

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 economy.

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 giveaways 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 ANNIVERSARY 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

zone, your life expectancy will be impacted and your personality can be impacted. If you live in a hostile environment, hostility all around you, it is likely to impact your personality.

So where you live is important, which is why invidious discrimination in housing is something that should not be tolerated, and I am proud to say that there was a struggle that was overcome so that we could have this Fair Housing Act.

□ 1915

I would like to do this now. I would like to give a bit of history of the Fair Housing Act that was signed into law in 1968, April 11, 1968. A little bit of history is important.

If you understand the history, you can understand why I make the comment that the law, itself, was written in ink, but it was signed, in a sense, with the blood of the many who died and made sacrifices so that the bill could become the law. I believe that the history of the times is important.

It was signed April 11, 1968, as I have indicated, during the sixties. The sixties were not the best of times for this country. In the 1960s, on June 11, 1963, President John F. Kennedy proposed a Civil Rights Act. However, he was not to see it become the law because on November 22, 1963, he was assassinated. Upon being assassinated, President Johnson was sworn in as President on Air Force One that very same day, November 22, 1963. Then, in July, July 2, 1964, after the death of President Kennedy, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which outlawed discrimination based on race.

Now, it is important to note that President Kennedy, who was a great President, highly respected and admired, proposed the Civil Rights Act, or a civil rights act. He lost his life before he had the opportunity to see it come to fruition.

But it is also important to note that President Johnson worked tirelessly to make real the noble American ideal that was called to the attention of our Nation by President John F. Kennedy. President Johnson was, if you will, the person in the Senate who knew how to speak Southern.

He knew how to communicate well with the Southern Senators and the Members of the House. He knew the rules of the Senate. He knew how persons had voted in the Senate, and he knew how to leverage the votes and the rules to get Senators to do things that they might not ordinarily do.

So when you couple his knowledge of the Senate with the fact that we had lost a great President, and this great President had proposed this Civil Rights Act, you can understand how President Johnson, a great President, was able to get the Civil Rights Act of 1964 passed that outlawed discrimination based upon race.

In 1967, we had what was called the long, hot summer. There were what were called riots. I prefer another

term. I see what happened as rebellions. There were people who were suffering. I don't justify what happened, but I can explain that there were people who were rebelling.

Now, whether you agree with the rebellions or not, they took place. That was what precipitated what was called the long, hot summer. In fact, it was such a rebellious time that, on July 28, 1967, the Kerner Commission was appointed to investigate the causes of these rebellions.

President Johnson appointed this Commission. He wanted to get to the bottom of what was going on in this country. And on February 29, 1968, the Commission released its report, which said, in essence, that the rebellions—they didn't use the term "rebellions," that is my term—the rebellions were caused by discrimination, that this Nation was becoming two separate people, if you will, people who were segregated from each other. This is in a very general sense. That we were becoming two nations, in a sense, separate and unequal.

This was something that I think President Johnson was impacted by. But there were many others who were impacted by this.

Dr. Martin Luther King, he was trying to bring this country together. He was an integrationist. And in trying to bring this country together, Dr. Martin Luther King went to Memphis. He was trying as best as he could to achieve some degree of fairness for those who were working as sanitation workers.

President Johnson announced, on March 31, 1968, that he would not seek reelection; and then some days later, on April 4, Dr. King, while in Memphis, was assassinated.

So now we had the death of a great President; we have the death, now, of the great human rights, civil rights leader, Dr. Martin Luther King, taking place; and then President Johnson, the same President Johnson who pushed through the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the same President Johnson sought to push through the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which contained the Fair Housing Act. It was within about 1 week of the demise, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King that he was able to sign into law the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

The important aspect of this history is this: that these acts, though written in blood and signed in ink, were able to be signed because of the death of great persons, and also many persons who were not so great. They weren't great in the eyes of history because they were not documented as having done the things that President Johnson or President Kennedy or Dr. King accomplished.

But there were other great people, as well, who shed blood and gave their lives. There were people who were found to have marched, and some of them were protesting and lost their lives. There were people who suffered the indignation and humiliation associated with segregation and the fact that

there were those who wanted to maintain the institution to the extent that Medgar Evers lost his life. They wanted to maintain the institution to the extent that Schwerner, Goodman, and Chaney lost their lives.

They wanted to maintain segregation. They wanted the South. They wanted the country to remain two separate nations, if you will, within this Nation: one, unfortunately, discriminated against, and another having all the benefits that this great Nation could offer.

The loss of lives allowed us to achieve an integrated housing system within this country. The integrated system was just not enough, and still is not enough, because housing discrimination exists to this very day. The empirical evidence is there. The truth of the matter is that we can do more to eliminate the discrimination.

One of the best tools to eliminate discrimination in housing is testing, where you send out persons of different races, different ethnicities, and you ask them to acquire housing at a certain location. Those who are of one race may find that housing is available to them, but those of another race may find that it is not—at the very same location, on the very same day.

We have found that testing is one of the best tools to eliminate discrimination, especially in housing. But I want to announce today that testing is also a great tool to eliminate discrimination in lending.

This Civil Rights Act, this Housing Fairness Act, and all of the tools that we have used to achieve the degree of integration in housing and fairness in housing that we have achieved, this has been done, in great part, because of testing. That same tool of testing that helped us to integrate housing in this country is a tool that we can use to allow persons to receive fair treatment in lending, fair access to capital.

The truth is that access to capital in this country makes all the difference in your life. If you can go into a bank and you are qualified and you can get a loan to buy a home, that home that you will buy will impact your life in ways that I have talked about, impact your life expectancy, impact your education. It can have a positive impact on your life. It can be the means by which you will move from one status in life to another. Just living in that neighborhood and buying that home can be meaningful to you.

We believe that that loan should not be denied a person because of that person's race, color, creed, national origin, sexual identity, sexual orientation, familial status, religious status. That person's loan should not be denied. It should be granted because of your qualifications.

This is why I am a proponent of testing. This is why I want to see more testing in banking. This is why I believe that we need additional laws to protect those who apply for loans, because access to capital makes a difference in your life. This is why I will

be introducing, in this Congress, legislation to make it a crime to discriminate in lending.

People who deny people access to capital are committing an offense. People who deny people access to capital are impacting their lives. I want to make sure that people who do this are properly punished for what they do. If we can pass such a law, I believe it will deter those who would discriminate against persons because of who they are, and it would cause them to better understand that every person who is qualified for a loan ought to acquire that loan.

So I am leaving you with the notion that we are building on what happened with the Civil Rights Act. We are building on the sacrifices that have been made by persons such as Dr. Martin Luther King and a good many others. We are going to build on it.

We are going to introduce legislation that can help all persons receive not only the house that they merit by virtue of having the money, but also acquire the capital in lending such that they can afford the house that they qualify for by way of the loan they will receive.

I am honored to thank you for the time that I have been accorded, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful that I have the opportunity to stand here in the House and make this presentation, and I am grateful to this country for allowing a person who, at birth, would never have been thought to stand in this position in the House of Representatives.

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

**BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT**

Karen L Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on April 11, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 3445. To enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3979. To amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 13, 2018, at 9 a.m.

**OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES**

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the

United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

“I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.”

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

CONOR LAMB, 18th District of Pennsylvania.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

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

4482. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2017 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4483. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) Program Report for FY 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 13218(b)(1); Public Law 102-486, Sec. 310 (as amended by Public Law 109-58, Sec. 705); (119 Stat. 817); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4484. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Colorado; Control of Emissions from Existing Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0552; FRL-9975-39-Region 8] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4485. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Revisions to East Helena Lead SIP [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0634; FRL-9975-63-Region 8] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4486. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Navajo Nation; California; Correcting Amendments [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0133; FRL-9975-96-Region 9] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4487. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Nebraska Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide and the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0477; FRL-9976-09-Region 7] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4488. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0680; FRL-9975-65-Region 9] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4489. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, San Diego County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0140; FRL-9975-66-Region 9] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4490. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0737; FRL-9976-08-Region 9] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4491. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Maryland; Control of Emissions from Existing Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerator Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0570; FRL-9976-31-Region 3] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4492. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0701; FRL-9976-30-Region 3] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4493. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Hampshire; Approval of Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements and Single Source Order [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0266; FRL-9975-79-Region 1] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4494. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; KY; Removal of Reliance on Reformulated Gasoline in the Kentucky Portion of the Cincinnati-Hamilton Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0389; FRL-9976-20-Region 4] received March 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.