

States, Ukraine, and our allies by allowing Putin to succeed in his sinister mission.

Despite President Trump's negligence, the United States Congress remains laser-focused on the threat from Russia. It is serious, and it is real.

While Ukraine fights for its very existence, the United States Congress and freedom-lovers everywhere must continue to support Ukraine through military aid, programs to fight corruption, and the development of civil society, which the American people do so well.

Congress must get to the bottom of President Trump's effort to withhold vital defense aid to Ukraine. She is facing a mortal enemy. This is liberty at stake in our lifetimes. Will we meet the challenge?

The abuses of power outlined in the whistleblower complaint underscore the danger that President Trump's decisions pose to American national security and democracy itself. The American people must learn to what extent the President solicited interference from a foreign country in the upcoming 2020 U.S. Presidential election.

From our own FBI, we have learned how many times Russia interfered in the last election and how many times then-candidate Trump contacted Russia during the campaign.

I was thinking about that one night. If I were running for President of the United States, would I be in touch with Russia nearly 200 times? Think about that. How unusual is that?

The American Presidency cannot be a tool for Russia to gain its insidiously destructive power. Above all, the American people deserve liberty first, last, and always in a political system free of malign foreign influence.

Long live a free America, and may the people of Ukraine ultimately gain the freedom they so justly deserve.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CHINA: ONE WORLD, TWO SYSTEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I certainly enjoyed my colleague's dissertation there, much of which was a criticism of the Chief Executive of our country, when many of the same comments she made could be directed at this House and its investigation of the President—not following the precedents set, not following the precedents set in the Nixon impeachment or in the Clinton impeachment.

The Speaker has not had a vote of this House to commence an impeachment inquiry. That is an open system.

That is the transparency my friend was talking about. That is the kind of accountability the American people would like to see. That should be the policy of this House. Sadly, it is not.

She talks about contacts with Russia by political campaigns. Many of us look forward to the investigation by the Attorney General and by the U.S. attorney in Connecticut on exactly that in the 2016 campaign and how the opposition party, the Clinton campaign, was, in fact, the one digging up activities about the Trump campaign.

So, anyway, I enjoyed that comment about Ukraine, the importance of Ukraine, and the importance of democracy in Ukraine. But all throughout that presentation, one had to endure a lot of supposition and fiction.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk, not talk about Ukraine, not talk about Syria, but talk about China and where we are in this very important, critical bilateral negotiation between the United States and the People's Republic of China to end China's mercantilistic trade environment, their lack of openness, their failure to police the terrible intellectual property theft that has gone on for over two decades there that has hurt not only American businesses but those elsewhere in Asia and also in Europe.

I commend the President for calling out the challenge that we have had and faced in the West on how to obtain China as a better player for trade. President Trump has worked for nearly 3 years now to change China's outlook, to end its mercantilistic protectionism and join the world trading system truly, not just on paper, Mr. Speaker, but, in fact, completely, and be one with the developed world as it has grown its economy so mightily over those two decades.

I commend the President's point men on this issue: Larry Kudlow at the National Economic Council; Secretary Mnuchin, the Secretary of the Treasury; and Ambassador Robert Lighthizer, who is his U.S. Trade Representative who has the point on trying to work out something that is a major change in that relationship between the U.S. and China, but also China and the rest of the developed world.

At the heart of this trade dispute is the fact that we live in an integrated global economy with deeply connected, multicontinental supply chains. This integrated global economy is based on the extraordinary foundation of the post-World War II reductions in trade barriers, the expansion of the rule of law, and the extraordinary success of the free-market capitalist system that has lifted so many out of poverty around the world since World War II and enlivened the capitalist spirit throughout the world.

Beginning slowly in the 1970s and 1980s, the People's Republic of China was encouraged to open its domestic market, increase economic freedom, better respect human rights and reli-

gious tolerance, and join the global family of nations.

Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany, as that freedom breeze finally blew away the shroud of the Iron Curtain, reform in China remained the next great touchstone of the post-World War II agenda.

The 1989 crackdown in Tiananmen Square sidetracked this progress, but China's integration into this world economy began in earnest in the 1990s. That is where this story gets complicated, and that is where the concern of President Trump really begins.

European and American leaders who shared values of economic freedom, religious tolerance, and common national security goals witnessed the historic and extraordinary transition of post-war Japan and the Asian Tigers, those countries of Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and South Korea.

Over the decades, the Asian Tigers had been authoritarian, condemned for their rampant theft of intellectual property and spurning of democracy, so much so that, in 1976, when Jimmy Carter was elected President of the United States, he campaigned on pulling American troops out of South Korea, ending aid to South Korea and writing off South Korea as a failed experiment, that it was going to be an authoritarian dictatorship and never adapt to democracy, never stop stealing intellectual property. Basically, write it off as a failure.

□ 1730

Fortunately, this initiative was shelved and, instead, we witnessed Japan and the Asian Tigers expand their economies, really begin to open their markets, fully embrace democracy and the rule of law, and join in the world global progress.

Policymakers considered China to be next, and they believed that, while a much larger country, under a much more authoritative communist regime, the economic benefits of greater freedom and global transparency would penetrate even the Middle Kingdom.

In 1996, in a column in the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette offering suggestions to the Clinton administration on how to have a more directed China policy, I argued that China, too, must change. I said: "China, as a world power, for her part must recognize that bilateral and multilateral treaties are to be enforced. Lack of compliance with international treaty obligations must produce a known and delivered set of sanctions by the world community. China must clearly understand the consequences of noncompliance."

So, Mr. Speaker, that is what I wrote back in 1996 as a private citizen, former Bush administration official, thinking about what needed to change in America and Chinese relations, China's multilateral relations.

So, despite encouragement and best intentions, China has not changed, Mr. Speaker, but, instead, has grown more

aggressive; hence, the challenge of one world, two systems is market-based capitalism versus state-controlled communism. They are not compatible when it comes to this complex, integrated global capital market I described.

In the 1990s, the epicenter of the fight was to reign in rampant theft of intellectual property. At the time I uttered those words in 1996, the U.S. computer software industry, music CDs, and Hollywood videos all were being ripped off by the People's Republic of China. In 1992, the Business Software Alliance testified before the U.S. Senate that Chinese piracy was costing the U.S. an estimated \$225 million in software sales.

The reality is, despite efforts in 1992 at the end of the Bush 41 administration and vigorous efforts by President Clinton's negotiators Charlene Barshefsky and Mickey Kantor, essentially nothing happened. President Clinton threatened to impose 100 percent tariffs on select imports if Beijing didn't enforce Mr. Clinton's new 1995 intellectual property rights deal.

So, what happened? Does this sound familiar? Is this not the exact conversation we are having today in 2019?

What happened in 1995? Meeting after meeting was held, agreement after agreement was signed, and still the piracy continued. And to my point about the world delivering a known set of sanctions that China must clearly understand the consequences of non-compliance, instead, China was rewarded and admitted to the World Trade Organization, the WTO, in December 2001.

Sadly, pirated goods have only increased. Recently, the Business Software Alliance, the same folks I quoted back in 1992, now estimate that 70 percent of PC software installed in China in 2015 was unlicensed, and the U.S. trade representative estimates that intellectual property theft costs between \$225 billion and \$600 billion, annually.

Thus, the world has not banded together and offered clear and known sanctions for not following the global trade rules. In fact, global trading partners have rewarded such behavior with the admission to the WTO and continue to tolerate IP theft, closed domestic markets, and dependency on frequently dominant Chinese supply chain participants.

This is why President Trump has elected to go forward with a more aggressive, direct manner and deliver the message that lack of compliance with international treaty obligations must produce a known and delivered set of sanctions by the world community. However, the President's success in this endeavor may well be diluted by the opening up of trade disputes all over the world simultaneously, including disputes with America's allies.

Specifically, I am talking about across-the-board unilateral steel and aluminum tariffs, for example, or trying to renegotiate every trade treaty

that we have all at the same time, while we are trying to press China.

Now, that is not to take anything away from the extraordinary work of the President and Ambassador Lighthizer to update the North American Free Trade Agreement with the new USMCA, updating the U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement, and initiating and completing an agricultural agreement with Japan. But I have to say that doing all that at once and not engaging our allies fully and publicly to be at our side impressing China, I think, makes it more difficult, because, as I have traced over the past 25 years the lack of success with China, the one thing that I would argue that will make it different this time—always dangerous words to utter—would be if we had the European Union, Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, the Philippines, South American countries all at our side as we tried to get a concrete change in China's mercantilistic behavior.

In my view, the President would be more successful if he focused on this Chinese challenge and rallied the world to a common purpose of focusing China on that important point to clearly understand the consequences of non-compliance. We have done many things in this country that are improving that relationship and fighting, but we must have full global support in order, I think and I believe, to ultimately lever China into compliance.

Not successful in Bush 41, not successful with President Clinton, not successful with President George W. Bush, little effort by President Obama, so I admire President Trump for identifying this challenge that benefits the whole world, not just the United States; but it is going to take a sustained multiyear, multilateral effort to do that, and I wish him well, and those of us in this House stand by him as he tries to get a quality, substantive deal to bring China truly into compliance.

CONGRATULATING CARL CARTER

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize some Arkansans who have done extraordinary things in my home district in central Arkansas.

I rise today to recognize Carl Carter for being awarded the 2019 Community Service Award by the Real Estate Educators of America for exceptional spirit of service.

Carl is a second-year student attending the University of Arkansas Clinton School of Public Service in Little Rock. Carl credits his strong community service to his mom, Beverly Carter, who lost her life at the hands of two people posing as real estate clients.

Carl founded the Beverly Carter Foundation in her memory, an organization dedicated to the cause of helping real estate agent safety.

Through the Beverly Carter Foundation, Carl works to improve agent safety through traveling and talking to escrow agents, lenders, agents, and brokers all over the United States on how to avoid being the victims of crime.

I know this is only the beginning for Carl, and I am excited to see where his ambition and his kind heart take him, and I congratulate him on this good work.

RECOGNIZING SEARCY FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Searcy Fire Department and the firefighters from Station 1 for going above and beyond the call of duty.

Earlier this summer, firefighters responded to a call for a fire alarm at a resident's home in Searcy, Arkansas. Fortunately, the resident was not in immediate danger, but they did notice one issue: The resident could not leave his home without assistance, as there was not a wheelchair ramp.

The firefighters at Station 1 took it upon themselves to fix this situation. They reached out to the community for help, including the local Lowe's Home Improvement store. They got discounted supplies. The Searcy Fire Department Ladies Auxiliary provided funding, and these firefighters were able to build a ramp for this resident.

This is just a small example of how the Searcy Fire Department and central Arkansas law enforcement officers go above and beyond the call when keeping Arkansans safe. I thank them for their continued hard work and service.

CONGRATULATING RYAN DAVIS

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ryan Davis for receiving the Arkansas Emergency Medical Technician Association Air Medical Award of Excellence. This award honors those who help the air medical industry continue to see growth.

Ryan grew up in Quitman, Arkansas, and is currently the fire chief for this community. Ryan is a nationally registered emergency medical technician and paramedic and is flight paramedic certified.

Ryan has served his community since 2003 and also works for Air Evac Lifeteam 30 in Morrilton. Ryan has served on numerous State-level boards and committees, including the American Heart Association, the National Association of EMTs, and also the Arkansas Air Medical Society, where he serves as president.

I would like to extend my congratulations to Ryan Davis for receiving this prestigious award.

RECOGNIZING JAMIE CHENEY

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jamie Cheney of Greenbrier, Arkansas, for her outstanding service to our community and the State of Arkansas.

Jamie serves as a local medical technician and also as a volunteer firefighter on her day off. She gained her EMT skills at the University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton, where she juggled school while working at the Greenbrier Nursing and Rehab Center.

Jamie received the Phoenix Award while serving as an EMT in North Little Rock. This award is bestowed onto

first responders who successfully revive a patient who has suffered from cardiac arrest.

I am proud to have such a dedicated member of my district volunteering and assisting those in need, and I join all Arkansans in thanking Jamie Cheaney for her selflessness and wish her continued success.

RECOGNIZING LINDSAY HENDERSON

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate an emerging leader from the Conway Area Chamber of Commerce, Lindsay Henderson.

Lindsay is a Bald Knob resident and serves as the chief revenue officer for the Conway Area Chamber of Commerce. Lindsay was awarded the Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives' 40 Under 40 award.

The 40 Under 40 award honors young professionals who have demonstrated significant success in their career, as well as having made noteworthy accomplishments in their community.

The Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives recognizes emerging leaders from chambers across the country and honors 40 such chamber professionals who exemplify creativity, dedication, and innovation in their work towards their chamber's mission.

I congratulate Lindsay on achieving this 40 Under 40 award and wish her continued success.

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

□ 1745

DECLINE IN THE U.S. MURDER RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to address the good news that we had a significant drop in murders in this country in 2017 over the recent peak in 2016.

However, before I address the House on that matter, I would like to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), my good friend.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GROTHMAN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke a little earlier in a 1 minute on this topic, but I was a little pressed for time, and I saw my good friend from Arkansas, Mr. HILL, speaking on this and other important issues, and my friend from Wisconsin, and I thought I would expand a little bit upon my remarks earlier.

As the previous speaker just talked about, we have important trade issues and other issues the President of the United States is working on with other countries, and I couldn't agree more that those are important issues to be working on. That is exactly what the President and Congress should be focused on. In fact, it should be focused

on that in a bipartisan way, Republicans and Democrats working together.

Instead, what we are faced with is this pretty bizarre impeachment inquiry process. I think it is important for the American people to know and understand how this is supposed to work and how it is working.

An impeachment inquiry sounds, first, like it is a fair discussion process, but in the past, during impeachment inquiries of President Nixon and President Clinton, the House of Representatives right here, led respectfully at the time by Speakers Carl Albert and Newt Gingrich, established the following procedures that are currently not being provided in this rushed process to attempt to impeach President Trump.

This is an important precedent when you are dealing with the President of the United States, who is duly elected by the people of this country. The people of the West Virginia Second Congressional District that I represent voted for Donald Trump for President.

This country, in the fair process of the electoral college, put Donald Trump in as President of the United States, and my district voted for Donald Trump for President of the United States. So that is how we choose the leader of our country.

I stood there on the steps of the Capitol just a few years ago and watched Donald Trump be inaugurated as President, with the support of all the former living Presidents who attended at the time.

Our country has a process that is emulated in this world, admired by the world, that we have a free election and we respect the results of that election.

Instead, what we are seeing here, announced by the Speaker of the House, is this so-called impeachment inquiry. However, she is denying this President the same rights that other Presidents were given under this so-called impeachment inquiry.

And what exactly are those? I think it is important to understand how this has happened in the past and how it should be happening right now but is not.

I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats in Congress here, would like the American people not to understand what they are doing. But first and foremost, in the past when this was done, the two times it was done in the past, I am going to list the seven things, the seven rights that have always been given to the accused party. In this case, that is Donald Trump, the President of the United States.

First, in the committee hearings, there should be given coequal subpoena power to both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee, which is the minority party. At that committee level, they are given coequal power to subpoena witnesses. Right now it is one-sided. Those who want to impeach Donald Trump are subpoenaing witness after

witness after witness, and the other side does not have the power to subpoena witnesses to maybe offer counterinformation. That is how a fair process is supposed to work.

Secondly, all subpoenas have been subject to a vote of the full committee at the request of either the chairman or the ranking member. So to avoid a one-person witch hunt, when you want to subpoena somebody, the head of either party here in Congress can request a committee vote, and the committee can vote "yes" to subpoena or "no" to subpoena. So rather than one person making all the decisions, which seems to be how it is occurring right now, you have at least the committee input. That is how it has been done in the past. That is not happening right now.

Third, the President's counsel had the right to attend all hearings and depositions. Can you imagine that? We have hearings and depositions going on right now in the committees, and the President and his counsel who represent him are not even allowed to hear what is being said about him. This is, again, a denial of the basic right in America in a legal process of any kind.

The President's counsel has had the right to present evidence, because when you had evidence being presented on one side, unless it is a kangaroo court, you had evidence presented on the other side. That is being denied to the President of the United States.

The President's counsel has always had the right to object to the admissibility of evidence. Again, another basic legal procedure, a legal right. The evidence being presented, it may have some objections to it, it may not be accurate for a variety of reasons. The President is not there, his counsel is not there. He can't even object to the evidence being presented.

In the past, the President's counsel had the right to cross-examine witnesses. This should be familiar. In this country, we have a right to face those who accuse us, the right to face our accuser and the right to cross-examine witnesses. Basic legal precepts in this country.

Last, the President's counsel would have the right to recommend a witness list.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand that our President is being denied these seven basic legal rights to defend himself right now. This is not a fair and just system in any way.

My mother fled a communist country. When she was 20 years old, she was in Cuba. Fidel Castro came down from the mountains with guns and locked her and her family up. My mother was in prison for 7 weeks.

In communist countries, you have to prove your innocence. You are accused first, and then you are stuck with the burden of somehow trying to prove you didn't do something, trying to prove that you are not guilty.

In this country, they have to prove you are guilty. You have the right to be presumed innocent. Innocent until proven guilty.