energy industry have brought about an incredible transformation of formerly polluted areas, restoring landscapes to their original natural beauty.

It is a success story all around, both environmentally and economically. Unfortunately, one-size-fits-all Washington regulations threaten to stop this success story in its tracks and to destroy the family-sustaining jobs the coal refuse-to-energy industry supports.

That is why, for the third time, I am reintroducing the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment, or SENSE Act, in the 115th Congress as H.R. 1119.

My legislation ensures that regulations are tailored to allow a very specific and small subset of power plants to continue their remediation efforts and restore western Pennsylvania's natural beauty, as well as landscapes in historic mining communities across the country.

This legislation passed the House with bipartisan support last year, and I urge my colleagues to support it once again so that the vital and successful work of providing electricity while cleaning up the environment can continue.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT SAVES LIVES

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, from the mother of four with a preexisting condition to the family of a young boy who can now afford health insurance for the first time—we have heard constantly and over and over how the Affordable Care Act has saved lives. The Affordable Care Act provides quality, affordable insurance to millions of Americans.

For example, just in my district alone, nearly 100,000 people who are now covered through the Covered California exchange or through the Medicaid—which is in California Medi-Cal—expansion, they stand to lose coverage if the Affordable Care Act is repealed.

It is completely irresponsible to speak about repealing the Affordable Care Act with no replacement. I urge my colleagues to think about their own constituents before doing so.

THE THIRTY MILLION WORDS INITIATIVE

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a truly innovative pilot program in my district in Pensacola, Florida. This one-of-a-kind program, known as the Thirty Million Words Initiative, is a collaborative effort brought by researchers from the University of Chicago in partnership with the Studer Community Institute.

The Thirty Million Words Initiative will educate parents of newborns at Sacred Heart Hospital, Baptist Hospital, and West Florida Hospital on best practices for speech and engagement during the critical learning stage up to 3 years old.

As we all know, interaction by speech or music with young children has not only had an impact on learning abilities but also emotional needs. This program builds on this principle and strives to include all newborns, regardless of income level, race, or ethnicity.

Through this simple commitment, we can challenge the socioeconomic stereotypes we have become too used to and build a future for leaders and innovators stemming from all walks of life and bringing new ideas for a vision for the future.

This truly unique partnership between our community leaders and the parents of our future generation will garner a secure foundation for our children to bring stronger education, allow limitless possibilities, and meeting the challenges to build a better tomorrow.

U.S.-ISRAELI RELATIONS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the United States and Israel is a very important one, a moral one, and one beneficial to both sides.

I was very glad to see this week the President, so early on in his term, inviting and making welcome Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to this country and showing that the U.S. relation with Israel is as important to us as it is to them.

Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish state, through much of its history of this Earth has been a very strong one for their assertion for their rights to be part of the fiber of the Middle East. The United States needs to be on their side and a firm partner in what they need to do.

So, again, kudos to President Trump for making this establishment of this relationship early on in his term and sending that assurance to Prime Minister Netanyahu, the people of Israel, and the importance to the people of this country of that relationship.

LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, this great deliberative body.

To start this off, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. Perhaps this will embarrass you, my colleague, STEVE KING, but as I was flying into Nebraska last week—and I do this on occasion—I am looking out of the window and looking at the rolling hills of the western edge of Iowa as it borders the Missouri River and all of that beautiful terracing that has been done, all of that extraordinarily productive farmland, in order to save the soil and increase yields, and I wonder how much of that STEVE KING did himself in a former life. So I am grateful not only for the opportunity but mostly for your friendship.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The answer would be a fair amount, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, as I was going through my mail last week, I read a publication that I receive frequently at my house from what is known as the Great Plains Trail Network. This is a dedicated group of people who enjoy, promote, and foster the growing network of hiking and biking trails in my hometown of Lincoln and the vicinity. They provide an extraordinary service to our community. Most notably, the trail systems provide an alternative means of transportation, physically linking our community in creative ways along creek beds and underpasses, through open plains and wooded areas, and beside the wooden fences between residential neighborhoods. These trails also link us in a more profound way. They link us to the values of healthy exercise, neighborliness, and the beauty of nature—even in the setting of the urban city environment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I received an unusual media request recently. New York Magazine wished to speak to me. I took the meeting because I wanted to give a broader perspective on the issue of environmental stewardship, particularly in light of policy debates about energy and the environment. Since this topic can be so toxic, I thought it was important to reframe the issues with some prairie perspective, if you will. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is time to spike the football and focus on solutions and activities that all of us can agree on and that all of us see are beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, for the 21st century, we must harmonize environmental and economic security. As a different public policy approach, I am considering a new idea called the zero-emissions energy credit, or ZEEC.

□ 1600

The more that we can do, I believe, to stop waste and pollution through conservation and innovation gives us peace of mind in regards to the proper use of our resources.

This ZEEC concept would reward reduced emissions through a tax credit

system. In this way, the government is not picking one technology over another or fighting over one regulation versus another, but positively valuing the diminishing externality cost of polluting emissions.

Mr. Speaker, environmental initiatives can also take many other forms. I am very proud to be recently named the co-chair of the International Conservation Caucus, called the ICC. It is one of the largest bipartisan caucuses in the Congress.

The ICC works to ensure the sustainability of both persons and wildlife, works to promote market innovation, as well as proper stewardship of our precious natural resources.

As an example, not long ago, in the African country of Mozambique, in the midst of a civil war, the Gorongosa National Park was completely stripped of wildlife and devoid of people. A once lush microecosystem is dead, primarily due to political disagreement.

Interestingly, fascinatingly, extraordinarily, a mere 10 years later, thanks to the work of a major philanthropist and a receptive government, a park system now teams with wildlife, with indigenous people reintegrated back into their homeland, who are engaged in now good and sustainable farming methodologies, engaged in park management, as well as conservation, all creating an atmosphere in which the entire ecosystem once again thrives.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know anyone in this body or anywhere else who wants dirty air or dirty water. However, as another example, if you live in Beijing, polluted air alone costs you 5½ years off your life. Parts of India are perhaps worse.

By the way, the Chinese Government was infuriated with the United States because we created at our embassy a pollution monitoring device, and then publicly released that data to Chinese society. It had a major effect. As one Chinese person once whispered to me: What is the point of all this economic development if it kills you?

Economic development without a soul strips us of the capacity to fully prosper. On the other hand, one of the prime contributors to environmental desecration is economic underdevelopment. Persons who have diminished economic options will use the resources at hand, sometimes merely to survive.

The tragedy of the commons occurs when there are fractured social linkages, a lack of access to technology and information to feed, clothe, and house in a more sustainable way.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this: as new technologies emerge, we may see exciting opportunities to build our own sustainably sourced microenergy economy, one that harmonizes with the environment and creates new economic opportunities and linkages.

This doesn't mean we all live on game preserves, but through proper public policy and innovation, we may be on the trail to environmental, economic, and community security, and perhaps create a new type of Great Plains Energy Network.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Congressman KING, for the various aspects of leadership he has provided, particularly today, on an essential issue: a pro-life issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for his presentation here today, his friendship, and the job he has been doing for a long time representing the eastern third of Nebraska, generally speaking.

I would point out also, Mr. Speaker, that we actually first met on the pro-life issue. As I was looking at the primary candidates that were vying for that position in eastern Nebraska, I wanted to measure their character, the content of their character, the value of their faith and their commitment to principle and planning and Constitution, but especially life. In looking at the candidates, it didn't take very long to figure that out.

I think Nebraskans have done very well with the representation that they have sent to this Congress, especially in the case of Mr. FORTENBERRY, who has exceeded my expectations. And I am pleased to say that here.

As the gentleman indicated, I came to the floor here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to speak about life, about innocent, unborn human life.

To start with, I will put it this way, Mr. Speaker. There are a series of values that we hold dear. Many of the debates here on this floor and in the committees and the various committee rooms around the Hill that we have are more or less working around the edges of the central issue. Sometimes, though, we do get to the central issue. The central issue was debated here on the floor earlier with a different piece of legislation.

When young people are growing up in America and they are listening to their parents, their teachers, other friends and relatives and schoolmates, the question will emerge—and you can't grow up in America without the question of abortion emerging; and sometimes they are counseled on one side of that question and sometimes on the other—but when I am talking to young people, I want them to shape their values around the most solid principles, as our Founding Fathers shaped the values of America around the solid moral principles.

It doesn't do to simply pass off the idea of abortion and say: I am not going to think about it; or I am going to leave it up to God to decide. He calls on us also to contemplate these things.

Our Founding Fathers wrote into the Declaration of Independence that we have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. When I contemplate those words and the order of those words, often it is conflated together as equal or equivalent values as if life and the pursuit of happiness are equivalent values, with liberty in the middle of all that, and you can stir it up and no one's pursuit of happiness should be diminished by someone else's search for liberty or the exercise of their liberty or that no one's life should trump that of someone else's pursuit of happiness or liberty.

Mr. Speaker, in understanding the Declaration of Independence, the foundational document that undergirds our Constitution and the most beautiful document written in the history of the nation-state—and I believe that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were inspired with divine guidance, just a little bit lower standard of true than divine inspiration; a divine guidance—I believe our Founding Fathers thought deeply about that message that was coming to them from above and the words that were put down on that parchment by Thomas Jefferson.

The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were rights that were considered carefully to be prioritized in their order of what was the most important down to the least important of the three. Life came first. They didn't say right to pursuit of happiness, to liberty, to life. They didn't say right to liberty, pursuit of happiness, and then to life. They wrote life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To understand what that means, think of this. First, the definition of pursuit of happiness is understood by our Founding Fathers. Our Founding Fathers didn't see this pursuit of happiness as let's just say a tailgate party on a Saturday noon or early Saturday afternoon. It wasn't about going off to a party or sitting in your backyard with your family or doing the things we enjoy to do, enjoying sports, watching or participating; or being out on the water or down the ski slopes.

That was not imagined at all as the pursuit of happiness because they understood pursuit of happiness to be the definition of the Greek term that I pronounce eudemonia, pronounced with a Greek accent. But what it means is: in pursuit of happiness.

Happiness under the Greek understanding of the term was the whole person; to develop one's self as the whole person. That would be to develop yourself physically. As you grow into adulthood, keep yourself in shape, build your muscles up, eat healthy, sleep healthy, do the healthy things, make sure that this temple of our body is taken care of and respected and appreciated. That is the vessel through which we carry our values and are able to carry out many of the things we do in our lives.

So physical health was part of the pursuit of happiness, but also the mental development. And it is not just pursuing knowledge, not rote memorization alone, which has its value—always has, always will have—but also the understanding of a philosophical person and an intellectually complete individual to complement the physically healthy and in-shape individual, philosophically sound, intellectually sound, but also theological sound.

That is eudemonia. That is the complete human being. That is making the most out of God's gift to us and developing ourselves physically, mentally, emotionally, theologically, and psychologically. The whole human being.

The understanding that our Founding Fathers had was that you have a right to pursue this. You have a right to develop yourself. In fact, the implication is that we have an obligation to do so. That means we have got an obligation to evaluate the moral questions in front of us with the brain that we are given and the values that we have developed and the education that we worked to earn.

That is pursuit of happiness. But that is the lowest of the three on the priority, Mr. Speaker.

The next value is liberty. With that value of liberty, there are certain things that are liberty. We take liberty with our speech. We take liberty with our religion. We take liberty with the press. We have our right to assemble and all of those things. If someone is in pursuit of happiness, they are not going to take away our rights to our liberty.

Most of our rights to liberty are wrapped up in the Bill of Rights. The First Amendment catches the most important ones early. Also, the liberty to keep and bear arms, the property rights that come along in the Fifth Amendment, the components of liberty that we have and the provisions that allow us to face a jury of our peers and no double jeopardy. Those are liberties. The liberties that are defined trump the pursuit of happiness. In other words, someone else can't take away our freedom of speech because they are in search of a good tailgate party.

We go from the lowest priority, the pursuit of happiness, to the next level up, liberty, and to the highest level up, which is the right to life. Life itself is sacred.

When I talk to young people, I ask them the question: Do you believe that human life is sacred in all of its forms?

They look around each other in the bleacher seats in the gymnasium, if it happens to be a school in that fashion, and they come to a consensus: Yes.

And I will ask them: Is your life sacred? How about the person sitting next to you, is their life sacred?

After a little while, they start to nod their heads and agree.

It is no trick question. Human life is sacred in all of its forms. Once we understand that and we accept that universal consensus that is here in this society of America, then the only other thing we have to say is: Well, if human life is sacred and we protect it with all that we have, then we need to know when life begins and we need to know when life ends.

We know that in 1973, 44 years ago, the Supreme Court came to a conclusion. Well, actually, they didn't know, but they spoke of viability and they used a vague, mushy definition of viability and trimesters, but that is not a way to define life. When you deal with something that is sacred in all of its forms, you don't use a definition that says maybe it is or maybe it isn't a life; maybe it is viable, maybe it isn't; maybe it has actually crossed this threshold of this trimester or this one or this one.

So what they ended up in Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, the combination of the two was abortion on demand and the person's right to life. That personhood that begins at the moment of conception is subject to the judgment of the mother, who may think that this life is inconvenient to her liberty or her pursuit of happiness.

□ 1615

That was when they crossed a moral line that needs to be examined by everyone in this country who goes to the polls and votes or conducts themselves in a fashion that is affected by the abortion industry itself.

So I say to them, students especially: Is human life sacred in all of its forms?

The answer comes back: Yes, it is.

And then I say: Then you have to choose a moment that life begins, and that moment, there is only one moment that we know, and that is the moment of conception. That moment of conception that life begins is a moment that I believe that God places the soul in that little being that is a full complement of a combination of the DNA of the father and the mother, the full complement of the human being, a unique human being, a unique human being that there will never be another one exactly like that little baby that is conceived.

There will never be another one. Even identical twins have their distinctions, Mr. Speaker. Mothers can tell them apart. Not always easily, but they can tell. Fathers can tell little babies apart. Even though they have got matching DNA that is exactly the same DNA, they are still unique. They are still a little bit different in certain ways. Their personalities develop in different ways, and they have physical characteristics that become more and more apparent as the years go on. There are no two human beings exactly the same. That is because God made it that way. Think of how unique this is.

There are over 7 billion people now on this planet. Our population has gone over 7 billion people. Of all the people who have gone to their graves throughout history from the beginning of time, from the Garden of Eden until today, and all the people who live on the planet, 7 billion today, and of all the people who will come, likely by the billions, into the future, there are no two faces that are the same. They sometimes look a little the same—more than a little—but there are no two faces that are the same. There are no two faces that anybody who knows them can't tell the difference.

Think how genius it is to create a species, Homo sapiens. We each have a unique visage that will never be matched again throughout the duration of time. It has never been matched before from the beginning of time, and no matter what any scientist might do in a laboratory, there is never going to be anybody exactly the same, even if the DNA matches exactly. That is a unique approach to this.

Think about this: The thing that we measure ourselves by and recognize ourselves by, our face, our visage, carries with it the package of all of the emotions and the thoughts and the expressions that bypass so much need to use the words in this very excellent language that we have.

Think of how you interact with your friends, your family, your neighbors, when you are sitting at a meeting, when you are giving facial expressions that don't require a sound. People read those facial expressions, and they react off of them.

I think of the days that I am out, as Mr. FORTENBERRY said, working on a crew, maybe laying pipe with my three sons, and we may not even have to speak all day long because facial expressions, a nod here and there, we know each other, we can communicate with our facial expressions, and that is enough. That is a unique thing that we have been blessed with.

Every one of us is unique. Our lives begin at the moment of conception. We can't measure and we can't prove scientifically when that moment of conception is. We just know. We know that that is when that baby, when the components of the DNA of the father and the mother come together in that fertilized egg. That is the moment of conception; that is the moment that life begins.

I would like it if we could identify scientifically, if a little bell went off and we knew, here is conception. There is a unique little life here in the womb of the mother—and, by the way, she is a mother at that moment. But we can't do that yet.

We have come a long way. When our family was born, at that time, we couldn't tell whether it was a boy or a girl, and so it was nice, in my opinion, to have a surprise on whether it is a boy or a girl. Of course, I always prayed that they would be mentally healthy and, after that, physically healthy, but never began to ask whether it should be a boy or a girl.

But today we know. We can measure if it is a boy or a girl. We can tell facial characteristics. We can see the personality of these little unborn babies in the womb. When they make faces, you can see them grimace. You can see them smile. You can see them suck their thumb. There are many, many people in this country today who have a 4–D ultrasound of one or more of their children that is taken well before they are born.

I can think of one of my district personnel who has, in his office in Sioux City, a framed picture of the ultrasound of Joseph Dean Anderson, my godson. It is there, framed, the

ultrasound of that little baby boy months before he was born. Now he is about 7 years old or so, perfect little towheaded, blond-haired kid running around, full of happiness, love, and energy. But he was first known in his mother's womb and first recognized as a family member there and his picture framed. It still is there in the office in Sioux City. He is about tall enough to see it straight on these days.

That happens all over America because we know that life begins at the moment of conception. We hold it; we cherish life as sacred to us.

These little babies are the future of America. They are God's will, and they are the future of America. Yet, nearly 60 million of them have been aborted over the years since 1973 and Roe v. Wade, nearly 60 million. Think of that, 60 million babies in 44 years. And we are watching a nation that has a birthrate now that is lower than the replacement rate.

You hear debate on this floor, Mr. Speaker, that says that we have to go to foreign countries to bring people in here to do the work that we don't have enough people to do. I don't accept that as a rational thing for a country to do in that way.

What we need in this country is we need good people to have more babies and raise them right, and yet we are missing 60 million. That doesn't include the second generation of those who were aborted in the first half of the 44 years of Roe v. Wade.

Thomas Jefferson concluded that a generation was 19 years. It is probably a little longer than that today. Generations turned over, by his estimation, in 19 years. It is just convenient for me, 44 years since Roe v. Wade, I am going to call that, divided by two, two generations, 22 years a generation. Two generations, a third of Americans, gone because of a court decision that unjustly found, unconstitutionally found, immorally found, irrationally found, and the guilt that this Nation carries for tolerating a Supreme Court decision and accepting that Supreme Court decision.

But it is not everybody in this country who carries that guilt because we have armies of pro-life workers who are out there on a daily basis doing all they can to bridge the gap for, let's say, a mother who is in a crisis and can't care for the baby that is on the way; the crisis pregnancy centers that are there; the lives that have been saved by the thousands and thousands by the pro-life workers, the lives that have been saved by the inspiration that comes from seeing hundreds of thousands of pro-life marchers come to this city and make that march from around the Washington Monument on up to the Supreme Court and to the west side of the Supreme Court to plead for justice for those who are voiceless in the unborn.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to address this. It is time for Congress to move along the issue. And so because we cannot medically prove when a conception begins, we believe profoundly that personhood begins at the moment of conception, and personhood needs to be protected in all of its forms. The closest we can get to verifying that personhood, that conception, is the measure of the heartbeat. We all know that a beating heart is life. When the heart stops beating, life ends.

Now, we can detect a heartbeat as early as 16 days from conception, and often the number is published to be 18 days from conception, Mr. Speaker. It may not always be detectible in every pregnancy that early, but it is entirely detectible early on in the pregnancy.

So I have introduced legislation, Mr. Speaker, to protect these innocent babes, these babes that can't speak for themselves, that can't cry out for their own mercy, but they are already formed in their mother's womb, and the unique individual that grows from the matching of those two DNAs. And when that heart starts to beat, a physician can detect that heartbeat, when they can detect the heartbeat, we need to protect the baby. With the understanding that when a heartbeat can be detected the baby must be protected, I have drafted and introduced legislation that is H.R. 490, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this bill is titled the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017. It makes a life-saving stride in enshrining the rights, the rights of the unborn, into U.S. law. It ensures that no child for whom a heartbeat is detectible is aborted unless the life of the child's mother is endangered in fact by a physical disorder, by a physical illness, or by a physical injury.

Any abortionist who performs an abortion under this legislation, H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017, any abortionist who performs an abortion in spite of a detectible heartbeat and outside of the exceptions that I have defined, which is for a physical disorder, a physical illness, or a physical injury, any physician who performs an abortion outside of those exceptions would be subject to a fine or imprisonment—and that is for a period up to 5 years—or both. This is a serious piece of legislation, and it needs to be, because life itself is the number one thing that is sacred here on this planet, especially in this country.

This legislation, the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017, will require all physicians before conducting an abortion to detect the heartbeat of the unborn child; and that means they have to maintain the records of their endeavor to detect a heartbeat, and if a heartbeat is detected, the baby is protected. That is the center of this law.

Ever since Roe v. Wade, which was unconstitutionally decided in 1973, 44 years ago, these 60 million babies—almost 60 million babies that have been ended by the abortion industry—have received a rubber stamp from the courts, from the Federal Government, not from this Congress and not from the States. The Supreme Court overrules the efforts in the States to protect innocent, unborn human life. The Supreme Court overrules this Congress to protect unborn human life, and we have been trying to find ways around that decision ever since 1973. But I have introduced the bill, and it will protect the lives of the voiceless innocents.

Then to make a point now, Mr. Speaker, there are probably some people who are thinking this is a little bit too big of a leap for where we are on the topic today. I would submit that it is not, that we have been working too patiently with what I will call incrementalism. When I came to this Congress more than a decade ago, I had been, at that time, already working to try to help pass legislation that banned partial-birth abortions, and the Supreme Court had found the partial-birth abortion ban to be unconstitutional based on a couple of things. One of them was the Supreme Court ruled that it was necessary to save the life of the mother or the health of the mother, and the other one was that Congress hadn't defined the act precisely enough.

So we went to work in the Committee on the Judiciary. I want to thank Congressman STEVE CHABOT of Ohio for taking the lead on this issue. We held hearing after hearing, and Congress had findings that a partial-birth abortion was never medically necessary to save the life of the mother; and that is with much, much testimony of experts before the committee for a long period of time definitively concluding such, and then the act itself was more precisely defined.

Then it went back before the courts, and each of the Federal districts that heard the case, three of them, simultaneously, all of them turned it down as unconstitutional. But it went to the Supreme Court, where the ban on partial-birth abortion was upheld. It has saved some lives but has put a small dent in this huge 60 million aborted babies industry.

We began to go to work on this in other ways. We have legislation that is introduced before this Congress that bans sex-selected abortions.

We know that there are mothers and fathers that will use the ultrasound to determine the sex of the baby. If they want a little baby boy and it is a girl, sometimes they will abort that little girl and try again for a boy. We know this is happening in places like China, where they have had, up until recently, the one-child policy, and the proportion of boys to girls is way out of whack in China because they are aborting little baby girls because they would prefer having a boy.

□ 1630

That happens in America, too, but not as statistically evident. It is immoral to do that. That piece of legislation has 77 percent support. That is the strongest support we have, statistically, for abortion legislation that

exists, as far as I know, in this Congress.

Then we have pain-capable legislation, little babies that can feel the pain of abortion when that needle with a saline solution is stuck into—Mr. Speaker, I am just going to bypass the details of how this functions. Babies can feel pain. They can experience joy; they can experience pleasure; and they can experience pain. We have legislation to prohibit abortion from the time that we can determine that that baby feels the pain of being aborted. But that is a definition of pain, not a definition of life.

If this is a unique life, as I have described at length here, then this unique life must be protected. We don't say this unique life which has this soul—and God put in this soul from the moment of conception—doesn't deserve to be protected unless they feel pain. What we are saying is it bothers our conscience too much to have a baby killed that can feel the pain and suffering.

I support these other two pieces of legislation that I have described: the ban on sex-selective abortion and the ban on pain-capable abortion. But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't get at the heart of this.

The heart of this is this: sacred human life. Human life, sacred in all of its forms, begins at the moment of conception. We need legislation to protect that personhood. And when we can define and clearly detect a heartbeat, a heartbeat in a baby from as early as 16 days, we must protect the life of that innocent baby.

So that, Mr. Speaker, is my conviction, my deep conviction, my very profoundly held conviction. But I wonder: What does the rest of the country think?

Sometimes I find myself out there right without a majority. Sometimes they will say: Well, you didn't have a majority because you weren't right. And this one, I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, human life is sacred in all of its forms.

So we ask the question in polling across America: What do the American people think of the proposal to ban abortion once a heartbeat can be detected? Mr. Speaker, the polling that we have out there is very carefully done, and I am going to give you the numbers first. This is the general number that asks the question, if the heartbeat is detected, the baby is protected, and here is how the polling came together. Sixty-nine percent agree with the position that I have just taken here in the bill that I have introduced, which is H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017.

The data contained in this polling report are responses to a question that was commissioned by Faith2Action. That is in a Barna Group OmniPoll. 1,002 interviews were conducted of U.S. adults nationwide. The sampling error for this 1,002 interviews is plus or minus 3.1 percent. That is about as accurate as you get with polling. That means that there is a 95 percent confidence level that these numbers are right.

The data is weighted in the national distribution of U.S. adults. They took minimal statistical weighting and they used it to calibrate the samples—so, of known population percentages—and it is in relation to the demographic variables of age, gender. I bet it is age, sex, education, and region, so that it is scientifically applied. It is a poll that was run from January 19 until January 27. This is pretty fresh information, about as fresh as it gets.

These interviews were conducted over a majority landline—60 percent or so off landlines and 40 percent off cell phones or other mobile devices, so that we got a good cross section of people throughout that. They were conducted by experienced, trained interviewers. They were supervised at all times. They were monitored. They were computer-assisted telephone interviewing to make sure that the balance of this thing was as good and as objective as it could get, Mr. Speaker.

So this polling result says, among U.S. adults nationwide, a slight majority, 55 percent, agree strongly that, if a doctor is able to detect the heartbeat of an unborn baby, that baby should be legally protected—that is the core of the question that was asked—and 18 percent disagree either strongly or somewhat with this.

So when I look at the numbers here, 69 percent overall are packaged up within the agree strongly component—fifty-five percent. Now, that is landslide in a political election, 55 percent. And this will be a landslide in the polling that says 55 percent strongly agree that, if a doctor can detect a heartbeat, the unborn baby should be protected by law, a 55 percent landslide majority, Mr. Speaker. And then you add to that the 14 percent who agree somewhat with this.

So, from a general agreement standpoint, 69 percent, or as close as you can get and not exactly hit the number, 7 in 10 Americans say let's protect those lives of those innocent, unborn babies when you can hear their heartbeat.

The people who disagree strongly are only 10 percent. And then those who disagree somewhat are another 8 percent; 18 percent disagreeing on the other side, but only 10 percent disagree strongly.

So 55 percent say they strongly support a ban on abortion, once a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected, and only 10 percent disagree with that strongly. I am going to say that they are probably some of the hardcore leftists that I am engaged in debate with on almost a daily basis with here, Mr. Speaker. But you can divide 10 percent into 55 percent and say, for everyone out here who says we should not protect that innocent, unborn baby whose heart is beating, for everyone who says that, there are five and a half Americans who say we have to protect, we have got an obligation to, and they believe strongly that we protect the lives of those innocent, unborn babies with a heartbeat.

That is a huge majority on the side of life. I am very gratified to know that that is the position of the American people, with only a 3.1 percent margin of error in a scientific poll that I am happy now is part of the RECORD in the United States Congress.

I would say there is another way to analyze this poll. I am looking at this one that says there are 13 percent undecided, Mr. Speaker. So you have 69 percent who agree altogether, and you have got 18 percent that disagree altogether, and 13 percent that neither agree nor disagree. Now, I always wonder, when we are doing polling, why do we measure those without an opinion? If they don't agree or disagree, that is about the definition of ambivalent. They call that mox nix where I come from.

So if I take that out of there and calculate it the other way and put it together, you add together 69 percent and 18 percent, and then you say what percentage are those that agree, well, it is actually 79.3 percent say we should not abort a baby whose heart is beating, and 20.7 percent say, well, it would be okay with them if we did. That is another way of measuring this. And that is a 4-to-1 measure—5.5-to-1, 4-to-1 Americans are ready to protect innocent, unborn human life.

Mr. Speaker, think what this means. Think what it means that we are a society that seems to have plugged our ears to the understanding that life begins at conception. I have known this for a long time. It wasn't a mystery to me.

I see the beautiful little baby going out now. Mr. Speaker, that is a very gratifying thing to see from down here, parents raising their children right.

But from my standpoint, I have this memory. Marilyn and I were married in 1972. I remember sitting there in card club, and the discussion at that time was we have all these babies being born in Central America and why do they have these babies if they can't feed them? Why don't they just abort them? I remember that discussion around card club on a Friday night.

It didn't really trigger me at the time because we hadn't been very far into the abortion debate. I hadn't thought about it very much. We weren't parents, and Marilyn wasn't pregnant at the time. We were just married.

So I remember that discussion though, and it just didn't hit me. It just kind of went through. I don't even know if I engaged in it. I just remember that somebody at the table said, well, if they can't feed them, why don't they just have an abortion?

Well, not very long after that our first child was born. And I picked up that little baby—actually, he wasn't little. He was just a little bit short of 9 pounds. But I looked at him, and I

was in such awe of the miracle of that little boy, that little baby boy named David. There was an aura about him. He was a product of Marilyn and me from our love. And there he is, a miraculous little child in my hands, warm and squirmy and soft and beautiful and a miracle. It is different if it is somebody else's child, I suppose, because it hadn't hit me like that. But there was an aura about this little baby, and you could have convinced me he was the second coming of Jesus Christ, himself.

And I looked at him and I thought, how could anyone take this little miracle's life? How could they kill this baby now? He is minutes old. How could they take his life the minute before he is born? No one could do that—well, almost no one. Could they take his life the minute after he was born? Or could they take it the minute before he was born? Or could someone take his life an hour before he was born or a day? Or could they take it a week before he was born or a month or one trimester or two trimesters or 8 months or 36 weeks or 37 weeks before he was born? What changed? What changed throughout that time?

In a matter of minutes, it all fell into place for me. From the moment of conception he was formed in his mother's womb, and from that point on he is growing on the genetic configuration that he is, blessed with a soul placed in him at that moment. That little boy grew from that point on, and now he is the father of three of my grandchildren. They are all miracles to me. And our other sons are all miracles to me, and our other grandchildren are all miracles to me.

But I can't conceive of doing anything except sacrificing, if I needed to, my life to protect them because they are unique human beings, worthy of all of the protection that society can give them, just like every American is; and, in fact, everybody on this planet is seen in God's eyes.

There has to be a moment that our lives begin. We have to choose that because we can't have an immoral position coming out of law that says, well, it is up to the mother to decide whether this baby is going to have an opportunity to fill its lungs full of free air and scream for its own mercy. They can't do that from the moment of conception, but they can do that from the moment of birth. And if we could hear that inner womb scream at that moment of abortion, we would plug our ears in terror and fright at the crime that abortion is.

So it is our moral obligation to protect all human life from the moment of conception until natural death. That is what this bill does, H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017.

The polling that we have here says clearly that the American people agree. And it is not only, Mr. Speaker, the American people—well, it is actually in the polling. But I separated them out into categories so we could understand how people think about this and how they think about it from the categories of being Republicans and Democrats and no party or Independents.

As you can see, among the Republicans, 86 percent agree that, if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. That is 86 to 6 percent disagree. Eighty-six percent of Republicans, that is about as high a number as you see on anything.

I should run a little measure sometime when you ask, does the Sun come up in the east. That is probably about only a 97 percent issue. But it is 86 percent want to protect a baby with a heartbeat—Republicans.

Democrats, still that landslide majority of 55 percent of Democrats want to protect a baby from the moment a heartbeat can be detected—25 percent say no, 55 percent say yes. It is more than a 2-to-1 support among Democrats to support the language that is in this bill for H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act.

And then when you go among Independents, they are a little more pro-life than Democrats are. I shouldn't be surprised at that. Sixty-one percent of Independents want to protect a baby from the moment that their heartbeat can be detected.

□ 1645

This is a huge issue for America. America is not yet informed enough about this legislation that is available. And sometimes we get stuck in a rut and we decide, well, we have been working on the sex-selective legislation or the pain-capable legislation, or we have been trying to get Planned Parenthood defunded—which this Congress must do—and we need to do it perpetually, not just annually.

Those are all things that we need to be working on, but it is time now for this Congress to swing for the fences, to move legislation that is based upon a clear and distinct principle of life. If that heartbeat of that little baby's heart, that innocent little baby can be detected, we have a moral obligation to protect that baby.

Then how do we measure the end of life? And how has it been from time immemorial? When the heart stops? When the heart can no longer beat?

Yes, we measure brain waves and we do other things. But when that heart stops and it can't be started and we can't sustain life, we call that death. And when an abortion is committed, that little baby's heart is beating. And you know that the abortion stops a beating heart. That is on posters by the Knights of Columbus and others all over this country. Abortion stops a beating heart.

We need to protect the lives of all of those little babies with beating hearts. We can detect them now with the ultrasound and the science that we have. It is time for this Congress to move.

In our March for Life here that I mentioned a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, when we have hundreds of thousands of people that come out here and gather on The Mall and then march to the Supreme Court building to plead for the court to protect innocent, unborn human life, what is happening is America is waking up. America is feeling the guilt, and we pray for the mothers who have had abortions. But America is also understanding that there is a life that begins at the moment of conception.

So of all of the families that have first bonded with this little unborn baby by seeing the ultrasound—sometimes by framing it, as exists in my Sioux City office for Joseph Dean Anderson's ultrasound—but millions of those cases across the country are raising the awareness of the American people, and it is not just the mother and the father that see that ultrasound.

They see it in realtime, and they hear the sound for real. It is not just a picture that goes up on the wall that is framed, but it is a living, breathing, moving organism where you can see that innocent little baby squirming and moving around inside in the amniotic fluid, and you can see the expressions on their face and the movement that is there. That this is a real human being and you want to get your hands on that little baby and hold them and love them, but you have to wait until they grow enough that you can do that.

But family after family has this, and little brothers and sisters are shown that ultrasound and they say: This is your little brother or little sister that we expect on such and such date—we have become pretty close with that date. And so kids, brothers and sisters, the siblings are recognizing their brother or their sister, acknowledging that they are an innocent unborn human being well before they are born. And they grow up knowing this.

Now, for the 44 years since Roe v. Wade, we have millions of millions of pro-life people and millions and millions of anti-abortion people who understand this. They grew up understanding this. And no one can any longer tell them that it is just a blob of a tissue and that it is not alive.

I recall a World War II veteran, one who I admired and respected. He has passed away now, as many of them have. His name was Vic Lunsman. We were having this discussion while we were talking about building terraces and tiling, and he said: When the pro-abortion people say that this baby is not alive—if this baby is not alive, why then do you have to kill it? Why do you have to kill it?

I thought he put that into a package about as compressed as it could be. We know that abortion ends an innocent life of an innocent human being that is created in the same image that we are recreated in, in God's image. And now we know from 16 days on that—it is not just that we know that there is a heartbeat, but we can hear it. We can hear the beat, beat, beat, beat, beat of

that little heart. And to think of that little heart struggling for life; to think of that baby squirming to try to avoid the abortionist; to think of that baby feeling the pain; to think of that baby being aborted because the mother or the father wanted a boy or a girl; or because somebody told them that that baby wasn't going to be exactly perfect, none of that measures up against innocent, unborn human life, sacred life, that life that we have to protect from the moment of conception to natural death.

That is what is wrapped up in this heartbeat bill. And if we had the science to prove the moment of conception, I would be standing here with a moment of conception bill. We don't have that science today, but we do have the science of detecting a heartbeat.

And we know the sound of a beating heart is the sound of life. And if you can detect a heartbeat, if you can hear that heart beating in any of us, you know that person is alive; you know there is a spirit within us; you know that our soul is still within our body; and you know that there is a hope for us—at least whoever that might be whose heart we are listening to—to get up and to move about, to live, love, laugh, learn, reproduce, and contribute, to glorify this Earth in a way that we are challenged to do.

Yet, 60 million babies have been denied that opportunity and have been denied that gift of life.

What might they have done? What might they have done for America? What might they have done for the world? How many Presidents, how many Mother Teresas, how many Billy Grahams? How many people have lost their life before they ever had a chance to breathe and fight for it that might have solved the problems that we are facing today here in this United States Congress?

We can't deny that potential. We carry that guilt today, but the best we can do is end it as soon as we can end it. And we would end 90 to 95 percent of the abortions in America with H.R. 490 the Heartbeat Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you here in this Congress that this is a bill that has strong support in the polling that we have rolled out here. Eighty-six percent of Republicans say that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby should be protected. Fifty-five percent of Democrats agree that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. Sixty-one percent of Independents say that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. And of those who oppose it—at least those who oppose it vigorously—only 6 percent of Republicans, 25 percent of Democrats—and I am going to suspect that a fair amount of these 25 percent of Democrats, Mr. Speaker, are more for political reasons and that they wouldn't be able to sustain themselves in a moral debate on the topic. I think that may or may not be the case for the 27 percent of no parties.

But to put this back into summary, Mr. Speaker, here are easier numbers to remember: 69 percent of the American people, with only a 3.1 percent margin of error, believe that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. That is 7 in 10 Americans that take that stand. And that is one of the strongest pieces of support you can get for any bill that would ever come to this floor or any discussion that we ever have if you get up to that level of 7 out of 10, and only 18 percent disagree vigorously.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the people that listen in on this conversation between us have contemplated the central points that I have put into this debate and this discussion here this evening, and I hope they have thought about the principles that are involved. I hope they are able to carry this message along to their children and grandchildren, and into our schools and our classrooms, our churches and our synagogues all across this land, this profound belief that if Americans share; that we believe that human life is sacred and it needs to be then sacred in all of its forms.

The second question is: At what moment does life begin?

There is only one moment in the full development of a full human being, and that is the moment of conception. The closest we can scientifically get to proof of that conception is the sound and the detection of that heartbeat, which we all recognize to be the sound of life. That sound of life, that beat of that heart cannot be extinguished by a moral human being who believes that a human life is sacred in all of its forms, and knows that it begins at the moment of conception. And then we can measure the heartbeat and protect that baby from the moment that that heart has begun to beat.

Any doctor that fails to follow the directive in this legislation, in H.R. 490, any doctor that fails to search for a heartbeat and conducts an abortion without—or conducts an abortion in spite of that beating heart is facing a fine and a prison term up to 5 years, or both.

That is a respect for human life. By the way, we hold the mother harmless. She is also protected from any touch of this law. It is only the abortionist that is the subject of this piece of legislation that I have introduced. But it aims to protect human life from at least the moment that the heartbeat can be detected; the baby is protected. And this will gain momentum as we go forward.

The American people will understand what this means. I am hopeful that across our churches, across our schools, across our families, they begin to talk about the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017. And our little kids that grow up, as mine did—having once seen the film, that families grow up respecting the heartbeat of innocent, unborn human life.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention this evening. I yield back the balance of my time.

DISMANTLING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be with you this afternoon. I have a series of other speakers who will be joining me later in the hour from the Progressive Caucus, as we discuss some of the key events of the week from our perspective.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all the Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I love magic, and I bet a lot of people out there watching today love magic, too. Ever since I was a kid, I loved the cup tricks, the card tricks, and the rabbit coming out of the hat. When I was in college, I even used to entertain at elementary school birthday parties, helping to pay my way through college.

The key move in magic, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is the sleight of hand. I looked up the definition of ''sleight of hand'' in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, which defines it as a cleverly executed deception.

A sleight of hand is also sometimes called a prestidigitation, quick fingers, or legerete de la main, which is the French phrase for ''lightness of hand.'' It is defined as the set of closely related techniques used by a stage magician to manipulate the perceptions of the audience.

Sleight of hand depends on the use of psychology, careful stage misdirection, constant blabbering, and strategic confusion to distract the audience.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has been masterfully deploying sleight of hand ever since his inauguration. With his nonstop tweeting and his incessant mad antics, the President distracts us from the real action, which is what is happening here in Congress. We are witnessing a magic trick on the world's largest stage, the auditorium of American democracy. And we, the people, are the captive, bedazzled, and totally distracted audience of the President. The tweets are a massive sleight of hand distracting us from the serious destruction of public policy and law that is taking place right here in Congress.