

Texas A&M is not alone in this fight to provide a voice for victims. According to the National Sexual Violence Resource Center, each year one in five women will be assaulted while in college. That is a staggering statistic.

Mr. Speaker, Meghan said it best: "A&M has a chance to be fearless on every front and to be fearless in the face of such horrible things that are happening to victims."

I applaud Meghan for having the courage to come forward and publicly tell her story to the world. Other victims who have been suffering in silence have been inspired to come forward and rally the cause, forming an organization called the 12th Woman, a group of determined women dedicated to stopping sexual assault on our university campuses.

This is not a question of loyalty and pride in Texas A&M. It is a call to action. The 12th Woman is relentless in bringing change to the way universities address sexual assault not just at A&M, but across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to listen to Meghan and her band of sisters and do what is necessary to make sure our universities are safe from sexual assault on campus.

And that is just the way it is.

#### WE HAVE TO ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise because I love my country. I am proud to say that I am an American.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe that, when democracy is at risk and the Republic is on the line, you have to take a stand.

I rise today because to be silent could be concluded as being acquiescent. To be silent can be said to be complicit. To be silent, according to Dr. King, at some point can be said to be seen as betrayal.

I rise because I love my country. Because I love my country, I will not allow myself to be driven by polls. I thank God that the great freedom fighters, the great wrong-righters were not driven by polls. If Dr. King, Rosa Parks, the great freedom fighters, had been driven by polls, I wouldn't be standing here today.

They drove the polls. They didn't adjust to the polls. They had the polls, the people who gave their thoughts, to adjust to righteousness.

So I rise today to speak truth to power, not driven by polls, not driven by political expediency. I rise today to let the world know that our country is better than what we saw in Helsinki.

I rise today to say to my colleagues: We have to act. Yes, we can talk about all of the atrocities imposed upon our society by this President, but that is not enough. At some point, we have to act, and more and more people are starting to say what that action is.

More and more of the people who present the news and give commentary are starting to say what that action is.

It is unfortunate that we haven't gotten to the point where we are going to act not withstanding the polls, we are going to act notwithstanding political expediency, we are going to act because there is a moral imperative to remove a President from office who puts democracy at risk and the Republic on the line.

There is a moral imperative for us to take a stand. And we can do all of the things that can lead up to what the Framers of the Constitution afforded us. We can do many things, but Article II, section 4 of the Constitution was created for a time such as this and a President such as Trump.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solution to a President who puts himself above his country. The Framers of the Constitution knew that we would have this moment in time, and they gave us the solution. We but only have to have the courage, the intestinal fortitude, to stand up for our country and impeach this President.

The time has come. No more political expediency. No more driven by the polls. Stand for our country on a moral imperative.

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

#### INFLUENCING ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last year CNN reported that the U.S. had interfered or attempted to influence presidential elections in other countries at least 81 times. This is probably a very conservative estimate.

This report came from a study by Professor Dov H. Levin of Carnegie Mellon University and apparently was just the tip of the iceberg. His study covered just years up to 2000, and these activities may have increased since that time.

Professor Levin defined an intervention as "a costly act which is designed to determine the election results in favor of one of the two sides." He said these acts were carried out in secret two-thirds of the time and included "funding the election campaigns of specific parties, disseminating misinformation or propaganda, training locals of only one side in various campaigning or public announcements on threats in favor of or against a candidate, and providing or withdrawing foreign aid." He reported that in 59 percent of these cases the side that received assistance came to power.

In a December 21, 2016, article, the Los Angeles Times said: "The U.S. has a long history of attempting to influence presidential elections in other countries."

□ 1030

The newspaper reported, that "the CIA has accused Russia of interfering in the 2016 Presidential election by hacking into Democratic and Republican computer networks and selectively releasing emails." But the Times added: "But critics might point out that the U.S. has done similar things."

I am not criticizing our government's activities in this regard. Some of it has been good, designed to fight communism and promote freedom around the world. However, some of it has probably been wasteful, and, at times, has increased hatred for the U.S. We are involved, in many ways, in almost every country around the world through our State Department, Agency for International Development, the CIA, the Defense Department, and just about every Federal department and agency. Most countries take an active interest and involvement in U.S. Presidential elections through their citizens and former citizens who now live in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this article from the Los Angeles Times.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 21, 2016]

THE U.S. IS NO STRANGER TO INTERFERING IN THE ELECTIONS OF OTHER COUNTRIES

(By Nina Agrawal)

Update: President Obama on Thursday slapped Russia with new penalties for meddling in the U.S. presidential election, kicking out dozens of suspected spies and imposing banking restrictions on five people and four organizations the administration says were involved.

The CIA has accused Russia of interfering in the 2016 presidential election by hacking into Democratic and Republican computer networks and selectively releasing emails. But critics might point out the U.S. has done similar things.

The U.S. has a long history of attempting to influence presidential elections in other countries—it's done so as many as 81 times between 1946 and 2000, according to a database amassed by political scientist Dov Levin of Carnegie Mellon University.

That number doesn't include military coups and regime change efforts following the election of candidates the U.S. didn't like, notably those in Iran, Guatemala and Chile. Nor does it include general assistance with the electoral process, such as election monitoring.

Levin defines intervention as "a costly act which is designed to determine the election results [in favor of] one of the two sides." These acts, carried out in secret two-thirds of the time, include funding the election campaigns of specific parties, disseminating misinformation or propaganda, training locals of only one side in various campaigning or get-out-the-vote techniques, helping one side design their campaign materials, making public pronouncements or threats in favor of or against a candidate, and providing or withdrawing foreign aid.

In 59 percent of these cases, the side that received assistance came to power, although Levin estimates the average effect of "partisan electoral interventions" to be only about a 3 percent increase in vote share.

The U.S. hasn't been the only one trying to interfere in other countries' elections, according to Levin's data. Russia attempted to