



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 200

Recorded 10-30-21

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

Andy 00:17

Recording live from FYP studios east and west with one edition transmitted across the internet. This is episode 200 of Registry Matters. How are you, sir?

Larry 00:29

Awesome.

Andy 00:31

We are we're right on time, aren't we? It's 15 minutes afterwards, we've been dealing with some minor tech issues and getting everybody situated with the hundreds of people that are listening in for the 200 to 200 episode. How are you?

Larry 00:43

But actually it is a larger audience than normal. And, and we are grateful that you're here. And my lovely fiancée is here. So welcome.

Andy 00:54

Your fiancée is is a married woman, Larry,

Larry 00:57

doesn't matter. I do not discriminate.

Andy 01:01

I see. All right. Is everybody they're on board with this whole plan?

Larry 01:08

I don't see any objections so far?

Andy 01:11

All right. Well, excellent. Do you want to tell me what we have this evening?

Larry 01:16

We have a special guest from the great state of West Virginia that's going to be balancing my liberal Do goodism. As you know, we're going to be taking a couple of questions, three questions, I think two from behind the walls and one that came in from gatekeeper at NARSOL. And we're going to be talking about public policy and when people should whether they're in Congress or whether the state legislative bodies are within whether they're their legislative seats or city council seats or county Commissions when they should tell the people to go screw themselves and when they should actually represent the people and what the contours are for representing people. Talk about we're going to talk about the Adam Walsh Act pending regulatory guidelines that are actually going to become final very soon here, but we're gonna kick that around a bit. It's generating a lot of interest around.,

Andy 02:17

Okay, have we talked about that before by chance?

Larry 02:20

We have indeed. We've definitely talked about the Adam Walsh Act and the proposed regulations, that were issued during the Trump administration, and now they're going to become final during the Biden administration.

Andy 02:33

All right, then well, then, let's get going from this first one from the NARSOL gatekeeper. This one says, Sorry, I've been super busy. That's just part of another conversation. I live in Bartow County, and I register as homeless. Ever since I became homeless within a week of moving to Georgia, the sheriff's department has told me I have to text them. Every single night, as soon as I reach my sleeping location, yet, I can't for the life of me find a single law on the books that state this is a requirement of a homeless registrant in Bartow County, or in Georgia. And honestly, it's very, very stressful. Because any night I've worked overnight, or over time, or excuse me over overnight for over time, I get harassed about it. The one or two nights I've forgotten, I've been harassed about it. And I constantly worry about being sent to jail over something as simple as not sending a text. It's one thing if it's on the books as a law, but I don't see anything that makes it legal or gives them the ability to enforce it. Boy, I know what the answer is to this, Larry, I totally totally know what the answer to this is. Can I say it?

Larry 03:37

You do indeed. But as we were in pre-show, I was thinking this was Bartow County, but it's actually a county that I've never heard of in Georgia. It is Barrow County.

Andy 03:51

Yeah. Okay. So I read that wrong.

Larry 03:52

Northeast Georgia law had said that I thought it was Bartow. But Georgia has 159 counties, which I think it's the second highest number largest number in the United States. And I don't even know them all. But yes, there apparently is a Barrow County, it has a 69,000 population. And it's kind of looks like it would be there Clark County and Athens area of Georgia. Okay. All right. So you know the answer. So tell tell people the answer, then we'll dig into it.

Andy 04:20

The answer is they can do it until they are told to stop just like the signs in Butts County. Right?

Larry 04:25

Correct. So we have actually, we meaning NARSOL, and for those who have never heard that before. That's the National Association for rational sexual offense laws. We have actually litigated in Georgia against sheriffs who have invented requirements that are outside the law. And in pre-show prep, I went ahead and pulled the Georgia statute as represented by the Georgia Bureau of Investigation website. And it's available there for scrutiny. It was in the shared folder. And as I went through that my recollection was accurate. He is correct. There is nothing in the Georgia statute that requires a weekly text, I mean, a nightly text of a PFR in Georgia.

But there was nothing in there that required a PFR. To put up signs. There's a lot of things that law enforcement invents. But Georgia doesn't provide in their statute, the opportunity for law enforcement to invent things. There's no catch-all clause that says and such other things as furthers the purpose of the sexual offender registration statute. And those clauses alone are unconstitutional because they're vague. And they would be properly challenged to be void for vagueness, but this issue was settled many years ago, I think we talked about it in Pre-Show soft put the case of Santos versus state, which dealt with a PFR, who did not have a permanent address. And the Georgia law used to require them to provide a physical address no PO box, and the Georgia Supreme Court has held 13 years ago now that that, so you don't have an address, you don't provide an address. And the way I read from the GBI website, is they have to report within 72 hours a homeless person that if they change their sleeping location, but I cannot find any reference to a nightly text.

Andy 06:19
Okay,

Andy 06:20
um, so does he just like flip them the two middle fingers and say, I'm not doing it.

Larry 06:28
I would not strongly encourage that. If he would do that they would go what they would do. If he did take that approach, they would go and try to find the places where he is staying because he would be reporting something, they may even be GPS tracking him for all we know, you never know what law enforcement, they do what that what they call that Sting Ray that moves the cell phone tower route. I don't know all that technology. But for all we know, they're tracking, they do track people surreptitiously. By attaching devices to their cars, I don't know if they can do the same thing by cell phone technology. But if they're tracking, and what they would do is they would contact the entities that control the property where he's sleeping, it might be privately owned, or it might be a public right of way under a bridge somewhere. And they would get him they make sure he would receive directions that he's trespassing if he sold that public property, or he's trespassing result that private property, and they would upset the appcart to where he would not be able to sleep there, if that's what they would do sauce would not encourage that course of action.

Andy 07:30
Then he has to go through the whole I'm gonna say it, Larry, the Kabuki show of then finding an attorney, and then going through and trying to file a challenge to do something to get the attorney to act on his behalf to go stop.

Larry 07:46
That is correct, and since the organization that I serve on the board. We're interested in Georgia, we've put Georgia on our radar. It's very possible I can't be premature, but it's very possible, we might look at that. And it's possible, we might send a cease-and-desist letter to Barrow County. But those are all possibilities. Because we work in team collaboration. Nobody makes unilateral decisions. So we would have to consider the pros and cons and that could be a course of action we might choose.

Andy 08:17
Being as this individual is homeless, Larry, I'm sure he doesn't go into his nightly room and go bathe in all of the \$100 bills here and for the day,

Larry 08:26
probably not.

Andy 08:27
So what is the person in that sort of situation? How do they then file a legal challenge against like the state, this isn't like your neighbor irritated you. And you go to Judge Judy, and you do some sort of small claims court, this is going to be thousands of dollars to do.

Larry 08:44
Potentially, it might be thousands of dollars, or maybe a cease and desist letter to the to the county attorney of Barrow and to the to the Barrow County Sheriff's Office, possibly. Sometimes on rare occasions, they see the light and they stop doing what they're doing. So but yes, you're correct if litigation, were the only course of action. That's the reason why these things go unchallenged, because a homeless person is in a very weak position, generally speaking, they're not going to have those resources, nor are they going to have access to them and the organizations that would be available to him. The first thing he would think would be the ACLU and they're not likely to undertake this cause they're not.

Andy 09:24
Does this have far reaching implications? As far as like we talked about impact litigation, that's something that you are you and others are mostly interested in, you're not interested in helping like the one person but if it has some sort of greater impact for many more people, does this fall into that kind of category?

Larry 09:41
It would indeed it would be similar to what we're working on in Cobb County, which is a suburban Atlanta County. We're working on launching an action there because the sheriff there and we don't know if they've changed but the previous sheriff was inventing requirements about work schedules and things that were not in Georgia law that people had to provide. So the greater impact would be, you did put your hand on a Bible and you swore to uphold the law to enforce the law. If you would like to be a lawmaker, all 159 sheriffs in Georgia, you need to run for the Georgia General Assembly. But that's not your role to invent a law. And you're going to be slapped down from time to time. Because if we find that you're inventing the law, there is someone watching.

Andy 10:25
And one final question is about the separation of powers that I'm pretty sure that the sheriff is part of the executive branch, and they don't have the power to invent laws, which comes from the legislative branch. Do I have that reasonably close?

Larry 10:40
reasonably close? Yes, they are independently elected officials, but they do not have lawmaking powers. He, or she, I don't know who the sheriff feels in Barrow. But he or she is not able to invent the law. When they tell someone to do something, as I said, they

put their hand on the Bible. And they were going to enforce the laws as written. And that is not in Georgia law. I don't know how they can invent that. Because you just can't tell people to do what you'd like them to do. You enforce what has been required of them. And they also need certainty of terms of what they can be required to do. That's the whole reason why we have laws and people don't just invent it as they go, nobody would ever be safe.

Andy 11:21

Right? Yeah, I mean, that would that would set up the minimum standard of what they're supposed to execute, but then at the same time, it creates the maximum of what they're allowed to do as well.

Larry 11:31

So yes, I will I will be further investigating disclaiming and Barrow County. And it's possible that we could be sending a letter to them.

Andy 11:42

All right. Excellent. And then let's move over to this is a two parter, but this will be part one. And it says thank you for sending me the transcript of the podcast. I'm glad and grateful that the issues discussed on this forum are being approached in some fashion. However, I'm not sure that the late night show with the live audience is the most appropriate format. The light hearted semi calm comic tone seems a bit tone deaf, to the situation where there are broken lives and broken homes, people languishing in prison for decades and facing lifetime ostracism and exclusion, social disdain until death, there really is very little to laugh about, unless the laughter is a kind of gallows humor. At one point in this transcript, there is a tangential conversation about a gentleman who travels with plumbing tools and his favorite showerhead, that he installs in hotel rooms to avoid the occasional week spray. In prison, we have no such luxuries. And I'm sure that those PFR is doomed to live in public shelters or on the streets don't either. Boy, oh, boy.

Larry 12:43

Well, that is from Fernando, who's spending some time with the feds in the state of Texas. We do appreciate the feedback as always, that episode that he happened to receive was recorded at an annual event. And we would have either not had an episode that week, or we thought we would take advantage of that accumulation of 150 people and give them opportunity to see the show the program live and to participate. So yes, there was some laughter. And when we did the transcript, we made sure that the laughter was represented in the transcript, we put that in there purposely so that the people who are reading would feel like they were there as much as you could feel like you're there. And the terms of the showerhead, the person that's me, that's the person we're talking about with the showerhead. So, yes, I'm quite well aware that people in prison have, have not the best showers they have. They have short timers, in many instances where you have to press the button over and over again. Sometimes you can invent bypass tools like putting cutting your coffee cup, the plastic and you can put little wedges in. And most of the modern designs they fix they'll kick that won't actually kick the plastic out but it'll turn the shower off even though you have a permanent wedge in there. That's what people used to do in the old days.

Andy 14:09

But he did it last place I was that it would run like from the time that the showers were opened that thing was on at Full Tilt for I don't know, six hours just running.

Larry 14:19

So yes, but that that's not the point. The point I was making is what I travel. I'm getting up in years, and I pay decent money for the lodging and I expect to be able to take a shower but we can't compare that with prison. In prison you get accommodations that are not intended to make you feel like you'd want to come back when I go to a hotel. I'm they are hoping that I do come back in most instances that's the whole point of the business is that we want repeat guests they would like to have repeat guests so I I don't feel any guilt about having a decent shower. But I do recognize that people in prisons are not and luxurious accommodations

Andy 15:02

I would also, there's like a flurry of comments being thrown out in chat. One of them is exactly otherwise, it's all doom and gloom. So we've had this comment come up before and we beat it around on how much lightheartedness we would do. But that's exactly it. This all sucks, really, really bad for those that are still inside. And it sucks for a whole lot of people that are on the outside, obviously, to varying degrees. You can't compare the people that are inside to the people that are outside. Same as you, Larry, you have the privilege and the freedom to travel with a showerhead and replace it, not trying to make that comparison. But at the same time, if all we do is come on here and go, this sucks, and this is gonna make your life worse. And I didn't say that on purpose, then I, I'm sorry, I don't, I don't personally live that way. So I am very snarky. I'm very sarcastic, I have a dry sense of humor. Like, that's just kind of the personality that I have. And I would apologize to the person sending in the comments that that's how this program exists. But that's kind of the character of it too.

Larry 16:09

So, and in fact, I noticed there's a large number in audience right now they're muted, but I could probably generate some laughter about my latest bathroom antics. I've never talked about but at home. Rather than having a hot lather machine, I have a whole fashion technique for making sure my shaving cream is warm. So what I do is I take the cans of shaving cream, and I put them in a small igloo of hot water. Because otherwise if you put them in something that's not it doesn't have some insulating effect to water the cold by the time you get out of the shower. So I get out of the shower, and my shaving cream is nice and warm. It's in the igloo. And I have nice heated lather and it didn't cost me a dime. So but it did cost me a dime for the shaving cream, but it's nice and warm. A friend of mine came over to light my furnace today. And he needed to use the bathroom. But he saw the igloo and he said, Why do you have an igloo in the bathroom? I said everybody does.

Andy 17:10

Of course they do. Larry, everyone has one in their bathroom.

Larry 17:14

Every every bathroom I've ever been in the last 10 years at least has an igloo sitting there. So I don't know what his problem was. Don't you have one of yours?

Andy 17:26

Definitely,

Larry 17:27

How many of you a chat have an igloo in your bathroom?

Andy 17:33

The answer is gonna be none. But I will then just pile this on. So I think humor can be lost in a text transcript for that listener. He could listen to podcast and then he would hear the humor in the voice. That's totally true. And if this is the first transcript that this person has received, then there's also a whole lot of context lost in how much we do play around with what a serious and then what is joking? So yes, and I did receive an F bomb and then a no Larry. So no, there are no igloos at anybody's houses?

Larry 18:03

Well, I've just totally shocked because I'm confident that the TSA finds showerheads and every piece of luggage they screen. And I would be very surprised if I didn't start knocking on doors and asking about igloos at the bathrooms were full of them.

Andy 18:19

Alright, well, then let's move on to comment number two from the same individual. It says thank you for the FYP transcripts. I've submitted by core links, email request to Registry Matters cast@gmail.com but have not yet received a reply. I would like to be included in the dialogue as a voice from the inside, there may be some value to my input. We've discussed this. I think it's within the last six months, I'm pretty sure and we You encouraged me pretty much live on the program. It's like you probably don't want to get into that because if we do, then we're going to receive 8000 email messages and we just can't handle it. I get enough emails from people with questions. They go to you, we pick them up from other sources. I'm not saying that the value the input is valuable. But it would then start to get abused too. And that's just a hard line to cross. If we had a volunteer perhaps if someone wanted to step up and receive these email messages, we could work something out like that.

Larry 19:14

I would be receptive to that. But I was saying in Pre-Show. I just don't have the additional bandwidth. I'm already over extended and I'm trying to downsize so I don't have the capacity to have any more things thrown at me. So I cannot take that on but I'm not opposed to someone doing it. We have hundreds and hundreds literally hundreds of people who are listening out there on a regular basis. Maybe one of them might want to be our CorrLinks monitor but I can't do it either.

Andy 19:42

Okay, moving right along then. I guess this will be this is question from Isaac. To Whom It May Concern. I find your newsletter very informative. I've even recommend it to others. I have a few questions. However. Rumor is Indiana has talked about going up us going up a civil commitment facility in the near future opening

up sorry, opening up a civil commitment facility in the near future. Do you know anything about these rumors? What all states have says civil commitment. And then the third one, I suppose to start lifetime parole when I get off of probation? I'm sorry, I am supposed to start lifetime parole when I get off probation. Shouldn't this be a violation of my rights? Since that wasn't in my plea? Fourth, the Second Amendment says the right to bear arms. How am I supposed to protect myself from being the victim of a hate crime? Again, I am part of three minorities and have been assaulted due to two of them. Respectfully, Isaac? Boy, there's a lot to unpack there. Larry, what's the first one?

Larry 20:43

Well, I have not heard that rumor. But just let's be clear, always like to take this moment to educate. As far as I know, all states have civil commitment. So let's be clear, we're talking about a different type of civil commandment which has at present 20 states have, but I didn't check to see which 20 They are, I'm not gonna recite those 20 states and the federal government have a form of PFR specifics civil commitment. It's not, it's not a very good system, because there are fewer protections, the standard of putting a person away is much lower. And the process for getting a person out is almost virtually non existent. And some, like in Minnesota, a handful have gotten out in the history of that program. But I do not know about anything of that nature. Being that Indiana is a conservative state, if you were trying to fight that, and I realized he would have limited resources from where he is in prison, but you would want to remind those conservatives in Indiana that they are against big government, and creating new things that will grow exponentially, and you would cite to the states for the programs have grown exponentially like Minnesota, and Virginia. And you would say we just can't afford this and to hold true to your conservative values, do not create this monster because it will grow and grow and grow. And that's the best argument you can come up with. And they may adhere to their conservative beliefs, or they may abandon them and magically do a flip flop, which conservatives frequently do. But that's what I would where I would start if I were trying to argue against that. So I can't give you the list of the 20 states that it takes care of number two, it lifetime parole, it made, it may be permissible even I mean, there's just too much there to unpack on this program, because we don't know what law was at the time. If he's got lifetime probation at post prison supervision, if the statute existed, they fail to apprise him of that requirement. It could be that he could get out of the plea, that's probably not his interest. So I've got I'm going to dodge that one. And then the second amendment. That's one of those things where, since 1968, there have been prohibitions against felons and people who have had various Well, they've actually added misdemeanor convictions like domestic violence to that prohibition. They've also got people who have been committed to mental health facilities against their will, you know, involuntary commitment. Those people were forbidden to have a weapon. So Martha Stewart, who sold stock, and did not tell the truth to the federal investigator cannot lawfully own a firearm, because to my knowledge, she has not received a federal pardon for her federal crime. And I do not believe she can possess a weapon. But so yes, that is a problem. And again, if the NRA was as consistent is it pretends to be about that, right? They would fight for restoration of those rights and a much more narrowly focused prohibition, but the NRA, like most organ organizations, they're not consistent because they're afraid that might alienate

some of their donors, or maybe many of their donors, so therefore, they don't take that posture.

Andy 23:53

Back to the point three, about lifetime parole, no lifetime parole when he gets off of probation, isn't that, to me, that feels backwards. Parole is something that is like prison, but not inside and then probation is what you're free with restrictions.

Larry 24:12

So Well, like I said, I just don't feel like I have enough information to be competent. He may have he may have a beef there. In terms of that, I would suggest that to the extent he can he talked to legal professionals. I can't unpack that. But he may very well have a good cause of action. I think there's been states like in Tennessee where I think they've imposed that on people retroactively, and it was not a part of their negotiations. And just because they they've done it doesn't make it constitutional, but they could do it until their stopped.

Andy 24:45

Okay, but back to that recurring theme. They can do it until they're stopped. Then last question, boy and I get to read this one. This is gonna be hard to read. Thank you for all the insight you give in your newsletters. They are much appreciated my question to you is this, all states do have registries, which states limit which, which of the registries are listed on the internet. I'm currently incarcerated and do not have internet resources to help out. Thank you for your time along with any help to my question, Larry, can you just rattle off of your head, which states limit who's on the listed on the internet?

Larry 25:25

Well, let's, let's be clear. There, there's no state in our union, that doesn't have at least a significant amount of their PFRs listed, I think Minnesota might have the lowest ratio list on the internet, but all states, all states have some segments of their PFR is listed and it ranges all the way from anyone who's registered to like in Arkansas they have a risk based system and they put the level two, I mean, level threes and fours on the on the website. And Minnesota has a similar system. Vermont has a similar system unless you have an offense against a minor and then magically that prohibition goes away. And they did that a few years back as they expanded their law. And Vermont. But still in Vermont is a little bit better, because they don't put your physical address they put your city. But in terms of what he's trying to do, he's trying to state shop, and we don't really encourage state shopping. First of all, most people don't have the luxury of going to wherever they want to go. He may because he's in federal custody, he may have that luxury. But when you state shop, you're assuming that the laws are stagnant, they cannot be changed, and they change all the time. If you look at the legislative history, you'll see that they changed sometimes annually, in certain states, the victim, and the law enforcement apparatus never feels like they have sufficient control. So the victims' advocates want more restrictions on the law enforcement industrial complex wants more restrictions. So even if you were to have such a list, and even if you didn't have the resources to get to that state, that does not mean that that's the way the state's going to be. Look at two states that had private list, law enforcement only Nebraska, Oklahoma, Wyoming, on and on. And people thought, well, they were safe. And all of a sudden

they were not safe. So we just don't encourage state shopping. But yeah, I appreciate it. I understand. If you could not be on the Internet, what you want to be not be on the internet who would want to be on Internet didn't have to be

Andy 27:31

definitely not anybody. Nobody I know would want to be on it if they didn't have to be.

Larry 27:35

Well, not in this. Actually, people want to be on the internet all the time with their social media, but it doesn't take your social media platform. This is one of those things where people are not chomping at the bit like the Arkansas registration manual said some years back it said that people who have been convicted of these offenses have the opportunity to register it, it was so hilarious, because most people would have been happy to pass up that opportunity.

Andy 27:58

I think I would probably pass that one up as well, to be honest. So all right. Well, so I

Larry 28:08

He's got a lot of he's got a lot of research to do to try to figure this out. It may change by the time he gets released. It I didn't do any research to figure out what his projected release date is, but, but it may be that everything's changed by the time he gets out.

Andy 28:24

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

Andy 29:13

Okay, I think then we can move over to the Oh, there's one. I think we're ready to go to the future segment. I believe there. I think we're there Right.

Larry 29:25

I think we are and we have a very, very special guest that's going to be joining us from connection has held.

Andy 29:33

I hope so. Philip King Oh, so little soundcheck? Yeah. Sweet. You're still here. Excellent. Yeah. And you have a follow up there. We you are Phillip and you are the head person for the West Virginia affiliate of NARSOL and you're pretty smart cat. So we thought we would have you on because I made an analogy to Larry in the recent days or weeks comparing the position of Joe Manchin and what is coming down the pike from the federal legislation, I think it's called the Build Back Better plan. And the position that he is as a Democrat, versus the position of the state being super red. And I'm not trying to play sides on that. That's just the reality of what

they are. But I made the analogy with Larry, I said, Yeah, it's definitely red. And so I made the analogy that Joe Manchin is in a position where maybe he is a Democrat, maybe he wants all the green things that could ever be. But the state doesn't really support that. So he has to figure out some line to toe in there. And anyway, and vote according to what would potentially get him reelected, mostly. And so thought you would be an excellent candidate to come on and discuss that. And then also throw in the proposed changes to the AWA we can talk about that. But all that said, Welcome. How are you?

Philip 30:50

I'm doing absolutely wonderful, Andy.

Andy 30:55

We've met a number of times at the NARSOL conferences, and I think that you're a stellar, stellar, great guy. Like you a lot. (Philip: Well, thank you sir.) Yep. So where do we go, Larry? What do you want to do?

Larry 31:11

Well, what Andy laid is the intro is really where I wanted to go in terms of public policy, and how we formulate public policy and talking about as we elect people to represent us, when are those people supposed to flip the middle finger and do whatever the hell they want? And when are they supposed to represent the people that sent them there? And I get all these conflicted. I get all the time, well they should just tell the people to go to hell. Well, of course, that's your feeling when you disagree with the majority of the people, but they represent, whether it be a city council or county commission or county board of supervisors, or whether it be a state legislative district, or whether it be the US House or the US Senate, they represent the people. So therefore, the people of West Virginia, are not the same as the people of California or New York. So imagine being a member of the Senate and being one of 50 Democrats. And actually, it's not that many there was an independent, I think, so he's one of 49. But the other one caucuses with Democrats for organizational reasons. But we've got an equally divided Senate. And what is he supposed to do? Because I'm quite certain, if you were to take a poll about PFR issues in West Virginia, I'm doubting that there would be a massive uprising against the registry. And I'm suspecting that the people are pretty much happy with the laws as they exist or maybe want them to be tighter. So if you want Manchin to represent you on the Green Deal, and oppose it, because that's where the average West Virginian is, they think that that's Kabuki because they want to keep their industries that they're familiar with in place. How is it that we can ask him to flip the middle finger on the stuff related to PFRs, and he's supposed to vote for against the Democrat Party, and he's supposed to represent the people of West Virginia. It confuses me a lot. When do you get to represent the people and when to get to tell the people to go to heck? Yeah, to go where it doesn't snow?

Andy 33:22

Shine.

Andy 33:29

Snow or shine?

Philip 33:30

It's definitely a challenge, that's for sure. And you can definitely say that West Virginia is a very red leaning state. And Joe Manchin has been the senator in West Virginia for a lot of years. But Joe has never been a left, left senator, he's always been a center left. But yeah, in West Virginia, they're not chomping at the bit to increase registry law and make it harder, but they're also not chomping at the bit to roll it back where you would see, you know, most reform, liberal movements moving towards. But Joe has stuck around for a lot of years by being a centrist. He's been in the Senate for a long time. He's an old timer. He believes in and bipartisanship but at the same time, you know, he's not looking to gut the entire West Virginia economy and all the coal producing jobs. He still has to have that balance and weigh in with what his constituents want. There's definitely in West Virginia and Kentucky, coal is a major, major thing. Turning that all over to a new green world is not something I think Joe is totally against. But he certainly doesn't want to do it in five years, that's for sure. So it's a challenge, a balancing act challenge for sure.

Larry 35:12

Well, that's what the lefties don't seem to understand. You take someone like AOC, that I can't pronounce all of her names. So I'm just going to let that go sufficiently.

Andy 35:22

Alexandra Ocasio-Cortez.

Larry 35:25

We can put it in the glossary of what it stands for. But those people are tone deaf to the differences in the United States. So they represent a district or a state. In her case, she's in the house. So she's representing a district. And they just assume that since they have broad support from their constituents, that somehow or another, their courage is something that should just translate around to places where they don't look at things the same way. Texas is not the same as California. We were just there. And you can cite to how many people were wearing masks when we were there. 150 people, what would you say as you scan the audience, how many of the 150 actually wear masks after the presentation? So it was a very small number.

Andy 36:10

I don't think there's one person that was adamant about wearing a mask.

Larry 36:14

Had you been in New England, you would have seen a lot higher. Even in New Mexico, you would have seen a lot higher percentage of people. In fact, you have been almost unanimous 100% here, because when you're in public, you have to be masked and very few people defy that. But in Texas, somehow the lefties don't get that. But when we're talking about things as PFRs go, we somehow find such disdain for that they just don't have any backbone. They just don't go "fuck the people," and they just don't do the right thing. Well, in my view, over time, transitioning away from the type of energy that we've been using for 100 years, it's probably in our best interest over the long term. But it's going to be disruptive as all change is. It's going to be painful. As we went from agriculture to industrialization, and we went from industrialization to the technical revolution, when we lost a lot of industrial jobs

that paid well and had nice benefits. But in the meantime, Joe Manchin, who's also been governor of that state, if I remember, right, he was the governor. He served that state for a long, long time. And he has been a centrist and I would say centrist to the right more than to the left. Politically, he's been at the center, maybe leaning to the right. But that's where he has to be. He could not get elected if he were out on the lefty land where AOC is. He just couldn't. The people of West Virginia would not vote for him.

Philip 37:46

Well, it's absolutely certainly he could not get elected. And if he was to lose his seat, it would absolutely be filled by a Republican.

Larry 37:57

So that's what I struggle with all the time, when the party is so adamant, "You'll either vote our way, or we don't want you." Well, first of all, the Democratic Party used to be a broad and welcoming party. You had a broad diversity in the Democratic Party across the political spectrum. You had the same thing in the Republican Party. You had liberal and moderate Republicans, and both parties have polarized, but back to the PFR issue. What do you expect when that's where the people are on the issue. They do not want to see things lighten up on PFRs. And they make that known. Believe me, they make that known. When there's any hint of lightening up, there is an outcry about it. The news media goes crazy. The phones light up in the legislative offices. I answer them. I know that for a fact. So the people are not ready for that. So what are they supposed to do?

Philip 38:55

It's a good question.

Andy 38:59

Explain further, Larry, in that, if, so, say you voted for Joe Manchin because he was a coal supporter. And then this registry stuff comes up on the plate. I realize that you would want him to vote for the PFR stuff, but your coal job is there. And I wanted you to go into about the other issues that they may work on. And this is something that like, this isn't their pet project. A lot of people get elected because they're like, I'm going to focus on schools, focus on jobs, I'm going to focus on economy. They get there on their signature platform. But then these tangentially, not even tangentially, these other issues come up that it's not their pet project. What are they supposed to do with those?

Larry 39:43

What they generally do, is, they look as best they can. And I should say we, because I'm a part of that process. We look at where we think the public is based on what we know the reaction is going to be. Well, I can automatically tell you in our state the news media would go ballistic if you started, because that's where the people are. And that would drive their ratings through the roof. And in a capitalist system, ratings is what you live or die by. So we would say, gee, we're going to get killed on this in the media. And therefore, we would lay low in the grass. What you do when you're in politics is you lay low in the grass, and you hope someone that has a little bit safer seat/posture that they're in. Matchin is not in a safe seat. I mean, he did squeak out a reelection in his last go round. But it was not a barnburner by any means. What was it like three points, maybe?

Philip 40:39

Yeah, I think it was either three or four points.

Larry 40:42

And he is not in a position to burn capital on this issue. So if there would be federal legislation, he would lay low in the grass, and he would let others take the lead on that. And he would vote how he felt that he would suffer the least damage politically, because this is not an issue that he can gain any political advantage with. This is not something that would gain him votes. It isn't. I hate to tell you, folks, but it would not get you votes to be soft on crime, and particular, soft on PFRs. So therefore, it's something that is politically toxic, and you're gonna stay away from it. That's why the votes are always 100% or very close to it, because you see it as political toxicity if you touch it.

Andy 41:26

Someone just posted in comments, Philip, maybe you can speak to this. Just imagine the attack ads if he didn't lay low.

Philip 41:32

Oh, yeah, there would definitely be lots of attack ads. He's up for reelection in '24. Not really sure that he's gonna run again. He's, I believe, 74 at this point. But yeah, if in a red state like we are, anytime anything is raised that even remotely goes out and wants to challenge the registry, the attack ads just start on the nightly news. It's the only thing you see on the news, it seems like.

Andy 42:08

So what else Larry, what else is important to know about from the registry side of voting, and then the general population? Isn't this where it would be really important for things to get killed in committee, so they don't come to a vote?

Larry 42:22

Absolutely. Everything that we are angry about now, we're angry because the committee process broke down and finally let it through. At the federal level, the International Megan's Law, when the Congress was under democratic control, it was able to be bottled up by a few key people, particularly the Senate. But when the majority shifts - people don't really pay attention to this - when the majority shifts, the committee chairs shift also, because one of the perks of being in the majority is you get to name the chairs of the committee. And the ratios are representative of the ratio of advantage you have over the other party. So right now, the committees are, in the Senate, they're 50/50, because that's what the ratio is. So the rule that they're operating under now is a shared power agreement where anything that can't pass out of committee, say if every Democrat votes no, and every Republican votes yes, you've got a tie. So they've agreed as the sharing power process to send that on to the floor. But normally, if they were 52/48, then all the Senate committees would be one more than there is of the of the minority party. And that would mean if they voted in lockstep, you kill it in committee. So when the Republicans took control of the of the Senate in 2014, that shifted the committee control as well. So the committee chair, I believe, was Leahy of the key committee. I'm not sure. It's been a few years back, but the Democrats had control and the IML was being bottled up. Well, that shifted. I mean, it's just that magic. When the majority party shifts, committee chairs shift. And the majority

party controls the flow of what gets heard in committee. They control the flow. You hear all this time that Mitch was blocking this, he would not allow a vote, Mitch wouldn't allow a vote. Well, same thing happens in the House. If you're in the majority, you can block votes. The rules are slightly different than house representatives, but blocking votes, you don't want this crap to get to the floor, you cannot let it get to the floor. It will be voted, it will be approved on the floor. That happens time and time again. You have to stop in committee. And that's just the reality of the situation. It works the same way at the state level. If it gets to the floor, it's going to pass. It's too toxic not to vote for it.

Philip 44:48

That's absolutely right. They did distance restrictions in West Virginia six years ago for those who are on supervision. And as soon as that law was passed, I was like, Okay, the next step is all the rest of us, and sure enough, the next year, they introduced it. It was introduced five years running. This last year it got taken out, it was not reintroduced. But for five years, we, you know, obviously we got together and we spoke out against it and it died. We got to die in committee every one of those years, but that was the ultimate goal was to get killed in committee.

Larry 45:29

So, yep, and people are really not familiar with the committee process. The committee is where the public gets input. It's where the real in-depth dive goes. Yes, they do have floor debate. But the real experts come in and testify in a committee setting. You don't, when you're on the floor, it's debate among the members. It's not a debate among the public. So your real involvement, and the real expertise comes in the committee process. They have analysts that look at these things. They take public comment, in most states. I'm told that there was a couple of states where they don't allow public comment. But as a general rule, public comment comes in. And you're allowed to say what you want to say, you may only get one, two or three minutes, but you're allowed to speak, and you have every right as a PFR show up at your Capitol. And when I say that, I'm going to get the email from North Carolina, they're going to tell me, Larry you don't seem to realize that North Carolina has the capitols within an exclusion zone. And PFRs are not allowed to go there because of that. And I just tell people, well, you know, what, I'm allowed to petition government for redress of my grievances. And I would go the capital anyway. But that's easy for me to say, because I would fight back. But even if you can't go to capitol, you can participate other ways in that process.

Andy 46:48

What other stuff is going on in in West Virginia, Philip? Is there any activity at the legislative level that you guys are looking out for and going to try and stop and whatnot?

Philip 47:00

There's not a whole lot of active stuff going on, we have an annual legislature. So we don't have you know, a full year running or twice a year. So it's once a year. The biggest thing over the last couple years has been the distance restriction, but glad to see that it's not been reintroduced and hoping that it'll stay that way. We're looking at trying to raise funds and look at adding on or forcing the legislature to have a way to get off of the registry in

West Virginia. Currently, there is no way off of the registry. There's no legislative process to redress whatsoever.

Andy 47:43

You only have like 50 people on the registry in West Virginia, right?

Philip 47:47

Just a little over 6000. And there's a handful of people who are designated as what they call violent predators. But West Virginia is definitely not the worst place in the Union to be for registering. Certainly not Florida, let's put it that way. But they're definitely worse places to be than West Virginia. But, for example, not being able to get off the registry is something that we certainly want to try and get on to the books.

Larry 48:25

That should be very appealing to your conservative lawmakers who profess such a belief in small and limited government. And the cost, that would be one of your talking points. Now, West Virginia probably offloads this to the counties, which is quite common around the country. There's only a handful of states where they actually do it at the state level. So you get to you get to disguise the cost of it. It is absorbed by the counties. Is that the way they do it in West Virginia? Do you register with the county?

Philip 48:54

Yeah, you register. The state police control the registration and it's registered in the counties. It's centralized, but it's the county levels that do all the registrations.

Larry 49:05

Yeah. So they get to absorb the cost. And it's the county officials that come out and check on you, the sheriffs or whoever. Now if you really want to have fun with them, you go talk to a conservative lawmaker, and you say, You know what? I've been thinking about this damn thing. And it sure is one of those unfunded mandates that conservatives really profess that they hate. And you know we're having an unfunded mandate to the local governments who are already struggling to provide basic services. You know, you're local governments provide your most basic service like trash and parks, and law enforcement, county jail, whatnot. And they're stressed to the limit. So what we ought to do is remove this unfunded mandate. And let's make sure that it's handled by the state or at the very minimum that the state pays the counties for doing it. And then we could get a more clear picture of what it's costing because right now it's just being absorbed by the counties. And this is just such a horrible thing that we're shoving on our counties. That's your strategy. And you'll actually be able to find out how disingenuous they might be, or how honest they might be about their belief in unfunded mandates. Because they'll roll their eyes and say, I've never thought about that. No sheriff has ever complained. Of course, no Sheriff, ever would complain, because if you complained about the registry, it would be adverse to your electability as a sheriff. Nobody wants someone who complains about the registry. So every sheriff says, I'm happy to do that. Because to say otherwise would be to jeopardize their electability. So that would be a good way to have a conversation. And let's find out how conservative these people are about unfunded mandates and how much they believe in not piling things on local government and see if they

really are sincere. And, I mean, you can keep a straight face because that is an honest dialogue to have with a conservative lawmaker.

Philip 50:48

So that's good tact.

Andy 50:52

Do you want to move over to SORNA stuff, Larry, or are we done?

Larry 50:55

Well, I wanted to talk about my picture, because there's a reason that picture is up there. So folks, there's a picture of me running a buffing machine. And for those of you who do not know what a buffer is, I'm going to try to make the story somewhat succinct. But to make it as funny as I possibly can, I'm gonna add a little bit of levity here. That machine is used for stripping and waxing and polishing floors. And that's probably an old thing. Now the machines, they're big. And you know, they're bulky, and they run on their own power. But this is a machine that would have been very common. They used in the 70s and 80s. I went to school as an aide to the janitorial staff in the early 70s on a youth summer program. And there was four of us teenage boys. And two of them were very strong athletes. One of them was a large, hefty guy, but not an athlete. And one was a nerdy kind of skinny guy. And I was the nerd. And I just could not understand why the buffing machine was so difficult to operate. Because I saw the strong boys and they were struggling with it after an hour, they would be they would be tired, and they'd be sweating. And they couldn't operate the buffing machine. Well I didn't have the strength they did. So I said how the heck? I mean, we got these older guys that were running the buffer who were 60 years old. One of them for sure was in his 60s and I said these old men are doing this and they're not fatigued, and that there's a secret I don't know. So I asked one of the old guys. I said, you know, there's something that I don't know about this machine, but I'm doing something wrong. How do you operate this thing? He says, Well, I'm glad you asked. He said most of these strong punks. I don't think he said punks, but he inferred smart aleck, like kids, teenagers, they don't care to learn a thing because they already know it all. And he said, now that you asked, he said it's really easy. The handle, you go up when you want the buffer to move to the right, and you go down on the handle when you want the buffer to move to the left. And you hold it steady and balance it like a bicycle when you want the buffer to stay in one spot. He said it's just that simple. I started doing it. And amazingly, the buffer did exactly what I wanted it to do. And if you learn how a process works, you can actually be successful. Now I've simplified that. But the legislative process, it actually works exactly the way they've designed it over our 240-year history. It works the way it was designed. And if you would accept the political reality of we work in a process by which people must stand before the voters and be affirmed. And when the voters are outraged, they're likely not to affirm their presence. If you'll accept that, and if you'll accept that the legislative rules that exist developed over generations, and you're not going to change them. If you'll actually learn how to work in that system, you'll be maybe as successful as I was at learning the buffer, but you'll actually learn how to be successful, and your success rate will go up if you'll quit fighting it like those boys did that were trying to struggle to run the buffer with brute strength and actually learn how what is done is being done and why the results are the way

they are. It's really not as complicated as people make it. So, and Philip, I think you could affirm that once you started learning the process, you just described the success rate of, what, five years straight?

Philip 54:28

Yep, five years. And but, yeah, that's a great analogy.

Larry 54:33

You knew where to go to stop the bill before it got to the floor, because you knew if it got to the floor, what would happen?

Philip 54:42

Dead in the water. That buffer was gonna go all over the place. And I wasn't gonna like it.

Larry 54:48

So folks, try to learn the process, don't resent the process. It is what it is. We're a democratic society. We affirm our leaders periodically, and they are a reflection of who we are and what we want. And I think that was the real point of having Phillip here was that West Virginians want different things than what people in San Francisco, or what Queens, New Yorkers might want. You know this country's vast and diverse, and what people want, and how they communicate those wants and needs to their lawmakers are different. You have poverty galore. The Mississippi Delta, the needs of the Mississippi Delta are different than what they are in Silicon Valley. So a person who's answering our congressional staffers in Silicon Valley is going to be dealing with a whole different series of questions and inquiries than they are in the Mississippi Delta.

Andy 55:42

Okay, um, let's move over to this AWA regulation changes. Larry, I looked up using the Google and I found that we did this on episode 139. Sorry, 138 even, and it came out in it came out August 3 of last year. So just a hair over a year ago is when we talked about this prior to. So there was like, I saw chatter everywhere. Like, when are we going to talk about this? Like, I think we may already have done it. So what are we doing with this?

Larry 56:11

Well, we're just trying to clarify what's going on. The Adam Walsh Act was passed in 2006. And it was signed by none other than George W. Bush who was president at the time. And no intent to knock George W. Bush. It got to George W. Bush, and he signed it. If it had gotten to a President Albert Gullah, he would have signed it. If he had gotten to a president, Ronald Reagan, he would have signed it. So this is no disparaging of George W. Bush. But the Congress delegated, the US Attorney General at that time was Alberto Gonzalez, to figure out what the 50 states and the territories, what can be done to achieve the greatest level of compliance that could possibly be achieved with the intent of the federal legislation. And the attorney general at the time published an interim rule. And then they published final rules. Those final rules went out for comment. There was a comment period, nothing changed. I think maybe one thing changed about juveniles. And that may have even changed after the final rule was promulgated. But very little changed from the time the Gonzalez Attorney General Office of the United States put out the proposal

until they were adopted and they became the way that the Adam Walsh Act was implemented. Well, there have been some modifications and new rules have been promulgated along in these intervening years. But the bottom line is, this is a law of the United States. It is the desire of the Congress, and presumably the people because they elected the members of Congress, that this be the law of our land. And the job of the executive branch is to implement the will of the people. So the Trump administration proposed an additional set of guidelines which would make it easier for states to come into compliance. Basically, the states would be able to administratively do what legislatures haven't done. So they kind of came up with a proposal that would allow the states kind of a backdoor way to comply, if they chose to do that. And many states will do that. Well, when Trump did not win reelection, the new administration decided to put everything on hold. They did that not because they had any desire to help PFRs. They did that because they wanted to stop some of Trump's last minute changes. Administration's leaving power typically try to make changes on things, public policy that they don't agree with. And the fear was that the Biden administration, they were going to change environmental regulations. That we're going to allow the open the dumping of toxic waste and all this kind of stuff. And to seem fair, they said, well, we're going to put a moratorium on new regulations that the Trump people have proposed. And we're going to look at them and see that they're appropriate. Well, they looked at these, and they found that they were very appropriate and consistent with the intent of the Adam Walsh Act. And they said, these are good to go. That's, in essence in three and a half minutes, that's what's going on here. The Trump proposal has been accepted by the Biden administration, and it's going to be recorded in the federal register. And the states will have the green light to try to bypass their legislative process and they will try to tighten their rules as they pertain to PFRs. I mean, is there anything else you need to know?

Andy 59:43

Why is there so much chatter all of a sudden then if this has been in place for a year and some change in the pipeline?

Larry 59:51

People have forgotten. Americans have relatively short focuses and short memories. And they forgotten that this is on the agenda. It's been on the agenda for so long. I mean, there's nobody that remembers hardly who signed the Adam Walsh Act. It's like that's ancient history. But through all the controversy of January 6th, recounts and lawsuits and everything, people have forgotten this. But it's old news. And the bottom line is that there really isn't anything that can be done administratively. And I'll tell you why. This administration is not going to take any political risks. First of all, the Attorney General Merrick Garland, he put his hand on a Bible, and he swore that he was going to enforce the laws of the United States. This is a law of the United States. So he's going to do his best to enforce this law. But there's the political angle. He is not going to stick his neck out to throw... Here's what you're facing if you wear the democratic banner right now in 2022, which is fast approaching. The midterms, where like the entire House of Representatives, and 1/3 of the US Senate are up for. Reelection. What we're looking at is a person saying, well, we kind of need to be a little bit soft on the PFRs. Well the Republicans and Conservatives, they're going to hit them on bail reform. Because the Democrats are making it where people can just sign there.

They don't have to post any money in some of the states because that's this big thing about cash bail is oppressive. So they've got them on bail reform. They've got them on defunding the police. So if you're a Democrat candidate, you're trying to defund and destroy law enforcement. You're trying to dismantle qualified immunity, which makes the good officers vulnerable to all these crazy, ridiculous lawsuits. You know, they're trying to let prisoners go. I mean, they're for soft on crime. And so you've already got that coming at you if you're a Democratic candidate. So would you want to add the additional stuff about PFRs if you're running as a Democrat in 2022? I think not. So that's the reason why nobody in their right mind would do this. But now, at FYP we try to be fair. And there was a Republican president, he was candidate at one time, but he became president. And he got vilified for sticking his neck out. So we have a person who ran for president 1988, who ultimately got elected. But he made a pledge that there was not going to be any revenue increases, because that's one of the things as a Republican, you cannot ever consider raising taxes. That is a cardinal sin to increase taxes. But the deficit widened 1990 because that was the year Kuwait got invaded by Iraq. And we had a disruption of oil supplies. The budget deficit - the economy was already somewhat softer - the budget deficit ballooned. I mean, it was very small by today's standards. But there was this talk about fiscal responsibility back in those days, and this person decided that fiscal responsibility was more important than that pledge and decided that taxes needed to be increased. And this person and their reelection campaign got vilified over and over and over and over again with "Read my lips." It was played relentlessly. And that's the type of thing. It does work both ways. But see, I can't undo 30 years of history. I can't do anything about that. I can't make that go away. I can only call on people who are doing it today to stop doing it, and they're not going to stop doing it. So then I have to tell you, that since that's going to happen, that's the reason why this administration is not going to pull back on the Trump administration's proposal. It's really that simple, folks. Nothing complicated about it.

Andy 1:03:56

I don't want to leave Philip out of the conversation Larry. Is there anything to direct back and forth with Philip in the in the conversation?

Philip 1:04:15

Read my lips.

Larry 1:04:18

But Philip, do you understand how I'm analyzing this?

Philip 1:04:25

I totally, totally understand it and totally agree with it. I totally agree with the analysis.

Larry 1:04:32

There is not a prayer's chance that this administration is going to pull back on this proposal. First of all, it didn't create it. So therefore, it's merely following the previous administration. So if they were to pull... there's a former president that used to have like, how many followers before he was kicked off social media? Was it 60 million or... I've lost track. But I mean, potentially, this former president would vilify them as well, saying not only have they ruined the economy, they've let criminals out with no bail.

And they're defunding the police. And they're, they're tearing down qualified immunity, but now they're turning the sex offenders loose.

Philip 1:05:15

This is probably the one thing that Trump did in his entire time in office that this administration is not gonna mess with.

Andy 1:05:29

I think I just had something that I wanted to bring up but then it left my brain and I forgot it Larry. I think we're at a little over an hour. How much more do you want to do?

Larry 1:05:39

Oh, I think I'm happy with it. Because basically, what I want to get across to people is that these regulations, it would be the most long shot. I mean, if you feel good sending an email, please send the mail to the Attorney General's United States Office. If you feel good making phone calls, if all these things make you feel good, please do them. But don't expect a whole lot in the way of results because this is baked in the cake. If you really want to see change...

Andy 1:06:03

I just remembered Larry. *Gundy*. Right? This is the administrative state, there's no voting for this, none of that. This is The Federal Congress level telling the organization that does this, Hey, you guys need to do your job.

Larry 1:06:18

Well, sort of. Everybody would generally assume the Attorney General of the United States would have the capacity to figure out the various state constitutions, and what you could do. No one ever expected to my knowledge that all 50 states would be in substantial compliance, because that's the reason why they did that delegation. They said, well, we're not smart enough to figure that out here in terms of all the nuances of the various state constitutions and existing state court decisions as it pertains to PFRs. So they said, Department of Justice, figure this out. Set up a regulatory framework and make it possible for as many states as possible to gain substantial compliance. That is what Alberto Gonzalez set into motion in 2006. And that is what's continued through the various administrations, through Obama, through W. Bush, and through Trump. And now with Biden. They're going to continue to seek substantial compliance, as long as that's the law and the will of the people that we have an Adam Walsh Act. If you really want to see it go away, then seek a member of your congressional delegation to start an effort. And you can start with Representative Bobby Scott, because he's not big and keen on the Adam Walsh Act. But you're going to need some Republican support, because you're not going to get Democratic support until Republicans are on board with dismantling the Adam Walsh Act. But until that happens, it's really a long shot. We're going to be challenging. As the states administratively implement this, there will be challenges launched. I will be doing my best to monitor and, with your help, we'll figure out where to launch these challenges. But this has got to keep going, folks. Yeah, it's on the books, and they're not gonna abandon it. It's their job to enforce the law. Remember, they put their hand- Merrick Garland put his hand on that Bible and that's what he's gonna do.

Andy 1:08:08

All right. Larry, someone in chat telling me that they sent me an email message. They emailed me a voicemail message, and boy, oh, boy, I gotta find it real quick, or else he's gonna get very mad at me.

Larry 1:08:19

Well, let's just do it next week. We are out of time and you've got still got the secret stuff to do. The mystery speaker, whatever we call that segment.

Andy 1:08:27

That is true. Yes. Who's That Speaker? All right, then. Tell me if it's really, really important, and we'll try and get it and squeeze it in. Otherwise, yeah, we'll move on. And we will do the new patrons this week.

Philip 1:08:40

What about your saxophone?

Andy 1:08:43

That's coming up after we finish recording because this is for the patron people. This isn't for the regular Joe's. That was the whole point of that. (Philip: Gotcha.) Um, while I find the patrons, I will do the Who's that Speaker? So last week, Larry, we played this one.

Franklin D Roosevelt 1:09:03

A date which will live in infamy. United States of America was suddenly I'm deliberately attacked by naval forces of the Empire...

Andy 1:09:21

Okay, and I cut that off on purpose, because I thought it was going to give away too much stuff at that point. Who was that Larry?

Larry 1:09:27

That would be Franklin D Roosevelt.

Andy 1:09:31

And that was given to us accurately by J. S. And wow, something is happening. Okay, there it is. Yeah, J. S. The sections had been duplicated. Alright, that's what I'm confused with. And all right, so J.S., thank you very much for writing that in. And so this week we have, it's already sort of been teased this evening, but you're gonna have to give me a lot of detail about this one because it's going to be obvious who it is. So don't just send me the name, and don't scream it out in chat. You need to send it to RegistryMatterscast@gmail.com. And, yeah, so here we go.

Who's that Speaker? 1:10:07

My opponent won't rule out raising taxes, but I will. And the Congress will push me to raise taxes. And I'll say no. And they'll push. And I'll say no. And they'll push again. And I'll say, to them, read my lips. No new taxes.

Andy 1:10:32

Like I said, you gotta send me a lot of detail. That could be like, where it happened, what was the date of it? Obviously, give me the name. But you can't just do the easy part.

Larry 1:10:44

Tell us the backdrop of where that happened. Because that should still be fairly easy to figure out. So well. All right.

Andy 1:10:52

There's a person in chat, Larry, that's 15 years younger than me. So I don't even think they don't know who that is.

Larry 1:10:59

So well, it will be easy to figure out.

Andy 1:11:04

I would think so. I would think so. New patrons this week: we had Audra. And God, I think there's another one Larry. I really, really, really do. And I do have the message from the individual that I'm going cold play this Larry. And I boy, I hope it works. I will try and do all my things. It's important for the 200th episode.

Brian 1:11:23

Hello, there. Registry Matters. This is Brian in Louisiana, saying congratulations on 200 episodes and 100 patrons and let me tell you something else. Whether I'm sitting on my oil platform in the Gulf, or down the bayou, or up the river, there ain't no place I'd rather be on Saturday night than hanging out with Larry and Andy and the rest of you people. Except for maybe watching football in Tiger Stadium. And that's fasho.

Andy 1:11:54

Ooh, Tiger Stadium. I think that's LSU. LSU Tigers right Larry?

Larry 1:11:57

I think so. But Philip is probably a better guy on that.

Philip 1:12:01

Oh, when it comes to sports.

Andy 1:12:05

I know, right? Um, but yeah, we had we had Kevin come in as a new patron and then Audra also come in as a new patron. Thank you all so very much. And I think Larry, visit the show notes. Like there's nothing else to cover. Right? We're done?

Larry 1:12:19

We're done. It was really fun having Philip here. And I think we're gonna have you on a regular basis because you need to balance this liberalism of these two.

Philip 1:12:30

I was glad to be here.

Andy 1:12:32

I really appreciate you coming in on pretty short notice and contributing and yeah, we will definitely put you on the shortlist to come back. And you are the head person in charge of the state of West Virginia...

Philip 1:12:43

Executive Director of West Virginia for Rational Sexual Offense Laws, sir.

Andy 1:12:48

Thank you very much. How can people contact you?

Philip 1:12:52

WVRSOL@gmail.com

Andy 1:12:57

Beautiful. Thank you all very much. Find the show notes over at registrymatters.co. Leave voicemail at 747-227-4477. RegistryMatterscast@gmail.com. And as the patrons are about to enjoy, for us achieving not only just going over 100, but like smashing it, that I'm about to play a little performance for you people and so there you go, and that is at Patreon.com/registrymatters. With that Larry thank you very much everybody and have a great night. And those that are here in chat, stick around and I'll take a little time and we'll do our thing. See y'all later. Thanks, Phillip. Good night Larry.

Philip 1:13:36

Thanks. Good night.

Larry 1:13:38

Goodnight. And thanks for this awesome audience in chat. It's unbelievable how many people are here. Thanks.

You've been listening to Registry Matters Podcast.

Registry Matters Podcast is a production of FYP Education.

