

state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) encourages equitable treatment of Israel in international fora;

(2) urges United Nations member states to support Israel's future candidacy for the United Nations Security Council;

(3) encourages the diplomatic recognition of the state of Israel and robust engagement with Israel from all United States allies and from governments across the globe; and

(4) reiterates its support for a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security.

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas May 14, 2018, marks the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel;

Whereas May 11, 2018, marks the 69th anniversary of Israel's membership in the United Nations;

Whereas on May 14, 1948, the United States officially recognized Israel as a state;

Whereas Israel offers invaluable contributions to the international community, including to the fields of start-up economies, entrepreneurship, cyber security, military weaponry, counter-terrorism, intelligence gathering, airport security, agriculture, water management, arid-zone farming, medical advances, natural gas, and other technologies;

Whereas in 2000, with the support of the United States Government, Israel was accepted into the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) at the United Nations headquarters in New York, and its membership became permanent in 2004;

Whereas in 2013 Israel also became a member of WEOG at the United Nations bodies in Geneva;

Whereas WEOG membership made possible the election for 2016–17 of Israel's Ambassador as the chair of the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, and in 2017, Israel's election to the Executive Board of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women);

Whereas in May 2017, Israel was elected as one of the Vice-Presidents of the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas robust bilateral ties with Israel maximizes security, economic, and cultural benefits in the region, increases regional stability and builds confidence with respect to peace negotiations;

Whereas Israel maintains diplomatic relations with 158 nations and retains 79 resident embassies, 22 consulates general, and 6 special missions globally;

Whereas Israel maintains free trade agreements with the United States, members of the European Union, members of the European Free Trade Association, Canada, Turkey, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Mexico, Romania, Bulgaria, and Jordan;

Whereas Israel has been designated by the United States Government as a major non-NATO ally;

Whereas in 2014, the United States Government designated Israel as a "major strategic partner";

Whereas the United States and Israel have signed three 10-year memoranda of understanding, in which the United States committed to provide \$26,700,000,000 between fiscal year 1999 and fiscal year 2008, \$30,000,000,000 between fiscal year 2009 and fiscal year 2018, and \$38,000,000,000 between fiscal year 2019 and fiscal year 2028;

Whereas Congress has appropriated amounts in accordance with such memoranda of understanding, reflecting the two countries' shared priorities in the region and the strength of United States support for maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge; and

Whereas Israel's involvement as an active member of the community of nations benefits both Israel and the United States, and allies who share common values and promote democratic stability throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431) and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term effective May 14, 2018, and ending May 14, 2020:

Dr. Tenzin Dorjee, Fullerton, California

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Next week is National Police Week, so several bills will focus on supporting the work done each day by our men and women in law enforcement. That includes H.R. 5698, the Protect and Serve Act, sponsored by Representative JOHN RUTHERFORD. This bill would make inflicting or attempting to inflict serious bodily harm on any police officer a crime punishable by up to 10 years in prison.

The House will also consider H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, sponsored by Representative Mike Conaway.

Ronald Reagan said, "American farmers are the backbone of our country," and both myself and the data would agree.

Food and ag industries drive more than 43 million jobs, over a quarter of all American jobs, and U.S. farm exports generate more than \$300 billion in economic activity.

This important bill will reauthorize farm and nutrition assistance programs for 5 years, while making reforms to modernize key programs and better support rural America.

Since my friend often asks about items beyond the week to come, I would like to make this a bonus colloquy for him, and preview several items that are possible during this work period.

This includes H.R. 5674, the VA MIS- SION Act of 2018, sponsored by Representative Phil Roe. This bill would fundamentally transform the VA and the way American veterans receive care for the better.

I want to applaud Chairman ROE for his hard work on this legislation, which recently passed his committee on a bipartisan vote of 20–2.

Next, H.R. 3, the Spending Cuts to Expired and Unnecessary Programs Act. At \$15.4 billion, the bill represents the largest single rescissions request in history.

More importantly, this bill allows Congress to give our Federal budget a much needed spring cleaning to the benefit of hardworking taxpayers.

Third, H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act, sponsored by Representative MAC THORNBERRY. This bill supports the historic investments we have made to rebuild America's

military and ensures our brave men and women have the resources they need to keep us safe.

Finally, the House may take further action on Dodd-Frank reform, including potential action on the community bank regulatory relief bill passed by the U.S. Senate.

I look forward to both Chambers taking additional policy actions in this space in the coming weeks as we continue to improve access to capital for American families and businesses.

As soon as our schedule is finalized, I will be sure to inform all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information and for the bonus of a little longer-term view of what we might be considering on the floor of the House.

One of the things I didn't hear on that, and perhaps I asked the majority leader about this before, is whether the majority is expecting to offer on the floor or consider a budget resolution this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has asked before and as we have worked time and time again, the committee is working on a budget, and as they get through, we will bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, although it was not on this list, I wonder if we might expect a budget resolution to be offered at some point in time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Even though I gave him a bonus colloquy beyond the week in front of us, that does not mean if I don't mention something, that that item would not come forward. So as the Budget Committee works, I will keep the gentleman apprised of where they are and when the timing is for us to bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Of course, April 15 is the day set forth. Many times we did not meet April 15. Clearly, last year we didn't meet April 15 by many, many months, but I appreciate the gentleman's answers.

Let me say that I will be joining Sunday night at the National Law Enforcement Memorial here in Washington, D.C., the ceremony to honor those who have given their life in service to our country as law enforcement officers. We ought to pause not just next week, but every week, to recognize the extraordinary service given to us by what I call our domestic defenders, both our police and firefighter personnel, and emergency medical response teams.

It is appropriate that we say thank you. They obviously have a very, very tough job. They get a lot of flack from time to time, but without them, we could not maintain the system of order that we have in this country that allows democracy to proceed. So I want

all of us to join, not just next week, but next week particularly, to recognize. We will have, of course, a ceremony on the west front of the Capitol.

We just had a ceremony the other day, which the Capitol Police conducted, remembering the loss of life that we experienced here in this Capitol to Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson in defending the Capitol and those who reside therein and who visit this Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, on the farm bill and on rescissions, the farm bill, as I understand it, again, I think pursuant to what the Speaker said after we passed the tax bill in which we gave 83 percent of \$1.5 trillion to the wealthiest in America, the farm bill is now trying to fill that \$1.8 trillion hole that was constructed by the tax bill by reducing benefits to those most in need in this country.

I would not so much ask a question of the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, but simply to observe that I would hope we would not try to fill that very, very deep hole that we have dug by passing that tax bill by taking it from those who are most in need.

□ 1145

I notice that, as well as the farm bill, the rescission bill was referred to by the leader as coming to the floor as well, and that seeks to cut a very substantial amount from the contingency fund for child health insurance.

The majority leader will make the point, well, that is money that is not necessarily expected to be spent. In fact, he wrote to CBO asking them a question. The CBO said they didn't think any children would be dropped off because if the contingency is not realized, no children will be dropped off. If, however, the contingency is, and there are no contingency funds available to do that, then, in fact, children will be at risk, unless we pass additional legislation.

I think it is unfortunate the majority is pursuing a policy now, both on the farm bill and on the rescission bill, that seeks to undermine the safety and security of those who are nutritionally underserved in this country.

It is amazing, in the richest country on the face of the Earth, we have people—one out of five children is going, Mr. Speaker, to bed at night hungry. We ought to be moving in the other direction.

This bill has, historically, been a very bipartisan bill. Mr. LUCAS and Mr. PETERSON, in the last reauthorization, brought a bipartisan bill to the floor. Very frankly, it was turned into a partisan bill on the floor, Mr. Speaker, when an amendment was offered and voted on by much of the leadership on the majority side, which would have cut \$40 billion from food stamps for those who are hungry Americans among us.

This is less than that, but I understand that the Heritage Action, Club for Growth, and Americans for Pros-

perity are opposed to the bill because it is not a deep enough cut, either in farm programs or in nutritional programs.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we hope that these will not be policies that we will pursue as a House of Representatives, or as a Congress, and, very frankly, we think the farm bill has little chance of passing the Senate. I would say zero, but that perhaps is a little bit too strong, but certainly little—so that we will be spinning our wheels to send an ideological message to constituencies, I suppose, that want to undercut the ability to ensure that people have food that are hungry in our country.

As to the rescission bill that the majority leader mentioned, Mr. Speaker, rescissions are pretty common. Rescissions are common and mostly done by the Congress of the United States, and we do it annually. In almost every appropriation bill that we pass, or omnibus that we pass, not so much CRs, but they have been present in CRs as well, that we have rescissions.

The Congress has also gotten, as the majority leader will point out, rescission requests from the executive department. Largely, those have been not agreed to by the Congress. Only in one instance has one President had even a majority of his requests acceded to, and that was President Clinton.

But the fact of the matter is, for the most part, rescissions have been pursued by the Congress of the United States, appropriately so, doing its job. And, of course, President Bush asked for no rescissions. President Reagan asked for a lot of rescissions, but President Bush asked for no rescissions—I refer to the second President Bush—nor did President Obama, notwithstanding when the Republicans were largely in charge of the Congress of the United States. And we exercised our judgment and did, in fact, do rescissions in the appropriations process.

Now, we have not had a budget. It is the middle of May. It is a month after the budget was to come forward. Our side does not see a budget moving, but perhaps the majority leader is correct, the committee is considering that, and that would be another place where the Congress could take initiatives and a decision to rescind various amounts of spending.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I said if there was spending that was neither necessary nor had been authorized over long periods of time, then I would have no objection, personally, to that rescission, and would think that we could initiate that action. But I would hope that, in both of these instances, we would not take actions which would adversely affect those who are challenged in America, either because of health reasons or nutritional reasons.

I would secondly say, and lastly—the majority leader, I am sure, wants to make some comments—60 percent of the budget that we passed, which our Republican friends apparently think

was too much, was defense. Not a single red cent is included in the President's rescission from the defense side of the budget, only the nondefense discretionary funding, the people part of the budget.

Now, I am a strong supporter of national security, Mr. Speaker, and I have been for the 37 years that I have been in this House. But I do not delude myself that every bit of money that has been appropriated—trillions of dollars over the last 4, 5, or 6 years—has either been spent or is not subject to, perhaps, the Congress saying, well, we put that money on the table but it hasn't been spent.

But apparently the President can't find a single red cent for that, but he can find places where we can undermine research for innovation, Children's Health Insurance Program.

I understand the leader is going to say that CBO says not a single child will be dropped. That may be true; but if we drop the contingency fund, which has been available and has been used year after year, either directly for health insurance or for related programs for children, then we will be at risk of hurting people whom I don't think anybody in this body wants to hurt. So I would hope that, before those bills are brought to the floor, we would keep those matters in consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those many questions.

I have got good news for the gentleman. If his concern is the contingency fund for the Children's Health Insurance Program, no need to fear. In the life of the entire program, the most that has ever been used, accumulated completely, is \$300 million; that is why we set aside \$500 million.

Go beyond the long history of it. CBO tells us they don't expect any of it to be used, but we want an insurance, just as we wanted this program to survive; that is why it got extended more than 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to remind my friend he voted against that. But we care about the Children's Health Insurance Program; we care about the taxpayers.

The good news is, in this rescission program, none of that money can be spent. And if you are concerned about it and worried about maybe you would make that vote, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the other side, she voted to take that same amount from CHIP in the omnibus to spend somewhere else, because you can't use the money, and we have already extended it 10 years, and no child is going to be harmed by this. CBO says it, all the way through, and we keep the contingency fund there.

But you won't rescind the money that you now have the authority to even spend on the program to give back to the taxpayers? That is what is interesting to me because I listened to you

closely, and we have had this discussion before about rescissions. It was just in our last colloquy.

I remember when we talked about rescissions because that used to be common practice. President Bill Clinton did it 111 times. President Ronald Reagan did it 214 times. And both Presidents, Mr. Speaker, had Congresses that were from other parties some time during their administration.

So when you and I talked about it, because you had voted for rescissions before, I wanted to make sure I got your input before ever talking to the administration because I would like to have your help on this. I think the American taxpayers would like to have everybody's help on this.

So I asked you in that colloquy, I was hoping that you would support this bill from our last one because you said, in our last colloquy: "I wouldn't irrationally oppose a rescission which said we've had money laying in an account that has not been spent for 1, 2, or 3 years. We shouldn't just have it sitting in that account."

Because in our colloquy, Mr. Speaker, the concern on the other side from my friend was we were going to break a trust; that we were going to take money from that omnibus that he felt a lot of people negotiated in, but, unfortunately, that trust he couldn't vote for.

You even interrupted me to say you believe that rescinding those funds was a reasonable thing to do. I agree that it is a reasonable thing to do.

So this administration, I think, may have listened to our colloquy, Mr. Speaker, because if you look at this rescission package, the largest one ever done, common practice from President Ford up until Bill Clinton, you asked for funding that has sat for the last 1, 2, or 3 years. But even in this one, we identified programs that have sat there for 7 years.

There has not been a loan in a program since 2011, and there is more than \$4 billion sitting there. Taking you at your word, you would jump at this. I should have asked you to cosponsor it.

Now, I hope all Members will put the politics aside and be able to support this because this is really what the taxpayer is looking for. This is really what this House has a history of doing.

I know you have brought up a few other issues in there, and I know, when you talk about the Children's Health Insurance Program, the CBO has said that "rescinding the unobligated balances would . . . not affect outlays, or the number of individuals with insurance coverage."

There are so many times I hear CBO quoted here, so I hope we would quote it here as well. In other words, this will have no effect on the CHIP program.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted earlier, in the omnibus, those who voted for it, and the leader on the other side did, it did the exact same thing with a higher number. So it was unobligated then and okay to do it. I am just not sure

why it wouldn't be now if you send it back to the taxpayers.

Now, I do want to, also, Mr. Speaker, know because we have worked on this CHIP program for quite some time. Now, the Republicans passed the longest and most generous CHIP extension in the program's history.

Now, for the record, my friend did vote against it, not once, not twice, but three times in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to quote an AP article from Andy Taylor, because you just can't make this stuff up.

"Just weeks ago, Democrats supported almost \$7 billion in cuts to the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, eager to grab easy budget savings to finance new spending at the Department of Health and Human Services. But some Democrats howled over the Trump proposal anyway."

Let me get this straight. Is it okay to rescind the CHIP program, Mr. Speaker, when NANCY PELOSI wants to spend more? But when President Trump wants to save the taxpayers money, with no effect on the CHIP program at all, is that what Armageddon is?

Now, I don't want to play politics, and I know you have mentioned a lot, and you did mention the tax bill, and you did mention April. There was more good news in America. It wasn't just that unemployment is at 3.9 percent. You know the last time—the whole time I have been elected in Congress—

Mr. HOYER. 2000, as I recall, when Mr. Clinton was President.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, 18 years ago. Do you know that the claims for unemployment are at the lowest point it has been in more than four decades? That is more than 40 years.

Do you know, just in the last year, 2 million more people have jobs? Did you realize the millions of people who actually got bonuses; or just in one company, 1.2 million Americans have a longer maternity leave?

□ 1200

And did you see the revenue into America's Government last month? It was the largest surplus in the history. The most revenue coming in.

So all of those colloquies we had of the fear of this tax bill, the one that allowed Americans to keep more of what they earned, the one that we promised would create more jobs, the one that would bring more prosperity, facts don't lie. America is in a very good place, and I am thankful that we had that debate.

Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, the others on the other side, there wasn't one of them who could agree with us. But I think today they can agree with the numbers of what it says and what it means; that we know for any American who has a child that is 18 years old and ready to go away to college, they don't have the fear that they are going to have to come back and live with their

parents. They are going to enter one of the strongest economies to find a job, of course, in their lifetime, but maybe almost in one of the best times we have seen in ours.

So, yes, I am excited about this. I am also excited about the idea of bringing a tradition back that saves the taxpayers money, one that, Mr. Speaker, my friend has voted for before, one that protects the CHIP program by setting aside, on a contingency basis, more than what has ever been asked for in the history of it, \$500 million when only \$300 million it has, and even though they say not one dollar would be spared. So we have the reserve there for it.

I am excited that the administration listened to our colloquy, took my friend's wisdom and advice that he would look at any accounts that sat there 1, 2, and even 7 years that was unobligated, to be able to save the taxpayer money. And I look forward to when that is on the floor so that we can vote on it together and show the American public that we are serious about saving taxpayers money.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He mentioned a number of facts.

Economically, I think all of us can be happy that unemployment is down. The gentleman then mentioned that there are less unemployment requests being made.

Is the gentleman aware that, in 2016, we created 400,000 more jobs than we created in 2017? Is the gentleman aware of that fact? That is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman realize that there are 2 million more people in the workforce in less than a year?

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman understand that more than 5 million people got a bonus that, Mr. Speaker, some people on the other side thought was crumbs?

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman understand that the 3.9 percent unemployment rate, many Americans have not seen that in almost two decades?

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman understand that we just watched last night our President at Andrews Air Force Base bring back three Americans that were held in prison in North Korea, and for the first time since that conflict has gone on there is an opportunity to end that war?

So, yes, I think some of our best days are right now; but with the potential of what we have not only with our tax bill, but, if we get our farm bill moving where we help individuals to get into that workforce, because that unemployment is so low, I do believe the best days are in front of us.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I presume the answer is the gentleman did not know that there were 400,000 more jobs

created in 2016 than were created in 2017. I didn't get the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

Let me ask, however, if the gentleman is convinced that there is not a single nickel that can be rescinded from the Defense Department budgets over the last 10 years, trillions of dollars of money, and that only the non-defense side of the budget is subject to rescissions, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman of the opinion that there are no sums available from the defense budget to try to fill the \$1.8 trillion hole created by the tax bill?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I remember what the gentleman said. The gentleman is very concerned about the trust that we would have because of the months that went into the omnibus, that we would break this trust, even though those who negotiated, still some did not vote for it. But in that omnibus, because defense had been cut more than 20 percent, because when I wake up this morning and I see rockets flying from Syria into Israel, when we watch the world become unsafe, it is not 20 percent safer. We made an investment into military.

The gentleman does not want any cuts to go into that process, but my question to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is there any cut in the rescission the gentleman supports, because I took him at his word.

I said to the administration: I just had a great conversation in a colloquy that the gentleman on the other side said of course he would look at anything that was 1, 2, 3, or further years that was unobligated.

That is the only thing that is in the rescission. The easiest way not to save taxpayers money is to find something that is not in the bill that you just really need.

The gentleman laid out in a colloquy what he wanted in a rescission. It did not deal with the omnibus because the gentleman is worried about the trust. The gentleman said he would look at anything from 1, 2, 3, or further. That is the only thing in here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend: Is there anything in the rescission bill that he could support by giving the taxpayers more money back?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, of course the answer to that question is yes.

Mr. Speaker, as I have explained to the majority leader, the Congress has rescinded billions of dollars through the years, and I have voted for rescissions that have been sent down by Presidents of the United States, and there may well be rescissions that are sent down that I could support.

I do not intend to support rescissions, Mr. Speaker, that I view as undermining children's health. I know what the majority leader says: nobody is going to be hurt.

Now, interestingly enough, in that answer, he does not answer my ques-

tion except we all want a strong defense. Nobody on this floor has longer supported Israel's right to be safe and defended than I have.

The issue is I asked the majority leader this does not include a single red cent of rescissions from the trillions of dollars to the Defense Department, not because I want to undermine the Defense Department any more than he says he wants to undermine children's health, but this is not about rescissions, per se. What it is about is the flack that the majority party is getting, that the President is getting from the Club for Growth, from Heritage Action, from Americans for Prosperity, saying: Your budget was too big. The omnibus was too big. We don't like it. Show some fiscal discipline.

So in an effort to show fiscal discipline, who do they go after? The Children's Health Insurance Program.

He can say it all he wants, but he well knows, and the appropriators will tell him, Mr. Speaker, that that money has been used on an ongoing basis by the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee and by the Appropriations Committee to backfill in places where there were clearly shortages on services to children and families.

The gentleman may want to say whether or not he believes—because outlays are not affected, he says—that, in fact, this rescission will lower the nondefense discretionary baseline in 2019. That is what I think the real purpose is, Mr. Speaker, and that is why the majority leader has not answered the question about whether there is a single cent to save the taxpayer money—we all want to save the taxpayer money—out of the Defense Department side of the budget or whether that is simply sacrosanct and not worthy of oversight by the Congress or by the President.

That was my question. It was not answered, and I regret that.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has any idea, because I know he has served on the Appropriations Committee, please offer up, like any Member can, what he would cut or what he wants to find as savings. I will look in any department anywhere to find a savings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman show me where in the CHIP program—because, one, you cannot use these funds; two, the contingency base is more than what has ever been used in the history of it—show me where the Children's Health Insurance Program, because no one is saying it. No one can show that it is. Please point it out to us.

You do not have the authority to spend this money. We put a contingency fund, set aside, and looked at the history of the program. The most that was ever used was \$300 million, so we keep \$500 million in reserve.

If the gentleman could explain to me why, then, for those who voted for the omnibus on your side of the aisle, would you make a larger, same amount, and the argument then to take that money in the omnibus but not now, why is it different?

Why is it different when the taxpayers will save money into an account you cannot spend, you don't have the legal authority to, and it is just sitting there, and it goes to the criteria of what you laid out, 1, 2, 3, or 4?

The great thing about a rescission, this doesn't have to be the only one. So if you want to work with us and you find areas that you want to find savings to the taxpayers, I will make myself available to have those meetings.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is the majority leader aware of the fact, when he says that the rescission was cut or the CHIP was cut, is the gentleman aware of where that money went when it was cut, or—I would say it in a different way—reprogrammed to other items in the omnibus or in the Labor-Health bill in previous appropriations? Is the gentleman aware of the difference between the cut and the reprogramming of money for a different objective related to the appropriation that was included?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, because if you listened to what I said earlier, it went to HHS.

But this is the point: Then the gentleman is acknowledging that you could not use that money for the CHIP program, so it is still sitting there. You do not have the authority for it. It is exactly what you said to me in a colloquy, just our last, that you will look at any account that is sitting there 1, 2, 3, all the way to 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the argument, if no child could be harmed, if the Republicans put it for 10 years, the longest it has ever been, you can't use the money, and we leave a contingency fund there.

If the gentleman wants to find a reason to get to "no," I understand that. But I am of the belief I want to find a way to save money, and I don't know what points the gentleman tries to bring up and say it is political. No.

The whole time I have been in this House, I have always held to the belief: It doesn't matter; we can find in any program waste. But this rescission program is about money that is sitting in accounts that you laid out that you said you would be more than willing to look at, and that is what we have done, and I hope you would be able to keep your word and vote for it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not answered either one of my questions, A, whether there was a single red cent available in the Defense Department for rescission, because that money has been laying there 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 years. Is there a single red cent there? B, he did not answer the question whether or not this rescission will adversely impact the discretionary baseline for the 2019 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. Did the gentleman yield to me? On what point?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I did yield to the gentleman about the single red cent, because all of this deals on the nondefense side of the budget, which is, by the way, the smallest part of the budget.

The gentleman keeps saying we need to make sure we do these cuts. He wasn't as concerned, apparently, about balancing our budget when he cut \$1.8 trillion, \$1.5 trillion—\$1.8 trillion when you include the interest. I know they say it is going to pay for itself. I have been here a long time. They have said that before. It never has paid for itself.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will not answer those two questions: Is there not a single red cent in the Defense budget; are they looking at the Defense budget to see whether or not we put money on the table that is either no longer necessary or has not been used for a significant period of time—that seems to be his rationale—or, secondly, whether or not it is going to have an adverse effect on the budget deal that was reached in terms of where the non-defense discretionary spending base will be for the 2019 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I will answer any question he has or any other reason why he finds a way you can't save taxpayers money, but let me answer your questions.

Since we don't touch FY18 funds, it does not affect FY19 baseline.

Secondly, I said earlier, the gentleman is a Member of this Congress. Rescissions do not have to be a one-time offer. If you have any ability or any ideas, I am more than willing to work with you. I am more than willing to work in the future not just on that line, but others as well.

□ 1215

Mr. HOYER. Is the gentleman aware that there are \$95 billion of unobligated funds in the Department of Defense?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is great. Will the gentleman offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the majority leader—he wants to do these rescissions. Congress usually does these. They do them in the appropriations process, and that is fine. Presidents have also done that.

My question to him was: If you want to see rescissions, and—as he has quoted me over, and over, and over again—funds that are not necessary, not needed, not going to be spent, obviously, we will consider rescissions for those.

However, what I have asked the gentleman is, you make the assessment. Very frankly, the first time we make a rescission suggestion on defense, he will stand up, or others on his side will

stand up, and say: See, they are against defense.

I am strongly for our national security, and I always have been. But I think it is perverse in the farm bill to look at people who need nutritional help. This CHIP program, if there is \$500 million as he claims, and he is probably accurate—I don't want to assess the gentleman's saying something inaccurate—but clearly, these funds have been used for other issues almost annually by the Appropriations Committee. Mr. COLE would say that. Mrs. LOWEY would say that.

I would expect, Mr. Speaker, for both the President and the majority to propose where those \$95 billion in unobligated funds might also add to his desire to make sure that taxpayers get some money back that is not being used.

I yield to my friend and then we will conclude.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman used Congressman TOM COLE's name, saying that he would say something. Congressman TOM COLE is a cosponsor of the rescission bill.

He is an appropriator, just as Congresswoman KAY GRANGER, Congressman TOM GRAVES. They are all on the Appropriations Committee, and they are all cosponsors of this bill because they want to continue to look to ways that you can save taxpayers money.

I know we have gone around and around here. The question really ends to a philosophy. Can we find a place that we can save the taxpayers money, or can we only find the time that we will take that money when you can't spend it and spend it someplace else? I believe we could take money that you cannot spend and give it back to the taxpayer.

The gentleman brings up other areas. My door is open. I don't want this to be the only rescission. I look for any department, any area in government that we could find savings that are left over, that are sitting there. Or let's make it more accountable. Let's find savings in the current process as well. I am all for that.

But the one thing, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to is voting "no." That is the easiest thing to do on this floor. I can always find a reason why I am against a bill because something else was not in it.

What is in this bill today is what my friend said in the last colloquy. His argument against having a rescission package was all based upon the omnibus. So he laid this out. Then we meet that criteria, and then he is going to lay another reason out.

You cannot point to anywhere, CBO or any other place, where it states that the CHIP program is harmed. I am sure he was concerned about that, Mr. Speaker, when he voted against it three times, when he extended for 10 years.

This isn't about CHIP. It has nothing to do with it, because the CBO says it is all protected. We put a contingency

fund in there greater than what was ever used in the history of the program.

Mr. Speaker, what the real story here is: Can you take money and give it back to the taxpayers and save money, or do you always have to spend more in Washington? I think when the bill comes to the floor, the American people will get that answer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has mentioned numerous times that I voted against some of the bills that were offered on this floor, and he is right. He tries to make it as if I voted against the CHIP program. He knows that is not an honest representation, Mr. Speaker, any more than the chairman of the Armed Services Committee voting against one of those bills with me being against defense.

I was against it, frankly, because the Speaker and the majority leader made a representation in September that we are going to solve a problem we have yet to solve. And I am sorry about that. I think it is wrong not to have solved it, and we were told we were going to have a solution to it.

But the fact of the matter is, what I am saying is, the Republicans talked and talked mightily about deficit reduction and giving money back to the taxpayer. But if you break their bank, the money is going to be taken from our children.

And so they passed a massive, \$1.5 trillion tax bill, massive, and then they come here with nickel-and-dime programs and say they are going to give money back to the taxpayer.

I am for giving money back to the taxpayer. I am not for doing it by creating additional debt for their children and their grandchildren. I think that is not only an intellectually bankrupt policy, but an immoral policy. But we are not going to resolve it today. I understand that.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman just said nickel-and-dime programs. This will be the largest rescission in the history of this country. It is not nickels and dimes. It is the taxpayers' money. If it is nickels and dimes to the taxpayers, I want to save those, just the same. But this is billions.

The gentleman tries to make an argument that doesn't hold. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman argues that CHIP could be in jeopardy. The CBO says that is not true. The press writes that it is not true. I cannot find anywhere that this program would be harmed.

I listened to my friend on the other side explain why he voted against CHIP three times. His explanation is because he said there was a promise on the other side for some other bill to come to the floor. I can take him at his word, but my only question back to him would be: Then why does he vote for any bill? Shouldn't he vote "no" on every bill that is on the floor then, if that is the protest?

I don't understand why he would take it out on the Children's Health Insurance Program. I don't understand why, when we had the opportunity and we were able to achieve it, he voted "no" to get the longest extension in a decade.

Mr. Speaker, I know the American public will see through what is politics and what is policy and what is opportunity. Yes, we did pass a tax bill and, unfortunately, it was just one side that voted for it.

Yes, our unemployment is the lowest it has been in more than 18 years. Our unemployment claims are the lowest they have been in 44 years. Two million more people are now in the workforce.

If you go back, 9, 10 years, the participation rate in America was over 65 percent. Unfortunately, just a few years ago, it got all the way down to 62.7, the lowest it has been since 1978. But the good news is, it is on its way back up.

The good news is, Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans got bonuses where they could fix their car, maybe buy that new washing machine. The better news is, Mr. Speaker, that the revenues into government are even higher—part of what the argument was on passing the tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, it was even an excitement to watch President Trump sitting at Andrews Air Force Base watching three Americans get off an airplane that have been in prison in North Korea, released on the hopes that the war and the battle of North Korea against South Korea can end, and that the President has announced that he has a location and time for that meeting.

Yes, the world looks brighter. But there are still places around the world that are not safe. And, yes, we did make an investment into the military that I am very proud of. I actually voted for that bill. People will say a lot of people negotiated. Some that negotiated didn't vote for it in the end.

So, Mr. Speaker, I try to listen to the other side and I take what they say very seriously. When I heard in our last colloquy that a rescission bill had to be made on those funds that have sat there for 1, 2, 3, and even 7 years, that is what we did. And I look forward to working on further bills in any department that anyone in this body would like to work on.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this administration will have the largest deficit increase of any administration in history. They haven't been here very long, so that is a prediction I make, and I am absolutely positive I am correct.

They are now trying to bring that down, as I have said, by going after investments on the domestic side of the budget, both in the farm bill and in the rescission package. There are clearly rescissions that are justified and that the Appropriations Committee and administrations have made on a regular basis. When administrations have made

them, almost invariably, the majority of the rescissions requested by the administrations—Democrat or Republican—have been rejected by the Congress of the United States.

But I am hopeful, as the majority leader says, that we can reach bipartisan agreement on rescissions that, in fact, make sense. I would also hope we could reach some bipartisan agreement on solving issues that confront this country.

The farm bill is a perfect example where it historically has been a bipartisan bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a partisan bill this year, as they made it the last time when Chairman LUCAS reported out a bipartisan bill and pleaded with his party not to make it a partisan bill. They made it a partisan bill and, of course, it failed in the Senate. It wasn't even brought up in the Senate. The Senate did its own bill.

So I would hope that the words of the majority leader about wanting to work in a bipartisan fashion will be realized with respect to all of these issues, including rescissions. And I would hope that we could perhaps have some rational policies to try to stem the extraordinary deficits that will inevitably be caused, as they have been in the past, by a tax cut bill that gave 83 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest in our Nation.

Without further ado, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LETTER CARRIERS' STAMP OUT HUNGER FOOD DRIVE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about an excellent event that will take place Saturday in communities throughout the Nation.

The 26th annual Letter Carriers' Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive is the country's largest single-day food drive. It is the brainchild of the National Association of Letter Carriers in response to the need they saw every day on their routes.

Letter carriers go into neighborhoods in every town at least 6 days a week, and they have a keen awareness of their neighbors in need. After receiving input from food banks and pantries, the letter carriers determined that late spring would be the best time for a food drive since by then most food banks in the country start running out of donations received during the Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday periods.

Known for its distinctive blue plastic bags, the Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive provides nonperishable food to local food banks, shelters, and meal programs across the United States.

One bag of food may seem small, but it goes a long way to stamp out hunger.