



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 220

Recorded 4-2-22

Registry Matters is an independent production. The opinions and ideas here are that of the hosts and do not reflect the opinions of any other organization. If you have problems with these thoughts, fyp.

Andy 00:19

You're trying to mess me up at the beginning there, Larry. Recording live from FYP studios, east and west. Transmitting across the internet. This is episode 220 of Registry Matters. Saturday night. The sun's out and shining. How are you, sir?

Larry 00:33

Awesome, man. It's 75 balmy degrees and clear here.

Andy 00:36

That's nice. And you have like 3% humidity or whatever?

Larry 00:40

Yes, pretty dry right now. Sure is.

Andy 00:43

Um, so I was listening to an explainer video about the whole time change thing, the daylight savings time. And something that came up in there that you asked about are kids safer in the dark now versus when they were then, whatever. But it turns out that convenience store openers, and I'm sure that this isn't the only reason, but a driving factor is how much more commerce occurs if the sun is still out. So if the sun is up later in the afternoon, there is more commerce driven. And that's why, particularly, like I can understand why conservatives would be more on board with this is to drive more market.

Larry 01:22

Well, I was asking if we're going to have a repetition of what happened in '73 and '74. If those factors have changed sufficiently... and I don't know, time will tell. We will learn as we go through this experience. I suspect that with the 24-hour news cycle, that if it does repeat what we had in '74, we'll hear about it fairly quickly if children are getting rundown at bus stops. We'll hear about it.

Andy 01:50

I'm sure we will. But anyway, so I heard like a big increase in commerce happens by the sun going down later, because I guess in the dark, everyone wants to go hibernate. I guess that's the opposite side of that.

Larry 02:02

So, I didn't know that. But thanks for sharing that with me. Time will tell.

Andy 02:07

That's why I'm here. Um, hey, tell me, give me a rundown on what we're gonna do this evening. You know, the reason why I do this is so that I don't have to write that part of the show notes. I can just copy and paste what you did into what the synopsis of the show is. So I'm cheating.

Larry 02:20

So tonight, we're going to take four listener questions. And we're going to explain about a 501(c)(3). And we're going to go through some articles rapid fire. I mean, really rapid on the articles, because by the time we finish the other stuff, we are going to be out of time. So let's roll this train.

Andy 02:39

Then let's start right off the back then. What does it mean to be a designated 501(c)(3) - and that's five a one with "c" in parentheses, and then a "3" in parentheses - by the IRS? And how do I get my tax deduction, because I want my money Larry. How do I get my money?

Larry 02:57

FYP is not in the tax preparation business. So you'll have to talk to your preparer about that. But as far as the designation, it allows the full contribution that you would make to be tax deductible, meaning that whatever your tax preparer tells you in terms of your church tithing, if you do church tithing, or any other charitable donations that are 501(c)(3), it would have the same deductibility. And the exception is that goods or services derived are not tax deductible. So therefore, if we had a cottage that we gave you as a benefit from for being a supporter, if the value of that was \$200 a night, then if you gave us \$1,000, we would have to take the \$200 value from that and remove that from the equation. So if you're receiving our publications that we're sending out, then that would be extracted from the value of the donation. So it's the actual donation itself. Tangible goods or services are not tax deductible. And what we'll do is we'll be setting up the infrastructure now that our designation occurred as of February 1st, all donations to FYP are tax deductible. So we'll be monitoring the inflow from Patreon. And we'll be monitoring the inflow from people who make donations through other channels. And we'll be sending out an end of the year statement, explaining this is how much that you donated. This is the value of any tangible goods you received. And this is the amount of your deduction that you can claim. And the rest of it is up to you and your tax preparer to work out.

Andy 04:33

And does this then mean that we're buying yachts and whatnot? And we're going to go retire on some remote island in the Pacific or something?

Larry 04:43

Well, that would be my hope, actually. I would hope that with the 1000s of 1000s of people out there that are, in my mind, benefiting from our work, that more and more people would find it within their heart. When people are going to give to charity, Americans do that for a variety of reasons, including tax deductibility. But when you considering your options for charitable support, you can now consider this one among the other ones that are competing for your dollars. And believe me, it's a competition business. The charities are out there doing research on you. Buying lists from other organizations and renting lists of donors. And they're doing extensive market analysis of your ability to give. And they're sending you packets of stuff, saying, if you will support us... you know, you can get that packet with a calendar, and all

these gifts in there; they have done research on you that you're capable of donor and that you would potentially be able to support their work and that you're inclined to be supportive with the type work they do. I doubt FYP will be doing that. We will not have that level of outreach. But we're hoping] that now that it's an option, that more people will find it within their heart to support us.

Andy 05:51

I threw this at you in the context of something else, but maybe we could do something through FYP and if people send us referrals, that we do something. Could we just- and completely off the cuff- if we had FYP shirts, T shirts or something like that, and someone sends referrals, can we make that as some sort of perk for people sending us referrals?

Larry 06:13

We can. Again, that would be something that would have to be factored out of the equation, because that's something tangible. So the \$20 shirt would come off the donation. And lots of times people that do that, organizations that do that, they will have a box for you to check. They'll say, keep my gift and put the entire donation to work. And the reason why they have that box there is because they're going to deduct the value of that gift, or that carry pack, or whatever it is, and they're going to subtract that out. And if you just check that box, then they're happy. And you get the full deductibility of your donation.

Andy 06:48

I'm just trying to figure out how we can inspire our vast listening audience to spread the word about us.

Larry 06:57

Well, I know now that if we make it known- which we're going to have to upgrade our website and do some things. But I'm sure they're going to be flocking to us now.

Andy 07:06

I believe so. Alright, well, then we should move along, sir. Let's go to listener question number one. Hey, Registry Matters cast, thank you for your bravery in creating and maintaining the show. Technical question: Is anyone familiar with the definitions of standing as it relates to a federal lawsuit against a state and fleeing the state with the intent to return upon the resolution of the suit? I'm currently involved in a federal lawsuit against a state for several violations related to PFRs. I am wanting to move to a state in a different federal circuit so that I can be involved with the lives of my kids until the suit finishes and return. Is this standing like presence restrictions Larry?

Larry 07:50

Not exactly. He's wanting to know about legal standing. It's a great question. When I heard it, I said put it in. The only problem is we never have enough details. And you really can't get into enough details. But standing is something that's of common interest to people because if you're going to sue, you need standing. And here's what's going to happen in all likelihood. So if you've made a constitutional challenge against the registry in Georgia, hypothetically, or Tennessee, hypothetically, and then hypothetically, you move to the Nebraska or you move to Vermont, if I'm the attorney general in the state of Tennessee or

the state of Georgia, I'm going to argue that there's no longer what's called a justiciable controversy. Because I'm going to argue that you are now required to register pursuant to Nebraska's law or Vermont's law and Georgia is out of the equation, Tennessee is out of the equation. So, I'm going to do my best to not have to do any work. Plus, it's a hypothetical. Judges and courts are not there to give advisory opinions. Whether or not you would have to register in Georgia / Tennessee, if you returned is no longer relevant because you're not there. You're registering because of Vermont and Nebraska's registry law. So I'm going to say this case should be dismissed because the requirement that's imposed on this plaintiff and the disabilities and restraints that he's alleging no longer flow from Georgia. They're flowing from Nebraska. So he needs to file this in Nebraska. That's what I would do. And that's likely what they will do, if they haven't already done it. So he may not have the requisite standing because his complaints may no longer exist. Now, I met one person in Washington that was a legal beagle, although his professional wasn't the law. But he was just fantastic at litigation. And he wanted to travel, and he litigated in I think it was maybe Hawaii. But he litigated in a state outside of Washington state that hypothetically, he did the very thing saying should I have to register in that state, and he got that court in Hawaii to issue an advisory opinion. Because if I were the Hawaii AG, it's a hypothetical. He's not here. Doesn't have a connection to our state, which is kind of the reverse of what this guy is saying here. He's saying he's left the state where he's filed these challenges against that. But even though it's the reverse of the scenario, the same principle applies. His registration nightmares are coming from whatever state he's gone to now, not from the state that he left.

Andy 10:38

I think, one piece of clarification: He is still in the state where the suit is. He is talking about leaving that state, so that he has more freedom to be involved with his kids' lives. Does that then terminate the lawsuit in the state where it was challenged?

Larry 10:54

It very well could. Because if I'm the AG, if I'm on the defending side of that... there's one certainty about a case, you can never lose it if there's not a decision on the merits. You cannot lose if that doesn't go to trial on the merits. Would you agree with me on that? (Andy: I think I gotcha.) So I do not want a decision adverse that I have to file on appeal. So I'm going to try to get rid of it jurisdictionally. I'm going to argue that you're no longer my problem, that you're whatever that state is' problem. So if you leave that state where you've got the lawsuit going, you should expect a motion to terminate that litigation. That would be my expectation.

Andy 11:39

Can I make my lay person understanding- and this may sound crude- but if you have a case going and your key witness happens to end up deceased, the case falls apart, because your witness has gone away. That removes the ability to prosecute the case. Is this something of a similar analogy?

Larry 12:01

Well, it's vaguely similar, but not exactly that. That means you just simply don't have a case because your material evidence is not there. This is different, because I do not want a decision on your

complaint. And I'm trying to duck having any litigation. So I'm going to do everything I can with pretrial motions to extinguish you without ever getting to the point of a decision. And the first thing when you move out the state is I'm going to say "well, he doesn't like our registry much. But guess what? He's not registering in ours. He's registering with theirs. So therefore, this stuff no longer applies to him. So therefore, judge, he doesn't have the requisite standing." Now he can argue against that. He can say, well, actually, I have a home in that state. And I have connections to that state. And I'm going to be very- I mean, he can file a response pleading to their motion to dismiss for lack of a justiciable controversy, and he can force a ruling on that. But that would be what I would expect them to do.

Andy 12:59

What about, he was being damaged by it? I mean, if you leave a state, the prosecutor could still come and get you and then prosecute you even though you've then left the state. If he leaves, he was still damaged in the past because of the way the rules are. Just because he left doesn't mean he wasn't damaged in the past.

Larry 13:18

Well, I'm assuming. I don't have all the details. I'm assuming he's making a constitutional challenge against the registry that it is putting disabilities and restraints on him. You're not gonna get any monetary damages. You're not gonna get any monetary damages out of this. You know, that's just not gonna happen.

Andy 13:34

I'm with you on that. I was just trying to speculate that, I mean, if he's being damaged today and leaves tomorrow, he was still damaged today. The disabilities and restraints of today that impacted his life, they don't go away.

Larry 13:46

They ended. (Andy: Okay.) So the problem has now resolved itself. And that's what they're going to argue.

Andy 13:58

Gotcha, gotcha, gotcha. All right. Is there anything last things before we go on to number two?

Larry 14:03

I think I've done about the best I can with that.

Andy 14:07

Okay, so this is number two. And like, you alluded to this that I was not aware. So are there any states that do not have a removal process? And I don't like the way that that's worded. But are there any states that do not have a removal process and would allow you to simply drop off the registry after you've completed your required registration time? I guess the scenario would be if x state has a 10-year registration requirement, and at the end of the 10 years, you don't have to do anything actively and you just disappear from the registry.

Larry 14:38

There are such states. I don't have the list of them, but there are such states. I feel like I'm a little bit awkward if I start naming them. All we're gonna do is cause those states more problems, but yes, there are such states. I would feel a lot more comfortable

giving it out privately to a person if they have the capacity to move to those states. I don't know how many there are. But I know that they exist, and they still exist today where your term of registry is provided in law. It's not a removal process. You just simply term out, which is the way it should be.

Andy 15:13

And so there's a page on the NARSOL website that tells you this?

Larry 15:21

I think there is. I don't have a lot of faith in the accuracy of that. But I think that you can follow the statutory scheme and possibly interpret it for yourself of whether petitions are required or not by using that tool on the NARSOL website.

Andy 15:36

Well, but there's not a list that says, this state allows you to get off in just concise list? You could go read off of the wiki all the different rules and go find it. But there's not a page that says this is the best state for you to go to, this is the second-best state. That doesn't exist, either.

Larry 15:54

We have a philosophical problem with doing that because all we're going to do is be pointed to- if you've been watching anything to do with the Brown Jackson hearings, I think you would be able to figure out what would happen if we had such a resource tool. A national organization has pointed to our state as being the most PFR-friendly state. How long do you think that state would be PRF friendly?

Andy 16:19

Well, we even have advocates running around trying to- sorry, states, I guess- trying to compare, saying this is an easy state and we should be more like those that are around us. So yeah, I understand. If everyone's got a U-Haul truck going to whatever state that is, then they're going to be like, we don't want them here either. So, then they're going to tighten up the rules. So yes, we need the secret handshake.

Larry 16:41

I'm not a genius in terms of tech stuff. But I would imagine that if there were a key word on our website that said, "best states," I have a feeling that not only would the PFRs pick that up, I have a feeling that law enforcement and detractors would pick that up as well. And I have a feeling that they would approach their legislators, and they seem to be in great supply. Like I say, if you watch the Brown Jackson hearings, you will see that they're more than willing to jump on the bandwagon to be tough on PFRs. So I suspect that we would do a lot of harm if we had such a resource. So I'm a little uncomfortable. But yes, those states do exist where you would simply vanish after your requisite time. Now, just because you would vanish- like, say for example, you may have a state where that law is 10 years, but they don't give you credit for the time in another state. So that's the nuances you got to pay someone like me to figure out if there was a provision under law to give you credit. What if you've done 10 years, and you find a state, which they do exist, where after 10 years, you're done if you only have one offense / one conviction, and then you find out they don't give you credit for the time in the other state. You got to start your clock all over again. Would that make you happy?

Andy 17:54

No, that would not make me happy.

Larry 17:56

That's why you need to talk to a professional who understands this stuff. That's why, some years ago, I made a fair amount of money, me and an attorney did, from a person who decided to move to our state. Because he had done his own research. He was- what do you call it? The ones that work with animals? Not a doctor. The doctor that works with animals, what do you call those people? (Andy: Veterinarian? Haha.) The veterinarian. He did his own research. And he determined that we don't have any residency restrictions here. And he was correct. But he was also under supervision. He didn't determine that we have administrative requirements that the Corrections Department have imposed for those on supervision. And all of a sudden, he had bought a home, and he couldn't live in it because the 1000-foot requirement. He could not live in the home that he'd already purchased. And I told him you've got a couple of options. I said you can sell the home and take whatever loss you might take and find something that complies or you can see if the state that imposed your supervision will make you unsupervised. Because he even had the compact administrator of that particular state asking me if there was anything I found out because I was supposedly the go-to person. And the compact administrator talked to me and said, Why can't you people take him? His offense is so unique. And he's been such a great person. I said, Well, you got to make him unsupervised. That's the only way you can escape the requirements of the compact, but he can't live in that residence. So you can pay an attorney to see if you can get unsupervised or you can pay a consultant to see if maybe you can get an exception made. And he chose to pay the consultant and there was an exception made.

Andy 19:39

Okay, so there are states. You're not saying. I have no idea. So you're on your own. But if you want to, I guess they could figure out how to hire a professional to help advise them. But even in all that you're saying, not all states are created equal. Your conditions may be more favorable in this state versus another one.

Larry 19:58

Absolutely. You need a professional. So that's where you need to play my clip that we haven't played in a while.

Andy 20:04

Oh, I know which one that is. I mean, I'll do that now. I gotta find it. This is the one.

MacAuthur Clip

I agree with you entirely. That is why I am here.

Andy 20:32

And that is why you are here. Okay, well, let's, let's go over to question number three. I live in Virginia where both senators are Democrats. They both vote the way that I want. Can I contact an out of state senator to express my which wishes? My email address does not indicate where I live, so unless I need to fill out a form in order to express myself, they will not know that I do not live in their state. Alright, I'm on board with this question. That sounds good.

Larry 20:42

I would say do it. It cannot hurt. I don't know how much it'll help. The way it works in the state system, remember, folks, I've never worked in a federal legislative office. So I've given you state advice and feedback. Your one email doesn't really make a lot of difference. It's the totality of the volume of emails that are coming to us in a ratio. So if there's a hot topic, and we get 340 emails. Well, if 100 of them are one way and 240 are the other way, we're looking at the ratio more than anything else. And we're trying to figure out as best we can if they're within our legislative district. And that's a challenge in and of itself. But we're looking more at the ratio. So if we could generate a lot of emails, and a lot of phone calls, a lot of communication to these senators that we played clips from last week, the ratio would be important as compared to how many that are very supportive of their stances. And I would say they're getting a lot of support for their stance. I just about guarantee that the people in Missouri are just excited as can be. The people South Carolina are excited as they can be. The people in Texas with- let's just name him- with Cruz in Texas, and with the with Lindsey Graham, in South Carolina, and with Josh Hawley, they're just as excited as they can be that they took those positions. So it's a good thing. I would not discourage it. I don't think they would pick up on that you're out of state. But it's going to be evaluated in the totality of the traffic that's coming in. And, I mean, if you watch Ted Cruz, they had a shot of him where he just finished ranting and they had him checking his Twitter.

Andy 22:27

He was trying to see if he was trending. So narcissistic. That is so narcissistic.

Larry 22:35

You saw that, right?

Andy 22:37

I did. I saw a clip of that eventually.

Larry 22:39

Yeah. See, everybody has this great notion that the public's sunshine, seeing what goes on is better for democracy. It can be. It's kind of like being a textualist, it can be good. It also can be bad. These cameras are very bad in some instances. The sun shining in is not always a good thing. And this is a fine example of it not being so great.

Andy 23:06

Um, in chat, someone says one email and a \$1 million campaign donation might get their attention.

Larry 23:14

Is he offering a million-dollar campaign donation?

Andy 23:17

He may have one. I'm not gonna say how much he has. I don't know how much he has, but just saying. But like, I mean, at a state level, I don't know how much senators go for. But I bet a million bucks in a House of Representative person, that would go a long way. But that's gonna trigger a lot of campaign money finance rule things, right? Aren't there limits?

Larry 23:42

Well, in the state, we have state limits. I don't pay any attention to federal law campaign limitations. I don't think there are any limits, but there could be. But yes, we have cycle limits here of what can be donated. I think it's \$5200 if I remember right.

Andy 23:57

And what happens if you receive that? Like you just can't? They return it?

Larry 24:01

Well, what happens is- getting into the nuances- the system tells us. When we're entering it into the system, it tells us if that donor has exceeded and it flags out that donation for us. You can override it, and you can tell it to go ahead and accept it. But guess what? When you do that, you get a notice from the Secretary of State saying that you're out of compliance. And then you need to either return it to the donor or you need to give it to a charity. You need to get it off your books. But yes, you can actually take more. Sometimes it happens inadvertently. Big entities, larger entities, one hand doesn't know what the other was doing. Or they intended to be reported in two different cycles. And they give you they give you money at the end of one cycle, and you don't actually receive it, and you're not careful about when you can log it into the system. You use the date that you received it versus the date on the check and then you're in another reporting cycle, and you end up with too much too much in that cycle. So there's so many things that can go wrong, but yes, it is tracked.

Andy 25:01

I will just tell you that there's a tech podcast that I listened to that had someone that was running for Congress somewhere in Massachusetts. And she's here on a podcast that gets 100,000 downloads a week. And she's like, Here's my address for you to donate money. So she could have received donations. She's trying to run for the House of Representatives at the federal level for representing Massachusetts, but she could be receiving donations from all over the country. That would be okay because it's a single donation that is underneath those limits.

Larry 25:36

If there are any limits. But yes, they solicit outside their districts for federal races for those competitive Senate seats. Particularly, you'll see a lot of fund raising with your senator Warnock. He will be raising money all over the country. Any senators in a swing seat that's competitive that's up for reelection this year and even key House races, they fundraise outside their districts. Absolutely.

Are you a first-time listener of Registry Matters? Well, then make us a part of your daily routine and subscribe today. Just search for Registry Matters through your favorite podcast app. Hit the subscribe button and you're off to the races. You can now enjoy hours of sarcasm and snark from Andy and Larry on a weekly basis. Oh, and there's some excellent information thrown in there too. Subscribing also encourages others of you people to get on the bandwagon and become regular Registry Matters listeners. So, what are you waiting for? Subscribe to Registry Matters right now. Help us keep fighting and continue to say FYP.

Andy 26:49

Alright. We should probably move on. Number four. Says I've asked you people before about my cousin who's facing federal CP charges. His family is considering cashing in their 401K and refinancing their home to hire a private attorney. The case has been put off for at least twice by his Federal Public Defender and the peanut butter has hit the fan on CP with all the controversy surrounding Judge Jackson and if she will be on the Supreme Court. The family thinks it's the best option because they believe that a private attorney can get the best outcome. Does FYP believe that this is a good strategy? So I mean, if it's simply if having a private attorney is better than a public defender, the answer probably always has to be yes, because just of the resource constraints that a public defender is most likely always overloaded with 10 times as many cases as a private attorney.

Larry 27:42

I can buy into part of that in the state system, but the Federal Public Defender system is much different. Much, much greater resources. It's a very coveted position. A lot of people yearn to be a Federal Public Defender that are in criminal defense because of the high salary and the selective nature and the support staff and the smaller caseload they have. I would say to this family, I would not advise it. It's a personal choice. I would not advise discharging a Federal Public Defender and substituting in a private attorney. I know the actual details of the case. I'm actually talking to the person. And they're talking \$100,000 because of the number of images and how much how egregious the charges are. I can't see a different outcome in this case. There has been a confession. There has been a counseled confession in this case. It is unlikely this is going to change. Now in terms of putting the case off, that was a strategic decision that an attorney makes when they have a young offender. And I have no consultation directly with this attorney. I can only tell you what we would be doing in a similar scenario. What we're trying to do is to keep a young person that doesn't seem like they would do well in prison because of their tender, youthful look, we're trying to figure out a way to keep them from going to the big house. In the federal system, you're going to get time. It's only a question of how much. And so we're looking for a way to try to- if you're in a holding facility pretrial, which this person is, we would be looking for a way to build up as much pretrial confinement as we could possibly get by doing all the delays you can. In the federal system, they don't tolerate a lot of delays like they do in the state system. But this case has been delayed twice. What we would be doing is trying to be able to put forth a sentencing option to the court to look at the 18 months or whatever it is that's already been served and considering that. Plus maybe halfway house confinement, which is also recognized as detention. But it's community-based, halfway house confinement. We're trying to put together a strategy that'll save that person from going to the big house. That's probably what the Federal Public Defender was doing. I don't think any Federal Public Defender could have foreseen the Breyer retirement and the controversy that was going to ensue around the appointee, because you would have to know who the appointee was going to be. You'd have to know what her sentencing practices had been. And you'd have to know that that was going to be vilified by the people on the conservative side of the aisle. That would be very difficult for the average public defender to know all that, and be able to anticipate all that. So even though the peanut butter has now hit the fan, I can't see a judge now that would have been

inclined to have bought into my argument that the young man's already got 21 months in custody sitting pretrial or whatever it is, and we can give him another 42 months or another 16 months or whatever in community based confinement, and then with all the other constraints that go that were enunciated by Judge Jackson, I don't think that's going to be very palatable to the judges right now. Because they're looking at this saying I don't want that to be me next. If I'm going to be considered for an appointment to an appellate level court as a trial judge, I got to be real careful, because this is going to be under the microscope. Sentencing is going to come up again and again. The reason why? It worked. It changed the attitude of people about sentencing. We're going to get into an article later in terms of proposals to change sentencing guidelines, but it worked. Therefore, folks, since it worked, you would expect that they will do this again, and again, and again. The only reason they would not do this again, is if it did not work. But it worked. Now, when I say it worked, it's not going to stop the confirmation, which I predicted. There's one Republican already said that she's going to vote for it. So there's nothing they can do to stop that. But that's not their goal. I mean, that would be an extra benefit. But their goal was to stop future appointments to appellate level courts by taking control of the Senate by scaring people into a shifted control senate. That was their goal. And that's what that's where they're focused right now. I mean, Jackson's like ancient history. I mean, she's gonna be on the Supreme Court.

Andy 32:17

Right, right. Right. Right. But I mean, what's she gonna have? Like 53? I don't know she may end up with more because there's a whole lot of undecideds. But I read an article today that Mitch McConnell's urging his party to vote against.

Larry 32:31

And Graham's already announced. And I had some clips but decided not to use them because I think we've made our point already. But Graham has been very eloquent in his disgust about how these kinds of people should not be treated lightly. And we would just be beating a dead horse playing stuff that he said again when he announced he's going to vote against her.

Andy 32:52

Let me ask you one question about this question. What is the peanut butter has hit the fan? What is peanut butter?

Larry 33:02

That's a nice way of saying that.

Andy 33:06

Alright, so this is the sh*t hitting the fan, but someone decided to say peanut butter. Got it. Now I understand everything. Oh, let's see. Do you want to do the Hawley thing, or do you want to do the question about language first? Which do you prefer?

Larry 33:22

Language?

Andy 33:25

Yes, the language of a bill.

Larry 33:28

Oh, let's do Hawley since we're on that same subject area.

Andy 33:32

Very good. Very good. So someone posted this actually in the Discord server. I'm not sure if it made it out to any other of the affiliate groups or anything like that. And this is from Senator Josh Hawley's website. Hawley leads bill to protect children, toughened sentences for CP offenders. Here is some serious, like propaganda / hyperbole about the exponentially growing problem of CP epidemic in the United States that I want to definitely point out- So I guess there is citing. I was trying to see if there were numbers. That new number grew to 45 million material pieces, whatever, of CP in '18 and has doubled since then in 2021. So whatever. There's a whole lot more people running around with cell phone cameras taking pictures of the junk that would be classified to be. I just think this is ridiculousness, but the whole thing here is that here is the representative that was- sorry, Senator- that was attacking Miss Jackson in the Supreme Court nominations. And here he is trying to make a bill that makes everything much worse for people with these charges.

Larry 34:39

Yeah, and let me just read the first paragraph because I want people to be clear who is behind this. This this bill is co-sponsored by Senator Mike Lee, Republican from Utah. Rick Scott, Republican from Florida. And Thom Tillis, Republican from North Carolina. And then they don't state the party affiliation for Ken Buck from Colorado congressperson who's going to carry an identical bill in the House. If people want to do a quick Google and see what party, we will bash Ken Buck regardless of what party.

Andy 35:14

I did. I looked him up. He is a Republican.

Larry 35:17

Okay, so we've got the sponsorship of- this is not FYP. We are saying it, but this is the reality. This is a historical fact. And this will, according to the Protect Act, this is from Josh Hawley's website, so I'm assuming he would only tell the truth. He says at the bottom, to enhance the penalties for possessing CP, federal law imposes a five year mandatory minimum for receiving CP but not for possessing it. There is no meaningful difference between possession and receipt. So this would make the mandatory five years for both. And then the other bullet point it says, the Supreme Court declared in *USA versus Booker* that the guidelines cannot be binding. But this bill would prohibit judges from sentencing below the guidelines range for facts found in trial that are admitted by a defendant. This change would ensure that judges impose tougher sentences. Now if you are for what you say you are, for discretion, we have just named four lawmakers that need to hear from you. Now, I don't think you're going to change their mind. But they just need to not get a free ride that they think that everyone's for this. But also, you might consider when you vote, when people tell you what they're for unequivocally as these have, take them at their word. They're going to do everything they can to make your life miserable when they're in office as it relates to this issue.

Andy 36:51

Larry, I always struggle with that, in this specific case- and we talked about this, so if we can extrapolate out and talk about different subjects at some other time- but we have technology that is advancing at a mind-numbing pace. And our system is not designed to move at a mind-numbing pace. And the production of anything photographic a decade ago was challenging. Like cameras on phones was garbage. But now you're running around with an 8k camera in your pocket. And people make full on movies with just an iPhone, a \$1,000 cell phone. And they're making a movie that gets released into theaters, practically. So the pen itself is not good or evil, it's what you do with it. And here, we're going to do something with legislation that is so easy to do, that a lot of people would not necessarily be doing it with any sort of intent to be doing something wrong in the case of people taking pictures of their junk. And that is then classified as CP because obviously someone is a minor in the photo. This is more of a cultural shift than needing to have legislation against it and just throwing away the key on a whole bunch of people with pictures of people and their junk. That balance in there so hard to me.

Larry 38:16

It has to be a minor junk. Your junk is fine. So that's the problem. But that can be a real problem because minors, under federal law, they're anyone under 18. But age of consent laws, oftentimes, are less than that. So you can have a consensual relationship with someone and you have the picture, which is kind of common, I'm told. I mean, it wasn't in my day. We had to have a big bulky camera back in the 1800s. (Andy: A Polaroid.) Well, we didn't have a Polaroid in 1800s.

Andy 38:51

The thing where you put the carpet over your head, so you can get in there and the thing poofs.

Larry 38:59

But we didn't have that option. But we would have done it. We would not be any different than any other adolescent. The only thing was the options were different.

Andy 39:13

But we're going to introduce legislation and then potentially throw away the key on people.

Larry 39:19

That's what we're going to do. And that's where the public is until it happens to them. That's where they are. This sounds really good. The family that I'm working with that has that question, they are very much in the same line of Hawley and Cruz. And they are totally shocked he's going to prison, that he got held pretrial. And I said well, this is the stuff you voted for for the last several decades. You wanted you wanted to be tough on criminals and not let them out so they could victimize society. You wanted lengthy prison sentences. So you're getting exactly what you were for. I'm surprised that you're surprised. It shocks me that you don't understand. This is what you were for.

Andy 40:09

Yeah, yeah, just now that it has personally impacted you, now you're like, What in the world? How did this happen?

Larry 40:16

That's exactly what they say. Well, I didn't know you weren't entitled to bond. We haven't had traditional bond in the federal system since the bail reform act of 1984. And here in our state, it's not quite as old, but we've got a similar system here where people can be held pretrial without bond. It's a real serious problem. I happen to believe that you're presumed innocent, and I don't care about your offense. I care about the presumption of innocence. When I say I don't care, I do care. But I want to stick with that presumption except in extraordinary, narrow circumstances that a person's presumed innocent and should be eligible to be released. Now, there will be some extraordinary circumstances with a serial killer where the proof is insurmountable. But as a general rule, people need to be presumed innocent. If that means anything, if you think that constitution provision seriously, then you should not be holding people pretrial, because they're not guilty.

Andy 41:14

Right. I just want to read one of the comments from this article, this proposal. The confirmation hearings of Biden Supreme Court nominee have exposed a troubling leniency on the left and most surprisingly, on the right, for those who commit sexual offenses against children. It's time for Congress to stand with the victims of these offenses, and to ensure that perpetrators receive the severe punishment these crimes deserve.

Larry 41:40

Yep, yep. That's where they are. But like I say that's resonating quite well. They're getting a lot of mileage out of that. That is going to be a major issue in the election cycle. You don't need to be surprised. They are going to try to capture the Senate back by saying, we can't stand any more of these kind of judges on our appellate courts. That means the courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court. We need to be your guardian, you need to entrust us. We will see to it that these current judges don't get through if you trust us with the Senate. That's what the campaign is going to be about.

Andy 42:15

Gotcha. Okay, well, then, finally-ish, this would be the last main segment before we cover some articles. I wanted to talk to you about the impact that's specific, and I mean, down like, hyper, hyper, hyper specific down to the impact that a single word can have in the impact of legislation rolling through Georgia. And I know, there's somebody out there that b*tches when we talk about Georgia, New Mexico all the time. But look, I live in Georgia. So this one kind of like showed up on my radar. And of course, when things show up in New Mexico, they're in your wheelhouse. But if you have something that you want to talk about, feel free. But anyway, so this one was in Georgia, and it's House Bill 347. And among the changes in it, there's one specific change that was made, and it's on line 17. And they changed one word, Larry, from the word "or" to "and." And while that to me would be like, what's the big deal? What does that matter? But because of the way the two conditions that we're talking about in this bill, this proposal, it says 10 years have elapsed since the individual has completed all prison parole, supervised released and probation, and has been leveled a level one by the review board. But before it said "or." So you could have condition A or condition B. And you could be released from the registry. This one word makes it that you have to achieve both of them. So I wanted to noodle around with you

since you're a policy / legislative expert person about the impact of these individual words and how important that is.

Larry 44:00

Absolutely. Well, the funny thing about this bill is that what you just said is exactly the way it would have been presented in committee. The lead sponsor would have said exactly what you said. You know, this is existing law. Here's what would have gone down. The committee chair would have said, Now we're moving to house bill 347, the gentleman / gentlelady, whoever the lead sponsor is, to explain the bill. And the person would have said, well, this modifies the Sex Offender Registration Act. And we're seeking to align Georgia to be more like our surrounding states in terms of the removal process. So we don't really need to do a whole lot of change, but we're going to change one word, and only one word. And we're going to change from an "or" to an "and." And then they would stop at that point. And so unless you had someone on the committee who wanted to be pro PFR, no one's going to have a problem with changing "or" to "and." If someone does on the liberal left stand up and say what's the purpose of the "and?" Well, Madam Chairman / Mr. Chairman, the reason why we're changing that is because we're trying to bring Georgia to closer alignment to the surrounding states. So this will make the removal process more consistent with the states that surround us. And, you know, it's not a big change, but it's to have consistency. Georgia is a little bit lenient now, in terms of how people get off. Oh, you'd see people at that point that were playing with their phones, when the "lenient" came out, they would all of the sudden put their phones down, and they would stop typing on their laptop, because they know that this is a threat to their political career if they're lenient on PFRs. Or they perceive it that way, whether it's a legitimate fear or not. They would say, So we can fix this with just one word? That would be a question for one of the members of the committee. We can fix this with just one word. And they would say yes. And they would move Do Pass. And when they look around to take public comment, there wouldn't be a single person, in all likelihood, speaking against the bill. The Georgia Sheriffs Association would be for it. The Georgia Association of District Attorneys would be for it. Not telling how many law enforcement type entities would be for it. And there would be virtually no one speaking against the bill. (Andy: Unless we're there.) This type of thing typically would roll right through. Now, This pandemic has apparently been pending for a couple of years, and since assembly has adjourned, I don't think this made it through. But it's surprising to me that it did not make it through because it's such a minor change.

Andy 46:36

Um, I guess what I'm trying to focus on here is that one of the things that FYP, Registry Matters, and advocacy in general would be this isn't just about how you go vote for your particular politician at the ballot box. But how, leading up to every year, if you're an annual session, or if you're- is Texas, is it every two years? Is that right? (Larry: It's every two years? Yes.) So whenever your legislation is in office, though, is then our job/duty, our responsibility to be watching for things that have what would seem to be the most innocuous language in there, and then this one's passes right through committee, and they put it on the house on the floor, and they vote and poof, five minutes later, life just got dramatically more difficult to people?

Larry 47:24

Oh, absolutely. This would be the type of thing that could easily go through with unanimous support because what the scenario that it would have been presented, there would be unlikely that any material opposition would be on the committee that would be spontaneous. With your famous cameras and everything being live streamed, you cannot risk speaking in favor of a PFR as a committee member, because it's being live streamed. It's being archived for future campaigns. So, if you're a member of the Democrat party, which you're already a minority in Georgia, if you're a member of the Democrat Party, and you're in a swing seat that has something approximating a balanced representation of voters, the last thing you're going to do, even if you're so inclined, is to say, Well, I'm sorry, folks, but you know, I think having to do both of these things is going to make it harder for people to get off the registry. And I have some concerns about this, Mr. Chairman, that we're taking what has worked fairly well and we're going to transition to forcing people to have the 10 years in and to be a level one. And that means fewer people are going to be off. Can you imagine how many people would be willing to have that archived in perpetuity to be used in the next election cycle? It's just not the way it works. It's just not.

Andy 48:43

So then what is the strategy for something like this to not make it? We have to derail it so that nobody has to vote and then it's not on record for anybody?

Larry 48:54

Well, the strategy is you've got to build support with these conservatives who can- first of all, they don't get hit on crime. They get hit on other issues. So I'm not trying to say that the Democrat Party doesn't hit conservatives. They do. They absolutely vilify conservatives.

Andy 49:08

It's just a completely different plate of issues.

Larry 49:11

It's all a completely different thing that they're going to hit you on. They're going to hit you because you're trying to destroy the environment. You know, you're trying to be probusiness, you're trying to keep the workers from having any rights. So I mean, they're gonna hit the hell out of you, but not on crime. I've challenged and I continue to repeat the challenge, if you can show me a Democrat hitting a Republican on crime, we will vilify that Democrat, because it just doesn't happen in the modern times. Now that did happen in the not too distant past when the parties were more diverse in terms of their tolerance for viewpoints. But now the parties are very polarized along an ideological bent, and they don't have conservatives in the Democratic Party like they used to and you don't have liberals in the Republican Party like you used to. But yes, what you would do is you would try to convince somebody who is on the committee that it's been assigned to- be great if it's the chair, but if it's not the chair, some member on the committee who has very little opposition, they're in a very safe seat, that this is not good public policy. You need a couple of good points to convince them this is not good public policy. And I don't know what those points are because it's unique to the bill, the lay of the land of the landscape of what's going on in Georgia at the particular time. If there hasn't been a high profile

PFR case where somebody has done something that's on the registry that got off the registry. But you would have to convince them, that there are some good, solid reasons and throw your stupid recidivism out the window. It's going to be more fiscally driven, because conservatives talk about fiscal responsibility. So you would have to come up with some arguments revolving around keeping the large group of people in the registry makes it more expensive and unwieldy. And we can't focus our very precious and limited resources on the ones who need to be tracked and followed. And that would be one argument you would make. And you need a conservative to lead that charge to raise that issue. And you will get the minuscule number of Democrats on that committee, you'll find bipartisan support for that if you can get a Republican to speak against and express concern. So that would be my strategy if were in a Republican state. If I were in a democratic state, I'm gonna take a different strategy. I'm gonna try to wreck the thing without it ever getting to vote. And if I can't wreck it in the first committee, I'm gonna try to wreck in the next committee or the next, because ours goes through so many committees before it can make it to the final vote. So I'm gonna try my best to do a trade wreck and make sure it doesn't make it to the finish line. But some people don't have that option, because they don't have as extensive committee assignments as we do here. Everything here is going to go through generally four committees, two on each side of the rotunda.

Andy 51:51

Okay, and that would be opportunities for you to find some way to delay it, have someone out sick when they need to vote. Anything of that sort?

Larry 52:01

You're trying to keep it from being heard. That's what you're trying to do. If it gets heard, once it gets out of committee, depending on where you're in the session, it may not make it through the process. I don't care if something passes in the final four days on the House side if it hasn't got to the Senate yet, because in four days, it's the most extraordinary effort to get it to the finish line. So you can relent on your opposition. It's all very intricate strategy. You have to understand how these processes work. And that means you can't do it on your keyboard. You actually have to go meet these people, watch them work, get to know them, understand how they make the process work, and where the pressure points are. In part time legislature like Georgia where they're only gonna meet 40 days, every day is precious. And everybody's jockeying trying to get their bills hurt. So if you've got a bad bill, you can afford to let them vote on it if it's close to the end of the session, and it can't make it to the finish line. You can afford to let the Committee be bold and say you were going to all vote unanimous Do Pass. Never going to make it the finish line. But you have to understand all that. You have to understand whether it can make it to the finish line.

Andy 53:12

I gotcha. I think we should probably move on, before everyone's eyes roll in the back of their head because it starts to get a little wonky.

Larry 53:18

That's correct. All right. Let's keep going.

Andy 53:22

Um, I just wanted to acknowledge that a patron sent in a question regarding a decision that was in Texas about prosecutors withholding evidence and just wanted to let you know that we got it, but there wasn't really enough time to get into it. Did you want to even say anything about it or just kick it to next week?

Larry 53:35

It's a civil lawsuit. I think the criminal conviction was actually reversed. But the civil lawsuit, I don't think I understand it well enough to sound intelligent about it. I'll have to read the case from the from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Andy 53:50

Very good. All right. Well, then, I guess we are at the speed round of articles to cover. And we got seven minutes to cover articles Larry. So if you can keep it brief, then we can cover many. If not, we'll cover one.

Larry 54:08

Well, let's pick out what we're gonna do. Let's do the Sidney Thomas, and Biden struck out on police reform. And let's do North Carolina. Let's do North Carolina, Sidney Thomas and Biden struck out. Those three.

Andy 54:22

Alright, so we'll do North Carolina first. And come on. Get that loaded in there. So this is from the News and Observer. Felon voting ban is racially motivated, unconstitutional North Carolina judge rules. What is going on here, sir?

Larry 54:41

Well, I don't understand the judiciary system in North Carolina, but it appears to be a three judge panel. As I did a quick read of the 71- I didn't do a quick read. I did a glance at the 71-page opinion. But apparently, this ruling is unprecedented, and it has the potential to open up the voting rolls in North Carolina to about 55,000 felons. And you don't have to wait till you complete your sentence. Once you're released from prison, the new standard would be that once people leave prison, even though they're being supervised... and they cite to Maine and Vermont that do that. And the ruling was two to one by panel of three superior court judges. I don't understand that that system in North Carolina, but what I do understand is what it says about who's opposing it. And I know we're supposed to not be partisan here, but it says and I'm just reading from this that the opposition, where it's coming from. And it's not coming from the Democrat Party, that's all I can tell you. That's what happened here. So there's a lot of folks in North Carolina that do not want felons voting.

Andy 55:58

I think I'm gonna leave the rest of that alone. Yeah, we'll move on. So we'll move over to Sidney Thomas then? I had some ideas.

Larry 56:13

Well, I'll just read from the article, so it's not me saying it. It wasn't clear if Republican lawmakers who had defended the law so far will appeal the ruling. So again, like I say, it's not the Democrat party that's trying to keep people that have felonies from voting in this instance in North Carolina. So let's move on.

Andy 56:34

Okay. So this is from courthouse News Service. Sidney Thomas, former chief judge of the ninth circuit, to retire. Why do we care about this?

Larry 56:43

We care about this because of what the election cycle that's bearing down on us the US Senate, we're at 1/3 of the US Senate is up for re election every two years. And as I was saying a little bit earlier, this battle about Jackson has nothing to do with Jackson any longer. She's gonna go on the court. But what it does do is that, since this person has been appointed and been supposedly a representative of the liberal way of thinking, Thomas served on Ninth Circuit, beginning in 1996 when he was appointed by the US president, Bill Clinton. He served as chief judge of the court from 2014 to 2021. Well, if he steps down, which he is going to, and the strategy that they're working is successful, then guess who will get to confirm or deny the President's appointment? Now, we don't have to look back very far. All we have to do is look back in the final two years of the Obama presidency from 2015-2016 when virtually no federal judges were confirmed, because that's when the Republicans took control of the Senate in 2014. And their tenure of control lasted 2015 and '16 and beyond, but they had control of the Senate. And they virtually put the brakes on confirmation. That is what this battle is about, folks. They are not going to confirm any more appellate judges if they win back the Senate. So if these are the type of judges that you like, then, as you go to the ballot box in your state, if you have a US Senate seat on the ballot, you need to think about who you're voting for. Because two years ago, the people in Texas had that choice. And they chose Cruz. Two years ago, the people in South Carolina had that choice. They chose Lindsey Graham. And I think it was four years ago that they had that choice in Missouri. They had Claire McCaskill versus Josh Hawley. And they made the choice they made. If you're for what you say you are, then you need to keep that in mind when you vote.

Andy 58:56

Should I bring up Larry that there are so many other issues that we need to look at? We have to look at this issue and that issue, and this is just one of those issues?

Larry 59:05

Well, that's what they tell me. They say, Larry, you don't understand. I have to look at the bigger picture. Then I say, Okay, well, you know, that's kind of insulting as if I don't look at the bigger picture as well. I'll look at taxation. I'll look at environmental policy. I'll look at everything that you look at. National defense, I'll look at all these things. But apparently they don't think we do. So I ask them to be specific. What are the big issues? You know what they usually align themselves with? They worry about prayer in schools. They worry about same sex marriage and how that's destroying the country. They worry about the individual choice for an abortion, and they will vote on those issues to the detriment of everything else. They will say, well those things are just more important to me and I have to have to vote my conscience on that. So that's where it comes down. I'm not criticizing that. I'm just telling you, that's what they tell me. It seems a little strange to me. If you can't go to your school to see your kid grow up, you're not allowed to have a job because of

employment restrictions, you're not allowed to rent a place or even buy a place because those places are off limits because they're too close to things even though you have the money to purchase them. If you're not allowed to live in a place, to me those issues would be far more important in my prioritization than same sex marriage and prayer in schools and stuff like that. But that's just my prioritization of how I would look at things.

Andy 1:00:23

There's a buddy of mine in the state, and he's basically a one issue voter. Not being critical of it, but if someone is prochoice, he cannot vote for them, regardless of anything else. That is the one issue. That trips me up.

Larry 1:00:36

That's what I was just saying. That's what they tell me. So well, I don't understand it. But to me, those other things would rank a little higher. But that's just my priority.

Andy 1:00:50

Very good, sir. Um, the final one that we're going to talk about is from the Marshall Project, the Biden one. That's the one that you asked for? (Larry: Yes.) Okay. Biden struck out on police reform. Is Trump's remaining policy enough? Was there police reform during the Trump administration? I don't really recall that being a thing.

Larry 1:01:11

There wasn't really. Trump was more law and order. But we're at this point where anything that would seem to be reform, like- you remember we've talked about on various episodes about the qualified immunity, for example. That's not gonna happen. That would be a lot to do with police accountability. The civil lawsuits against police agencies, the consent decrees, like we have one here in Albuquerque right now, where the police were just killing an awful lot of people, those are gonna be a thing of the past. I mean, when this administration is done, and it will be done in two years, when this administration is done the reforms of reducing sentences, the first step act, there's nothing coming down the pipeline anytime soon. Right now, people are scared about crime. Crime is supposedly going up at an alarming rate. In some cities, it has been very alarming. But the citizens are no longer where they were a couple years back on reform. So Biden has struck out. There's not going to be any... and I think I called it here some months ago before this Marshall Project put their story out there. Reform is pretty much not happening.

Andy 1:02:28

Right. Totally understand. Do you want to do one more Larry? Are we done? We can be done.

Larry 1:02:38

I think I've done enough. I'm sick of this.

Andy 1:02:41

Very good. So I'm going to cover something. So here we go, just to make sure that everyone presses like and subscribe. And of course, share it with everyone that you know on the planet to make sure that we get the word out and spread that we exist here. And that would be fantastic if you did all that. Um, should I do Who's that speaker Larry or should I not do Who's that Speaker?

Larry 1:03:03

Do it if you've got a good one. And if we don't double our YouTube subscriber base by Christmas, I'm shutting this thing down.

Andy 1:03:10

I can't even tell you what one I picked. I know which one was there last time, so it'll almost be a surprise for me. But last time, I played this one.

Judge Judy. 1:03:20

To save a dog that looked as if it to them it had been abandoned. And here they get thanks from you people.

Andy 1:03:29

I had to do that just for you, Larry, because it had the you people in it. And of course, who was that? That was Judge Judy. And again, that was just totally picked because of the whole you people thing paying homage to you, Larry for the "you people" part. Right?

Larry 1:03:44

Awesome. I love that.

Andy 1:03:48

All right, so this week, I don't even know who it is. So it's a surprise to me. Hopefully I have it even cued up. But we'll see. So if you want to respond to this one, this one is for RM 220 Send an email to registrymatterscast@gmail.com And we'll see how it goes.

Who's that Speaker?

And then we're going to Washington DC to take back the White House.

Andy 1:04:13

I know you know that is. I do not remember who it is now.

Larry 1:04:13

I know who that is.

Andy 1:04:18

That is the most ridiculous scream. What was going on? Nevermind. We'll talk about that next week to tell me how that came about. We did get a new patron this week. Heather came in at a very generous level. Thank you so very much Heather and appreciate you becoming part of the Registry Matters and FYP team. Tell us about FYP education Larry.

Larry 1:04:41

FYP education. We had a new subscriber finally. I think we're gonna have to really push that because I need the number to make it economically worthwhile. If you're dividing the production cost of the transcript over a larger population, it makes the cost per unit much smaller. You know, the hard cost for the ink and the paper and envelopes and postage doesn't change. But the process is not automated. We actually have a human doing the transcript. So we'd like to make it really worth our while. And they're out there available for free. People can download them, of course, and send them to their loved ones. And that would even help us get people addicted to them if you would just go send one. Pick off of the fyp.org website, pick off the most recent edition of the

transcript and send it to them. And they will be hooked and then they will want to subscribe. But yeah, please help us.

Andy 1:05:36

Who was the new subscriber?

Larry 1:05:38

That was Douglas.

Andy 1:05:41

Okay, Douglas. Thank you very much, Douglas for coming on board. It's really special to have people on board with us. I guess that will close...

Larry 1:05:49

And that was for one year. His loved one is sending out a payment for one year and asked me if I'd go ahead and start it. I said, Of course I will, because I trust you.

Andy 1:06:01

Do you think that what happens if someone rejects it? Do we get it back? Do we have positive confirmation that it didn't make it?

Larry 1:06:08

We don't. We have an advantage over the NARSOL newsletter because it goes by bulk mail. There's no postage being paid for it to be returned. We send our transcripts by first class mail, which means that return to sender is guaranteed if the recipient rejects it. Oftentimes, certainly at least occasionally for sure, prisons don't follow the policy when they return something or reject it and they just don't return it. And the inmate never knows about it. But we do occasionally get a transcript back. And we are told why. And they say because we need to use text behind the wall. It is the friends and family correspondence. And we have to write to them and tell them that is not Friends and family mail, that this is an organization. And sometimes it works, and sometimes it doesn't.

Andy 1:06:55

I see. All right, well then head over to registrymatters.co for all the show notes and links to everywhere you need to go including FYPeducation.org. And you can leave voicemail at 747-227-4477. And as I said earlier, the email address is registrymatterscast@gmail.com. And if you want to support the program, then you can head over to patreon.com/registrymatters. You can find us everywhere on social media. Pretty much just twitter.com/registrymatters and youtube.com/registrymatters because we had to get to 100 subscribers to get that name brand thingamajigger there at YouTube. But I think that's all we got for Saturday night. What did you want to say?

Larry 1:07:44

And if you don't want to become a patron at a regular interval, you can do a one-time donation at fypeducation.org. It doesn't require you to do an ongoing thing, but we'd like both.

Andy 1:07:55

Sure. And so if you do do that, then make sure you let me know and if you want to get signed into discord to participate, then I can override and give you access to that too so you don't miss out on any of those perks.

Larry 1:08:07
Our global headquarters operation here would let you know if anybody makes the donations.

Andy 1:08:12
Sure. The vast research team?

Larry 1:08:16
Yes, we would certainly forward those to you. We haven't had a lot of traffic on that donate button yet.

Andy 1:08:22
Not yet. We're getting there. It's brand-new man. Like the paint still drying on it.

Larry 1:08:28
Absolutely. This is gonna be a booming entity. Just give it a little more time.

Andy 1:08:32
Very good. Well, thank you, sir very much as always. We record Saturday nights around seven o'clock Eastern time for anybody that's in different places. Because you know what, Larry, Eastern Time is the only one that matters, just saying. And with that I bid you a fine Saturday night and I'll talk to you soon.

Larry 1:08:51
Good night.

You've been listening to Registry Matters Podcast.
Registry Matters Podcast is a production of FYP Education.

More show transcripts are available at fypeducation.org.

In prison and can't get the podcast? Have a loved one "subscribe" at <https://patreon.com/registrymatters> at the **\$15 level**, and include your prison address information. Or send a check to cover at least 3 months.

Glossary:

PFR – Person Forced to Register
NARSOL – Nasional Association for Rational Sexual Offense Laws
AWA – Adam Walsh Act
BCC – Bureau of Community Corrections
CCC – Community Corrections Center
CCF – Community Corrections Facility
ICAOS - Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision
PC – Protective Custody
PREA - Prison Rape Elimination Act
DOC – Department of Corrections
CSL - Community Supervision for Life
DCS – Department of Community Supervision
IML – International Megan’s Law
SOMP – Sex Offender Management Program
BOP – Bureau of Prisons
STARC - Secure Treatment and Rehabilitation Center

CAGE – Citizens Against
Government Entrapment
PV – Parole / Probation
Violation

SMART Office - Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring,
Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking
MSR – Mandatory Supervised Release
ICAC - Internet Crimes Against Children
ACLU - American Civil Liberties Union
ACSOL - Alliance for Constitutional Sexual Offense Laws
ALI - American Law Institute
NCIC – National Crime information Center



**REGISTRY MATTERS
MAIL-IN SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Sign me up for _____ months X \$6 = \$ _____
(Minimum 3 months) * **We do accept books or sheets of stamps. No singles please.**

First Name Last Name

Name of Institution ID Number

Address

City State Zip Code

**Make check payable to FYP Education and send to RM Podcast,
Post Office Box 36123, Albuquerque, NM 87176**

FYP Education is designated a 501(c)(3) for tax purposes. Donations made to FYP Education are tax deductible.