□ 2000

Deputy Nix was able to create a dialogue with the suspect and persuaded him to surrender peacefully. He did not have a firearm, but he was armed with a knife. The suspect was arrested and charged with domestic battery by strangulation and is being held in the Marion County Jail on $10,000 bond.

During this standoff, Deputy Nix and K–9 Drago accidentally stepped into a yellow jacket nest and were stung over 20 times. K–9 Drago was taken to the veterinarian's office to be checked out after the call, and he and Deputy Nix recovered and are back to work. Great job for everyone.

The K–9 team locates burglar, recovers approximately $3,500 of stolen property: On the morning of Thursday, February 1, 2018, Marion County Sheriff's Office deputies responded to Ernie's Auction Center, located at 5305 South Pine, in reference to a burglary that just occurred.

As employees were opening the business, it was observed that the front door had been forcibly entered and suspects were observed running through the inside of the business.

Deputy Branden Donahue and his K–9 partner, Tipster, and Deputy Nickolas Frost immediately tracked the suspect and located him within 30 minutes. During the track, two different locations were found where the suspects were stashing stolen items from the business. The stolen property, valued at $3,500, was recovered and returned to the businessowner.

People just don't realize the acute sense that these dogs have and why they are so valuable.

Another story is about Deputy Brian Litz. On February 7, 2004, Deputy Brian Litz and another deputy responded to the Pine Run subdivision in reference to a well-being check on a 74-year-old individual.

When the deputies arrived at the house, the individual met them at the door with a handgun. Deputy Litz was attempting to pass under the front window of the home to get a better visual on the individual with the gun. Unknown to Deputy Litz, this person was watching from the window, and he then shot and killed Litz.

Today, a statue in honor of Deputy Litz and his K–9 stands proudly in Florida's capital. In a tragic twist, Deputy Litz' call sign was Batman. Today, visitors of this statue at the Florida capital can find the Batman emblem on the bottom of his K–9's foot.

Just an amazing story and, again, a great example of the ability of these dogs and their success in helping out with people, whether it is the person in need, the lost individual, search and rescue, the drug dealer, and just people who want to do other people harm in domestic violence.

I just want to briefly talk about dogs and handlers. The Putnam County Sheriff's Office has five dogs: Aries, handled by Sergeant Randy Hayes; Judo, handled by Blaine Moody; Zeke, handled by Jerry Gentry; Halo, handled by Josue Garriga; and Putnam, named after the county, handled by Emmett Merritt.

Bradford County Sheriff's Office: Deputy Brandon Shoup and K–9 Grim.

Ocala Police Department: Officer King and K–9 Zorba; Officer Burgos and K–9 Babbo; Officer Arnold and K–9 Senior.

The Marion County Sheriff's Office, again, yesterday, we had the privilege of going down and presenting all the working dogs and their handlers with our Congressional Challenge Coin. As you can see, that dog looks rather well the way he is wearing that. At the Marion County Sheriff's Office, where we were yesterday, we got to have the demonstration on the catch dogs, or attack dogs, and we got a great demonstration. There are: Sergeant Daniel Trammell and K–9 Nitro; Deputy Alan Lee, who handles K–9 Zeus; Deputy Timothy Fretts with his dog, K–9 Robo; Deputy Colton Sullivan with his dog, K–9 Adelmo; Deputy Matt Bowers with K–9 Otow, which is named after a retirement village that donated the money for their dog; Deputy Jeremie Nix with his dog, K–9 Drago; Deputy Branden Donahue with his dog, K–9 Tipster; and as we just heard the story, Deputy Matt Hopper with K–9 Rambo.

The Gainesville Police Department: Corporal Jeff Kerkau with his dog, K–9 Roo; Corporal Dylan Hayes-Morrison and his K–9 Ares; Officer Rob Rogers and K–9 Nero; Officer Ed Ratliff and his dog, K–9 Ace; Officer Josh Meurer and his dog, K–9 Ranger.

And the Alachua County Sheriff's Office:

Deputy Sheriff Lloyd O'Quinn and K–9 Eins. We just heard a story about them. A Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and tracking.

Deputy Sheriff Esau Bright and K–9 Deacon, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

That is what a lot of people don't realize. These dogs are trained in multiple disciplines and just work their hearts out.

Deputy Sheriff Mikell McKoy and his dog, K–9 Kaos, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

Deputy Sheriff Brian Ritter and his dog, K–9 Kolt, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

Deputy Sheriff Chris Griseck and his dog, K–9 Mack, a Malinois working in patrol, bombing, and tracking.

Then there is Deputy Sheriff Bill Arnold and his dog, K–9 Wick, a Malinois working in patrol, narcotics, and trafficking.

I think we are getting the point here of how valuable these dogs are. I would recommend to people, if you want to see the value and why we want to spend money and allow these dogs to be in our law enforcement, military, DEA, then watch demonstrations of these dogs and the acuteness of them.

There is Deputy Sheriff Chris Drake and his dog, K–9 Rous, a Malinois working in patrol, bomb, and tracking.

Sergeant Michael Hurlocker, who we heard the story of, and his K–9 partner, Havok, a Malinois working in patrol, bomb, and tracking.

Deputy Sheriff Adam Diaz and his dog, K–9 Shiloh, a Labrador Retriever working with the Drug Task Force.

Sergeant Bryan Jones and K–9 Jerry, a Malinois working with the Drug Task Force.

And then there is Sergeant Nigel Lowe and K–9 Zoey, a mixed breed working narcotics detection in our schools; and K–9 Malzi, a Malinois just joining the sheriff's office as a gun detection dog in our schools.

It is interesting, after the Parkland shooting on February 14, we had a roundtable of law enforcement, county sheriffs, city police chiefs, superintendents, school resource officers, and one of the things that came out of there is how the resource officers in our schools act as a deterrent for a lot of the kids. They are there. They see a person of authority.

One of the sheriffs brought up what I thought was a great suggestion that a lot of people also thought was a great suggestion, and that is a dog that can detect gunpowder in our schools. Let them tour the schools, let them show what the policemen can do beneficially to all of us.

It is a shame that we are in a time in society where we have to worry about guns going off in school, but until we rectify the underlying cause of that, I think we need to do what we can to keep our schools safe so our kids feel safe going to school.

I just want to end with this picture. Again, this is the Clay County Sheriff's Office with their dog, Diesel, who proudly took our Congressional Challenge Coin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give a shoutout to all the offices that participated and shared stories with us. We are proud of them. We are proud of their K–9s. I don't want to say we are more proud of the K–9s than we are of them, but we are proud of all of them for the work that they do to keep us safer as citizens of the Third Congressional District, but also around the country and around the world.

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

STANDING UP FOR THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

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.

I would say in defense of the K–9 Corps—and I appreciate the presentation delivered by Dr. Yoho and my great friend from Florida, who gets common sense right in this Congress—that I am a fan of the K–9 Corps.

I am also a fan of the ''benign corps.'' And I want the ''benign corps'' to be thinking about what that means. It is not just a bingo game, but it is bingo for a cancer patient. So when you get the diagnosis of K–9 or benign, I am taking benign over K–9 because that is the thing that we celebrate more than anything else, is that lease on life, that if it goes 5 years, you are cancer-free. Benign cancer-free for 5 years, that gets the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for standing up for the K–9 Corps, and I am now going to stand up for the ''unborn corps.''

Mr. Speaker, I came here to the floor to speak this evening about this Nation and about a nation that has granted to its Supreme Court—sometimes just because we weren't paying attention or we didn't have the confidence of our convictions—I suppose there was a time when Americans were no better informed on constitutional principles than we are today. Over 216 or so years, we have had this experience of accepting the idea of Marbury v. Madison, a Supreme Court decision that over time, with accumulated decision by decision rooted back in Marbury, that the Supreme Court of the United States was the final word on what the Constitution says.

The Constitution doesn't say to the Supreme Court that they have the final word. Instead, it is court precedence, case precedence, that laid the foundation in about 1802 that has been built upon ever since.

The longer we accept the tradition of a Supreme Court decision being the final decision on what the Constitution says, the more deeply ingrained is the commitment to that decision and the less our Constitution itself means and the more the traditions of the acceptance of a decision of the Supreme Court means. So here we are today.

Mr. Speaker, if people aren't quite understanding what that means, I would describe it a bit of another way. There is a practice in this country called birthright citizenship.

There is nothing in the Constitution that requires that a baby born in the United States is an automatic citizen. In fact, the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1868, says: ''All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States . . . . ''

Well, in post-Civil War, they knew what they were doing. They didn't think we would confuse it over the years the way we have, but they wanted to make sure that the babies born to the newly freed slaves as a result of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Civil War would be American citizens.

They expected that those babies born to the former slaves would be full-fledged citizens with all the rights of citizenship bestowed upon them as those created in the image of God, just like everyone else. But what happened was, even though the amendment was there that said all persons born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are American citizens, over time, in the latter part of the 19th century, they began to bestow citizenship on any baby born in the United States. And it wasn't successfully challenged, neither is any case on point in all of the full history of the litigation that has taken place that has found its way to the Supreme Court. There is no on-point precedent case that determines that the Constitution requires that a baby born in America be automatically an American citizen, but the practice has prevailed.

The practice has prevailed along the way that a baby born on U.S. territory, with certain exceptions, is an American citizen, even though the Constitution doesn't require it, because the ''subject of the jurisdiction thereof'' clause that is in there meant a number of things.

First, that meant loyalty. Where is your allegiance.

There were Native American Tribes—called Indian Tribes at the time and still today—that if the children born on that reservation were American citizens automatically, they were automatically removed from membership in the Tribe. So the folks who drafted the 14th Amendment wanted to exempt them. That is one of the reasons they inserted the clause, ''subject to the jurisdiction thereof,'' because the allegiance of those born on reservations wasn't viewed to be equivalent to that of those born in the other territorial areas of the United States of America.

Then, of course, they wanted to exempt the children born to ambassadors, the children born to diplomats, the children born to their staff.

Could you imagine if there was an invading army and babies were born to the folks who followed along on that army, that they would be American citizens?

No. They weren't subject to the jurisdiction thereof. They didn't owe their allegiance to the United States. It was clear they owe their allegiance to other foreign princes and potentates, to borrow a phrase from the naturalization oath.

So the clause, ''subject to the jurisdiction thereof,'' exempted those who were not obligated to owe allegiance to the United States, but the practice persisted. It persisted to this day. In fact, some years ago, about a decade ago, we had hearings. In those hearings, the research, at least the testimony, said that somewhere between 340,000 and 750,000 babies were born in the United States where both parents, the mother and the father, were illegal, yet they have been bestowed an automatic citizenship.

□ 2015

And it has created this birth tourism where, back during that testimony time—now the price has surely gone up—if there is a pregnant mother in China, she could buy a $30,000 ticket to fly into the United States, be smuggled into the United States, get her OB care, live in an apartment next to the hospital, deliver the baby, and have that little baby's feet stamped on the birth certificate. And that little birth certificate made that baby an American citizen. Then they loaded the baby up and flew the mom and baby back to China, and 18 years later that baby could begin to petition to bring in the family reunification plan.

That is how a practice gets started that hasn't been successfully blocked because of litigation that would go to the Supreme Court with a decision made based upon justice.

So this situation persists. Three-quarters of a million babies a year, or more—I mean, the entire population of the Dreamers, every single year—born in America to illegal parents, granted automatic citizenship and the ability, once they reach of age, to begin the family reunification process and bring in the whole kit and caboodle of family into America and start them on a path to citizenship.

What kind of nation would do that?

A nation that is steeped in a precedent of habit—a bad habit—that persists in delivering a policy that is not constitutional but rooted in a murky understanding of what the Constitution actually says; I wouldn't say a dishonest, but a misunderstanding of what the Constitution actually says.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I think sets the foundation for the decisions on Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton and Planned Parenthood v. Casey and a number of Supreme Court precedents that built us up to this situation that we have today.

And I am speaking of abortion in America, abortion on demand in America, babies who have a chance to live outside the womb being killed because they are inconvenient. They may be, at the time, not wanted by the mother. We are seeing data that shows that a significant percentage of mothers who have abortions are coerced into that by the biological father who doesn't want to carry that responsibility.

And what is this based upon?

Supreme Court precedents that are—looking back on it, how did they ever build to the position that we are in today?

Back in the sixties, there was a case known as Griswold v. Connecticut. That case was one where a family in Connecticut, a husband and a wife—I don't know if they were parents—wanted to be able to buy contraceptives. And because of the Catholic influence in Connecticut, they had outlawed contraceptives in Connecticut. So they went to the Supreme Court, the Griswolds, and said: We have a constitutional right to purchase contraceptives. It is not the business of the State legislature to tell us that we can't purchase contraceptives. We want to take care of our own reproductive rights by managing our contraception.

So the Supreme Court stuck their nose in what should have been a

States' rights issue and came down with a decision that created, manufactured out of emanations and penumbras—not even whole cloth, but the imagination that there was some cloth there to manufacture it out of—the right to privacy. The Supreme Court concluded that the right to privacy would guarantee the privacy for the Griswolds to be able to purchase contraceptives even though the State of Connecticut said it is against the interests of the people in the State of Connecticut that we control birth through contraceptives.

That was their decision in Connecticut. If people wanted to vote with their feet, they could have left Connecticut. But, instead, the United States Supreme Court decided they had the power and the authority to manufacture a whole new right that doesn't exist in the constitution, a right to privacy; and a right to privacy guaranteed the ability for the married couple to purchase contraceptives.

Well, that was sometime in about the mid-sixties, and not very long after that the Eisenstadt case came up. It was this: An unmarried couple said: Why are we excluded? We have the same constitutional rights as the married couple has. If they have a right to purchase contraceptives because they have a right to privacy, unmarried people have also a right to privacy.

So the Supreme Court decided: We had started down the slippery slope and had granted this right to privacy and a right to purchase contraceptives and keep the government out of the private lives, especially the reproductive lives, of people, consenting adults. How can we deny the unmarried couple the manufactured constitutional right that we have always granted to the Griswolds?

So the Griswold case became the Eisenstadt case, and the non-married couples had the same rights as the married couples.

Along came 1973. Two cases came before the Supreme Court: Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton.

Roe v. Wade took that concept of a right to privacy that was manufactured, not out of the Constitution, manufactured out of thin air—out of the emanations and penumbras, which means in the shadows of, where the text of the Constitution is—and they decided that a woman had a right to abortion, and it was an inherent right rooted in a right to privacy: You have a right to a contraceptive. You have a right to put an end to the life of that innocent, unborn baby under the same standards of privacy.

Who gets to take the life of a baby, or a child, or a young adult, or a mature adult, or a senior adult? Who gets to do that by saying, It is only my business; I control that; it is my right to privacy?

But the Supreme Court concluded exactly that. But they did say that it could only happen in the first trimester.

But the simultaneous case that came down was Doe v. Bolton. And in the Doe v. Bolton case, they gave exceptions, Mr. Speaker, and said: Well, we are going to restrain this right to an abortion that we have created and manufactured in Roe v. Wade; but we really can't say that if the woman has danger to her life, she shouldn't be able to get an abortion. Sure. We will give her the right to abort her baby if it risks her life.

How about if it risks her health? What if it damages her health? What if it affects her psychological health? What if her familial relationships are going to be upset if she doesn't abort the baby? In other words, what if a young lady doesn't have a husband and it would be disturbing to her family for her to have the baby? We want to give her the right to abort the baby because it would upset her familial health, her family life.

And, of course, if it affects her economically and it affects her psychologically, it might affect her familial life as well. So if it affects her economics, her psyche, her physical health, risks her life, then abort the baby. She has a right for all that.

So when you take them together—Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton—it was abortion on demand, manufactured by the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Speaker, not written into the Constitution, but pulled out of the emanations and penumbras, the shadows of, that little shadow around the cloud out there that maybe we can't see it because we are just laypeople with normal perceptive abilities. We might have the best eyesight. We could have 20/20 vision. Well, we could even have 20/20 rear vision to see what is going on, but the Court put on their black robes, they looked up at the sky and they decided: We know what is written in that place around the edges of the clouds in the emanations and penumbras. We know that it is there because we want it to be there. And we can't read it exactly into the language in the Constitution, but we want it, we see it, and we are going to shape society around it. And they did.

And they came down with the Roe v. Wade decision and the Doe v. Bolton decision the same day: January 22, 1973. Abortion on demand. And how many of us at that time knew what that would mean, Mr. Speaker? How many of us understood the devastating debacle that was served up to the American people?

I remember those times. I remember those years. Marilyn and I were married in 1972. As we looked around at our friends, our contemporaries, there were young couples who were getting started and starting with their families at the time. We knew a decision came down, but we had no idea how bad it would be; and no one in 1973 would have predicted that, 45 years later, we would have experienced 60 million abortions in the United States of America, 60 million babies whose precious lives—perfect little babies, little babies created in God's image. No one would have expected that there would be 60 million on the conscience of America.

No one would have expected that we would hear the business community clamoring for labor saying: We don't have enough people to go to work in America; we have to go to foreign countries and bring in millions of people to do this work.

Nobody out here is even doing the math to say: What happens when 60 million babies are gone, ripped out of the generations over the last 45 years? What does that do to society? What does it do to our economy? What does it do to our mortality, the conscience, the guilt of America, the sins on the soul of the United States of America? What does it do to all that?

But what does it do also to the next generation and the next generation? What about the guilt that is carried by the people who stepped in and took the advice of Planned Parenthood and decided it really isn't a life and there aren't any repercussions—I can be free of the burden of raising a child that I had not planned to raise and walk away and life will be fine again?

What has happened to the people who bought into that story? What has happened to the—let's just say—family force, the workforce of America?

Sixty million babies ripped out of America, ripped out of the womb, ripped apart out of the womb, ripped out of America. Sixty million babies. Forty-five years.

Mr. Speaker, if you do a back-of-the-envelope calculation and you think, of those little girls who were aborted, many of them would be mothers again today, would be mothers by now—and I did a back-of-the-envelope calculation, and I will say that I just figured that, if each little girl that had been aborted since 1973, in those years that they would be of reproductive age—and some of them wouldn't be of that age yet; but if each of those who would be had had three babies, as Marilyn and I have had, that is another 60 million babies. Sixty million.

So now the hole in our society is 60 million babies plus another 60 million babies: 120 million Americans. You could dial it down a little bit. You could say, well, they aren't going to average 3. That is probably true. They could average maybe 2½ or a little better. If you take the 120 million and you dial that down a ways—I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the population of America was 100 years ago.

Let's pick the 1920 census. Mr. Speaker, 106 million Americans was the total population of the United States of America in the census of 1920, which comes up in a couple of years. It will be a century in a couple of years. 106 million Americans. That is how many we are missing today, all of that many babies, all of that many million developed adults, young people who would have lived, loved, learned, laughed, played, raised families of their own, gone to school and gotten educated,

started businesses, created jobs, improved the quality of life of all of us, enriched our lives.

The love that would flow from over 100 million babies growing up in America who were denied the right to life, the right to live, and were taken from this world before they ever had a chance to fill their own lungs with air and scream for their own mercy, that is the burden that America is carrying today.

Mr. Speaker, when that day comes that abortion is over in America and we respect and we revere life again, as it once was and one day ever shall be, when we reach that point, that doesn't mean that America is absolved from this sin on our Nation. What it really means is we can begin to put our pieces back together and build a history and a legacy of a love and a respect and a reverence for life. All life. Life from the moment of fertilization until natural death.

□ 2030

By the way, that life, from moment of fertilization till natural death, is the mission statement of the National Right to Life. The National Right to Life's mission statement—and I am not reading it; I am going from memory, so if I miss a word—says they are dedicated to protecting life from the beginning of life until natural death.

I embrace that mission statement. I embrace that ideology and that philosophy that shaped that mission statement for the National Right to Life, the country's oldest and largest pro-life organization. But I did ask the question: How do they define the beginning of life?

I looked down through their website, and it is defined from fertilization. Life begins at fertilization. That is the mission of National Right to Life, and we agree. I applaud that position, and I applaud the work that they have done over the last more than 45 years, because they formed themselves before Roe v. Wade, I believe, 1968. So they should be applauded for the work that they have done over the years.

But National Right to Life is married to a concept of incrementalism; and when you read through the statements, the testimony that they have supported before various State legislatures, the positions that they have taken, Mr. Speaker, become—and as I have done, sat down and talked with their leadership and tried to convince their leadership to be stronger, more bold, the same answer came back from each one of them that I talked to at National Right to Life, and it is this: they are committed to doing what can be done around the edges.

The Supreme Court has built a fence around what they call a right to abortion. There is no right to abortion. There is no constitutional right to abortion. It is manufactured, as I said earlier.

But National Right to Life, the Nation's oldest and largest pro-life organization, has built a fence around the Supreme Court decisions, and they are working with incrementalism to try to get as close to that fence around the Supreme Court decisions as they can without being reversed by a decision of the Court.

That is their strategic approach, and they have been granted a de facto veto power to any legislation that would come to the floor of the House of Representatives that doesn't have their support. I said ''de facto.'' That is the net result of it. In fact, that is the result of it.

So we have 170 cosponsors on the Heartbeat Protection Act, the piece of legislation that says, before a doctor can perform an abortion, commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat, and if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected.

We know, if there is a beating heart, there is life. And if there is a beating heart and you go in and stop the beating of that heart, you have ended that life. The most innocent lives that there are are those unborn little babies; and if there is a heartbeat that can be detected, the baby must be protected. That is the bill. That is the Heartbeat Protection Act.

But National Right to Life doesn't support, and they say it this way, Mr. Speaker. National Right to Life, they say: National Right to Life does not oppose the Heartbeat bill—does not oppose—which is a little bit of semantics, Mr. Speaker.

So I struck through the ''does not oppose,'' and I will put it there in exactly the same meaning: they do not support.

If you are the National Right to Life and you are committed to protecting life from the moment of fertilization till natural death, how do you not step up to support the Heartbeat bill that protects babies? From the moment a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected.

The rationale is: our strategy is not here on Heartbeat; their strategy is try not to ever challenge the Supreme Court of the United States.

So how can we have the Nation's oldest and largest pro-life organization that is entrenched in a philosophy and a legislative strategy that says that they are never going to challenge the Supreme Court of the United States? If you are not going to challenge the Supreme Court of the United States, then it is on your head and on the conscience of anybody, not just National Right to Life, but anybody who says: I am not willing to challenge the Supreme Court of the United States; I am not willing to challenge Roe v. Wade, Doe v. Bolton, or Planned Parenthood v. Casey. Then you are de facto accepting the idea that there will be—no, accepting the actual reality of a million abortions a year, as far as the eye can see.

This language here that says the National Right to Life does not oppose the Heartbeat bill, I say they do not support the Heartbeat bill. Both statements are true, but opposing challenging the Supreme Court decisions of Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton guarantees a million abortions a year as far as the eye can see over the horizon of history and out of sight, a million a year.

We have seen 60 million abortions in the United States of America in the last 45 years. This ratio that we are on today, if the population doesn't grow and if the ratio stays the same, and it sure looks to, unless we do something, we are looking at a million a year and, 45 years from now, another 45 million abortions. In another 15 years, we are back another 60 million, and then it is 120 million babies, and we know how that works.

Then those babies not born to the mothers who would have been giving birth to them, you can double the number again. But already we are missing the entire population of the United States of America of 100 years ago as a result of the abortions since 1973.

This Nation must step up to the moral principle that every human life is sacred. They are sacred in all of their forms. In fact, Governor Bob Casey, Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania, since passed away, God rest his soul, said: ''Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure, itself, against which all other things are weighed.''

Well, I am prepared and at least 170 House Members are prepared to go to the Supreme Court again if challenged. Pass the Heartbeat bill out of the House. Pass it out of the Senate. Send it to the President's desk. The President will sign it. The other side, the pro-abortion people, will litigate it, and it will end up in the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court needs to decide are they going to reflect and honor life. The 14th Amendment requires that we protect life, life over liberty; and, in fact, there are prioritized rights of life, liberty, and property in the 14th Amendment. In the Declaration of Independence, it is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but always life is number one, Mr. Speaker. Life is always number one.

This country must step up and defend human life. And I want to, from the floor of this Congress tonight, put a shout-out out in congratulations to the Iowa Senate, who moved a very similar Heartbeat bill by a vote of 30–20, passed it off the floor of the Iowa Senate with a 24-minute debate was all the longer it took, 24 minutes, and a 30–20 bipartisan vote came off the floor and got messaged over to the Iowa House of Representatives.

There they are in serious deliberations today. I don't know the results of those discussions. I left there last night with optimism that the Heartbeat bill in Iowa would come to the floor there soon, perhaps as early as next week. And should it pass, then it is likely to go to the Governor's desk.

I do not have her public statement, but I will just say that I have confidence that Governor Reynolds will sign the Heartbeat bill if it gets to her desk. She is a solid, principled, clear-thinking leader who is also pro-life, Mr. Speaker.

So we are doing the things that we can do to protect the lives that we can protect, but it is not good enough to play a perpetual strategy of incrementalism. Incrementalism of a little bit here, a little bit there, try this, try that, what has it done for us?

It has saved a few lives, it really has, and every life is precious and worth saving, but it is not good enough. It is not good enough to accept the idea that we are going to see a million babies aborted in America every year as far as the eye can see.

So that is why the House of Representatives needs to get the Heartbeat bill to the floor where I believe the votes are there for it to pass. National Right to Life needs to lead, follow, or get out of the way.

Right now, the number one entity in the entire United States of America that is holding the Heartbeat bill off the floor of the House of Representatives is right here, the Nation's number one pro-life organization, the National Right to Life.

Justice Kennedy has announced—it is announced, at least, and not by Justice Kennedy yet, that he is likely to retire midsummer. We will have a pro-life Court by September, and it is time to move now.

That is my message, Mr. Speaker, and I ask all of us to stand up and protect innocent, unborn human life, and let's start to cleanse, again, the soul of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through March 16.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delay.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4219. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services Under the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA) received February 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4220. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4221. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's March 2018 Chemical Demilitarization Program Semi-Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j); Public Law 99-145, Sec. 1412 (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1421(a)); (126 Stat. 204); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4222. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Michael S. Rogers, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4223. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Sean B. MacFarland, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4224. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III Fund for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4534(f)(3); Sept. 8, 1950, ch. 932, title III, Sec. 304 (as added by Public Law 111-67, Sec. 7); (123 Stat. 2017); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4225. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interpretation — Updates to Commission Guidance Regarding Accounting for Sales of Vaccines and Bioterror Countermeasures to the Federal Government for Placement into the Pediatric Vaccine Stockpile or the Strategic National Stockpile [Release Nos.: 33-10403; 34-81429; IC-32785] received March 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4226. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Office's report on discretionary appropriations legislation within seven calendar days of enactment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901(a)(7)(B); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 251(a)(7)(B) (as amended by Public Law 114-113, Sec. 1003); (129 Stat. 3035); to the Committee on the Budget.

4227. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities and definitions — Secretary's Final Supplemental Priorities and Definitions for Discretionary Grant Programs [Docket ID: ED-2017-OS-0078] (RIN: 1894-AA09) received March 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4228. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications [WC Docket No.: 14-58]; Rural Broadband Experiments [WC Docket No.: 14-259]; Connect America Fund Phase II Auction [AU Docket No.: 17-182] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4229. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Electric Storage Participation in Markets Operated by Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators [Docket Nos.: RM16-23-000; AD16-20-000] March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4230. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Essential Reliability Services and the Evolving Bulk-Power System--Primary Frequency Response [Docket No.: RM16-6-000; Order No.: 842] received March 8, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4231. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4232. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Iran, originally declared on March 15, 1995, by Executive Order 12957 is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—101); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4233. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4234. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-02, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4235. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-79, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on data mining activity in the Department of State for calendar year 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-3(c)(1); Public Law 110-53, Sec. 804(c)(1); (121 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4237. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,