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[00:00:48] **Unidentified** Before you get there, try to get it.

[00:01:26] **Speaker 1** Last call. Four questions from the audience. Last call. Anybody. Anybody? Anybody. Don't be shy. I planned to ask. What do you guys know about the world? Oh. All right, everybody. I'm just very strong with Politics.com.

[00:01:58] **Speaker 2** Thanks very much for coming to this event.

[00:02:01] **Speaker 1** Of a very important Supreme Court race.

[00:02:03] **Speaker 2** And your attendance shows it. One of the anchor sponsors, of course, State Bar, Wisconsin. Thank you very much. Who we do a debate with attorney general debate and Supreme Court debate with the state bar.

[00:02:17] **Speaker 1** Every time there's an important race.

[00:02:18] **Speaker 2** So candidates, the winners who emerge will be invited. And I hope you'll nod your yes right now that you will be part of the state bar debate, Judge. Yes, very go. All right. I did my job, Larry. Also want to thank our other sponsor, of course, the the Wisconsin Institute for Law and Liberty. Thank you very much, Will, and all your guests for for being part of this event. Okay. So this is not a debate. It's a forum. So I ask you to, you know, please refrain from jeers or boos or wild applause or shouts of joy. Just try to keep it contained, okay? Please, please silence your phones if you can. So we. This is not being live stream. It's being recorded for a full broadcast later today by Wisconsin I. And when we get the link, we'll posted at our site and we'll also distributed in our products so you can go to his politics.com.

[00:03:21] **Speaker 1** Later on for that.

[00:03:24] **Speaker 2** So, again, silence your phones. Thank you very much for attending. And now I'm going to turn it over to the co-hosts of a Wisconsinite program that we are.

[00:03:33] **Speaker 1** Also part of called Rewind. Jerry Ross is.

[00:03:36] **Speaker 2** The was politics.com editor and Emily Fannin. She's the capital bureau chief for channel 58 of Milwaukee. So please welcome them and the candidates.

[00:03:57] **Speaker 3** All right. So I will begin just talking to you guys about the former that will be doing today. Each candidate will have 92nd opening remarks and each will make a statement in alphabetical order. We did draw names in the back on who will be going first for opening remarks. So with that, we have Everett Mitchell, who will be going first. Then we will be taking questions from myself and J.R. and then we'll be gathering some questions from the audience to wrap up this 90 minute debate. All right. Well, with that, we'll start with opening remarks. So, Judge Everett Mitchell, you can begin.

[00:04:32] **Speaker 4** Well, good afternoon, Wisconsin. Good afternoon. Yes, my name is Everett Mitchell, and I'm running for Wisconsin's Supreme Court because I believe our state deserves a justice that reflects the diversity and ideas and values of our entire state. For too long, Partizanship has separated us so that we're not able to have the representation that Wisconsin people need. And as a judge, since 2016, I've learned that justice is not just what you say. Justice is what you do. And I believe that we need a justice that can represent what that means for our state. I've worked hard as a judge to be tough but fair. I work hard to be proactive in our community rather than reactive to address public safety and the needs of Bay County hats on. Like my a couple of my opponents here. I've been a former prosecutor and now judge handing out punishment when necessary, but hoping giving up hope. When is in time in this need as well? What separates me from my opponents is this I've also worked with community leaders, faith leaders, school officials, LGBTQ leaders, police chiefs, sheriffs and rank and file officers to take on crime to stop it before it starts and to prevent people from becoming victims in the first place. One of my proudest accomplishments is establishing the Juvenile Empowerment Teen Committee, where we work with rank and file officers, school officials to go out and work with young people to ensure that they are not committing crimes in the first place. Because if they're not committing crimes, that means their futures are protected and there are new victims being offered at the same time. My commitment to our young people is that here in Bay County, we want to make sure that crime is stopped. And I want to bring that vision and that passion to our entire state. I want people to know that you not only can trust the work that I've done, but also trust the vision that I have for the rule of law and what our Supreme Court can be able to provide for our entire state. And look forward to this conversation. And you get to know a little bit more about me and me getting to be able to answer your questions about the things and the values of our state that will continue to be forward for the next ten years. Thank you so very much.

[00:06:43] **Speaker 3** One region has proposals.

[00:06:45] **Speaker 5** Thank you very much. Well, first, I would like to thank was politics for hosting this forum. And thank all of you for turning out today to hear us talk about our views and what we think about some of the issues that may or may not come before the Wisconsin Supreme Court on such a critically important race. I got into this race to bring change and common sense back to our Supreme Court. I started thinking about it last spring. I could not sit back and watch extreme right wing Partizans hijack our Supreme Court. And that is why I got into this race change and common sense. My entire life has been dedicated to community service. That is all I have ever wanted to do. For the past 30 years, I have worked as a prosecutor in Milwaukee County. And it doesn't want to go. As a prosecutor, I handle some of the most violent, troubling cases that have come before a court. And the fact that a community is so rare that way as a justice for three years in a homicide sexual assault court, I have worked very, very hard to keep the community safe and make the tough calls necessary to ensure safety and uphold people's constitutional rights. I got into this race late last spring, but I have to tell you, I have been all over our beautiful state and my daughter to beautiful. It is gorgeous. I have been everywhere during this period of time. I have garnered over a thousand endorsements from judges, community leaders and attorneys across our state. I have spent time listening to people and hearing about what they think is important, and I know what they think is important, why they want to see extremism to stop it immediately. That is what people want. I am here to tell you that.

[00:08:46] **Speaker 3** Figure out what you're fighting for. That I.

[00:08:48] **Speaker 5** Am. That changed how some candidates candidacy. Judge Jennifer Major was halted for posting this form to the moderators and to the audience for fear they will eventually watch online today for taking time out of their busy schedules to be here. I am judge for the world. I am a wife and a mother. I'm a coach and I'm a judge. And I'm a lifetime resident of Wisconsin. This is my home. Over my 26 year legal career. I served as a prosecutor, a private practice attorney, and an advocate for abused and neglected children. And for the last 11 years, I have served as a Waukesha County judge, having won two elections as a trial court judge. I'm running for the Supreme Court because the people of this great state of Wisconsin need and deserve a justice who will uphold the rule of law, protect our constitutional rights, and not inject their political bias by legislating from the bench. I have a depth and breadth of experience, unlike any other candidate and an honest, wavering commitment to a fair and impartial judiciary. I am also the choice of law enforcement for the Wisconsin civilian court, having earned bipartisan support and more law enforcement and endorsements than any other candidate on this stage. I also love this state and here deeply for its future. I want to do my part to ensure that my children, my children's children and the families of Wisconsin have a safe and secure, safe and want to live, work and play, and where judges and justices protect their constitutional rights. Your time as a trial court judge. And now I have the honor to do that on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Your remarks.

[00:11:00] **Speaker 2** Thank you. Well, good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to take just a moment to introduce myself to you. I came to Wisconsin 40 years ago as a young man getting ready to study at Carroll College. I fell in love with the people of Wisconsin. The very first day I was here, because the very first people that I met there were the most warm and welcoming people you could imagine. And over a long weekend of camping and fishing, they taught me what it is to be with us. I learned from the Wisconsinites or the people, the open hand, the generous hearts. A few years later and met my wife at InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, meeting in a school for three years and five children later. They were my precious people. Wisconsin. The same as when I met them for years. People who opened the genocide. As one of the reasons it's been such an honor and a privilege to serve you as one of your Supreme Court justices. This afternoon, I'm looking forward to continuing our conversation as they study their story. Many years ago about the probable and functioning versus green court now approved, it is to a lack of justice whose commitment is to understanding and applying the original meaning of our Constitution, preserving the rule of law and preventing politics interfering with the work of the court. Thank you so much.

[00:12:43] **Speaker 1** We drew feet first over the counter, a rotating random question for visiting the fair, which is the first question here. This raises I like to be full to for. We know what choices offered hate labels to avoid views judges, virtual faces with the left of center. The store of Justice Kelly's website also proposes to spend millions of dollars. One of the very few is what is for CPAC and they spend the candidates support will vote the political right way. Can you point to any ruling you disagree or personal experience with the law? Should you be an independent thinker on the court? Rather, while both insider.

[00:13:23] **Speaker 5** Thinking of judicial independence is absolutely crucial and critical? Wisconsinites deserve a caucus and the common Wisconsinites deserve a court where there's not a thumb on the scale. Wisconsinites deserve a court where outcomes are not preordained. So the question is, what have I done to show that I'm judicial and the kind of quality I am in court every single day? I told her I just came after three years of homicide, sexual assault, where before that I spent two years in high intensity drug trafficking court before that, a year of domestic violence for every single day. I heard arguments from district attorneys, from defense attorneys, and I heard Victor tell me what's important to them. How do you know I'm independent? Even though I have a career prosecutor, I side with a person or party who I think is the most appropriate. Sometimes I would say what capacity, what the defense wants, but you never know. I follow the law. I uphold the Constitution, and that's what I plan to do and that's what I plan to continue to do. And if you allow to be, the next justice will look at the Supreme Court. Wisconsinites deserve better than what we have had. We deserve much better. And that is what I plan to do. Fair independence.

[00:14:48] **Speaker 4** All of your next question is from.

[00:14:53] **Speaker 5** The core of my judicial approach has always been fairness and impartiality. But people who look, the people who appear before a judge expect and deserve this. I say they should demand this. For the past 11 years, I have administered justice fairly, faithfully and impartially. Sometimes judges are faced with the difficult, but I guess a reason we had such an experience in the case that I handled the citizens of Wisconsin got a very unique opportunity to see my approach to fairness and justice. And I was deeply touched by the feedback that I got from around the world for how I handled that case. I heard from judges across the country and even Phenix, who sat there praising my efforts to be fair and impartial in the face of extreme disrespect, disruption, and at times even vile behavior. Through it all, I protected the very rights of the person who engaged in that behavior, while also ensuring that the rights of the victims and the witnesses were also protected. You can expect nothing less for me as your next Supreme Court justice, fairness and impartiality. That is what I was just.

[00:16:22] **Speaker 2** So I think it's important to emphasize the significance of the premise of that question. Politics is supposed to work with everybody who comes to the court, regardless of what they might tell you. Everybody has political beliefs. The question is whether you can set them aside to do the work of the court. In order to do that. You need to have the methodology involved and it you have to even apply consistently every single day to make sure that the results of the decision are commanded by the law and are not influenced by most personal beliefs or personal politics. The methodology I've used is really, really quite straightforward. I start always with the processes for the law that applies to the case, and then I emphasize reverse logic to move from those premises all the way down to the conclusion. And when you're done, you should be able to look back and see an unbroken chain, a light connecting the premises to the conclusion. And if you see an unbroken chain, that's your guarantee that the conclusion is commanded by the law rather than by the individual's personal preferences or personal policies. Now, I was told that there are so many things that I've written on the court and have not been. The favorite of those who might be considered otherwise would be my supporters. Because in truth, every opinion that I read for the Supreme Court, every dissent, every concurrence, has been based on 100% what the law is, not on what I think it ought to be, and certainly not on what any political party or member of the legislature thinks that it ought to be. My opinion has always been the same. Simply applying the law used to rigorously reach the conclusion so that the people of Wisconsin can have confidence in the decisions of the courts are solely informed by the law. And I've written my opinions in such a way that they are accessible to anyone, regardless of whether they have a legal background. Because I understand that I'm using prior authority for what people business and every opinion that I write is my report to the people of Wisconsin and what I have done with their own thought. So I've made it accessible. I made it logical so that anyone in the state can confirm the opinions that I write are commanded solely by the law.

[00:19:03] **Speaker 4** I will say that shortly after I took the bench, one of the first things I realized is how unfair the system truly is. So many qualities within our system that you don't have an income to be able to have representation in the court system. Your voice is there. Fairness for me, meant to make sure that my courtroom was a place where every voice had an opportunity to be heard, regardless of the income that you didn't have because of your race, regardless of your self-identified gender. And also to give a space so that people could be heard because of those things. And when you judge overseas view of the cases, it becomes even more important because you're not dealing with adults. You're dealing with children who often have the voice, children who have allowed these who can come in and lobby for how you treat them. So it's up to the judge to appeal to those cases to make sure that grieving environment is being fair, that is honest, and also support the case from those cases. I do I do believe that there are times when politics can try to enter into that space. But a judge who is committed to the rule of law, committed to fairness in and our state will make sure that they understand that when that person comes in, he will ask them what he did with you, Green Party, independent Wisconsinites. And they deserve to have a case heard without any bias whatsoever. And I always enjoy, of course, the bench with a predetermined idea already should recuse herself from the process because the fairness of our system is at stake. The integrity of the court system is at stake. And so we have to suspend those things. So at that moment in which somebody needs to be heard, that we remain curious to the facts are going to be brought before us. And when you lose that curiosity, you know, alone with a judge, you no longer you acquire some tool that somebody can use to be able to get what they want. And I can promise you, I have a whole lot of hours in it that shows you I'm no bias to stand on. The beliefs are saying what I stand for, what's fair. And I live in that role and I believe what it is. I remember I was a pastor when I actually married, when I was supposed to marry same sex couple of my congregation. People told me they said, We don't do that black Baptist preacher, Christians don't do that. And I said to them, I said, I will go stand on what is right even before the Supreme Court gave us code to do so. And I'm very close to women in my congregation because they have been together 42 years. And when they ask me what I do. I said, Of course I would. I don't know me people that didn't go to 42 years. So I'm here to say that I pass.

[00:21:29] **Speaker 5** On the open and affirming.

[00:21:30] **Speaker 4** Congregation wide because I'm independent and I can not be controlled, but I was brutally assaulted. So the example I ask you to give us an example. I remember when I had a case before me with a lawyer that I loved that came to my court over. He presented somebody before me and I remember that it was against Scott Walker. And I looked at the law, look at the facts, and everything in me said, this is about the rule of law, not about my friend. That's not my friend. At this moment. He's litigate and I have to make sure I follow the law. And so I made that decision to uphold the decision related to the Scott Walker administration, because to me, that is the job. After the veto, we can go. This would be a matter of two and a half years. But I had to do the job that I was called, that I was committed to doing that strategy that frankly.

[00:22:20] **Speaker 5** Right.

[00:22:20] **Speaker 3** Continuing to in our order. Every girl will start with this question. The state Supreme Court has rejected past petitions asking the justices to set a recusal standard for cases in which a party has contributed to the campaign. Essentially, the court has said it is up to each judge to make a decision on whether they can be impartial. Still, the state and the state Democratic and Republican parties are already fundraising for the race, are expected to spend millions of dollars in this campaign. One, do you believe the court was correct in rejecting requests to set a standard for her perusal and to will you hear cases involving the state political parties knowing they will and likely spend against you in this race?

[00:23:09] **Speaker 5** Well, first and foremost, my integrity cannot be bought by anyone. We have rules and statutes already that address recusal and they are important. I would, of course, follow them and apply them to the facts of any given case. At the same time, I know that recusal is often used as a weapon by litigants to secure the judges they prefer. And that is wrong. Justice requires that judges and justices hear the cases that come before the court. We have an ethical obligation to diligently take care of our cases. That is the job that the people of Wisconsin and other counties elect us. To do. I also think of recusal in the context of a one judge county. A judge in a one judge county knows probably everyone, or at least a large portion of that county's population. And if we start looking at one, why don't we look at time? Why don't we look at the efforts that other people put into our campaigns? But if a judge, a one Judge County, would recuse themselves based on every relationship that that judge had, even if it's just a litigant or an attorney or even a financial manager, without more, that judge wouldn't handle the cases that that judge was elected to do. We can still look at the cases from a broader perspective, even when they come to the Supreme Court and again, go back to the rules, go back to the law, because the law is important and our statutes and our Supreme Court rules on recusal and the case law that talks about them are very important. And I would start with that. And I would then apply those laws and those principles to the facts of the case before we.

[00:25:15] **Speaker 3** Can do justice to.

[00:25:17] **Speaker 5** California's.

[00:25:19] **Speaker 2** Here's where I stand. I understand with all of the authority to create and maintain governments in the state of Wisconsin comes from well, you know, we the people of Wisconsin, and it comes to us fully as in law, not lone is mediated by the Constitution and the people of Wisconsin decide, create and maintain. But the point of this is that the question recusal is for the people of Wisconsin to decide for me if they believe that there should be new rules or different rules governing how that is handed. Right now, what they've decided is that there is a cap on contributions to judicial candidates. That's their call. They believe that to be an appropriate way of handling that issue. The people of Wisconsin decided that our judiciary is to be an elected judiciary. There are many different ways of doing that. You could have an appointed judiciary. You could have a Senate confirmation for judicial nominees. But Wisconsin has decided on elections, and they know well enough that elections require that the candidates have the ability to get their messages out to the people themselves. And so they put their stamp of approval on the contributions they think is appropriate for a judicial candidate to receive and continue to sit on cases. I think on top of that, it is the individual responsibility of the Supreme Court justice. Only we can truly know whether we want whether we are going to be adversely impacted by someone's contribution, by someone's time or efforts in supporting us, or conversely, by someone who is against us in a campaign. The truth of the matter is it is it would be extraordinarily difficult to develop a standard of recusal that could capture all of those elements and all of those dynamics in a way that could be administered in an intelligent fashion. But the real key recusal sense is the choice of the people of Wisconsin and who they send to their Supreme Court. That has to begin with a level of trust and a sense. It has to be a commitment to looking at the character of the person and not understanding that that person will stay true to the law and will not allow other factors to influence the way they decide cases. And if they should encounter a circumstance in which there is an outside factor that is so powerful. So in that would threaten to change the course, the case that that person would have the integrity and the honor to step aside. And that's what recusal is.

[00:28:25] **Speaker 3** Agnes is Judge Mitchell.

[00:28:28] **Speaker 4** So if you ever go to the Wisconsin Supreme Court website, there's a see this beautiful seal, because it's different than other cities that I've seen representing justice. The Wisconsin Supreme Court seal has a hand that's holding a seal and a hand is holding the scale. It is meant to say that there's a certain balance that judges and justices are supposed to have when it comes to thinking about what justice should look like in every case. So when I think about recusal, I think about assuming that one of the judges hand starts to tilt the balance in a different direction, he or she needs to make sure that they choose themselves. I think that is also a decision that we all question all the time that a person is always in the community. The first thing people always ask with a judge, would you have to choose yourself? Because you know, so many people say, no, this doesn't have to do with me. I got to achieve myself. What it means is that I have to make sure that there is a standard in which I review and explain the relationships. I think what has often made the court seem as always a dark place is because justices and judges are not always honest about the relationships that they have when they see them in the courtroom. Any time I see somebody that comes up, I make sure everybody is aware of what their relationships may look like and I make sure that everybody is aware that those things are important and they may be in play. So if I understand the rules of engagement in that moment that we're going to address that particular case, because my view is always that we should never be the point where we're tipping the balance of how in one direction or the other, because the relationships that we have and I said earlier, it is about curiosity. And I think that there are rules relating to recusal. And if you are in position when you do believe that you can no longer effectively, fairly and impartially administer a decision or you will be able to make rulings in a particular case even before going for a jury, or if you have to ask yourself and a court trial, if you cannot listen to the evidence in a fair manner, then you need to make sure that you view the person in front of you the due respect to tell them I need to get off this particular case. And that goes back to the integrity of the individual investor. And that to me, and that goes back to our people, understand that it's not about having a particular vision. It is about a person or the person or the bodies or the issues that are in front of you. Make sure that they get litigated fairly in way that brings and holds the integrity of our court system in place at the same time. So again, I go back to the example. I think we need a justice who are evenhanded and they make sure that they are able to face the facts, too, in the direction that we're supposed to go.

[00:31:19] **Speaker 5** That judgment is what I think we are looking for a goal. I think we have two distinct scenarios that we've been talking about. Sure, we all go into our courtrooms and we all know that many of the people in our cases, we always disclose. I know the plaintiff I know responded. I know the defendant. You know, I know the defendant's attorney is one of my court commissioners. We always need to disclose that. But I take it a step further when it comes to little political contributions. I think that due to the extreme partizanship and the amount of money that comes into races like this, we absolutely need a recusal rule. Now, what's that recusal will be? I think the public should be able to weigh in on that. I know that it has been talked about and presented to the Supreme Court in the past. And the idea of talking about the recusal rule has been rejected. But I think there should be open hearings about that. I don't think I live in a minority. I can tell you that there are a majority. Retired Wisconsin Circuit Court justice also think there should be a recusal rule. And I also understand that there are limits as to how much money individual or unions can contribute to a personal campaign. And in this particular campaign, an individual can contribute $20,000 to my campaign. The question is from the Supreme Court, with $20,000 where you are, that each individual, whatever on answer to that. However, that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about outside money that's going to come into this campaign in millions and millions of dollars. Millions of dollars. That is why there has to be a refusal. The public has to weigh, yeah, I'm not going to sit here and tell you what I think an exact number is, but I absolutely think there has to be a hearing that the public has to weigh in. And I think there should be a way to rule 100.

[00:33:28] **Speaker 1** So the question I have. Okay. Yeah. All right. You're saying that. All right, Justice Kelley, you're next. Now, Judge Doyle and Justice Kelley. The applications you filled out for appointment, the bench asked you the worst ruling by the Wisconsin Supreme Court in the last three years. Judge Doro, the 25 to 23 U.S. Supreme Court ruling overturning a Texas anti-sodomy law. Justice Kelley, you cited to those five women that court that said that justified the government taking private property be put to more productive economic use. The two of you want to know is that sources that you've seen the last three decades for Judge Mitchell tell us which what's the worst ruling you've seen in the last three decades in Wisconsin or U.S. Supreme Court Justice? KELLEY The first.

[00:34:16] **Speaker 2** Thing I don't think that stands up. Well, you know, we have to look at our Wisconsin Constitution and the very first article and the very first section says that we are endowed with inalienable rights, that amongst these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Governments are created to protect those rights, gain their trust. And so. When the government steps in, it takes private property. It's not just an economic problem for the person who loses property. It's also a question of literally acquired that property, whether it's real estate or personal property for a reason, because you believe that it will be productive, that it will be enjoyed because it will advance your pursuit of happiness. And when the government steps in and takes that for you, it has to have a really good reason and it to be just composition. But the just compensation only takes care of the financial aspect of that intrusion. So I think any opinion of the court that would allow for the government to live without regard to absolute subsidy of taking it for the purpose of public use, that would allow the government to take that property. Is that a problem? See, the problem in that case, was it not being taken for public use programs, transferring it from one private party to another? And this is a significant interference with the liberties that our Constitution protects. And so I think that stands up well as one of the worst offenders.

[00:36:19] **Speaker 1** Thank you. George Mitchell.

[00:36:22] **Speaker 4** So I think for me, there are a lot of Supreme Court decisions in various categories that have had very adverse impacts. I think I can think of no other greater impact that I've seen with all the terms of Roe decision. I think overturning the overall decision really put in jeopardy the idea of piracy that we were founded for men as critical, as critical place. I mean, that's how we understood the law. It was one of the first time that I can remember my own history and a right was reached into the lives of people and taken away. While we also understand that, you know, the decision really focused a lot on precedent. It also invalidated the ways in which courts often used precedents to make sure that we ensuring the rights of individuals are consistently maintained and protected. At the same time, the invalidation of a protection for reproductive choice also was telegraphed through Justice Thomas to also look at, you know, not only same gender relationships, but also all of the other constitutional rights that we also see as protector as well. So I think overturning that also put our country in a very, you know, chaotic place where we have 15 different types of interpretations of our reproductive choice. And our states are struggling to try to figure out where these things mean, because that was taken away from something that the majority of individuals in our communities, in our states had also thought was foundational at that time. So there are a lot of consequential decisions when we're talking about Shelby County versus Holder, that of our voting rights over time that talk about engagement with around police reform. But this one is significant because it was the first time in my study of law that I can see that the Supreme Court went and took a right in a way for people for 50 years. And and we're dealing with the consequences of that instability of the country and all of the people's lives right now.

[00:38:22] **Speaker 1** So with that justification, which.

[00:38:26] **Speaker 5** I agree, I think the Dallas decision is the worst Supreme Court decision that comes to mind. That is the epitome and definition of judicial activism. Quite frankly, I was surprised when they briefed and rendered that decision. Three generations of women have counted on Roe v Wade to allow them to make their own decisions in regard to reproductive rights. Now, I can't tell you where I'll end up. Any case. I can tell you a little bit about my values, and I used to be asked about that being so secret, what my values are in regard to Roe v Wade in regard to the database case. Privacy issue was paramount. My value is that women should be able to make their reproductive right decisions themselves. Sure, go ahead. Talk to your clergy, talk to your family. Talk to your health care provider. But in the end, my values tell me that that should be your decision. That's exactly why we need to bring common sense back to the court. That's exactly why we need to bring change back to the court, to not only uphold our Constitution, to not only. Sorry to say this, but to uphold the will of the people who have relied on it three generations back, 50 years, potentially three generations of women. Many women never knew a world before world. Now they certainly do. So to me, that is the most critically poor decision. And as I indicated earlier, an absolute example of judicial activism in Israel. I'll be honest with all of you, sometimes I don't personally agree with the law that I'm applying, and I'm sure that's also true for the US and Wisconsin Supreme Court justices. Sometimes the words or even the statutes themselves are stupid, but super doesn't mean unconstitutional. It doesn't matter. It's my job whether I like the words or even to agree with the law. My job is to apply those the words and what they need. If I are running for the Senate or Assembly and my campaign changes some laws. I'm not running for the legislature, not on the side and running for a seat on Wisconsin's Supreme Court. Politics have absolutely no place in the courtroom, and we should not be legislators heroes. All right. The Senate question will start with Judge Mitchell.

[00:41:19] **Speaker 3** We now have with that question that we just asked you around, what ruling has most shaped your judicial philosophy?

[00:41:28] **Speaker 4** Yeah. Yes. If you have a judicial philosophy, including and probably a judicial mentor that you used to get to understand how the law stands, while the issue of. Yes, Justice Thurgood Marshall and I think he has argued that in the Brown versus Board of Education, when it overturned the 77 million people doctrine, which was one of those decisions, when you're growing up as a young man learning about what the law is, as you understand how the law can be used to oppress and the mean and hurt communities of color because of the fact that are using the law as a foundation for their ideology. And so the fact that, you know, Justice Marshall was educated by Charles Hamilton, used to Howard University, and he was educated on an idea that the 14th Amendment could be the vehicle that used to change the dynamics of the law, and that you can use the law as a force for good. If you view that as a force for change and making people have said, no, we're not here trying to legislate or even even the language of the law that we're supposed to enforce itself should make sure that lives are being built. If we have the discretion to do so. And as Justice Marshall's ways in which he thought about the law and using the law, that gave me a sense of purpose in my own judicial philosophy so that when I think about the discretion that judges have and trust me, Wisconsin judges, especially those who serve in the U.S. courts, we have a lot of discretion where we can implement all kinds of things that have not codified the statute, you know, in case law that you have to make ruling on in the everyday. So you make those decisions. So I still remember the time that I had these ideas about Justice Marshall using it and Ravi's modification and decision to need to desegregate all these schools and bring our communities together. I think about the times in my courtroom when I had a young child come into my courtroom, my poor child, and I still see him strikes. And I ask myself, what do I use my discretion for in this moment to make this child better? To make sure the lives of the children are better. And when I pushed for taking away anchor children out of the in Dane County. But I also joined the petition and the year before Supreme Court to do is say why. It was a reminder that the law not only is about what's in books and statutes in case law, but the law.

[00:43:52] **Speaker 2** Is what little what it.

[00:43:54] **Speaker 4** Looks like in the lives of people who have it impacts change something that is wrong for you. And that is what a judge is supposed to do also. Now you just follow patterns and trends what everybody else is. But ask a critical question of why are we doing this and can we change? And so I always paid attention to how passionately Justice Marshall argued for integration in a world that seemed to be set in how we do things. Gave me the courage to do something to serve lives, to make the judiciary reflect a certain value system of affairs, kindness and equality.

[00:44:32] **Speaker 5** Just stay with. Judicial philosophy is. I'm not going to say it's complicated. It is what you do every single day that you walk into your courtroom. And my goal, in my view, with judicial philosophy, is that every single person who walks into my courtroom gets a fair shake. I think common sense, Judge, I was a common sense prosecutor. And I'll be a commonsense justice on the Supreme Court. There's no thumb on the scale. Put it down a weight for one side or the other. Everybody is treated absolutely fairly. I read in some sentences that parties don't like, but my goal is when they walk out of the courtroom that everybody feels as though they've been treated fairly in regard to specific cases. I have a couple of them that have really impacted me. We talked about Brown versus the School of Education. We talked a little bit about Plessy versus Ferguson. And it's a precursor. And I think it's critical that when you look at those two cases, you see that Plessy versus Ferguson talked about separate but equal. What did we learn back in high school? Always separate, never equal. That's what we learned in a class in Ferguson. Then when you come forward to the Board of Education, where those laws are struck down, and to me and my judicial philosophy that tells you, is that we are a living, breathing document and our laws change and they evolve and the case law changes and evolves. I think that that is critically important. So fairness, evolution, no down on the scale. Everybody being treated equitably would be what I would have to say is my judicial philosophy. Judge Stern. So the role of the judge at its core is to apply the law, not make it. Laws are written and words have meaning. Everybody knows this. We use words every single day in the contract we enter agents in the world make so that they will be applied, that we expect that the words we use in those moments of our wills and our contracts will be twisted later on by giving them a meaning that we didn't intend or frankly, wasn't even in existence when we use them. Statutes and the Constitution should be treated differently. The role of a judge should not be interfered with by our political views, where a black wrote in part to tell of our authority, but also to shield us from the biases and the prejudice that we and others bring from our personal experiences. You know, I spent nine of my 11 year on the trial court bench in key leadership positions, dedicating my career to improving the justice system. I have been appointed three times by the Wisconsin Supreme Court to serve as a chief judge. And I've been selected and have the honor and privilege by my peers to serve as the chair of the Committee of Chief Judges or Chief of the Chiefs, or we in fact, we refer to it. That is where judges can really have an impact on improving the justice system. Of course, we need to be fair and impartial in every case that comes before us. The litigants deserve it. The victims deserve it. The families of everyone involved, the accused, they deserve it as well. But it starts and ends with our commitment to be fair and impartial and to get to due respect to the role that our founders gave to us when they instituted the three branches of government.

[00:48:59] **Speaker 2** Justice So I'm influenced by all of the court of Kenyans in which the justices have demonstrated fidelity to the Constitution. That's the North Star for us, fidelity to the Constitution. Now, sometimes circumstances call for the Constitution to change. That's why to both the United States Constitution is our Wisconsin constitution providing for amendments, amendments in which the people and their representatives decide how and when those constitutions are going to change. It does not change in it has over the courts. It must not ever change in the hands of the court is a fundamentally illegitimate set to take. The reason for that is because of the nature of the authority that we wield. You see what the people of Wisconsin put together our Constitution. They did not ask us what our views on the Constitution were. They did not ask us to decide what laws are important and effective and which are not. They asked us to do one thing. We used to find court cases according to the way the law is written. And we all take we, we, the people will take care of it if those laws or the Constitution needs to change. Now, there's been mentioned both the Plessy in Brown versus Board of Education. I think that's Vegas. Plessy was wrong. It was wrong that day. It was decided it was wrong every day after that. And when Brown came along and overruled, it was not because they took the Constitution into their own hands to change it. It is because they looked at Plessy and they compared it to the Constitution, and they said Plessy was simply wrong. And we are fixing that error. Now, I'm the only candidate in this race who has experience doing this sort of thing. Now, this might be a little self-referential. I apologize that, but I wrote the opinion in the techy tab versus Department of Revenue. Now, that wasn't the case. As monumental as Plessy and Brown was. The question of whether the Supreme Court of the state of Wisconsin had gone off on the wrong track for about 100 years. The question there was who decides, as a final matter, how to apply the law? Is it an executive agency for the Supreme Court's, for the crash, for the people of Wisconsin entrusted with the judicial power? No reports about 100 years. The Supreme Court has slowly begun deferring to administrative agencies interpretations of the law, and they concluded that we we have to defer to what they think the law is. So we researched that. We compared it to the Constitution, and we concluded that those precedents were wrong. They were wrong the day they were decided. They were wrong every day after that. So it was our responsibility, our job to correct that wrong. And it was my honor to write the opinion interpretation in which we said we are repatriating. And according to the court, American law passed with the judicial. And the consequence of that is that when you have cases in which the government is a party, you'll be assured there is the court applying the law and not your opponent in the courtroom.

[00:53:01] **Speaker 1** And we will tell you from our purpose when we want that redistricting door total complete, that's the door to apologize or to justice is your precedent for summarizing the dozens and dozens and dozens of pages you guys wrote about the district in the past year and a half that said directors, of which the court issued some rulings that this one was the hardest take, least changed approach. Matthew Smith They did eventually picked a map drawn by GOP lawmakers because all that record and was race neutral. My question is, was the court correct require at least change of process? And do you believe there are conditions, Wisconsin, that meets the requirements to allow race to be considered as a factor drawing political boundaries?

[00:53:43] **Speaker 5** So let's be clear here. The maps are a red flag, one absolutely, positively red, and they do not reflect the people in the state. They do not reflect accurately representation, neither the state assembly or the state Senate. They are red, period. Come right out and say that I don't think you can sell to any reasonable person that the maps are very. Please change your approach. I mean, I think the idea of it might sound good to some people. I see no basis for in the Constitution, no basis and case law. Basically, what the least change in approach has done has taken votes away from meaningful votes away from people in larger communities in Dane County and Milwaukee. I believe the gerrymandering decision was wrong. As I indicated to you before, I can't ever tell you what I would do on a particular case, but I can tell you my values and common sense tell you that it's wrong. And I was talking to somebody and the person used this phrase with me in regards to the maps, and I wrote it down. So I get it right because I think it is so interesting. They said Wisconsin to the voters, choose the politicians or the politicians choose the voters. Right. And that absolutely resonates with me. So as I've indicated, I think those maps are rigged. I think they're unfair. I don't think they fairly reflect the population in our state.

[00:55:18] **Speaker 1** And generally.

[00:55:21] **Speaker 5** I think we all would agree that that happened this past year was very interesting and unique following the census. Every ten years, the legislature and the governor are tasked with coming up with the maps. The process is guided by the principle of one person, one vote, the Voting Rights Act and the Wisconsin Constitution. When the legislature and the governor could not agree on the maps, the Supreme Court was asked to step in. And that, of course, we saw a very unusual back and forth between the Wisconsin Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court. Ultimately, after the U.S. Supreme Court reversed our court, the 2020 maps proposed by the legislature was adopted. Now there is talk about further challenges. So I will not put myself in a position to prejudge anything. But as with any case, I will listen to the challenge and I will apply the law to the task at hand. Thank you.

[00:56:28] **Speaker 2** Justice Scalia I think when someone tells you what their values are, in answer to a legal question, they're telling you how they're going to decide the case. This redistricting map isn't entirely political as it involves political calculation. It involves communities of interest, involves give and take. It involves compromise. It involves the political process. It is political from start to ends. Now, there are legal elements to allow the phrase This change is meant to capture what the court's responsibility is when it has to be considered in redistricting. So we we do have legal standards for what a map must do, has to have equal population. And if you look at our Constitution, Article four, Section four, it tells us that the districts must be compact and contiguous. These are legal requirements. The courts are for the law, and the law alone is not for politics. And so when a mayor comes to the court with a challenge that it is unlawful in some regard, the court's responsibility is limited to considering the legal challenges, not the political challenges. How districts get apportioned according to political considerations must have no purchase in the courts unless we are dead set on tearing down the distinctions between the branches of government that our Constitution creates. But if we are going to preserve the constitutional order, if we are going to, to make sure that our courts exist wholly and only for the purpose of deciding legal questions, then we can't let our values, our personal values or personal politics reorient what the different branches of government are supposed to do. When that name comes to the court, its mandate is the same as with respect to every other case that has ever come before the courts or will ever come before the courts decide questions of law, not politics.

[00:59:15] **Speaker 1** George Mitchell.

[00:59:18] **Speaker 4** I think I'll my comments around this idea from Justice Ginsburg in the her dissent in Shelby County versus Alabama versus Holder. And Justice Ginsburg said the evolution of voting discrimination and to more subtle second generation barriers is powerful evidence that the remedy as effective as preclearance, remains vital to protect minority voting rights and to prevent backslide. She said the second generation of barriers are no longer said. It's a reminder that when we think about the major massive decision that the Supreme Court was in many ways had to make that decision. It is because our democracy in many ways has become broken, partizanship has become broken, and now they're looking to the courts to answer questions for which courts should be focused on the law. But now we're being forced to answer questions because democracy is no longer work. So I think in order to restore people's faith in our democracy, what we need to do is to ensure that legislative districts are drawn in a fair, nonpartisan way. And I think the way our extremely personal maps of God and we're saying to folks both on the left and to the right, it's your voices don't matter. In these districts, only party leadership does. So I think you're right in the sense that, yes, the law is a place for us to consider these bigger things, but it's also the implications that our laws will have upon the lives of people that I believe our Constitution asks us to be able to make. Just an example that we were given earlier when we talked about overturning Plessy versus overturning the Plessy and implementing Brown versus Board of Education. They implemented that idea not because they were following the law, because they understood the implications of having children educated in separate environments and what that meant. Also, they understand why the Supreme Court also supported same gender marriage because of the social implications of what this also looked like as it relates to piracy. So I believe our our maps that we have now have read the so many people have a particular voice that is necessary and the standard of least change approach anytime, any time as a as a as an African-American and judicial space is here, the world needs change, of course. It just brings up all kind of parts of how people do want to change stuff because it did not empower our communities and our communities. Whether it is black, Wade is native. I bet you if you have some native jurisdictions, same thing. And this is to me to say the same thing, let's change. The court always means the same. It always means wait. It always means never, and it always means more oppression and more pain for folks who don't have a voice in the political process. So the role in which we want to play, we all have values and is our importance. It is important to you to know our values so you can decide who you want to be sitting in that black robe making decisions about the values of our state. I will say this and I'm done. I wasn't born in Wisconsin, but I chose Wisconsin as a place to have my children, as a place to be a community because of the values of people that I see in this state, all throughout this state. My wife and I traveled this entire state with the intended purpose of introducing the state to journey every mission and everybody in my community was like, You got to be careful when you go throughout the state. And I said to them when I gave a five minute speech and a person asked me, Do you want to come hang out with us later? I was like, okay, this is Wisconsin because it is more welcoming. And those are the people that I make sure that we pay attention to in that space, because they are the ones who we are making a constitution commitment to ensure that we're following the rule of law. That particular panel of.

[01:03:23] **Speaker 3** I will do one more question for all of you and then take some audience questions. Just earlier, start with you on this one. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2008 that the right to bear arms doesn't only apply to militia, but to all individuals. In doing so, it overturned the District of Columbia's handgun ban and requirement that lawfully owned rifles and shotguns be kept unloaded, disassembled or bound by a trigger lock. Would you have sided with the majority or minority in that case? And please explain why.

[01:03:56] **Speaker 4** For a long time. So by 19 things, in one hand, I would feel I could do it. Go ahead.

[01:04:05] **Speaker 3** The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2008 that the right to bear arms doesn't only apply to militia, but to all individuals. In doing so, it overturned the District of Columbia's handgun ban and requirement that lawfully owned rifles and shotguns be kept unloaded, disassembled or bound by a trigger lock. The question is, would you have sided with the majority or minority in the case? And please explain why.

[01:04:29] **Speaker 5** Judge Earle In our country, we have not only the Constitution that's made up of the original words of our founders, but then we have the Bill of Rights within that Bill of rights. There are a number of very important rights that are important to our communities, are important to our democracy. And I believe we shouldn't pick and choose which ones we need to follow. As with any case before me. I would start with the law. I'm going to look at what the law means. I'm going to consider the challenge that is before me, the facts of their case, and then apply the law as written to the facts of that case. That's really at the core of what a judge and justice is. I think we all can imagine a variety of settings where the Second Amendment is brought to the Supreme Court for a decision that is implicated in a case. I want to be true to my ethical obligations about not prejudging or letting my personal biases or opinions or even what I want the law to be about to influence what I do. And that means I need to start again, as I said before, with the facts, with the law, and only render a decision that addresses those very specific things. So because cases raising the Second Amendment are very likely to come before the Supreme Court, I'm going to leave my answer at that and make a pledge to all of you at once again. I will start with the law and I will apply the law to the facts. Every decision, every time.

[01:06:34] **Speaker 3** Thank you, Justice Kelley.

[01:06:35] **Speaker 2** So I heard the Second Amendment is something of a controversial provision of our Bill of Rights. You know, one of the reasons that we create a constitutional language is to put it beyond the reach of simple majority rule. It might be that any given time in our history, the people would favor the keeping the various forms. And then time goes along, circumstances change and people might decide, Well, I don't like that so much anymore. Well, we have a way of accommodating those changes in time. We call it amendments. The Second Amendment came into existence as the same states as an amendment did not exist in the original Constitution. So the question is, when we see that language, the promises, the right to keep and bear arms, what do we do with it? Do we take a survey of current impressions and preferences and determine to most people like the terms of the Second Amendment? And if they do, then we will uphold the terms and we will say that it is okay to keep and bear arms. Or do we say, you know, ten times have changed and people really aren't that committed to the keeping and bearing of arms anymore? And so as justices, we're going to strike that down. The role, of course, is to not look at passing fads and fancies. Changes in political party is to apply the law now in this instance. The question is what did that language mean when it was passed and adopted in 1791? So the role of the court is to discover the original public meaning of the terms included in the Second Amendment and then to officially apply those without regard to what opinion polls might say today about the popularity or lack thereof of the Second Amendment. And that's the role of a justice. I can tell you it's not easy. There are rulings that I've made that were commanded by our law, by our Constitution, and I was raked over the coals, sometimes by the left, sometimes by the right to my commitment every single time was to simply apply the law as it exists, because my confidence is in the people of Wisconsin that if they are so opposed to a particular standard, if they're so desirous of changing the law, they will move heaven and earth to make sure that it changes. And they've done that a lot. You can look at our Constitution and go through and see all the amendments that have occurred over time. So my confidence is in the people of Wisconsin, not in four lawyers sitting in a madison courtroom thinking that they know what the Constitution ought to say, thinking they know what the law ought to be. Our responsibilities, sit outside and wait for the people of Wisconsin to make their call. Do I think our decision was right? Of course it was. It inquired into the original public meaning of the Second Amendment, and that's precisely what it meant. The right to keep and bear arms. Do I understand there are people who wish that were not true? Yes, I do. And to those of you, I suggest you do your organizing and follow the constitutional process for changing that, rather than asking your members of the courts to disregard their oath of office to steal the power of the people of Wisconsin and the legislature to change it themselves.

[01:11:19] **Speaker 3** Thank you, Judge Mitchell.

[01:11:23] **Speaker 4** I saw by answer to your question up front is the law that says I actually hear the facts of the case. I'm not going to tell you how to rule in that case. Does that make sense? No. All right. But in terms of values, what I think is very important is I think Dan said something when he talked about, well, one group that disagrees is that we should really be paying attention to our law enforcement officers, our rank and file, who also indicated that the number of guns on the streets outnumber the amount of Americans that we have, everybody in America. We look at all the guns on the street. Everybody could have seven guns on them. And I think listening to the people, one of our law enforcement who've been saying about the number of guns on the streets makes their job almost unsafe. I think about the tragic case of the young man, ten years old, in Milwaukee to the mother's life. It is reminder that guns are not toys. How we play with guns and not toys, how we talk about these guns and these mass violence, they tend to have been used to take lives of so many people as a consistent reminder of us better decisions that we make and how we make them and how we understand the rule of law. And what that looks like has real implications on people's lives. Now with Karen Casey on and so I have not permit. And so I recognize the importance of the Second Amendment. And I recognize and I will and I own that because that is an important value that I think everybody should have. But the stuff that we're seeing right now has far more far reaching implications for people whose lives are being taken on an everyday basis. Murder rates all the way in Milwaukee and different states around us remind us of the critical nature in which we are supposed to be engaged in these conversations. We may not understand how we rule because of the fact that, you know, we're supposed to follow the rule of law. But it's clear that when certain facts come to us a certain kind of way, it is important for us to think about the implications that are going to have on the facts that are being presented to us. And when we make our movements and when we demonstrate our rules, we need to make sure that they're narrowly tailored so as not to lean so far. One way to give one group influence or means another way that they are totally takes away the capacity for one group not to be able to give a voice to advocacy that they need. Because at the end of the day, you know, lives are being lost, will not be attentive to the commitment that we have to the rule of law, but also to the lives impacted when we don't do our jobs as consistently and affordably as we need to.

[01:13:55] **Speaker 3** So thank you. Thank you, Judge Fortes with.

[01:13:58] **Speaker 5** That's a very challenging question. I have not carefully read the dissent. I have not carefully read the majority opinion. I don't know what the legislative history is behind the law in the District of Columbia. I didn't hear the attorneys arguments. I haven't reviewed the briefs, so I'm not able to tell you. Do I agree with the majority or the dissent in that case? I can't tell you what I can tell you. This is all a balancing act. Obviously, we have the Second Amendment. People are entitled to bear firearms. We all know that. I also can tell you that I know lots of responsible firearm owners, many responsible firearm owners. I also have seen many irresponsible firearm users. So the question becomes, was that an overreach by the United States Supreme Court or was that an appropriate decision on this particular case? I'll tell you, I am well aware of what's going on in the community with firearms. I am well aware that the community is frequently people in the community frequently don't feel like they're safe because of the number of firearms in the community. But like I said earlier, I can also tell you there are many, many responsible firearm are owners and firearms users. So I am not going to take a position on this case until I very carefully read it. Thank you.

[01:15:24] **Speaker 1** Thank you. We're getting close to time. We have two quick audience questions. The first one. I'm hoping to do it like in 3 seconds or less. All right. My favorite founding father and why Justice Kelley wrote first.

[01:15:42] **Speaker 2** I guess I'd have to say Alexander Hamilton.

[01:15:44] **Speaker 4** Oh, come on, man.

[01:15:57] **Speaker 2** Oh, you're supposed to say so. I can read.

[01:16:02] **Speaker 5** It while.

[01:16:03] **Speaker 2** He's still lengthy. And there's a reason for that is because he wrote so extensively about the nature of the court and its function. He really was the first expositor of the important but limited role that the court has any constitutional safeguards. He understood the dangers that happen when you combine the powers of different branches into what he called the court the least dangerous branch. Why? Because it has neither the power, the sword, nor the purse. It can't require anything. It can't do anything with moral force that belongs to the executive branch. All it has is its judgment. And he goes on to say that even the execution of that judgment is entirely dependent on the executive branch. It is the least dangerous, but only so far as it does its job and only its job. She went on to say that if it should ever combine itself with the powers of the legislature, that would then become the very definition of tyranny. But I have heard a fair amount this afternoon is my opponent's talking about their values and what they think that the law ought to do. That is the step towards the combination of the power of the judiciary and the legislature. That is a step we cannot take. Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton's my favorite. Because he explains the importance of keeping those branches separate. And he went on to explain the dangers that occur if the court steps outside of its constitutionally limited role. Not in place. And great production about the tennis courts?

[01:18:20] **Speaker 4** Well.

[01:18:22] **Speaker 2** Yes, indeed.

[01:18:23] **Speaker 1** The judge vigilant.

[01:18:26] **Speaker 4** Well, to to to go off what you said, Alexander Holmes, I'm not going to take away my shot and. Right. Right. Oh, I think for me, if I have to do an answer, which is always complex, you know, for African-American communities were enslaved at the time of the founding of this country, I would say Thomas Jefferson probably gives me the greatest one because he also penned those revolutionary words, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And he's also the one who also codified the idea of what race is in the local state of Virginia. When he said that the blacks are inferior and whites are superior, giving our country the first time a theory of race in our country. So it is a juxtaposition of founding fathers who also inspired for what this country, this young country to become. But it's also a recognition that as they had aspirations, aspiration for some, it didn't have that aspiration of ours. And so I live in that intricate space of balance between those two communities at the same time, because there were so many who were not included in that space and that and yet at the same time, it is still the same values again, that my mentor and, you know, God mentor, Justice Marshall, said that we have a right to live in as well. And I use that same argument to say we should overturn these laws that oppressed people and make sure that we have integration of community. So so he still acts on the mantle. So I.

[01:19:52] **Speaker 1** Would not. Jeffrey Toobin was with.

[01:19:56] **Speaker 5** Our founding Fathers. We're obviously a brilliant group, but they had some flaws, Right. I like the two founding fathers that my opponents have mentioned. Salsa for somebody else. I'll take John Adams. Brilliance, creative, hard working, hard, scrappy New Englander, staying away from Abigail, fighting so hard to form this country saw little John Adams.

[01:20:22] **Speaker 1** Maybe George Durrell.

[01:20:23] **Speaker 5** I want to take a little bit different approach to this, and I think back to our very first President, George Washington. And the reason why I'm selecting him is because he had an unwavering commitment to his faith in the face of incredible tyranny. A man who's kind of like a David against Goliath went out and led our troops in battle against the tyrannical government that King George had thrust upon the colonies. And even though there weren't a lot of founding fathers, I know there were a lot of women supporting those men. Women like Betsy Ross, of course. But I can still look at someone like George Washington and be very proud of his faith and how he brought that faith to his role as president. And I'm proud to say I like him a lot.

[01:21:15] **Speaker 3** All right. Last question for all candidates. The state's high court has and has and is expected to hear many cases addressing the voting laws. Judge Mitchell, we'll start with you. How do you plan to protect voting rights?

[01:21:31] **Speaker 4** You know, as I have always talked about, I mean, voting is an essential part of my of my values because it is rooted in the law. In 1965, when he signed the Voting Rights Act. The whole intention of the Voting Rights Act was that all branches of government, including civil rights leaders who endured the brutality of Selma, was to expand access for all people to participate in the political process at the local, state and national level. Any time we have an erosion of that law and those principles, we are losing what is foundation for our community. So I think for me, obviously, I don't know facts. I don't know what cases, maybe I don't know those issues. But I can tell you that being able to overcome so much in our history, the historical nature of our community so we could be able to check that box is in my DNA. And so it is a consistent value that I would want to make sure that we protect that value and make sure that within our discretion to be able to to view the law a certain way, that the lens of that we have a ruling and make sure that we protect it as a work last year. But I have a love for the library. And when it comes to that, when it comes to the Constitution League, we have to have some sense when we pay attention to the historical nature of the document. But we also have to have a living approach to it to understand the implications of what the law moves us to. And so for me, there's nothing more critical than the voice of the democracy of people and making sure that they have access to the ballot and make sure they have access to the right to vote. And that goes no matter how young you or old you are. Everybody should make sure they have access to that. And and well, we can make those decisions and we do. I think we must lean always on the side of opening our democracy rather than shrinking.

[01:23:23] **Speaker 5** Thank you, Judge, for statements. Thank you. I think this question dovetails into some of the areas that we've already talked about. Right. Our founding fathers maps gerrymandering. And I suspect the reason we are asked about our favorite patriot or founding father has to do with what our values are, what our history has taught us, what we think, what we think going forward. Remember, we fought that battle against Great Britain in the 1700s when it wasn't necessarily popular. A third of the people wanted to split from Great Britain. A third of the people wanted to stay with Great Britain. About a third of the people were indifferent. Right. But that third, who are really, really fighting to separate. We're fighting to separate for one reason. They wanted fair representation. Remember the Boston Tea Party? Remember the Stamp Act? Everything we've talked about taxation without representation. It all comes back to that. And then that question dovetails with that gerrymandering question. When I said to all of you, to the voters, pick the politicians or the politicians to get the voters right. It all comes back to representation and every single person voice should be heard. That is what is so critically unique about this country. Every single person's voice should be heard. So what case has been coming to the Wisconsin Supreme Court? I would suspect so. But I can tell you our entire history is all about our democracy and having everybody's voice heard. George girl. So not only is the right to vote essential, it is core to our democracy. I also believe that election integrity is vital. The system needs to be fair and reliable, and the people need to be confident that it works as it should in future cases. Making ballot access claims. I will apply well developed case law from the United States Supreme Court, and as with any case that comes before the court, I will listen to the challenge and then apply the law fairly and faithfully to the facts of that case. Thank you.

[01:25:40] **Speaker 3** You just say.

[01:25:42] **Speaker 2** So. I believe part of the question was how will you enforce the law? Could you.

[01:25:48] **Speaker 3** How do you how do you plan to protect voting rights?

[01:25:51] **Speaker 2** Right. So my plan to protect voting rights is to do my part of the job. So this goes back to the whole question about what is the proper role and function of the court within the constitutional construct. Now, I know we're sitting here talking about the Supreme Court election, so we're focused pretty heavily on the court's side. But a justice must never lose sight of the fact that the justice resides in only one third of the governments created by our Constitution. And the protection of voting rights is a collaborative work amongst the three branches. The legislature makes the law, the executive executes the law, and the court does one thing. It resolves legal questions about the law. It doesn't tell the legislature you didn't think wisely about this. It doesn't help the legislature. There's a better way of doing this. It doesn't tell the executive you should be more energetic. Improper justice concentrates on simply the role of the courts to decide disputed questions. A law used that to resolve the case, nothing more. Now some might have more ambitions for them. Some may look at voting rights and say we need to be more active in this. We need to reach outside the authority of the courts. We need to adopt laws that I think should be in place or perhaps will just stretch the boundaries creatively for the laws that are already there. That's not for us to do that with great faith, not only with our Constitution. It would break faith with we, the people of Wisconsin, because it would be going beyond what you have asked us to do. And we'd be venturing into that space that Alexander Hamilton warned about where tyranny resides. When we start combining our power for the power of the other branches. How will I protests first and foremost by not exercising anything but a judicial authority, and then by faithfully applying the terms of the law to your representatives? The legislation I'm chosen and then relying on the people of Wisconsin that if they think that there is to be a different standard, that you'll take care of business, you'll let your legislators know that there needs to be a difference.

[01:28:52] **Speaker 1** Thank you. Thank you. Thank you all for you for coming today. Link to our sponsor as well as State bar. Thank you all for coming. Listen, we appreciate your time.