

then the government's war on poverty has been wildly successful. After all, we now have 13 Federal agencies running more than 80 government welfare programs.

But if we judge success based on how many people have been able to rise out of poverty to take care of themselves and their families, these government programs have failed.

So what have we learned after spending \$22 trillion? It is simple: Workfare helps people stand on their own two feet. It helps people get off the welfare treadmill.

For example, before Congress reformed Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, also known as TANF, to incorporate a strict work requirement, there were 4.9 million families on the welfare rolls. Now, thanks to workfare reforms, we have seen 3.3 million families rise out of welfare dependence. That is a success.

□ 1015

In 2014, when Maine began enforcing workfare for able-bodied adults without dependents who are receiving food stamps, the Maine caseload decreased by 80 percent within months.

The simple requirement that able-bodied adults without dependents should work in order to receive welfare benefits, paired with job search assistance and training opportunities, works. It gets people out of welfare and into the workforce.

We have learned that it makes a profound difference in people's lives when they understand that welfare is not meant to be a handout but, actually, a hand up.

Now, we need to apply these lessons about the benefits of workfare to more government welfare programs like food stamps and housing. That is especially important today because, with the economy growing, thanks to tax reform, job openings recently hit a record high of 6.6 million, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. By taking a stand for workfare requirements, we now have an opportunity to move millions of Americans from reliance on welfare to work and financial independence.

I commend the House for passing a farm bill that includes a strong workfare requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents. We have opened the door to welfare reforms that will help put people on the road to self-reliance, and I encourage my colleagues to build on this foundation and continue to stand up for workfare instead of welfare.

BIZARRE BEHAVIOR

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

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, I was on a congressional trip with the Judiciary Committee into the Balkan region. A number of the countries there, living in the shadow of Russia

and, also, the aggression of the Serbian allies of the Russians were very concerned about their security and their future.

Russia has, obviously, invaded Crimea, is supporting rebels in Ukraine, and is deeply involved in Syria to support the dictator there.

Now, in this last week, our President went to Europe, and he went to a meeting of our closest allies and NATO, which these countries on the periphery of Russia feel is critical to their defense. And he seems to—or did—deliberately so dissent and insult our two longest and strongest allies in NATO: Germany and England.

He seemed to be facilitating the Russian agenda there: Let's weaken NATO. Let's cause dissent in Europe.

But that couldn't be. He is the President of the United States. Of course he wouldn't be doing that. No. He was just being a businessman and trying to extract bigger payments out of them. He didn't mean to weaken or threaten the future of the alliance.

Then yesterday, in a sort of very bizarre moment, he meets alone with a professional KGB agent-dictator of Russia, Vladimir Putin. We don't know what went on in that room. Maybe they watched videotapes. I don't know. But the President came out again and, this time, directly attacked the United States of America.

How could this be? He said that he does not believe that our intelligence agencies—his hand-picked head of the DNI, Dan Coats, told him the Russians had interfered and proved to him the Russians had interfered in our election. He said that once about a year ago.

But then he comes out with Vladimir Putin and says: Well, I asked him about it. He says they didn't do it. You know, there's two sides to this. We did it. They did it. Who knows. Whatever. It doesn't matter.

Our basic institutions, our democracy, has been attacked by Russia, and Dan Coats says they are going to do it again in this election year.

What can explain this bizarre behavior on the part of the President of the United States?

I couldn't figure it out, so I went to my bookshelf and I said: Hmm, I'll look around my bookshelf. Maybe I'll find something.

I found two books. It is my recommended reading list to explain President Trump and some of what is going on in America today. The first would be "The Manchurian Candidate." The second would be the dystopian novel, George Orwell's "1984." Read them and weep.

THE 12TH WOMAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Meghan is a fourth-generation Texas A&M Aggie. Her decision to attend the prestigious school was never a question

in her mind. It was an amazing experience, until it wasn't.

One morning, while serving as a tutor in the athletic department, a member of the Fighting Aggies football team twice her size exposed himself to her not 2 feet away, making sexual advances toward Meghan and becoming aggressive. Terrified and shocked, she abruptly left the room, trying to remain calm as he followed her. Unbeknownst to Meghan, her assailant had done the same thing to another tutor just hours before.

Mr. Speaker, Meghan feels she did not get justice against her attacker. Instead, she tells me, she was failed by a university that was not totally committed to protecting victims.

Meghan was scared of the upcoming process, scared to go back to work, terrified she might run into this individual again.

Before the hearing, the university claimed she did not need a lawyer; the assailant wasn't facing any criminal charges. So she didn't hire a lawyer. But she received no notice that her assailant had hired a lawyer.

Months later, Meghan's assailant was found not responsible for exposing himself to both tutors, with the panel stating it appeared he had a skin condition and simply couldn't control himself.

The response she received was nothing short of appalling. The school said: Sorry, Meghan, that you were offended, but there is nothing else we can do.

So she appealed the case. She still believed in the university and that the university would provide some justice for her. At the appeals hearing, she was informed that the charge against her attacker had been downgraded from sexual exploitation to sexual harassment; therefore, she was removed from the remainder of the hearing.

Doesn't that seem odd, Mr. Speaker?

Also, no one from the university title IX office ever contacted her. She never received any information regarding what sanctions her assailant received, if any. Of course, Mr. Speaker, her assailant was allowed back onto the football team.

Meghan felt abandoned by the university, and she thought the accused was protected due to his special status.

As a former judge, I agree with Meghan that universities must put the safety and care of sexual assault victims first, make it a priority. Together with CAROLYN MALONEY and JACKIE SPEIER, we have introduced several pieces of bipartisan legislation to end sexual assault on campuses.

First, the Bipartisan Campus Accountability and Safety Act, introduced by Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, does many things, including establishing a mandatory victim advocate on campus and ensuring assault situations like Meghan's do not occur.

Second, the HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act, which will be introduced this week by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER and me, makes sure that the universities do not shirk their legal responsibilities when responding to sexual assault crimes.

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