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[00:00:00] **Speaker 1** You mean testing or something?

[00:00:01] **Speaker 2** Yeah, we have. The university still does testing right across the street. So it's super like you get same day results. Oh, I haven't had a test yet. Okay.

[00:00:09] **Speaker 1** Yeah. Ever?

[00:00:12] **Speaker 2** Yeah. The university relaxed their policies for a while, so we're actually. We're bringing more people back in. And then within two weeks, it was, you know, and you can never tell if it was someone got it from here. Yeah, but someone would get test and say I'm positive and all of a sudden we're all close contacts or it was just more, you know, the safe than sorry. We had designed everything to be remote if we needed to. And we're good. All right. Well, let's start with tell me about your process of getting into this race, because at first you were a bit of a reluctant candidate.

[00:00:40] **Speaker 1** Yeah, that's fair to say. I'm not a career politician. I am a 20 year private practice attorney. My wife and I own small businesses. Even when I served in the legislature for a couple of terms, I kept my private sector job. I believe deeply that the private sector provides common sense in government. And so it wasn't my ambition ever to get back into politics. But I am very concerned about the state of our country and our state and where we were heading. And that propelled me to jump into this race in somewhat of a reluctant way, almost like Ron Johnson. Right. He's he's not necessarily saying, I absolutely need to be the US senator and I need to run for reelection. But Ron knows that we're in a seriously difficult spot. And I believe I believe like like Senator Johnson does, that we're in a difficult spot and we need people from the private sector to jump in right now to fix the major problems that we have.

[00:01:32] **Speaker 2** Walk me through some of that thought process early on, because there were a couple with another candidate in the primary and then he dropped out and you were making calls for someone else to run. What were you hearing during that time from other people?

[00:01:42] **Speaker 1** Yeah, it's funny when you talk to I talked to a lot of attorneys around the state. Obviously, when you're talking to people about the attorney general race, you're generally talking to attorneys. And most of them said, I agree with you that we're in a very difficult spot, but I don't want to, you know, leave my great job and and pay as a private practice attorney to get my teeth kicked in for the next eight months, running a campaign. And then, oh, by the way, take a job where where, you know, many of them perceive they would have a pay cut. And so people were concerned about the issues, but they also said you'd be a great candidate, you should run. And, you know, the more that I talk to people about it, the more the more people kind of persuaded me that this is something that would be a good fit and that I could make an actual difference. And that's the thing that I look for in public service. I don't spend a lot of time worrying about talking points. I just think that the most effective people in public office just get things done. And we need people right now who will get things done.

[00:02:39] **Speaker 2** The traditional route to attorney general has typically been as a prosecutor or in some rare cases, a judge. But that kind of background. Why do you think that your background gives you a better perspective?

[00:02:49] **Speaker 1** Yeah, as we've looked at the way the role of attorney general has expanded all around the country, we see fewer and fewer prosecutors being elected to that office. That kind of was the old model. The new model really is people from the private sector or who have legislative experience, because so much of what you do as attorney general is manage a huge agency like 750 employees and deal with the legislature and the governor and the Congress and bring suits. But before our Supreme Court in the United States Supreme Court. So, you know, really having that background as that very, very narrow background as a prosecutor where you've only touched, you know, one narrow aspect of the law is not a particularly good training ground now for the very expansive role of attorney general. And, you know, I'm the only candidate in this race with the depth and breadth of experience to, on day one, immediately walk into that office and be able to handle every single one of the issues that would come before the AG. And I think that that the voters are seeing that. And that's why our fundraising has been so strong. The legislators are seeing that. That's why I've gotten, you know, three dozen legislative endorsements, including Representative Tom Tiffany. Law enforcement seeing it. I've got 30 or so police chiefs and sheriffs that have endorsed our campaign. So, you know, in just a very short period of time since I've gotten into this race, we've really made an impact bringing that message of depth and breadth of experience and not needing on the job training to get going on day one.

[00:04:24] **Speaker 2** Historically, this it's always been a partizan office, but it was somewhat apolitical in a sense. And we've actually seen, you know, attorney generals are the opposite party of the governor in the past. That's changed at least over the last decade plus of it's become more political. You have to understand who's the president, what party you work with other attorney generals to file group lawsuits, to challenge federal rulings, to challenge state laws. How important is political savvy and knowledge to what the what the new ag role is?

[00:04:52] **Speaker 1** Well, it's increasingly important because we're in an era of unchecked power of the federal government and our own. Bureaucracy here in the state of Wisconsin. And so you have to understand that the role of aide of the AG can be to rein in the federal government. You see this historic Supreme Court term that we just had. Many of those cases that we've been talking about over the last few weeks were brought by Republican attorneys general from around the country, reining in our own bureaucracy here in Wisconsin. That is the job that the attorney general can do very effectively and efficiently. One of the problems, though, with overly politicizing that office is when you ignore the rule of law the way that Josh Kaul has done, when you do ridiculous things like sue the legislature, sue the speaker and the majority leader after the Dobbs decision came down, that that lawsuit, any legal commentator who's being honest with you will tell you it's absurd. It borders on frivolous, and it should be dismissed.

[00:05:52] **Speaker 2** When it comes to the powers of the attorney general. Obviously, the legislature stripped some of those away. Would you seek to reinstate any of those?

[00:06:00] **Speaker 1** You know, I'm comfortable having legislators involved in these issues. In fact, I am a co-plaintiff with the legislature in a lawsuit against Josh Kaul because he refuses to follow Wisconsin law. I see nothing wrong with having a legislative check on how money is spent. Settlement funds are spent from DOJ. The people's representatives ought to have a say. That's why I supported that, that law. And even if I'm attorney general, I'll continue to support that.

[00:06:29] **Speaker 2** What would have been different in the early days or even the middle days of of COVID and some of the regulations the state brought down was put in place. If you had been in this position at that time, I would have forcefully.

[00:06:41] **Speaker 1** Absolutely, forcefully pushed back on every single one of those orders. Remember when the legislature sued Governor Evers over the stay at home order? I wrote a brief for free on behalf of business owners that had been shut down, and it was filed in that case that overturned the order. Our small business, along with others, was a plaintiff in that in the capacity restrictions case. Some of my friends that I helped recruit for the Wisconsin Institute in Law and Liberty were plaintiffs in the Mask case. All of those orders were illegal, unconstitutional. And as attorney general, I would have forcefully fought back against those illegal orders.

[00:07:17] **Speaker 2** What what role could the attorney general taken in that place? I mean, besides being, you know, forcefully speaking out on it legally, could they have stopped it or was still would have gone to the Supreme Court?

[00:07:27] **Speaker 1** I certainly would have tried. I certainly would have done everything in my power to stop it. So remember, you had an order from an unelected bureaucrat, the secretary designee of the Department of Health, Andrea Palm. The idea that an unelected bureaucrat would have the authority to shut down our state, tell us we had to stay home, tell us we couldn't go to church is absurd. And I would have brought litigation to immediately stop that same thing as you see across the state with some of the local orders and the the mask orders. I believe that many of those items that we've seen struck down because of cases brought by groups like the Wisconsin Institute for Law and Liberty. Those kind of things should have been brought by the attorney general. The attorney general should be there fighting for our freedom and liberty. In fact, I've said that when I'm Attorney General, I will open an office at DOJ of individual liberty and religious liberty to make sure that people have a resource when bureaucrats are violating their rights.

[00:08:26] **Speaker 2** How important was all of the issues surrounding COVID to you deciding to get into this race and seek alternative candidates to to one of the first people to get in the race, the Republican side?

[00:08:36] **Speaker 1** It was defining for me. My wife and I at the time owned a restaurant that was shut down. We owned a small campground with a little bar on it that was illegally shut down the day that I had to lay off dozens of employees because of that illegal shutdown order. Remember, that came down on Saint Patrick's Day. I remember walking into the kitchen of the restaurant that my wife ran and owned, and she was cooking the corned beef for the Saint Patrick's Day and saying, the governor has shut your business down. We have to close and lay these employees off. It was one of the darkest days of my life, not just because it was our business, but because it was fundamentally un-American. It's fundamentally un-American to tell people they can't go to church. It is a clear violation of the First Amendment. And so seeing how far down the path we went really propelled me to once again have an interest in serving in public office.

[00:09:33] **Speaker 2** What is it about your your opponent that made you decide that he needs to be challenged? You can't just have a free lane to the nomination.

[00:09:41] **Speaker 1** Yeah, it maybe isn't even so much about my opponent. It's about what we've seen from folks who have run and said they are conservatives. And I'm thinking specifically of Brian Hagedorn. I remember being in the room when Brian Hagedorn was campaigning for Wisconsin Supreme Court. And telling all of us what a conservative he is. And he has turned out to be anything but a conservative. So having a robust primary where issues are vetted, where candidates are vetted, is incredibly important. And when you add to that that my primary opponent, Eric Toney, helped enforce Governor Evers illegal lockdown order by prosecuting small business owners. He prosecuted a restaurant owner. He prosecuted an individual who owned a very old because kids were swimming in a pool. So if you add that together with my concern about conservative or Republican candidates running as conservatives and then governing in a different way, that's one of the reasons that propelled me to jump in.

[00:10:43] **Speaker 2** There are still some people out there that think that there shouldn't be a conservative or liberal point of view to the attorney general, that enforcing the laws you enforce. What's the law? How do you respond to them in terms of, you know, interpreting the law is actually a big part of that?

[00:10:57] **Speaker 1** Yeah, it is. And remember, this is under our system a partizan office. So any time that you have a partizan office, you're going to have a differing viewpoint. And so long as you can have these debates and discussions in a healthy way, that's actually important. Having debates and discussions is important for America. There's nothing wrong with having a different viewpoint or a different interpretation. And so I think that is perfectly fine and perfectly healthy. But the one thing that we shouldn't ever lose sight of, regardless of whether it's a partizan office or not, is that the rule of law matters. And as I said earlier, Josh Kaul has overly politicized this office by being basically a partizan warrior. And really as attorney general, what your job should should be is to enforce the law regardless of whether you like the law or not.

[00:11:50] **Speaker 2** In terms of obviously election security is a big question among primary voters in general election of voters. What have you heard from people you've talked to and are they concerned about the validity of an August primary?

[00:12:02] **Speaker 1** Yeah, people are very concerned about our election security and for good reason. We just saw was it last week, two weeks ago, the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled that the ballot drop boxes were illegal, not just illegal now, but were illegal in the 2020 election. And so you had that going on. You had the Zucker box essentially buying the election process in some of our largest cities. You had democracy in the park. You had all of these things that, in my view, violate Wisconsin law, Wisconsin election law. Right now you have the WPC saying that clerks can cure ballots. And thankfully the legislature, it looks like, is stepping in to stop that rule. Look, if we want clerks to be able to cure ballots, the legislature has to make that change to the law. We cannot do that. Having unelected bureaucrats make these changes simply continues. This distrust in our election process and trusting our election process is the cornerstone of our republic. We have to be able to trust. We can't have every single election where half the people can't trust that the person that won legitimately won. And so having an AG who will investigate allegations of election wrongdoing and prosecute people when they violate our election law is really important. Whether you're doing that because you're a Republican or a Democrat, it really shouldn't be a partizan issue to want our elections to be safe and secure.

[00:13:37] **Speaker 2** Do you think that the Gabelman investigation is legitimate and has actual findings that will be helpful to the discourse? Or is that Robin Trump trying to manage the Trump side of of of his base to have to worry about that?

[00:13:52] **Speaker 1** No, there were certainly if you look at his investigation and you look at the report that was done now, this was quite a few months ago. It lines up nicely with a number of other reports that were done, including the nonpartisan Legislative Audit Bureau report, the report that was done by the Wisconsin Institute of Law on Liberty Sheriff's Mailings, Investigation, Racine County. We have all of these reports that generally find the same five or six significant issues that need to be addressed. And by the way, the legislature tried to address many of these issues. They passed, you know, over a dozen election integrity bills and Governor Evers vetoed them. Sheriff's mailing put on the desk of Josh called the nursing home abuses. Call hasn't lifted a finger. That is the very problem that we're in as we have serious problems that were even raised not just by the Gabelman investigation, but by the very respected, nonpartisan Legislative Audit Bureau. And Governor Ivers and Josh Kaul won't do anything about it. And I think that continues to build distrust in our election process.

[00:14:54] **Speaker 2** If you were the attorney general, would you prosecute the members of the WAC?

[00:14:58] **Speaker 1** So I would. Take a look at what the allegations are against them. I think a number of those cases have gone to a variety of district attorneys who have, you know, made decisions one way or the other, whether there was the necessary basis to prosecute and whether the A.G. even has the authority to prosecute is something that you would you would have to take a look at. So I'm not going to sit here today and prejudge whether, you know, I would prosecute a case or not prosecute a case because I haven't seen all of the facts. And, you know, as you know, in the law, actually reviewing all of those facts really matters in prejudging that kind of case would be a serious a serious dereliction of duty.

[00:15:39] **Speaker 2** When it comes to the 2020 election. There's obviously a lot of the details that some of those witnesses the Supreme Court has already cleared up and the legislature and the governor, you know, have not addressed but have been brought up in those venues. But there's no large scale allegations of fraud that say that the election would have been tipped one way or the other by any of these actions, unlike what Donald Trump has continually said, and that there is a large portion of Republican voters specifically that believe those lies, that it was all fraudulent, there was mass fraud, and that he actually did win that election. How how do you interact with those voters who who don't necessarily think about ballot drop boxes, but think about they say there's massive fraud of 20 or 40,000 votes.

[00:16:21] **Speaker 1** You know, I think the message of election integrity and security is a broad message that covers a broad swath of folks. And so, you know, people who who are believe that, you know, one way or the other how many votes were swayed. They also believe that the ballot drop boxes were illegal. The the the ballot harvesting illegal, the guidance illegal, the voting in nursing homes illegal, the Zucker box illegal. Now, we've seen courts on some of these say, well, no, we're okay with that. And some of them haven't been litigated yet. But I think once you talk about the steps that you will actually take to secure the next election, that's what people are are most concerned about. You know, people are angry about the the previous election. But looking forward is the is in my view, what we have to do is we have to look forward, figure out what the problems were. And we mostly know what the problems are, how to address those problems. We mostly know how to address them. The legislature has mostly done that through the legislation that Governor Evers had vetoed. So the important thing here is let's let's elect a Republican governor who will sign those bills and a Republican ag who will actually investigate election wrongdoing and work with the legislature to make sure that the AG has authority to prosecute people who break our election laws.

[00:17:42] **Speaker 2** When it comes to a lot of those issues, there were no lawsuits filed at the time when drop boxes were issued or the guidance was put out to the the Republican Party specifically did not file a lawsuit over democracy in the park, for example, all of those lawsuits came after Donald Trump lost the election. Would the attorney general, being a Republican, have changed any of that or is that just Trump lost and so therefore all those became larger issues?

[00:18:09] **Speaker 1** No, I think it would have certainly if I was attorney general and I looked at the law and said, well, democracy in the park is not legal, drop boxes are not legal, ballot carrying is not legal. Zucker box are not legal. I would have challenged every single one of those because they are not legal. Now, if the voters threw their elected representatives decide that they want to make some changes to our election laws, to, you know, make some of those things legal, that's up to the legislature. But at the time, those things and this is clearly what the Wisconsin Supreme Court recently ruled on, ballot drop boxes, those things were clearly illegal. And as AG, I would not have stood for the violation of the law.

[00:18:47] **Speaker 2** Is there any concern that in 2024, if a Democrat wins Wisconsin's electoral votes for presidents for president, there could be enough of a base uproar from from Trump or anyone else that could put pressure on a Republican governor or Republican attorney general to try and overturn the will of the electorate.

[00:19:06] **Speaker 1** Certainly, we have to respect the will of the electorate. So if you have a Republican who wins a majority of the votes, a Republican presidential candidate, they will get the electoral votes. Same thing. If it's a Democrat that wins the majority of the votes, they will get the electoral votes. You saw this in 2016, by the way. A friend of mine was one of the electors for Donald Trump. And he will show you literally hundreds of emails and letters that he received asking him, demanding of him that he not vote for Donald Trump. And the point of all of this is that if we can secure our elections, which I believe we will do when we have a Republican governor and a Republican AG that will restore faith in our election process. And you won't have this groundswell of people saying, Oh, Trump won in 2016 and you're a Hillary, a Hillary supporter. So you're going to say don't vote for Trump if you're going to be a. Elector. Same thing in 2020. On the other side of it, we have to secure our election so people on both sides can believe they can trust the outcome. And there's not pressure on the on the electors or the or the legislature to, you know, upend the will of the people.

[00:20:13] **Speaker 2** Tony Evers has has repeatedly said that the the the summation of all the Republican actions since he won in 2018 to strip powers away from him, stripped powers away from the attorney general to not confirm his appointees, to let Fred Brain or others sit on boards longer, that the Republicans don't believe in democracy unless they win, that they will do anything to find the most technical reasons to subvert the will of the voters and the executive. How do you respond to his allegation?

[00:20:40] **Speaker 1** Actually, it's Tony Evers that doesn't believe in democracy or believe in the will of the people. The people of the state of Wisconsin elected a majority of Republicans to the state Senate. What that means in divided government is Tony Evers doesn't just get to say who he decides should be, for example, the chairman of the Natural Resources Board. He actually has to compromise and work with the majority in the state Senate. Now, he doesn't like that, and you can tell he doesn't like that because he surreptitiously was recording conversations with with legislative leaders. What does that do to the trust between legislative leaders and the governor when he's surreptitiously taping those meetings? It destroys all trust. So if Tony Evers wants somebody other than Fred Prehn to be on the Natural Resources Board, the answer is pretty simple. Go sit down with the Senate Majority Leader, Devin Lemahieu, and work out a compromise. That's how divided government works. Tony Evers doesn't accept the fact that we have divided government. Republicans have accepted that fact. Republicans have passed two budgets that passed a majority through the state legislature and Tony Evers signed. And so Republicans have continued to work with Tony Evers. Dozens and dozens of bills have gotten signed that the legislature has passed and put in front of him. But it's Tony Evers who has consistently tried to have more power than what the state constitution and state law grants to him. He doesn't like it that he has a check of a Republican legislature. And my message to Tony Evers is too bad. If you want to have, you know, unified control of the state government, stop running crazy people in northern Wisconsin and then maybe you'd win some seats.

[00:22:25] **Speaker 2** One of the other big issues that will likely be in front of the attorney general next year would be abortion and all the questions that surround that, the things that haven't been resolved either through court or the legislature. What role would you see for yourself in that position?

[00:22:38] **Speaker 1** The same role as with any other law, right? The job of the attorney general is to uphold and enforce Wisconsin law, whether it's with respect to abortion or any other issue. And so my job as AG would be to uphold and enforce Wisconsin law. And that's what I do.

[00:22:54] **Speaker 2** But there are some questions, right, if assuming no new new laws are passed, the current law there are questions for doctors, for instance, of what is the threshold of when the mother's life is in jeopardy and they can intervene. Questions about if a woman receives an abortion pill through the mail and they take it themselves. They can't be prosecuted under that law. But could an abortion doctor out of state be pursued? Would an attorney general step in if Madison or Dane County or the Walker County prosecutors weren't in these cases? So there are rules that you could be under playing, right?

[00:23:26] **Speaker 1** There's certainly some roles. But keep in mind, original jurisdiction in most of these cases rests with the district attorney of those counties. Now, my view is that we have too many lawless prosecutors in our in our state, not just in Dane County, Milwaukee County, but across the state. We have this cancer in our criminal justice system where prosecutors just routinely refuse to follow the law. So as attorney general, I will bring transparency and accountability to the criminal justice system, both with prosecutors and judges who won't follow our law, and as importantly, because of my legislative experience. If they continue to refuse to enforce the law, I'll work with the legislature to make sure that the Attorney General has the authority necessary to actually uphold and enforce Wisconsin law.

[00:24:16] **Speaker 2** So right now, it's not clear if the attorney general could step in and prosecute a case in Dane County, for example.

[00:24:21] **Speaker 1** It just depends on what the what the specific issue is and the specific facts. I remember the original jurisdiction of the attorney general to prosecute cases as defined in state statute. And so you have to find a provision of the statute that gives the AG that authority. And those are always fact specific inquiries.

[00:24:40] **Speaker 2** Now, we've seen other examples surrounding abortion. Attorney General Indiana recently outed an abortion provider who had served a ten year old rape victim that had traveled across state lines. How high profile do you expect your office to be in these types of cases? Because obviously any case becomes high profile when it comes. Such a controversial topic.

[00:25:01] **Speaker 1** Are you talking about a specific case?

[00:25:03] **Speaker 2** Well, we have two border states, Minnesota, Illinois, that anticipate increasing the amount abortion services available because there is no legal abortion in Wisconsin. Would you anticipate being involved with the attorney general from those states or potentially seeking to look into some of those cases? Or will you let things come to your office as opposed to seeking them out, I guess?

[00:25:24] **Speaker 1** Well, we certainly will have investigators at DCI who if they're, you know, given credible information that Wisconsin law has been broken, they would investigate that. And if if the law has been broken and the original jurisdiction rests with a district attorney that would go to the district attorney to prosecute if it rests with DOJ, that the DOJ prosecutors would prosecute it. So I'm not exactly sure what specifics that you are trying to get at here, but I think that so long as you have an attorney general who is committed to upholding and enforcing Wisconsin law and working to ensure that, you know, we have the investigators and the prosecutors at the Department of Justice who understand that that is their mission. Then that is what the voters have put in place by electing representatives who have passed that law and an AG who will actually enforce the law.

[00:26:18] **Speaker 2** One of the other issues that your opponent has brought up is the question of electability. And obviously, you're a politician. You've been elected before. You know more than anyone what that term can mean or doesn't mean. You went through a convention. There was no endorsement. How much should any primary voter be looking into endorsements or the qualifications? Or which candidates have the more support of sheriffs or politicians or the polling? How much of that matters?

[00:26:45] **Speaker 1** I think getting your message out to voters and making sure that voters understand who you are and and who you will be when you're elected is what really matters. And so having the ability to raise money and compete with Josh Kaul, remember, he just reported that he's got just about $2 million cash on hand. We need to have somebody who can actually compete with Josh call on the fundraising side in order to make sure that we get our important message out of supporting law enforcement, supporting and upholding the rule of law. And if we do that, the voters will be with us. They've consistently been with Republicans on that message, and particularly when you talk about the failures of Josh Kaul when he failed us during the Jacob Blake incident in Kenosha, when he's failed us by overly politicizing the office, when he's failed us at the crime lab, when he's allowed prosecutor positions to go unfilled, when DCI agents have been allowed to retire and not not filling those positions, getting that message out and making sure voters understand that you will be a different kind of attorney general that will uphold and enforce the law. And that that you have support from law enforcement, that you have support from legislators. You know, somebody like me that has the support of the National Rifle Association, Wisconsin, Right to Life. You know, all of those things matter in terms of getting your message out to not only primary voters, but general electorate voters. And that's what we've been working for since I got into the race in January.

[00:28:12] **Speaker 2** He also mentioned your special election for state Senate, saying that alone should be a disqualifying thing. How much should anyone read into a special election in that year?

[00:28:22] **Speaker 1** Yeah. So I ran for the state assembly in where I live two times and won by over 60% of the vote, or right around 60% of the vote, both times in a very low turnout January special election when we were in just the opposite way that the Democrats are right now, they have a very unpopular president. At the time, the Democrat base was very fired up. And so their base turned out in our state in a very low turnout special election. I don't think that that's indicative at all of, you know, the kind of candidate that I've historically been winning my assembly seats by wide margins and certainly not indicative of how we will we will thump Josh call because he has no message. His his message and his record are one of not supporting law enforcement, putting a target on the back of our brave men and women in law enforcement, not upholding the rule of law. And once we bring that message to the voters, I'm 100% confident that we will win.

[00:29:15] **Speaker 2** It's interesting that if you had won that special election, you likely would have been reelected by a wide margin and you'd be in the state Senate right now. Would you be considering would you be in the same road you're running for AG if you were a sitting state senator?

[00:29:28] **Speaker 1** It's an interesting hypothetical. I have no idea. I might not even have continued in the state Senate. As I say, my my life has been in the private sector. I enjoy being in the private sector. I have a very successful, thriving law firm. We have successful, thriving small businesses. The only reason that I'm running for this job is because I have little kids and I'm scared for the future of our state and our country. And we have to have people who will actually stand up and fight back against this socialism that we see being pushed on us. I mean, we had a. Democrat U.S. Senate candidate the other day in their debate proposed nationalizing the oil companies. That is absurd. It is ridiculous. And that but we don't see Democrats really pushing back on that. That is the direction that they're going. We have probably their leading candidate, Mandela Barnes is endorsed by AOC and Bernie Sanders. There was never a time before, you know, right now when the Democrats would even consider having somebody like that be their standard bearer. So we are in an entirely different environment, and we have to have folks from from outside the system who will stand up, fight back and take our state and country back.

[00:30:37] **Speaker 2** All right. Anything else you'd like to add?

[00:30:39] **Speaker 1** No. Get out and vote on August 9th and I'd appreciate your support.

[00:30:42] **Speaker 2** All right. Thank you very much for your time. Thank you for coming in.