

on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1009.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE FACES SIGNIFICANT READINESS CHALLENGES AF- FECTED BY BUDGETARY UNCER- TAINTY

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1010) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Air Force faces significant readiness challenges due to insufficient personnel levels, a shrinking and depleted aircraft fleet, and maintenance deferrals, all of which are affected by budgetary uncertainty and impede the Air Force's ability to meet ongoing and unexpected national security threats, putting United States national security at risk.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 1010

Whereas according to Air Force Chief of Staff General David Goldfein, the United States Air Force is "the smallest we've ever been";

Whereas according to an April 2018 report from the Government Accountability Office, more than a quarter of fighter pilot positions are unfilled;

Whereas the Air Force has just 18,000 of the roughly 20,000 pilots it needs to crew its 5,500 fighters, bombers, airlifters, cargo planes, and rescue helicopters;

Whereas this 10 percent gap in its air crew requirement could, as Secretary of the Air Force Heather Wilson said in November of 2017, "break the force";

Whereas almost 1/3 of the Air Force's aircraft were not flyable, or mission-capable, at any given time in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas over the last decade, the total number of aircraft in the Air Force has been on a downward slope;

Whereas the total number of aircraft in the Air Force will drop again from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2018;

Whereas the average age of an aircraft, forcewide, increased from 24 years in fiscal year 2010 to 27.6 years in fiscal year 2017; and

Whereas between fiscal years 2013 and 2017, accidents involving all Defense Department warplanes rose nearly 40 percent: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the United States Air Force faces significant readiness challenges due to aging aircraft and depleted personnel;

(2) Congress must provide the Air Force regular and sufficient funding to address procurement, maintenance, and staffing shortfalls; and

(3) without this funding, United States national security is at risk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), my friend and colleague, to discuss his resolution.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from the Cowboy State (Ms. CHENEY), for yielding me time, but mainly for her leadership on this issue to ensure that we as a country and as the leaders of this great Nation fulfill our most important responsibility to provide for a common defense, our constitutional first job, to provide for the common defense, and, I would add, to secure our liberty and the liberty of our posterity, because there is no freedom without liberty. So God bless the gentlewoman, and I thank her for leading the charge here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, H. Res. 1010, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Air Force faces tremendous readiness challenges, reflected in a shrinking and dilapidated aircraft fleet, insufficient personnel, and dangerous levels of deferred maintenance, all of which are due, I think, in large part, I would say, to budgetary uncertainty, which impedes the Air Force's ability to meet our national security threats.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important than the safety of the American people and the security of our country. To do this, it is real simple. We have to have a strong military. To do that, we would need to include a strong Air Force.

For the past 70 years, our Air Force has ensured that America's military prowess is unmatched in the skies, protecting our people, our allies, and our interests around the world.

I am honored to have Dyess Air Force Base in my backyard, the largest B-1 bomber base in this country, and I am proud to represent the brave airmen of the 7th Bomb Wing and the 317th Airlift Group, and all those in the Key City and in the Big Country area who support them.

I know that these men and women, along with all of our men and women in the armed services around the world, are doing all they can every day for our Nation's defense, and we as Congress ought to do all we can to support them.

I think it is a moral imperative to ensure that our sons and daughters, that our brothers and sisters who we ask to risk their families, to risk their very lives, I think we should, at a minimum, make sure they have the tools and resources necessary to be safe and successful.

But recently, because of our continued reliance on temporary funding measures known as CRs, or continuing resolutions, and the budget uncertainty and disruption that those create, we have hurt the Air Force's readiness and our combat capabilities.

We have failed, it is hard to believe, for almost 10 years in a row to fund our military on time. Temporary spending measures, coupled with continual defense cuts—I think it is about \$200 billion over the last decade—often delay procurement of important assets. Every contract, whether it is to buy a plane, repair a plane, fuel a plane, or arm a plane, is adversely affected by this funding start and stop.

But I think we could put it another way. This broken funding process, or budget and appropriations process that I have been describing, weakens our defense and plays directly into the hands of our adversaries.

□ 1515

Throughout our Nation's history, our airmen and airwomen have always answered the call of duty. They should not pay the price because Congress has failed to fulfill our duty, which is to fully fund our military and to do it on time. That is going to send the right message to our troops. That will affirm our support for our troops. And I think it sends the right message to our enemies as well, just as importantly.

Congress, though, has continued to fail to do this, and it has caused significant damage to our entire defense community, including the U.S. Air Force.

The Air Force has a 70-year history. This is the smallest and oldest Air Force—the smallest and oldest—we have ever had.

The Heritage Foundation's "2018 Index of U.S. Military Strength" rates our Air Force readiness as being merely marginal. With marginal processes, marginal inputs and resources, you get marginal results.

I think both sides of the aisle, my colleagues and my Democrat colleagues, would agree that our troops deserve better than marginal support. More than a quarter of our fighter pilot positions are unfilled, and there is a 10 percent gap between the pilots that the Air Force has and what they need to crew their aircraft, a gap that the Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson said could "break the force." That is from our Secretary of the Air Force.

Last year, almost one-third of the Air Force's planes were not flyable, and the average age of our aircraft is almost 30 years old.

Here is the worst part: Not only are we compromising our capabilities, but

aviation accidents, including fatal accidents, are on the rise. We now have four times as many servicemembers dying in training-related accidents than in combat.

Mr. Speaker, by June of this year, we already matched the number of non-combat crashes in the Air Force than we had all last year. Between the years 2013 and 2017, we had 133 military accidents leading to deaths. That is a 40 percent increase over that timeframe.

While our Nation's Air Force fleet continues to diminish in size and effectiveness, our adversaries, like China, are modernizing and expanding. The way I think of it, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to our investment in national security and our military strength. We are retreating while some of our adversaries are advancing. That is scary, and that is unacceptable.

As President Reagan said, weakness invites aggression. He also said that peace is achieved through American strength.

Our first President said that our military readiness is "the most effective means of preserving peace."

If we don't reverse this trend, we as a Nation will leave ourselves vulnerable at a time of escalating threats and increasing instability around the world.

That is why we need to give the Air Force the quantity and the certainty of resources that match the caliber of our airmen and their enormous commitment of that sacred duty of protecting our fellow Americans. If we do this, our Air Force can continue safeguarding the skies, remaining the greatest fighting force in the world.

Mr. Speaker, America is still the leader of the free world, and the world is safer when America leads and when America's military is strong. The world is counting on us. The American people and our allies are counting on us. Most importantly, our brothers and sisters in uniform are counting on us.

Politicians too often make the important seem insignificant and the insignificant important. There is nothing more important for the American people and the future of this Republic than what we are talking about here today.

Let's be leaders. Let's do the right thing, and let's support our troops.

Again, I want to thank Representative CHENEY, along with my fellow Texans, Chairman THORNBERRY and Chairman GRANGER, for their efforts.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, as long as it does not exceed 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas spoke boldly and correctly. If I could get a copy of his speech, as I will, I think I will use it myself.

He covered all the issues that I would want to cover in talking about the United States Air Force as a representative of two very important Air Force bases, Travis Air Force Base in Fairfield-Vacaville, California, and Beale Air Force Base just outside of Marysville, California.

I found myself not only in sympathy and empathy, but also marching right alongside the gentleman from Texas as he eloquently spoke about the role of the Air Force and the necessity of Congress to provide the adequate funding for not only repairing and maintaining the existing aircraft and bases, but also to expand and improve.

Certainly, I am looking forward to the arrival of the KC-46s to Travis Air Force Base. If Boeing will get that done, we will get on with it.

However, I want to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that funding for the military is ultimately dependent upon the revenues of the Federal Government, which are dependent upon the health of the economy. Those things go together.

My esteemed colleague from Wyoming, in her remarks on the previous bill, addressed the issue of how we tax and who we tax or whether we tax. An interesting point was raised about this and whether it is possible to tax too low.

A situation has arisen in the State of Oklahoma, where they thought they could cut taxes continually and everything would grow, and there would be great opportunities. Well, the opportunity turned out for the highway patrolmen to buy their own gas, and for schools to go to 4- and even 3-day sessions, because there was no money.

So my point is this, that we have to balance things here. I raise this issue in the context of the appropriate desire of my colleagues to adequately fund the military, because I read in the newspaper yesterday and again today that my colleagues intend to go to tax cut 2.0. Very interesting.

In the face of a trillion-dollar deficit in the 2018–2019 fiscal year, we would do another massive tax cut in hopes that the situation would be such for the revenues of the Federal Government that we could fund everything that the military wants and whatever other needs we decide must be funded.

Well, let's see. We just borrowed, or are about to borrow, \$12 billion from China to pay American farmers for their losses resulting from a trade war with China in which China was supposed to somehow grow our economy by not shipping as much to America.

That is convoluted, but it is what we are going to have to do if we cut taxes again. We are going to have to grow the Chinese economy, so we can borrow money from China, and then import from them.

I guess this makes sense to some, but I think we best be very careful here.

Mr. Speaker, I guess some people would say that I am off subject matter here, because we are really talking about fully funding the needs, in this piece of legislation, of the United States Air Force, and we should do so. However, at the same time, we must consider the revenue sources for the Federal Government, and we did.

In December 2017, the 435 of us who are selected by the 350 million Ameri-

cans to represent them, a decision was made amongst us to slash the revenue of the Federal Government by more than \$1.5 trillion over the next decade.

Now, my colleagues on the Democratic side didn't vote for that, but, apparently, the deficit hawks migrate out of Washington, D.C., in the winter. I suspect they are coming back—not "suspect," they are actually back. The Speaker of the House tells us that we must cut Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security in order to deal with the deficit that was created by the tax bill. Well, we shall see.

How are we going to adequately fund the military in the face of last December's tax cut, which I will remind folks, if they care to be reminded, that the beneficiaries were principally the great American corporations that were doing quite well, profitably, prior to the tax cut, and that somehow promised that they would bring jobs home, which they have not. Well, we shall see.

It takes \$1.5 trillion out of the Treasury, and my esteemed colleague from Wyoming said: Look how successful Oklahoma was.

Well, I don't think she said that. But as she was talking about tax cuts, it came to mind that we ought to think about Oklahoma and what happens when the government doesn't have the revenue it needs to do the things that it must do.

Now, maybe you want to argue that the government must not provide funding for Social Security. Maybe you would want to argue that the government must not provide money for Medicaid, of which some 60 to 70 percent of the recipients are elderly people in nursing homes. Maybe we ought not do that. Or maybe you would want to argue that the Medicare program for seniors should be slashed and cut.

Those are all suggestions that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has made. I disagree.

How do we fund the programs that Americans need? Surely, they want a strong Air Force, as I do. And I suspect they would also want to see that those seniors in nursing homes are cared for, and those who are on Medicare are able to get their drugs and their care, and that the Social Security checks not be slashed and reduced. We shall see.

In any case, I support the resolution, and I think we ought to fully fund the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to insert some facts into the debate about the tax cuts. According to CBO estimates, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is going to result in an increase in GDP of \$1.7 trillion. We are going to see 900,000 new jobs. Wages will increase by \$1.2 trillion. Investments will increase by \$600 billion. The tax cuts that we passed in this House—and my colleague is right, none of the Democrats voted for it. In fact, the minority leader has said that

she thinks we ought to reverse those tax cuts, which would be devastating to the economy.

We lived through the stagnation of the Obama years, and we passed a tax cuts bill that fundamentally changed the trajectory of this economy. We have seen 1.3 million jobs added. We have minority unemployment at the lowest rates, I believe, in history.

So the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working, and it is helping to bring jobs back. I am really pleased that we are looking at ways that we can make those cuts permanent, that we can make sure that we are helping the middle class, and that we are helping small businesses across this country on a permanent basis.

We can spend all of the time my colleague from California would like debating the tax cuts, debating the impact on our economy, but the facts are clear, that those tax cuts, despite the politics and the rhetoric, have had the kind of impact that, frankly, we knew they would have.

So I am really proud of what we have done with respect to the tax cuts, and now we need to make sure that we fund the military. If we don't fund the military, it doesn't matter much what else we do if we don't provide for the security of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, if you are a person who wants to cut taxes and borrow money from China, then you can keep the economy going. In fact, the job growth has been basically steady for the last 8 years. It has been in the last year, also, and most of this year, and we are thankful for that.

Nonetheless, we have a very serious deficit. The CBO estimate that was quoted a moment ago actually took place prior to the tax cut. More recent estimates indicate that the deficit is larger than anticipated and that the growth rate has not expanded to the point that was anticipated and that the deficits that are going to be there are very real. All of that is true.

While there have been increases in wages, some 2 percent over the last year, almost 18 months now—and we are grateful for that—those wages are less than the inflation rate; and, therefore, for those working men and women across the Nation who have received an average of 2 percent or so of wage growth, it has been eaten up by inflation.

The point here is one of this resolution reminding us that we have a very important obligation to adequately fund, in this case, the Air Force; in the previous piece of legislation, special operations. Indeed, we do have that ob-

ligation. But at the same time, we need to have a fiscally sound government.

Unfortunately, what happened last December was to pull the foundation of fiscal soundness out from beneath the government's revenue stream.

Now, there is a necessity for some adjustment in the taxes, and you will get no debate on our side of the aisle about the necessity to do that. It would have been our choice, had we the majority, to reduce taxes far more than the tax bill did for the working men and women and for the smaller businesses in America, and not for the wealthy corporations that were doing quite well, and certainly not to create an international Tax Code that continues to encourage the offshoring of American jobs.

That simply happened because the reduction in the corporate tax rate for America went to 20 percent, while those American corporations operating offshore could get a 10 percent tax, providing a very significant benefit to corporations to offshore jobs. I don't think we would have done that. Maybe that is why many of us voted against the legislation.

There is much more to be said about it, but the fundamental point at this moment is this resolution that says fully fund the Air Force. We are 100 percent for that.

The question we ask is: How are we to do that in the face of the massive deficit and, to hear from our Republican leadership, tax cut 2.0? What does that mean, on tax cut 1.0? We don't know. But I would draw the attention of all of us to what happens when you do not have the revenues necessary to fund the government—Oklahoma.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize that this was going to be a defend Oklahoma debate. I invite my colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI, to come and look at our thriving economy, our sustained economic growth of nearly 6 percent since 2008 when my colleague's State has been on the wane.

This thing about deficits and deficit spending, we have a balanced budget amendment, unlike my colleague's State. And further, we don't borrow from the Federal Government to bail out our State; instead, we pay the bills ourselves.

Now, I thought that this was a measure to support our military and to support the United States Air Force, and in that we will wholeheartedly agree. But, Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in the people of Oklahoma. With one-

tenth of the population, we can do everything that my colleague on the other side of the aisle's State does itself, and I take great pride in that.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his remarks. I also want to thank my colleague from Texas for this important resolution.

I am honored, Mr. Speaker, to represent F.E. Warren Air Force Base, located in Cheyenne. The missileers of the Mighty Ninety Missile Wing are responsible for maintaining, protecting, and manning ICBMs that are deployed throughout Wyoming, Nebraska, and Colorado. These missiles remain on alert 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. They are one of our most important deterrents against attack from our adversaries.

But these Minuteman 3 missiles, Mr. Speaker, were developed in the 1960s and deployed in the 1970s. We have made modernization and modifications since then, but we desperately need additional modernization to these ICBMs and to our force in general to keep pace with adversaries like the Russians who have made significant investments in their ICBM force. We cannot do that, Mr. Speaker, without predictable and reliable funding that is required to complete such a complicated and complex multiyear project.

The ICBM replacement program, known as the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, is slated to receive the necessary increased funding in fiscal year 2019 so that we can accelerate that program. But for these resources to be effective, Mr. Speaker, we must make sure we get the additional funding to the Air Force on time.

As my colleague from Texas talked about, Mr. Speaker, the Air Force faces readiness and modernization challenges, and the ICBM replacement is just one of those.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have to stop allowing our dysfunction and we have got to stop allowing the demands, frankly, by some on the other side of the aisle to hold our defense funding hostage. We have got to stop allowing those political debates to put our men and women in uniform at greater risk and, frankly, the long-term national security of this Nation at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1010.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT NOT FULLY RESOURCING THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN A TIMELY MANNER ERODES THE ARMY'S ABILITY TO MAINTAIN READINESS**

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1007) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that not fully resourcing the United States Army in a timely manner erodes the Army's ability to maintain readiness and poses risk to the Army's ability to conduct military operations.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

**H. RES. 1007**

Whereas, in previous years, the United States Army delayed supply transactions, and later had to order parts from sources outside the Department of Defense supply system and pay more to get parts fabricated or shipped quickly to keep up with maintenance timelines;

Whereas, in previous years, the Army was forced to restrict to home station training due to not having enough resources;

Whereas the Army, if not fully resourced, will postpone all noncritical maintenance work orders until later in the year when resourced correctly;

Whereas the Army is attempting to add military personnel to meet critical skill gaps, and if not fully resourced, will delay the recruitment of new personnel which will result in units continuing to lack the full complement of personnel needed to be 100-percent effective;

Whereas, if not fully resourced, noncritical travel, which includes relocating soldiers' families (change of duty station) will be postponed and may result in missed school year timing for dependent spouses and their children;

Whereas United States Army Forces Command is responsible for the training, mobilization, deployment, sustainment, and transformation of conventional forces to provide relevant and ready land power to combatant commanders;

Whereas global threats require the Army to prepare to fight both terrorist organizations as well as possible near-peer adversaries; and

Whereas it takes both significant time and resources to build a professional Army: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) finds that not resourcing the Department of the Army in a timely manner erodes readiness and puts the United States Army at a disadvantage; and

(2) affirms that Congress should resource all our warfighters prior to the beginning of a new fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and in-

sert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), who is my colleague from the Armed Services Committee, to discuss his resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her important leadership in the strengthening of our military and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I work with well on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, nothing is too good for the troops, and nothing is what they get—at least on time, year after year, by this Congress. Our lack of diligence and commitment to provide timely funds in Congress erodes military readiness and weakens our Nation. H. Res. 1007 helps fix that for the United States Army.

For me, these are not academic or political issues but, rather, experiential. Having served as a combat infantryman in more than two decades of uniformed service prior to coming to Congress, these are not issues that I take lightly. I have lived the hardships created when Congress is derelict in its duty.

When supply transactions are delayed, the Army is forced to order parts outside the Department of Defense supply system, pay for more parts, and risk getting any spare parts at all. Soldiers are severely hampered in their training, being forced to stay at home stations with limitations on equipment, fuel, and ammunition. Consequently, the readiness of units diminishes, and their morale flags.

Even if the Army were to somehow make the best of those circumstances and attempt to send their warriors to school in the time that is created because they can't train to maybe increase their vital skills, they can't. Their funds are delayed, so their schools get canceled, and the time is gone forever.

Adding insult to injury, many people who were promised schools to make important promotions have those schools taken from their grasp, and, disillusioned, they exit the force, affecting recruitment and the trained warriors who had invested years up to that point.

Another insult to injury is the relocation of families. It gets postponed, and it causes undue family hardship on those in uniform, missed school for their children, and stresses on the warrior at home which not only affect his performance, but what is sad is that it was all preventable, while we in this Congress who are responsible for this and the timely delivery of funds fly home to our families weekend after weekend without interruption.

Our founding documents state that we should promote the general welfare

and provide for the common defense. Both sides of the aisle need to be mindful that these founding documents do not say provide the general welfare and promote, somehow, the common defense. If we cannot defend the Republic, all of these other things are simply not going to matter.

Our lack of diligence in Congress creates reduced readiness, a less capable military, cancellation of training, untold family hardships, and a less secure nation. It is so easily solved. We simply do the work, sign the bills, and get them to the President by October 1.

It is pretty simple, and it is extraordinarily important. Today is the 25th of July. There is plenty of time.

The question that I and warriors who still serve in uniform ask is: Will this Congress have the heart and the guts to do what is right?

The clock ticks. Let's stop the madness. Let's stop the debate of ancillary things that don't have anything to do with providing for the common defense, and let's end the continuing resolutions that affect our military funding. Run a clean defense measure.

If we are in so much agreement about funding our military, then my challenge to both sides of the aisle is let's run a clean measure. Let's not attach anything else to it, no Labor-H, no other appropriations measures, a simple, clean measure that we all agree to anyway and we pass year after year. Then we can get it to the President's desk, and our warriors who give us our freedom and allow us to continue with this great Republic for generation to generation will have what they need.

We have not done it in years. This could be a first and could be a hallmark of the 115th Congress.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for making me aware of the current financial situation, and I will remind him that California is running a very significant budget surplus at the present time. Both of our economies are presently growing, and we are thankful for that.

I also want to thank the gentleman for being a voice of knowledge on the Armed Services Committee, for his many years of service in the United States Army, and for bringing us this resolution today calling for the full and timely funding of the United States Army.

□ 1545

My father, who served in the Army and ended that service as a major, would have been very pleased to hear that there was adequate and timely funding.

I know I have said quite enough on the issue of how we are going to fund the government, and I am sure my colleagues across the aisle probably think I have said too much. If they feel that way, so be it. But I do think that we need to understand the need to be balanced as we move forward.