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[00:00:00] **Speaker 1** Let's start by the big broad question for you. What is your number one priority or what do you think is the number one topic of importance for this campaign?

[00:00:07] **Speaker 2** Well, I think public safety is the most important issue for the attorney general. It's been my top priority since I took office, and it continues to be. And the Department of Justice, under my leadership, has investigated and prosecuted some of the most serious crimes in Wisconsin. And that includes homicides, sexual assaults, Internet crimes against children and drug trafficking. And we have worked throughout my administration to make progress on important public safety issues from reforming our sexual assault kit laws to holding opioid companies accountable to get resources to our communities, to fight the epidemic, to school safety, where we've worked to improve the ability to get to schools, guides for how to stay safe at school, and to set up a 24 seven tip line, our Speak Up, Speak Out program.

[00:00:55] **Speaker 1** Your opponent also says public safety is the number one issue. How much of how do you get across to the public, the voting public, how much you can do to control public safety and crime versus police departments or local district attorneys? How limited are you in terms of the attorney general's ability to fight crime?

[00:01:14] **Speaker 2** Yeah, well, there are a huge number of things that go into making our communities safer and stronger, and that certainly includes law enforcement agencies, local Vas. It includes things like making sure we have strong communities so that people are less likely to to commit crimes in the first place. But the AG's office has an important role to play in making our communities safer as well. And that's why it's so important to have somebody who is up to the job of being AG. I spent part of my career as a federal prosecutor in Baltimore. I prosecuted drug trafficking, gang members and homicides. And as AG, our administration has investigated and prosecuted some of the most serious offenses. We need to have an AG who's going to continue to be a leader not only in investigating and prosecuting cases, but in making progress on things like getting resources to law enforcement around the state and advocating for changes to our laws that will make our communities safer.

[00:02:05] **Speaker 1** Considering that the Legislature is most likely to remain in Republican control for the foreseeable future, your opponent says that he's in the best position to advocate for communities on behalf through the through the Republican legislature. Well, he says you have a more adversarial role with the legislature. How do you respond to that?

[00:02:21] **Speaker 2** Well, I think you can look at my record from the last four years and see that the opposite is true. We've made it a priority throughout my administration to advocate for policies that are in the interests of public safety. And we've delivered on on issue after issue, reforming our sexual assault kit laws was a priority of mine, and we got that legislation passed. We've also worked to advocate for increased training for for law enforcement agencies around the state, and we've got additional funding for training on top of that. We've worked with the legislature to get some legislation passed that supports law enforcement officers that hadn't been passed previously, like ensuring that benefits are available to families who lose a family member in the line of duty. And we've also got protections in place for officers who suffer from PTSD. So we've had real results. And part of the reason that's happened is that I'm willing to stand up to the legislature and call on them to act. That's the kind of leadership we need. My opponent has been unwilling to stand up to the Republicans in the legislature. And when that happens, you don't see the kind of progress on public safety issues that we've seen during my tenure.

[00:03:26] **Speaker 1** And that Republicans are trying to make a big issue out of Kenosha and the riots that occurred there and the idea of the defund the police movement. Do those have any traction in your mind?

[00:03:37] **Speaker 2** I don't think they do. I mean, I strongly support funding the police. And throughout my time in office, I've advocated for getting more resources to support public safety. And in my inaugural remarks today, I was sworn into office. One of the things I talked about was addressing the long term underfunding of our criminal justice system. And, you know, I mentioned some of the issues we've made progress on. We also have had 70 new prosecutors added in the last two state budgets. That's far more than there had been in many prior budgets. And I'm going to keep advocating for for resources, for law enforcement. We've also, as I mentioned, held big pharma accountable. And that means we have resources going to communities to help fight the opioid epidemic. Now, we were the lead investigative agency in the case involving Jacob Blake. We conducted that investigation professionally, thoroughly. And, you know, this is there have been a lot of high profile officer involved shooting cases. This one, though, after the investigation was complete. This is a situation where there was no rioting after the conclusion of the investigation. There hasn't been. We certainly haven't heard much criticism of the way that investigation was conducted. And when the reason is we did it professionally, thoroughly and transparently and talked about what we were doing as the investigation went forward.

[00:04:54] **Speaker 1** Is there any role or any where you could have changed what happened in the initial aftermath of the. The shooting?

[00:05:00] **Speaker 2** Well, we did everything we could to work to calm the situation. Now, we were the lead investigating agency, so it's important to note that our top priority had to be making sure we were conducting the investigation with integrity. But I was in Kenosha the day after that incident took place. I was standing alongside local leaders as we talked to the press about the incident. And then I was back again two days later, again speaking about what was happening. So, you know, we worked and responded quickly and again and conducted a full, thorough and professional investigation.

[00:05:33] **Speaker 1** Your opponent has said that you have mismanaged the crime lab, saying that the number of resources that are able to be sent in to the crime lab decreased during COVID. And it's because you sent too many employees home and didn't call them back in to to do the job that needed to be done.

[00:05:48] **Speaker 2** Well, first, there's there's no question that COVID impacted our crime lab, just like it's impacted everybody and their jobs. But if you look at the numbers in our crime lab, they show the opposite of what my opponent is saying. And DNA testing, for example, when we took office, there was a queue of cases that needed to be tested prior to COVID. That number was dropping consistently. Now, there was an uptick during COVID, but it's again gone back down into the number of cases that are needing to be tested has dropped significantly over the course of my time in office. We've also upgraded the work that the crime lab does by ensuring that people are trained on some some new technologies. Because of that, our crime lab is well positioned for long term success. Now, it's going to continue to need to have investment made into it. But we're now making progress with the crime lab. We've reversed the direction of the queue for the DNA cases that need testing. So we've got more progress to make, but we're also making progress.

[00:06:45] **Speaker 1** You came into office literally with the lame duck session trying to strip all your powers over the four years. What have you seen? What's been the actual impact of those changes that were made?

[00:06:56] **Speaker 2** It's impacted us in a few different ways. One is it has limited our ability to resolve certain cases. It requires us to go to the legislature or a committee of the legislature to get cases resolved. So that has not only impacted just how quickly we can resolve cases, but it impacts the way that cases are litigated. And it makes it harder for us to make offers that we know will be final because we don't know if the legislature will approve it. And for parties on the other side of cases, they are sometimes concerned about having their case go before a legislative committee before a settlement happens. The bigger impact, though, is that the lame duck legislation included provisions that really strained our budget at the Department of Justice. And so we came in facing budget challenges because of that lame duck session. Now we worked carefully and manage our budget carefully and have worked through the challenges that the Legislature imposed. But one of the things I'm so proud of is that despite those challenges and despite the challenges presented by COVID, we've delivered on issue after issue for Wisconsinites, whether it's getting out of the lawsuit that was trying to end the Affordable Care Act or strengthening our protection of our clean, clean air and clean water, or passing sexual assault kit legislation or doing more to keep schools safe.

[00:08:09] **Speaker 1** It's interesting you note some of those those issues, because the public doesn't always come into seeing what the attorney general does or the Department of Justice, unless it's on the negative side of that of being prosecutor involved in that kind of case. So how do you get across to people like I have made an impact and it's been better than it would have been if the other guy had been in office.

[00:08:29] **Speaker 2** Well, the Department of Justice works on a wide range of issues. Public safety is my top priority, and we do a lot of work directly related to public safety, but we also enforce our environmental laws. And so we work to protect clean air and clean water. We've held polluters accountable. We filed suit against PFOA companies responsible for PFAS contamination. We also protect consumers. We've worked to reduce robocalls or to ensure that when a robo calls coming in, you have an indication from the caller ID that that there's a robo call. We've held for profit colleges that engaged in predatory practices accountable. And we are now working to restore access to safe and legal abortions in the court and to we've worked to protect our democracy. So we work on a whole range of issues.

[00:09:13] **Speaker 1** How do you think that your your opponent would have filed suit against the first companies, or would you be, I guess, beholden to some of the interests that want fewer restrictions?

[00:09:23] **Speaker 2** Yeah, you certainly have to ask him and you'd have to ask him whether he's going to continue with that suit, if it if if he were elected into office. But one thing that has been clear is that he has tried it throughout his campaign to cater to special interests. My priority has been to stand up for Wisconsin families and to work to get justice for people. It's a clear contrast. It's similar to the contrast. When I ran last time, my opponent was trying to take health insurance coverage away from folks. I was willing to stand up for Wisconsinites access to health insurance under the ACA. Again, my opponent in this race has been catering to special interests. My priority has been standing up for what's.

[00:09:59] **Speaker 1** On tonight's that the office of Attorney General has been politicized at a national level more and more since the Obama era, maybe even before, where it's now, whatever party you belong to. That's why you file these joint lawsuits against the federal government. How how much does that matter who the attorney general is and what party they belong to when it comes to how Wisconsin is represented in these federal cases?

[00:10:22] **Speaker 2** I think it matters enormously on a number of issues, and you can look at any number of things. My office was working with other AG's offices to fight against efforts to roll back protections for climate change during the Trump administration. We've also engaged in some efforts to advocate for stronger protections against PFAS contamination. So there are some issues where there is a partizan divide. There are other issues where we work together across the aisle really effectively in a way that you don't see much in government. And I'm proud to have done that throughout my administration. One good example is our work to hold opioid companies accountable for their role in the opioid epidemic. That was bipartisan, and the work that our office did has helped to secure over $400 million. That's going to go to communities in Wisconsin. And we're not done yet, by the way. We're going to keep working to hold companies accountable to get resources to communities in Wisconsin.

[00:11:13] **Speaker 1** Talk to me a little bit about election integrity and conspiracy theories in general. What role does the attorney general's office have to play when you hear Republicans saying, I'm going to create this Office of Special Integrity Watchdog and I'm going to do this and I'm going to do that. What should voters be thinking about when they hear that?

[00:11:30] **Speaker 2** Well, this is a clear contrast in the attorney general's race. If you want a candidate who you can count on to protect democracy, I think my track record speaks for itself and my opponent's track record speaks for itself in a very different way. Our office was engaged in preventing tens of thousands of voters from being purged from the voter rolls. I personally argued that case in our state Supreme Court, and we won that case 5 to 2 when the Postal Service tried to slow down the mail prior to the 2020 election. We joined with other states in challenging that to make sure that people's votes were counted. And then after the 2020 election, when Donald Trump and his allies tried to overturn the results of the election, our office defended against those efforts, and we won every single case. When Michael Gabelman launched his fake investigation, we first I personally called on that investigation to be shut down, but we also challenged some of his subpoenas where he's trying to depose people behind closed doors, even though the law requires that to happen in public. Now, a different AG could have taken a different position on many of those issues. We also work with law enforcement around the state to ensure that our laws are followed with respect to voter fraud and voter intimidation and other issues relating to two elections. My opponent has helped fanned the flames of the big lie by, among other things, suggesting that laws had been violated in the prior election. He called on several election commissioners to be removed from office. I don't think he said anything negative about the Gabelman investigation, which wasted over $1,000,000 of taxpayer money. And, in fact, he's he's embraced Michael Gable in support. So this is a clear difference among many other issues in the AG's race.

[00:13:12] **Speaker 1** There were a couple of other court cases that did you're on the losing side of with the Tiguan and the drop boxes were those. Could they have been argued differently to persuade a different result in that outcome? Or is that just the nature of the balance of the court?

[00:13:24] **Speaker 2** You know, we made the best arguments that we think were available. I think we made very strong arguments. We lost that case 4 to 3 and it fell along the sort of typical lines you see with the four conservative justices in the majority. You know that that practice had been used in Wisconsin for a long time. Robin Vos and Scott Fitzgerald had encouraged people to use drop boxes. So that that's a result that I disagree with. But that was the court's decision. And so now we are you know, we will we are inviting by that decision as clerks are around the state. But, you know, there are a lot of close cases in front of our Supreme Court. And I again, I feel good about the arguments we made. And I you know, I would emphasize the legislature can act to restore access to two drop boxes. That was a decision that the court made based on the current statutes. And while I disagree with that, it doesn't prevent the legislature from acting. But so far they've been happy to make it less accessible for voters to cast a ballot.

[00:14:24] **Speaker 1** And that also doesn't mean that voters who voted that way cast an illegal ballot in 2020, correct?

[00:14:29] **Speaker 2** No, that's right. You know, there's a principle in election cases that cases need to be decided well before an election for the rules to change. And the reason for that is that we don't want voters to be confused by a lot of changes to the election rules at the last minute. And so it's not uncommon for there to be a case that ultimately comes down one way, that changes the way that election administrators need to act, that that's pretty common. But that doesn't mean the votes don't count, because the goal of our elections is to. Figure out the will of the voters. And we know that Wisconsin elections do that. We've had recounts after a full state recount, after the 2016 election and a recount of our two largest counties after the 2020 election. Both of those recounts showed that the results that were were reported originally reflected the ultimate results. We've had audits. We've had reviews consistently. Wisconsin's election system has been shown to be safe, secure, free and fair.

[00:15:27] **Speaker 1** If Republicans are in charge of our election system in 2024, is there any certainty that they will certify that votes for a potential Democratic nominee?

[00:15:37] **Speaker 2** Know that's a real concern that I have, is that if there is Republican control, that they would overrule the will of the people. And I'm worried that if Eric Tony were A.G., that he would potentially suggest that, you know, falsely that laws were broken or that there was fraud. And and again, he has suggested that laws were broken in 2020, despite the fact that this has been litigated in case after case after case. The reason that that is is well, there are a lot of reasons that that's really concerning. But this is fundamental to our democracy. What we've seen, though, is on issue after issue, Republicans in Wisconsin have been unwilling to stand up to Donald Trump. It's part of the reason we had this waste of money in the Gabelman investigation. And if in 2024 he's calling for the results to be overturned, we need to have people in key offices and that certainly includes the AG's office who are going to stand up for the will of the voters and our democracy and not put their loyalty to a political party or to a particular politician ahead of our democracy.

[00:16:37] **Speaker 1** Harry Reid has been subpoenaed by the Department of Justice. Are you involved or how closely are you involved in that case?

[00:16:43] **Speaker 2** Well, our office is prosecuting that case. We investigated it. He has been charged criminally. Now it's an ongoing matter. So I can't say much about the details of that case. But we take any violations of our election laws seriously. Ensuring that there's compliance with our election laws and that those laws are followed is is vitally important to protecting our democracy. And we're going to keep ensuring that those laws are enforced.

[00:17:08] **Speaker 1** Hypothetically, if you break a law, does that prove that the law can be broken? I mean, if I steal something, does that show that theft is wide open and that we we have to do more to stop theft? Yeah.

[00:17:22] **Speaker 2** Any law can be broken. The reason we have the laws is to prevent people from engaging in the kind of conduct that the law makes illegal. Somebody can. Can walk into a bank and commit a crime that doesn't prove that our our banks are vulnerable, that it simply proves that they were willing to commit a crime. What I can say is that our system has been tested over and over again in Wisconsin. Again, a statewide recount in 2016, a partial recount in 2020, audits, reviews. And consistently what it has shown is that our results reflect the will of the voters. This is this is not a state where there hasn't been testing of our election results. We have close elections time after time. You know, I won by less than a percentage point in 2018, and four of our last six presidential elections were decided by less than a percentage point. Our election officials are committed professionals. They do a great job of running fair elections. And people who are suggesting that that's not the case are not being honest with folks.

[00:18:21] **Speaker 1** You mentioned abortion. And I want to move to that topic because obviously that's moving a lot of people in your time on the campaign trail since jobs came down, have you heard more people talking about that and your your role as AG?

[00:18:33] **Speaker 2** Yeah. Since Jobs, that issue has been a central one to a lot of people in a lot of different elections, certainly including the AG's race. And we have an incredibly clear contrast in the AG's race. I am pro-choice. We are leading the challenge in court to prevent Wisconsin's incredibly restrictive 1800s ban on nearly all abortions from being enforced. That ban has no exception for cases of rape or incest. The only exception it has even to protect the health of the mother is if and this is what the statute says, if it is necessary to save the life of the mother. There have been some truly horrific cases already that have happened. The Washington Post talked about a case where a woman had to be left to bleed for ten days before the doctors could intervene. I think a lot of folks saw about this case where a ten year old from Ohio had to travel to Indiana. If that law is enforced in Wisconsin, that 19th century ban, women in Wisconsin will be less free, less equal and less safe than they had been before. Now, my opponent has has been clear that he is eager to enforce that law. The Wisconsin Department of Justice has about 100 investigators, as well as a number of prosecutors, putting those resources towards going after doctors or nurses or spouses or parents for violating that 19th century abortion ban. First is wrong by. On top of that would be shifting resources from protecting public safety by going after murderers or drug traffickers to instead going after people for abortion. I think that would be an incredible misuse of DOJ resources, and my opponent has said he'd withdraw from that challenge to the 19th century ban on on day one in office. So there's a very clear contrast on this issue in the AG's race.

[00:20:22] **Speaker 1** Do you think that it's motivating more voters who perhaps have always agreed with abortion but may have voted Republican for other issues to perhaps reconsider how they're going to vote this fall?

[00:20:31] **Speaker 2** I do think that this is going to impact the election. I think there are people who may have voted Republican when they when they knew there was a constitutional protection for access to safe and legal abortion, who are now seeing how extreme Republicans, including my opponent, are on this issue, wanting to enforce a ban with without any exceptions for rape or incest. And I think there are people who are going to be motivated to vote because they want to make sure their voice is heard. This election is going to be remembered for years to come as the election after Roe versus Wade was overturned. And the message that comes out of this election is one that I think people in elected office are going to remember for years to come. And I think it's critical that the message that Wisconsinites send is that we don't want to see Wisconsinites rights taken away from them.

[00:21:16] **Speaker 1** That there is a lot of uncertainty right now about what qualifies as the life of the mother in that 1849 law. Is there room for an attorney general opinion to help clarify it, or does that have to be a legislative fix?

[00:21:29] **Speaker 2** Well, there are a couple of things I would say. First, we're right now in court arguing that that law is not enforceable at all. And so getting clarity on that, on that just whether it's enforceable in any cases is sort of a first step. The second challenge we have is that this law has been unenforceable in Wisconsin for almost 50 years. And so the medical procedures that exist literally didn't exist last time. This law could be enforced. So how that's going to apply to specific circumstances is going to take guesswork because we don't have any precedent for this. Ultimately, having the legislature act to clarify the law would certainly be helpful in some of these unclear cases. But my hope is that the courts will instead find that that the ban is not in in effect from the 19th century. The other thing that's so important to mention is the legislature can fix this issue today. All they need to do is come into session and repeal that 19th century ban. But so far, they have left this draconian law and the uncertainty that comes with it in place. I wish they had met in special session when the governor called on them to do so. But instead, they they just gaveled in and gaveled out.

[00:22:36] **Speaker 1** Now that you mentioned your margin of victory four years ago, the governor got a few more votes than you. And that's typical for the attorney general, a little bit of an undercount compared to the top of the ballot. Do you think you could win if Tony Evers doesn't win? Can voters separate these two races as they did 20 years ago when Jim Doyle and Tommy Thompson were elected?

[00:22:56] **Speaker 2** Well, first, I think that Tony Evers is going to win. So hopefully I don't think that's the scenario we're going to need to worry about. But it is clear that Wisconsinites split their tickets. You know, the year that we won, Tammy Baldwin ran well ahead of the rest of the ticket. As you mentioned, there were elections in which Tommy Thompson and Jim Doyle had been elected. So the focus of our race is going to be on the issues in the AG's race and the differences between my opponent and me, which are significant as we've been talking about. So I'm, you know, I'm confident that voters are going to see the results that we've delivered. They're going to see the differences on some of these key issues like public safety and our different views on access to safe and legal abortion. And ultimately, voters are going to side based on this particular race and the particular candidates in this race.

[00:23:44] **Speaker 1** During the Republican primary, there was a big debate on the Republican side about electability between their two candidates. Would this have been an easier race against Adam Darko, considering his limited prosecutor and absent prosecutorial experience and the fact that he was considered even more to the right than Eric?

[00:23:58] **Speaker 2** Toni Well, I think it would be a different race, but I think it's important to note in some ways Mr. Toni is actually even more extreme than, than Adam Marco was. I mean he's been very clear that again, he's eager to enforce this 19th century abortion ban, with no exceptions for cases of rape or incest. He has touted himself and this is part of the way he's fanned the flames of the big lie. He's touted himself as the toughest election fraud prosecutor in Wisconsin. And certainly if there is election fraud, it should be prosecuted. But any suggestion that there's widespread fraud is just false. So so there are some very clear differences. And that's true with my current opponent. It would have been true with a different opponent. Ultimately, Republican voters were were very divided in the Republican primary there. It was a less than one point margin between the top two candidates and even the third candidate running, you know, whose platform was based around going after doctors for not prescribing ivermectin. Even she did I believe got over. 40% of the vote. So it was a divided Republican primary. You know, and regardless of who had won, you know, we were going to focus on my record. And the reason it's important to continue building on that record and moving Wisconsin forward rather than going backwards.

[00:25:15] **Speaker 1** And this seems to be a question that comes up every four years for attorney generals. But is there enough oxygen in the room to let voters understand the importance of your race as compared to the US Senate or the gubernatorial?

[00:25:26] **Speaker 2** I think absolutely there is you know, we are going to have one of the most high profile U.S. Senate races in the country. We're going to have a highly competitive governor's race. And so I think everybody in Wisconsin is going to see far more TV commercials than any of us want to see for political candidates. But we've been working hard to travel around the state and talk to Wisconsinites. We're going to keep doing that between now and Election Day. And I'm confident that when Wisconsinites look at look at our records, they're going to have a clear understanding of who the candidates are and what the differences are.

[00:25:57] **Speaker 1** All right. And I want to clarify one thing. We're running a story out this week about the Milwaukee prosecutorial powers that your opponent asked for. And we have your soundbite from the roundtable, but I want you to address that here, if you would. Just so we have that on record about would you seek to have additional powers in Milwaukee County or the whole state?

[00:26:15] **Speaker 2** Yeah, my my opponent has limited his request to Milwaukee County and really targeted that part of the state. I think the same rules should apply statewide, and I think that the AG's office should have the ability to bring criminal charges in in cases across the state when when there's an appropriate case to do so. What we really need, though, is not just a shift in authority. We need to get resources to our communities. And in November of last year, I proposed the Safer Wisconsin plan, which would invest $115 million in communities across the state to strengthen public safety. That includes funding for community policing, for officer recruitment and retention, for victim services, for mental health crisis response, among other things. And it would also crack down on gun violence. And that's one of the big differences between my opponent, me. I think we need some common sense gun safety measures like universal background checks, and that we need to strengthen the penalties for people who've committed crimes like repeat felon in possession or repeat straw purchasing. My opponent has wanted to go the other way and and loosen our gun safety laws that would move us backwards when it comes to fighting gun violence. So I think we need to invest resources and having jurisdiction in the AG's office for Criminal Prosecutions is something I think should happen on a statewide basis.

[00:27:32] **Speaker 1** Why is it that Republicans continually target Milwaukee County and how much of that has a racial subtext to it that that's where the largest portion of our African-American population lives?

[00:27:43] **Speaker 2** Yeah, you know, I certainly think you'd have to ask Republicans in the legislature why it is that they're targeting Milwaukee. But one thing I will say is that my my opponent has made Milwaukee a big issue in his campaign. And he's talked about who's going to get resources from Milwaukee. But what he hasn't done is stood up to the members of his own party in the legislature. And if you listen to debates that are Joint Finance Committee, you will hear Republican legislators specifically saying they don't want resources going to Milwaukee. I think that that's the wrong approach. But my opponent, rather than calling on those legislators to direct those resources, hadn't said a word previously. Now, now that we're a couple of months out from the campaign, he's saying something very different. But we need people who are going to say this when it counts, when the legislature is in session, and when those resources can get to our our communities. So back in November of last year, I proposed the safer Wisconsin plan. Unfortunately, Republicans in the legislature have chosen not to make those investments in public safety. But we've got a massive budget surplus and we've still got lingering impacts from the pandemic. So now is the time for us to invest in public safety and work to make communities across Wisconsin safer.

[00:28:50] **Speaker 1** And finally, if you could kind of succinctly give us an idea of what the limits are of you, the attorney general's office, to prosecute individual counties like what cases or if there's a range of cases?

[00:29:01] **Speaker 2** Yeah, there are there are certain statutes that's a pretty limited number where the attorney general's office has what's known as original prosecution authority. So if there's a crime committed, we can bring a charge. And it's as simple as that. What happens much more often is there are cases where we either work in partnership with the DA's office, or they basically have us come in either as a special prosecutor or in a role that's an assist role, but where we're really handling the case. So we will often work with DA's offices to prosecute cases in that capacity and sometimes happens if a D.A. has a conflict or there's a particular type of case that we have more expertize in the DA's office does due to the nature of the case. So that's the time when we are most often involved in cases directly, and then we also provide guidance to DA's around the state. And so sometimes that's something we'll issue to all days. Other times DA's will have a particular question and they'll. Reach out to our office and and they'll communicate about that.

[00:30:02] **Speaker 1** Are there any examples you can think of where you have reached down to prosecute a case that would not have otherwise been prosecuted?

[00:30:10] **Speaker 2** It's it's really hard to say. These cases that have come up are cases where we work with the DA's office. And so sort of by definition, if the DA's office is working with us, it's the case that they likely would have prosecuted. The one exception that may be that there there may be cases where the DA's office would bring a case if it had unlimited resources. But it doesn't. But because we have available resources at a given time, we we do. So it's it's difficult to say in general.

[00:30:41] **Speaker 1** But they're not neglecting a crime or declining to prosecute because they don't believe something is a crime.

[00:30:47] **Speaker 2** This is DA's you're referring to. I can't think of examples where, you know, DA's think that there is a prosecution that should be brought and they're choosing not to. So, you know, certainly if DA's would would reach out to us and want us to take a look at something, we would. But, you know, generally speaking, DA's around the state are committed to fighting crime and ensuring that their communities are as safe as they can be.

[00:31:14] **Speaker 1** So when your opponent makes a claim like he needs to be more involved in Milwaukee County, it almost feels like he's saying they're not doing enough to prosecute crime like they're ignoring crime. So are there cases I mean, if he had that authority, would he be saying, oh, no need to go for a more a higher felony? Or how would he actually use that authority?

[00:31:34] **Speaker 2** You'd have to ask him about specific examples as to as to how we do that. I mean, the other thing is that the Milwaukee County DA's office has far more prosecutors than than the Wisconsin Department of Justice has in the criminal litigation unit. What is true is there are changes we could make to our laws that would would address some of these issues. And that's not something that's a matter of who the DA's are. It's a matter of what our laws are. And so, as an example, as a federal prosecutor, when we have pretrial detention issues that federal equivalent of bail, the decisions were made based on whether somebody was a danger to the community or a risk of flight. And if somebody was dangerous, you know, I would go into court and argue that they should be detained pending trial. And the decision that the judge made was based on those common sense factors. And often people who were dangerous were simply detained pending trial. In the state, we have a system that's that's based on resources. And so instead of having people who are dangerous detained, you have bail set at a certain level for people. And what happens then is you can end up with people who are dangerous, but who have access to resources like a large scale drug trafficker or a gang leader who can get those resources together and get released on bail. You also sometimes see bail set at a lower level than it should be to protect public safety. And so you see people getting arrested for serious crimes who then get out very quickly. That's really dangerous to communities. If if we've arrested somebody for a serious offense and the evidence is there, they shouldn't then be going back out to commit more crimes right away.

[00:33:06] **Speaker 1** All right. We've taken up enough of your time. Is there anything you want to add?

[00:33:09] **Speaker 2** No. Thanks for having.

[00:33:10] **Speaker 1** Me. All right. Thank you so much for your time. Appreciate it. Yes, I see the people coming up the door is perfect.

[00:33:15] **Speaker 2** Yeah.