



## Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 167

Recorded 2-27-21

Andy 00:00

We'd like to thank our patrons for supporting this episode of Registry Matters. Recording live from FYP Studios, east and west, transmitting across the internet. This is Episode 167 of Registry Matters. Happy Saturday, Larry. Good evening. How are you?

Larry 00:14

Oh, very well, thank you. Glad to be with you.

Andy 00:20

Yeah, I decided that we probably should invite you back. Because you're the only person that knows anything about this stuff. Well I shouldn't say the only person. You're the most knowledgeable person that I know of.

Larry 00:30

Well, I pity you, if that's the best you can do.

Andy 00:34

I wanted to throw something at you, some kind of big news in the week of a particular very wealthy golf player was a, I was riding my bike back from dinner. And this sort of was crossing my mind about the safety of such things me riding a bicycle, whatever. And so this particular golf star superstar, had had a bit a little bit of a mishap. And I was just, like, if you had that much net worth, he's got a net worth of like, nearly a billion dollars, it's like \$800 million. If it were me, I would not drive. I like driving, but I would not drive. I would have because my body is really like he makes his money from driving, not driving, he makes his money physically using his body. And I wouldn't put myself in a precarious situation where my mishap would cause me to not be able to earn money anymore. And I wanted to get your opinion on this. Since we covered stocks now we can cover golf real quick, and then we could go talk on the registry stuff.

Larry 01:26

Well, I would, I would say that there's a lot of logic in what you're saying, particularly when I think this is like his third accident.

Andy 01:36

He's demonstrated an inability to function properly.

Larry 01:41

He's either been extremely unlucky. And I think there might have been the suspicion of alcohol being involved in one of them. I really don't follow very carefully. So it may be spewing, or I don't know what I'm talking about. But I vaguely remember him having one or two other accidents. And there was suspicion of alcohol involved in one. Am I right?

Andy 02:02

honestly, I don't even know someone at some golf pro person, feel free to let us know where we're wrong here. But I just I was really just going after it from this this one thing and so he broke his tibia in this event?

Larry 02:14

He broke his what?

Andy 02:16

his tibia. Are you familiar, this is a bone in the lower portion of your leg via in your calf area, it's a larger bone in your leg. It's called a tibia. You've never heard of this word?

Larry 02:26

I can't say it's ringing any bells?

Andy 02:29

Alright, well, I guess we should move on from anatomy and sports and move on to registry issues. So tell us what's going on for the night?

Larry 02:38

Well, we have a plethora of questions. Do you think we can actually get to them all they're from the inside and from the outside. Can we get to all the questions?

Andy 02:49

I believe that we can get to all of them. I will turn on my speed reader voice.

Larry 02:55

And then we have one article, we're going to talk about civil commitment, because that is such a tragic situation. And people constantly remind us that we don't talk about that enough. And then we wanted to bid a farewell to the esteemed, distinguished, I should should say, a distinguished talk show host that we forgot to mention last week, I think it was on the agenda, but somehow it got missed.

Andy 03:22

I think we were we were packed for time. Possibly.

Larry 03:25

Yes, but the conservative icon Rush passed away on that there's been a lot of eulogies and although I was not a great admirer, I did listen to Rush with some regularity, because I felt like that I needed to be balanced and informed. And I needed to hear perspectives that I might not agree with. So I was a regular listener to Rush.

Andy 03:47

Completely. And does that round it out and ready to move on?

Larry 03:50

Let's do it.

Andy 03:52

Cool. All right. The first question of the night comes from it says dear Registry Matters, guys. And this is the second question. We're not going to cover the first one. It says:

### *Listener Question*

In Michigan, the new law removes many restrictions on where you can be present. What restrictions does it leave in place? Can I go to state or local parks now? How about the Detroit zoo?

Alright, that's pretty concise and all that.

Larry 04:17

Yeah, this is from one of our subscribers, and I wasn't able to get him full answer on this because it doesn't seem like anyone knows for certain yet. As best I can understand, if your conviction predates, is in advance of, there were 2006 and 2011 amendments that that render the Michigan registry to be punitive. And, and those included proximity restrictions. As best the Michigan person that I communicated with, as best as I can understand it, those restrictions are no longer there for the people who have those older convictions. But I would say the safe thing to do would be if you're going to live in Michigan would be to check with a legal professional or at least with some website like the ACLU of Michigan where they try to explain what your rights are and how this has changed. It would be best to double check that in terms of the Detroit zoo. That's just too particularized. I don't know that there was ever an exclusion from the zoo. But I don't know that there is not but it looks like that that the people was older convictions may have escaped all those restrictions. But don't hold us to it, it Registry Matters.

Andy 05:34

And they close out and say thanks, guys, great podcast, fyp, and etc. And then moving on to an article or a question coming over on the NARSOL side says:

*Listener Question*

Dear NARSOL when looking for a place to live, whether it be an apartment or house to rent, are you required to inform the officer and/or landlord of your requirement to register? Can they evict you if you do not tell them and they find out that you are on the registry? Are apartments or homeowners associations allowed to deny your application because of your requirements to register? Thank you for your time.

Oh, can I like provide some teeny little bit of anecdotal evidence on this one?

Larry 06:09

Sure.

Andy 06:10

All right. When I was moving into my apartment, I had no intentions on telling my landlord. And I looked up online, and I saw that there's a park, that turns out to be 800 feet away, but it's not an official Park. So it turns out that they allow me to live here. And I ended up telling him I was like, hey, look, this is the situation and I'm sorry, I can't live there. But then they came back and said I can and he's like, I don't think I can rent to you without telling the neighbors. And I was like, I don't think you have to tell the neighbors. And I even talked to you about it. Because there's nothing in the statute that says yes, to tell the neighbors and he comes back he goes, I think I have to tell the neighbors, and so back and forth and back and forth. And then he said you can move in because he didn't have to tell the neighbors.

Larry 06:46

So well, on this one I really liked it. I think I'm going to run it in the Digest as well, the newsletter that NARSOL publishes. I'll take the last one for the last question are homeowners associations allowed to deny your application because of your requirement to

register? I would phrase it slightly different. I would say because of a conviction for a felony and most sex offenses in almost all of our states, they're very few left that are misdemeanors. And the answer is yes, they can. And that's what they would say. They would say that it's because that you have a felony conviction. Management would not say it's because of it being specifically a sexual offense. So they'll escape you on the last one. So unless you have a particular anti-discrimination clause that includes felons in that particular jurisdiction, that's not going to help you. So we've got that one off the table. Can they evict you if you do not tell them and they find out you're on the registry? I would say probably not unless they specifically asked you on the application and you omitted the information. I'm a person who believes that if you're not asked, you should not volunteer the information. Now there'll be 100 emails that will come in and say, full disclosure is the best thing to do. And that's all right. That's your opinion. But I did property management for 17 years. And if I did not ask it, I was surprised they would tell me anything if it wasn't on the application, or if I didn't feel the need to ask it in an interview. So the answer is yes, they could evict you if they had it on the application. And you said no, and you had been convicted of the offenses. The application would go something like have you been convicted within the last X number of years, have you been convicted of a felony or any criminal offense other than minor traffic? They have worded that either way. If you answer no, then you've misrepresented yourself, and they could terminate your contract. So that would be all dependent upon whether your application requires you to disclose it. But then he gets to get back to what's really the crux of it, in my opinion. He wants to know about informing them, even if you're not required to. And there may be cases where you're not required to by law. But your PO, your supervising entity, may tell you that you have to notify them. For example, in in the state of New Mexico, and I think in most states but particularly in this state, I know for certain that if you're under supervision, the supervising authority will notify your employer of what you're being supervised for because they have been hammered with negligent negligence lawsuits because someone got a job and they embezzled the place blind and they were they had embezzled the previous place blind and they were on supervision from embezzling the place blind and they did it again. And so they will do that. So your supervising handlers may require that you do that. Or there may be states and jurisdictions where they prevent and prohibit clustering. So they may have an issue with you clustering. So they may need to know that. And I'm really unclear how that is enforced. Because if you don't know a person's on the registry and your landlord, how, how would you be able to prevent clustering? That one puzzles me. If you don't know, how would you know? So what would you do?

Andy 10:24

Can you describe clustering?

Larry 10:26

Well, if there's like only one can live at this address, only two can live at this address. Because what they do is they build these Exclusion Zones where that a person required to register can't live with them, all these things. So you end up with a little sliver of land that's in an industrial area. And all of a sudden, that's the only place people forced to register can live. And all of a sudden, you have an accumulation. And we can't have that, because now they're clustering and who knows they might network together.

And they might overthrow the government or something. So they pass these laws that at any given address that only two can live, that are required to register. So, you can run into all sorts of issues. So even though it's a great question, the answer is, it's all particular to your situation and what jurisdiction you're in. And you're going to have to deal with it when the time comes. And I think for this person, the time is coming fairly soon. So that's why he's asking the question.

Andy 11:23

And let me get back to your property management experience. I'm going to assume, because my experience with apartments is that they are a single address with apartment A, building this and does that count for the clustering of it being the 123 Main Street, apartment A? Or the individual addresses for each unit?

Larry 11:43

Well, that would be my question. I don't know the answer to that since we don't have ridiculous laws here. But it would, my contention would be that each apartment is a different address. But okay, if you if you were trying to prevent PFR from living that you would say, well, 5721 Osuna Boulevard is all one address. And you say, Well, no, there's actually 164 units in here. And each one of them is a unique address. And so, I don't know the answer to that. It would depend on a judicial interpretation unless the statute that created that defined what an address was. And that's where the PFRs were not at the table, you could easily have something very carelessly drafted, that would not make that clear. And you could have an enforcement unit, the sheriff's department say, Well, I'll tell you what I will do. I'm going to keep our community safe. And we're not gonna let them cluster in those old apartments, then they'll be 30, or 40 or men, no telling what they'll do.

Andy 12:46

Yeah, because you would have, if they were all efficiency apartments, they're only 300 square feet, and you could stack a million of them in a square mile. And then you have just a hole. And that landlord happens to be like, Hey, man, if they pay rent, I really don't care. So then they'll cluster so to speak in this one tiny little space, and you have this super red zone, a heat zone on a map that looks like there's just a billion of them in that one tiny little spot. But they're all living in their own apartments and not hanging out with each other. And they're just taking the bus to go to work and doing their own thing. But it looks like I shouldn't live in that part of town, because they're all there. So it sounds like from your point of view, you wouldn't necessarily have cared, you're looking for the quality of the person and all the other factors. This might be something on your list of things. But you're not going to say you're on the register. you're disqualified, just done. Kick rocks.

Larry 13:35

well, I should have a guest who used to, invite a guest that used to be a tenant of mine who, who was internet savvy before I even knew what the internet was. And she came and told me that I had pfrs living in complex I had two at the time and she came and told me about them. And I was unclear how she knew. Because nobody in the right mind would go down to the, to the to the central office and asked to see the printed list. And she'd helped me out and she looked him up online. I said you did what? She said I looked them

up on the internet. And so then we had a discussion because she wanted to know how they got past the screening. She said I almost didn't get in and I'm a professional. She does tech support and stuff. And she said, you know, you put me through the third degree, how did all these people get in here? And said, well first it's not all these people, and second of all, their circumstances were evaluated, and we did a risk assessment. We decided that it was worth giving them a chance, but she was very discombobulated that we had anybody on the registry there and I had no idea that it would be that easily discernible. That was nearly 20 years ago. And she was like, Hey, did you know? I said, Yes, we know. How did you know?

Andy 14:50

Yeah. All right. Well, then let's move on to:

*Listener Question*

Dear Legal Corner. I was wondering if I wanted to change my supervised release to another state, is it easier to change that when still in federal prison or when I get out? Also, what are, what are the steps to do both. And I see that with boff. And that's thanks so much, Robert. God bless.

Larry 15:14

So being that I have limited experience, I did reach out to a federal practitioner. And as best the practitioner knows, there's really not going to be a great deal of difference when you're trying to change your supervised release, because they're generally going to release you to the jurisdiction where you were convicted. And, and the federal system, you may have gotten shipped all across the country, because any facility that's appropriate for your security level and that has bunk space may be where you end up. And so, the practitioner told me that you can, you can request to be released at another location, but they're going to apply the same type of scrutiny wanting to know if you have connections that would warrant them letting you be released there. And if the if you don't have those connections and support structure, I think we had a question last week where that came up about being denied because inadequate support. And so the lawyer told me that, that in terms of what do you apply on the outside or inside, he is not aware of there being any difference in terms of the standards. They're going to be looking before they let you move, and transfer your supervised release, what type of living environment you're going to have, what type of support structure you're gonna have. So as best I can answer the question with the resources I have, it's not going to make a big difference. Now I happen to be just a tad bit more skeptical about people who work in prisons, and I don't think they're looking to do any more work than they have to do. So something tells me even though I can't, this is only an opinion, I would bet that the person in the prison is going to want to do a little bit less work and deal with trying to get your supervised release, when you get out of prison. To people that are that are listening to the podcast that have tried to do that from within the federal system before they were released, and if these people helped them immensely to be transferred, that would be good information for you to share with the podcast, because that way we can enlighten others that that they are actually willing and able and diligently do try to help you get released to a jurisdiction that would be to your liking. So my knowledge is limited. So, our listening audience. And we have the best audience as Rush said, in the whole United States. And

people who listen to this program, they do know a lot too. They can contribute.

Andy 17:37

I got you. I think we actually, somebody is in chat, but they are being very non talkative. I would try and impromptu, get him to come on, because I believe he has, he is an individual that was incarcerated in a state and then was released into another state. And I'm pretty sure he's fed charges. He's up in the middle North there starts with a W. I don't know if you remember who I'm referring to or not?

Larry 18:02

Yes, yes, I think I do.

Andy 18:03

And but I just wanted to add one little thing that someone in chat has said, there's not a whole lot going on lots of work. Not much play. RM is my social life. How pitiful is that? And I think that's kind of offensive, that it's not that pitiful that this is your social life. I think this is amazing.

Larry 18:19

I agree. I think we should do this seven times a week.

Andy 18:24

I don't know about all that. That would be a lot of work. I couldn't put up with you seven times a week. That would drive me crazy. And Brenda says they seem to be more interested in knowing you have a support network plans for housing and work and all that. I think that probably makes a lot of sense too.

Larry 18:40

Yeah, that's what the attorney was telling me that that, that your support, your level of support has more to do with it and whether you're in custody or out of custody when you're wanting to make the move. But I have so limited experience, I don't want a person to rely on everything I say if we can get better advice.

Andy 18:58

Well, as you just said that we have the best audience and now that Rush has passed, I think our audience is actually quantifiably the best audience.

Larry 19:05

Well, it would be and I'm guessing that everybody listens to Rush is now going to immediately switch to rRgistry Matters.

Andy 19:11

I think that's pretty good. That could work out. All right, then moving over to another article of question to the legal corner.

#### *Listener Question*

I am a federal prisoner, and I plan to be released in Florida. My question affects large amounts of people. While in prison, I have asked the same question to three case managers. I reached out to four sources outside of prison. No one can answer my question. They can only tell me what they think a prior procedure, "we've always done it that way," or what they've heard. My question is simple. Where in writing does it state a federal prisoner cannot be released to halfway house in Florida? I always say things like who

said or why? One cannot fight the proverbial beast unless one knows who the origin of the beast is. I was convicted of bla bla bla bla bla of a minor that crime is either the only sexual crime or one of the few that allows a person to earn time under the first step act. I do qualify under the law to earn time off towards a halfway house or home detention. However, in Florida in order to be released to home to detention, you must get an ankle monitor. To get this ankle monitor, you must go to an orientation. This orientation may only last a few hours, but the orientation is only given at the halfway house. As a sex offender, I can't go to a halfway house, thus no home detention, no first step act. This is a catch 22 and just another way to keep sex offenders in prison in Florida. If I can find out why sex offenders cannot go to a halfway house, maybe I can fight the issue and open a path for others. Only two states prevent sex offenders from going to halfway houses. In my situation, no one ever asks why they just accept. Please give us any help you can. Sincerely

Larry 20:52

Wow.

Andy 20:55

Yes, there's a lot going on there. But like I got it, if halfway houses, I think run by an individual or something of a nonprofit, they probably don't want the risk associated with PFRs. If there is one?

Larry 21:09

Well, in Florida, you have and see the reason why nobody can answer it is because there's a multiple number of answers that go into it. And it's kind of like the one-line zingers. He wants just one simple thing. Is there a statute that says sex offenders cannot go. No, there isn't. I have not been able to unearth it. I shouldn't say, No, there isn't. This came up about two years ago. And I wrote an email to the Bureau of Prisons. And not surprisingly, they didn't answer it. But they didn't answer it because there is no statute. I can't find it. It's not there. But just because there isn't a statute doesn't prevent things from being done. For years and years in Tennessee, th Department of Corrections told everyone who had an obligation to register about the 10-day, 11-day Halloween festival prohibition against doing it. Well come to find out in one of the recent court decisions out of the batch of good decisions we've had out Tennessee, it's been unearthed that there was no requirement that could be imposed. There was nothing in statute. This was just administratively being done. And the people in Tennessee who were required to register, were just accepting it at face value and saying okay, yes, sir. I won't go out on Halloween. And I won't go out for the 10 days. I cannot unearth any statute, per se that says an offender cannot go to a halfway house. Now I can unearth restrictions, Florida's a hodgepodge of restrictions that vary from 2500 feet - Collin County - to various levels of restrictions. So the halfway house may fall within one of those local Exclusion Zones. Anyone that's required to register can't be within 1000 feet, because the halfway house is within 1000 or 1500, or whatever the exclusion zone is. So that may be one thing that's keeping the halfway house from... there could be an internal BOP policy, which I don't have any way of getting to that. But there may be a directive in the southeast region that that we don't do that. Or maybe it's just particularized to the state of Florida because of the heightened sensitivity. But there are a number of things keeping him from being able to go to a halfway house. And it's a combination of that the way they've always done it. There

are local restrictions that are imposed by cities and counties. And the halfway houses themselves, although they are privately owned and funded by governmental contracts, they're usually nonprofits. They usually say the BOP doesn't own any halfway houses, to my knowledge, they contract with providers. They may just simply not want what they perceive as liability. It's kind of like I think Brenda could tell you 10 years ago, the legislature when they were trying to they will look at it considering civil commitment, this specific sexual offender civil commitment, and the mental hospitals made it clear, the administrators, we do not want those kind of people in our asylums. We're not equipped for that liability.

Andy 24:13

Yeah, Brenda was pretty much agreeing with the point she was saying it just before you were speaking to it, that Florida that probably are a lot, a lot of them are off limits due to the living restrictions.

Larry 24:24

And it makes it very difficult for the writer of this letter. He can't attack it, because it's innocuous. He doesn't know what to file and to whom, whom to file it against. Because no one can tell him what he's fighting. So he wants to attack the provision. And what I would tell him is that I wish I mean, it ought to not be that way. But if I were looking to reintegrate my life and get started, Florida would be way down on the list of places I'd want to be because of all this minutia you're gonna have to deal with and how horrendous their sexual offender registration requirements are and the fact that you never get off. If I were you, I would try to avoid ever getting on Florida's registry because if you're lucky enough to be able to go to another state where you can get off the registry, and you've ever registered Florida, as it currently stands now, they will carry your registration information forever. So if you go to Vermont, do your 10 years, or you go to Minnesota, do your 10 years, or you go to Georgia and you do X number of years and you get released from registration. Guess what? You'll still have that image and that information on the Florida registry. So I would try to avoid them. That would be my advice. But I understand what he's what he's what he's arguing about here, what his issues are, but I don't know what to do about it.

Andy 25:43

Yeah, I'm with you. And then this one is second to the last one. This one dude, this one has a great image. And now of course, I'd say that I won't be able to I'll try to get to the to the picture, someone has artistically drawn themselves with their head through the bars. This is a really great looking picture. It'll show up in on the YouTube side here in a minute.

#### *Listener Question*

Dear friend, I will be released from prison on August 2, 2021. (Andy: Well, congratulations on it being about six months away.) Hence, I'm asking for your advice. What is the best states for a PFR on lifetime supervision to live in, and the contact information of any advocates in these states that might be willing to help me find a job as a paralegal? I've enclosed my employment info, feel free to pass it on to interested individuals. Thank you, Jeffrey.

Wow, I'm really impressed by the artistic ability of doing a self-portrait like that. That's, I'm impressed.

Larry 26:35

Well, how do you know that he did it? How do you know it wasn't done for him?

Andy 26:39

Well, that's true. I don't know that. So I'm going to make that assumption.

Larry 26:45

Well, you know, some kind of nut put this in here. But it's one of those that's difficult to answer. Because we, the last thing that we or NARSOL or any advocacy organization should want to do is to cause the states that are not as horrendous to become more punitive with the registration requirements. And so therefore NARSOL has taken the position that we don't, we don't encourage state shopping. Now, having said that, I would agree. I wouldn't want to be in one of the harsher states, I just told you, where you don't want to be for sure. You don't want to be in Florida. And I forget where he wrote from. So I was gonna, I was going to take a look at that. But maybe I can find it real quick here. He has, he has written to us before.

Andy 27:38

Okay.

Larry 27:41

But I would not, as a general rule, the southern states are not places you're going to want to live, as a general rule. That's not, that's not, not picking on the south. But the the high, the high fees, Louisiana charges, Alabama, for a community notification. It's just very oppressive in the south. And that's where they have the branding of your identification with sexual offender and the litigation that ensues around that. And, and they have so many Exclusion Zones of where you can live and work and the Job. Job restrictions where you can't have these types of jobs. See, like in New Mexico, we don't have we don't have the most lax registration requirements in the whole nation. But you can live anywhere you want to. You can work anywhere you want to that will hire you. There's no, there's no prohibition in the registration statute that says they have all these things, you can't work here and you can't even drive an ice cream truck because you might snatch in a child while you're selling them ice cream. Well, we don't have any of that. You have no occupational departments here in terms of being registered. The occupation itself may debar you, but the law doesn't prohibit you. So, so in terms of the contact information, since we're not able to refer him to a particular state, we could refer him to the wiki page, which again, has a lot of restrictions for being in prison. And we truly understand that but perhaps someone could do some research for him. I've generally told him the South is not pretty. And I've generally told him that that, that we don't encourage state shopping, but there are states where you would have better registration obligations. But if you got supervision for life, guess what, the registry is going to be a lesser part of your problems.

Andy 29:36

Yeah, probation is certainly going to be a bigger hindrance than just the registry. I mean, even like Georgia, so you may you know, maybe you just have to do your registration one time a year. If your convictions that old you may not have living restrictions, but you're going to constantly get harassed by the Popo

Larry 29:52

What do you mean by harass? The police do not harass people.

Andy 29:56

Yeah, I know you know and to be to be fair Larry, I was scrolling through Reddit and I went by something. And there was a cop standing there was somebody riding a motorcycle. And they were, they were kind of hauling ass. But there was a cop in the road. So you think, man, they tagged me, but the cop was standing there and he goes, Hey, just wanted to warn you. Because if you're on a motorcycle, and there's an oil slick that runs for a mile up the road, and you're riding in the center where the oil is, you're gonna have a bad day. So here was a cop, don't want to ever, like, bash them all the time. You know, I can play my little clip here. That'll do just that. (Audio Clip: I got my rights to do what I want as a police officer.) So we can we, the cops do do a valuable service. And this was one that stepped out to keep someone from wrecking and having a really bad day while they're on their motorcycle. But that's what I mean by that harassing is constantly knocking on your door, hitting you with taillight out just being a pain in the ass.

Larry 30:47

Oh, I just I just looked up Jeff's letter. I didn't have the full thing in here. But what I can say to you, Jeff, is that since you are in state custody in Tennessee, if you've got supervision for life, you're going to be severely restricted, you're not going to be able to do a lot of state shopping, because you have to get permission to go to another state. And that state's going to have to agree to supervise you. So therefore, you can shorten your list of states that where you might have connections and support systems that would allow you to transfer your Tennessee supervision. But you don't have the other 49 states as options. You have wherever you have connections and resources that that might would be willing to sponsor you. And then you might be able to facilitate an interstate supervision compact supervision transfer.

Andy 31:35

And I guess then we are going to go cover this article briefly that is from the Star Tribune.

Larry 31:45

Wasn't there one more question here? There's one called G.

Andy 31:51

I missed loading it.

Larry 31:55

I'll read it.

Andy 31:56

Please.

Larry 31:59

I can I think the reader can read but I can read this one. Cuz it's, it's typed and it's mainly just for info. He says this might seem a strange question for SOs often writing regarding the legality of a law and the registry, but I have a unique situation. And anytime you say you have a unique situation, that is always going to gain my attention because everybody's situation is unique to them. I

have been down several years, and in my time, I've been productively working to become a writer. I have four complete novels, and I'm currently working on a fifth, I intend to try and publish them upon my release. This is a point of contention, I was told that you cannot publish while incarcerated in the feds for monetary gain. Is this true? There are many who publish and many prison publishing companies for inmates. Is there any way of putting my work out while incarcerated still? In eight years, I have no other choice. My question is obviously, I would not use my actual name. That would be a death sentence. And so the point is, can he publish? And I could not find the answer to this, but I know our FYP audience knows.

Andy 33:04

I have a suggestion, is it lifetimes? The publication by Will in Illinois? (Larry: Uh huh.) That would be a place to publish it is in the Lifetime's magazine.

Larry 33:23

So well he wants to make a little money. (Andy: Oh, well, that part I don't know about.) Yeah. He's says that there's a prohibition against publishing by the feds while you're incarcerated for monetary gain? I did not find that on first Google search. But with our expansive audience someone knows if there is such a prohibition. And we can come back to this next week. But I wanted to get it out there for our audience and for our research staff.

Andy 33:48

All right. Yeah. The article is up on the screen, too. All right. And so now we can go to this article that I jumped to earlier. says All right, this the Star Tribune case challenging constitutionality of the Minnesota PFR program can move forward, federal court to decide if state's treatment system is constitutional. Now, why did you people put this in here? Like, what did you want to do with this?

Larry 34:17

Well, I wanted to try to give the people in Minnesota civil commitment, some hope. I was I was dejected, probably not as much as the people that are there when the federal judge had found it unconstitutional was overturned by the Eighth Circuit. But the attorneys didn't give up and they've been they've been following everything they can imagine. And the Eighth Circuit has decided that they wanted to give another opportunity for these challengers to show and they cited an old case of the US Supreme Court *Bell v. Wolfish*. And the case is going to go back to the district Judge. And I think the quotes that I put in here, were useful. It says, "This decision gives the plaintiffs another opportunity to demonstrate that the program is not designed to treat and release people but is designed to confine them, which is what I've said the whole thing is about," said Daniel Gustafson, the lead Attorney for the class of plaintiffs who sued the state, quote, "civil commitment has to be focused on rehabilitation and release, as what I've said about John Hinckley, when he was confined, that was the goal. If the goal is just to lock these people up forever, which is what appears from the history of the program, that would be punishment, it is not a proper purpose." So this is going back to the trial judge. Now the trial judge has already telegraphed to us that he's not too happy about this when he found it unconstitutional. So although the wheels of justice turn slowly, it

sounds like the Eighth Circuit has had a change of heart in terms of this Minnesota civil commitment program. So stay tuned, folks.

Andy 36:00

And civil commitment is, is what let's uh, let's give a quick recap of what that is.

Larry 36:06

Well, let's be particular, we're talking about civil commitment of sexual offenders. And how it differs from regular civil commitment, which all states to my knowledge, have civil commitment. When you civilly commit a person and take their liberty away in normal circumstances, you're doing it for the briefest period of time possible, with the full goal of, of readmitting that person to society. So everything that happens while they're in custody, is merely to keep the community safe and to keep them safe, sometimes from themselves. And to get them back into society. John Hinckley shot five people in 1981. And matter of fact, we're coming up on the 40th anniversary of that next month, it was March 30 1981. He was released, one of those five people was the president united states. But the goal of the guilty by reason of insanity verdict was not to see if we could just substitute prison and call it treatment. The goal was to administer Hinkley treatment and release him which ultimately occurred. Apparently, in some of the civil commitment regimens that are that are that are particularized for sexual offenders, which there's 20 states to my knowledge, and the federal government has civilly commitment. There is a far lower release rate. And the goal doesn't appear to release people. It appears to be to feed the bureaucracy that they've created, and to keep an input and a full employment program for those people. And they spend gobs of money. But no one ever seems to recover from an illness that's only magically discovered after they serve their time.

Andy 37:43

Yes, they could initially, you have a 10-year 20-year sentence, they could initially start treating you and maybe you have maybe you finish your treatment in that period of time. But no, they identify that you need to have further treatment in your final five days. And they say that you're they're going to send you off to some further treatment facility. And they it's a place you can never check out. You can check anytime you want. But you can never leave. That's the Hotel California song but you're never leaving that place.

Larry 38:12

Well, the odds are low in Minnesota. The odds are a lot greater in other states that have this particular type of civil commitment. People do get out. They get conditional release, and they get more liberties. But in Minnesota, it's a very slim number of people that have been released. And the 8th circuit said, despite the fact that so few people got released, there was theoretically a process that would allow them to be released, therefore, it wasn't unconstitutional. It's not unconstitutional to civilly commit people. I mean, I've said that over and over again, it's unconstitutional to do it in a way that provides deprives them of due process and deprives them of any meaningful review and deprives them of ever having Liberty again. But if you think they're so ill to begin with, why don't you, rather than prosecuting them criminally, why don't you seek a civil commitment in the beginning? You have a hospital in your state? Why don't you, in Virginia or in Minnesota,

why don't you seek their civil commitment? The answer is very obvious. You want to extract every bit of punishment you can and then you want to continue to punish them by putting them in a warehouse after they've paid their debt to society. That is what's so sad and tragic about this.

Andy 39:21

Anything before we then move on over to the final section?

Larry 39:25

No, I think I've covered that but you folks up in Minnesota. This is this is a breath of new life into the case and are so happy to see and hear about it.

Andy 39:37

Ready to be a part of Registry Matters? Get links at [registrymatters.co](http://registrymatters.co). If you need to be all discreet about it, contact them by email [registrymatterscast@gmail.com](mailto: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](https://patreon.com/registrymatters). Not ready to become a patron? Give a five-star review at Apple podcasts or Stitcher or tell your buddies that 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.

Very good. And now we're moving over to a discussion about the legislative process from something coming out of New Mexico. This is House Bill number 74. And you people put this in here the Senate, like I said New Mexico something about House Bill 74. That something about the final vote. And I guess I could tease it upfront about the way that the voting went about and trying to get into more discussions about this to try and give people some kind of framework on how maybe they can approach their legislature. And you as always there you have an agenda. And what is the reason that you've put this in here, but I really don't see what purpose it serves. So what's the what is House Bill 74? And why would we care?

Larry 41:10

We put it in because it is a proposal that would provide felons either would not be disenfranchised to begin with if they happen to receive a probated sentence, or they would be they would be refranchised immediately upon release. This proposal would provide that felons would only lose their right to vote for the period while they were in prison, but upon release, they would be eligible for immediate reinstatement. Unfortunately, the republicans chose to prevent this from happening. And they did a floor amendment when the bill was on final passage in the house

Andy 41:54

What is, tell me what is a floor amendment? Like what does the amendment, what does that do?

Larry 42:00

Well, as the proposal was originally drafted, it wouldn't it had no carve outs. All felons were treated the same. So if were you were a PFR, or you robbed banks or whatever you did. If you're released from New Mexico prison, then you would receive a paper saying that you are eligible to vote. And you would take that to your local voter registrar, which in most cases is the county clerk and you

would you be able to vote. Well, the floor memo was offered on final passage, which it's an effective parliamentary procedure used, but this board member provides that the sheriff will only be the person who can provide a PFR that documentation that they would normally get from the department corrections and that documentation would certify that they are in compliance with SORNA, the sex offender registration notification act, and the person can probably take this to the county clerk. And they will have a special document from the sheriff saying this person say complies with SORNA. And everybody else would just say the person has been released from custody, and that they're eligible to vote. Now something tells me maybe I'm not the brightest person, but I'm not thinking that people would want to display their document from the sheriff's. What do you think?

Andy 43:21

Certainly, I'm trying to wrap my head around that they would get this extra piece of paper that says they're in compliance with SORNA. And then they would have this extra piece to go to the clerk?

Larry 43:32

Well, they wouldn't have the regular piece. The department corrections can't give them that document. If they have a sexual offense that's going to trigger registration obligation. The department corrections says, too bad. So sad, you're out, go get this if you want to vote, go see the sheriff to get registered. And the sheriff will give you this piece of paper and it says that they're in compliance with SORNA. But otherwise, the Department of Corrections would give it to you and say that you're eligible to register.

Andy 44:00

Okay. And let's let's dig in deeper on what this amendment does for those who do not know. So what does this do for those people?

Larry 44:12

Well you want to get into the nuts and bolts of how a floor amendment works? (Andy: Uh huh.) because that's okay. So a floor amendment, so Bill has been introduced. It has made it through the committee process. In this case, it was a House Bill, so it didn't have to go to the Senate. It had to go through House committees. So it went through the house consumer Public Affairs Committee, do pass. It went through the House Judiciary Committee, do pass. Then it's reported out to the floor for a vote. So an amendment is a parliamentary maneuver, and it's very legitimate. And it's it's, I mean, it's it can be legitimately used because in the committee process, sometimes you will legitimately overlook something that was that was significant was overlooked, not often but it does happen, but it's more often is used for sinister reasons for you to impose your will, as a minority on what you don't like. So, for example, in this case, it's well known that the republicans are generally opposed to expanding the voter base to include additional felons. All you have to do is look at the citizen initiatives that were approved overwhelmingly in Florida, and how successful the governor Desantis and all the people in Florida have prevented most felons from voting because they litigated, litigated, litigated and said that all obligations included fines and court costs and restitution and blah, blah, blah. So in this particular case, on House Bill 74, it was the Republican

strategy was to force the Democratic Party to appear soft on sexual offenders. So they presented this amendment as a tool simply to assist in achieving that, they said that there's no sinister motivation, we just want to help make sure that the offender is in compliance with SORNA. And they claimed it was about public safety. But their real agenda for doing this was they wanted to make it appear as though the Democrat Party was soft on sex offender. So, they made it impossible for the Democrat party to vote against this for amendment because so you got this, you're in floor debate, and you got this amendment. And it's simply just to make sure that people that have a registration obligation to just make sure that they comply with that to enhance public safety. And if you're a member of the Democratic Party, and you vote no on that, what's going to happen in the next election cycle?

Andy 46:26

Now you have documentation that they voted in a certain way.

Larry 46:31

So that was their agenda.

Andy 46:38

Okay. And if the floor amendment gets adopted, did the floor amendment get adopted?

Larry 46:47

The Democrat Party was not willing to vote against the floor amendment, so it did get adopted.

Andy 46:52

Alright, and then to the Republican support the bill? The republicans added the amendment. Ostensibly so they might support it more?

Larry 47:03

Yes, that was my point. We want to make sure that we have compliance with SORNA, but then I put the cheat sheet in because people don't tend to trust me when I tell them these things. So I've got the voter tally, in the show notes, colored by party registration and a column that identifies the political affiliation. And despite the fact that leader, the Republican House leader, Rod Montoya sponsored the amendment, they still all in lockstep, voted no. They do not want, Apparently, they do not want former felons to vote. Now, I know you're gonna say to me, why are you being so partisan? I'm not being partisan, and I'm merely talking about what happened. If you can't identify what happened, then you can never do anything to rectify what happened. Here's what happened, folks. The Republican Party did everything they could to wreck this felon reenfranchisement. I can't change the history. This is what happened. And the votes there for you to look at and you can decide.

Andy 48:11

And I can't help but even like, personally, the way that this is coming across cringe at this does sound like you're being super partisan.

Larry 48:19

Not at all. Not not being partisan. I'm merely being factual. If the day comes that we can't talk about what, who votes which way, then we probably should just stop having democratic government.



Because I criticize the Democrat Party probably more than anybody that does anything, like what we do here. But I don't have blind allegiance to the Democrat Party. I don't have blind allegiance to anybody. I have blind allegiance to good public policy. And this was good public policy. And it will, will continue to be my belief that allowing people to vote after they pay their debt to society is a good public policy. And the fact of the matter is, the Republican Party of New Mexico did not agree. And they did not vote for it. I can't change that you would have to ask them why they're so vehemently and adamantly opposed to having people vote. I can't speak for them.

Andy 49:21

Well, now what might be a decent time to talk about Rush? Why does that particular bent so vehemently oppose having everyone vote?

Larry 49:33

Well, they would say that it's because of the integrity of the voter rolls. We need to have integrity of the voter rolls. But in terms of felons voting, they mistakenly believe that they're going to have a lot of new Democrat voters. And that's just simply not the case. And actually, I'm probably advocating against my own interest because probably most of these people are not going to vote for Democrats. But I believe that it helps the person to want to be a law-abiding citizen if they're more able to participate in our system. Yeah, it's another one of those things that the more you seclude and isolate a person, the more you can expect bad things. The more you include, and have people participate, I think you're more likely to have a good outcome. I think a person is a better citizen that votes, particularly if they take the time to figure out a little bit about the issues they are voting on rather than just voting blindly allegiance?

Andy 50:33

Well, tell me tell me this real quick. Since we're gonna now cover international politics, Australia has compulsory voting, I think that's the right word. And they get like 95% participation, should we have something along those lines? Should we have 100% voter participation or close to it instead of we get 20 and 30%. And that's for the national elections. For the off-year ones, we get dismal outcome.

Larry 50:55

I didn't know that Australia did that. But I don't believe in that. I don't think he should require people to vote, I think people should want to do their civic duty. I think they should want to have good governance, and they should want to be informed about issues. And here we have a whole group of people who want to vote. And for some reason, there's this concerted effort to prevent them from ever voting again. And in Florida in particular, I think Florida doesn't want those people to ever rejoin the voter rolls.

Andy 51:25

And that goes way back to that original amendment was amendment four to the Florida constitution, that probably goes back to the 1800s would be a guess. I don't know if... that probably was pre Civil War, early 1800s would be my guess without me doing any quick google searches. If anybody wants to do that for me in chat, then we can report the year that that happened. What

happens next for this bill in New Mexico? Do you accept the amended version or do you have a different strategy?

Larry 51:54

Well, let's be clear. I don't like that amendment. And I hope we can remove it. However, I would not kill the bill because of the amendment because I'm not one of those that has to have it all or nothing. I would find it tragic that PFRs would have to go in and get their special document from the sheriff, that announces to the county clerk that they are PFR. But I would prefer them at least having the option of doing that versus not voting at all. And all the other people that would be reenfranchised saw. But I would hope that that it doesn't come to that. But my strategy is to get the amendment removed in one of the two Senate Committees. It'll have to go through two committees in the Senate. And I hope to try to get it removed. Although unlikely, I would like to find a republican senator who would propose striking the amendment. So what you would do is when it's in committee, when it's been debated, you would ideally you'd have a republican say I'm looking at that house floor amendment number one and I think we should strike that amendment. And that's not likely. But that would be my preference. My next strategy would be to seek a member of the democrat party to make the motion to strike House floor amendment one. If I'm successful in finding a senator who will do that, then all the democrats on the committee will be politically exposed on the issue because the committee vote is likely to go right down party lines, all republicans will vote no on striking the amendment. And all democrats vote yes. Or at least enough to pass it because we have a fairly significant Democratic majority. So you can afford to allow a couple on the committee to vote no, but but you're going to expose all of those people on the committee to strike them to backlash, and how this is going to be used against them. So So like I said, expect all the republicans to vote no, these votes are recorded. And that means that the Democrat Party will look weak on public safety.

Andy 53:49

Well that's probably not a good way to get reelected isn't it?

Larry 53:52

Not generally.

Andy 53:56

I heard you people talking about an identical bill that must pass both houses in a bicameral legislature. If the Democratic Party amends the House Bill, doesn't that mean, the bill would have to go back over to the house for them to agree with it for concurrence?

Larry 54:11

Wow, you actually remembered that?

Andy 54:15

I can see how I would have but I had a little help in crafting these questions.

Larry 54:19

So Wow, that's exactly what it means. The same identical bill has to pass both. So what would happen is that if we were able to strike House floor amendment one from House Bill 74, then you no longer have the same bill. So so when you strike the

amendment, it passes in the senate with all Republican opposition, as I anticipate, and then it would, it would no longer be identical. So it would go back over to the other side of the rotunda for concurrence. And and, and so the first question always goes to the sponsor. What do you think about this bill, as admitted by the Senate, in this case, the house sponsor would be delighted that the bill got that amendment got removed, and would give a thumbs up. And that would mean that the Democratic majority in the House would be able to concur, and they likely would concur if it comes to that. But the only problem is they just got another recorded vote. You've got a recorded vote where the Democrat Party in the house agreed to, to a watered-down version of what had originally passed. And you've got 40 something members of the democratic party who have been soft on sex offenders, and they all become politically exposed again. So you've got the you've got the senate politically exposed, and you've got the house politically exposed all over the shenanigans from Rod Montoya.

Andy 55:48

Okay, God, that's garbage. And I had a recent, where I listened to the Schoolhouse Rock thing and this whole thing of the bicameral like going back and forth. If there's amendments, then they have to agree you can't have it go without having the both parties agree. That definitely leads to me remembering like how that question would get asked, like I said, I had helped getting there. Oh, boy, do you have, let me let me ask you this question, it says, What about later down the bill where they limit the governor's pardon powers? How do you think that's going to go? That comes from from a person in chat from Raiders fan in chat?

Larry 56:31

Okay, what's the question again?

Andy 56:33

What do you think about the, where they limit the governor's pardon powers?

Larry 56:37

Well, I don't think the governor is going to be too interested in that. So I think I think it'll likely meet with a veto if it passes. (Andy: Oh, really?) Yeah. What governor would want their executive powers weakened?

Andy 56:50

I totally get that part. It just then we end up down the discussion of why did Obama not veto blah, blah, blah, that I know that they get overturned in the recent defense budget thing with Trump got. He vetoed it, and then they turned right around. And and what's what's the word that I know that they overruled the veto? With this, then? If he vetoed, it, Would there wouldn't be any support to to to try and push back against the veto? Like this is weird, of which the is your governor, on your team or not in your team?

Larry 57:25

Well, she pretends to be progressive. But but but it goes out, it goes beyond that. No governor is going to want their executive powers to be weakened. So as a general rule, anything that would weaken executive powers, the executive would veto that legislation. She's made it clear on that there's an attempt to weaken her Public Health Authority. And she has said, go ahead and send that to me, I will veto that. She would veto anything and

as any other executive would that would weaken her powers. And she would say that it's not about me, per se. It's about the ability to govern the state in an emergency. And on this thing, pardons are something. If I were a governor, I don't think I'd be cherishing. I would like more like the Georgia system has where they were they have a board that does it. But since the governor possesses those powers, I can't see this governor or any governor wanting to give those powers up. So I would expect to it to meet with a veto. But overrides are unlikely in this state, because of the way our system works, they're only in session for 60 days, in an odd number year. And they're only in session for 30 days and an even numbered year. If they work, if you look at when most things pass, they most likely pass in the final week, both legislation passes in the final weeks. And most of most of the time, it passes within the final three days, which means the governor doesn't even have to act on it till they're out of session. So anything like this, this is controversial is weakening the parking power part and power of the governor. It's not going to pass until the final day or two the session. She's that they're going to be out of session when she issues the veto. And they're not going to be overriding because they won't be there. And then when they come back in January, everybody's facing that's a member of the House when they come back in January to the next regular session. They've got a 30-day session, and they've got their own campaigns to worry about. And they're not going to be worried about overriding the governor unless it was something draconian. So a veto is not likely to be challenged. It's just very rare in the state that there's a veto override because our system is not designed for that to happen.

Andy 59:34

Okay. And can you with your work around the different states, New Mexico would be considered a small state with a short legislative session. Is that fair?

Larry 59:45

Well, the majority of states have short sessions.

Andy 59:51

I know that they're not full time but like I'm Georgia is similar in timeframe.

Larry 59:56

Yeah, like 40 days. Yeah. It's very, very similar. They were 30, 60, 90 days, 120 days max except for the full time states, so it's not...

Andy 1:00:07

This is all part of wrecking the train, I believe..

Larry 1:00:13

Well, in general, yes, this is a train I don't want to wreck. this as a train I want to see make to the finish line. I'd like to see it making it to the finish line. And I'm gonna do everything I can to restore it to its original condition of how it was before it was hijacked. But I just want the listening audience to know that a lot of the people that you voted for did this to you. Okay.

Andy 1:00:40

I don't I don't know what else to say about that. I, I know that we have this conversation very, very, very much on the regular and I just don't have any personal evidence to support or or go against I just accept that what you're saying is true. I just have nothing.

Larry 1:00:54

You have plenty. You have ample evidence that the first step act was hijacked by Tom Cotton, you have all the evidence you would ever need.

Andy 1:01:09

no, I was I was talking about specifically you say that our people are right leaning generally. And I just I don't have any experience that that's the part I was getting. No, I got you on the first step act, I got you on, on where the party's vote, generally very broad strokes, that red votes for more law enforcement type things that generally screws us. I totally get that. And I know that the left things like statute of limitations that the left is voting that screws us as far as a criminal justice issue in general, because 700 years later, someone can say, Hey, I feel bad about something that they did to me and you go prosecute someone way long after the event happened. You have no ability to defend yourself, I totally get that. I just don't have any personal to say that these people are this persuasion.

Larry 1:01:55

Well, why don't you put a nonscientific tool up and let and ask people their political leanings if they're conservative, moderate or liberal. And I'll tell you that 75% of our audience will check the conservative or more. That's just the reality of what I've learned in all these years of advocacy. I can't even believe you even question it after effort after all the encounters you've had with all the people that you've met. And I'm surprised that you read that you even are surprised. I mean, it's a given.

Andy 1:02:24

I live in a very red state in a very red area of the state. So it's not like I can go run around. And so the people in this area, how their how their leanings are because I would just this, this area is very, very red. So that's not it's not a fair, accurate way to look at it.

Larry 1:02:37

Well, I'm not talking about you area. I'm about to people you interact with in the work we do here. Our audience you've had, you've had them for a while, and you've had them for every state from Louisiana. And I don't, can you can you cite to the most recent liberal that we've had that you've let chime in on the podcast.

Andy 1:02:53

I mean, I know of them in chat. I know of the handful that are there in chat. There are a number of them. Yeah, total total. All right, well, then let's let's close things out. So now that we went on a little bent about politics and whatnot, so send all the hate mail to crackpot at registry matters.co, which gets redirected to Larry. And then just to close things out, I want to make sure that we highlight those specifically that when you send us questions, if you get specific and say my case was this, and I would like to know what I should do here, that can't be answered. So with that said, we received a question from Will and also similar question from Chuck says, Would it be accurate to say that the ruling in Tennessee would be successful to the point that PFRs could go back into court and get only the registry restrictions, obligations, etc, that were in place at the time of conviction or plea? I pled guilty on such a such date with this ruling mean that I could file a

challenge with this as guiding case law and force the state to die on my registration obligations back that was in place in '02. And again, like I said, there was another question from somebody else, it was sort of vaguely similar, but provided a whole lot of details, and we can't give legal advice. So Larry, what do you think about that question?

Larry 1:04:01

Well, the answer is no. Well, you cannot do that. Well, you could, but you would not win at this stage. Because the the case we talked about recently from Tennessee, it's not final, nor is it precedential. Yet, because it's it's only the district court. And the odds are that the state's going to find some way to appeal. But let's just say that I'm wrong and that they do not appeal. And that they did they say yep, we got it wrong. And there's a slim chance to take to do that. That doesn't say you go back to the conditions you had in 2002. What these cases are telling us and what the what the legal landscape is showing is that there is some point when a registry becomes punitive. And there's a point where you can peel off restrictions, so would they have to peel off everything that they've added since 2002 to you? I don't know which year, which year would have been something that would have triggered that analysis. So they might could peel off some of the things. The more egregious things like in Michigan, it was primarily the proximity restrictions, and primarily the tiering of people without due process to 2006 and 2011 amendments. So we'll there might be a whole lot of things that Tennessee added in those changes that they made year in year out, that would not have been enough. So there's no court that says you have to put them back to the registration conditions that they had originally. So far, I'm not aware of any such decision. what they've said is you can't apply certain things because this triggers it, where it where the analysis now shows that this is punitive. So what what a legislature in Tennessee would be likely to do would be say, how little can we peel back and still have a constitutional registry? That's exactly what Michigan did. That's exactly what Pennsylvania did. That's probably what they would do. But it is too early. It's too early yet because this this case needs to work its way through the court.

Andy 1:06:10

So in other words, if we were the Lone Ranger's and we would have a silver bullet and we could just shoot the thing and the registry would go away. Is that what you just said?

Larry 1:06:21

Well, I said the opposite there. There's no silver bullet to make the registry go away.

Andy 1:06:28

I just wanted to clarify, just to make sure. Is there anything else? Oh, let's do our little tribute to your favorite now deceased radio show host. (Larry: We did that.) That way all the flags are flying at half-mast. Well, I thought we were gonna do like that. Was it? Is that all you wanted to say about Rush?

Larry 1:06:44

Yeah, unless you got something else to add. But yeah,

Andy 1:06:46

we did. I got nothing. I think he's a terrible human being. That's all I gotta say.

Larry 1:06:52  
You shouldn't say...

Andy 1:06:52  
let me ask you this.

Larry 1:06:54  
They're gonna burn out transmission tower down.

Andy 1:06:57  
do you think that he created the modern day like talk show format? Or would that go to somebody like Larry King before him? Because I think that he's kind of like the genesis of that whole kind of radio program.

Larry 1:07:12  
He certainly had the largest accumulation of radio stations. But no, he was not the first. He was not the first by any means. There were people who had nationally broadcast programs before he came along, but he was able to perfect it to a level that no one has ever seen before and probably no one will after.

Andy 1:07:31  
All right. Um, I guess we could say you can find the shownotes everyone and like I get this question a lot. So if you've made it this far, if you want to know how to get into discord, go to either the website where you'll find a discord link in the show notes. That's over at registrymatters.co and look for any of the show notes and you will find a link to get into the discord. If you want to listen to the show live. You can leave a voicemail at 747-227-4477 you can email us at registrymatterscast@gmail.com. Support the show on patreon at patreon.com/registrymatters. Larry, you are the best and the most informed person I don't have anything else and if that's it, then I bid you a good night. Thanks, sir.

Larry 1:08:18  
Good night.

Andy 1:08:19  
Take care. Bye bye.

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

---

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.

<b>REGISTRY MATTERS</b>		
<b>MAIL-IN SUBSCRIPTION FORM</b>		
Sign me up for _____ months X \$6 = \$ _____		
(Minimum 3 months) * <b>We do accept books or sheets of stamps. No singles please.</b>		
_____	_____	
First Name	Last Name	
_____	_____	
Name of Institution	ID Number	
_____		
Address		
_____	_____	_____
City	State	Zip Code
<b>Make check payable to FYP Education and send to RM Podcast, Post Office Box 36123, Albuquerque, NM 87176</b>		