

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.

Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace what is happening here. The President is somehow in this court of public opinion with one-sided evidence trying to prove his innocence to people who are assuming he is guilty and haven't presented any real evidence to that fact.

Even if a person is not a supporter of President Trump, they still should object to this process. Only imagine if they were falsely accused of something or God forbid their son or daughter was falsely accused of something. They would expect their child to have these same basic rights of legal process to defend themselves.

If they can deny these rights to the President of the United States of America, rest assured, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will deny that right to other citizens one day. We should be alarmed at this no matter where we stand on the issue of liking President Trump or not.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I again thank my colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman GROTHMAN, for yielding me this time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address the body on the topic of the recent decline of murders in the United States of America.

For people who watch this House, we know that there are all sorts of bad things we can dwell on. We can dwell on the immigration crisis, we can dwell on high healthcare costs, we can dwell on the debt, but recently some relatively good news—we have more work to do—was brought forth, and that is the murder rates for 2018 were published.

Largely in this country, murder rates skyrocketed from the early 1960s, when we had the beginning of the welfare culture, the war on the family under Lyndon Johnson, and murder rates rose from around 5 per 100,000 to over 10 per 100,000 in 1980. Murder rates stayed relatively high throughout the 1980s and the early 1990s.

Since that time, I think in part because of increased incarceration, those murder rates were falling until 2015.

And then, I think in part because of a government that spoke negatively of police, talked about or implied that police shootings were racially motivated, something happened opposite of what had been going on the 25 years before that.

All of a sudden for 2 years in a row, the number of people murdered in this country jumped up, jumped up from a low of 4.4 to 5.4 per 100,000 in the years 2015 and 2016.

After that, we can talk about whether it was because of this or not, but Donald Trump took over, somebody who ran encouraging support of the police, respect of the police, and the murder rate began to drop a little bit in 2017, and last year, it one more time fell to less than 5 per 100,000.

President Trump ran, of course, on respect for police. That is one of the reasons I think people wanted him in there.

The prior President, a dignified man, had Al Sharpton in the White House over 80 times. And I think if you look, Barack Obama is praising Black Lives Matter, is encouraging people to view police with distrust, was perhaps one of the reasons why, completely out of the ordinary at a time when the economy was not bad, we had police shootings rise significantly.

Now we have a President who, as the yard signs in my district say, “Respect the Badge”, we have somebody as a President who is more a respect-the-badge sort of guy, and in 1 year we have a decrease in murders in this country—despite the fact the population continues to grow—of 1,000 people; 1,000 lives saved.

We have to ask ourselves, why was there a spike in murders before President Trump took office and why was there a reduction in murders after he took office?

As I mentioned, I think the embracing of people like Al Sharpton, who encourages disrespect for police, or at least blames them, blames sad shootings on racial motivation, I think that is one of the reasons why you had an increase.

You had police who were afraid to do what they could do for fear of being sanctioned. You had people maybe afraid to go to the police to report criminals, perhaps because they were told the police were their enemy.

But in any event, in this era, I haven't checked, but I am sure Al Sharpton hasn't been invited to the White House a dozen times in President Trump's first 3 years. I would be surprised if he was there at all, actually.

Instead, we have someone who knows that as long as the police are appropriately doing their job, he has their back. And we have seen that significant drop in the last 2 years, which is rare good news that you get.

I anxiously await when the statistics come out for the year 2019. We know there was another drop of about 7 percent in the massive city south of me in Chicago, I believe, in the first 7 months of the year. We saw another 10 percent drop in Milwaukee. There was another drop in New York.

Is this a coincidence or is it because our police know that they are respected at the highest level of government?

So I know when I get back home, I hear some people talk about crime and worry about crime, and there is more work that has to be done. Obviously, having as many people as we have murdered every year is still a figure way too high, but a drop of 1,000 was a significant drop.

I hope everybody pays attention to what I believe is another drop that is going to happen in 2019, and I hope everybody realizes that this may not have been just an aberration. One thousand lives are a lot of lives. It could be the result of a policy based on respect for the police, punishing police when they are wrong, no doubt about that,

and there are bad police, but not a love affair with Black Lives Matter; respecting the fact that when studies have been done by groups such as the National Academy of Sciences, they find that when police do kill people, it is collectively not a racially motivated or a racial thing.

It is, sadly, something that happens because sometimes people do wrong things and it is usually people that are in the process of or are trying not to be apprehended from very dangerous crimes. And a couple times, a few times, it does happen because police make mistakes. But when it is, it shouldn't be used to tarnish police as a whole and it shouldn't be used to come out with the idea that these things are racially motivated.

So there is my report on the good news to the American people.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BUDD (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2019

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 16, 2019.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2019. This status report is current through September 30, the end of fiscal year 2019. The term “current level” refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018, as adjusted, for fiscal year 2019. These comparisons are needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018, as adjusted, for fiscal year 2019. These comparisons are needed to enforce the point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which prohibits the consideration of measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(c), which provides an exception for committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2019