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[00:00:00] **Speaker 1** to walk free. My worst nightmare as a mom is really disqualifying. I don't think Susan Crawford deserves to wear the rope.

[00:00:38] **Speaker 2** It was just a one -time thing. That's what Brad Schimel said when he gave a, quote, sweet bargain to a man who sexually assaulted a 10 -year -old girl. The sex predator served just 18 months in prison for his crime and got out. A few weeks ago, he was convicted of sexually assaulting a child again. And that was just one time Brad Schimel let a sex predator loose on our kids. So why would we ever give him another chance? Brad Schimel, too extreme for the Supreme Court.

[00:01:09] **Speaker 3** A great white has taken out our electrical systems. We can't move, and we can't send it to stress signal. We've got critically ill patients, they need to be ready for evac to a hospital.

[00:01:21] **Speaker 4** It's a two -hour boat. I guess I should be the one out there.

[00:01:39] **Speaker 5** Passenger Giggle Fest next.

[00:01:43] **Speaker 6** Travel consideration provided by

[00:01:50] **Speaker 7** Imagine checking your own heart with medical precision from anywhere. Introducing Cardia Mobile 6L, the FDA cleared EKG that provides six times more heart data than any smartwatch. And it detects three of the most common arrhythmias in just 30 seconds, including atrial fibrillation, bradycardia, and tachycardia. Check your heart with the most advanced personal EKG outside the hospital. Get yours at cardia .com or Amazon.

[00:02:17] **Speaker 6** Stay tuned, there's more Inside Edition to come.

[00:02:22] **Speaker 8** Extremist Brad Schimel supports the 1849 law that would ban abortion in Wisconsin, even in the case of rape or incest, or to protect the mother's health. Schimel says we have no right to an abortion and supported overturning Roe vs. Wade. No surprise Schimel is backed by radicals who oppose birth control and IVF. With our rights on the line, Schimel would be the deciding vote on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. But he's an extremist politician who puts Wisconsin women in danger.

[00:02:52] **Speaker 6** Tiffany's daughter was struck in a hit -and -run accident.

[00:02:54] **Speaker 9** We only had one opportunity.

[00:02:56] **Speaker 6** to get this right. She called. She'll be in Abraham.

[00:02:59] **Speaker 9** QP and Abraham knows how to get what your family definitely deserves.

[00:03:04] **Speaker 6** medical bills, pain, suffering, lost wages, all the money you may deserve. Call now. Your case is probably worth more than you've been told. Call 800 -800 -5678. Hupy and Abraham.

[00:03:20] **Speaker 9** They really do mean business. We've been doing projects in this house for six years and haven't had a single quality issue. The product is incredible. The workmanship is incredible. issue.

[00:03:31] **Speaker 5** by one window. Get 1 30 % off at next window dot com. Finally today, this guy definitely has room to spread out.

[00:03:45] **Speaker 10** This guy is the only passenger on a plane. And the Delta flight attendant gives the safety instructions just for him. He thinks it's hilarious. Yes, ma 'am!

[00:03:59] **Speaker 5** I'd be happy to hope you got some extra snacks. See you next time

[00:04:08] **Speaker 11** Attention. If you suffer from consistent pain in your joints caused by arthritis, overuse, or injury, you may be a candidate for a revolutionary therapy that could revitalize damaged tissue. This approach can provide long -lasting relief from pain in your knees, shoulders, hips, and other joints with no surgery, no drugs, and no downtime. To find out if you're a viable candidate, you may request a free consultation from QC Kinetics by calling six zero eight nine two five three six two eight Instead of masking the symptoms, it goes to the root of the problem to resolve it at its source. Already used by thousands of satisfied patients nationwide, this joint pain therapy is available right now to the public, but only for qualified candidates. Again, to find out if you're a viable candidate for this therapy, you may request a free consultation by calling QC Kinetics at 608 -925 -3628. Again, that's 608 -925 -3628.

[00:05:09] **Speaker 5** your home is a place of comfort and protection. That's why our durable, energy -efficient, and weather -resistant windows, roofing, siding, and gutters, as well as our bathtubs and showers, are guaranteed. Scan the code to try our new, free Design Studio app. Upload a few pictures of your home and transform your home in 3D. Get 60 % off installation. Special financing available.

[00:05:33] **Speaker 7** Call 1 -800 -HANDSUNS, get it done!

[00:05:38] **Speaker 6** The threat of severe weather on our horizon.

[00:05:50] **Speaker 12** This is one sexy automobile. If Margot Robbie were a car, she'd be a 1960s -

[00:05:55] **Speaker 13** potty head fire burn. It looks great, boy. I'll tell you what. We got a modified suspension. All disk brakes, a straight -six modified O -Rite cam. Oh, yeah. Keep talking, baby.

[00:06:08] **Speaker 9** Y 'all need girlfriends.

[00:06:11] **Speaker 13** No, no, no, don't touch it, don't, you know, Mr. J. Leno, very picky about his paint jobs. Hey, listen, wait a minute, do you want to hear Grease Ricky's touch record?

[00:06:21] **Speaker 12** You sound like Tickle Me Elmo.

[00:06:24] **Speaker 13** You guys are crazy. It sounds just like Leno. Drop the mic. Come on, let's do some gag. Little bits.

[00:06:29] **Speaker 1** There's the man I'm looking for. Did anyone ever call you Matty? Never more than once. Are you familiar with the North Hollywood Improvement Association? Oh, I love NoHo Imp Ass. Anyway, we're fixing up that janky park down the street I was hoping you'd join the other local businesses and donating an item for our auction. It'd be great PR for the shop

[00:06:52] **Speaker 13** Much like your biblical namesake, Eve, I think you're trying to tempt me, but unlike Adam, I'm not going to bite on your apple.

[00:07:00] **Speaker 1** Come on, why won't you help us out? This is a fundraiser for a good cause. Just donate something small like a tire change or your heart.

[00:07:11] **Speaker 13** We're a restoration shop, we don't do tire changes, and I have no heart. Bye -bye.

[00:07:16] **Speaker 12** Hey, man, come on, man. Park's not important. Plus, the world could use some generosity from white guys with money.

[00:07:21] **Speaker 13** since she took Snoop Dogg from us. A very generous heart. A generous man. I'm letting two of my employees stand around here doing nothing with their thumbs in their butts.

[00:07:32] **Speaker 6** For the record, my thumb was nowhere near my butt.

[00:07:36] **Speaker 1** Cute I have a few friends that you could make really happy for like a week

[00:07:41] **Speaker 12** Thank you.

[00:07:43] **Speaker 1** So, you like parks?

[00:07:44] **Speaker 12** Oh, I love parks. Spent my whole childhood in them. I crashed so many quinceañeras. Them piñatas didn't stand a chance.

[00:07:52] **Speaker 1** Love it! So what are you donating?

[00:07:53] **Speaker 6** We could make one of those charity calendars. You know, the hot mechanics of Parker Restoration?

[00:08:00] **Speaker 1** I was thinking more along the lines of a tuna.

[00:08:02] **Speaker 6** Like a sexy tune up?

[00:08:04] **Speaker 1** Stitch. Oh, my God, Wendy is going to love you. Well, what about you? I bet you're incredibly talented at something.

[00:08:13] **Speaker 12** I do a little DJing, mainly for my friends. But I did one slam in Pac -Man's foot.

[00:08:20] **Speaker 1** Hello, Brick! Perfect. I'll put you down for a four -hour event. Gabe, unlimited auto care for a year. Dancing optional.

[00:08:28] **Speaker 6** Oh, there will be dancing. Stitch.

[00:08:33] **Speaker 1** I'll text you Wendy's number.

[00:08:48] **Speaker 14** Uh, Mom, is it okay if I have some friends over after school to play some video games? Friends? Oh, that's nice. Did you hire them? No, she didn't hire them. You didn't, right?

[00:09:04] **Speaker 15** You think I can afford friends for you? I can't afford new bras. So, who are they?

[00:09:09] **Speaker 14** Just a couple guys, I call them my crew. They call me C -Dog. Not sure what the C stands for, but Duh, chill dude, it might make sense. This is

[00:09:20] **Speaker 15** It's hard to watch.

[00:09:22] **Speaker 13** So what's their angle, Carter?

[00:09:24] **Speaker 15** If they don't have an angle, they want to hang out with them.

[00:09:27] **Speaker 13** I don't buy it, no offense, but I don't know if I want strange kids coming over here. God knows what they're bringing in, drugs, weapons, crackers made of seaweed, who knows what.

[00:09:37] **Speaker 15** He needs to make friends here. Just let me take the lead. This is a job for cool mom, not get off my long grandpa.

[00:09:48] **Speaker 12** Hey, guys. Hey, Eve, what's up? Hey, how's the auction going? How many bids you got for DJ Slow Your Roll?

[00:09:55] **Speaker 1** B -b -b -b -b -b -b -b -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a -a

[00:10:01] **Speaker 7** Don't worry guys, it's early, bidding's just getting started.

[00:10:03] **Speaker 1** The Wellness Center's already got 14 bids on a colonic.

[00:10:07] **Speaker 7** So instead of, you know, hearing you DJ, people would rather have water pumped up there. Which is hurtful. So, you know, I'm gonna go back to work.

[00:10:17] **Speaker 1** You know what? I bet people would spend a lot of money for a spin in one of these cool cars.

[00:10:21] **Speaker 7** Yeah, they would. And then they'd find our bodies in the trunk if Matt ever found out.

[00:10:26] **Speaker 1** I get it. You're daddy's boy, and you're the bad boy who plays by his own rules and doesn't care what the boss man thinks and does whatever he wants.

[00:10:36] **Speaker 12** I know what you're doing. And it's working. You know, we taking this 66 Shelby Mustang out for a test drive next week. It couldn't hurt if someone happened to be in the back seat. I'll be back to take a picture for the website. Eve, you want a video for my item?

[00:10:54] **Speaker 1** What's this? No, but I am donating five dance lessons. You might want to bid on those.

[00:11:01] **Speaker 15** Have fun on your sleepover. Be sure to thank Sophie's mother. Don't worry. Mom's love me. I compliment their hair. Say they've got good taste in music

[00:11:09] **Speaker 14** I make him feel young. Oh hey, this is Ethan and Kyle. See? They're real. Nice to meet your two followers on Instagram. Ah, good one. How's that 830 bedtime treating you?

[00:11:24] **Speaker 13** Well, well, well. Looks like the Girl Scouts got through the Sprinklers. Your dad's like a thousand.

[00:11:31] **Speaker 14** I'm a grandpa, and yeah. We're gonna go play Call of Duty.

[00:11:36] **Speaker 13** I gotta check these backpacks out first, and after that, put your hands against the wall for a little pat down. Condoms? You're never gonna need these. It's inspirational.

[00:11:52] **Speaker 15** Strip search is over. Have fun boys, I'll bring you some snacks. I don't know what you're worried about!

[00:12:02] **Speaker 4** that there is nothing wrong with that law and it should be enforced. That is not the kind of open -mindedness that we expect from judges. It is prejudicial to the parties in that case and Brad Schimel is making those pronouncements not based on the law in that case or the facts or the arguments of the attorneys but based on political considerations.

[00:12:22] **Speaker 16** I can't let that go. Quickly, and we'll get to abortion. Very fine. My opponent had someone there recording that speech. She knows what the whole speech is, not just the few seconds that they released to the media. I was asked if the 1849 law was a valid law. 1849 law was a valid law. that was a failure. And the answer is, my answer was, it was passed by two houses of the legislature and signed by a governor. That means it's a valid law. But what I said next was that there's a real question as to whether that law reflects the will of the people of Wisconsin now and today.

[00:12:56] **Speaker 17** Let's talk about abortion. So you believe the 1849 law is valid.

[00:13:00] **Speaker 16** It was a validly passed law. I don't believe, I don't believe that it reflects the will of the people of Wisconsin today.

[00:13:07] **Speaker 17** Judge, do you believe that law is valid today? The 1849 law.

[00:13:10] **Speaker 4** Well Matt, this is an issue that's pending before the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The parties in those cases have filed briefs, they've made legal arguments, they've presented evidence in support of their decision, and I'm not in a position to weigh in at this point. It would be prejudicial to the parties in that case for me to do so. So you know, what I can tell you is that as a lawyer in Wisconsin, I've represented organizations like Planned Parenthood of Wisconsin and their doctors. back when Roe versus Wade was in case, making sure that women could make their own choices about their bodies and their healthcare. As a woman, as somebody who has gone through pregnancy, labor and birth, I wanna make my own healthcare decisions and I trust women to do that.

[00:13:53] **Speaker 17** Let me set the stage real quick for our viewers, just on where everything is with abortion. Justices have yet to rule on a case involving the legality of the 1849 law. Another case brought by Planned Parenthood is pending asking justices to decide whether there's a constitutional right to an abortion in Wisconsin. So Judge Schimel, you have routinely said you're pro -life and make no apologies for that. You signed on to a 2012 legal paper from Wisconsin Right to Life, advocating a plan to make abortion illegal and keep the 1849 law in place if Roe was overturned. You've told supporters you don't believe there's a constitutional right to abortion. Is that a fair position? Is that your position?

[00:14:29] **Speaker 16** No, I think there's some things you've said that aren't correct. I've been clear from the day I got in this race on my position on abortion. My family is somewhat unique. Two 18 -year -old young women at the time, 23 and 21 years ago, gave my wife and I the chance to have a family we can't have biologically. Because of that sacrifice, my wife and I treasure those two young women. And we treasure life even when it's not planned. But judges don't make the law. As a judge, no judge or justice should be deciding this issue for the voters of Wisconsin. This issue belongs in their hands. And should it be decided by the voters, or should it be decided by four justices and a majority on the court? And if four justices on the majority in the court can make that decision for the voters, that decision can flip back and forth every time the majority flips. We have to let the voters make this decision. I've been clear on that. Now, my opponent talks about taking positions on cases. When she ran for judge in Dane County, she proudly declared that she was the lawyer that went after the abortion restrictions that were put in place. She proudly declared that she was the lawyer that went after voter ID. She was the lawyer that went after Act 10. She bragged about that when she was running in Dane County. Now that she's running and has to run in 71 other counties as well, now she backs off from things she was once proud of campaigning as a judge.

[00:15:58] **Speaker 18** Judge Crawford I want to ask you have previously Represented Planned Parenthood as you mentioned and you received the endorsement of Planned Parenthood advocates of Wisconsin in its endorsement The group called you a quote leader committed to reproductive freedom and said that you have quote upheld Constitutional rights and protected access to reproductive health care. Is that a fair characterization of you and what you would do as a justice?

[00:16:19] **Speaker 4** Well, I'm proud of the work that I did as a lawyer. I was standing up in court fighting for the rights of women and their doctors to make those decisions, those critical decisions about healthcare. You know, when I went through pregnancy and birth, a really tough, really long labor and birth, I wanted to be able to make my own decisions with my doctors and not have anybody getting in the way of those decisions. And because of the Dobbs decision of the US Supreme Court that threw away an almost 50 -year -old precedent, Roe versus Wade, that recognized a right under our Constitution for women to make their own decisions about their bodies, my 23 -year -old daughter doesn't have the same rights that I do. And what I want for her and what I want for Judge Schimel's daughters is the same thing. If they are pregnant and something goes terribly wrong in their pregnancy, I don't want them to lie bleeding on a hospital bed while their doctors are huddled in another room trying to decide if they're close enough to death before they can deliver healthcare services to them. So voters need to understand that this is a critical issue in this race. My opponent has said. He believes the 1849 law in Wisconsin is valid law. He's trying to backpedal from that position now. And he said that he does not believe there's any constitutional right to abortion under the Wisconsin Constitution. That's the choice presented to the Wisconsin voters. On that. Like That's the truth.

[00:17:45] **Speaker 18** On that, do you believe there is a constitutional right to abortion in Wisconsin?

[00:17:49] **Speaker 4** Again, I'm not going to take a position on that, because that is an issue pending before the Wisconsin Supreme Court. I have not read the briefs in that case. I have not heard the party's arguments or seen the kind of evidence they've presented in support of their positions. That's an open question. That's a question that will be decided by the Wisconsin Supreme Court. What I can say is that I believe that Dab's decision was wrongly decided when the US Supreme Court, for the first time ever. overturned a precedent that had extended and recognized constitutional rights to women through our country. It threw it away. And now here we are, back in the state of Wisconsin, having to re -litigate and re -decide these critical issues, these life and death matters, these very personal decisions about health care that women have to make.

[00:18:37] **Speaker 17** I want to turn to money in the race. This is a problem.

[00:18:40] **Speaker 16** part of this campaign. I'm sorry, but she just said several things about me that I need to respond to. Go ahead.

[00:18:45] **Speaker 17** Go ahead, quickly.

[00:18:46] **Speaker 16** Again, the 1849 law, those oral arguments were completed five months ago from yesterday. I don't know why the Supreme Court hasn't been able to issue that decision yet, but I think they're playing politics. They're waiting until after this election to keep the 1849 law a live issue. That 1849 law is going to be resolved by the Supreme Court long before I take the bench on August 1st. And what I said about the Constitution... I said that the word abortion doesn't appear in the Wisconsin Constitution. So if there's a constitutional right there to abortion, someone's going to have to make a creative legal argument to explain where that is implied within that constitution.

[00:19:28] **Speaker 17** Let's move to money in the race with politics, our editorial partner at Upfront. Just tally the record, $59 million spent on this race and counting. You both received praise and criticism for the support you have received. Judge Crawford from Elon Musk, for example. Judge Schimel, that is, from Elon Musk, for example. Judge Crawford from George Soros. At least we got a laugh from the audience a few minutes into this. from George Soros. I want to first quickly start with this. Judge Schimel, do you embrace the endorsement of Elon Musk?

[00:19:59] **Speaker 16** I got in this race over 15 months ago. I have campaigned in all 72 counties. I've gone to every corner of this state. I'm looking for the endorsement of the Wisconsin voters on April 1st. Outside help that comes is not something I control. It is expensive and it's difficult to get your message out on the airwaves to all the voters of Wisconsin, but there's a difference here. My opponent was supported by George Soros. That man has funded DAs and judges, fair enough, but I'd like to talk about it. He's funded DAs and judges who have let dangerous criminals out on the street. He's funded efforts to defund the police in America. He's a dangerous person to have an endorsement from. Recently, Bernie Sanders is campaigning in Wisconsin. They had a singer perform an absolutely grotesque attack on people of faith. And that crowd of my opponent's supporters applauded wildly as that person blasphemed against the God that so many Wisconsinites believe in, taunted us for being believers. And they got up after that speech and said, Those people in that audience need to vote for my opponent because she shares our values. Nobody in the media has asked her to disavow that. She should disavow that kind of hate speech.

[00:21:26] **Speaker 4** Well, I do disavow that. I heard some of those lyrics and I don't agree with those sentiments. It wasn't my event. It wasn't. I wasn't there, I didn't organize it, and I certainly didn't hire the singer. But let's get back to campaign finance. But let's get back to campaign finance.

[00:21:39] **Speaker 17** Let me ask you about George Soros. Do you embrace his endorsement and his spending on your...

[00:21:42] **Speaker 4** You know, I have had generous contributions that have gone to the Democratic Party of Wisconsin, the Democratic Party of Wisconsin has endorsed me and supported my candidacy. But let's talk about Elon Musk, talk about somebody who's been dangerous, who's firing air traffic controllers, who's firing the people who are trying to figure out the avian flu issue that is causing the cost of eggs to increase so rapidly in Wisconsin. He has now spent over $10 million on My Opponent's Race. He has basically taken over Brad Schimel's campaign. He's got paid canvassers who are knocking on doors, handing out flyers that say, support the Trump agenda. Put Brad Schimel on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. He is putting false ads out and deceptive ads that try to make me look like a more far -left liberal person than I have ever been in my life. and he's putting these untrue ads out on television. He is the one, this is unprecedented to see this kind of spending on a race and it is no coincidence that Elon Musk started spending that money within days of Tesla filing a lawsuit in Wisconsin. Two quick questions. He's trying to buy access and influence by buying himself a justice on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Two quick questions.

[00:22:59] **Speaker 17** Two quick questions on the endorsements. Will you recuse yourself from cases involving the State Democratic Party of Wisconsin?

[00:23:05] **Speaker 4** Well, look, I will apply the laws required by the Wisconsin Supreme Court that set out the rules for recusal, and if I believe I cannot be fair and impartial in a case involving the Wisconsin Democratic Party, yes, I will recuse.

[00:23:20] **Speaker 17** there are new flyers coming out from groups tied to Elon Musk that say that are arriving to voters' mailboxes tonight that say conservative Brad Schimel will support President Trump's agenda.

[00:23:31] **Speaker 16** I have no control over what any outside group does. I will enforce the law. I will apply the law the way the legislature has written it. If President Trump or anyone defies Wisconsin law and I end up with a case in front of me, I'll hold them accountable as I would anybody. In my courtroom, I have individuals come in that sometimes are supporters of me. Sometimes are people that don't like me. It doesn't make any difference. I've had political cases in my civil courtroom. It makes no difference who's in front of me. In the courtroom, my personal views are irrelevant and President Trump's personal views are irrelevant as well.

[00:24:10] **Speaker 17** One final question on the money, on a recusal. Tesla, which Elon Musk is CEO of, is suing the state over a decision that has prevented the company from opening dealerships in Wisconsin. If that case came before the court, would you recuse yourself? on a recuse.

[00:24:23] **Speaker 16** answer to that. I haven't seen the lawsuit, I don't know, I know a little bit about what it's about. Now the interesting thing is that I have spent most of, I've spent 35 years representing the people of Wisconsin. During a large part of that as the attorney general, I defended Wisconsin laws. And I'm aware that there's a law that requires that for you to sell vehicles in Wisconsin, you have to have a dealership. There are dealership rules. That's a law passed by the legislature. It's entitled to a presumption of constitutionality. So. Elon Musk is trying to get some result in that lawsuit, he may be failing because I enforce the law and I respect the laws passed by the legislature. That's a law in Wisconsin.

[00:25:05] **Speaker 18** A lot of voters are seeing this play out on TV ads that are inundating the airwaves right now. So let's talk about these TV ads. You have both accused each other of being soft on crime in these TV ads. Judge Schimel, you've recently accused Judge Crawford of being an ally to child rapists and violent criminals. Judge Crawford, you have recently accused Judge Schimel of allowing rapists to roam the streets while rape kits went untested as attorney general. Since the court does not sentence violent criminals or determine how the state manages DNA testing, a question for both of you, but we'll start with Judge Crawford. And why have you made this a prominent part of your campaign?

[00:25:36] **Speaker 4** Well, look, I think that voters deserve to know what our records are. And I worked as a statewide prosecutor at the Wisconsin Department of Justice, taking cases all the way to the Wisconsin Supreme Court and making sure that our communities were safe. I'm proud of the work that I did as a prosecutor and I'm proud of the work that I did later representing Wisconsinites in our courtrooms, protecting their healthcare rights, protecting their voting rights, and protecting their rights in the workplace. I don't shy away from that record. I am proud of the work that I've done. And I think it is important for voters to know about Brad Schimel's record, too. He's the one who, as attorney general, because he was pursuing other partisan right -wing lawsuits, like trying to take health care away from people, left over 6 ,000 sexual assault kits, the kits that may contain the DNA that can identify the perpetrators of those crimes. He failed to get them tested for years. And in a period of over two years, He only got nine kits out of 6 ,000 tested. And then he lied about it. He told the press that he had had hundreds of kits tested that was wrong. Earlier, he'd said, oh, there is no backlog, when indeed there was a backlog. So I think it's important for the voters to understand not only that Brad Schimmel failed to take care of that top public safety priority, left those victims, who were mainly women and children, waiting for years while he pursued things like trying to overturn the legal protections. that people have when they have pre -existing health conditions to not allow health insurance executives to take away their coverage.

[00:27:18] **Speaker 18** Judge, and we'll let you respond to that as well, but I do want to ask the same question. While you've made your campaign, a prominent part of your campaign has been on the negative record of Susan Crawford, Judge Crawford.

[00:27:30] **Speaker 16** My opponent can't even be honest about her own record. She calls herself a prosecutor who put dangerous criminals away. She never did that. I spent 25 years as a frontline prosecutor in the Waukesha DA's office. I was the guy they called at 3 AM to go to the crime scene. I was the guy who worked with law enforcement to build that case from the crime scene all the way to conviction. I was the shoulder that crime victims cried on time and time again. My opponent never did that. She never stood in front of a jury and argued as a sword and shield for that crime victim to get justice for them. That's a difference between us. When she started claiming she was a prosecutor, I needed to start pointing out that she's not. And with the cases she decided, this isn't, there's not an equation here. She criticizes me on some cases where I was the prosecutor. or as a judge, where I follow the recommendation of victims, she has repeatedly just ignored the pleas of victims to lock up dangerous offenders. A man who sexually assaulted a five -year -old child repeatedly. She had to testify at trial. The jury convicted. My opponent still refused to revoke bond. The $500 signature bond she released him on. She let him live near us across the street from an elementary school. She didn't change any of that after he was convicted. And then at sentencing time, in spite of the pleas of the victim, she ultimately gave that offender a sentence that resulted in him being in prison for less than two years after that sentencing date. There is, this is a dangerous flaw in my opponent's judgment. And that's just one example of many.

[00:29:13] **Speaker 4** Sure, you know, Brad Schimel has given dozens of people convicted of crimes like domestic violence, sexual assaults, and abuse of children, short jail sentences or no jail sentences, and those offenders have gone on to re -offend. I'll stand by the cases. They have... focused between him and Elon Musk. They have focused on two cases out of thousands that I've handled where I sentence people to prison and then followed that with several years of extended supervision. Those two people are still on supervision. They have not committed any new crimes. and they will be on the sex offender registry for the rest of their lives. So I think that voters need to focus on Brad Schimel's record. He is somebody who has blamed victims, said things like with child sexual assaults, that the child was responsible because she went to a party or it was, it is not a lie.

[00:30:08] **Speaker 16** The transcript is a lie.

[00:30:08] **Speaker 4** It was a it was a first -date situation. He has let people go and they have re -offended That has not happened in the cases that they're highlighting of mine

[00:30:18] **Speaker 17** Let me ask about these assets.

[00:30:19] **Speaker 4** If I can also just respond to his claim that I wasn't a prosecutor. I was a statewide prosecutor at the Wisconsin Department of Justice. I handled both county -level prosecutions of health care fraud and patient abuse, and I also took cases to the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Those are cases that are the most relevant for service on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. cases that involve the development of the law. and the kinds of legal arguments that you have to consider when you're making decisions that are going to involve statewide precedent that every prosecutor in the county, in the state rather, will be bound by.

[00:30:59] **Speaker 17** both of you quick on these ads we're seeing. You referenced one. In 2020, you did sentence a child sex offender to four years in prison after prosecutors requested 10. Do you regret that sentence?

[00:31:08] **Speaker 4** I don't regret that sentence because I followed the law in that case, as I always do. I applied the law, which says that judges have to consider every relevant factor in sentencing. You have to consider both the aggravating and mitigating factors. And the Supreme Court has said you have to order the minimum amount of prison time you believe is necessary to protect the public. That's what I did in that case and every other case. and my goal is always to keep the community safe. And those have been sentences that have been successful. They have kept the community safe, unlike the short jail sentences that Brad Schimmel has entered over and over, where people have gone on to commit new crimes. That's when you know the sentence has failed.

[00:31:51] **Speaker 17** to some of the ads people have seen about you, Judge Schimel, nine rape kits tested in your first two years of the attorney general. Do you regret that?

[00:31:59] **Speaker 16** My opponent just revealed the problem in her judgment, that in weighing all the factors, giving the minimum amount of time to a dangerous sex offender. That is what the law requires. ways higher than protecting the community, that's what she just revealed to you.

[00:32:12] **Speaker 4** That is not what I said.

[00:32:13] **Speaker 16** and she has not found one case, she hasn't found one case.

[00:32:16] **Speaker 4** has written the court requires you to order the sentence.

[00:32:19] **Speaker 16** You should go ahead.

[00:32:20] **Speaker 4** the sentence necessary to protect the community and that's what I've done and that's what those sentences did. go right ahead.

[00:32:26] **Speaker 17** Judge Schimel on rape kits.

[00:32:30] **Speaker 16** By the way, on her ads, she hasn't found one case in her ads where I failed to follow the wishes of the victim and the prosecutor. The sentences I gave were at least what the victim and the prosecutor recommended in every one of them. On the rape kits, let's talk about numbers. She puts it in terms of numbers. When I got to the Department of Justice for 25 years, those rape kits had been neglected in police department store rooms and hospital store rooms. When I got to the Department of Justice during that 25 years, my opponent had spent 12 years as a manager and then Attorney General Doyle's Department of Justice and as the Chief Legal Counsel for Governor Jim Doyle, 12 years. She didn't lift a finger. She didn't do anything to try to solve this problem. So it was left to when I got to state government in 2015. we had zero tests, tests, excuse me, zero kits tested. about three and a half years later, every kit that needed to be tested was done. But in the interim, let's talk about some more numbers. We had to conduct a statewide inventory. We didn't even know how many kits were out there. We had to go to every single police department in Wisconsin, every hospital storeroom, find out where the kits were, how many there were, what the case circumstances were, and when I left the Department of Justice, that problem was solved, and we put in place a process where this will never happen again.

[00:34:02] **Speaker 17** Just quickly, do you regret the first two years of your time as AG?

[00:34:05] **Speaker 16** We did this exactly the way we needed to. And the architect of that program is now Justice Jill Korofsky. We worked together, I had her as my director of the Office of Crime Victim Services, and I'll tell you, there's nobody in the state that would have done a better job than she did in that role. But this was her plan, we implemented it. She had been planning this before I got the Department of Justice. When I got there, she was waiting for an attorney general to finally give someone the green light to do it. And when I gave that green light, we solved this problem.

[00:34:38] **Speaker 18** In the new market, we'll let you respond in just a second. We have a lot of issues to get to in the new Marquette Law School poll. 79 % of voters say that they want the candidates in this race to discuss the issues. We've talked about abortion a little bit. Other high -profile cases will also be before this new court, likely including Act 10, the law signed by then Governor Scott Walker, eliminating collective bargaining for most public employees. Judge Crawford, you represented teachers who sued attempting to overturn the law. Why then wouldn't you recuse yourself from a case involving Act 10?

[00:35:06] **Speaker 4** Thanks for that question. So Act 10 was a 50 -page long bill that changed multiple different parts of the Wisconsin statutes. And the challenge that I raised back in the 2011, 2012 period was focused on a particular provision that it challenged. My understanding of the new case that's now moving through the courts is that it involves a different provision. So, you know, you saw that Justice Hagedorn decided to recuse from that case because he not only was involved in drafting Act 10, but was involved in a defense to the exact same provision that is now at stake, a previous legal challenge to that provision. I think that's appropriate. And if the same provision that I was involved in litigating back in those early days was challenged again, I most likely would recuse. Again, it would depend on the specific facts of the case, but I think that when it's the same provision, yes.

[00:36:08] **Speaker 17** that provision in this current challenge.

[00:36:10] **Speaker 18** Judge Schimel, you were a Republican Attorney General under Governor Scott Walker after the law passed, but you have previously said that you would have defended the law in court. Why then should voters believe that you could hear a case on Act 10 fairly?

[00:36:23] **Speaker 16** So, as you noted, Jaren, that was all resolved. The Wisconsin Supreme Court decided that case and the Seventh Circuit Federal Court of Appeals in Chicago decided that case, upheld Act 10, before I was ever attorney general. I've said I would have defended the law when I was attorney general, of course I did. My job as attorney general was to defend Wisconsin law. not to pick and choose which laws I like or didn't like. My job was to defend the law. For 35 years, I've been a public servant and my only client, unlike my opponent, who's representing some very left -wing organizations, my only client has always been the people of Wisconsin. And of course, I said that's the very definition of attorney general. You represent the people of Wisconsin, you defend the laws passed by our legislature and signed into law by the governor.

[00:37:14] **Speaker 17** Justice Brian Hagedorn, who served as Governor Walker's chief legal counsel during that, recently said he would recuse himself from this case involving Act 10. Did he make the right decision, Judge Schimel? Only he knows that.

[00:37:23] **Speaker 16** only he knows whether he can be objective about that. You know, every jury that comes to my courtroom, before we start for our dear, I start by preparing them for what this is gonna be like. And I hold up a pen with a click on the top, and I say, folks, I don't have one of those men in black pens that I can click and erase your memories. You all come here with a history. You all come here with political views, personal views. The question for you as we go through this process is for you to discern, for you to search your conscience, can you set those views aside and decide this case based on the evidence in the courtroom and the laws I'll instruct you. We expect that from jurors. We should expect the same from judges. Now, here's the danger. Do you think he made the right decision? Here's the danger with the Supreme. See, as I said, only he can make that, and that outlines the danger. Because the only person who can decide whether a Supreme Court justice should recuse from a case is that Supreme Court justice. So you're electing someone to a 10 -year term, and if you're not sure that they'll be objective, or you're not sure that they'll recuse on the cases they can't, you better be careful about giving them 10 years.

[00:38:30] **Speaker 17** We'll get to recusal. Justice Janet Protasewicz, who protested the 2011 law and signed the recall petition targeting then -Governor Walker, recently said she would not recuse herself from this case. Did she make the right decision, Judge Crocker?

[00:38:41] **Speaker 4** Well, I read the decision that Justice, or order that Justice Protasewicz put out about that, and I thought that her analysis clearly showed that she considered the facts and applied the standards under the Wisconsin Judicial Code and came to a reasoned decision that. She believed that she could be fair and impartial in that case. That's what the law required and I think that it's a decision that she should stand by.

[00:39:13] **Speaker 17** And you believe that as well, that you can be fair and impartial.

[00:39:15] **Speaker 4** Well, you know, I think that I agree with Judge Schimel on this, that the law requires each individual justice to make their own determination about whether they can be fair and impartial. I trust that that's what she did.

[00:39:27] **Speaker 18** We'll talk about recusal here in just a second. I do want to ask, though, about voter ID. The state's voter ID law will also be on the April 1st ballot asking voters whether to untry the law into the state constitution. 77 % of Wisconsin voters say they favor voter ID. Judge Schimel, as attorney general, you fought to keep the law in place. Judge Crawford, you have argued against it and tried to block the law, even at one point comparing it to a poll tax. Judge Crawford, do you still believe that?

[00:39:52] **Speaker 4** Well, look, I brought a lawsuit on behalf of the Nonpartisan League of Women Voters when that law was first passed. And when it was first passed, it was the strictest voter ID law in the country. And it left a lot of people behind. There were many registered voters in Wisconsin who were unable to vote because they simply could not obtain the ID that they needed. People who were disabled, elderly people, people who were born in rural communities in poverty that never were issued a birth certificate. That's who we were fighting for. You know, for me and probably everybody in this room, the voter ID law was no big deal. You show your driver's license and you get to vote. But for the most vulnerable citizens in Wisconsin, it took something very precious away from them, and that was their right to vote. So I'm proud of the lawsuit, the litigation that we filed, because ultimately the Wisconsin Supreme Court, with a very conservative majority at that time. Found that because the law required people to pay to get a drive Voters ID they ordered the administration to make changes so people would no longer have to pay and indeed They said it was like a poll tax and the legislature, well no because they removed that. The court ordered the administration to stop doing that and the legislature then revisited the law and created a procedure that allows people to get their IDs more easily even if they're missing some of these underlying documents. It's called an affidavit procedure and Brad Schimel said at the time that that law was pending that if the legislature revisited that law and enacted an affidavit procedure The Legislature You that all the litigation would drop and go away. And I agree with that. So the law is a very different law now than it was then. You said that you

[00:41:41] **Speaker 18** You have told us previously that you will not reveal how you will vote on the constitutional amendment. I'm just curious, why don't voters deserve to know?

[00:41:47] **Speaker 4** Well, I think that they can hear from politicians and legislators and people like that, what their views are. I just don't think it's appropriate for a judge to weigh in and try to influence voters on something like that. And that's, and let me just explain a little further. And that in part is because that, you know, if that does become a constitutional amendment like any part of the constitution, it could come before the court and have to be interpreted. So I just think it's more proper not to comment.

[00:42:16] **Speaker 18** Judge Seymour, how will you vote on the constitutional amendment?

[00:42:18] **Speaker 16** I wanna start by saying, when I'm on the bench, my personal or political views are utterly irrelevant, and they're utterly irrelevant in the Supreme Court race. But if you wanna know how I'm gonna vote, I'm gonna vote yes, okay? Now, voter integrity laws are critically important. The legislature has a solemn responsibility to put those laws in place, and we should all expect as voters that those laws are gonna be implemented the way they're passed, because the danger with vote fraud is you can't undo the vote. You could catch the perpetrator. You could lock them up in prison for decades, but you can't change that fraudulent vote they cast. And that waters down the honest vote of a legitimate voter. That can't happen.

[00:43:03] **Speaker 18** You have once said that you once suggested that President Trump won Wisconsin in 2016 because the state had voter ID in place. Does Wisconsin's law favor Republicans and disenfranchise other voters?

[00:43:15] **Speaker 16** You know, interestingly, in the lawsuits, they've never found that voter that's disenfranchised. You might have heard my client say, or my opponent said her client was the League of Women Voters. They didn't find that client out there because that client, they can't find that person who can't get that free ID.

[00:43:33] **Speaker 18** To the question, do you believe that the law favors Republicans and disenfranchises voters?

[00:43:36] **Speaker 16** No, what the law does is it favors integrity so that the votes of the people of Wisconsin are accurately reflected in the totals that are reported on election night.

[00:43:48] **Speaker 17** Let's talk about the state's congressional maps. It's widely expected and reported that if liberals maintain control of the court, interest groups will file lawsuits challenging the state's congressional maps. Judge Crawford, you were recently on a call with Democratic donors who have given to your campaign. The meeting was billed as a chance to put two more House seats in play for 2026. No matter how long you were on that call, how was that appropriate?

[00:44:10] **Speaker 4** Well, I don't think that the email that was sent out was an appropriate way to announce a judicial candidate, to be frank. I appeared in a short Zoom appearance with that group. No mention was made of the congressional maps while I was in the meeting. I introduced myself, you know, gave a standard short. a little bio of myself and why I was running for the Wisconsin Supreme Court. As I always do, I pledged that I would be fair and impartial on the Supreme Court, was not bringing any type of partisan agenda, and then I bid the group farewell and left the meeting. I don't know what they discussed for the rest of it, but certainly no mention was made up the congressional maps while I was in this room.

[00:44:55] **Speaker 17** You still chose to join that meeting.

[00:44:57] **Speaker 4** Right, I also did not see that email or the way it was being billed before I participated. I only found out about that after the fact.

[00:45:05] **Speaker 17** Judge Simmel, do you believe the current congressional maps are fair?

[00:45:08] **Speaker 16** That's not my decision to make. The legislature passes those maps. The governor signs them. Sometimes courts have to take a look at that when there's a dispute that they can't reach an agreement on something. But it's not for me to say whether they're fair or not. I'm gonna note this. We have to take my opponent's word for it about what happened on that phone call because we've never had any evidence of just what happened except the email that went out. And it's hard for me to accept that she didn't see the email invitation that was inviting them to come on this call with her and find out how you can get her on the Wisconsin Supreme Court and they can turn two Republican congressional seats into Democrat congressional seats. And for the viewers, what that means is the court would move the lines, just like they did with the state districting lines. They struck down the maps and then started forcing. how they should be changed, they're going to do the same thing with the congressional maps. And that's why those billionaire donors started kicking in. I want to note something about donations in this race. 97 % of the donors to my campaign are people who vote right here in the state of Wisconsin. Almost 50 % of my opponent's donors can't vote in the state of Wisconsin because they don't reside here.

[00:46:24] **Speaker 18** I do want to ask you about transgender issues, transgender sports bills.

[00:46:27] **Speaker 4** Can I just respond briefly to what he said about the contributions because in fact I have because, in fact, I. twice as many Wisconsin contributors to my campaign as Brad Schimel was. I have a broad base of supporters and supporters from every one of Wisconsin's 72 counties. So, I just wanted to correct that. And he has a very active imagination about this call. I did not mention that... I'm speaking, please. I mentioned that I have never been... I've never taken any position on the congressional maps and I don't think it's appropriate as a judicial candidate to do so. And he has a very... But you don't dispute the 50 percent.

[00:47:05] **Speaker 16** I'm sorry, Jim, but you don't dispute that nearly 50 percent of your donors don't live in this state.

[00:47:12] **Speaker 4** You know, I have support from all over the country, and it is because Elon Schimel is trying to buy this race, and people are very upset about that, and they are disturbed about that. He is spending over $10 million. That dwarfs the contribution of anybody else in any campaign in Wisconsin history. People should be very concerned about it.

[00:47:33] **Speaker 18** Both have tried to argue that the millions of dollars that you receive are fine and good and the millions of dollars your opponent receives are corrupt and equates to selling a seat on the bench. So, why should voters trust or believe either one of you? Judge Schimel.

[00:47:44] **Speaker 16** As I said before, I don't control that money. We're not allowed to coordinate with outside groups. I haven't solicited that money from them. They've made this decision on their own to support my campaign, and they've decided what their messaging looks like without any assistance from me.

[00:48:02] **Speaker 18** I have campaigned. I have campaigned.

[00:48:04] **Speaker 4** Well, look, Brad Schimel said that he wanted to be part of Donald Trump's support network. That's a very partisan statement. And that is exactly why Elon Musk is involved here. That and the fact that he's got a Tesla lawsuit going in the state of Wisconsin and thinks it might be good to have some influence over the Wisconsin judiciary. He's also the one who, when he launched his campaign, immediately said that he was going to nationalize this race and go after the conservative billionaire contributors that he had made ties with as a Republican attorney general. He was out at the inauguration in Washington DC in January attending these high ticket fancy galas. And within days of him coming back, all of a sudden, Elon Musk is tweeting about the race and Brad Schimel is bragging about being on his knees, wearing out his knee pads, asking for contributions. To Jerry's question.

[00:48:59] **Speaker 17** To Jared's question though, how is that any different than the millions you are receiving from Democratic donors across the country?

[00:49:05] **Speaker 4** You know, I have never promised anything, and that is the difference. Brad Schimel is saying what his positions are on that 1849 abortion law, which he said is a fine law. There is nothing wrong with it. He believes it should be fully enforced and criminalize all abortions in Wisconsin. He has said how he would decide that Act 10 case that's moving through the courts, he made us, that he is. his campaign issued a press release on that decision a day after a judge ruled that it was unconstitutional. Not based on anything in that case, but just based on the headlines. A quick response and we'll move on.

[00:49:47] **Speaker 16** I said about the 1814 line law and my opponent knows this because she has the whole recording only released a small portion of it to a reporter the whole recording makes clear I said was asked was it a valid law and yes the legislature passed it both houses of the legislature agreed on the final form the governor signed it that makes it a law the question then is does that reflect the will of the people currently and unlike my opponent I'm ready to respect the will of the voters of Wisconsin on this and all issues.

[00:50:19] **Speaker 18** Senator Ron Johnson has recently said this race is critical to protect laws banning men from participating in women's sports. Senator Tammy Baldwin is reportedly pushing Democratic colleagues to argue the issue is best left to the states. Judge Schimel, can conservative voters count on you to uphold any law that bans men from playing in women's sports?

[00:50:38] **Speaker 16** they can count on me to uphold the laws written by the legislature unless they violate the constitution. Absolutely, yes.

[00:50:46] **Speaker 18** Judge Crawford, can liberal voters count on you to reverse any law that bans men from playing in women's sports?

[00:50:51] **Speaker 4** Well, I'm going to agree with Judge Schimel here. They can count on me to make a determination about whether such a law is constitutional. And if it is constitutional, I would uphold it.

[00:51:02] **Speaker 18** A lot of the potential cases all lead to the questions of recusal. You both have said that you trust yourself to make that decision. Give me two examples of a case, of any case that would force you to recuse yourself. Judge Crawford.

[00:51:13] **Speaker 4** Well, I can give you one that I recently had on the circuit court as a judge. I opened a case file and was looking at the complaint that was filed by the parties and I recognized a name in there. The defendant, and this was a kind of typical personal injury case involving a car accident, and the person who was alleged to be at fault was somebody I know, somebody I've been friendly with. And because of that relationship, I felt I could not be fair and impartial in that case. So I stepped aside and recused myself. That's the kind of thing I would do on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Ah, that's.

[00:51:50] **Speaker 18** Judge Schimel, give me an example of a case that would force you to recuse yourself.

[00:51:55] **Speaker 16** Well, I think you asked about on the Supreme Court. I mean, certainly on the Circuit Court, I've recused myself. I know lots of people in Waukesha County and some of them I have close relationships with and some of them end up litigating cases. Those cases, I've recused myself. In any case where it's a close call, I've alerted the parties that I know someone involved here. I don't believe it poses a conflict for me, but if anyone's uncomfortable with me hearing the case, I would recuse. On the Supreme Court, if there's a case that comes up that's reviewing a decision I made as a circuit court judge. Yeah, I probably shouldn't be deciding if I was right when I decided the case in the circuit court. Certainly, any case that involves any personal financial interest for any member of my family or myself, absolutely the rules are clear, you have to recuse. Otherwise, it's that same question that you have to ask jurors. Can you set your personal opinions and views aside and hear the case?

[00:52:51] **Speaker 18** Why should voters believe that you can police yourself?

[00:52:55] **Speaker 16** The whole reason I got in this race is to try to restore objectivity to the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Part of what caused me to jump in this race was seeing how a justice candidate promised how to rule on cases and then said they'd consider recusing if that came up on the wrote a lengthy decision, my opponent made reference to, wrote a lengthy decision explaining how, no, no, I don't have to recuse, I was talking about my values, I don't have any problem with this. I got in this race to end that.

[00:53:28] **Speaker 17** why some voters believe you can police yourself.

[00:53:32] **Speaker 4** You know, I think that voters have to trust justices under the current rules that we have for recusals. And I would welcome petitions or proposals to strengthen and improve the recusal rules. I think they can always be improved. And I think that's kind of underlying your question, is should there be stronger rules? We've seen with the U .S. Supreme Court what happens when the. ethical rules for justices are too weak. When you've got justices who are accepting luxury trips from people who have an interest in the cases, or are flying partisan flags outside of their homes. the people lose faith and lose confidence in the court. So I would welcome proposals to increase and improve the ethical standards for justices. But as the rules exist now, the rules require the public to trust the justices. And you know, I've always held myself to a very high ethical standard and I would follow the law of the court.

[00:54:38] **Speaker 17** You have both said tonight you will act independently as justices. You've said that on the campaign trail. Judge Crawford, would you have joined and agreed with the court's liberal majority when they threw out the state's legislative maps? And do you agree with Justice Protasewicz, who once called those maps rigged?

[00:54:54] **Speaker 4** Well, I looked at that decision, and what the court did in that case is review a provision of the state constitution that requires the legislative maps to be contiguous. They had to interpret that term, and that's what they did. They actually looked the word up in the dictionary, which judges often do. and they made a determination that contiguous means basically you have to draw a line, be able to draw a line all the way around the legislative district. And that's not the question that was addressed in that case. The question that was addressed in that case was, did those legislative districts comply with the Constitution? I think that the Wisconsin Supreme Court was correct in deciding that they didn't comply with the Constitution and it's important to note. Get those maps away. outcome of that decision was to send the legislative back maps back to the legislature and the governor and the legislature and the governor reached a political compromise on new maps which were then put in place it was not the supreme court rewriting the maps it was the legislature and the governor through the normal political process.

[00:56:00] **Speaker 17** Judge Schimel, some of the court's most recent consequential decisions came after the 2020 election when President Trump challenged the results in Wisconsin, in one case attempted to get 220 ,000 absentee ballots in Dane and Milwaukee counties thrown out. Justice Brian Hagedorn joined the court's liberals, justices, in rejecting those lawsuits. Would you ever rule against President Trump?

[00:56:21] **Speaker 16** If President Trump violates the law or President Trump brings a lawsuit that he's wrong on the law, of course I would. I don't have any personal loyalty to him that supersedes the oath I take as a judge.

[00:56:38] **Speaker 17** Did Justice Hagedorn make the right decision in this?

[00:56:42] **Speaker 16** I get you yet. You've got to tell me which case you're

[00:56:44] **Speaker 17** The 220 ,000 absentee ballots.

[00:56:48] **Speaker 16** Boy, I don't know. I'd have to review that case. It is the decision of the court, and that's final. Part of what's so important about this race is the decision for justices in a majority on the Supreme Court. That ends up being the final word. The Wisconsin Supreme Court is the final word when it comes to what a Wisconsin statute means or the Wisconsin Constitution means. So we should be very, these people should pay better attention to these April court races.

[00:57:17] **Speaker 4** If I may just respond to that, Brad Schimmel, in fact, said when he was in front of... I didn't say anything about her. when he was in front of a private, what he thought was a private audience of his political allies, he said that he believed that the Wisconsin Supreme Court screwed Trump over in 2020 when it rejected his effort to throw out the results of the Wisconsin election in 2020. He has said that he is part of Donald Trump's support network. He is partisan. He is not impartial. And he says different things in front of a broad audience like this when he knows it's going to be televised than he'll say when he's talking to his political allies. He is not trustworthy. Judge will give you a chance to respond.

[00:58:01] **Speaker 16** I'll say the same thing that I said in front of those crowds and I'll say that to this audience right here. What I said was in 2020, the Wisconsin Supreme Court, three liberals and one conservative decided not to hear the challenge from the Green Party. The Green Party was kept off the ballot by the Wisconsin Elections Commission on a technicality in their nomination papers. they came to the Supreme Court. and demanded their right to be on the ballot. The Supreme Court said, we don't want to hear this case because it's too close to the election. We could affect the outcome of an election. I have said that was a mistake. The court should have heard the case, decided that issue so that we would know whether the Green Party had a right to be on the ballot or not. That's the challenge I made. And yes, that did screw up an election because Donald Trump lost by 21 ,000 votes. The Green Party typically takes over 30 ,000 votes. So the decision not to hear that case did affect the Elkman election.

[00:59:02] **Speaker 18** We have just a few minutes left, Chair. I do want to ask about what you both see as the biggest issues or the biggest cases that could come before the Supreme Court in this next term. Judge Crawford, we'll start with you.

[00:59:11] **Speaker 4** You know, it's really hard to predict that, because every term the Wisconsin Supreme Court hears petitions from parties that have had cases moving through the court system. And if three justices decide that that particular case raises an issue that is of such statewide importance that should be decided by the Wisconsin Supreme Court, they'll take that case. I think the important, if I may, the important thing for voters to know is that the cases that come before the Supreme Court can. can involve a wide array of issues of great importance to Wisconsinites. They can involve issues of public safety, of fundamental rights, things like whether we have clean drinking water, and these are really important cases. And as I said at the outset, they affect the fundamental rights and freedoms of all Wisconsinites, and that is why Wisconsinites should care and pay attention and vote in these elections.

[01:00:05] **Speaker 18** Judge, what do you see as the biggest issue or case that could come before this next Supreme court.

[01:00:09] **Speaker 16** Unfortunately, since the majority on the court right now is running through a political agenda, what cases get filed and what cases get accepted by the Supreme Court is going to be impacted by who wins the election. You know this court in their first in their first term heard only 14 substantive cases. Normally the Supreme Court hears over 50. They've been so busy going through a political agenda that they've forgotten that they are supposed to resolve legitimate disputes that help guide Wisconsinites on what the law is.

[01:00:41] **Speaker 17** Real quick, and I apologize if we cut you off here, but we're getting close to the end. Both of you have political supporters, and that has become a reality of these campaigns. You've both said you will act independently, which at times could anger your supporters. Judge Schimel, give me an example. As a time, as a judge, you made a decision that angered your supporters.

[01:01:00] **Speaker 16** I don't recall, I recall people, I'm sorry, I don't have an example of a case that angered supporters, I'm sorry.

[01:01:08] **Speaker 17** Judge Crawford, do you have an example?

[01:01:09] **Speaker 4** So I had a lawsuit before me in the circuit court in which the current attorney general was trying to throw get laws thrown out that were enacted in the lame duck period after Shema lost election, re -election as attorney general and... Governor Scott Walker lost re -election as attorney general. Between them and then and their leaving office, they enacted laws that stripped the attorney general of many of the attorney general's powers and authority. And a lawsuit was brought into my court that challenged several of those changes. And I rejected. most of them. I did issue a narrow ruling that found that a part of those changes were unconstitutional but the rest of them I threw out.

[01:02:04] **Speaker 17** Two quick rapid fire questions, the first one or two words that come to your mind. Judge Schimel, what U .S. Supreme Court justice, current or former, would you like to have dinner with?

[01:02:17] **Speaker 16** Antonin Scalia would, as I've heard, is a fascinating dinner companion. Judge Crawford.

[01:02:22] **Speaker 4** Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

[01:02:24] **Speaker 18** Judge Crawford, what current justice on the Wisconsin Supreme Court would you most resemble as a justice?

[01:02:29] **Speaker 4** I would like to believe that I would most resemble Justice Ann Walsh -Gradley, whose seat I'm running.

[01:02:36] **Speaker 16** And Judge Schimel? Oh my goodness. We're all human beings. We all have good character traits, and we all have weaknesses. I don't hero worship anything like that. It is.

[01:02:48] **Speaker 17** It is now time for our closing statements. We flipped a coin to determine the order. We will begin with Judge Crawford.

[01:02:55] **Speaker 4** All right, well, thank you. I wanna thank you for the opportunity here tonight and thank you for everyone who's been listening. This election presents a really critical choice for voters. Do they wanna have a common sense judge, someone who's going to be fair, independent, and impartial, or do they want someone who has a history of being an extreme politician? As throughout my career, I have always worked to protect the rights of Wisconsinites and protect the safety of our communities. And that's based on the values that I learned growing up in Chippewa Falls. Things like honesty, hard work, and fairness. And that's what kind of justice I'll be on the Supreme Court. By contrast, my opponent Brad Schimel has always been about politics, partisanship. and special interests. He's the one who failed to get those sexual assault kits tested, who attacked the rights of women to get health care, and supports now an 1849 abortion law, and is trying to sell the seat on the court to the highest bidder. I'm going to ask you for your vote, and thank you so much for your attention. Judge Schimel.

[01:04:00] **Speaker 16** Well, thank you to you to moderating this and to all the viewers who have tuned in for this. I've been a public servant for 35 years. My only client for those 35 years has been the people of Wisconsin. I didn't plan to run for Wisconsin Supreme Court. But after I watched what happened in 2023, when the court threw away objectivity and began going through a political agenda, I resolved to get in this race. and I got in over 15 months ago. I have campaigned in all 72 counties of this state and I'm proud to say that I have the endorsement of over three quarters of the elected sheriffs in Wisconsin. That includes a number of Democrat elected sheriffs who are publicly endorsing my campaign because they've seen behind the scenes what I do to take care of public safety and to take care of the people I serve. I got into this race to restore objectivity to this court. That's my solemn commitment to the voters of Wisconsin, and I'd be honored to have your vote on April 1st. Thank you.

[01:04:59] **Speaker 17** We made it. Our sincere thanks to both of our candidates this evening for being here tonight and to all of our guests here at the Marquette University Law School, including the seven current justices on the Wisconsin Supreme Court.

[01:05:12] **Speaker 18** If you missed any part of this debate, it will be available on the 12 News app and streaming on Very Local. We will have full post debate analysis Sunday on Upfront. Early voting begins in just six days on Tuesday and Election Day, less than three weeks away from right now, April 1st, Tuesday, April 1st, Election Day. Thank you all for spending part of your evening with us. Have a great night.

[01:05:48] **Speaker 5** Welcome to Dwellings, Madison's best kept secret for beautiful furniture, sofas, chairs, and recliners, sectionals, and fun accessories. Shop our Fitchburg showroom today. Doctors at UW Health say there's been an increase in patients looking for long -acting, reversible contraception. Add 10 what doctors are seeing now and why it's happening.

[01:06:11] **Speaker 6** And we're tracking that next threat of potentially strong to severe storms in our forecast.

[01:06:16] **Speaker 10** At Muir Roofing and Construction, 99 % of our residential roofs are done in a day and come with a lifetime shingle warranty, as well as a 15 -year craftsmanship warranty. Call me, Jim Muir, for roofing, siding and gutters, and remember, as always, we do it right at any height. The Girls WIAA State Basketball Tournament is back!

[01:06:35] **Speaker 6** See every game from every division. Live on air, online, and streaming on the WIAA app. With analysis and insight from experts all across Wisconsin.

[01:06:46] **Speaker 5** And the only place to catch all the action is right here on your official WIA station.

[01:06:52] **Speaker 6** one chance to win it all. Watch her stream live March 13th.