congress basically. My main motivation here is for my children and my grandchildren. To pass on a world that is as good as the one that I grew up in and right now it’s not looking good for them. But, to address your question, the accountability comes back into play here. Congress has to be accountable to the American people and right now Congress and this administration are not accountable to the American people. We see spending, out of control spending. And that will affect future generations. It will affect your children,

your children's future and our future as a nation. So, Congress has to be accountable on all levels to ensure a bright future for not only you, but for your family and your children.

MR. BEGLEITER:                   Congresswoman, your response to the student's question about looking ahead to the future of the younger generation?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER:    Yeah. First of all, Meg, thank you so much for the question. You know, as I have gone up and down the state and talked to young people there are issues that are really important to you and climate being one of them was one of the reasons that I ran. And I think that what's important for us is to model what you want to see. For example, the fact that we've been able to pass legislation that has the largest investment in climate in the history of this country is something that I hope restores your faith. The fact that we've been able to deal with issues, such as criminal justice reform and environmental justice, I hope that restores your faith. That really, part of it is us doing our part and then also including you in the decision making and being part of what we do. And I can say we have young people not only on our team but also providing us with policy insights because that's really important. And then I think the other thing is to run, to get involved, to get engaged. Many of you have been the ones that have really pushed forward the major challenges and solutions of our time. And so, I would just encourage you to continue to be a part of the solution. And, and again, I, I feel, I feel hopeful because I look at you. You give me hope and I'm, I'm just grateful for that. And we will continue to work with young people to make sure that we save this planet and that we save each other.

MR. BEGLEITER:                   I need to switch gears now. I know we could talk about the economy for the entire time of the debate but there's a lot of other topics worth talking about as well. And I want to focus on another major national issue that we, we all

know is on many voters' minds – the Supreme Court's decision after five decades to revoke the right of pregnant women to choose abortion. So, for both of you please, address this specific question. Should Congress pass legislation reversing the Supreme Court's decision codifying abortion rights into Federal law or pass laws protecting women, physicians, providers who help women who are fleeing states that now ban abortion? Or, should Congress stay out of the abortion issue all together?

Congresswoman Rochester, please first.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Well, I am proud to say that I voted for, am a big supporter of the Women's Reproductive Health Act in Congress which we passed in the House. I believe and I've said it on the floor of the House, I've said it here in Delaware, I believe there is no room in women's womb for politicians. I, I just want to be clear about that. It feels like people are trying to rollback the freedoms that we've had; the autonomy that's we've had and I think that's a big difference between us. I, I'm proud of what Delaware has been able to do but what Republicans in Congress are proposing would actually nullify the will of the people here in Delaware. And we don't need to go backwards. I'm excited about moving forward and making sure that when we get back in the House and the Senate that if we have the votes we can codify Roe so that we can make sure that our bodies, our choices.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy, on abortion? Should Congress stay out of it? Should the states, should the Congress legislate on abortion?

MR. MURRAY: Well, really, this is not a political issue, number one. I agree with the decision, the Supreme Court decision, the constitutional decision to return the right, this important decision making process back to the states. As people know here in Delaware it's, it's a right. It's a protective right here in Delaware. And, we, if someone wants to have an abortion here in Delaware it's protected. And I believe that

the decision making power should be with the states. And if people want to change it one way or the other they need to get involved. They need to talk to their legislatures. It's up to the states. It's up to the people in each state to make this important decision. Now what's good for Delaware may not be good for another state in the United States. I think it's good. Personally I am pro-life. I have always been pro-life. But a personal story; my daughter went through some tough times. She went through drug addiction, she came through rehab and she got her life back out together. She was pregnant. Did I tell her that, what to do or what not to do? No, she made her own choice. She made her own choice and that choice was for life. And I applaud her for that decision. But did I tell her what to do? No, I did not. And the government, when it comes down to it, it's a woman's choice.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy, on, on the basis of what you just said about it being a state decision, if you're elected to Congress then would you vote against the Republican House leader, Kevin McCarthy's proposal, which he's already put before Congress, which would pass a federal law specifying abortion limits because you just said it, it should be a state decision?

MR. MURRAY: I think constitutionally the Supreme Court was right. It is a state issue. It's where people can really have their voices heard and each state can make their individual decisions on what's appropriate for their particular state.

MR. BEGLEITER: And you would vote that way in Congress if you were elected?

MR. MURRAY: Can you repeat that please?

MR. BEGLEITER: Would you vote that way again? If you were elected would you vote that way and, and if McCarthy –

MR. MURRAY: I would vote –

MR. BEGLEITER: – McCarthy’s bill comes up as he’s already put it in Congress you’d have to vote against it then right?

MR. MURRAY: Yeah, I, I uphold the Supreme Court’s decision 100 percent. Yes.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: So –

MR. BEGLEITER: – Congresswoman?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: So, just to be clear, right now Lindsey Graham and McCarthy are suggesting a bill that would overturn the will of Delaware. And you are saying you would not support their proposal that, that would put limitations on, on women across this country? I mean, your daughter had a choice.

MR. MURRAY: She had a choice.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: That’s what you –

MR. MURRAY: She made –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: – shared –

MR. MURRAY: – the right choice.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: That’s what you –

MR. MURRAY: But it wasn’t my choice.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: But it was –

MR. MURRAY: It was her choice.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: – a choice.

MR. MURRAY: Yes. She had a choice.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: And in the end that’s what it comes down to.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: So, clarifying again, you would support Lindsey Graham

and McCarthy or you wouldn't?

MR. MURRAY: I, as I stated, I support –

MR. BEGLEITER: Yeah, you, you –

MR. MURRAY: – the Supreme Court decision –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Okay.

MR. MURRAY: – handing it back to the states where it rightfully belongs where people can get in touch with their legislators and do what's best for the interest of that particular state. That's where it belongs. It's protected in Delaware. The fear mongering that Republicans will ban all abortions every – the, the fear mongering really gets to me. It upsets people. I have, I've had people call me that, that, that this, I'll just end it there.

MR. BEGLEITER: Yeah, with, this question's been asked and answered. So, but I, I have a related question that will, that both of you can respond to as well. And that is prompted by my reading of a piece by Mr. Murphy in the First State Times in which he wrote that Roe v. Wade is not settled law, that the concept of settled law is a made up concept. And I want to ask each of you, how do you feel about the concept of settled law? Do you apply it to other court precedents including cases protecting gay rights and interracial marriage so they also would not be settled law or, or are settled law depending on your point of view, and should be reconsidered or even reversed. So, the question is how do you feel about the issue of settled law on abortion and would you apply it to other issues as well? Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURRAY: The abortion issue is separate and there's; I have complete faith in the Supreme Court in their decision making process. And I believe everybody should have faith in the Supreme Court. In terms of other issues, I would very much have to look at those issues and make a determination on whatever Supreme

Court decision came down and whether I agree with it or not agree with it.

MR. BEGLEITER:                   Congresswoman?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER:    You know, I think that what really concerns people, and young people as well, is that we believed that it was settled. Roe versus Wade was settled. Then when you get a justice like Clarence Thomas who basically says other things are on the table like contraception, like gay marriage, marriage equality, that doesn't instill confidence unfortunately. I believe that these things; you know, my ability to even be on this stage as a black woman who ran for Congress, who even had the right to vote, these things, we don't want to go backwards. We want to go forwards. And so, to me when people start talking about contraception, when they start talking about marriage equality, it's a slippery slope when you go after something that is almost 50 years old that has been the law of the land. To me, that, that, that is unsettling for people. And that's why so many people are coming out and voting because they don't want to go backwards. They don't want their rights to be taken away. And that's one of the reasons why this moment is important.

MR. BEGLEITER:                   Staying for, with the concept of federal guarantees of civil rights for a few moments. And I just want to point out the Center for Political Communication at UD just came out with a new public opinion survey here in Delaware that showed that 80 percent of Delawareans support laws protecting transgender students from discrimination in schools. So I want to ask you about a very particular aspect of that policy area. So, please bear with me on this question. Should the federal government pass a law guaranteeing individuals regardless of their age a right to seek and receive medical treatment for gender transition? Should medical treatment in transgender cases like medical treatment in abortion related cases as the Supreme Court has now ruled, be decided by the states, by the federal government, by doctors,

by the courts, or by individuals and their families. In other words, should states have the power to allow or ban medical treatment for people who are gender transitioning?

Congresswoman?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: You know, again, this is a moment where people are feeling excluded. It's challenging enough going through what these young people are going through and I think it's very clear that there are medical aspects of this, that there are aspects of this that relate to that young person and their families and this is not something that I've seen come up in Congress but we have been very upfront and supportive of protections for transgender children. That's something that's important to me. Part of it is that I think a lot of times people, people want to be seen, they want to be heard, they want to be respected. It's not a, it's, that's what, that's what this is really about is young people being able to be fully who they are. So, I think this is one of those issues that should it come before Congress I, I would definitely do my due diligence but I would definitely support those young people that really need to be, be able, to be able to live their full free self.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, I mean, this issue is very near and dear to me having been a teacher and a coach for many years. I have coached boys and girls all ages and I, I've thoroughly enjoyed it. And I think what we are talking about here as a coach, as a teacher, we are compassionate. We are compassionate people and we deal with every child individually. And regardless of, of who they are or, or what they're going through or, or how they're, how they're perceived in the world. And, and compassion is the big word here and we care about everybody. We care about all children. But I just want to address the fact that I can't even really believe that I'm talking about parents having rights here in our schools and what's decided in our schools



and in, outside of our schools. Parents should have the right to determine, you know, on these important issues regarding sexuality it should be between the parent and the, the school and the child and whatever other professional that they need to talk with. So, the state, this is a very personal and it's a very, it's not a political issue and it should not be treated as an issue to the – which I think divides people rather than bringing people together.

MR. BEGLEITER: And so, you would make a distinction. What, what is the distinction that you apparently make between the transgender policy issue and let's say the abortion issue which you've already said here tonight should be decided by the Supreme Court and then by the states?

MR. MURRAY: Yeah, I, I just feel that we instead of dividing, it, it, this is very divide; look everybody is protected under the laws of this country. We don't need to, to really – we, we need to not continue to, to, to set this group over here and this group over here and this group has special needs and this group – we, we need to come together. Everybody – and, and again, going back to the word, its compassion. And, and treat individuals as individuals, address their needs, and for God's sakes, parents need to have a say in, in their child's life, period.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Are, are –

MR. BEGLEITER: Congresswoman, you said a moment ago this issue hadn't come up before Congress yet. But –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: I want, I just want to, I, I want to say something though about I'm really glad to hear you talk about compassion. I know two young people in this state that have, have come to me with their parents and talked about the challenges that they face every single day. And, you know, in this country right now you, you, as you've said I do feel these things are being politicized. I do feel that for those young people life

is challenging enough, it is hard enough without having been demonized. And so, you know, I wish we all would talk about compassion but also recognize that just because we say we all have rights doesn't mean that it really plays out that way in people's everyday lives.

MR. BEGLEITER: I want to turn our attention in this next segment to some questions about the state of democracy in the United States. National public opinion polls show that many Americans, both Republicans and Democrats, say they are concerned about threats to American democracy. I want to ask each of you if you think state or federal legislators in the United States have the power to overturn, reverse or otherwise change the decision of the voters in national elections after the voters have cast their ballots. Do national legislators have the ability, the power, to change the outcome of an election after the voters have cast their ballots? Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURRAY: No, our, our elections are spelled out in the Constitution and there are certain procedures to ensure the integrity and the, the fairness of all our elections. When the voters speak the voters speak. And, that their will should not be overturned.

MR. BEGLEITER: Congresswoman?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: What is surprising to me, again in this moment, having been trapped up in the Capitol on the day of January 6<sup>th</sup> is to see that – I, I read an article recently that there are 299 election deniers running for office at this moment. That means people who didn't believe in the results of the last Presidential election. It was clear. There were court cases. There were all of these different things and I do believe, again, one of the reasons why young people are concerned is because our democracy is also at stake; fragile and at the same time resilient. Thank God we came back that night and did our job and actually really upheld that peaceful transfer of power.

But no, should, should people be able to just overturn the will of the people? No. And the people spoke. Joe Biden is the duly elected President of this country. And some people just don't, don't believe it.

MR. BEGLEITER: You both have sort of moved in the direction of my next question so I'd like to kind of go, continue on this topic for a minute. Mr. Murphy, how would you characterize; Congresswoman Blunt Rochester just characterized the January 6<sup>th</sup> events and so I want to give you an opportunity to do that as well. How would you characterize what happened on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021? Of course, you know the National Republican Party, your party, has officially described it as legitimate political discourse. How do you characterize it?

MR. MURRAY: Well first of all, I just want to touch on 2020's election. There were a lot of concerns over the integrity and transparency of that election. And that's really a nonpartisan issue in my travels here. People want fair elections regardless if you're a Democrat or Independent or a Republican. So, going forward voter integrity is very important and transparency is very important.

MR. BEGLEITER: Was 2020 rigged?

MR. MURRAY: I ran in 2020. As I said, there were many concerns and the transparency of that election there were many inconsistencies and we need not to let that happen. Many voters are really upset and turned off. They think their vote does not count. We have to restore that faith in our system that every vote counts in this election upcoming. So –

MR. BEGLEITER: So just to be clear, you're, you're not saying it was rigged or not rigged? You're just not weighing in on that issue?

MR. MURRAY: Yeah. I, I am. Inconsistencies, lack of transparency and, and your question.

MR. BEGLEITER: Your question was about January 20; January 6<sup>th</sup>. Was it legitimate political discourse?

MR. MURRAY: January 6<sup>th</sup>, it, we have a, I will uphold the Constitution of the United States when I am sworn in as your next Congressman. The First Amendment is, guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of assembly. And the vast majority of people that day demonstrated and voiced their opinion. However, there were people that broke the law that day that should be punished and held accountable for their misdeeds on that particular day just as everyone that, that breaks the law in this country – destroys properties, destroys businesses – everybody that breaks the law in this country should be held accountable and but the First Amendment guarantees assembly and freedom of speech.

MR. BEGLEITER: Congresswoman, you already mentioned your presence at the Capitol. How would you characterize what happened on January 6<sup>th</sup>?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Well first I want to be clear that it has been said and documented even by Trump officials that that was one of the most safe, fair elections with, I, I don't even know where we're getting all this stuff about there's bipartisan agreement that there were inconsistencies because there wasn't. People voted and they made their voices heard. On that day I will tell you, I, sometimes I think back to the fact that if somebody came into your house, broke in your house or your job, they broke in, they stole things, they defecated, they, they then wanted to kill you I would not call that a walk in the park or a trip or whatever it was being characterized as. That day was to me the hardest day and my greatest day in Congress. It was the hardest day not because, you know, of what was happening in that moment but what I saw afterwards in terms of people scaling the Capitol, walking through with a Confederate flag. All of that. And then it was a great day because we came back that morning and we made sure that

we certified that election. That showed both the fragility of this moment but also our resilience as a country. And that's another thing that I hope young people pay attention to, that we came back and that this is about rule of law and that this is about peaceful transfer of power and that this is about our American way of life. If we believe these things then we have to baseline, acknowledge who the President of the United States is and say it with authority.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right, since you mentioned again young people I'd like to turn to Meg Roessler again for the next question that's going to be thematically on this same area. Go ahead, Meg.

MS. ROESSLER: Thank you, Ralph. So, there is a lot of negative conversation regarding our nation's democracy on platforms like Tik Tok and Twitter. So do you believe that the checks and balances system established by the founding fathers is still working today?

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. Checks and balances. Mr. Murphy, you're first on this one.

MR. MURRAY: Meg, that's a great question. And, in the last four years or six years we've seen a, a, really a lack of faith and a breakdown in our institutions. Where we had checks and balances before we've seen a Department of Justice basically go off the rails and pretty much hunt down a President based on no knowledge and no facts or no evidence at all. Using government institutions to go after individuals whether they be in the government or outside of the government is wrong. It's just plain wrong. So, once again we have to have faith in our institutions. I think the approval rating of Congress is like 17 percent. The approval rating of the President is at an all time low at 39 percent. All our institutions are, are at risk right now. And the founders that, of our great country put those checks and balances in place so no one, one arm of

the government could get out of control and rule this world and destroy our republic.

MR. BEGLEITER:                   Congresswoman Blunt Rochester is; are the checks and balances of the institutions working?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER:   Well, first of all, Meg, to the beginning of your question where you even talked about those platforms, I think one of the biggest challenges that we've had and really to, you know, follow-up, you know, you talked about a President who actually took classified documents home and thinks it's okay to have them there, really created or allowed for this environment where people don't, not only do they not trust the media, they don't trust each other. And so, for me, even as we went through the beginning of this pandemic there were three things: it was recover, rebuild and restore. We have to recover from this pandemic and so to say that Joe Biden is the reason why we have supply chain problems is, is not true. But we have to recover economically and physically. We've got to rebuild and that's what we've done with the bipartisan infrastructure bill. And then we have to restore and that's part of what this whole moment is about; finding those things, sharing with people the things that we've been able to do as Democrats and Republicans on gun safety, on making sure that veterans with the PACT Act are taken care of. There are things that we can do to restore people's faith but the biggest check is the people. You need to be able to participate. You need to be able to have the right to vote. And we don't need individuals that are trying to take away your rights. We need folks that are going to make sure that you continue to have that right to be the biggest check on all of us.

MR. BEGLEITER:                   I'd like to turn now to some questions on public safety and gun policy issues. They've already come up. This debate is being held at the University of Delaware which is a highly ranked research institution. But researchers here at UD and at many other similar places are prevented from gathering information

from the real world about gun violence in the United States including recent gun violence just in Wilmington, Delaware for example because Congress doesn't approve federal funding for such research. So I'm asking both of you, should Congress approve funding for national research on the causes and potential cures of gun violence in the United States to help frame gun laws to be passed by Congress? Congresswoman, you're first on this one.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: You know I want to thank again many groups out there like Moms Demand Action and in every town and others that pushed this issue of gun violence to the fore. This really, you know, a lot of times we hear about the mass shootings but it's those everyday shootings in our communities and in our neighborhoods that are also impacted. And so, I'm proud to say that I was supportive of making sure that we could study gun violence. But I also am proud to say that I was actually one of the supporters and a voter of the Safer Communities Act which is actually a bipartisan piece of legislation first of its kind in 30 years and really it was because it was pushed by young folks to make sure that we lived up to common sense gun safety legislation. I also was involved in our, actually co-lead in a bill called Break the Cycle of Violence based on things that I learned right here in Delaware, things that work like group violence intervention and hospital-based interventions to stop retaliation. This to me in addition to making sure that we got funding that comes to local communities to solve local community problems has been what I've been working and what I want to continue to work on because we still have so much more to do. I, again, applaud being able to collect the data but it's also important what we do on the ground with that data. And so I'm, I'm glad that we've been able to pass this legislation, this first in 30 years but there's still more to be done.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy, your view on, on doing national research on

gun violence to help shape future legislation?

MR. MURRAY: Well, we, we do have a problem with violence in this country and for the Congresswoman and the Democratic Party to put on law abiding citizens that legally lawfully own guns I think is terribly wrong. I am a strong supporter of our Constitution and I'm a strong supporter of our Second Amendment. When we look at violence in this country there's many root causes. And one could be classified as the economy where we have a economy that is not working we have poverty. And what happens in poverished (sic) neighborhoods? Violence happens. People turn to other means of supporting themselves. And that many times includes violence. The drug trade in our country is out of control. We; the root causes of violence are not at the hands of legally owning gun owners that support our country; it's more; it's deeper, it's more involved. We have to get to the root causes of our violence in this country. What causes it?

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. I want to follow-up on public, public safety issue. There have been clashes as we all know from reading the news of the last couple of years and across the political spectrum. Local and state police departments have made a variety of different decisions about officers wearing and using body cameras. I'd like to ask you both whether you favor expansion of body camera use by community police forces and for that matter maybe other forms of surveillance such as cameras on utility poles or even in drones as are used in other countries. Do you support surveillance of U.S. citizens using facial recognition, for example, as China does extensively? Mr. Murphy, first?

MR. MURRAY: No, I don't support facial recognition as China. Not in this country. And overall, there's surveillance and then there's surveillance that violates our rights, our privacy rights, rights under the Constitution. And we're talking, we're



talking about policing here in, in our country and I, I am proud to have the endorsement of the Delaware Fraternal Order of Police for the second time. But let's, let's look at what's happening here in our public safety. Police officers are, are leaving in droves in, in our country. And what does that, what happens there? Our most vulnerable neighborhoods are at risk. I campaign all over, up and down the state in all kinds of neighborhoods and the most vulnerable people in our cities, in our, our states, in this state are really left at risk. Again, the police should be supported; the police are not the problem. They need our backing. We have a breakdown in law and order in our society right now. It cannot continue. If we're going to have a civil society where people can walk down the street and be safe and feel comfortable we have to get back where criminals are prosecuted, victims are protected and people that commit crimes face penalties. Right now they face nothing.

MR. BEGLEITER:                      Congresswoman, the question of expansion or continued use of body cameras and other kinds of surveillance like facial recognition?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER:      So, I have to say, you know, body-worn cameras is something that I've had the opportunity to work on as our Congressperson. You know, and that was based on again how I work. I bring people together. We brought people from the community, we brought advocates, we brought law enforcement to the table and said what are some of the things that we all agree on? One was that body-worn cameras are both a positive for police because they actually have proof if they need it but it's also an accountability piece. And so one of the things that I did was bring them around the table and actually put, they put in an application to make sure that Delaware could be one of the first states if not the first state where all law enforcement who were eligible have body-worn cameras. Again, the goal here was to make sure that there was accountability, but at the same time I also want to touch on the support for police



MR. BEGLEITER: – comment? Brief.

MR. MURRAY: Congresswoman, you haven't really supported the police. You haven't been out front. You haven't raised your voice to support the police. And, I just want to ask –

MR. BEGLEITER: I'm –

MR. MURRAY: – the audience –

MR. BEGLEITER: I'm going to ask –

MR. MURRAY: – what – okay.

MR. BEGLEITER: – that we adhere to the rule which is we're not –

MR. MURRAY: Yeah.

MR. BEGLEITER: – attacking each other in this debate. We're talking about our own qualifications and our own positions –

MR. MURRAY: Okay.

MR. BEGLEITER: – on these issues.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: I appreciate that, Ralph.

MR. BEGLEITER: You can continue if you want to but –

MR. MURRAY: I, I, I just want to ask the audience out there who today, who today in the audience would want to be a policeman? Why, why would you step forward? This is an honorable profession; one of the most revered in our history in our country. But who today would, would want to be a policeman where you're not going to be backed. Where you're going to have laws passed in Congress that really cut your legs off and, and don't give you the ability to enforce the law.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. I want to change topics again. Again, we could talk about any one of these things for a long time. This is an important –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: I, I do have to –

MR. BEGLEITER: – issue to that –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: – I do have to, I have to say something.

MR. BEGLEITER: You, you were attacked so –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Exactly.

MR. BEGLEITER: – respond.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: I think it's wrong, disingenuous for you to say I have not been supportive of the police – maybe that, that's your opinion, but for me, I'm trying to support everyone. We had a saying when I ran that when Lisa goes to Washington we all go to Washington. And that's what I strive to do every single day. Hear the voices up and down this state. Again, if Republicans in Congress mean it then they need to put their vote where their mouth is and vote to support law enforcement.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. I want to turn to housing issues, the nation's housing problem and it's a problem not just around the nation, it's a problem in virtually every state including in Delaware. Some people even call it a housing crisis when they think about homeless people or young people trying to buy their first home for example. So a question I want to ask you is: homebuilders in the United States have very few incentives to build what you and I would call affordable homes; high land prices, not in my backyard politics, wealthy home buyers in desirable areas, and even local governments who are thirsting for real estate tax revenue all drive builders in the direction of building large, expensive homes. Should Congress do anything about this to improve the supply of affordable and smarter; affordable starter homes in desirable areas in this country? Congresswoman, first on this one?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Yeah. I mean, housing to me is one of the, the number one issues that a lot of times you don't hear on the TV but it's something I hear up and down this state. I went and visited a business and one of the owners asked his COO to

come in, the Chief Operating Officer. She was 51 years old and he said tell the Congresswoman where you live. And she said with my parents. This is one of the issues that I have tried to be very up front with. Number one, I introduced the Housing and Affordability Supply Bill in Congress to really breakdown the barriers and help municipalities as well as communities come together to figure out the, the plans to be able to build that affordable housing that we're talking about. I've been able to bring dollars to Delaware for both homelessness as well as housing as well as organizations such as Habitat for Humanity. This is one of those things where, you know, it's many times building generational wealth for a family. It's sometimes, I remember for my family coming to Delaware our first home as kids, it deals with our education system. It, it cuts so many different ways. And so, for us, this is a priority and we will continue to make it a priority. That bill, the Housing Affordability Bill had over 100 organizations across the country support it including Up For Growth. This is a bill that we need to pass and we need to make sure that we have more affordable housing stock in Delaware. And I will continue to work on that.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy, your view on afford – should Congress do something to increase the amount of affordable housing, not just for the homeless problem, but also for the problem of the young people trying to start out?

MR. MURRAY: Well, absolutely Congress should do something and, and this goes back to the runaway inflation we have right now. We have a administration that, that, where the Fed is raising interest rates by the day, by the week. Mortgages are at a all time high, seven percent, over seven percent. We have to get back to a vibrant economy. The answer is not for the Fed to raise interest rates and in, that in, raises mortgage rates. It raises, it; people need to, to have a healthy economy. In a healthy economy the Fed does not have to artificially raise their rates. We just witnessed two

years ago where you could get a mortgage for one, two or three percent. We need to get back to where people can afford houses. And continue to talk about the economy, where people are working in jobs created by a healthy economy that will in turn allow them – just as it did when I first bought my first house – to be able to afford a house. And we have seen in these inflationary times, you know, mortgage rates are going up, rents are going up. Everything is going up. So this is an economic issue. Rather than the, the Congress or the, the government subsidizing, let's get back to a healthy economy; get our economy going so people can work and buy a house.

MR. BEGLEITER:                    Mr. Murphy, interest rates have been at a very, very low level on mortgages for a very long time; many years, not just the, the last couple of years. The high mortgage rates certainly are high now but only in recent months. I'm asking you about fundamental policy, national policy, on affordable housing, not about something that's just happened in the last few months.

MR. MURRAY:                    I think, I think locally here in, in Sussex County I'll just use a, an example that the local government in Sussex is, is looking into and making affordable housing for the people that actually work in that area. As you know, Sussex County is a, a vacation, many vacation homes. They need workers. The workers have to travel great distances to get there. The local government, and I think this is a local issue too, are, are working to provide and make available housing that is affordable to people that are not in, in the upper income levels of our society.

MR. BEGLEITER:                    Okay. We've gotten to the point in our debate where it's time for what we call the lightning round of questions; its a few questions which lend themselves to shorter answers. So, I'm going to ask you each to, to answer these questions, the following questions in a minute or less. And the first one is going to be asked by Meg Roessler, the executive producer of Student Television Network here at

UD. Meg?

MS. ROESSLER: Thanks, thanks again, Ralph. So, President Biden has taken some administrative steps to reduce student debt and the application for debt relief is open through the end of 2023 but for future generations of college students. Is debt relief something you believe should become permanent?

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Mr. Murphy, you're first on this question; permanent relief for student debt?

MR. MURRAY: Perm, permanent relief for student debt? I don't believe in permanent relief for any debts in our United States of America. Let's just talk about this student loan forgiveness. I paid back my student loans. My, my children paid back their student loans. Um, and I, I knew many people that I graduated from high school that, that could not afford to go to college who are still working. And my problem with the President's action other than being unconstitutional it should have been passed in Congress and Congress should have stood up and said no, this is our job to vote on this not you Mr. President. But why should people that couldn't afford to go to college, hardworking Americans are now forced to pay this billions and billions of dollars of debt that other people incurred. It's just wrong.

MR. BEGLEITER: Congresswoman, student debt; it's temporary right now. Should it be permanent?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Well, first of all I want to say that, you know, we've got to remember just last year we weren't even able to be here in person. We were in a pandemic. These times are different than before. And so as we look at what folks are going through right now, if this provides relief to those families and then also gives them dollars that they can go out and be able to put back into the economy that's a good thing. These are people, some of whom have had these debts for years and years and

years. For me, one of the one of the things that I think we need to be looking at is college affordability. We should be talking about why does college cost so much? And then the second thing is not everybody needs a four year degree. So I put forth legislation called the Jobs Act and it's to allow for Pell Grants for short-term training and opportunities, to be able to deal with some of the workforce issues that I've heard from employers throughout this state. So, to me I think this was a good thing. I think this was a timely thing. I think it was a necessary thing to help hurting families.

MR. BEGLEITER: Speaking of the pandemic, next lightening round question. The pandemic by now has produced a lot of data. We, we've collected all the information now over three years showing who was infected and who got vaccines and, and so on, who died of course. The data among other things shows that black and brown populations suffered significantly; more infections and more deaths in, around the country and interestingly to me anyway it shows that Republicans have suffered more infections and more deaths than Democrats. The data also show our public health system struggled to respond to the pandemic. What legislation would you support in Congress to improve the future strength of public health systems at the state level around the country? Congresswoman, you're first on this one.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Well, first of all, I'm proud that I was able to be a part of passing the American Rescue Plan, the Cares Act. Those bills, many, some of those bills that started us in the very beginning of this pandemic were bipartisan because we recognized the situation that we were in. I'm also proud that I was able to be able to get provisions in that dealt with collecting that data and make sure that we got the data because before many of us didn't even know because of our public health infrastructure. I actually had the opportunity to serve as Deputy Secretary of Health and Social Services here in Delaware and I'm also on the Health Subcommittee. And so we've



been working very diligently to be able to bolster with legislation and investments to bolster our public health infrastructure because you're right, what this pandemic showed were the holes and the, the lack of, where we had those holes in our system. And it gives us an opportunity to strengthen them moving forward.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy? Strengthening public health in the United States?

MR. MURRAY: Well, strength, strengthening public health is always an important issue in our country and we learned a lot during the pandemic for sure. And, I hope our country moves forward and a, we've learned some hard lessons. But public health, I think number one is, is education. And what people don't talk about in this country are, are healthy lifestyles, people that prevention, a, it's seems like we are a reactionary many times in terms of, of, of diseases and other sicknesses. We really need to head it off, prevent and deal with that. And education, education, education when it comes to pub, public health.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. I, I, I'm going to apologize. I intended to ask a follow-up question on the housing thing. It's my fault; I got it out of order so I'm going to come back to that topic. But its related in a way that I think you'll, you'll be able to follow the train of thought. I apologize for my, my error. And this one is connected to climate change. Do you think Congress should require states to begin moving people and businesses away from environmentally threatened areas in the United States such as the coast here in Delaware in other parts of the United States and the western U.S. facing wild fires and drought? How will you deal with the issue of rebuilding and re, and moving people into areas that are environmentally threatened? Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURRAY: No, I, I think we live in a country and I think people can make their own personal decisions on what, where they want to live. I happened to live

in New Orleans in before and during and after Katrina and I have to say that not only is it a great city but New Orleans has always been in a position where they have been vulnerable to national (sic) disasters. And after Katrina many people wrote New Orleans, New Orleans off and, and it's back and it's strong as ever and people want to live there for a reason because it's a good place and it's their home. So no, I don't think the government has that right to, to do that.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. I've got to follow-up though because you said people have a right to live wherever they want to live and I certainly wouldn't dispute that but are you saying that they have a right to live there and then when their house gets washed out by the sea or burned down by a wildfire or something like that the federal government has a responsibility to subsidize flood insurance and other kinds of insurance to rebuild their house in the same threatened area? Is that what you're saying? They have a right to live there?

MR. MURRAY: Well, first I don't think, you know, people want to live there and incur the costs of that insurance and it should be incurred by them. That's [indiscernible] –

MR. BEGLEITER: They have federally subsidized flood insurance. They're not paying the full premium on that insurance.

MR. MURRAY: Well, then they should be, we should take a hard look at where those tax dollars going to support that and make strong recommendations that people maybe should move to another location.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. Congresswoman, how about you on the question of is it time to be looking at moving people away from threatened, environmentally threatened areas?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: You know it's interesting because for, for us as a state, I

mean, we have the lowest mean elevation in the country and so I say to my colleagues that we're urban, suburban, rural and coastal. When I talk to our farmers the climate has an impact on what they do. When I talk to our environ, folks from environmental justice communities they talk about the fact that when it rains it floods there. And so, just yesterday I got to participate in a, an event that was the grand opening of the Southbridge Wetland Park and it was incredible because it was an opportunity to do the science of making sure that we're resilient and that we have the right plants and things that will be able to but also dealing with wastewater and making sure that we have healthy communities and there was a boardwalk and it was a, really a combination of state, federal, local but led by community. And so, to me, this presents an opportunity for us. That's why the Inflation Reduction Act, that investment, in addition to what I'm doing with Senator Carper called the Shore Act will deal with some of the, the mitigating some of those challenges so that we don't have to deal with people being displaced. That, so, so for me, it's really about making sure that we save this planet and that we make sure that we have a good quality of life for everyone.

MR. BEGLEITER: So, I've got to follow-up with you just as I –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: And on flood insure, and on flood insurance –

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: – I can actually say that for, for me it has been watching – because I'm not on the committee of jurisdiction that does this but there has been a lot of debate about how much to subsidize and whether to subsidize. I believe that there are families in our state that, you know, are living in areas that, you know; they do deserve to have that flood insurance. And so, one of the things that I also worked on was to make sure that the maps, even the coastal maps were correct to allow those who were eligible to be able to get it. So, you know, similar to, to Mr. Murphy, we might

actually agree on something in terms of making sure that we look at what's the right mix but this has been an issue that has challenged Congress for I would probably say this whole, whole session.

MR. BEGLEITER: So a very short follow-up to both of you on this question because you've both talked about this. You both talked about the fact that people need to live where they like to live and so on. Congresswoman, you frequently tout the money the federal government sends to Delaware and other states –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Right.

MR. BEGLEITER: – as well –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Right.

MR. BEGLEITER: – to rebuild beaches after they're swamped in a storm.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Right.

MR. BEGLEITER: Is that the right federal policy?

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: But think about it; our beaches aren't just those homes. Our beaches are economic development. Our beaches are our natural habitats. Our beaches are a part of who we are as Delaware. So, yeah, I'm proud of that work to be able to restore our beaches. I think that's important to our state.

MR. BEGLEITER: Do you want to comment on that one, Mr. Murphy?  
Restoration of beach, beaches using federal funds; would you vote for that?

MR. MURRAY: Well, if we have to restore Delaware beaches we have to restore beaches everywhere.

MR. BEGLEITER: Well –

MR. MURRAY: – and, and that –

MR. BEGLEITER: – the Feds do that, yeah.

MR. MURRAY: – and, I, I love our beaches in Delaware and, and I, I, I

want them in pristine shape.

MR. BEGLEITER: [Laughter.] All right. A final lightening round question if I may. If you are elected to Congress will you support continuing or shutting down the House investigation of responsibility for the January 6<sup>th</sup> attack on Congress? It's a short answer question. Do you support continuing or shutting down the House investigation? And, what about the Justice Department's investigation; continue or shut it down? Congresswoman, you're first on this one.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: I think you go until you get justice. I think there's a, as I said before, there were people who broke the law. There was miss – I mean this is the fundamental part of our, our, our country and when the hearings first began I can tell you that those of us who were trapped up in the Gallery talked about the feeling of finally understanding what happened, finally understanding what, who did what. And now we get to figure out how do we avoid that from ever happening again. So, we finish it when the job is done.

MR. BEGLEITER: Mr. Murphy, what about shutting down or continuing the House investigation and the Justice investigation?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, when we a, a, when the next Congress convenes we will have instead of this partisan investigation we will have a nonpartisan investigation. And we do need to get to the root causes and reasons of why January 6<sup>th</sup> happened but with the current investigation it's very partisan, one-sided. We need to have a nonpartisan – the American people deserve to know the truth about what happened on January 6<sup>th</sup>.

MR. BEGLEITER: All right. Well I'm afraid that concludes our time available for the Q&A so I'm going to give both of you a chance to offer voters your; the concluding thoughts for this debate and I'd like to ask you to please keep your



concluding thoughts to about one minute in length. We'll start with Congresswoman Blunt Rochester. This was part of the coin toss decision before the debate for a closing statement. Please.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER: Thank you, Ralph; thank you, University of Delaware; and thank you to all of you who tuned in. I think tonight is really for me about those three themes that I talked about. Our ability as a country to recover, rebuild and restore our faith in our institutions and in each other. In addition to that, I think this election is also about two things: making sure that we don't go backwards in our rights, particularly a woman's right to choose; and making sure also that our democracy stands intact. I want to thank you for the opportunity to serve you especially during this time. And I want to tell you, I renewed my confidence, I renewed my strength, I renewed my commitment to our democracy on January 6<sup>th</sup>. And now I want to continue to serve you because there's so much more to be done. I also want thank you so much for your support and for your prayers and I hope that I have your elect, your vote on Election Day, November 8<sup>th</sup>. Thank you so much Delaware for being there.

MR. BEGLEITER: And now to Lee Murphy for your closing statement please, also about one minute please.

MR. MURRAY: thank you Ralph, for hosting this event. You'd think my opponent was the challenger. She has lots of ideas and she's also had years to act but she hasn't. She could have spoken up as recession reared its ugly head. She didn't. She could have voted against trillions in inflationary spending. She could have spoken out about the bad foreign policy that got 13 U.S. Marines killed in Afghanistan. She could have used her soap box to stand up to a President just one time. She didn't. She went along with all of it. In fact, she voted with Nancy Pelosi 100 percent of the time. Pelosi does not have Delaware's best interests at heart. If you want someone that



does, who will help your family build a better life right here in Delaware with lower crime and better schools vote for me. I'll vote for policies that help small businesses create jobs. I'll vote to make America energy independent. I'll fight inflation by working to balance the Federal's checkbook just like you have to balance yours. These are the stakes in this election, ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate your vote on November 8<sup>th</sup>. Let's get to work and thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER:                    Because both of the candidates agreed not to attack in their closing statements, um, I'm going to have to give Congresswoman Blunt Rochester an opportunity to respond to Mr. Murphy's attack.

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER:    thank you, Ralph. Listen Delaware, I'm not going to respond to those things because those are not the things that I hear from you when I'm talking to you up and down the state. My dad always said to me, Lisa, when you run for something run for the people, don't run against someone. I'm going to continue to be who I am. I'm going to continue to serve you by bringing people together. I'm going to continue to uplift. I'm going to continue to hear your voice and take it to Washington, D.C. And again, if that's what you want in a leader then I'm your person. I want to serve you. You have been there for my family, for me, and I have been there for you. And I've got your back. And so, we just hope that you will show up in strong numbers on November 8<sup>th</sup> and make sure that we take this country in the right direction, a positive direction, and uplifting direction for our water, our health, our planet, and for our democracy.

MR. BEGLEITER:                    Congresswoman Blunt –

MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER:    Thank you.

MR. BEGLEITER:                    – Rochester and Mr. Murphy thank you both very much for participating in Delaware Debates 2002. On behalf of Delaware Public Media and



the University of Delaware Center for Political Communication thank all of you for watching Delaware Debates. I'm Ralph Begleiter encouraging all of you to cast your vote by Tuesday, November 8<sup>th</sup>. Thank you.

# # #