

Jill:

Welcome back to #SistersInLaw with Kimberly Atkins Stohr, Barb McQuade and me, Jill Wine-Banks. Luckily for all of us, Joyce will be back next week, as I hope you all know by now, the SistersInLaw are going on tour. It's going to be in May in Portland, Oregon, on May 12th, New York City on May 19th, and the District of Columbia on May 21st. So, go to politicon.com/tour to get your tickets. They are selling fast, so hurry up. Let's get on with the show today because we have a lot to cover. We'll be discussing the New York grand jury, the Georgia grand jury, and the federal activity regarding Trump this week. And as always, we look forward to answering your questions at the end of the show. But before we get to all those topics, let's talk a little bit about Walgreens. And I know you all know that Walgreens has stopped selling one of the essential pills for abortion, and they caved into the anti-abortion forces.

And I had an interesting discussion with my doctor. I was at the dermatologist and she gave me a new prescription and I said, "Don't send it to Walgreens. I'm going to look up right now the CVS nearest me." This is the first prescription I've had since Walgreens took this action. And she said, "I'm so shocked, but you're the first patient who has done that." And I thought that every patient would be doing that. So, have any of you decided that you're going to boycott Walgreens and change your prescriptions or even your shopping habits? I used to buy a lot of cosmetics and other essentials at Walgreens because it's the closest store to me and has good parking. So, what about you, Barb? I know you have serious thoughts on this.

Barb:

Yeah, I have and it's an interesting situation. Walgreens sells drugs across the country, and there are certain states now that are banning mifepristone and Walgreens has said they're not going to sell in those states. I imagine if you are a business advisor to Walgreens, you would say, "We want to avoid risk and selling in those states means that you are likely to be in violation of the law, and that will bring with it some consequences." I guess I'd rather see them be more courageous and take on that battle and fight it, but it's hard to put yourself in their shoes and know all of the other battles that they are fighting. I also don't know that every other drugstore isn't doing the same. Walgreens has gotten some heat about it because Gavin Newsom in California has said they have a contract with Walgreens and they're going to stop contracting with Walgreens because of that position.

But I haven't done enough research to know about it. And I think sometimes if you're going to engage in a boycott, it's important to do your homework and also to be uniform and consistent about it. And so, I just haven't done the homework to know, and I also, I have a little bit of sympathy for Walgreens that finds themselves, they're not the wrongdoer here. I think the wrongdoer is states that are trying to push these laws.

Jill:

So, let me say, I did do the research because I agree with you that no one should take action that is not based on the facts and the states that they are refusing to sell in include states where abortion is still legal. So, I don't know why they went that far.

Kim:

Well, it's because the Republican attorney general, attorneys general in those states sent them that threatening letter. It's why they didn't do it. Not every state where the Republican sent the letter is a state that has yet banned it.

Jill:

Right. But they will win in those states. They will probably win overall. And because Walgreens is the largest pharmacy in the Chicago area, although CVS is larger nationally, it's giving up a lot for me to not use Walgreens because they are way more numerous and much closer to me. So, it is a lot. I just felt like they, like Disney, have the resources to stand up to this kind of threat and that they should have stood up for their patients' right, for the people who need this care. And mifepristone is used not just for abortion, but it's used for management of other diseases and for miscarriage management. So, it's an important part of healthcare for women, and I just think that it's wrong for them to do it. What about you, Kim? Are you boycotting or are you not?

Kim:

So, just as a technical matter, my prescriptions are filled by a pharmacy that is not Walgreens. There's no Walgreens close to me, so I can't remember the last time that I was in Walgreens, but I also appreciate Barb's comments. On the one hand, I think that voting with one's pocketbook is a really important way that citizens can demonstrate their views and make people aware of what they want. So, I certainly don't oppose the idea of a boycott generally. I think that's part of the marketplace. That's how the marketplace works. You put your products out there, you support or don't support what you don't want to, and then customers have the right to support or not support you. So, I think that that is important. For me, just in living life, I have found that it is very difficult to try to be a purist to the point that you only support companies that do everything that you agree with.

And so, I don't draw lines that broadly, generally. And so, I can understand what Barb is saying. I know that there are a lot of companies that have terrible records with things like work-related things or supporting less than ethical work habits. Some big companies, some of the things that we use every day have a lot of issues and sometimes they address them, sometimes they're satisfactory and sometimes they're not. That's different for me, just where I draw the line from a company Chick-fil-A, which I haven't gone to, I haven't frequented Chick-fil-A in a long time because that company directly supported organizations that push for policies that I find important when it comes to LGBTQ communities. So I'm not going to give my money there knowing that my money directly goes to that cause. But if an executive or something else, or if a company has some policies that I may not support, if I boycotted everyone, I might not be able to buy any products.

So, I just find that a difficult thing to do, but I really support the decision by individuals to choose to shop at or not shop at places based on their views. I think that's part of the marketplace, and I think that's a very powerful way where people are empowered. We get asked a lot from our listeners, what can we do? Well, that's one thing that you can do.

Jill:

That is definitely something you can do. And I actually went a step further, when I went to pick up my prescription at CVS, I made a point of saying to the pharmacist that I was a new customer and that I was there because CVS was still selling mifepristone. And so, I wanted them to know that there was a benefit to them to not follow the policy of Walgreens. But that's my decision, and I hope others will at least think about whether it's time to walk away, talk with your pocketbook. And this goes back to the Vietnam War when we started boycotting Dow Chemical because they were making Agent Orange. So, I think there is some impact on our shopping habits.

Kim, I've had so much fun cooking this week. For me, it is a relief from all of the pressure of the news and all the bad news to just put my mind on cooking. And I use HelloFresh, which gives me a recipe and great ingredients. Have you tried it?

Kim:

I have. With HelloFresh, you get farm-fresh pre-portioned ingredients and seasonal recipes delivered right to your doorstep, which is so great because as you know, as I've mentioned, I don't like the grocery store. So, you can skip trips to the grocery store and count on HelloFresh to make home cooking easy, fun and affordable. That's why it's America's number one meal kit.

Barb:

With the cost of groceries going up and up, now is the perfect time to get started with HelloFresh. HelloFresh is cheaper than grocery shopping and 25% less expensive than takeout. Even better, HelloFresh makes it easy to eat what you love. You can customize select meals by swapping proteins or sides or even adding protein to a veggie dish. And now you can even upgrade for organic chicken or organic ground beef on select meals.

Jill:

Takeout must be cheaper in Ann Arbor than it is in Chicago because it's definitely more than 25% less to cook HelloFresh than to do takeout. And they're also really flexible. They work with your schedule. I know with my schedule changing because of travel and work and everything, sometimes I can't use all three meals every week and I can change it. It's really easy. Their plans are flexible. Update your delivery date, change the location. If you're on a vacation where you can cook, you can get it sent to there. Just use the app and it's done. Imagine getting fresh quality produce from the farm to your door in less than a week, allowing you to enjoy the flavors of the season right from home.

Kim:

Go to hellofresh.com/sisters60 and use code Sisters60 for 60% off plus free shipping. Go to hellofresh.com/sisters60, S-I-S-T-E-R-S60 and use code S-I-S-T-E-R-S60 for 60% off plus free shipping. And you can also look for the link to HelloFresh America's number one meal kit in our show notes.

Barb:

Well, folks, I want to talk about what might be coming up in the coming week. When I was pregnant, I read this popular book that was recommended to me called What To Expect When You're Expecting, and then there was a sequel, what to Expect the First Year, and then What to Expect the Toddler Years. And I read them all. They're very useful at different stages. You could imagine a sequel for raising children in the Trump family called What to Expect When You're Expecting to be Indicted because I think that's what we're expecting next week. There has been great anticipation that Donald Trump may be indicted by the Manhattan District Attorney's Office as early as next week. And Jill, let me ask you about this. Do you agree with that speculation and on what basis do you make that speculation?

Jill:

So, I feel comfortable answering the second part of your question about what the basis for my conclusion is. I hate making speculation, but I do agree with you that it's really coming soon and there's good reason for that. The reason I don't like speculating is because we don't know. It's not in our hands,

but we've seen some things publicly that make me think it's soon. Trump's lawyers met with prosecutors. Trump's lawyer is making a series of media appearances, the most outrageous of which was his interview with Ari Melber, which was absolutely unbelievably a brilliant interview. There's reporting that the former president was invited to testify before the grand jury. We know that Stormy Daniels spoke to the prosecutors. From what I've heard, she did not appear before the grand jury, but did a Zoom with the prosecutors. Hope Hicks was in, and Michael Cohen was in for two days, and he is of course one of the major witnesses in this.

When you put all of those things together, but particularly an invitation to testify before a grand jury, that's one of the last things you would do when it's the possible target is you give them the opportunity to present their case. He has now publicly through his lawyer said he has no intention of appearing, but it's also been made public that his lawyers did have conversations and of course his lawyers on television saying what their defense is, all of which are ridiculous. Maybe we'll get to that in the conversation, but those are the reasons why I do anticipate the Manhattan DA is about to act.

Barb:

Yeah, I think you're right. I think we're close to the end. All of those things you talked about kind of the key witnesses, Donald Trump himself being invited in, seems like the kind of things you would do at the end after you have armed yourself with all of the information so that you could ask good questions. And Michael Cohen finally, after 19 or 20 meetings with the prosecutors, finally gets to go into the grand jury. And I think they wouldn't put him in until they had done all the work and satisfied themselves that they could trust that he was telling the truth and that they could persuade a jury that he was telling the truth. So, I see the handwriting on the wall in the same way. So, Kim, what to expect when you're expecting to be indicted. If you were representing Donald Trump, God forbid, what would you tell him to expect to happen if he were to be indicted?

Kim:

Well, I think if that happens, there are some ways that Donald Trump should expect to be treated just like anybody else who is indicted, and there are other ways that he probably will be treated differently. So, it starts, if I were the attorney, I would try to talk to the Manhattan prosecutors and find a way for him to, for example, be surrendered voluntarily as opposed to being arrested and detained and handcuffed and given the traditional perp walk. I don't expect that that will happen, I think-

Barb:

There's not going to be that moment where they say, "Don't be too nice and push his head down until he doesn't bump it on to the car."

Kim:

And ram it into the... Right?

Barb:

Yeah.

Kim:

Ram it into the car. Yeah, I don't think that that's going to happen. I think they will work out a way to get him where he needs to be processed, but he will need to be processed, which will include, he will be

fingerprinted. There will be a photograph of him taken known as a mugshot, and I expect that that photograph will probably be released. He will have his cheek swabbed for DNA, which is done with people after they are in custody to put in a database. There'll also be some sort of arraignment. Now, there too, usually people have to show up for that arraignment. I would expect that his lawyers would try to get some sort of out non-present arraignment, whether it's done virtually or something else, so that he doesn't have to show and say that he understands the charges. But there will be some process there and we will see him in this traditional way that we've seen other people who've been indicted.

Barb:

Yeah, boy, I've always been opposed to perp walks, but I might make an exception in this case.

Kim:

You'll get the mugshot. You'll get the mugshot.

Barb:

Yeah, there will be a mugshot.

Jill:

And that'll be public.

Barb:

Jill, how about in terms of public safety? I've been reading that law enforcement is preparing for the potential event of an indictment. What do you expect they're doing in anticipation, if anything, of a Trump indictment?

Jill:

Well, I'd be shocked if they weren't preparing because we've seen the reaction based on false information, but believed by many of the MAGA crowd. And so, they are going to have to set up all sorts of preparedness for possible demonstrations, possibly violent. Certainly if he surrenders in New York or wherever he surrenders, they'll have to take some precautions. Right now, of course New York is going to bear the brunt of it because right now that's what we're talking about is a New York indictment. And I should say by the way that I debated what pin to wear, even though our audience can't see, you guys can. I decided on my number one since he is individual number one in the Michael Cohen indictment, but I also have a Stormy pin. I thought about wearing that too.

Anyway, I think that they are preparing to resist some sort of demonstration by crowds and the FBI is involved. Homeland Security will be involved, New York Police will be involved, but I think they're going to have to go beyond New York because I think the demonstrations could be certainly in Florida, which is where he resides. They certainly could be in DC, which is seen as the evil leader of all this. So, I think that there will be a lot to look at for the law enforcement.

Barb:

Mm-hmm. And peaceful protest certainly is not just permissible, but a tradition in this country that should be permitted. And as you say, there'll be concerns about making sure crowds are safe and other kinds of things. But I know one thing I worry about is like what we saw in Cincinnati after the Mar-a-Lago search was announced. A man approached the FBI field office there with a staple gun and an AK-47, and

it led to a standoff in which that man was killed. And so, I think thinking through those kinds of scenarios, of course you can't plan all of them, but being prepared for angry people coming to government offices anywhere in the country, I think is something that law enforcement's going to have to be prepared for. So, we used to do special event planning when we had things like the Super Bowl in Detroit or the World Series was here, the NCAA Final Four for planning to make sure everybody was safe and there was no threat or attack.

I think they almost have to approach this the same way, but what's challenging about this is I think this kind of attack could take place anywhere in America. So, definitely something to worry about. Well, Kim, how about as we're talking about what to expect when you're expecting an indictment, how about in terms of press preparation? You are a member of the press, what do you think the press is doing in preparation for a Trump indictment? No doubt they all want to be there if there's a court hearing. What other kinds of things do you think the press is doing to prepare?

Kim:

Yeah, it depends on what each member of the press's role is. Certainly the beat reporters will be around trying to see if they can catch a glimpse of him somehow as he is entering or exiting the place where that processing will take place. Certainly they will be ready to be able to explain whatever potential charges he might be facing once those indictments come down. I know there's probably a lot of B copy written and a lot of experts who have been interviewed already or on call to be interviewed. I know people like us will probably be on call to help explain what's going on MSNBC and other news organizations. So, I think people, they've been gearing up for this for a long time. They've been knowing that this is a possibility, and I think you will see wall to wall, the news coverage of this once this happens, I think the press will be prepared.

Barb:

Yeah. And how about politically, Jill? Certainly, a former president has never been charged with a crime before. So, in that regard, it's big news and it's very significant news. On the other hand, I think there might be some who say, "This is the first crime you could come up with. This happened seven years ago. It was about something in his personal life to protect him from embarrassment or to protect his wife from embarrassment." What do you think would be the political reaction if and when Trump is charged?

Jill:

Well, of course, as you know, Trump has already started on that route, but I think he'll go beyond the claims of, "It's a witch hunt. It was extortion. I just was trying to protect my wife and family from the embarrassment of this. It had nothing to do with politics, and it's just a big old witch hunt. The Democrats are out to get me." That's what's going to be. And Democrats unfortunately will not respond because there's just no evidence that they have. You're right that this is the first time that a former president has been indicted. I take personal responsibility for that failure because Richard Nixon should have been indicted, I think both while he was the sitting president, but certainly the minute he resigned, he was eligible for indictment and should have been indicted and tried with his co-conspirators. I failed in convincing the special prosecutor. I and many others on the team failed in getting that done. And then we wouldn't be having this argument politically of can you, should you? We would see that the country can and will survive this as other countries have.

Barb:

So, interesting. I can just picture you in your Watergate girl Miniskirt slam pounding your fist on the table saying, "We need to do this for history." And you were right. At the time, I remember thinking that the Ford's pardon and all those kinds of things were in the best interest of the country, and I think they were intended to be, but I think if Nixon had been held accountable, we might see a different series of events playing out today. Kim, let me ask you about the political response from the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. If you are preparing right now what their messaging ought to be next week if and when these charges come? What advice would you give to each of those parties about how they should respond? Should they be distancing themselves from Trump, for example, if they're Republicans? Should they be piling on if they're Democrats or just like let the news speak for itself? How would you be messaging those things?

Kim:

Oh, boy, I'm glad I'm not a political strategist and I certainly have no idea how to advise the current Republican Party, so I'm not going to try. Listen, I think that the best response by anyone if this is happening is no one is above the law. No one is above the law. The rule of law is important and it should be supported. Are we going to hear that from a lot of people? Probably not. What I expect to happen, certainly from Trump himself and those in his orbit, is to spin a lot of nonsense about how this is a political conspiracy politically motivated out to get him baseless. That this is in itself the threat to our country and all these other ridiculous things. It's not. It's the rule of law playing out.

I think that it would probably be a mistake for Democrats too to overly politicize it. I think that the best response is to say, "This is the rule of law in action. We should let that play out. We have trust in our judicial system. We have trust in the people that administer it. We have trust in our jurors who will hear this case if it goes to trial and move forward from there." So, what should happen, what will happen are different, but I'm really glad that's not my job.

Barb:

Well, we will see how it plays out, so buckle up and tune in. I'm sure it's going to be an interesting week.

Jill:

With all the change in our climate, it is so essential that we reduce waste, that I am loving a new product that I'm using called Blueland, and I think it's one of the best things possible. I know you're using it too, Kim. Do you love it?

Kim:

Yes, I absolutely do. We have Blueland products at every sink in our house, and we use it in a host of other ways. Did you know that an estimated 5 billion with a B plastic hand soap and cleaning bottles are thrown away each year? And if that's not bad enough, most cleaning formulas are 90% water, which is heavy to ship leading to excessive carbon emissions. Plus those products are often filled with nasty ingredients like chlorine and ammonia. That's a lose/lose situation for you and the planet. That's why Blueland is perfect, because they make it so easy to start a new low-waste lifestyle. Blueland is on a mission to eliminate single-use plastic by reinventing cleaning essentials to be better for you and the planet.

Barb:

Their idea is simple. They offer endlessly refillable cleaning products with a beautiful cohesive design that looks great on your counter. Then just fill your bottles with water, drop in the tablets and wait for them to dissolve. You'll never ever have to grab bulky cleaning supplies in your grocery store again. Refills start at just \$2.25. You can even set up a subscription or buy in bulk for additional savings from cleaning sprays to hand soap, all kinds of cleaners, Blueland products are made with ingredients you can feel good about. We recommend you try their Clean Essentials kit, which has everything you need to get started. Three bottles of cleaner plus a bottle of hand soap, and it comes in beautiful light scents such as Iris Agave, Fresh Lemon and Eucalyptus Mint.

Jill:

My favorite product is the toilet bowl cleaner. I had to say that because I know you would be-

Barb:

Thank you, Jill.

Jill:

... cringing at the thought.

Barb:

That was beautiful, thanks. I'm touched. That was lovely. Thank you.

Jill:

Actually, they're all my favorites. And Blueland has an offer just for our listeners. To get that 15% off your first order, go to blueland.com/sisters. You won't want to miss this, blueland.com/sisters. That's blueland.com/sisters, or you can get that link in our show notes.

Kim:

This week we learned that five of the 23 special purpose grand jurors in the Georgia probe of alleged election interference by Donald Trump and members of his inner circle were interviewed by the Atlanta Journal Constitution about their experience, and they gave new details about the evidence that was presented in the case. So, let's first talk about some of that evidence that was revealed by these grand jurors. Jill, tell us about the third phone call that we learned about this week, and what does that tell us about District Attorney, Fani Willis' case?

Jill:

So, there are already two phone calls that we knew about. This one, we actually knew that there was a phone call. What we didn't know is that it was recorded, and the grand jurors talked about that they got to hear the third phone call. It was a call between the former president and David Ralston, who was the Georgia Legislature's Speaker of the House. And it was a call in which Donald Trump tried to convince him that he should call a special session of the legislature to overturn the election to undo the vote of the people of Georgia. So, it was a clear election violation to me, and it was clear that it was handled very well by David Ralston, who basically, when he was asked to do this said, "I will do everything in my power that I think is appropriate." And apparently, according to the grand juror who spoke, it sort of left Donald Trump's speechless, and all he could say is, "Well, thank you."

So, that was a pretty interesting exchange. I haven't, as none of us have heard the actual tape recording, I'll look forward to actually hearing it because there's nothing more persuasive and more dramatic than actually hearing the defendant speak the words that are the subject of it. And what this shows us about the DA's case right now is that it is a very broad investigation of a lot of election fraud. It isn't focused solely on what was the original phone call, which was to Raffensperger, the Secretary of State, about how he could find 11,780 votes, which was one more than Donald Trump needed to win since he had lost by 11,779 votes. And that started this. But the investigation has clearly gone beyond that into the fake elector scheme, into this phone call, into a phone call to one of the investigators for the Secretary of State.

And so, I think that leads us to the speculation about whether Willis, who has been known to use the Georgia RICO statute, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations' statute, whether she's thinking of calling all of this an enterprise for corruption and looking at all of the crimes that may be committed here as a combined thing, or whether she's planning to just go with individual indictments for election fraud, for tampering with an official proceeding, for soliciting lying or election fraud, for lying, for forgery, for influencing witnesses, which can combine up to a lot of things. But the RICO has a 20-year penalty, and that's important to keep in mind because it really does up the penalty.

Kim:

So, Barb, the former Special Purpose Grand jurors talked about three buckets of witnesses. What does their description tell us?

Barb:

Yeah, it was really interesting, and I guess not surprising really. They said that the first set of witnesses, and this was the group they heard from early on, were very forthcoming. They had nothing to hide. They wanted to be helpful, and they came in and told their stories. And then they said the second bucket of witnesses were those who were maybe a little more reluctant. They needed to get a subpoena before they were willing to come in. They wouldn't come voluntarily, but once they got there, they were willing to talk and tell their stories in a forthcoming manner. But the third was this group of people who clearly did not want to be there. They had fought their subpoenas. When the witnesses testified, they were very tightlipped. In fact, one of the jurors said, "It was like night and day when we got to that third group, the tone in the room completely changed overnight."

Kim:

Yeah, I found that really, really interesting. And Jill, they were surprisingly specific about exactly what some of these witnesses said from the testimony of the election workers in Georgia, Ruby Freeman and her daughter, Shaye Moss, who the jurors said made them emotional when they testified to Senator Lindsey Graham. So, what of this new information that we learned about the actual testimony was most interesting to you?

Jill:

First of all, I have to say that this article was so well-written that you almost felt like you were reading the script of a movie and you could visualize all the stuff that was going on. I could see the juror sitting in her car afterwards breaking down in tears over what she had heard about the trauma that Ruby Freeman and Shaye Moss had suffered as a result of being attacked by the president. But I also was very taken with their testimony or their saying to the interviewers about how seriously they took their job. And as someone who has worked with grand jurors, I know how seriously they take their role and how

they pay attention and how they really do it. But the whole process they described about how they wrote the report, that it wasn't written about their relationship with the prosecutors and with each other, I found that to be really, really interesting.

And their relationship to the foreperson, Emily Kohrs, who was not one of the five that was in this article, she is the one who spoke first and did a round of television and I think newspaper as well, interviews. And they wanted to make sure that the arguments that are now being made that made the grand jury look like they weren't taking this seriously to talk about how seriously they took this. And of course, the final thing that you can't forget is one of the jurors saying, "I said to my wife, if everybody in this country knew all the facts that we now know, this country wouldn't be as divided as it is now." And that really was a very moving statement to me.

Kim:

Yeah. And Barb, I want to talk about the fact that these special grand jurors six, now, if you count their foreperson, Emily Kohrs, who did a very public media tour a few weeks back, are speaking so openly about this process. Honestly, it seems it's discomfoting to me. What are the rules that govern what grand jurors can and can't say after their service has concluded? And are you surprised at how forthcoming they're being with the press?

Barb:

Oh, it's been stunning to me, Kim. When I practice in the federal system, it's very, very different. Jurors like prosecutors and the court reporter who's in there taking down all the words are sworn to secrecy. They may not discuss any matter occurring before a grand jury. There's a Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) that talks about it. Only the witness may disclose what happened in the grand jury. And imagine we have that exception so that a witness can't be browbeat or in some way intimidated or coerced. They have the ability to disclose what happened there. But the grand jurors, I have never had a case I'm aware of where a grand juror so much has uttered the fact that they'd even served on a grand jury. And so, it's really shocking to me to hear all of this detail coming out.

In Georgia, it appears that the rule, I'd looked at the grand jury handbook there, and all it says is that grand jurors must not disclose their deliberations. That's the word. And the judge who presided over this grand jury said the same thing and even gave some public remarks later that said, "As long as they don't divulge their deliberations, it's all right." And so, I don't know how they define deliberations, but Emily Kohrs, the foreperson disclosed that they had recommended the indictment of more than 12 people. And it sounds a lot like deliberations. I guess she isn't disclosing like the back and forth, maybe just that's the deliberations and [inaudible 00:37:33].

Kim:

Or exactly who these indictments would be against, but yeah.

Jill:

Yeah. The judge said, he specifically said that, and these jurors said, I shouldn't say he said it. The jurors said that the judge had said to them that they could talk about witnesses, what the prosecutors said and what was in the final report, except for the names of people they recommended for indictment and they couldn't talk about their deliberations which, Barb, you're completely correct. It's a little vague to me as to what that means given some of the information that came out. And it is so shocking because as a federal prosecutor, that would never ever happen. There's no way, you have to get special court

permission to reveal anything other than during the trial where you can introduce some of the evidence from the grand jury. So, it was surprising. But I have to say it's very interesting.

Barb:

And there's a reason for the secrecy rules.

Jill:

Yes.

Barb:

It's not an arbitrary rule. The reason for the secrecy is to protect everyone involved. Number one, if people know who the witnesses are who've been coming in, they could be intimidated, they could be threatened, they could be coerced, they could be harmed. And so, there's a real worry about protecting them. There is also a desire to protect the accused. If people know, "Oh, charges are coming," that is not good for the reputation of people who might be involved in those things or conduct business in the community or what have you. It can also compromise the case itself. It's good to be able to produce the case, to do what you need to do without people having a window into what's going on. And the grand jurors themselves, if they're disclosing it, outing themselves, Emily Kohrs is perhaps putting herself at risk with some of these Trump supporters when she puts her name out there. So, I think there's a reason we have these secrecy rules, and I wonder whether Georgia might adopt more stringent secrecy rules after this.

Kim:

So, what do you both think happens next? Do you think that there will be charges forthcoming? I know Willis said that a decision will be made imminently, but that feels like a long time ago now. What do you think is going to happen next? Start with you, Jill.

Jill:

I would be shocked if there wasn't indictments and if they didn't happen soon, and I say soon because to the extent that we speculated on why imminent didn't happen imminently, which it did not, you're right. It was a long time ago when she said the word imminent. It was because we thought she was waiting for the new grand jury to be seated, because Georgia has another strange rule, which is that a defendant can request a speedy trial within weeks after the grand jury expires. So rather than her indicting immediately with a grand jury, that was expiring days after the indictment would've been brought down. She was waiting. Well, the new grand jury was seated on March 7th, I believe, and that's already 10 days ago, so it won't expire for two months. So there's that. But even still, I would think that she would want to get it in earlier in the grand jury session than later if we were right about the reason why she didn't indict earlier.

Kim:

Yeah. Barb, what do you think?

Barb:

Yeah. She's the one who chose the word imminent. She told the judge, and now some weeks ago that her charging decision was imminent. I guess I recognize Jill's point, which is she had to wait for the new

grand jury to come in. And my guess is she had to do a little bit of work there to republish some of the findings of the prior grand jury. They heard from 75 witnesses, she doesn't need to call all 75 witnesses. She could probably use a summary witness or two, like a law enforcement agent who could just recap some of the highlights without going through all of the details that all of them talked about. And that takes a little bit of time. And then the prosecutor has to present a proposed indictment and has to do a summation. So, that could take a few days, but I kind of feel like imminence here, I'm ready. I'm ready for imminent. Wouldn't it be something if Fani Willis beats Alvin Bragg to the punch next week, or that they both come in the same week? I suppose that's a possibility. So, I think that's coming.

And before we wrap, can I just say one thing in the article, the Atlanta Journal Constitution that you've been talking about, Kim, with the dynamic of the grand jurors that I think is so interesting? I think Jill is absolutely right that the reason these five are talking is they might have been concerned that Emily Kors, who seems like a very enthusiastic and earnest and diligent person who did her duty may have been portrayed as less than serious, and that there was a concern that the public would see that they had not been serious about their work. Some of the things that Trump has said about her disclosures, and that's why they wanted to come forward and explain just how serious it was.

There's a detail in there that I love, and that is she became the foreperson because she was an enthusiastic volunteer and she was between jobs, so she had the time, and so no one opposed her. Some thought that the one lawyer in the group ought to be the foreperson, but that person, and this is what's so lovely, I think my reading of this demurred and said, "Tell you what, Emily can be the foreperson and I'll be the deputy." Right? Isn't that just a beautiful thing? She really wants to do it. And he says, "Let's let her do it, but I'll be the deputy, so" and I don't know if this is a man or a woman. They said, "I'll be the deputy. And so just a little safety net there to make sure things were done properly." But giving Emily Kohrs her moment in the sun to swear in the witnesses and shake hands with Rudy Giuliani and all the things that she wanted to do.

Jill:

And it's also interesting just the fact that a lawyer was on the panel. Most of the time when I've been up for jury service and I've never been considered for grand jury, but when I've been called for a trial jury, I'm the first person that's dismissed.

Barb:

Yes.

Jill:

And so it's a different story as to grand juries and how they're selected. It's not the same process of cause for being stricken, but even still, I was just surprised to hear a lawyer was on the grand jury.

Barb:

Jill, I have become a bit of a Noom evangelist. I see people, and if they ask me whether I've lost weight, I begin to read them from the scripture of Noom and tell them all about how they too can get fit and healthy with Noom. Have you been keeping up with Noom these days?

Jill:

I have gone back to Noom. It is a life-changing thing. It really does help you create new habits and break the old bad ones. I've tried every diet that's ever existed, and none of them really works because you go

off them and then it doesn't work. This changes how you approach your attitude toward food. Trends and fads come and go, especially when it comes to health and wellness. Noom is not a fad. They use psychology, not trends to help you make intentional and sustainable choices that are aligned with your values and weight loss goals and to build lasting results. And it's not just weight loss. It is a healthier way to live. Noom Weight's psychology-based approach empowers you with the knowledge and support to build more sustainable habits and behaviors. It uses scientific principles like cognitive behavioral therapy to help you understand your relationship with food so you can align your lifestyle with what you want.

Barb:

Jill, I've always known, or at least suspected that eating vegetables and lean meats is good for you. Turn turns out with Noom, it's true. When you eat those things, you feel energetic, you feel fit, you feel healthy, and you lose weight. The program helps you understand the science behind your eating choices and why you have cravings. And your daily lessons are personalized to you. Whatever your health goals are, the flexible program focuses on progress instead of perfection. And you can choose your perfect level of support from five minute daily check-ins to personal coaching. It's helped us change our habits because Noom Weight shows you how to pursue the goals you set for yourself and it gets you to them.

Jill:

And first time Noomers lose an average of 15 pounds after being active in the program for just 16 weeks. And 95% of customers say Noom is a good long-term solution. They've even published 50 peer-reviewed scientific articles describing their methods and effectiveness. So, get empowered and stay on track with Noom. You'll get nourishment not restrictions. Stop chasing health trends and build sustainable healthy habits with Noom's psychology-based approach. Sign up for your trial today at noom.com/sistersinlaw. That's N-O-O-M.com/sistersinlaw to sign up for your trial today. Also, check out Noom's first ever book, *The Noom Mindset*, a deep dive into the psychology of behavior change available to buy now, wherever books are sold. You can also find the link in our show notes.

Well, let's follow up our discussion about what's happening in Georgia and in New York with what's happening on a third prong of possible criminal cases against the former president activity at the federal level, which includes Speaker McCarthy giving Fox News, specifically Tucker Carlson exclusive access to over 41,000 hours of January 6th footage not previously seen by the public and what's happening in the special counsel investigation. I'm going to start with looking at the facts and consequences of McCarthy's release of the footage to Fox News. And first, Barb, let's look at what is the possible justification for this footage being given to any media outlet when it creates a security risk to members of Congress and their staff and anyone else who works in the Capitol Building by showing escape routes and where cameras are, you're our security expert. So what do you think?

Barb:

I think there's no justification for it. I think it's incredibly irresponsible. It seems that Speaker McCarthy is motivated by concerns that the January 6th committee showed only the bad stuff and they cherry-picked and it was somehow a misrepresentation of what really happened that day. And so he wants to show the other side of the story, but the way to do that if there is something to be shown is do it through Congress. And then you can have people screen out things that might be a security issue, cameras in stairwells and hallways, and showing the locations where they take members of Congress to keep them safe during moments of emergency and crisis. Not to give all of it. Like, "Here you go, have at it."

He sort of outsourced the project to Fox and say, "Here you go, have at it." He must have known that the agenda here would be to cherry-pick this footage and try to show that no, it wasn't dangerous at all. Why? Look, here's some people walking in quite calmly. They're not maniacs trying to kill Nancy Pelosi. So, therefore, it's all been a big misunderstanding. It's sort of like Jill saying, "Well, you just focused on the time that I killed my husband. You didn't show the footage of all the times I wasn't killing my husband."

Jill:

That is such a great description because that's exactly what it was. And for me, it sort of proved when Tucker Carlson used basically minutes of 41,000 hours compared to the hours that were shown previously by all networks and by the Congress, is that there wasn't much to cherry-pick that showed non-violent behavior. So, it sort of to me, proved the opposite of what he was trying to prove. But Kim, from your perspective as a member of the press, is there a justification for giving it only to Fox and was the result of giving it only to Fox a false narrative? And has anybody criticized Fox for how they use the tapes?

Kim:

Oh, certainly. There's been criticism about this one-sided cherry-picked and completely concocted narrative that was being made based on the use of this footage. And in terms of how it was given only to Fox, Speaker McCarthy said something to the effect of, "Oh, well, it was a scoop. All the time, we give certain news organizations a jump on some information as happened since the beginning of time, and eventually it will release it to others." Well, they still haven't. He saying they may release it to others. Now the horse is out of the barn even if all the news organizations get it, scrutinize it and say there's absolutely no there or there, the damage has already been done. And so, this is an attempt to aid Donald Trump in getting exactly what he's always wanted, which is like state-run news. He wants something that's like Pravda, he wants something that's like the Chinese, the news organizations that I saw when I was in Beijing that only give certain pre-cleared news, created news and blocks out things that they don't want the people to see. That's what they're trying to create here, propaganda and it's really sad.

Jill:

It is an even McConnell and the Capitol Police chief have criticized how this is portrayed. So, it's been a really interesting thing. And so, Barb, beyond the false impression for the public tuning in to Tucker, there have been consequences of the release to other cases, the ongoing trial of the Proud Boys, for example, talk about what's happening in that case and how the defense is using the release of this extra footage.

Barb:

Yeah. So, we saw a motion filed in The Proud Boys case with the trial has been going on now for six weeks or so, since January. And there was a lawyer in that case who said, "Based on this security footage, the government has hidden exculpatory evidence that would tend to show that their clients are not guilty of this crime." Again, it goes back to the same idea that if I was behaving well for even a moment inside the Capitol, then that somehow is exonerating for the claims that I engaged in violence in assaulting police officers. So, it's really nonsense. There is also some argument that Jacob Chansley, he was the one referred to as the QAnon Shaman who wore the crazy headdress and painted his body

and all of those things, that because some of the footage was withheld from him, it would've been an exonerating and his case should be dismissed.

He's there for hours, they show four minutes where he is walking peacefully. It doesn't negate all of the bad things that he did. Go stand on the speaker's chair and leave a note that says Justice is coming and parade through there and disrupt the vote. So, it's really created a distraction and a sideshow, which is just another reason why it was so irresponsible for Kevin McCarthy to release this to Fox News.

Jill:

It surely was. And the government prosecutors have responded very strongly to this denying that any of this has any impact on any of these cases. But Kim, let's go to the last question about McCarthy's exclusive release of footage to Tucker Carlson. Does McCarthy have any liability for a security breach or for fostering a fake version by only giving it to Fox, which as we've all said, used it to create a false narrative? So, did he violate any laws by giving it only to Fox or what about some of the complaints that have been filed against him for doing this? And lastly, was it a political mistake for him to open up January 6th again, which doesn't seem to me to help the Republicans at all?

Kim:

Well, he clearly on that last question, he clearly doesn't think it's a political mistake, and for all we know, it may have been one of the terms that he was held hostage over by a segment of his caucus in order to help him get the Speaker [inaudible 00:55:13], who knows? He's doing this because he thinks politically he has no choice, and that's what he needs to do, and that's what he needs to do to please both his caucus and voters. That part seems pretty clear to me. In terms of liability, I don't see a clear way that he violated some rules. Yes, the complaint that I saw that was filed what was by a group called Public Citizen, which is a non-profit watchdog group, and they filed a complaint with the Office of Congressional Ethics basically saying that by releasing these tapes in the way that they did, it violates the spirit of the First Amendment in protecting a free press by giving Fox News this exclusive to it.

Now, I think the reason that Public Citizen, and there are other groups that are like this crew, other things, and they're happy to go to a court and file a complaint. The reason I think they filed this with the Office of Congressional Ethics is that I'm not sure a court case could be made. And at most this office, which is a non-partisan office that evaluates ethics claims of members of Congress, the most they could do is refer it to the House Ethics Committee for further action, the House Ethics Committee, which is run by House Republicans, which means nothing's going to come of that. So, I think the short answer is no, not much is going to happen, which is I think why McCarthy did it.

Jill:

Okay. So, that's why he is going to get away with it anyway.

Kim:

Yeah.

Jill:

Let's move to the other part of the conversation, which is a quick discussion of what's new in the special counsel investigations of January 6th and of Mar-a-Lago by Jack Smith. And there was a lot of news about their attempt to get one of Trump's lawyers, Evan Corcoran to testify. And as we were recording

this news broke, Barb, you want to talk about that and also talk about some of the interviews of dozens of Mar-a-Lago staff, servers all the way up to other staff at Mar-a-Lago?

Barb:

Yeah. Well, the news just in this afternoon is that Judge Beryl Howell in Washington DC, the chief judge there, has granted the government's motion to require Evan Corcoran to testify, finding that the crime fraud exception does apply to his testimony. That's based on reporting out of CNN citing unnamed sources familiar with the matter. So, I don't know who that is, but it rings true. There had been this battle. Evan Corcoran had reportedly testified before the grand jury, but had declined to answer certain questions, including a question about a phone call he had with Donald Trump on the very day the government served Trump with a grand jury subpoena regarding the documents, the documents still held at Mar-a-Lago in the summer of 2022 when they denied having any more.

And so, the attorney-client privilege of course, ordinarily protects any conversations between a lawyer and a client designed for the purpose of obtaining legal advice. And that is usually kind of hands-off, but there is this exception when it's being used to further a crime. And so, that has to be shown by the government by preponderance of the evidence. And it appears now that the judge is found that that standard has been satisfied and has ordered Evan Corcoran to come back and testify before the grand jury about these incidents. My guess is the government saw that phone call through phone records and saw that they were talking to each other and wanted to know what it was they were talking about. Like, "Yikes, got a grand jury subpoena, what do you think we ought to do with it? Should we give him the 27 boxes?" "Nah, just give him a little folder." So, I think it could be pretty interesting in terms of the obstruction of justice aspect of the investigation.

Jill:

And it'll be interesting, his testimony because he also is the lawyer who told another lawyer to file an affidavit that said that all the documents had been turned over. So, that's pretty interesting. And what do you make of the interviews by Jack Smith's staff of dozens of Mar-a-Lago people, do you think that's about moving the documents around?

Barb:

I do. My guess is that what you would want to do in that situation is to talk to everybody who might have seen something, both because you want to make sure you have all the information you can have, and also to neutralize anybody that might become a defense witness. If there's anybody who's going to be the fall guy later who says, "Oh, oops, I accidentally moved those boxes because I thought they were old papers that didn't have any significance. It was all me and it was all an accident." So, I think they just want to make sure they're aware of all of these things, and they also want to lock in people into a story so they can't fabricate a new story later if this case were to come to trial, say a year down the road.

Jill:

All right. So, last question, and I'll start with you, Kim, on this, but Barb, I'd like your perspective too after Kim talks, and that's sort of a general discussion of the pros and cons of indicting in any of the cases we've talked about today, Georgia, New York, federal, what do you think, Kim?

Kim:

Yeah. I want to hear what the prosecutors say because you both obviously have more experience on this than me. My gut on this is I worry that if he is charged with some sort of misdemeanor or even a low felony and it doesn't carry a lot of weight, that it can be very easily politicized and that it can, if that's the first charge that comes down, that can paint all of these investigations with the same brush and make it seem like there is something to this idea that this is just a political witch hunt. I would like to, if I had my druthers that whatever the most serious thing is that comes out first and you make it count and you have the goods, but we're not in control of that. And the prosecutors aren't even in control of that. They can't control what other prosecutors do. But I worry that the first charges, if there are charges are something small, something less serious, and it makes the whole thing look less serious.

Jill:

So, if you were the prosecutor in any of these cases, which would you want to be the first?

Kim:

Well, I don't know because I don't know what charges they're going to bring, but my point is, if the most serious charge may come out of Georgia, New York prosecutors don't have any control over that if they want to move with whatever they have, is what I'm saying. Yeah, we don't know how it's going to come out. The prosecutors don't know how it's going to come out. They don't know what each other is going to do. That's basically my fear. And I don't know, I don't want to say which one I'd like to see first because honestly I'm not a prosecutor. I don't know what evidence they have to charge and what a grand jury is going to back.

Jill:

So, Prosecutor McQuade, what do you think?

Barb:

I agree with Kim that none of them are going to coordinate. None of them can control what happens to the others. They're all going to bring their charges when they think the time is right. My guess is they're all moving as rapidly as they reasonably can, but they want to be thorough. If you come at the king, you best not miss. So, I'm sure they're being ultra-careful to make sure they know it's going to be a dog fight once Donald Trump is indicted. And so, they want to make sure that they've got all their Ts crossed and i's dotted. But I think that we tend to look at it in sort of the court of public opinion. And I think that when it comes to the cases, each of these cases is going to have to stand or fall on its own. And so, nobody in Georgia is going to be talking about what's going on in New York, and no one in the federal case is going to be talking about what's going on in Manhattan.

So, I think in some ways it might matter for the chattering classes like us, but maybe it matters politically because I think that Trump no doubt will call all of these things witch hunts. But I think that in terms of the cases themselves, once you get into that courtroom, all extraneous matters are off limits and you really have to focus solely on the facts and the law in that case. And so, I don't know that it much matters at the end of the day.

Jill:

Right. And I guess part of what I was aiming for in this question was the pros and the cons of any indictment, not of a particular case, but just going back to the failure to indict Richard Nixon after he resigned. For me, the pro for indicting is that one, no one is above the law and that accountability needs

to be had, and that if our laws are to mean anything, it means that they have to be enforced. So, if we have a law that says that you can't take home a classified document, then even though that may be a smaller crime than inciting a riot that led to the death of several police officers, I think that that still needs to be brought.

And the only cons against indicting are that it will have some political effect. And for me, that isn't a legitimate reason. I don't think that any prosecutors should consider the political impact of an indictment. They have to look at what are the facts that I have that I can prove by valid evidence, and what is the law? Can I meet all the elements of the crime that I'm indicting for? And that's the only thing they should look at is do they have the facts that match up with the elements of a crime? And if they do, I think they have to indict.

Barb:

Jill, I'm a member of many clubs, but one of my favorite clubs is the Athena Club. Are you a member?

Jill:

I am. And it's especially important now that the sun is coming back out. It's time to get friendly with our razors again. And honestly, there's no better razor out there than the Athena Club razor. Shaving used to be a dreaded if necessary chore, but Athena Club's products seriously make it more fun and easy to shave. Not only is it the prettiest razor I've ever seen, and I just got a new one in white that matches my tile in my bathroom very perfectly. It really looks good. So, not only is it the prettiest razor I've ever seen, but it's also really gentle on skin, leaving it moisturized, super smooth and bump-free.

Kim:

I hear you, Jill. I have one for home and I also have one in my travel bag for when I travel because it really is great. Athena Club's razor has thousands of five-star reviews from customers and is designed with built-in skin guards to help prevent razor burn while being gentle on curves. Plus the razor blade is surrounded by a water activated serum with shea butter and hyaluronic acid, which is a holy grail for skincare. The best part is the razor kit is only \$9 and comes with two blade heads, a magnetic hook for shower storage and your choice of handle color. So, I have a mint green and a royal blue. The handle cover options are so cute, but they even have black and as Jill said, white razors for all you minimalists out there.

Barb:

I'm sort of like Henry Ford when it comes to razors. You know how it's say you can have any color you want as long as it comes in black. For me, I'm all about the blue. If there's ever a choice for anything, I always choose blue. If food came in blue, I would order it that way. But with Athena Club, you never have to think about blade refills because you choose how often you want your replacement blades shipped to you for free, and you'll never be stuck with an overused blade longer than it should be used for. Athena Club also has the most amazing shave foam that will leave your skin soft, hydrated and smooth. It's so luxurious and feels great when you put it on. Plus it smells great and makes the shave super simple.

Jill:

So, show your skin you care with the Athena Club Razor Kit. Head to athenaclub.com and use code SIL for 25% off your first order. Again, that's athenaclub.com and use the code SIL for 25% off. Athena Club

also launched in Target stores nationwide this month. So, make sure to check out the shaving aisle to buy their products in store. You can also find the link in our show notes.

Now it's time for our listener questions. And we all love this part of the show. I know that the questions always make me think about things that I had never thought about, how certain things relate to other things and other times it's things that we take for granted because we're lawyers and we understand them, but they aren't obvious to other people. So, if you have a question for us, please email us at sistersinlaw@politicon.com or tweet using #SistersInLaw. If we don't get to your question during the show because of limited time, keep an eye on our Twitter feeds throughout the week where we sometimes answer your questions. We do as many as we can, so send us your questions.

And today we had some really good questions. I'm going to start with one from Robin and I'm hoping Kim can answer this. "Are the Fox TV's owners and or hosts being sued in their individual capacities for the undisputed defamation of Dominion? Or is the lawsuit only against the company? If the current lawsuit is only against the company, can Dominion also sue the individual defamers? What would the legal theory be?" Kim, can you take that question?

Kim:

I think I can. So, this gets to the very wonky tort law principles that I always love talking about. So, there are several cases that have been brought by Dominion and Smartmatic alleging defamation against Fox News and whatever news organization is being sued individual employees as well as the people within Trump's orbit who went on these shows as guests, people like Sidney Powell or Rudy Giuliani. So, in those cases, the Trump people would be sued in their individual capacity and they would have to defend these cases in their individual capacity. But when it comes to both the news organizations and the people who work within the news organizations, be they hosts or be they producers who chose to put these people on, it brings in a principle called respondeat superior. Basically that means that employees who are working within the scope of their employment, if they commit some sort of tort like defaming someone, it is the employer who assumes the liability for that tort.

And if there is a judgment issued in that case against the employees and the employer, that liability would be joint and several meaning that the entire judgment would have to be paid by one or both of those defendants. And usually the way it works out is the employer pays for it. So, I highly doubt that the individual employees will have to open their pocketbooks and pay. I know people in journalism, not in this context, but in other contexts who were sued for defamation, there was a judgment or a settlement and the news organization paid the whole thing. Now, those people may lose their jobs. There may be some price to pay, but with Fox News, who knows? But I love being able to talk about things like respondeat superior and joint, and several liabilities. So, thank you, Robin.

Jill:

I love that you got to say respondeat superior on the airwaves. I love it. We have another great question from Lisa L. She asked, "Do you think the newly signed child labor rollback law recently signed by Governor Sarah Huckabee Sanders will be a future SCOTUS case?" Barb, what do you think?

Barb:

Actually, I think I don't. It's really interesting to see how states, and they're not alone in Arkansas. We're seeing it in Ohio and other states where they're rolling back their state child protection laws, their child labor laws. In fact, the New York Times just had a big story about how immigrant children are working long, long hours in factories across the country,

Jill:

Dangerous factories.

Barb:

Yeah. And with the worker shortage and immigration bans, the workers have to come from somewhere. And so, they want to put more children to work, which I think in states that pretend to care about children when they want to protect them from things like phantom dangers like Drag Queen Story Hours, but they're willing to put them to work in manufacturing or long hours and roll back some of these protections, it really demonstrates the hypocrisy. But I think that as long as they're in compliance with federal labor laws, states are allowed to set their labor laws where they want to. And in most instances, states had previously had more protections than the federal protections. And so, for example in Arkansas and some other states, one of the requirements that the state had imposed was getting a certificate from your parents to say it was okay for you to work if you were under a certain age and that's one of the things they've rolled back.

That's not a federal requirement, and so it's not a violation of the law. I think that where we could see a legal challenge is if a state tried to evade federal laws and provide less protection than what the federal law requires, that's where we could see some legal conflict.

Jill:

And I'm going to take a question that came from Jill for good STL, and I of course picked it because it's a great question, but also it's a great name. Jill asks, "With the recent news that Fox News knowingly lied to its viewers, is there any regulatory body that can hold them accountable? Is this outside the scope of the FCC?" Yes, Jill, it is. The FCC does not regulate cable channels, and so they have no jurisdiction over Fox News or MSNBC, or any other one. That's an issue that probably needs to be looked at.

Thank you for listening to #SistersInLaw with Barb McQuade, Kimberly Atkins Stohr, and me, Jill Wine-Banks. And don't worry, Joyce will be back next week. You can send in your questions by email to SistersInLaw at politicon.com or tweet them for next week's show using #SistersInLaw. And don't forget, I know you know #SistersInLaw are going on the road. Come and join us as we record the podcast live on stage. We will be discussing the legal topics of the day and answering questions from you in the audience. We're starting off in Portland, Oregon on May 12th, New York City on May 19, and Washington DC on May 21st. There are still some tickets available, but hurry, because they're going fast. Go to politicon.com/tour to get your tickets today. We can't wait to meet you.

And please support this week's sponsors HelloFresh, Blueland, Noom, and Athena Club. You can find their links in the show notes. Please support them as they really help make this show happen. To keep up with us every week, follow #SistersInLaw on Apple Podcasts or wherever you listen, and please give us a five-star review, it really helps others to find the show. See you next week with another episode #SistersInLaw.

Kim:

By the way, I'm disappointed in you, Ms. McQuade on this Saint Patrick's Day.

Barb:

What I do now?

Kim:

Where's your green?

Barb:

Oh, yeah.

Kim:

Am I the only Irish person here?

Barb:

Yeah, I'm not wearing green. I am, however hosting an Irish feast in a little while with takeout from a local restaurant.

Kim:

Okay, well yeah. That makes up for it.

Barb:

Corn, beef and cabbage and-

Kim:

Nice.

Barb:

[inaudible 01:15:48] pie and fish fry for those who observe Lent.

Jill:

Whoo, yum!

Kim:

Okay, so you're forgiven.

Jill:

I may have to add a shamrock to my pins for tonight's TV hits.

Kim:

Oh, yeah.

Barb:

There you go.

Jill:

I have to wear a political one, but I do have a shamrock of course.

Barb:

This transcript was exported on Mar 18, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

All right, I will... With that shaming, Kim, I will be sure to put on a green shirt later. I'm doing MSNBC, I think a 10:00. So, I do have a good green shirt. I'll pull it out.

Kim:

All right. Okay.

Barb:

Thank you. Thank you for the reminder.

Jill:

Have fun.