

education in historically underserved communities and has been instrumental in Osceola County's "Got College?" efforts, which have resulted in an increase in the community college's going rate by more than 20 percent over the last 5 years.

Prior to joining Valencia in 2010, Plinske began her career at McHenry County College, rising up to ultimately becoming interim president of institutional effectiveness. A graduate of Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy, Plinske attended Indiana University Bloomington as a Herman B. Wells scholar, earning a bachelor of arts in Spanish and physics with highest distinction and honors. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, she completed a master of arts in Spanish from Roosevelt University, a doctorate in education technology from Pepperdine University, and a master of business administration from the University of Florida.

Actively involved in her community, Plinske has served as a board chair of the Education Foundation of Osceola County and as president of the Rotary Club of Lake Nona. She has also served on the board of CareerSource Central Florida, the Osceola Center for the Arts, Junior Achievement of Osceola County, and the Lake Nona Education Council.

In 2010, Plinske was recognized as one of 24 emerging leaders in the world by Phi Delta Kappa. In 2012, she was named Woman of the Year by Orlando Business Journal in its 40 Under 40 competition and the Outstanding Young Alumna by Indiana University.

In 2014, she received the Compadre Award from the Hispanic Business Council of the Kissimmee/Osceola Chamber of Commerce and the Don Quijote Hispanic Community Champion Award from the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Plinske was selected as an Aspen Presidential Fellow in 2016 and was named Pepperdine University's Distinguished Alumna in 2017.

And for that, Kathleen Plinske, we honor you.

HONORING KATHY WANDEL DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to honor Kathy Wandel.

Kathy Wandel comes from a career in transportation, which focused on sales, operations, and training. Upon her retirement, she and her husband relocated from Texas to central Florida.

She served on the board of directors for the Senior Resource Alliance, the Area Agency on Aging for Central Florida, representing Osceola County, and was board chair for three years. She also delivered Meals on Wheels for the Osceola County Council on Aging.

□ 1830

She became a volunteer guardian ad litem, helping to provide a powerful voice in court on behalf of Florida's abused, neglected, and abandoned children in 2003.

She was soon invited to join the local nonprofit for the Guardian Ad Litem Program in Osceola County, Voices for Osceola's Children, where she is serving as board chair. This nonprofit supports the efforts of over 200 certified local volunteer GALs, as well as provides for the unmet needs of over 500 local children while they are under the supervision of the court dependency system.

She is a longtime member of Rotary International's Kissimmee West Rotary Club in Osceola County. She plans on continuing to support her club's fundraising efforts through local causes, including the Adopt-A-Precinct program for the Osceola County Supervision of Elections.

She finds the Rotary ideal of "Service Above Self" a wonderful way to meet new people who share the ideal and work to give back to the community.

For that, Kathy Wandel, we honor you.

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

ABORTION IN AMERICA

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 have the opportunity to be here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I ask that people who are listening to our conversation weigh heavily on some of the remarks that will be made here this half hour.

I come to the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, to address the situation of innocent, unborn human life in America and to recount the path that we have followed and to lay out a path for the future that gives us a better opportunity to save as many lives as possible.

For me, Mr. Speaker, I recall that when 1973 rolled around—January 22, 1973—on that date, we had two major decisions that came down from the United States Supreme Court: *Roe v. Wade*, which most everybody knows; and the other was *Doe v. Bolton*. Of those two cases that dropped on us in January of 1973, not very many people, if any, understood the magnitude of the decisions that had been made that day or the impact it would have on the population of the United States of America.

They did not believe that we would see 45 years of pro-life marches coming to the city in the middle of the winter and sometimes marching through the snow from down on the Mall, all the way up to the United States Supreme Court building, calling upon the Supreme Court to correct the decision that was made by an activist court in 1973.

The bottom line of that decision was that an abortion was essentially declared to be, some would say, a con-

stitutional right for any reason or no reason at all, as much as you might want to parse the phrases in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, for me, I didn't realize the impact of this in 1973. But by 1976, when my first son was born, I remember holding him in my hands and looking at David Steven King, understanding the miracle of life and the miracle of birth and thinking within that first hour of his life how anyone could take his life now, this little miracle child with that big head and dark hair and blue eyes and gurgling a little bit and crying some and squirming a lot, but a miracle.

I thought: How could anyone take his life now, when he is an hour old or a minute old or a minute before he was born or an hour before he was born? Could they take his life a day before, a week before, or a month before, or a trimester before?

When could you decide that this child's life could be ended, and do so within a moral framework rather than a framework of maybe self-interest?

I concluded that there was only one moment, only one instant. We have to choose that moment when life begins. There is only one, and that is the moment of conception. We all know that. I knew it in 1973. I am sure I knew it before then, but I hadn't thought about it very much.

And here we are today and we know. We know by the benefit of ultrasound. We are watching little babies squirm around in the womb. We are watching them yawn and stretch and suck their thumbs and try to talk and stretch themselves and belch and do all the things inside the womb that they do pretty shortly when they get outside the womb. It is life. It is miraculous life. Little hands, little feet, little fingers, a little nose, little eyes. They are little babies that are defenseless.

This Congress has allowed a Supreme Court to impose abortion on demand in America, and we have worked to put together very few limitations on that abortion on demand. I don't think we have done enough, either, to send the message to America that life begins at the moment of conception. But ultrasound has shown many of us in this country—millions of us—that life does exist inside the womb.

We know that we can, even with a transabdominal ultrasound, verify a heartbeat in 7 to 8 weeks from conception. In 7 to 9 weeks, that little baby is formed by then with a beating heart. We know that of those babies that have a detectable beating heart, 95 percent of those babies will experience a successful birth. It is at least 95 percent. Some say more.

So 95 percent of them, or more, are destined to experience a successful birth. Yet the most dangerous place for a baby is in the mother's womb. It is the most dangerous place because our hearts are hardened by a Supreme Court decision that some think will not change, that we have to live with it

in perpetuity and accept the consequences of 60 million Americans being aborted.

There is a hole in the population of America that is 60 billion babies strong. Some of those little girls who were aborted would be mothers by now. When you do the math on that just on the back of the envelope, that is perhaps as many as another 60 million babies—a missing 120 million Americans that would otherwise have been born in this country and had the opportunity to live, to love, to laugh, to learn, to worship, to be mothers or fathers themselves. That is what we are asking for here in this Congress with 170 cosponsors on the Heartbeat bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), one of those cosponsors who is a bit of a rare commodity himself, a conservative from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed, pleased to join my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) tonight, who has been a very strong, tireless leader on this issue and many other important ones for our Congress and our country. So I thank him for that and for letting me be here to be a part of this tonight.

Obviously, this is a very important issue and we need to have a much better discussion than we have had in a long time in this country.

The moral of the Heartbeat Protection Act is extremely simple to understand. It is against the law for a physician to perform an abortion after detecting a heartbeat, other than to save the life of the mother.

Mr. KING was speaking a moment ago about this. For anybody who uses common sense, life begins at that moment of conception. At that moment of conception, you have a life. If you don't have a conception, obviously, you don't have a life.

So how is it that it is even a debate? How do people hide on the sidelines, in the shadows, somehow debating it as something like, "Well, is it really a life," or, "At what line do we draw that point at?"

That is an important point Mr. KING made as well with all the different ideas of when an abortion is appropriate.

We have a 20-week mark. We have the end of the first trimester, the end of the second trimester.

What date is appropriate?

We have people these days talking about partial-birth abortion not being a problem at all. Even in some extreme quarters, some people are saying that post-birth is somehow an acceptable way and that it isn't really a person with rights at that point.

We are talking about a much narrower thing here, with the heartbeat being a true detectable moment of life. When prospective mothers go in for those ultrasounds, it is a very moving moment for her, and, hopefully, her mate there with her, to see what is going on inside there with all those little baby parts that are being formed and the miracle that life is.

But it is really a telling moment when that prospective mother hears that heartbeat. That is what is so important in this debate about having the tool of an ultrasound to show what is really going on here, for those who try to obfuscate what is happening with the pregnancy. Let that prospective mother make an informed decision, not one that is hidden, not one that is obfuscated by, "Oh, it is just a tissue mass or something."

The crime about a lot of this is that a lot of these women are not being allowed to make an informed decision about what is really going on.

So this Heartbeat bill that Mr. KING is championing here is an important moment in time for a prospective mom and her mate to be able to have an informed decision and really contemplate this life that is happening and the downside of what that abortion might mean.

So, indeed, is it not a crime to murder a human being with a heartbeat?

It really shouldn't be any different for babies that are yet to be born.

Arguably, since they are innocent, isn't it more important we protect their rights?

They don't really have someone to speak for them, except for those of us who realize what we are truly taking about here: an innocent life with a heartbeat that will become a life outside of the womb and walk amongst the rest of us humans with dignity, with passion, with ideas, with dreams. That is what we are defending here.

It really mystifies me how legislation like this is so difficult to move through this body, the Senate, the Congress as a whole, or State legislatures in other types of bills we have tried in order to preserve life, to preserve the value of life.

Indeed, if we are not a country that is going to value life in all of its human forms, then what are we?

Our Founders placed a great value on those liberties that have formed this country. Indeed, right above the dais it says: "In God we trust."

I think God watches what we do here. He is watching what is happening to these babies and he wants us to tell the truth and know the truth and be able to project the truth on what is really going on with a pregnancy or those who are contemplating a very serious decision.

This bill will go a long way toward shedding the light on a quantifiable moment when there is a detected heartbeat that anybody around that ultrasound can hear. That should be a reality moment. I think more times than not, a prospective mother will make a decision for life, given that.

I commend my colleague, Mr. KING, for battling this for those who have lost their lives so many millions of times in the past and had nobody to defend them. But he is building momentum on this legislation and his effort with so many pro-life groups around the country, so many pro-life legisla-

tors that are onboard with this. We need a couple more of these national groups to get involved and not see the fog, but, instead, see the clear path that this is.

I implore people to contact their legislators and contact the organizations that are supposed to be standing for life and make sure they get onboard with this effort, because a heartbeat is a true indication of life.

I thank Mr. KING for his effort with this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman gives me a little too much credit and doesn't take enough credit for himself.

□ 1845

That is that measure of humility I was asked about earlier today. Trent Franks always said: The funny thing about humility, about the time you think you have achieved it, you have lost it.

Mr. LAMALFA is a solid principled conservative, and I appreciate him coming to the floor to defend life. The effort that we have had is the whip team has gone out and pulled together 170 cosponsors on this bill that has set the stage for a path that I believe soon will be to the floor of the House of Representatives. Let's put the Heartbeat bill over on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk. That is a good place for a lot of good things to have a chance to happen, even though they are a little slower at moving over there than we are over here.

One of the nimble folks who has been actively engaged in the pro-life movement in the House of Representatives is Mr. LAMBORN from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KING for his endless and tireless leadership in reminding us of the humanity of the unborn. I am a proud cosponsor of the Heartbeat Protection Act. I am one of those 170 who have stepped forward to support this much-needed piece of legislation.

The development of an unborn baby is truly miraculous. Around 6 to 8 weeks, you can detect, through ultrasound, the heartbeat of the little child inside the mother's womb; 6 to 8 weeks. So I don't see how people can deny that an abortion is the taking of a human life.

How many lives would we save if we remembered that simple fact?

What if instead of rushing to abortion, which some people think is their only option, we instead turned our attention to addressing practical needs, the needs of a woman facing a pregnancy decision?

What if we empowered women to carry and raise their child?

Or what if we did everything we could to promote a stable and happy life for the child through adoption?

America was built on the principle that life is a God-given gift. Here, in Congress, it is our duty to protect

human life at all stages. I will continue to do so, and I know Representative KING will continue to do so. I thank him for his leadership. I am glad that I can support him with this wonderful piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for coming to the floor to make such a strong message here on the sanctity of human life.

When I think about that heartbeat, a heartbeat is a certain indicator of life. If the baby has a beating heart, we know that baby is alive. Statistically speaking, 95 percent or more of those little babies that have a beating heart, that can be detected by an ultrasound in that 6- to 8-week period of time, 95 percent of them will experience a successful birth.

I have asked the question to those who weren't supportive of the bill: Did you ever hear the expression, "Let's error on the side of life?"

Well, let's not error with life at all if we can help it. If we have a 95 percent chance of a successful birth, we can't take a chance on ending that little baby's life.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bill that has come together over the last year and a half or so. Just to mention some of the points here that I think are important is that we have at least 162 pro-life organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. I have a little demonstration here.

These are some of the organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. We have to really search pretty hard to find somebody that is not on-board.

You can go down through this list. I could read these all off, but I think it would be a little bit tiresome and maybe a little bit redundant. I put this together. This may be one-third of—or maybe even one-fourth—of the overall list of 162 pro-life organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. It is nearly universal across this country.

Of course, we don't have Planned Parenthood on here. We don't have the NARAL here. The National Abortion Rights Action League is what they used to be. They say they aren't anymore, but, yes, they are.

We have the pro-life organizations here: the people who care about life, the people who understand that human life is sacred in all of its forms, it begins at the moment of conception, that we have to protect life from that time on, and that we have a constitutional duty to do so. We have an equal protection clause in the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution that tells us that.

But it seems as though the United States Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, upset that. They decided that a right to privacy, which was a manufactured right—I don't think I have it in my memos—but it is *Griswold v. Connecticut* back in the 1960s. It is a decision that a couple had

a right to privacy in order to buy birth control pills. It was in Connecticut in that period of time. Shortly after that decision, they decided it wasn't just a married couple that had a right to privacy; it was an unmarried couple that had a right to privacy in the form of contraceptives. That was only in the mid-sixties.

Then *Roe v. Wade* came along. I think that this Court can never be defended for the decision that they made, the idea that privacy trumps life, and that the privacy of a mother will allow for an abortion at any stage, is how this all came together between *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*.

But even some of our professors that you might think have been on the other side of the issue had their skepticism. In fact, there is a bit of it here in Ruth Bader Ginsburg in a statement that she made in 1985. Our Supreme Court Justice Ginsburg said:

Roe, I believe, would have been more acceptable as a judicial decision if it had not gone beyond a ruling on the extreme statute before the court. Heavyhanded judicial intervention was difficult to justify and appears to have provoked, not resolved, the conflict.

I would restate the Fourteenth Amendment. It says this: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

This comes back to personhood. I believe that a conceived baby from that moment is a person. We don't have the technical medical ability to define that moment at this point, Mr. Speaker, but we can define "heartbeat," and we have done so in the Heartbeat Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), who has been a leader and a fighter for life since back in the 1980s or so, when I was still in the crib.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. KING for his work on the Heartbeat Protection Act. It gives us an opportunity to reflect on some of those bigger issues that we have going on in our society.

This is personal to everybody. We all have our own stories of when we are in a family situation and somebody becomes pregnant. I certainly remember that when my wife and I had our first child. The first visit to the doctor when you got to hear the heartbeat was just amazing.

I remember also having a subsequent appointment where the doctor couldn't find the heartbeat. We were very concerned, very worried, so they sent us to the hospital. They wanted us to have another test. It is a small town we were in. The hospital was where they had the sonogram. My wife and I were praying all the way: Please, let this baby be okay.

Well, we got to the hospital and the technician did a sonogram, and, lo and

behold, we saw the baby, we saw the beating heart, and we were just in awe at this new human life.

Mothers and fathers are forever changed when they first hear that heartbeat, that tiny pulse that reinforces the big and beautiful reality of a precious human life.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise in support of H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act. As a lawmaker, I took an oath to our Constitution to protect the constitutional rights of all Americans. That is why I am cosponsoring this bill.

This legislation protects a pre-born baby's life when his or her heartbeat is detected. A heartbeat is a very basic sign of life. The pulse represents a unique person with inherent dignity and natural, human and constitutional rights that extend throughout the continuum of life through conception until natural death.

And where do these rights come from?

The Founders who signed the Declaration knew, for the Declaration itself says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

That is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because the first unalienable right that is identified is the right to life.

Do you know who else knew?

President Kennedy.

President Kennedy reminded us in a different context, in the struggle against atheistic totalitarian communism. He said these words: "And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

The right to life, defined in our Declaration, protected in our Constitution, and reiterated time and again by leaders across the religious and political spectrum, applies to every human life. It is easy to see who is human, if you look.

Twenty-six years ago, the late Governor Bob Casey from Pennsylvania, and others, including Sargent Shriver and Eunice Kennedy Shriver, signed onto a statement regarding abortion as true today as when it was published. Under the section of that document that was titled "Without a Doubt, a Human Life," Governor Casey and his coauthors observed:

From the beginning, each human embryo has its own unique genetic identity. Three and a half weeks after conception, its heart starts beating. At 6 weeks, brain activity can be detected. At the end of 2 months, the limbs, fingers, and toes are complete. By 3 months, the baby is quite active, forming fists, bending arms, and curling toes. At 4 months, vocal cords, eyelashes, teeth buds, fingernails, and toenails are all present. By 5 months, the baby is sucking its thumb, punching, kicking, and going through the motions of crying. By 6 months, it responds to light and sound and can recognize its mother's voice.

The statement went on:

Advocates of unrestricted abortion do not want the public to focus on these undeniable facts of fetal development, but the facts cannot be ignored. They may claim that abortion is a violent act, not against potential life, but against a living, growing human being, a life with potential.

Governor Casey subscribed to that belief.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Intentionally stopping a heartbeat is not healthcare.

H.R. 490 recognizes what science has already affirmed: that there is a baby growing in her mother's womb, one with her own distinct heartbeat.

Therefore, we have an obligation to protect the most vulnerable among us: to defend the defenseless.

How can our country continue to flourish and claim itself as a champion of human rights when we allow our society to rid ourselves of our own future generations?

That is why I came to the floor today to urge support for the Heartbeat Protection Act, to give our country a chance to reflect on some of the deeper questions and deeper values, to walk in solidarity with one another when one encounters a difficult situation, and to stand in each another's shoes with empathy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his eloquent words.

I hadn't heard the description delivered by Governor Casey in those years back. But Governor Bob Casey—God rest his soul—captured my attention years ago, 20 or more years ago. I had a quote from Governor Bob Casey, a Democrat, that I had on my bulletin board that I don't have to look up anymore. And it was this:

Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

It rang so clear and true to me that I cut it out of the magazine and stuck it up on the bulletin board. His words echo in this Chamber today. I wish they echoed in his son over in the Senate the same way they echoed out of the mouth of Governor Bob Casey back in those days when he was denied the opportunity to speak before the Democratic National Convention because he is pro-life. And we look today and we see this issue has been more and more polarized. I hope that we can be more broad with this and that we can be more bipartisan than we are.

□ 1900

We do have bipartisan cosponsorship on this bill. It is narrow, but it exists.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, this body to take this bill to the floor. 170 cosponsors is further ahead than any comparable piece of pro-life legislation. To have that many cosponsors and a good number of other Members who have said, "I am not ready to sign on the dotted line, but you bring it to the

floor, and I will vote 'yes,'" I think we get to "yes," but we need to bring it here.

There are concerns that, well, if we pass it off the floor of the House, the Senate won't take it up. Well, we know they won't take it up if we don't pass it off the floor of the House.

There is concern about the Supreme Court. Of course there is. We have to challenge the Court. We are going to live with the 1 million abortions a year in this country until we are willing to challenge the Court and do so successfully.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to see one or two more appointments to this Court in the next 2 or 3 or more years, and we need to get the bill off the floor, onto the desk of Leader McCONNELL so that it has a chance then to go to the President's desk, where I am very confident that President Trump will sign the bill. And then it has a chance to go—I am happy with it not being litigated, but we expect it will be litigated like every other effective piece of pro-life legislation.

I appreciate the attention tonight, Mr. Speaker, and the speakers who have come to the floor to weigh in for innocent, unborn human life and to lay out the path for the future that we have to follow here if we are to answer to God and country for that gift from God, which is life, in the first priority, then liberty, then the pursuit of happiness.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for after 4 p.m. today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and March 7 on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

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

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY2018 AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY2018 THROUGH FY2027

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. This status report is current through February 23, 2018. The term "current level" refers to the amounts of

spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits, as adjusted, contained in H. Con. Res. 71, as agreed to on October 26, 2017, for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2018 because appropriations for those years have not yet been completed.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits contained in the Statement of Committee Allocations of the Fiscal Year 2018 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017, for fiscal year 2018, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027. For fiscal year 2018 and the 10-year period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027, "legislative action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the levels set forth in H. Con. Res. 71 and the Statement of Committee Allocations published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2018 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending limits allowed under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

Table 4 compares the levels of changes in mandatory programs (CHIMPs) contained in appropriations acts with the permissible limits on CHIMPs as specified in section 5103 of H. Con. Res. 71. The comparison is needed to enforce a rule established in H. Con. Res. 71 against fiscal year 2018 appropriations measures containing CHIMPs that would breach the permissible limits for fiscal year 2018.

Table 5 displays the current level of advance appropriations for fiscal year 2019 of accounts identified for advance appropriations pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017. These tables are needed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of the Chairman published in the Congressional Record on November 2, 2017 and (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 5104 of H. Con. Res. 71.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregates in force.