live in the most densely populated city or whether they live back on long country lanes. So that is why I'm so proud of the bipartisan work we have done up to this point, because there is nothing, again, in this nutrition title in this farm bill that wasn't a part of all those, over 21, hearings that we had.

Some of the things that are in there, in fact, are some of the priorities. I enjoy working across the aisle in a bipartisan way. I dedicate myself to that. So I was pleased to see my Democratic colleagues who communicated their four priorities into this bill to the committee.

Their first one was to incentivize nutrition education and healthy eating through a continuation of the Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive Program. what we call FINI. I am pleased to report that the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018—that is what we are calling the farm bill-which includes the nutrition title. Title IV. maintains the FINI Program and enhances it with a technical assistance center allowing for best practices in operations and delivery to be housed and used for current and future grantees.

Additionally, the bill provides \$275 million for FINI over the life of the farm bill, actually establishes a baseline funding of \$65 million a year, allowing for expansion of opportunities to bring together stakeholders from the distinct parts of the food system to foster understanding of how they might improve nutrition and the health status of participating households and the people who live in those houses.

Their second priority, which I am pleased to report on, was-and I appreciated them putting this forward; it was important—to maintain our commitment to food banks with adequate funding for The Emergency Food Assistance Program. You just heard the former Agriculture Committee chairman, Mr. GOODLATTE from Virginia, talk about TEFAP.

The farm bill increases TEFAP, funding for our food banks, by \$45 million. We have been funding it at \$15 million. It goes to \$60 million and directs \$20 million of that in a very innovative way, that funding, to establish a farmto-food bank program in all States. It allows States to access agriculture surplus products directly from the farmers. The freshest of foods is the way I like to look at it. What a great en-

hancement, Mr. Speaker.

The third priority I am pleased to report on that is a part of this farm bill that they communicated was to promote the use of cutting-edge technology to ensure that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, retailers and recipients have secure, reliable, and efficient benefit processing. The farm bill introduces the concept of a national gateway, which is a system modernization that gives the USDA real-time oversight over the flow of transactions. It helps control costs.

It allows USDA to develop more tools to ensure integrity, assist in controlling access to individuals' payment information, and it sets the stage for the USDA to handle future developments in payment technology. With that increase in accountability, in those rare instances where fraud and abuse may occur, it allows for identification of that. And we incentivize States. States are now able, when they actually identify fraud, to keep a greater amount of that money that is recovered, although it has to be reinvested back into the nutrition title.

It is about to go for more program integrity, to make sure we are doing a better job of serving the needs of our neighbors who find themselves in those circumstances.

And finally, the last one was to continue to encourage States to collaborate with business and education leaders to provide innovative employment and training solution opportunities and programs. That is what we have been talking about this evening, largely. It is about the workforce solutions. This was put forward by my friends across the aisle that I am proud to serve with, the Democratic members of the Agriculture Committee. This was their

We were able to do that. We have provided significant attention and considerable investment to improve SNAP workforce and education development services for recipients. I appreciate what they put forward as a part of this process, and I appreciate the fact that we have stepped up and we see this as a part of the text of this farm bill.

The updates to employment and training include best practices taken from beneficiary, industry, and State feedback. It includes interim education and training pilot reports. It partners with the workforce-to-innovation opportunity works that are already in place across our communities and our counties all across this great country. And it heightens emphasis on publicprivate partnerships and nutrition education and also allows recipients to continue to receive a supportive suite of services to address both food insecurity and upward mobility.

That is what we are trying to achieve. We want to make families food secure. We want to provide them access to the rungs on the ladder of opportunity.

## $\sqcap$ 1900

Mr. Speaker, we have also done something for populations very near and dear to my heart as the dad of an Active Duty soldier, and that is, when individuals join the military later in life, they tend to enter with a spouse and a couple of kids, and it is hard to support a family on a private salary. Most privates are usually 18, 19 years old. They don't have that family support, and they do fine.

In fact, we just provided all of our military a 2.9 percent pay increase, the largest in over a decade. But for those

who are joining later in life, it is difficult. Their families live off base and they get a basic housing allowance to help pay for that, but in the past, basic housing allowance, 100 percent, with no contribution, no assistance, counted towards their eligibility for the SNAP program. They need that SNAP program to be able to make sure that their family gets support.

We have addressed that by providing moneys that would go toward an allowance, more or less, that would go towards to help them to truly to be able to receive those benefits and to be eligible for the SNAP program.

And so I am just so thankful for, really, the good bipartisan work that we have done up to this point, with all these hearings—over 100 hearings on the farm bill, as a whole; over 20 hearings for the nutrition title, title IV of this farm bill. We had over 80 witnesses. There is nothing in this farm bill that didn't come out there. There were some rumors of something about a Harvest Box, which was a terrible idea. That is not a part of the farm bill, never had any intentions of including that as a part of the farm bill.

I am appreciative to all the hard work that has gone into the bill, preparing this at this point, and I look forward to next week, next Wednesday. We will be marking this bill up in the Agriculture Committee. And I am pleased at the timing too. Normally, when we talk about reauthorizing the farm bill, we are 6 months, 12 months after it expired.

Quite frankly, we can't afford to do that. The farm income has been down for 4 years now, and this total farm bill is so important to providing for a robust rural America, and that is important to every American. Because without a robust rural America, people everywhere, including the cities, will wake up in the dark, in the cold, and hungry, because that is what the people of rural America, those farm families, provide for each and every one of

So, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the opportunity to be joined by so many colleagues tonight on this topic, and I thank you for your attention.

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

## ADDRESSING FISCAL DEFICITS

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I want to just state our opposition to the balanced budget amendment.

It is worth reviewing the history on this topic. When President Bill Clinton left office, he left this country with surpluses. He had reversed the policy of Reagan economics, which had some of the largest structural deficits in the 1980s and during the first President Bush's term.

And then we went from record surpluses back to deficits. And what was the reason for those deficits? There were two very simple reasons. One, we made a strategic mistake in Iraq and spent trillions of dollars, which even President Trump has acknowledged was a blunder, and that ballooned the deficit. And secondly, we made a decision to provide tax cuts for the very wealthiest Americans.

Now, the Democrats supported the tax cut for the middle class, for folks making \$50- to \$75,000, but we said you don't need to provide tax cuts for people making \$1 million, \$500,000; you don't need to provide tax cuts for those who are already paying capital gains tax rates at 20 percent and don't need additional tax breaks.

So those two decisions, the intervention overseas and our continued interventions overseas and these extraordinary tax breaks for the very wealthy, have led us to the deficits that we have today, have led us to the \$20 trillion debt.

No one wants that kind of debt. We don't want to see interest rates continue to go up and crowd out private investment. We don't want to see people's savings lose value. But the solution to that is not a gimmick of a balanced budget amendment where the Republicans have doubled down on more tax cuts for the very wealthy, where they haven't stopped our interventionism abroad. We still actually have escalation in Afghanistan, escalation in Iraq, escalation around the world, in contradiction to what this President promised on the campaign where he said that he would focus on developing our domestic economy and stop the interventionism, and we just have symbolic votes for a balanced budget amendment.

The question is how? How can you vote for extraordinary tax cuts? How can you vote for more overseas interventionism? How can you vote for huge spending bills and then just say you are for a balanced budget amendment? The math just doesn't work.

And so what Democrats have said is, instead of having a balanced budget amendment, instead of constraining our policy or economic policy to spend more at times of war or times of recession-which, by the way, Roosevelt did, which Woodrow Wilson did, what many of our Presidents did-that what we ought to do is have sensible government, that we ought to stop the foreign interventionism, we ought to repeal these tax breaks and giveaways to the very wealthy, and instead we ought to invest in the middle class, invest in our education, invest in our infrastructure, invest in our schools, invest in new technology that will grow the econ-

That is how you reduce the structural deficits. But, by the way, this is not a theoretical debate, because Bill

Clinton showed that when you have that kind of "people's first" economic policy, you left this country with surpluses, and the trickle-down Reaganomics has always left this country with deficits.

It is not enough to just vote for balanced budget amendments while piling on debt. A far more responsible policy would be to end the foreign interventionism, to repeal these massive giveraways to the wealthy, and to invest in the middle class.

That is why my colleagues and I opposed the balanced budget amendment. That is why we have offered the Congressional Progressive People's Budget that will lead to greater economic growth than anything that the President has proposed, and that will also reduce our Nation's debt.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNI-VERSARY OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am always honored to have this great privilege of speaking in the House of Representatives. We have a total of 441 Members of the House, including those delegates, those who cannot vote, 435 who can, and it is an honor to be one of the 441.

I never want to take for granted this privilege that has been accorded me by the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Texas, so I thank them for allowing me to serve, and I am grateful to the leadership in the House for allowing me the opportunity to speak tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight, I rise, if you will, because I would like to reference H. Res. 817. This was introduced on April 11, 2018. This resolution celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1968. The Civil Rights Act of 1968 contained the Fair Housing Act, and it is the Fair Housing Act that this resolution actually addresses.

I am proud to say that the Honorable EMANUEL CLEAVER is the person that worked with me. In fact, we worked with each other to produce this resolution. I am proud also to say that this resolution has a total of 54 cosponsors that are officially acknowledged, and then we have two additional cosponsors that have not been officially placed on the Record, but they are still cosponsors of this resolution.

This resolution does something that is important. It celebrates and commemorates, if you will, the passing of the Fair Housing Act. The Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination. It prohibits it based upon race, color, national origin, sex, familial sta-

tus, disability, religion, and should have other categories added. It should have sexual orientation. It should have gender identity. So there is still work to do.

And for those who may not believe that persons are discriminated based upon gender identity and sexual orientation, those persons who are fired from their jobs because of their gender identity, fired from their jobs because of sexual orientation, they have stories to tell, because they not only know that it happens, they have experienced it. They have had a firsthand encounter with this type of discrimination.

It also exists in housing. People are discriminated against because of who they are, because of their sexual orientation, gender identity, and for the other reasons that we have already codified into law.

So it is my hope that one day I will stand here with a resolution that will celebrate not only what the law is currently, but also what the law will be at that time, and, hopefully, it will include other classes of individuals.

I am also proud to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is one that is subject to have additional cosponsors. I have talked about original cosponsors, but there are others who will become cosponsors. The Congressional Black Caucus has a good many members who are cosponsors of this resolution. I am proud to tell you that we plan to continue to acquire cosponsors such that, by the end of this month, we will have many additional cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, housing is important, because where you live can impact your health. If you live near landfills and rock crushing companies, that can have an impact on your health. This is why a good many people find themselves combating, fighting, in a very political way, the placement of these types of facilities in their neighborhoods.

There is empirical evidence to show that where you live can impact your health, where you live can impact your education. If you live in an area with poor schools, it is likely that you will have a poor education. There are exceptions, but exceptions don't make the rule. Exceptions prove the rule.

Where you live can impact your employment. If you live in an area with high unemployment, you are likely not to have a job. If unemployment is exceedingly high, as is the case in some places around the world and in this country too, there are persons who are not likely to have jobs.

If you live in an area where you are likely to be in poverty, you are likely not to become wealthy. Your wealth can be related to the area that you are born in, where you live. There are exceptions, but there are also persons who don't acquire the opportunity to become an exception.

Your life expectancy can be impacted by where you live. If you live in a war