

Sarwar A. Kashmeri  
In Conjunction With  
The Twin-State Valley Media Network

## **Transcript of conversation with Sen. Chris Dodd, D-Conn., a candidate for the Democratic nomination for president.**

Friday, October 05, 2007

Transcript of conversation with Sen. Chris Dodd, D-Conn., a candidate for the Democratic nomination for president.

Q. Given the partisan Congress and the divided electorate, what in your background do you think stands out showing your ability to get results against such odds?

A.: Well, it's a very good question. Let me say it's about the most fundamental question that should be asked, because we've been through an exhausting period of time in recent past history where this country despite the promises of some, we seem more divided politically than any time I can think of in the last quarter century or more. And that has got to change. If it doesn't, I worry deeply about what this country's role at home and abroad is going to look like and not in a long time, but a relatively short period of time. It's a major argument I make for my candidacy. Over the last quarter of a century, I've been elected eight times by the people of this state. I chaired the national party for the re-election of Bill Clinton in '95 and '96. I'm the only person in the history of this state to be elected five times to the United States Senate itself. I'm known by both Republicans and Democrats as one of a handful in the Senate that's able to bridge parties and partisan lines to enact meaningful landmark legislation and it's what I've done ... but I started the Children's Caucus in the Senate 25 years ago, now 26 years ago, because there was no focus or attention on a quarter of the population of the country. I did it with the Arlen Specter of

Pennsylvania. When I wrote the first child-care legislation a couple years after that, I did it with Oren Hatch of Utah, a Republican conservative senator of that state, but I wrote the family medical leave act - one of the major landmark pieces of legislation. It took me seven years, three presidents by the way, and two vetoes, but I did it with Kit Bond and Dan Coates - two very conservative Republican senators - one from Missouri one from Indiana. Mitch McConnell and I wrote election reform legislation. Phil Gramm and I did financial services reform. The private securities litigation reform legislation reform was a major piece of legislation reform in that area. I was able to help manage the legislation for John McCain and Russ Feingold in finance reform. Jesse Helms and I ratified the Geneva convention a genocide convention, excuse me, a watered down version of it, I'll tell you but nonetheless examples of what I'm talking about, so for a quarter of a century rather than just talking about this it's exactly what I've done.

Q. And so there's no doubt in your mind that when you take a separate tact from Clinton, Obama and Edwards about the redeployment of troops, we need to end this war now, there's no doubt in your mind you can get this done?

A. None whatsoever because I know as a result of our relationships with others who on the other side who I think feel as strongly as I do about this but what's missing is the kind of leadership that helps us get there, a leadership that will obviously not abandon our troops first and foremost - no one would even begin to suggest that, I would hope - but secondly that we would also utilize the tools in our very rich arsenal that we have as a nation to maintain the robust presence in the region of the world which is critical to us, but done in a constructive, positive way, and recognizes the legitimate concerns we have and the legitimate concerns we have, but also has the ability to marshal those resources and relationships in a way that would provide Iraq with a relative period of stability if they so seek it.

Thirdly (it would) allow us to maintain an important role in that region and deal with legitimate threats that Iran poses. Military force is a failure of every other tool in your arsenal of working, I'm not opposed to using military force, I just don't believe we ought to draw that arrow out of our quiver prematurely,

Q. A couple issues here from New Hampshire. One is this lack of Internet broadband access in rural areas - it seems to be holding back rural areas but seems to be a growing problem in the nation in general and my question is there is a certain group of people that are now saying we ought to think of this in terms of the rural electrification scheme if it's so important for American competitiveness that we just need to get it done and the federal government should take a leadership role. Do you have any thoughts on that?

A. I agree with that and have acknowledge this many times. In fact, I was in Iowa this weekend and I used two examples. The first example of the Moral act which is an issue that people in New Hampshire may be familiar with - because it was their neighboring state of Vermont - elected a guy named senator moral to the U.S. Senate back in the 19th century who crafted a piece of legislation in the middle of the Civil War by the way, called the Moral Act which established land grant colleges, setting aside land in rural areas for higher educational purposes. So in sense the broadband is the land in the 21st century, the rural electrification administration. The Rural Electricification Act, the REA, at the time of the Depression, of course, changed brought opportunity to rural America just as land grant colleges did in sense. Those are two very specific examples where foresight and a very progressive visionary administration understood the value of not sucking opportunity out of rural America, requiring it to seek opportunity elsewhere but brought it to those areas, but broadband is exactly that case advocated

launching that broadband for rural America initiative where I've provide \$2 billion of low interest or loan guarantees to the below-market rate loans for the construction and improvement of broadband facilities in rural America. I'd also require the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, to make new spectrum available for wireless broadband services in rural areas. I'd be very involved in this tele-comuting issue. I've got a lot of people in the state who frankly, can now tele-commute with businesses they work for in New York City. The issue becomes a tax issue which is what is at the bottom of this thing, New York obviously believes they ought to tax that work in New York and New York has higher rates then Connecticut. Of course the residents here want to be taxed based on Connecticut's income taxes. So it's a tax question, but the fact of the matter is this is this is happening. But certainly we know today, given technology, opportunity can exist almost anywhere if you're willing to reach it and provide the knowledge that allows other people to be there so this is going to be very exciting in the 21st century where people are going to have wonderful choices about lifestyle - where they want to live and also have good jobs, where being physically present will be less and less of a necessity. But you've got to have, and take advantage and insist that this kind of knowledge is going to be there for educational proposes, health proposes as well as job opportunities. I'm a great advocate of increasing broadband access to rural areas of the country.

Q. And once more, and this is a Real ID Act, the one where federal standards for driver's licenses, folks in New Hampshire, many of them, think this is an encroachment of personal privacies and think it's another unfunded mandate. Your thoughts?

D: I've really been opposed to this. In fact, when I wrote the election reform bill with Mitch McConnell, Mitch very much wanted to have a

requirement of a photo ID. I oppose that. There are ways in which we can do this, and I get very uneasy when government wants to know too much about us. I mean, there are reasons and times when we want that information - maybe for health reasons, but that should be your decision. If you want your information shared with others, then you should have the option of doing that. I have deep suspicion about motivations of insisting upon this kind of access to information.