

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

with the section 302(b) suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending authorized in excess of the base discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Table 4 displays the current level of advance appropriations in fiscal year 2019 appropriations bills. All of the advance appropriations are for accounts identified pursuant to H. Res. 6 and the statement of the Chairman published in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2019. This table is need-

ed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that: (i) are not identified in the statement of the Chairman published in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2019 or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 103(c) of H. Res. 6.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregate in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2019

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2019
Appropriate Level¹:	
Budget Authority	3,752,421
Outlays	3,551,738
Revenues	2,590,496
Current Level¹:	
Budget Authority	3,641,183
Outlays	3,547,249
Revenues	2,590,070
Current Level over (+)/under (-)	
Appropriate Level:	
Budget Authority	-11,238
Outlays	-4,489
Revenues	-426

¹The resolution includes emergencies enacted in 2018, adjusted for inflation. Current level excludes all emergencies.

TABLE 2.—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2019

[Unified budget, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2019	
	BA	Outlays
Agriculture		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	2,414	1,401
Difference	2,414	1,401
Armed Services		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Education and Labor		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Energy and Commerce		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	509	173
Difference	509	173
Financial Services		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	20	19
Difference	20	19
Foreign Affairs		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Homeland Security		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
House Administration		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Judiciary		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Natural Resources		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Oversight and Reform		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	1	1
Difference	1	1
Science, Space, and Technology		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Small Business		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	42	55
Difference	42	55
Veterans' Affairs		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	-1	4,397
Difference	-1	4,397
Ways and Means		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	13	7
Difference	13	7

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[Unified budget amounts, in millions of dollar]

Appropriations Subcommittee	1 302(b) Suballocations as of August 10, 2018 (H. Rpt. 115–897)		Current Level Reflecting Action Completed as of September 30, 2019 ¹		Current Level less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	23,242	24,677	23,042	24,491	–200	–186
Commerce, Justice, Science	62,520	72,145	64,118	70,889	1,598	–1,256
Defense	674,591	625,811	674,383	624,840	–208	–971
Energy and Water Development	44,700	44,476	44,640	44,335	–60	–141
Financial Services and General Government	23,423	24,045	23,423	24,085	0	40
Homeland Security	58,087	59,384	61,576	59,602	3,489	218
Interior, Environment	35,252	35,015	35,552	34,975	300	–40
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	178,997	184,114	179,973	185,820	976	1,706
Legislative Branch	4,880	4,770	4,836	4,720	–44	–50
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	98,057	90,691	98,057	90,809	0	118
State, Foreign Operations	54,018	50,280	54,218	49,957	200	–323
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	71,800	132,364	71,079	132,524	–721	160
Subtotal (Section 302(b) Allocations)	1,329,567	1,347,772	1,334,897	1,347,047	5,330	–725
Unallocated portion of Section 302(a) Allocation ²	5,330	–8611	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
TOTAL (Section 302(b) Allocation)	1,334,897	1,339,161	1,334,897	1,347,047	0	7,886

Comparison of total appropriations and 302(a) allocation	General Purpose		OCO ³	
	BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation	1,257,897	1,299,110	77,000	40,051
Total Appropriation	1,257,897	1,306,996	77,000	40,051
	0	7,886	0	0

Memorandum	Amounts Assumed in 302(b) ⁴				Amounts enacted							
	OCO		Program Integrity		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Relief					
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT		
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories												
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	5,300	2,982	n.a.	n.a.		
Commerce, Justice, Science	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,160	377	n.a.	n.a.		
Defense	n.a.	n.a.	67,914	37,071	n.a.	n.a.	1,196	634	n.a.	n.a.		
Energy and Water Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	3,274	114	n.a.	n.a.		
Financial Services and General Government	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	91	34	n.a.	n.a.		
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	127	n.a.	n.a.	1,865	728	12,000	600		
Interior, Environment	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,581	1,001	n.a.	n.a.		
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,897	1,573	3,493	346	n.a.	n.a.		
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	10	5	n.a.	n.a.		
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	921	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,645	12	n.a.	n.a.		
State, Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	8,000	2,853	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	10	n.a.	n.a.		
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	5,772	204	n.a.	n.a.		
Totals	92,557	42,259	77,000	40,051	1,897	1,573	25,387	6,447	12,000	600		

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown on this table.
² Totals include 302(a) adjustments for Overseas Contingency Operations and General Purpose amounts that differ from amounts anticipated in the 302(b) suballocations.
³ Totals include an adjustment for Overseas Contingency Operations included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–6).
⁴ Totals assume an allowable 302(b) adjustment for Disaster Relief, pursuant to a revised 302(a) allocation filed in the Congressional Record on February 14, 2019.

TABLE 4.—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 103(c) OF H. RES. 6 AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2019

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]	
For 2020:	
Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations	
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted advances:	
Accounts identified for advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	1,772
Education for the Disadvantaged	10,841
School Improvement	1,681
Career, Technical, and Adult Education	791
Special Education	9,283
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	4,000
Project-based Rental Assistance	400
Subtotal, enacted advances	28,768
Enacted Advances vs. Section 103(c)(2)(A) limit	–84
Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations	
Appropriate Level	75,551
Enacted advances:	
Veterans accounts identified for advances:	
Veterans Medical Services	51,411

TABLE 4.—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 103(c) OF H. RES. 6 AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2019—Continued

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]	
Veterans Medical Support and Compliance	7,239
Veterans Medical Facilities	6,142
Veterans Medical Community Care	10,758
Subtotal, enacted advances	75,551
Enacted Advances vs. Section 103(c)(2)(B) limit	0
For 2021:	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445

U.S. CONGRESS,
 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
 Washington, DC, October 15, 2019.
 Hon. JOHN YARMUTH,
 Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
 House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
 DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through the end of fiscal year 2019. This re-

port is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018, pursuant to section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123), and section 103(m) of House Resolution 6 of the 116th Congress.

Since our last letter dated July 8, 2019, the President has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2019:

Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–33); and Sustaining Excellence in Medicaid Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–39).

Sincerely,
 PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
 Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2019 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019
 [In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^{a,b,c}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,341,676	2,236,400	n.a.
Authorizing and Appropriation legislation	1,884,827	1,949,095	–302
Offsetting receipts	–890,012	–890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	3,336,491	3,295,480	2,590,194

FISCAL YEAR 2019 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Table with 4 columns: Budget Authority, Outlays, Revenues, and Enacted Legislation. Rows include Authorizing Legislation (Medicaid Extenders Act, Consolidated Appropriations Act, etc.) and Appropriation Legislation (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019).

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law.

^a Includes the budgetary effects of legislation enacted during the 115th Congress.

^b Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include \$781 million in budget authority and \$770 million in estimated outlays.

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, amounts in this current level report do not include those items.

^d The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–5), as amended, extended several immigration programs through February 15, 2019, that would otherwise have expired at the end of fiscal year 2018. The estimated budgetary effects of those previously enacted extensions are charged to the Committee on Appropriations, and are included in the budgetary effects of P.L. 116–6 shown in the “Appropriation Legislation” portion of this report. In addition, division H of P.L. 116–6 further extended those same programs through the end of fiscal year 2019. Consistent with the language in title III of division H of P.L. 116–6, and at the direction of the House Committee on the Budget, the budgetary effects of extending those immigration programs for the remainder of the fiscal year are charged to the relevant authorizing committees, and are shown in the “Authorizing Legislation” portion of this report.

^e In the House of Representatives, and pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement shall not count for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and are excluded from current-level totals. The table below displays emergency-designated funding enacted during the 116th Congress which is excluded from current-level totals. (Those amounts do not include \$1,680 million in budget authority and \$25 million in outlays stemming from P.L. 115–254, which was enacted during the 115th Congress):

Table with 4 columns: Budget Authority, Outlays, Revenues, and Discretionary Emergency Requirements. Rows include Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Divisions A–G, P.L. 116–6) and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–26).

^f Section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123) required—in the absence of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2019—that the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2019; those aggregate levels were first published in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018. P.L. 115–123 also allows the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget to revise the budgetary aggregates.

Table with 4 columns: Budget Authority, Outlays, Revenues, and Original Aggregates Printed on May 10, 2018. Rows include Revision: Adjustment for H.R. 5895, the Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019 and Adjustment for H.J. Res. 31, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2020

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 2020. This status report is current through October 11, 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 3, 2019, as adjusted, for fiscal year 2020 and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2020 through 2029. These comparisons are needed to implement sec-

tion 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. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2020 because appropriations for those years have not yet been completed.

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 3, 2019, for fiscal year 2020, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2020 through 2029. 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 2020 with the section 302(b) suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending authorized in excess of the base discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregate in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH, Chairman.