

make a policy, to make a rule, that underlying data belongs to all of us. It is public policy by public data, and we all as Americans deserve the right, if you are so inclined, if you so choose, to sit there, see it, touch it, calculate it, crunch it, compare it, understand it. Who knows? You may be the researcher who comes out, looks at the data, matches it up against other things, and tells me I can eat butter.

I promise that in a couple of weeks, maybe a month, I am going to come back to this microphone, because I have collected an entire binder of example after example of what we were absolutely positive about—what we absolutely knew—and we got wrong, and how so many of those things we made public policy on, and we got it wrong.

My good friend from Iowa (Mr. KING) has a couple of other things in sort of that same vein that he wants to share, and he may be the best person I have ever seen behind these microphones.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

#### A HISTORICAL ASSESSMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for the remainder of the time as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for that outstanding transition that he made here. I actually came down to chide him just a little bit.

I was listening very closely to what he had to say, and it was very valuable, the comments on energy that we need and the direction this economy needs to go. I am going to restrain the chiding because of his outstanding transition that he made and, let you know, Mr. Speaker, that I came down here to address you and to talk with you a little bit about the things that are ahead for us in this Congress, the things that are ahead for us in this country.

When our Founding Fathers shaped this country and wrote our declaration and filed our Constitution and got it ratified, it was an extraordinarily accomplishment, and those documents will live for the duration of civilization, and they will be in our memory, they will be in our heads, they will be in our hearts for the full duration of the time of civilization, whether it is succeeding civilizations thousands of years from now, they will look back on what happened here.

When our Founding Fathers put together this republican form of government, which is guaranteed to us in article IV, section 4 of the Constitution, it also guaranteed protection from invasion.

They set up the House of Representatives to have elections every 2 years, so that we could be the quick-reaction shock force. When the public could see

that this country was going in the wrong direction, they wanted to make sure that the House could be restored and filled with people that came from all across the country—the Thirteen Original Colonies or the 50 States that we are now and the territories that send representatives here—and that we could reverse an erroneous course that could be taken by a Congress going in the wrong direction.

That is the reason for 2 years—elections every 2 years. The Senate was set up with elections every 6 years, so they didn't have to worry about reelection for a longer period of time, and they could take the longer view.

Now, that was the theory or a philosophy that was generally untested, at least within the culture and the civilization of the time, and it has proven to be a fairly effective approach.

We saw what happened here in 2010, when I will say an overexuberant, very liberal Democrat majority in the House and in the Senate, essentially a veto-proof majority in the Senate, by hook, crook, and legislative shenanigans, crammed ObamaCare down the throats of the American people.

I remember those dramatic times. Tens of thousands of Americans came to Washington, D.C., from every single State, including Hawaii and Alaska, to protest what was happening to our God-given liberty and our right, our God-given right to manage our health, our skin, and everything inside it.

Well, it was still crammed down the throats of the American people, that policy called ObamaCare. The real name for it is the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I know. If I would say that about six times and you are having trouble going to sleep, Mr. Speaker, that would put you to sleep. It is a substitute for Ambien, to say Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Democrats finally recognized that, and they changed the name and their verbiage that they use. They said, oh, it is offensive to say ObamaCare; and then they realized that the President is the one that coined the term “ObamaCare.”

He did so on February 25 of 2009 at the Blair House, in that big square seating when they had a conference on health care, and he acted like a professor and interrupted Republicans 72 times that day, but he used the phrase “ObamaCare.”

Now, when we use it, they said that is pejorative. Don't use that because it identifies what it really is, it is a health care system that is socialized medicine. It is a government takeover of our bodies, our skin, and everything inside it; yet when the President used ObamaCare, then some of the Democrats decided: we will embrace the word “ObamaCare.”

They did for a while, and they realized that they were adding fuel to the fire of the rejection of ObamaCare, and they decided, well, let's find another way we can name this thing.

So then they insisted that you weren't nice and you weren't polite and it was inappropriate if we didn't use its official name, which they would liked to have changed to the Affordable Care Act, not the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, but the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I get to this because I am thinking about our Founding Fathers and George Washington, who could not tell a lie. So I asked myself the question—this policy that is going to cost over \$1 trillion extra for ObamaCare that was promised it was going to cut our premiums, per household, by \$2,500 a year, and if you like your doctor, you could keep your doctor, if you like your policy, you get to keep your policy, those promises weren't true.

The big promises of ObamaCare weren't true, and many things that were not advertised as highly as that didn't come true either.

So now they want to say Affordable Care Act. George Washington could not utter those words, Mr. Speaker, because George Washington could not tell a lie. That is why he confessed to chopping down the cherry tree.

I am not certain that the stump exists out there at Mount Vernon yet, but I am convinced that George Washington couldn't say the term “affordable care act” in reference to ObamaCare because it is not an accurate term. It is a dishonest term. It is not affordable, and it is less care.

Maybe it is an act, Mr. Speaker, so that is my commentary on going down that path with our Founding Fathers.

They also had this vision and they hoped that—and they had a long-term vision. It was a wonderful long-term vision of what kind of a country you could build if you just laid down God-given liberties, timeless principles, and laid out the pillars of American exceptionalism, articulate them, sell them to the American people, get them to support your Declaration of Independence, get them committed to doing what they knew they had to do, fight a war against King George.

They had to go through the winter at Valley Forge, and they had to a march up and down the coastline and in the interior part of the United States, at least the Thirteen Colonies, and take on the redcoats wherever they where. They won that Revolutionary War, learned some lessons from that about how you field the Continental Army.

You have to have a Commander in Chief, and you have to have a centralized government if you are going to defend yourself against the global powers of the world. They set up a Constitution to do that.

They envisioned and anticipated a lot of things in this Constitution, one of them was a means to amend it, and they believed that the President of the United States would be a man of honor who would give his oath of office, and they wrote his oath of office into the Constitution, to ensure that the nobility, the integrity, the statesmanship,

the character that was part of the culture at the time would flow forth forever, or as long as the United States might exist, through our Presidents.

I noted the 210th anniversary of the duel that took place between three-time Vice President Aaron Burr and the Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. It was just last week—about a week ago.

They met on an island, and they shot it out. They fought to the death. It turned out to be the death of Alexander Hamilton because Hamilton had insulted the integrity of Aaron Burr.

Aaron Burr would defend his integrity, and Alexander Hamilton would not retract his allegations, so the two of them met in a duel. Think of that, that their word was so important, their integrity was so important that the two of them faced each other with dueling pistols, knowing that one of them was likely to die in that duel, all over their word.

They had already by then written into the Constitution for the oath of the President of the United States and ratified. I do solemnly swear to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States—later on added—and to protect against all enemies foreign and domestic—and later on added—so help me God.

In the Constitution is—they call it the Take Care Clause in the Constitution, and the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. It is not actually the oath, but it is a component of the oath.

I don't want to say the word "implied." It is specific in the Constitution that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, Mr. Speaker.

So we had men of honor, statesmen, men of dignity, men of an attitude, that their word and their integrity was more important to them than their very life itself.

When they wrote the oath for the President to take into the Constitution and when they wrote in the Constitution that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, they never imagined that we would have a President who didn't have that same sense, didn't have that same sense of nobility, that sense of integrity, that sense of statesmanship.

They never imagined that we would have a President that didn't think his word was worth more than his life itself.

We come to this place in time and history, Mr. Speaker, Alexander Hamilton went to his grave over a principle like that, and Aaron Burr lost his political career because he sent Alexander Hamilton to his grave over that principle of your word is your bond, and when you get to a challenge like that, your word is more important than your life itself.

Now, we are at a place where a President gives his oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed and, instead, simply executes the

law itself, wipes it out, ignores it, immigration law, in particular, Mr. Speaker, where the President, with his Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, the DACA program—DACA, which really stands for deferred action for criminal aliens, that policy and a number of other policies where the President has announced that he is going to ignore the law—and he constantly hides behind this phrase: prosecutorial discretion.

He says he has prosecutorial discretion to decide not to enforce the law against people that are breaking it.

Now, he has a prosecutorial discretion, Mr. Speaker, but it is on an individual basis only, and his lawyers knew that. That is why when they wrote the DACA memos—well, we call them the Morton Memos—when they were written, and we had Janet Napolitano, then the Secretary of Homeland Security, testifying before the Judiciary Committee, and I announced to her, if you go forward with this, you will be in court, and you will be sued because the President of the United States' job is to stick with his article II authority, and that is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and he is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. This is a limited government, but all legislative powers belong here in this Congress. That is article I, all legislative powers.

The President doesn't get to write the laws. He is compelled to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is his constitutional obligation.

Instead, the President has said, well, I don't like these immigration laws. If a law requires our immigration authorities, ICE—Immigration and Customs Enforcement—when they encounter someone who is unlawfully present in the United States, the law requires that they place them into removal proceedings. That is the law.

The President has issued an order that says to ICE, thou shalt break that law and never apply the law to remove people from the United States who are here unlawfully, unless they have committed a felony or three mysterious misdemeanors that are vaguely identified.

I don't know that they actually have ever executed that particular provision, although I would say it is likely that they have, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness.

So the President has created four different classes of people with his Morton Memos and his DACA language, and by grouping people into classes of people, he has got a number of those who he has exempted from the law, some number approaching 600,000 people who came into the United States or were in the United States illegally, who are exempted from the very application of the law that requires our law enforcement officers, particularly ICE, to place them into removal proceedings. That is what the President has done.

So he sent the message out, as far as back as 3 years ago, in midsummer—actually, June—sent the message out to everybody in the world, if you can get into America, and you don't commit a felony—and that is a little bit of a shorthand for the technicalities—then you get to stay.

He has acted upon that. He has executed that all right. He has executed his executive edict, but he hasn't taken care that the law itself be faithfully executed. He has defied the law, and his oath is to uphold the law, to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Now, I have to put into the list the pillars of American exceptionalism, so we are thinking about it, Mr. Speaker. What makes America the unchallenged greatest nation in the world, and it is the composition of the pillars of American exceptionalism, and you find most of them in the Bill of Rights, freedom of speech, religion and assembly, and the right to keep and bear arms, and no double jeopardy, the property rights in the Fifth Amendment. You get to face a jury of your peers, quick and speedy trial.

The Ninth and 10th Amendments devolve the powers not granted specifically in the enumeration in the Constitution to the Federal Government devolve to the States or, respectively, to the people.

Those are many of the pillars of American exceptionalism, but there are others. We have a free enterprise economy, the ability to invest capital and sweat equity, and buy, sell, trade, make gain and get rich if you can, and we like to cheer you when you do because it helps all of us when that happens.

Free enterprise economy is another pillar of American exceptionalism, along with the root of this culture and civilization being in Judeo-Christianity, the work ethic that came from it, the values system that allowed that work to be prosperous and profitable and trustworthy, so that we could do business with people in a way that we didn't have to always be checking up on them because we knew that God is looking over our shoulder.

That is shorthand for one of the reasons why this is such a great country.

□ 1745

Another one would be when the Statue of Liberty went up. The image and the inspiration of that statue said to the world that if you can come here, to America legally, you can achieve all that you are capable of achieving. All of the things that you might imagine that you are capable of achieving anywhere in the world, you can achieve in America because you have all of these other rights. And these rights aren't rights that the government confers upon you.

As in every other country in the world, the government confers any rights you might have. These are God-given rights, and God has given them to us. And our Founding Fathers articulated that and put that down on

the parchment, and we have fought and defended it all of our years.

So if our rights came from government, government could take them away. The reason that they can't take them away is because they are God-given. And the inspiration comes from all of these pillars of American exceptionalism, which send that message and beam it across the world in National Geographic magazines that show up everywhere around the world or in encyclopedias or through cyberspace today—that picture of the Statue of Liberty, of the Washington Monument, of the Lincoln Memorial, of the United States Capitol, the White House itself. American success across the world and all of the places where it has been, this record of achievement, this record of sacrifice of Americans to expand the nobility of the human race everywhere around the world has inspired people in every country.

And the people that came here, Mr. Speaker, were inspired by that image and those ideas and those ideals. So we didn't just get a random selection of people that came to America legally. We got the cream of the crop. We got the vigor of the planet.

If there were 10 siblings in a family and only one of them had enough inspiration to find a way to come legally to the United States of America, we got the superachiever. We got the can-do. We got the cream of the crop. We got the vigor of the planet from every donor nation on the planet to come to America because they were attracted to the God-given liberty that was established here. They came here, they achieved, and they embraced those principles. And America embraced them.

And in each generation from that, we taught our children the same thing. So it has descended down through the generations, and it has brought in more, and America has gotten stronger.

But we are not a stronger nation if we erode those pillars of American exceptionalism. We are not a stronger nation if we lose faith with those things that have been the core of the success of this country. And we can't be sacrificing the pillars of American exceptionalism for the sake of having our hearts overrule our heads.

Our Founding Fathers didn't let that happen. The principles that came through from the work that they did, the God-given rights and liberties that are there, they are timeless. And they index into human nature, all of human nature, but they are embodied here.

And, by the way, one of the other things I left out of that, another reason for American exceptionalism is that all of that settlement arrived here. And a lot of it, it arrived here on a continent with—at the time, at least, unlimited natural resources. And at the dawn of the industrial revolution, we settled this continent from sea to shining sea.

And here we are today, Mr. Speaker, with a President who wouldn't agree with what I have just said. I mean, if

he had the time or took the time, he would seek to rebut the principles that I have laid out. And he would say, instead, well, let's see. We really don't need to have borders in America. We don't have to have that. There is no reason for America to be as successful as we are. We are using a disproportionate share of the planet's resources. We are pumping CO<sub>2</sub> into our atmosphere. That is turning the Earth's thermostat up, even though for 17 years there is not any evidence of that happening.

And we have watched as he has diminished America. He has diminished it in foreign policy. He has diminished it economically. He has diminished it socially and culturally. And today we are watching as he has established this policy of amnesty. He is pushing hard for the Senate Gang of Eight bill.

The Senate Gang of Eight bill is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker. It is instantaneous amnesty for the people that are here illegally, whether they overstayed their visas 40 percent or whether they came across the border illegally 60 percent. Or it is instantaneous amnesty for them.

For anyone that would come into America in the future, it is silent, which means it is an unspoken promise that if you can get here—we haven't demonstrated the will to enforce the law if you came here. So if you come here, why would anybody think that we enforce a law on anybody that would come here after a Senate Gang of Eight bill might potentially become law?

And, to add insult to injury, they sent an invitation out to the people that have been sent back to their home country. It is what I call the “well, we really didn't mean it” clause. And that means that anybody that has been deported in the past is sent an invitation saying reapply; we really didn't mean it. That is how bad this is.

And this gaping hole that we have in our border in the McAllen sector of the Texas border, where we now have 57,000 unaccompanied children who have come into the United States—many of them hustled across 2,500 miles or more from El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala through Mexico, and there is a significant number yet from Mexico coming into the United States—these unaccompanied minors are hauled up here by coyotes who may live in those communities and recruit these kids.

All of this is going on. And we have a President who says: I need \$3.7 billion to expand the bureaucracy to maybe buy a hotel to put them in and move them across the country and infuse them into our communities.

People that are unlawfully present in the United States simply say: I am an unaccompanied minor, and I have been promised that if I can get into America, I get to stay in America. 57,000 of them, Mr. Speaker. And what percentage of the unaccompanied minors have been sent back to their home country? 0.1 percent. One-tenth of 1 percent.

They sent JOE BIDEN down to Guatemala. He landed in Panama and then

went to Guatemala. He said that he went down there to send a message which is that we are going to send your kids back. Don't send them here. Well, if there is no record of that, then they know it is not happening.

So think of the difference. If we would take a military airplane and put a couple hundred unaccompanied Guatemalan minors on it, for example, send that plane down the runway and up into the air, if the President picked up the phone and called the President of Guatemala and said: Be on the tarmac in 2 hours; you are going to have 200 of your kids that are going to arrive there, and you should greet them—that is what a leader does, sends them back. If you do that and do that and do that, eventually they will stop coming because they will know they are actually coming back, and they will know that their money is wasted. It is not happening.

But this President is not going to secure this border, Mr. Speaker. He has demonstrated that. We have got 2½ more years of this President. And whatever we do in this Congress, we can't make him secure the border. We can't make him do it. The Congress doesn't have the authority to do that. There are only two constitutional provisions that can force the President to do anything, and we have tried them both within the last 15 years or so, and neither one of them have proven to be effective.

Public opinion might push back hard enough. Well, they kind of are. But we cannot allow our border—especially right now, the Texas border—to be under invasion in the fashion that it is by the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors who are, by the way, only 20 percent of the illegals coming in in that sector. And they are maybe stopping, at best, 25 percent of those that are trying to come across. So we have got a number that is up there over 1 million people that are attempting to cross into the United States, and 57,000 of those that we pick up on that are unaccompanied minor kids.

The President will not secure the border. We should come to that conclusion. We have got 2½ years of open borders. Or we find a way to secure it, maybe even against the will of the President of the United States, because I don't know if he has got the will to block it if we do this.

But who has the authority? I look around the whole country, and the people who have the authority to do so are the Governors of the border States.

I have a resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to introduce into the RECORD that says so. It calls upon the border Governors to call out their National Guard to secure the border, and it says that this House of Representatives will support the funding to do so. I call for that, Mr. Speaker. I urge us to pick this up and sign it. I am going to introduce it tomorrow. I would like to take it up real soon and send that resolution to the world, and I would appreciate your indulgence in doing so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

H. RES. \_\_\_\_\_

Whereas, the crisis on the Southwest border is of such significance that it demands national attention and urgent action.

Whereas, the President, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Administration have enacted unconstitutional policies, such as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program and the Morton Memos, that have contributed significantly to a massive increase in illegal immigration.

Whereas, the President has not secured the border.

Whereas, the President has failed to fulfill his Constitutional obligation to protect each state against invasion according to Article IV, Section 4.

Whereas, states have specific authorities under Article I, Section 10 when “actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.”

Whereas, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection between October 1, 2013 and June 15, 2014, 52,193 unaccompanied children have been apprehended on the Southwest border.

Whereas, according to a June 3, 2014 Homeland Security Intelligence report, only 0.1% of illegal alien, unaccompanied minor children from non-contiguous countries were removed in FY 2013.

Whereas, the Secretary of Homeland Security expects 90,000 unaccompanied alien children to be interdicted by the U.S. government while crossing the border in Fiscal Year 2014.

Whereas, according to the Department of Homeland Security, only twenty percent of those interdicted are and will be children.

Whereas, border security officials estimate the interdiction ratio is twenty-five percent of those attempting to cross the border.

Whereas, according to border security official's testimony before Congress, the likely number of illegal crossing attempts is four times the number of those interdicted.

Whereas, our Southern border is not secure, and this fact represents an immediate danger to every citizen of the United States of America.

Whereas, the Governor of a state is the commander in chief of the National Guard of that state.

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes, supports and defends the Constitutional authority of any Governor to deploy his or her state's National Guard division to secure the border;

(2) commits to appropriating the necessary monies to effectively support any such deployment of National Guard troops; and

(3) calls upon the Governors of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to deploy the National Guard forces under their command to immediately gain effective control of our southern border, to turn back anyone without legal immigration status, and to ensure for the people of their states and the United States a safe and free future.

#### AMERICA, THE ATTRACTIVE NUISANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my dear friend from Iowa (Mr. KING).

I know we have a good friend here on the other side of the aisle who was re-

cently quoted as saying something along the lines that Mr. KING and I have never met an immigrant that we didn't think was a criminal, something of that sort, and I like the gentleman from Illinois, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ. I think he is a good guy. I think he has a big heart. But the truth is escaping him on such grandiose claims. He doesn't know my heart. I know he is a good guy. He has a big heart. But he doesn't understand the role of government.

When I looked at one of the most beautiful little girls I had ever seen. It was a Saturday night in the wee hours. She had been drug clear across Mexico. She was asked about home. Well, were you anxious to leave home? She starts crying. She didn't want to leave home, she said. She misses her family. But some adult decided that because the administration's policies are luring people here with the promise that they will most likely be able to stay, then people are coming and the children are not afraid of violence in their home country. Some adults may be. But they are adults making decisions to subject a beautiful child like that and so many of the others that our border patrolmen are processing, our border patrolmen and -women are processing out there, especially in the McAllen sector, which is a rough area.

It was interesting seeing my first tarantula in the wild. I have seen plenty of rattlesnakes before in that area of Texas, but I haven't seen any in the last month that I have been down there. I know they are there. The border patrolmen tell me they are there. But I had never seen a tarantula in the wild like that. It was interesting.

But parents are choosing to send their children, bring their children, in some cases put their children in the hands of drug cartel human traffickers hoping that the tremendous money they pay will get them to the United States rather than make them sex slaves. Some make it, some don't. Some die on the way. Some are raped. Some are abused. And it is all because there is what, under the civil law, might be called an attractive nuisance.

We learned in law school that if you have a swimming pool and you have no fence and a child comes over and drowns in your pool because you didn't have a fence, then you would be liable for civil damages for having an attractive nuisance that lured a child to his or her death. Well, this administration has created an attractive nuisance under civil law.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know the United States is not a nuisance. It has been a force for good because it has applied the laws of the Judeo-Christian heritage. That is why George Washington, in the resignation he sent to the 13 Governors, as the first and only general commander to have led the military in revolution, won the revolution, and then resigned and went home, asking nothing further.

But at the end of his resignation that he sent out to the Governors, he had a

prayer for the Nation, praying that he hoped we would never forget those who have served in the field. And I am grateful that both sides of the aisle repeatedly are grateful to our military for their service.

I have, in past years, heard someone say, you know, no liberal ever spit at anybody in uniform. Well, they just don't know; because I served 4 years in the Army after Vietnam, and it was not a good time to be in the Army as far as accolades for your service. I have been spit at.

And when I went through basic at Fort Riley, Kansas, there was a standing order from our commander going through training that we were not to ever wear our uniform off post because—though Kansas is one of the greatest States there is, with wonderful people—there were people who didn't like the military. And if they found you as one or two together, then you would likely get beat up.

□ 1800

They had had instances, and we were ordered—that is what we were told—we were ordered not to ever wear uniforms off post or in basic. Every now and then, even at Fort Benning, Georgia, there would be indications, orders, don't be wearing your uniform off post this weekend. So it was not a good time. And I thank God that people have realized the importance and value of our United States military men and women who take an oath and are willing to lay down their lives for their friends and for their fellow Americans.

But government has a different position from individuals. And that is why some Christians get confused and say, well, I am a Christian. I am supposed to turn the other cheek. I am supposed to love my fellow man. I am supposed to reach out and help sojourners. All of that is true. The beatitudes that Jesus gave are the kinds of things we need to be doing for anyone who is a Christian, and I would humbly submit for anybody who is an atheist, Buddhist. Buddhists practice many of the beatitudes and are very noble in doing so. But for a government, it is different.

The government's role, even when it is composed of Christians, is to make sure that the law is enforced fairly and impartially. Romans talks about the government being an agent for good, for encouraging good, but if you do evil, be afraid because the government is not given the sword in vain. If you do evil, the government is not supposed to turn the other cheek. It is supposed to apply the law fairly across the board.

So when an adult child of one of the wealthier families in all of east Texas who was before my court—and my predecessor had repeatedly given her probation—I couldn't give her probation because I knew I would not do that to anyone else in her situation. So I sent her to prison because I had to be fair and impartial despite knowing the parents, the family, and knowing that that family brought most of my contributors, the biggest contributors I