



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 149

Recorded 10-17-20

Andy 00:00

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 a problem with these thoughts, fyp. Recording live from FYP Studios, east and west transmitting across the internet. This is Episode 149 of Registry Matters. Larry, how are you? Saturday night, welcome back.

Larry 00:23

Fantastic. Thanks for having me. We're catching up with my age.

Andy 00:27

Almost, almost Um, I don't think that anybody realizes it because the comments I received. Like, I had it was about 10 hours of editing to put the podcast back together last week there were so many problems but everyone was like I didn't notice anything, but we had a lot of technical problems last weekend. So hopefully tonight goes much more smoothly-er-ist. How about that for a word transcription?

Larry 00:48

I hope that I hope he can figure out something with that.

Andy 00:53

It was, yeah we'll see, we should put a marker to go look flag that one down when we get to it. Tell me what we have going on tonight.

Larry 01:04

We've got a plethora of listener questions. Sometimes they're readers, they come from prison but we've got questions. We've got a discussion about the who should make the Supreme Court appointment and how did the hearing go, the confirmation hearing that is. Then we've got some articles to talk about. And these questions should be good because...(Andy: Stupendous) We should, we've got stuff about last week's episode. We got a polygraph voice stress question. I mean, this is good stuff.

Andy 01:43

Awesome. Well, let's let's get going. First on the list is a letter that came in to asking a question says I am serving time...who sent this letter. That's, I don't even know who this was. Let me see that was real quick. This is from Thomas is what this is. Says:

Listener Question

I'm serving time in Iowa where the state has recently started requiring voice stress analysis test to all inmates required to do sex offender treatment. The prison is telling inmates that this test is 100% accurate, which Larry, there's no way that that's a hundred percent accurate. The question pack given to inmates to fill out prior to this test, ask many questions about other acts or crimes, but does not pose a single question regarding the inmates current crime or conviction. This packet seems to be the very definition of compelled self-incrimination as defined in the McCune vs. Lyle, as completion of treatment depends on passing this test. And SOTP is required for good civil commitment, sorry, good time versus civil commitment, etc. In Iowa, there is no way that there is a stress test thing that would tell you whether you're lying or not. There's just no way.

Larry 02:53

We actually discussed if I think on an episode not too far back, I know, I wrote about it for the NARSOL newsletter the Digest in June. And it's interesting, because that questioner also came from Iowa. So this is a hot topic in Iowa, the introduction of this voice stress analysis. And we honestly don't have any case law that I've been able to unearth on that particular thing. So, my opinion would be that we would need to look at the existing case law in terms of the polygraph. Because force incrimination regardless of what tool they use, it's still it's still the constitution for self-incrimination. So the case law that's developed particularly in the Tenth, and I believe the Seventh Circuit, if I remember my article. In the 10th circuit was the Vaughn Bearing and then the *Lacy v. Butz* case, I believe it was out of the Seventh Circuit. If the person's being forced to bring themselves within a zone of criminal prosecution, they can decline to answer those questions. But they can't just decline to participate in the testing regimen. And I would, I would guess, like I say, we don't have any any any case law on point that I've been able to find out about voice stress analysis. But if if the person objects to a particular question, now what they're doing is they're doing the sexual history polygraph because that determines how much treatment the person needs. There may be a lot of victims that haven't been detected yet. And this person may have been offending for a very long time is their theory. And so, they do this sexual history disclosure to begin with

Andy 04:39

Whether it's voice stress or hooking up a kabuki machine to you to intimidate you into confessing to things, if that would then be required for you to complete your treatment which would then be required for you to potentially get off early, like get on to parole, whatever term you want to use in your state, they are putting you in I guess that's that Hobson's choice thing where maybe you do have a bunch of victims in your past, but there's no evidence to like there's no criminal case that's being brought before that. Or you could just be super stressed out, and they think you're being deceptive. And now you're just screwed and have to ride out your whole sentence.

Larry 05:21

Well, that's but I believe in the *Nichols v. Lau* case, that's what exactly what the Supreme Court said, they said that this is not to adding additional punishment. That punishment was already there. (Andy: Right.) You're just not getting the privilege of being released early. So therefore, you're not entitled to privilege. That was the Supreme Court's reading in that. Now it gets more interesting in states where you're not being released early, when you've actually done all of your time. And they continue to hold you. I'm not sure they're doing that for treatment reasons, but they're doing it for a lack of proper and appropriate housing, because they have a post-period supervision period that follows incarceration once you've served the sentence. Illinois would be an example. New Mexico would be another example. But when you're when you're being granted the privilege of leaving early, I mean, you can tell them where to take their polygraph and their voice stress analyzer. And you do not, you do not have to take these tests. At some point, if you leave prison with a period of supervision, you'll be back in the same position.

Andy 06:25

Yeah. And and the other thing that that has been suggested is, go ahead and take the test. And when they ask you the question that's going to cause you that much grief, then you decline that question. You don't just say eff you, I'm not taking anything. Right?

Larry 06:39

That is correct. And you're going to know the question before they wire you up. They don't just hook you up to the Kabuki machine and start asking questions. They do an pre-interview...

Andy 06:49

I love calling it a Kabuki machine for real.

Larry 06:53

They do so the questions in pretest interview and they do they tell you what they're going to ask you. So, it's not a surprise barrage of questions. I've had people tell me, well, they just hooked me up. And they just started asking... If they did that, that was not anything approximating a legitimate polygraphy. Because that's not the way polygraphs are done.

Andy 07:14

And the whole idea there is to see the question in advance to get you to start stressing over it so that when you like *breathes heavily* the question about four years ago, when like that they're doing it for the reason of planting the seed to get you to stress out over it.

Larry 07:30

Oh, well, that's not their theory, their theory is that they're giving you the question about so that you can disclose at thing you need to that would cause you to have problems. If the question was too broad, you can work on the phraseology of the question, and that that they claim they're not doing it to cause you to have stress.

Andy 07:49

And so what are, what is our answer for a Thomas? Is that what it was? Thomas, yes.

Larry 07:54

Yes. Well, well, the answer, the answer is that he's in the Eighth Circuit and the Eighth Circuit case law, I didn't find any directly on point. The seventh and the 10th was where *Vaughn* came from, those are persuasive. The eighth circuit is entirely, with the exception of one, the entire judge panel on the Eighth Circuit, so no matter which three-judge panel you draw, you're going to get all conservative appointed judges by various republican presidents. Obama had one appointment that's on that court, but they're all republican appointees. So, I know we won't get the right decision. Because the right presidents made the appointments. But we don't have any...

Andy 08:38

there's no snark there is there, Larry?

Larry 08:42

Nooo, but but we don't, we don't have any, we don't have any case law to go on. But I'm assuming that if I were in that position, I would argue that these persuasive cases from the other circuits

would be not binding. But you would argue that these are persuasive. But you just can't refuse to be polygraphed. There's got to be a threat, your self incrimination kicks in when there's a threat of actually something happening to you. The fact that you find a question uncomfortable does not put you within the zone of prosecution. And that's where *Vaughn* and the cases are coming down that there's has to be a credible threat of prosecution. And so I don't know where to thread that needle in terms of how far to tell someone to cooperate. You almost have to make your own decision when you when you're faced with this situation. What am I going to do? How bad do you want to leave prison?

Andy 09:31

Yeah, I'm pretty sure Charles is asking says what if you say you have no prior crimes and you fail the stress test, then they're going to call that you're being deceptive and you're certainly not going to get released early from after that situation. I'm pretty sure you wouldn't.

Larry 09:46

I'm guessing he's right. But what I would never do, and and this is something that people frequently do is they begin the confessionals after they're told that they failed. You never confess anything. Uncounseled confessions, What I mean by uncounseled is without an attorney, you would never admit to committing a crime without the advice of counsel. And normally you're going to get something in exchange for that admission. But I don't care how many times they tell you you failed the polygraph, you never say that you did a crime.

Andy 10:20

And this is also behind the walls where you would have way less chance to get an attorney to represent you.

Larry 10:26

It would be a lot more difficult, yes.

Andy 10:30

All right. Well, then let's bounce over to question number two, which is, maybe this is enhanced language. And this says:

Listener Question

I listened to last week's episode about the case that went to trial in New Mexico. Although I was happy to hear what sometime, excuse me, that sometimes there is an acquittal, I am sorry for the victim in that particular case because she was denied justice. It's obvious to me that Ashley is a high dollar attorney, and she was good at manipulating the jury. Now, thanks to Ashley, the victim has to carry this with her for the rest of her life. Ashley herself admitted that sex occurred, how can she sleep with herself knowing that her scheming and manipulation deny this woman justice? How many people facing sexual accusations can afford a high dollar attorney like Ashley?

Andy 11:23

Geez, Larry, that's kinda kind of harsh.

Larry 11:25

Well, I didn't put a name with it, because it would reveal the the person who is actually one of our advocates, that that wrote this. And there isn't much embellishment here, but just a tad bit. But

there are so many questions here that I don't know where to start. But I'll tell you that in this particular case, Ashley was not a high dollar attorney. She was a very, very lowly paid public defender who who received a contract appointment that paid only a few hundred dollars. So so that that did not apply in this particular case. Now that doesn't mean that people that have a large bank accounts, don't get better representation. But this was not a case of that. In terms of how can she sleep with herself, I can answer that one, we sleep mighty fine. Because our job is not to find the truth. When you're on the defense side, in an adversarial system, our job is to hold the accusing party to their burden of proof and make sure they carry that burden to be under reasonable doubt. We do not have any obligation to help figure out what happened. We have an obligation to make sure that the accusers prove what happened beyond a reasonable doubt. So we don't go home and think about it beyond the end of the trial, when the not guilty comes in, that's the last time you think about it. You celebrate it and you go on to the next case. If this person, did get away with something, I suppose that when they get a charge the next time, perhaps they'll bring in 404b evidence, which is the rule that allows you to bring in prior bad acts. And maybe the outcome will be different. But you sleep just fine.

Andy 12:58

So Larry, on the other side of that equation, though, for the prosecution side, they're not seeking justice, either they're seeking a conviction, you're seeking something of acquittal, not guilty, you're seeking that side, but from the prosecutors not trying to seek justice, either. The prosecution is just trying to seek a guilty verdict.

Larry 13:15

Well, I would like to think that the prosecutor believes the accuser, and that they brought the case because they actually believed, but the jury didn't in this particular instance. The jury of 12 did not believe that the sex that was acknowledged, was not consensual. Just because sex happens, doesn't mean that it's nonconsensual. And if you're going to try to put a person in a cage, and you're going to take their freedom away, you have the burden of proving that what happened wasn't consensual. The accused has no burden to carry.

Andy 13:56

I don't like it. I still see like, should they be interested in justice? Yes, I think they should be. And we you know, are 95%, 97%, 99% of the prosecutors out there seeking justice and not bringing bs charges? Yes. But does it happen the other way too? Are there vendettas, axes to grind? Yes. So then at that point, then you have people's personal agenda getting inserted into the system.

Larry 14:26

Well, you do indeed have that. You have the prosecutors are largely elected at the state level, they're elected by the local district where that prosecution office functions. And they, for a number of reasons, they could be driven to bring a weak case because of the politics. But I can't change that. That's the system we have. It's like when I talk about capitalism. When I talk about this system, we have a system where you have two jousting opponents. We don't have this lovey-dovey system that people are talking about where we have a restorative model. We have an adversarial system where the accusing party bears the burden to

prove in a criminal case beyond a reasonable doubt. And the people who are charged with carrying out that responsibility are elected. And they have a variety of considerations, including staying in office, because they've got kids to feed and all this stuff. And they do have that moral responsibility, and ethical responsibility that a prosecutor has that's actually greater than a defense attorney to seek justice if they know that the person did it, but they don't. Most of them don't know that. I mean, nobody knows what happened, whether it was consensual or not. All the prosecution has is a victim and the victim's advocate telling them that you need to get justice and what if that person's politically connected? What if they, what if they're prominent in the community or connected to someone who is and they're getting pressure? Suppose it's a high-profile case in the media and they're getting pressure. They're being told to get justice, the pressure on them is to get justice. And justice means convicting someone, holding someone accountable. So there's a variety of reasons why prosecutions happen. And it all actually comes back to us. It's us, we the people who apply this pressure.

Andy 16:17

Let's move over to another listener question. It says:

Listener Question

Thank you for your continued efforts to chip away at registration laws with the goal of pushing the wall over. I will continue to support you supporting us and this is from Brian, this is who this is from. I guess I could have seen that in the title. Briefly, I am incarcerated in Newcastle Correctional Facility in Indiana. Facility is around 95% PFRs. However, almost no one has heard of NARSOL. I'd like to see NARSOL reach more and more inmates. Have you considered uploading your registry matters podcast to the various companies that supply us tablets? For example, here in Indiana GTL, which is Global Tel Link is one tablet provider. Your podcast could be uploaded to the music library and we could search NARSOL to listen to any material you've uploaded. Use your podcast to advertise subscriptions to NARSOL, the Digest Lifetime's magazine etc. as Derek Logue says, with knowledge, we rise above the ashes, please consider expanding your reach and providing inmates with the knowledge they need and deserve.

Andy 17:20

I hadn't really considered this one. And I did like about three minutes of intensive Google searching to figure out that it looks like I would have to, we would have to pay to get it to each person. I don't know that this is for sure. I don't know if they have any way that we could upload the podcast and let it get disseminated just on its own. But I will continue investigating this. I think this is this is similar to the transcript idea, Larry, and might be an interesting avenue for us to get the actual audio feed into the prisons.

Larry 17:48

Well, that would be fantastic if we actually had listeners, and rather than having to wait a week, or we try to get them out within a week, but a week to 10 days to get the printed copy. That would be fantastic.

Andy 18:00

Yeah, I was, like I said, so I was looking, we would have to know the person's inmate ID all of that data and actually, like upload

music to their library. So, we would, I don't know if we would have to like press buttons and click and so forth to get the podcast distributed to their tablet. But it is something that we will definitely investigate. I think that's a phenomenal suggestion. I'm all for it. And then we will move over to, this is from Steven says:

Listener Question

I want to relocate overseas. As a registered PFR, am I allowed to do this? What stipulations are involved? I am not outright barred, am I? What does the process look like? Anyone who could contact for me for more information, I would love it.

Andy 19:18

This is you know, I was on the Connections, the NARSOL social media site and I somebody just made a post that said, I am about to meet the woman who will become my wife in Nigeria, I think it was? Maybe it was at Nigeria. It was Kenya, it was Kenya. And then there's a picture of him like I have now met my wife. I was like, Okay, this guy is taking extreme measures to get to the United States and he has gone to Kenya. He feels that PFRs are treated so poorly, he has gone to Africa. Wow.

Larry 19:18

This one is a is a regular question or variation on it. This person Steven is in the Texas state prison system. What we're going to assume since the letter short and we love short letters, but we don't have all the information. We're going to assume that you have a period of supervision to follow you. Texas as I recall imposes a long period of time. You might have a 20-year sentence but but you're eligible to be to be released after a fraction of that, which then you have that that remainder to be under supervision. But if you're under supervision, I don't imagine that the Texas authorities are going to approve a transfer to a foreign nation. So that would be the first thing that you would have to ask yourself and answer, am I under any type of supervision? If you're not under the supervision, if you walk out of Texas prison free, you can go anywhere on the globe. There, there are no barriers where the United States will preclude you from going you can go anywhere. The question you have to find out is whether any of those nations you would like to go to, would allow an American convicted of the type of offense that you have, if they would allow you in as a temporary guest, or if they would allow you in to a residency status and give you some kind of permanent status. And that's on a nation by nation basis, whether they would do that, and we've got someone or we've played videos from that seems to think that Germany is a great place to go. That you would, that you would love and find welcoming and that they don't hold your conviction against you, but but the US does not stop you from going. The door is wide open. You'll have to notify us authorities that you're going to be traveling outside the country. And they will send a notification blurb to the foreign nation that you're coming there and that you have a conviction in all likelihood. Now not everybody gets those notices, but in terms of America standing in the way, you can go anywhere you want to.

Andy 21:23

And we could point out that there's the Registrant Travel Action Group that I don't know how accurate their information is. But I don't know anybody else that has any information that says what countries will turn you away at the door, or ones that will let you

in. I suspect that Kenya probably doesn't care. I would suspect they have a lot of their own issues otherwise.

Larry 21:45

I used to think that but when I was at one of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers meetings, I met a person, actually I believe that was the National Conference of the State Legislature, I was I was at a meeting. And that's not necessarily the case, the African nations are being put under intense pressure to stop the sexual trafficking of people coming there. So they're signing up for IML alerts, and they're doing everything they can. So I would not make that assumption at all. But he's wanting not only to visit, he says he want to relocate, which to me implies a more permanent status. And and I'm not, I'm not so sure I would definitely not spend a lot of money flying to a foreign day should only be turned around. I would find out if you're going to be able to achieve any type of long-term entry into the country because as with America, we do the extreme vetting and we turn away people. I would expect that other nations would have similar interest in turning away people, including those who have what they would consider to be kind of bad criminal past.

Andy 22:55

Definitely. I think I think I think I think we're ready to go over to this little ad hoc thing that we are, we're going to cover. Do you wanna play the clip? You want to set it up? What do you want do?

Larry 23:07

Alright, so do you want to do you want to do the justice question or skip that one? Because we have one more we're gonna... (Andy: Skip it.) We're gonna skip? Okay, we'll skip.

Andy 23:14

Yeah, we'll skip it.

Larry 23:16

Okay, all right. So, I've gotten, I've gotten some emails about the Supreme Court, and I'm sure it's been the topic. And so I wanted to answer what my opinion is, should the next president make the Supreme Court appointment? This doesn't have anything directly to do with the registry. So for this segment, people you may want to, you may want to hit the skip or pause or whatever you do when you don't want to listen to it. And then what my impressions were of the hearing of the hearing, so I'm going to I'm going to start before before we play the clip that say that I agree with Rush Limbaugh on the clip he's about to play. I actually agree with him. And the only problem I have with Professor Limbaugh is that that's completely contradictory to the position he had in 2016. So let's hear what Rush says about which President should make the appointment.

Rush Limbaugh (Audio Clip) 24:12

But the Constitution is clear. Trump is the guy who makes the choice. Trump is the guy, constitutionally, who makes the choice. The controlling election on this nomination is 2016. It's not the election in 20 days or however many days it is. The controlling election for judicial nominees like Amy Coney Barrett is the one in 2016. Trump was elected by the people 2016. President served for four years. During that four-year term, Ruth Bader Ginsburg passed away, creating an opening. The President of the United States, Donald Trump is empowered, in fact duly constitutionally

required to choose a replacement and the Senate's role is just to advise and consent, and that's it. There's nothing about waiting for the next election if it happens if it's real close. Nothing like that at all. That's just a democrat-made argument.

Andy 25:13

Democrat-made argument. What was the, what was the situation in 2016, when Scalia passed away?

Larry 25:19

That is what is so intellectually dishonest about that is because that was not a democrat-made argument. That was a republican-made argument for a vacancy that occurred in February of 2016, which were at the very front end of the primaries, and hadn't even, didn't even have nominees. And so he misled his audience, which is millions of people. That is not a democrat-made argument. That was their argument. That's what they said. And now, if he were intellectually honest, I agree with him, the President is president for the entire four years. Now, realistically, having said that, depending on how late the appointment is, if you're not doing a railroad operation, rushing it through. The normal, the normal processes are so time consuming, that they put through the FBI background check. And setting, scheduling the hearings and giving the minority party a chance to do their background check. All those things take time. So normally, this process drags out for a few months, and this one's being expedited, because those things were recently done in 2017, when she was appointed to the Court of Appeals. But I only wish that we knew how to play the game with the other side, because the rules change just in four short years. It was it was a whole different rulebook back then, just four years ago. It was, in fact, they said that they might not confirm *any*, if Hillary won, because the polls pointed toward that. They said they might not confirm any Supreme Court Justice and let the court run on eight. That's what they said, back then. Not only were they not going to approve Obama's who was the sitting president in February when the vacancy had occurred, they said they wouldn't approve anybody.

Andy 27:06

All right. We don't need to beat around this one. I have like a million things to say. But we won't. We won't stick around here. So let's cover some news items Larry.

Larry 27:14

So what I thought of the hearing, I wanted to say what little bit... (Andy: Oh, go ahead. Go go go.) So the hearing, now if we had not politicized this process, I will tell you that this, this nominee is extremely qualified. She gave magnificent answers. She was she was polite unlike the last nominee, who was rude and obnoxious. She has the temperament to be on the court. And philosophically, she might be a little bit off for where I would like her to be, but she is eminently qualified. So, I don't see how they can vote her nomination down when it comes to a vote. I don't see how they could do it. I know it's going to be a party line vote. But in terms of if you were just, not regarding politics, looking at the qualifications, a law professor and the fact that she's already on the second highest tribunal being on the Court of Appeals. I mean, the question should be is she qualified? And she's she's no doubt very eminently qualified to be on the Supreme Court. But I'm just struggling with how the rules change and how they're doing this simply because they can. And Senator Whitehorse from Rhode

Island. I think he's from Rhode Island somewhere in that that part of the country. He reminded them that when you do something because you can, don't be surprised when you're in the minority if things get done because we can. And that was a warning shot of what's to come.

Andy 28:44

Right. I understand that. Yes. This is Yeah, the whole process is politicized. I recall hearing that RBG got confirmed with something like 97 or something like that votes. So how do we go from getting 97 votes to getting like it's just going to be 53 to 47, I'm pretty sure.

Larry 29:03

Oh no, it won't even be 53. They will allow the tittering Republican women to vote no, because they'll still have the margins so they can go ahead and allow three people that are in close contested races to vote no. Which will be surely it'll be Collins, Murkowski. And it's possible one more if there's someone who needs to be allowed to duck because their constituents want them to vote a different way. So, they've got three votes to spare. And I predict they will probably use those three votes to give people a pass that really don't need to take the heat. So, it'll be 50 or 51 rather than 53. But how we got to that point is hard to explain because it used to be that it was a question of qualifications. There was a tad bit of politicization in '68. But this was in '68, it was the Democratic president who wanted to replace the retiring Chief Justice. And it was the democratic senators from the south, who did not want any more. They'd had enough of that liberal stuff. And it was the democrats who stood in the way of their president making the appointment, they handed off the chief justice to President Nixon. And they've never there's been, every time it's come open since then, there's always been a republican president. So, since 1968, we haven't had a Chief Justice that was appointed by democratic president.

Andy 30:43

Yeah, I know it's been highly slanted in the Team Red camp since then. Ah, all right. May we move on now?

Larry 30:51

Sure. Let's do it.

Andy 30:53

Okay. So, first one comes from the Associated Press, Idaho prisons tell inmates about relief check eligibility. We should merge that with another article that we have coming up, I thought there was one. But this talks about the relief money that came up with the CARES Act and the whatever all the crazy names, that they come up with these things, that people that were incarcerated, they're going to get that money, too. That's what this is, right?

Larry 31:16

That is what this is. And again, I want to remind people, that this was an example of overreach by the executive branch at the direction of the Internal Revenue Service without any statutory authority. They asked prisons to withhold the payments. This necessitated a lawsuit. And the judge has ruled in favor of the inmates. Unless than the people, if the Congress had wanted people in prison, not to be entitled to this money, they would have said that, and they didn't. Therefore, the administration invented

a requirement. And yes, I'm bashing a republican administration. But just to be clear, I bashed the former governor of California, just I think the last episode for inventing requirements for early relief that weren't in the legislation. It's all about policy, folks. It's all about policy. I'm pointing out that the administration did this without any statutory authority, and they got caught with their hands in the cookie jar, and they're being slapped down.

Andy 32:29

Right, and that second article that we have is from the Washington Post, and I'm going to press a snazzy little button, and I think it'll switch over to it on the on the screen when it gets over there. But yeah, so this is, uh, so people in prison are going to get their 12- This is the \$1,200 dollar check. And I guess this would then give them the money that may come down the pike, if that ever gets signed into whatever. The one that you said we were going to get.

Larry 32:53

I have been proven wrong so far on that on that prediction. I would, I would guess that if there's a change in administrations, because it looks very unlikely now there will be another relief packet before the election. If there's a change in administrations, there will be immense pressure to exclude prisoners from any, any of these payments, because it's so heinous, that we're giving \$1200 dollars to people that incarcerated. We're already paying for their care, and sending them hard earned taxpayers' money. So they can sit in prison and live the high life. I mean, so I would suspect that the republicans would be very adamant about inserting that into future legislation, because the courts are saying that unless you unless they're precluded by statute, you can't do it by executive action.

Andy 33:41

Can we can we take a quick detour just to sit on that subject for a minute? I hear from people from time to time about the people that have received the money that shouldn't and like will just go dead people received it. Can you briefly explain how, because of the way that they did this, like it was let's get the money out as fast as possible, how people that were completely ineligible, and don't mean prisoners, I mean, dead people as an example, they might have received the money?

Larry 34:10

Well, it would be because of the, the, the urgency of getting the money out. And remember, we had the economy in freefall because of the shutdown. So, we had an unemployment rate that jumped from 3.5-3.6% to 14.3%. in one month's reporting cycle, like, like 20 million people lost their jobs. And this was, was when you take 20 million people out of the workforce, that that has an economic hit, that's significant. So, this was this was created to try to put cash back into the economy. And magically stimulus is okay when you have when you have this administration. But that's a separate topic. But how this happened was that they decided to use previous tax returns. Well, there's no direct link between those tax returns in who's still alive and who was dead. So when you're using, the IRS has direct deposit information for for people and addresses for people who filed a tax return, it's quite conceivable because if you had filed an '18 or '19 return, they were using that. And if you didn't file an '18 or '19 return, they were using social security. Now, Social Security does keep a pretty good track of who's alive. But still people collect Social Security

when they're dead, some of those fall through the cracks. But that's how it happened. People who were given payments actually had deceased. It's kind of like people who vote and they die before the actual Election Day. You've had early voting already going on for a couple weeks now in some states, and some of those people will actually die before election day that have cast votes.

Andy 35:44

Right. So then so somebody does some sort of poll, like checking out who voted and then you find John Smith had died, and they voted. How do you have dead people voting? It's because...

Larry 35:57

that's, that's one of the conspiracy theories that they come up with. They'll do their research and find out that there were people dead that voted, but they were mostly alive when they voted. And it's difficult to track precisely. You could die the day before election. You could have mailed your ballot three weeks before then.

Andy 36:18

Sure, sure. Or overseas and you're killed in some car bomb in a roadside bomb like okay, I'm with you.

Larry 36:26

This is one of those things where it was unavoidable. You try to recover the money, they'll try to recover the money from the from the people who shouldn't have gotten it but it was no grand conspiracy to give people money that weren't entitled to it.

Andy 36:39

Ready to be a part of Registry Matters? Get links at registrymatters.co If you need to be discreet about it, contact them by email registrymatterscast@gmail.com You can call or text a ransom message to (747)227-4477. Want to support Registry Matters on a monthly basis? Head to patreon.com/registrymatters. Not ready to become a patron? Give a five-star review at Apple podcasts or Stitcher or tell your buddies at your treatment class about the podcast. We want to send out a big heartfelt support for those on the registry. Keep fighting. Without you, we can't succeed. You make it possible. Over at the Tampa Bay Times. This is a this is pretty disturbing to me. This is the Hillsborough County Sheriff publicized a sexting. Did it target gay men? These were people that were being a little bit like voyeuristic or exhibitionist and having some naughty times in a public space. And I think it's like a misdemeanor for it to be done. But then the sheriff decided to like publish it to their hundreds of thousands of followers on the on the social media sites. How do you feel about this in the way that I'm reading this article? It definitely seems like somebody is not fond of the same sex couples partaking in activities where they probably would have just said, hey, go get a room. Stop that, if it were a hetero couple?

Larry 38:13

That was actually I, I, I put this in here with a great deal of trepidation because I hadn't read it. And I want those who believe in evidence. And I hear this accusation all the time about these biases, which do exist. I mean, humans have biases, but I like to see evidence. And so, I put this thing in and I asked Brenda, to take a look at that for me, cuz we're gonna talk about the podcast and I want I don't want to sound insensitive. And she said, Well, you

better read it. And after I read it, I said, well, gee, this is pretty clear that they were that they were targeting and what I interpret they weren't actually having sex. They were meeting up with the hope of having sex. (Andy: Fair enough.) They were meeting at the park with the hope of having sex. And the odd thing about it is that that, according to all the information in the article, the neighbors hadn't complained. That was my argument that I raised with Brenda. I said, well, you know, Brenda, here's the deal. If you've got a park, and the people who live around the park are calling and complaining about activities, and it turns out that that most of the activity is between consenting same sex couples, the police didn't pick and choose who's there at the Park fornicating. I mean, it is what it is. But that's not what was happening in this situation. This was an overfunded law enforcement agency that has too much time and resources on its hand that's running an undercover operation that no one has asked them to do. And when we talk about defunding the police, this is yet another example of why law enforcement could do with less funding.

Andy 39:54

There was a word I didn't know. So the men arrested in these stings typically face a charge of entering or remaining a place for the purpose of prostitution, lewdness, or assignation. I had, I had to go look up that word.

Larry 40:08

I don't know. Nope, never heard.

Andy 40:11

Oh, and now I gotta go look it up. Let's do a quick Google search. It is an appointment to meet someone in secret, typically one made by lovers. Awww, that's what Google says. I didn't know that word prior to.

Larry 40:23

So you people in Hillsborough County, you could do with fewer deputies because they clearly have far too much time on their hands. Now I'm not saying you should abolish the Hillsborough County law enforcement. I'm saying you could probably do with less.

Andy 40:45

There is also a picture in the article of the park Larry and it looks like it's an overgrown, not very well trafficked kind of area too. It doesn't look like it's, you know, like whatever park there it is in New York, where you just see gobs and gobs of people are sitting there on the Washington mall with the Washington Monument in your face and it's just an open Park and people are flying kites. It doesn't look like a park like that. At least the picture doesn't depict it that way.

Larry 41:07

That picture doesn't, no.

Andy 41:10

So they are and then they're just shaming people for going and having rendezvous and assignations.

Larry 41:18

Their what?

Andy 41:22

Should I highlight? Should I emphasize the first three letters of that?

Larry 41:25

Yeah, because the transcriptionist is never going to know.

Andy 41:28

Ass-ignations. And see, and I'm not cussing in this. Alright, too much too much 12th grade humor. All right, and this is over a courthouse news and then a companion article from the Washington Post. Military tells High Court there is no time bar to rape case. This is I think this is something along your one of your hot subjects of what's the word, statute of limitations?

Larry 41:53

Yeah, this is gonna be an interesting case when it comes out next spring, early summer. This is where you've got the military and the administration kind of on different sides about the weather.... But statute limitations is not a constitutional right. (Andy: Okay.) It's something we've had in law, but it's not a constitutional right. But they change the statute limitations after people commit their crimes. And therein lies the problem, because that's what happened in this case, they changed statute limitations and they abolished it in 2006. Let me remind you in 2006, Congress and the White House was under the R camp when they did that. But that doesn't matter, when they abolished the statute limitations for these types of offenses. So, it's something we'll circle back on later. But the military tells the High Court that there's no problem. And I tend to think that it's a statute of limitations, whatever was in place at the time, that should be the guideposts. But the way the courts have interpreted it, since it's not a constitutional right, if the statute, there was a place at the time hadn't expired, that they that they can merely extend the statute, which they made it an unlimited statute limitation on these of these crimes back in 2006.

Andy 43:18

I don't even have anything to say, because I know that the person that has been the victim of this feels that they need to get their justice. I know that is a really hard thing to square Larry. I know that you want to you draw the hard line and say, well, Justice has a time limit. I do find that that is a that's a hard line to just cross over. It is, for me.

Larry 43:42

Well, again, remember, the system is designed to be fair to both sides. (Andy: Right.) And you're leaving out, you're acting as if the victim is the only side of the equation. We don't only owe that alleged victim fairness; we owe the accused fairness. And the more time that passes, the less likely we can give the accused fairness because the quality of the case degrades and the witnesses die, and memories fade. And we have a situation where we can't give the accused a fair trial. So, we cage a person who didn't get treated fairly. And that's the part that the victims' advocates lose sight of. I understand your argument. If a person suffered a trauma, someone's getting away with it, if they did it. That is all sad and everything. It's unfortunate. But I worry about the caged, the caged individual who didn't receive a fair trial which is what one of the the ideals that our country is supposed to stand for. We are supposed to be the model of fairness for the world to

envy. And if we just make it so easy to get convictions, the appeals court, the military appeals court said that that the charges should be dismissed because of the statute limitations. And this, like I say the US Justice Department is arguing against the military saying that that the military appellate court got it wrong. The Court of military appeals got it wrong. They call it the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. But they're arguing against the court of the military and I find that odd because it seems like to me that in terms of the campus stuff, this administration has been on the side of due process and presumption. And it seems like to me that they would understand that if enough years go by, there's no way you can get due process, just like the hated senator in Alabama, Roy Moore. The would-be senator. He never actually achieved the status of Senator. But that to me, it's it's not that hard, because I'm for all sides be treated fairly, not just the accusing party.

Andy 46:07

And what is the punishment in the UCMJ for this for a rape crime? (Andy: I'm not sure. You tell me.) Second paragraph, it says For years, the US military code is placed no statute of limitations on the lodging of rape claims as the crime is one punishable by death. That's pretty extreme.

Larry 46:25

I don't think, I don't think they actually impose that punishment.

Andy 46:30

That is correct. They said somebody in 1960 did something and they actually sought the death penalty. Hey man, if that's on the table. Wow, that is a frightening.

Larry 46:43

but yes, this will be one that we'll be circling back on if we're still in business when this decision comes.

Andy 46:48

Larry, we are we are only like a quarter an eighth of the way to our run of 1000 episodes

Larry 46:57

Are we gonna shut down after 1000?

Andy 47:00

We will hope to, we will have the registry problem solved by 1000 episodes guaranteed.

Larry 47:06

Alrighty, I'll write that down in my book.

Andy 47:09

All right, the next article comes from the collateral conseq.... I can never, this is such a hard thing to say: Collateral consequences Resource Center, Michigan makes sealing of convictions automatic, including for some felonies. We have a second article from the Detroit Free Press about this one too. This is pretty awesome that how many states this is there's only a one of a handful of states that have become automatic expungement or sealed records states where after x period of time for such and such kinds of crimes, that you have a clean slate so to speak. That's pretty awesome.

Larry 47:45

It really is. And I wish we had a Michigan person here to explain it. But it is well explained in the collateral consequences Resource Center about those that will be automatic and those that won't be automatic. And then the exclusions are down at the bottom of the of the article. And of course, you know who got excluded?

Andy 48:05

I'm pretty sure PFRs are excluded.

Larry 48:07

Yep. That's always what happens. But it is a step, a significant step in the right direction. And it was bipartisan. Michigan is under democratic governor, but Republican legislature and they came together and got this done. So it's fantastic news.

Andy 48:27

And is there anything that we should cover the Detroit Free Press one is also quite long as I'm looking through it.

Larry 48:35

Yeah, I didn't even read that one. So, I don't know what's in Detroit Free Press.

Andy 48:40

Just says what the legislation does over in that article says the state follows Pennsylvania, Utah, California in adopting an automated system to wipe clean certain convictions from public records after a period of time, Michigan law will apply retroactively, and is the first to automatically clear prior low level felonies.

Larry 48:59

It's fantastic.

Andy 49:00

Jen in chat says Josh worked on it. Yeah, our friend over at the decarceration nation podcast. He had some hand. I don't know what his involvement is. But he had some hand in helping move that along.

Larry 49:13

I think he drafted it himself.

Andy 49:18

He may have. We should pause right now and I'll call him up and try and get him on the show. So we can have an interview with him right now.

Larry 49:23

Let's do it. Okay, the next one is more about stimulus.

Andy 49:27

Okay. And this is the one from the appeal? No, no, no, no, no, I moved that one over because that was the same one that we did back. That's the stimulus money that's going to the incarcerated

Larry 49:41

Okay, so we don't have to deal with that one.

Andy 49:43

Correct. We combined that with the other one. This is a this is Florida's most powerful pro police lobbying group is an anti-reform force. This is from the Florida Sheriffs Association gains third of its multimillion-dollar budget by selling big ticket items like trucks and mobile command centers to local sheriff's departments and other government agencies. This to be sounds like policing for profit Larry. This sounds like you could in the nefarious kind of ways you could have the police actually go hunting for people that are committing crimes and then they go impound the vehicles and houses and whatever stuff they can find, and then they go sell that off at auction so that they can have more money in their budget.

Larry 50:25

Well, what I took from it is the immense amount of money that they spend in Florida to extinguish any reform legislation. And they documented that in this appeal article about the significant presence they have and even things that are that are bipartisan, meat a dead end when the Florida Sheriffs Association oppose it. So again, reform can't happen until we get the law enforcement apparatus on board. And that that's the problem here.

Andy 51:02

What do you think about them like snatching, not snatching, I realize that's not the right word, you've committed a crime and then they impound your car. And then next thing, you know, Hey, can I go get my car back then? Sorry, we sold it.

Larry 51:14

Well, that's a whole separate debate. We have been here for a long time about asset forfeiture, which I'm dead set against. But I wanted to focus on during the 2020 session, the former Sheriffs Association opposed a bill from Republican state Senator Rob Bradley that would have imposed limits on maximum sentences for those convicted of certain drug offenses. And even Americans for prosperity, the lobbying group founded by by brothers, Charles and David Koch, supported Bradley's bill, but after the Florida Sheriffs Association mounted its opposition, the bill failed. (Andy: Hurray.) The next quote says, there are very few things in the legislature we find bipartisan support behind. But the criminal justice Democrats and Republicans are finding common ground. Unfortunately, it's law enforcement and prosecutors calling the shots. This is not Larry saying that. This is the reality of what's happening. We're up against the law enforcement apparatus. The people that you like their a little pretty things that they wear and all that insignia that you vote for that tell you how wonderful they are. And these are the people that are preventing reform from happening.

Andy 52:25

So yeah, we are voting for the people that turn it, like I remember when I first left, I read an article in Reason magazine, it was about the prison lobby, like the guards lobby. And I think this is pretty much exclusive to California, that they would lobby to make longer sentences and harsher and all that stuff. And I was like that's a really severe conflict of interest that people get locked up, then they lobby to make more people locked up that creates job security from a not a genuine incentive structure.

Larry 52:59

What do you mean by not a genuine incentive structure?

Andy 53:02

Well, I mean, it's not like they are seeking justice, so to speak, they're not trying to seek reform of being in the prison system, they are enhancing sentences so that they can keep their jobs. (Larry: Nooooo.) I know. And I'd like I'd never considered this as like the incentive structure. And this is the same thing here in this article of like, well, we need to keep our jobs. Shouldn't police go into their job, like the job of NARSOL is we would really like to not have to exist, that is like the ultimate goal of NARSOL. It would be same thing with us here. Our goal would be that we don't have to worry about a registry, which will probably never happen. So the police officers and the prison guard Association, their goal should be to have 100% safe cities and not need prison guards, because everybody abides by the laws that we have established to be like the the social contract of living in society a certain way.

Larry 53:56

Well, that's idealistic thinking. (Andy: Of course.) How many people want to abolish their own jobs and their own careers?

Andy 54:03

I get that, but for a safer, more wholesome society, like society at large. I know it's like, I know, I know, it's a what's the word? There's a P-word, I'm thinking of. (Larry: It's the liberal dogooders is that it is.) Ah, that's what it is. So anyway, so this is this is a misguided incentive structure that they could be in, they could vote to have harder and tougher laws and resources that they can acquire from just citizens who make some kind of mistake and then they steal the hundred thousand dollar car and go sell it at an auction. And that helps fund their system that would then just feed the system.

Larry 54:49

Oh, well, it's one of those realities of life. What do I say about it? I haven't said it for a while. It's not the world the way it should be. But what's the other part of that?

Andy 54:57

The world as it is be?

Larry 54:59

That's right. The world as it is be and the the law enforcement organizations, Sheriffs Associations, police associations, district attorneys associations, these people, they get to come to the legislature, largely on public funding, because they incorporate that into their day duty. They don't volunteer and show up and take off personal time. In fact, they generally designate someone to be their lobbyists, but they get to come in and scare people to death on public money about how these token reforms that are very well thought out would be would be so disastrous. Further up the article: Each year, the Florida Sheriff's Association employs a battalion of lobbyists to ensure their prison sentences remain long, mandatory minimum drug laws stay on the books, and police departments can buy up all the equipment they'd like. That's again, that's them saying it. Not me saying it. But that's what's happens in my experience.

Andy 56:06

Sure, totally. Okay, well, then let's move over to Mother Jones. And this article is titled private prisons have spent more on this

election than any other in history. I think this is probably going to be a pretty short segment. But if you look at the graph, what I have up on the screen, or I can describe it super quick, just a bar graph of how much they have spent to various candidates. And in so 2020, 2019 and 2018, they have spent what would appear to be two, three or four times as much donations to Republican candidates than everybody else. And the number seems to stay roughly the same to Democratic candidates.

Larry 56:46

Well, that seems to be going down, if you look at the blue part of it, it dropped in 2020. But I'm gonna take a moment to say that that I don't want to imply that they're buying Republican votes, because I'm actually on the backside of this. And most of the money comes because they like the way you're voting. They like the speeches you give, they like what you say, but this graph says what I could never say, what people would say I'm a partisan. This tells me and should tell you that they like the Republicans a lot better than they like the Democrat Party. If you look at what sliver of their donations goes to the Democrat Party, and then you look at what coast of the republicans and then the other parties, I don't know what other parties that encompasses, but the democrat party doesn't get a whole lot from private prison industry.

Andy 57:41

Yeah, and just for anyone who wants to yell at me for having an article from Mother Jones, the source to it has come from, it says [opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org), which I haven't heard of, to be honest with you. Center for Responsive Politics I have heard of, that's where their source data came from.

Larry 57:59

Now, now, I can dig a little deeper and tell you why the Democrat Party typically would not be on the receiving end of private prisons. The prison workforce, the public sectors are largely unionized, and they're not going to be typically strong supporters of the Republican Party, very, very few unions endorse Republican candidates, because republicans generally aren't not pro union, generally speaking. So the private prison operators, which largely are not union, they're not going to be attractive to the to the democratic party. They feel it's just the reality of how the democrats are more for having the prisons in the public sector, not in the private sector. So that's why you're not getting, that's why they're not receiving the donations on the democratic side.

Andy 58:46

Sure. And then our final article is going to be... This one's funny. He's just, you gave this one a couple days ago, it's from [justice.gov](https://www.justice.gov). It's a sex offender arrested at LAX, attempting to leave US allegedly failed to provide authorities notice of his international travel plans. I'm pretty sure this is IML related Larry.

Larry 59:06

It is. Well, this is one of those things where I encourage people to follow the law. And if you read the article, he had initialed on his registration, as recently as a few months before his arrest that he understood that he had this obligation under federal law to notify. And he didn't provide notice and they actually had left the gate as I understand it, and they returned to the gate to deplane him and to prosecute him and he'll get a federal term of incarceration. And this is one of those things where I wish that the litigation would

really zero in on this 21-day advance notice requirement because I feel like that that's where the meat of this argument is. All the other stuff is less compelling about some imaginary right you have to be in a foreign nation. But you do have the right in my opinion, to travel without being impeded, particularly with this 21-day advance notice they don't provide any for any exigent travel under any circumstances. And this notice that they send, it's fairly innocuous, but it does say that the person has been convicted of an offense against a child or minor. And, and it's, it's tragic to me that there hasn't been more focus on this prior restraint of travel, you don't have a right to be in Singapore. But you do have the right to try to travel to Singapore. Singapore will let you without being impeded by your own government, requiring a 21-day itinerary and all the stuff that they require. Now, Singapore still may not want you. But that's up to them. But you don't even get the chance to travel Singapore in any circumstances where you can't give the advanced notice because there's no exception under the law for not giving it.

Andy 1:01:02

Still don't quite get why we care if somebody wants to leave, we covered a Supreme Court case, if I'm not mistaken. And like Elena Kagan or someone like that said, like, why did we go get them from whatever destination country they were in and bring them back? Like they were gone. They can't recidivate in this country, if they are not here. So, if this person wanted to go to Egypt, why would we not let them go to Egypt?

Larry 1:01:25

Well, he's not leaving permanently. And the reason why is because we have made agreements with other countries, that we want them to give us information about people who are traveling here, who would be less than fully desirable, so that we can turn them away. And if we do not provide information, it is less incentive for the other nations to provide us information about people we might not want to admit. And it could be people who have criminal convictions, or it could be people who are on terrorist watch lists, or various things that we would want to know from foreign nations. So we are in an international agreement. That's why they call it international Megan's Law, that we will provide a two-way flow of information of all of our, what we consider to be bad guys, if other nations will provide us information about their bad guys. And so, the reason why we care is because if we don't do this, there's no incentive for other nations to do the same thing for us. That's why we care Andy.

Andy 1:02:28

I see. So, it's just about the reciprocity with other nations.

Larry 1:02:32

That is correct. And we do receive information from other nations about people for a variety of reasons. And believe it or not, we don't admit a lot of folks in the United States. We do not have open borders. Now, I wish the people who are so adamant that they have the right to be in another nation, I wish they would lobby our government that we just allow anyone to come in here that wants to be here. And magically, they quickly changed their opinion for some reason about having open borders into America. They only want or open borders for an American to go someplace else.

Andy 1:03:12

Correct. And this crime faces the statutory maximum sentence of 10 years in federal prison for not filling out some paperwork and providing advanced notice.

Larry 1:03:23

Well, but that's not the way the prosecution will spin it. So they've already done a press release. This is an immediate press release. So this is this is going to be a high-profile case. And they are sending a message to people in that jurisdiction, that the US Attorney's Office takes this very seriously, that you have to provide this notice. And if you don't, we'll put you in federal prison. So they will be seeking a significant prison sentence and they will use anything they can, including, like if he happens to have a distasteful offense that that you can really embellish, they will do everything they can to give him as much time as they can give him so that he understands and the whole community understands that this is serious business. We're not going to let you do this and get away with it. It's not going to be a slap on the wrist. So this is this is going to be dealt with very harshly.

Andy 1:04:13

Crazy. Okay. Well, that is all the articles, Larry, we have a special event coming up in a couple of days.

Larry 1:04:21

Do we?

Andy 1:04:22

Yes. I have been teasing it for a while people may have seen some Twitter postings. They've seen Connections postings with a big just a blank thing that says 654. And I'm telling everybody this because on the day that you're hearing this when this gets released. There has been a movie released, that FYP Studios has released and it's called The Intruders. Have you watched it?

Larry 1:04:45

I've watched it. (Andy: What did you think?) It's fantastic. It is so funny and very, very realistic, but maybe a little embellishment, but very, very good.

Andy 1:04:58

It is totally meant to be satire. I sat down with a friend of a friend and he writes movie scripts. And he, I saw some of the little shorts that he made. And he wrote a script with a guy named Freddy Offender. And he is doing his Halloween ritual. And the intruders ensue. And so the handlers come in and they harass him. And there's a takedown and it's all, it is a lot. It was a lot of fun. It was a lot of work. And I think it came out quite excellent. And I'm going to release it to the world on Tuesday, and I'm super excited about it.

Larry 1:05:32

I think that our audience is going to go up exponentially.

Andy 1:05:37

And actually, Teresa points out something that it's based on a true story which is very true. It is based on actual events, and you know, using different people's stories together because like Will in Tennessee still has challenges going to church during Halloween, which is ridiculous.

Larry 1:05:52

They have that blackout period of like, almost a month, I think.

Andy 1:05:56

Yes, it was 21 days, I think. So anyway, I hope everyone enjoys it, you will find it over at the YouTube page. That's pretty much the only place that I have a way to deliver it to you. So go check out the Registry Matters YouTube page. And Tuesday it will be released to the world.

Larry 1:06:12

Alrighty, well, we have we have some fantastic news about new patrons this week.

Andy 1:06:17

We do, we do. We got two and I hate when this happens. I don't hate that we have patrons, but we have two Michaels. So, Michael, thank you. And then Michael, number two with a very generous contribution. Thank you also. I can't thank everybody enough for being patrons. And I would also like to point out that there's like 100 people in chat and that's embellishing but there's a like a dozen people in chat and I thank all of you for participating this evening. Really appreciate it.

Larry 1:06:43

It is soon going to be that we have as many people watching and listening to us as we record as Rush has on his ditto cam.

Andy 1:06:53

It could be true. Could be true, Larry, I think that man I thought that we were gonna have a lot more, that it was gonna run longer. But I think we're about done.

Larry 1:07:01

How do people how do people contact us and support us and all this kind of stuff? Oh, I want to I want to promote the transcripts. We're getting a little bit of traffic but I was hoping for more. The first NARSOL Digest newsletter with our ad in there went out and all the prisons should have it by now. There was some delay because of elections and bulk mail takes backseat to election mail by statute. And our bulk business mail, we're still hearing that they were trickling in this past week, but they should all be out now. But we want to get more transcripts out. We are set up for getting transcripts out, we would like for people in the prisons to be able to share the podcast via the transcript. So subscribe. Combine into... more than one of you go in together and buy a transcript for a housing unit and share the thing but it takes being a \$15 a month Patron and you can designate for your loved one to receive the transcript or we're letting the people [inmates] subscribe directly to us for \$10 a month for the transcript and they are put out usually, the last few weeks, we're getting them in the mail by Tuesday after the recording. But they go out no later than the week that the public gets that they're going to go out that week at some point. But I've been getting them out Tuesday.

Andy 1:08:21

So what you're saying, if they're a \$15 patron, you'd have to reach out and either through Patreon, you could message us email registrymatterscast@gmail.com tell us we're going to need the full run, name, inmate number, all that address stuff to get somebody

to get it into prisons, which we could then tie this over real quick to making the nonprofit because that'll help get it into prisons, won't it?

Larry 1:08:44

Well, we're hoping it'll help do that and get some financial support. We would like for the price in prison to be less. But it pretty much devours what we're charging for the production cost and the postage cost and the envelopes. We are sending them out in an envelope for the moment, and we'd like for them to be less costly. And if we do the nonprofit, if we get approved, then that'll be part of our educational mission. And then I would imagine there'll be donations to help support the prison component of the podcast and then we can we can cut that price down as much as we can cut it down which I'd like to see it go down dramatically.

Andy 1:09:19

Fantastic. That is all in your neck of the woods, man. I don't, I'm not handling any of that. And I appreciate you doing all of that. That's really good. But we were about to say so the website is

registrymatters.co I'm feeling like gonna have some, some brain farts here that you always have. And phone number 747-227-4477. I already said it registrymatterscast@gmail.com. And the best way to support the podcast to show your love is at patreon.com/registrymatters. And thank you both both of the Michaels for supporting the podcast this week. That's all I got Larry. Thank you as always for joining.

Larry 1:10:01

It is my pleasure, Andy.

MacArthur

That is why I am here.

Andy 1:10:10

Have a great night Larry.

You've been listening to FYP

More show transcripts are available at <https://RegistryMatters.co> (that's right... just C O with no M)

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.

REGISTRY MATTERS		
MAIL-IN SUBSCRIPTION FORM		
Sign me up for _____ months X \$10 = \$ _____		
* 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 Registry Matters and send to RM Podcast, Post Office Box 36123, Albuquerque, NM 87176		