

that we're providing. Every penny that we've taken from every American covers about 84 cents of the cost of the program.

But you know, after we created Medicare part A, Madam Speaker, we created Medicare part B. Medicare part B is funded with zero dollars out of your and my paycheck, zero dollars out of any paycheck of anyone in America. Not one penny in Medicare taxes is taken out to fund Medicare part B.

Now, we charge Medicare part B premiums, Madam Speaker. Part B is what pays for your doctor visits and supplies, things like that.

We ask Medicare beneficiaries to write the government a check to cover 25 percent of those part B costs. But the other 75 percent—74 here because there's a little interest that gets picked up in there—74 percent of all of those costs are picked up by the American taxpayer, just out of general revenues.

You wonder where the money goes. Understand, we have told America that you pay into Medicare, and so you shall receive from Medicare. You've paid in all your life so it will be there in your time of need, and so we will ensure that it is there in your time of need. But that's just Medicare part A, about \$200 billion.

Medicare part B is exactly the same size, at \$200 billion, and we never paid a penny for it, but the government is pushing all those dollars out the door.

Move on to Medicare part D, Madam Speaker. Medicare part D, that largest expansion of entitlement programs in the history of the country since 1967, implemented by a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

Yes, we charge Americans. We ask Americans to pay some beneficiary premiums to get Medicare part D. About 11 percent of all Medicare part D revenue comes from beneficiaries' premiums. Eighty-three percent is picked up by the American taxpayer at large. No one ever paid a penny out of their pocket to deposit in a trust fund for that benefit. It's just a benefit that sprang up out of thin air, Madam Speaker, and 83 percent of it is subsidized by American taxpayers across this country.

Now, I bring up these numbers for two reasons, Madam Speaker. Number one, because folks just don't know. Folks just don't know. You're at home, and you're talking about Medicare. You're looking at your paycheck. You see that you're paying Medicare taxes. You think those taxes are going into the trust fund to fund the Medicare program. Well, they are. They're just going into the trust fund to fund the Medicare part A program. Medicare part B and Medicare part D have absolutely no trust funds at all. They never have. They get funded out of general revenues. We have made promises to people about benefits that they will receive for which they never paid a penny.

Madam Speaker, we have \$16 trillion in debt that we're passing on to our

children and our grandchildren. The days of being able to promise people something for nothing are long gone. We have to be able to have candid conversations with today's seniors, with tomorrow's seniors—I'm in my forties—with my generation, Madam Speaker, and we have to renegotiate the Medicare contract with folks my age and younger. We have to do it.

America cannot, Madam Speaker, sustain this path of debt. You know, I feel a little disingenuous putting this chart up here, Madam Speaker. This is the one of the current path of debt. The truth is, that if you're running the computer models, they really break down somewhere right about here. They really say that the laws of economics, what we know about the world banking system, what we know about commerce in this country, what they really say is right about here America's going to cease to exist anyway; that the numbers just don't work; that the economy just won't function; that America, as we know it, will be over here.

It's not going to get as bad as I've presented, Madam Speaker, because the Republic, as we know it, will have gone away.

You know, we talk so much about the debt limit on this floor, Madam Speaker, the debt limit, as if it's something that Congress passes. Every American knows a debt limit is not a law on a piece of paper. A debt limit is when you can't find anyone to lend you money anymore. The debt limit comes when the Chinese say, No, America, you're a bad credit risk, we're not going to give you anymore. When the Germans say, No, America, you're a bad credit risk, we're not going to give you anymore.

On the Budget Committee we had that hearing, Madam Speaker, and we brought in economists from the left and economists from the right, and we asked them all, folks, tell us how much longer do we have? When does the real debt limit get here, when the American economy can no longer find anyone willing to lend to them?

And this is what they said. Madam Speaker, the liberal economist that came to talk to us said we think you have 5 years, 5 years before that day comes. The conservative economists said we think you have 2 years before that day comes. So we have a window, Madam Speaker, between 2 and 5 years, when the entire economy is going to begin to come unraveled, when American jobs and businesses are going to be at risk, when our entire experiment as a Republic will be challenged.

□ 1410

The President in his budget this year introduced a \$2 trillion tax increase and found a way to save us just a little bit of money 9 years from now. Madam Speaker, we don't have 9 years.

Every day that passes makes the problem harder to solve. Every day that passes removes arrows from our quiver of solutions. Every day that

passes threatens the survival of our Republic, and that is why we presented the path to prosperity, Madam Speaker, as a solution.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for providing me the time today to talk a little bit about this budget. I hope folks will go to the Web and learn for themselves the truth of the challenges facing this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PRODUCING AMERICAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it's always a pleasure to get to address the House in your presence.

I tell you what. There was quite an election in November of 2010. One of the results was a freshman named ROB WOODALL from Georgia, and the gentleman from Georgia does his constituents proud. It's a pleasure to serve with him.

His comments, most meaningful. When we think of what is going on today in the world of energy and the world of constitutional rights, in the world of religious freedom, there are things to be excited about, and there are things to be greatly saddened about.

When I came to Congress as a freshman, was sworn in in January of 2005, it looked like our days of being an energy giant in the world were over. Sure, we were the kings of technology, but we were hearing from people that use natural gas for most of the stuff it seems like—you look around the room and see whether it's plastics, or if you've got food, probably had fertilizer, natural gas used to make the fertilizer—it has had such a role in many things.

In recent months I've asked some scientists, do you see anything on the horizon that might replace natural gas for the use as a feed stock for so many things we make, and manufacture, in this country. I was told not for at least 30 years or so.

The amazing thing, though, in the last 7 years that should have everybody in America excited, is all the energy that's been found in America. Here we are having to all wring our hands, lower our heads, oh, woe is us, gas prices going up. We've got a President, unfortunately, seems like a nice fellow, but he doesn't know anything about energy other than what's handed to him that he could read about. I wish that it was otherwise, but the fact is he keeps making statements that are not borne out by the facts with regard to energy.

I've been excited as a member of the Natural Resources Committee to find out all of the things that are being found. In east Texas, where I am, we are fortunate because there was a natural gas formation that Louisiana was

kind enough to share with us. It's called the Haynesville shale. For that reason, there's more natural gas being produced in east Texas than any of the other 31 congressional districts in America.

There's the Marcellus shale, Pennsylvania, runs up into New York State. But a massive natural gas formation. The ability of hydraulic fracking, which has never been shown by a single scientific study to pollute water, despite some of the stories—once they're investigated people find out they're not true. Because the purpose of hydraulic fracking is to push oil or natural gas out of the formation and up. There is a vested interest in making sure that everything is sealed thousands of feet below where drinking water would be found. There is no scientific study that finds hydraulic fracking has polluted drinking water.

Yet, you look at the things it's done. Depending on who you believe, we probably have at least 300 years of natural gas, even at an accelerated rate. People are now looking at having their cars running on natural gas.

Then, just when we think, well, natural gas is the thing of the future, now we've got 300 years in which to find a suitable alternative without bankrupting the country trying to create something in the way of solar power or wind power—one day solar power I think will be a very viable source, but in the meantime, this President, in supporting his cronies who are manufacturing solar panels, some of them not doing anything but enriching themselves—but the market will take care of these things.

When it is economically feasible and economically viable, then we'll see things like solar power become a reality. But it's no time soon. In the meantime, the President's friends are being enriched, the country is being taken to the poorhouse on a fast track. There is no need for that.

Natural gas is the cleanest burning form of energy we could hope for.

We're the largest repository of coal in the world.

Then we find all of this oil, this huge place in North Dakota. I've met with a third group now who tells me that in Utah, this hard reddish brown rock that you wouldn't think has oil, when put under intense heat, without oxygen, you get oil. They say it's \$60 a barrel. They can make \$10 or more a barrel. They're doing it right now in Estonia. The same kind of rock, the same kind of thing. Now the third group has told me they believe they think they can get 3 trillion barrels of oil from just one area of Utah. Then it goes into northwest Colorado and southwest Wyoming, from what I'm told.

We know that there have been enough wells drilled in the Middle East that all the oil that is there, we pretty well know where it is. We have a good idea from the way the wells and the fields are being depleted about how much is left.

□ 1420

Information that I've been given indicates that there is probably somewhere around a trillion barrels of oil left in the Middle East—a trillion. Yet, in one area of Utah, we're told there may be three times that much. Sadly, however, this administration does what it has done repeatedly for over 3 years: they put more and more of our resources off limits. So when the President reads the teleprompter and says, There's just nothing I can do to change the price of gasoline, would that we could get information to him to show him how wrong that is. There is oil; there is natural gas; there is coal.

We've also been given the information that when gasoline hits \$4 a gallon, normally at least 25 percent to a third or so is purely speculation. So I realize the President wouldn't say there's nothing he can do about the skyrocketing price of gasoline. He surely means that, or I'm sure he wouldn't say it.

Yet the truth is, if the President were to go on television tonight and announce, Do you know what, folks? My Secretary of the Interior in January of 2009 immediately on coming into office announced that he was sending back the checks for leases in this small area. It may have involved some in northwest Colorado, but it was certainly in Utah. He sent back the checks and said that we're not going to allow leases on these areas that were let at the midnight hour by the Bush administration. Well, we'd give him the benefit of the doubt and just say, apparently he didn't know at the time what he was saying was not true.

Those leases, as he admitted in one of our hearings as I had to keep pushing to get the answer, were part of a 7-year process. Companies can't just come in and bid massive amounts of money on a lease on which they expect to produce oil or gas until they've had a chance to study the information. It was a 7-year process—not the midnight hour, but 7 years. Secretary Salazar finally admitted that. It was 7 years just to get to the point where people could bid on those leases—a massive amount of Federal land. The majority of Utah is Federal land. He put it off limits and returned the checks after the 7-year process was completed. Fortunately, during the prior 7, 8 years of the Bush administration, there were other areas where leases were let and permits were granted and drilling commenced.

I don't think we ought to be allowing anybody to drill who has had as many safety violations as British Petroleum had in the gulf. If you can't have less than 800 egregious safety violations in your drilling, you've got no business drilling on American soil or over American waters. Yet they were allowed to drill when, during comparable times, Exxon and others had one, two, none. They had about 800.

It appears the reason they were allowed to keep going, even though there was such a great lack of safety, is that

they were about to come out publicly as being a big energy company that embraced the President's cap-and-trade bill. That was going to be big news, so they didn't want to alienate a big energy company. Of course, they were going to be getting even richer dealing in the carbon credits. Consistent with the crony capitalism, they were going to be thrown lots of bonuses through that.

But anyway, this ought to be an exciting time in American history. We have energy galore. A man from China told me that he thought they had figured out what we were doing for our energy policy. We keep declaring all of our energy off limits, more and more of it. We don't use the energy we've got. We do have more energy, when you consider all of the resources, than any other country in the world.

While the President is busy out there deriding America for using too much energy, we make the world safer; we make the world more peaceable; we make the environment cleaner. When manufacturers leave America and go to other places in the world, they pollute four to 10 times more in most of the places that those manufacturers are going to. If you really care about the environment, then keep them here. Many of them are union jobs. You'd think the unions would embrace what we're trying to do rather than what the President is doing, but I understand loyalty runs deep.

We've got health care that has been rammed down the throats of Americans. The majority didn't want it. The elections revealed that in November of 2010. All of the polls revealed that throughout 2009 and 2010. We got it forced upon us when, really, what this government does best is play referee. It makes sure everybody is playing fair and playing by the rules. The problem is, when we become a player, when we become a coach and the referee, we're terrible at all three. When we get so involved in owning part of Wall Street that we're not watching what's going on, you have things like Madoff ripping people off right and left. We should be the referees, making sure everybody plays fairly—not the players, not the coaches, but the referees. The government, Federal Government especially, is a terrible coach when trying to tell people how to make a business work.

The best thing that could happen is if we get insurance companies out of the health care management business that they're in now. They're really not in the insurance business anymore; they're in the health management business. If we don't get them back into the insurance business and out of managing our lives and our health, then they'll be out of business, and the government will take over it all just as ObamaCare anticipates. That's where it's all headed. If we don't get the Federal Government out of being a player and a coach and a referee in health care, then the government will ultimately be the only player and coach

and referee, and that does not bode well for Americans.

We have a chance now, for the first time since the sixties, since Medicare was thought up, to allow our seniors to take control of their own health care and to give them the resources to do it. There would be nothing like a real test: Medicare here. If you want Medicare, have it just the way it is or we'll buy you health care, a private insurance policy; and we'll be referees and make sure they pay fair. We'll make it a high-deductible policy because those are so much cheaper. Then we'll give you cash in a health savings account that will be enough to cover the amount of your deductible each year.

In the end, it will be cheaper, and it will give people the dignity and patience—the control—of their health care so they don't have to beg the Federal Government, so they don't have to beg this board that ObamaCare has set up, so they don't have to beg some insurance company—please, please, let me have this treatment. You'll have insurance; you'll have the money to cover the high deductible; and we will move people into being in charge of their own lives, because the alternative is rather grim.

But let's be clear: this government wants to control people's lives. As soon as ObamaCare were to be fully operational, then the Federal Government has every right to tell people what they can eat; to tell people what medicines they can have; to tell people when they won't get that pacemaker, as the President told a lady at the White House during a town hall.

Maybe it's time we tell people like your mom, who would have 10 extra years of life with a pacemaker, you don't get the pacemaker—just take a pain pill. If we don't get this turned around, the government will have every right to tell you what to eat, what to drink, how much you have to exercise, what you can and can't do.

Our freedoms will be gone.

□ 1430

I've got a great quote here from one of the Founders, a man named Thomas Jefferson:

If people let the government decide what foods they eat and what medicines they take, their bodies will soon be in as sorry a state as are the souls of those who live under tyranny.

Those that say: Gee, I want to have unlimited sex, and I want the government to pay for it. Somebody's got to. I want the government controlling my life. People that feel like they need the government telling them what to do whatever it is, whatever aspect of life.

Sam Adams is given credit as being one of the most influential Founders in giving us this great Nation:

If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen.

Now, once the government has the right to control everybody's health care, it will have the right to tell you what freedoms it will recognize and you can practice and which you can't. That's why one of the reasons ObamaCare is so objectionable. It's the government intrusion into so many areas of our lives.

The First Amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

We're not supposed to make a law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. ObamaCare does that. It gives this government the power to say: You know what? People ought to be able to get abortions paid for by the government, which means the taxpayers pay for it. They ought to be able to get contraceptives as they wish. So never mind the fact that right now if there is somebody in America that needs contraceptives, they can be obtained, plenty of sources, still the President feels the need to intrude upon religious belief and say: Folks, you can't practice this belief. If you believe abortion is murder, it's murder of an unborn child, well, I will tell you what we'll do. We'll just say your money doesn't go for abortions.

Yet in ObamaCare, it's very clear there will be clinics, there will be policies that will provide abortions, and people that pay into policies, those policies insure across the board and they will cover that. And money is fungible; it will be used for abortions; it will be used for contraceptives, even though there are people putting in money to the system that object and feel they are violating their religious beliefs.

So it struck me that the President recently found time to apologize to someone who had been up here on the Hill testifying, but he never found time to apologize to those whom he told: You cannot practice your religious beliefs. Oh, yes, he tried to make an accommodation for a church and a hospital, but Catholics that have these closely held beliefs—I'm a Baptist, but, good grief, if you're going to tell a Catholic they can't practice their religion because, as some in this body have said, a majority think you shouldn't, you're going to tell people they can't practice their religious beliefs? For heaven's sake, at least give them an apology. But not so, no apology there. So I thought, well, maybe it would be helpful to track exactly what deserves apology and what doesn't.

Well, we remember when the President first came into office, the first thing he did was take what a lot of people refer to as the apology tour. He went around the world apologizing for America's arrogance toward countries where we had Americans buried who gave their last full measure of devotion

to free those countries. But the President found time. Do they get an apology or no apology? Yes, you got an apology.

All right. There were Bush policies that our President said—toward countries that we actually give a tremendous amount of money to but who vote against us over half the time in the U.N. Do they get an apology? Bingo. He found time to give them an apology.

The family of Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry, murdered by an Operation Fast and Furious gun that our government forced to be sold to criminals, well, well, no time for an apology. They don't get one.

The CIA enhanced interrogation that saved lives and led to finding Osama bin Laden, we do have time to apologize to them. They get one. All right.

Detaining terrorists who killed or conspired to kill Americans at Guantanamo, even though there hasn't been a single incident of waterboarding or torturing of any kind remotely at Guantanamo, even though when they throw feces or urine on our guards, we will take away 2 hours of their movie watching, still, they get an apology from this White House.

The accidental 2012 burning of these Korans that were desecrated by the writing of detainees, yes, they got an apology.

The families of the American soldiers who were killed after President Obama said he "calmed things down" by apologizing to Afghanistan. No, didn't get an apology. No apology there. Our own soldiers, but, no, no apology.

Death of two Pakistani soldiers in Pakistan and the death of four other Pakistanis in 2010 when a plane, we were told, made a mistake. Yes, Pakistanis, they get apology; but Americans don't, Pakistanis do.

The President's support for the Ground Zero mosque at 2010 White House Iftar dinner opposed by most Americans, including 9/11 survivors, most Americans didn't want a mosque at Ground Zero. The President said it was a matter of religious freedom. So, basically, the word "apology" I don't believe was used, but it was an apology. We believe in them being allowed to do that, even though it offends most Americans and victims' families, yes, yes. They were at the White House hearing how sorry he was that Americans opposed that.

Comments in 2011 that Israel should return to its 1967 borders that would have subjected it to relentless attacks and vulnerability, as Prime Minister Netanyahu explained, no, Israel doesn't get one. No apology for Israel.

His good friends Bill Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn, the first people to have a fundraiser at their house for him, they were part of a radical left-wing group, Weather Underground, detonated a bomb at the Pentagon in 1972. And we know there are still people serving in the military that were

around when the Pentagon was attacked by his biggest, earliest supporters. They don't get an apology. No apology there.

Ordering many Christians to violate their religious beliefs and pay for abortion, drugs, and contraceptives, no, no apology there. Violates your religious beliefs; too bad, no apology.

Comments by President Obama and President Sarkozy in 2011 at the G-20 summit where they belittled Prime Minister Netanyahu. He's Israeli. No apology for that.

□ 1440

Comments made by Rush Limbaugh in his radio program about pro-abortion activist and Georgetown law student Sandra Fluke, yes, the President found time for that apology.

The President's support for not allowing nurses to save babies that were born alive after a botched abortion, we've heard from some of those—at least one of those nurses—how broken-hearted they were sitting there and being forced to watch a baby die. No apology for those folks.

Attendance for 20 years at Trinity United Church of Christ where radical pastor Reverend Jeremiah Wright used racial and anti-Semitic terms, inflammatory rhetoric and insulting comments about Hillary Clinton from his pastor—I believe the comment was he could no more disown that fine gentleman, which he later did. No apology for anybody offended by that.

And inflammatory and indecent comments of one of President Obama's biggest supporters, Bill Maher, regarding Sarah Palin and MICHELE BACHMANN, tens of times worse than anything Rush Limbaugh would have ever dreamed of saying. That's right, no apology for that.

So I think it helps to chronicle exactly what deserves an apology from the White House these days, you know, just so we know where policies lie and where this President stands and with whom he stands.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

CONGRATULATING JOE QUATTRONE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I would like to say that she is a pleasure to travel with. She is a real gentlelady.

The reason I take the floor for just a couple of minutes is one of our dearest friends in the Capitol is a fellow named Joe Quattrone. He is a barber down in the House barber shop, and on March 1 he celebrated 42 years cutting hair in

the Capitol of the United States. He came to the United States when he was 18 years old from Italy. He said he has lived the American Dream, and he's one of the nicest people that I think you'll ever meet.

Everybody who has ever worked with him or had their hair cut by Joe understands that he is a very caring person and one that they respect. He has cut the hair of every Speaker of the House except two—NANCY PELOSI, and I don't think she goes to the men's barber shop; and JOHN BOEHNER, the current Speaker. And I'm going to talk to Speaker BOEHNER as soon as we get back from break and get him down there so Joe can say he's cut every Speaker's hair since he has been a barber at the House barber shop.

He has cut the hair of Vice Presidents, Presidents, the President of Italy, the Secretary of Transportation, ambassadors, Governors, admirals, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; but his favorite person, besides me, is Tip O'Neill, the Speaker of the House when Tip was the Speaker sometime back.

He worked before he came here at Andrews Air Force Base and the Pentagon.

I would just like to say to Joe the Barber, because I'm going to give him a copy of this floor statement, Madam Speaker, that he has been a credit to the institution of Congress. He is liked by everybody who has ever been in his chair, and I just want to congratulate him on 42 years of working here in the Capitol. And I don't think anybody has ever complained about him. He's really a nice guy. He started March 1, 1970, and he's here now 42 years later.

I just say Joe, congratulations. I'll be down to see you in 2 weeks.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I was very happy to yield to the gentleman, and I indicated to you in the spirit of bipartisanship, although I've not had the privilege of having Joe cut my hair, let me congratulate Joe the Barber because he is the epitome of a public servant. He has worked for this august institution for 42 years, and I'm very proud to say that he can claim that he has cut the hair of all of our Speakers. And I don't think our Speaker, who has outstanding Italian heritage, our former Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, would in any way shy away from congratulating this distinguished gentleman who came to this country and literally is a walking, if you will, American Dream.

So I want to congratulate you, Joe the Barber, on behalf of a bipartisan Congress and join my colleague, Mr. BURTON, in congratulating you for your service. You are truly a public servant, an inspiration to all of your family members, and we wish you a long life.

Again, congratulations for 42 years to Joe the Barber.

With that, I will continue my remarks and thank the Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I look forward to addressing these very important issues to you, and certainly we want to make sure that we address questions.

In the coming weeks, we will be discussing the attributes of the Affordable Care Act, and I will look forward to coming to the floor of the House and again acknowledging how much money the Affordable Care Act, the health care act, has in fact saved this Nation: how it has preserved Medicare, how we focus on medical education, medical school education, medical providers' education, how we have talked about issues dealing with health care disparities, and in particular how we have expanded the community health clinics that have saved lives, how we have worked on issues dealing with children's health care, how we have provided access to health care for many, many people.

That allows me, or calls upon me, to again follow up to again distinguish the Georgetown law student who spoke before Members of Congress who got in the crosshairs of a commentary that was not very flattering. I just want to distinguish the commentary that came against the Georgetown law student from comments that will be made by entertainers and others across the Nation in the course of their comedic work.

The question about the Georgetown law student, Madam Speaker, was that she was called before Members of Congress to speak. She was not speaking on a television program or an interview. She was actually called by Members of Congress to testify to the question of access of health care to women.

And I will tell you that right now documentation shows that women who are 24 years old and above, their health plans today cost 84 percent more than a male similarly situated. So we know without health insurance how devastating it would be for women not to have health insurance.

Many of the Planned Parenthood family clinics and others are focused on health care. We want to have a firewall, as Planned Parenthood has, and that is that the firewall is that access to health care is a distinguishable factor of their service, and that's what this young woman was speaking about, the importance of access to health care.

It was in the course of that testimony that made her a victim of public ridicule. That's why I believe President Obama appropriately acknowledged the right of a citizen to petition his or her government and that if they do so, they should not be subject to public ridicule. There lies the basis of the President of the United States calling this Georgetown law school student. And I applaud that because no matter how high you are, the highest office in