

**Interview With U.S. Senatorial Candidate Danny Tarkanian**  
**Conducted on January 26, 2010**

The Republican: *“Contained within every bill that distributes monies to the states, are sometimes necessary, “strings.” What steps would you take to try to balance out the needs of our state with the apparent marginalization of the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment by the federal government?”*[after some confusion due to the wording of the question, we went offline to clarify.]

Mr. Tarkanian: Oh I see. So it's money that's distributed, like these mandates. Yes, I think we need eliminate what the federal government is mandating states to pay from the different bills that they are passing. For example, the Medicare which we get less money from the government because we because we don't want to fund it as much while our taxpayer dollars are being used to pay for other people's states Medicare bills. Those things are not the purview of the federal government. It should be left to the states.

The Republican: *“Some call our Constitution “Rigid” and some call it a “living breathing document” Which do you believe it is and why?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: I'm a strict Constitutionalist and believe the Constitution should be interpreted with the intent of the Founding Fathers. I don't believe whether it's legislators or judicial personnel should be putting their interpretations onto the document.

The Republican: *“Give us your reaction to this statement, “The US Government is a government with Limited Powers?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **Yes**

The Republican: *“Explain why.”*

Mr. Tarkanian: Well, the Constitution is what governs, is what our U.S. Government should be...it was created by the U.S. Constitution and empowered with those laws; I mean with the power from that document, the document provides four areas for the U.S. Government to have the power over. One is to enforce the powers of the state and it's called domestic tranquility, the other is the national defense, there is the...let me think of the third one. The fourth one is the catch all, the welfare of our country, for the welfare of the people of the country. And that...phrase has been used by expansionists to expand the powers of the federal government to an overreaching area that would take away the states rights...the rights of each of the states and the powers that they should be having.

The Republican: *“And that's where I was going with that. I try not to offer opinions during these interviews.”*

Mr. Tarkanian: I think the federal government, like every government, the state has it's powers, and the county has it's powers, and cities and they're limited in what each one of them should be doing. They shouldn't be trying to reach over

and usurp the powers from these other government localities just because the federal government is more powerful.

The Republican: *“One of the possible courses of action to reduce healthcare costs is tort reform. Since this subject is very broad and encompassing subject, how would you approach tort reform in the congress, assuming you had the majority support in the Congress?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: I'm...one of the four points that I came out to reduce healthcare costs is tort reform. I would cap the non-economic damages, just like we have in Nevada right now as there are in three or four states, maybe six or seven now. By capping non-economic damages we are not only helping doctors reduce their medical malpractice insurance, but the more important area is it would eliminate the upwards of \$210 billion a year the doctors are spending on defensive medicine. You cap the non-economic damages, doctors who do the treatment that they feel is necessary for the patient and not treatment that they do to protect themselves from potential future lawsuits.

The Republican: *“In every congressional session since 1995, AZ representative John Shadegg has introduced the Enumerated Powers Act. In this session of Congress both he and Senator Tom Coburn have introduced bills, HR 450 and S 1319. This bill requires that all bills brought before the congress cite where in the U.S. Constitution authority for such a bill exists. What would your debating points be on an Enumerated Powers Act if it came to the floor of the Senate floor for debate?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: [This bill here? The Enumerated Powers Act](#)”

The Republican: “Yes”

Mr. Tarkanian: I would be in favor of that. I think it's very necessary after witnessing what's happened in the past year and the acts that our Congress has done that' outside the Constitution.

The Republican: *“Since the Democrat controlled congress took office, it has passed innumerable bills that seriously affect our everyday lives and that of businesses. Assuming you get elected and the congressional majority shifts to the Republican Party, which actions would you take, if any, with regard to the laws passed by the Democrat majority during the last two years?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: Well, I certainly would work to repeal most of them, and I...you know there are so many of them; we can talk in specifics. The remaining TARP money, I would work to repeal that and not fund any more of that money; the same with the Stimulus money; like the government takeover of the auto industries; the AIG insurance industries. I would work to repeal all those bills. None of those were passed with any constitutional authority nor with any semblance of fairness to the people of our country. What I mean by that, when you start picking and choosing which companies your are going to save and pick

and choose which industries you are going to save, you no longer have a free market enterprise society which is what is what our country has been based upon and what has made us great for so many centuries.

The Republican: *“What about healthcare? The healthcare bill, do you think it’s dead?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: The current bill’s certainly dead. They will try to pass something. I’m hoping that it will be something much more reduced in government involvement, government...I mean this past bill has seventy-some agencies that’s going to cost between, whether you want to believe the Democrat side of eight-hundred and some million, to 2.4 billion on the next ten years, raise taxes 400 to 500 billion dollars and cut Medicare 400 to 500 billion dollars. All that’s wrong. I have come up with my proposal which would reduce the healthcare costs substantially by just doing four simple things that wouldn’t cost the taxpayer one additional dollar. You allow people to purchase insurance across state lines, it’s been well discussed now. The tort reform we just discussed. The third thing would be to enforce the federal law that requires Medicare to be the payee of last resort. Currently, the 13% of other Medicare recipients that have private insurance, the federal government is not making sure those private insurance companies pay the bill first and that they [Medicare] are the last to payee, which is what the federal law is. We need to do a better job and not stick the taxpayer with those costs. And the fourth is I we should eliminate or substantially reduce the state mandates that are required in each state. A state mandate is when a state tells its citizens, which are the purchasers of insurance policies, that you have to buy this policy with this coverage at his cost and you don’t have a say so in. It’s never in our country has that been forced upon citizens. It shouldn’t be force upon us now. We should be able to pick and choose what we want in our coverage based upon the costs and the benefits that we receive. 20 to 50 percent of our insurance premiums around the country are made up of state mandates. Nevada has one of the highest state mandates of 56%. Taking that assumption then, 50% of our insurance premiums in Nevada are just on state mandates. Just eliminate the state mandates and insurance costs are down 50%.

The Republican: *“The 22<sup>nd</sup> amendment limits the office of president of the United States to two terms. There have been many cases of both representatives and senators holding office for several consecutive terms, even to the point of senility. Do you support a constitutional amendment limiting terms of office for members of Congress to two six year terms for senate and six two year terms for the House?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **Yes! That’s an easy one because everybody’s is asking that question.**

Republican: *“I know. That’s a softball.”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **Yes! Thanks**

Republican: *“This one isn’t.”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **Okay**

The Republican: *“Referring to the previous question, would you support an amendment to the U. S. Constitution to require justices of the Supreme Court to be appointed for a 12-year term by the President, with a limit of two terms?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **Two twelve-year terms? Yes, I like that. Absolutely.**

Republican: *“I asked the question before, but it wasn’t specific enough and you said ‘well I don’t know about that.’”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **On the what?**

Republican: *“On this question, I asked you this at Grandma Hatties, but I didn’t phrase it this way.”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **I like it. I think the judges get in there...they don’t leave till you are dragging them out.**

The Republican: *“The War Powers Act cedes certain authorities, specifically, ersatz-declaration of war-power, to the president to commit U.S. Forces to conduct warfare. What are your thoughts on the president’s power to declare war without a declaration from Congress?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **It’s against the Constitution. I mean, I know that they’ve tried to...the president has tried to get around it by declaring that these military actions are not wars and they passed a law that says if our forces are there for so long of a period of time that it is and you have to get Congressional approval now. I think that law is still in place isn’t it?**

The Republican: *“There is rising support for the repealing the 17<sup>th</sup> amendment and returning to the original intent of the Founding Fathers to have state legislatures appoint senators. What would you say to the people who support such action?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **I think we should leave it to the people.**

The Republican: *“Posse Comitatus has been in effect since 1878. This act was intended to prevent use of military forces of the U.S. to enforce state laws after the Civil War. Some think that we should use our forces to seal our borders, both north and south, to prevent movement of illegal aliens as well as fight the drug trade. If you support such action?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: **Yes. And I don’t think that usurps state powers because we’re talking about a federal national security interest which is one of the things that our Constitution requires of the federal government.**

The Republican: *“What are your thoughts on legislation being a statement of a single issue, having no amendments, much like Nevada’s Questions or California’s Propositions?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: That would be one of the best pieces of legislation we could pass. One of the biggest problems we have is the type of add-ons, which we were talking about earlier that I thought your first question alluded to. Basically, bribes and extortions to get a bill passed by certain legislators.

The Republican: *“Nebraska, Louisiana?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: But I happens in all these other bills we just...the other ones just haven't gotten as much pub[licity]...in fact Reid said ‘this is just part of the way we do business. It doesn't mean it's right.

The Republican: *“Strict Constitutionalists think that most of the cabinet positions and their associated bureaucracies are a drain on our national treasure. Would you support divesting these positions of their mandate power and moving that authority and responsibility to the individual states? Examples: Department of Education and the Department of Energy.”*

Mr. Tarkanian: Well, I certainly wouldn't be in favor of dismantling the cabinet and giving that power to the states, in that broad sense. I do think that the Department of Education's get in the in areas that...as way...usurp the powers of the states. I'm more in...the education should be controlled by the locality and the states and the counties in which the children are going to school. So that example you make a little bit difficult. But I certainly wouldn't want to get rid of the State Department, the Department of Defense, and some of these other departments and say each state can determine.

The Republican: *“Homeland Security? Education? Energy? HUD? All those.”*

Mr. Tarkanian: Homeland security. That's and interesting one. I would have a hard time with that one. I would have to think through that one better. Again you're talking about the national security of the country and again that's one of the first things the Constitution requires of our federal government. The other ones, I think, would be more inclined to be with the state.

The Republican: *“I think the Homeland Security could be discussed at length in terms of what have they yielded us for what we paid for it?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: I'm not saying they've done a good job. I just don't know if we want the states to take control over it. I for one think that we need to have...they've talked about this and every time there's a terrorist act...having better communications between the agencies and maybe less agencies to able to identify possible terrorists and what's going on. We have one layer after another layer. Imagine if you put that with 50 different states and you try to get each of the other 50 states to communicate with to the other 50 states that this guy just drove across a border, you know, it would be back to the days of Bonnie and Clyde.

The Republican: *” Should the president have line item veto?”*

Mr. Tarkanian: Yes.

**The Republican: " There have been rumors, seemingly substantiated by e-mail traffic, that the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence endorsed you for Nevada Secretary of State in 2006 and that Sarah Brady spoke in a phone message endorsing you for that office. You support the D.C. vs. Heller decision as well as Congress' vote regarding CCW across state lines. Is there any truth to the Brady rumors?"**

**Mr. Tarkanian: I'm an unabashed supporter of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment, totally and fully and have been for my entire life. I've been a lifetime member of the NRA for longer than the time that I ran for that office and there's been nothing in my past that would indicate otherwise. Second of all, I've never spoken with or communicated with nor asked nor inferred or however far out you want to go to the Brady organization to support me. That being said, the first part of the paragraph is true. I just learned how this developed about a month ago because of...let me find the right way...the best way to word it so you can put it all into a clear, concise statement. I had a volunteer on my campaign named Dad Burdish who is now Sue Lowden's paid consultant. Dan Burdish has been disclosed and Dan Burdish has acknowledged that he went to the Brady organization without my permission, without my knowledge or consent and asked to have this endorsement and Robocall and this Robocall was used in the last two day of my election. I didn't know about the Robocall, I had never heard of Robocall. And it's funny, a newspaper columnist for the Washington Times who wrote on it, she, in fact I think it think it's going out as e-mails. They have a copy of the Robocall and the script; I've never seen any of that. The only person who had that was Sue Lowden's paid consultant, Dan Burdish. So it's clear where this is coming from. Lowden has been getting...the more Lowden is being exposed in her positions from being in favor of more pork, from being in favor of the first stimulus package, from being in favor of more taxes, at least for hiring employees, that she is now trying to divert that and attack me on an issue that I had no involvement in. And the ironic thing is that Dan Burdish was at least honest enough to tell the Washington Times, Examiner, Times I think it was, that I had no knowledge in it nor consented to it or having involvement in it whatsoever. That being said he said my mother was involved into it which my mother denies, but he says it is. So one of them aren't telling the truth and I believe my mother.**

**The Republican: " Okay."**

**Mr. Tarkanian: That's Sue Lowden's campaign.**