

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 notwithstanding 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

sway 36 foreign elections from the end of World War II to the turn of the century—meaning that, in total, at least one of the two great powers of the 20th century intervened in about 1 of every 9 competitive, national-level executive elections in that time period.

Italy's 1948 general election is an early example of a race where U.S. actions probably influenced the outcome.

"We threw everything, including the kitchen sink" at helping the Christian Democrats beat the Communists in Italy, said Levin, including covertly delivering "bags of money" to cover campaign expenses, sending experts to help run the campaign, subsidizing "pork" projects like land reclamation, and threatening publicly to end U.S. aid to Italy if the Communists were elected.

Levin said that U.S. intervention probably played an important role in preventing a Communist Party victory, not just in 1948, but in seven subsequent Italian elections. Throughout the Cold War, U.S. involvement in foreign elections was mainly motivated by the goal of containing communism, said Thomas Carothers, a foreign policy expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "The U.S. didn't want to see left-wing governments elected, and so it did engage fairly often in trying to influence elections in other countries," Carothers said.

This approach carried over into the immediate post-Soviet period.

In the 1990 Nicaragua elections, the CIA leaked damaging information on alleged corruption by the Marxist Sandinistas to German newspapers, according to Levin. The opposition used those reports against the Sandinista candidate, Daniel Ortega. He lost to opposition candidate Violeta Chamorro.

In Czechoslovakia that same year, the U.S. provided training and campaign funding to Vaclav Havel's party and its Slovak affiliate as they planned for the country's first democratic election after its transition away from communism.

"The thinking was that we wanted to make sure communism was dead and buried," said Levin.

Even after that, the U.S. continued trying to influence elections in its favor.

In Haiti after the 1986 overthrow of dictator and U.S. ally Jean-Claude "Baby Doc" Duvalier, the CIA sought to support particular candidates and undermine Jean-Bertrande Aristide, a Roman Catholic priest and proponent of liberation theology. The New York Times reported in the 1990s that the CIA had on its payroll members of the military junta that would ultimately unseat Aristide after he was democratically elected in a landslide over Marc Bazin, a former World Bank official and finance minister favored by the U.S. The U.S. also attempted to sway Russian elections.

In 1996, with the presidency of Boris Yeltsin and the Russian economy flailing, President Clinton endorsed a \$10.2-billion loan from the International Monetary Fund linked to privatization, trade liberalization and other measures that would move Russia toward a capitalist economy. Yeltsin used the loan to bolster his popular support, telling voters that only he had the reformist credentials to secure such loans, according to media reports at the time. He used the money, in part, for social spending before the election, including payment of back wages and pensions.

In the Middle East, the U.S. has aimed to bolster candidates who could further the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. In 1996, seeking to fulfill the legacy of assassinated Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and the peace accords the U.S. brokered, Clinton openly supported Shimon Peres, convening a peace summit in the Egyptian resort of

Sharm el Sheik to boost his popular support and inviting him to a meeting at the White House a month before the election.

"We were persuaded that if [Likud candidate Benjamin] Netanyahu were elected, the peace process would be closed for the season," said Aaron David Miller, who worked at the State Department at the time.

In 1999, in a more subtle effort to sway the election, top Clinton strategists, including James Carville, were sent to advise Labor candidate Ehud Barak in the election against Netanyahu.

In Yugoslavia, the U.S. and NATO had long sought to cut off Serbian nationalist and Yugoslav leader Slobodan Milosevic from the international system through economic sanctions and military action. In 2000, the U.S. spent millions of dollars in aid for political parties, campaign costs and independent media. Funding and broadcast equipment provided to the media arms of the opposition were a decisive factor in electing opposition candidate Vojislav Kostunica as Yugoslav president, according to Levin. "If it wouldn't have been for overt intervention . . . Milosevic would have been very likely to have won another term," he said.

SUPPORTING CONGRESSMAN JIM JORDAN

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is greater turnover in elective offices today than ever before. And in my 30 years in Congress, I have now served with almost 1,500 other Members. Almost all have been good, kind men and women. But one of the best, one of the kindest is my friend, JIM JORDAN.

Now, Congressman JORDAN has been attacked with one of the dirtiest, most low-down political hit jobs that I have ever seen. He has been accused of knowing about, but failing to report, sexual abuse that occurred 25 to 30 years ago. This alleged abuse was done not by Mr. JORDAN but by another man, a team doctor, who has been dead for 13 years. And this abuse was not done to little boys or girls. It was supposedly done to grown adult men, Ohio State wrestlers, none of whom reported it at the time.

The timing is so suspicious coming out now when Mr. JORDAN may be seeking a leadership post. He is supposed to have known about this because of locker-room banter.

All the coaches and many of his players have defended Mr. JORDAN, calling him one of the most honest men they know. Surely, Mr. Speaker, even though politics of hatred is prevalent today, surely we are not going to stoop to convicting people based on locker-room banter or gossip.

WATER SUPPLY IN THE VALLEY

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to the human right to have water to sustain ourselves.

Benjamin Franklin once said about this precious resource, water, that "When the well's dry, we know the worth of water."

In the San Joaquin Valley, I can tell you we know the worth of water. It is the lifeblood of our Valley commu-

nities and our agricultural economy. We like to say, Where water flows, food grows.

The Valley is one of the most advanced agricultural regions in the world. We produce over 250 crops that provide over 50 percent of the United States' fruits and vegetables on America's dinner table every night. The bounty of nature of food that we produce is coaxed out of the ground by some of the hardest working people you will ever meet, farmers and farmworkers, and it relies on a clean and reliable water resource.

And America's food supply, make no mistake about it, is a national security issue. I have spent decades working for commonsense short- and long-term solutions to address California's broken water system. When I served in the California legislature, I carried multiple bonds that were passed that provided over \$2 billion for crucial water projects.

While in Congress, I have advanced legislation that has improved water supplies and funding for projects in many different ways: The North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program, which helps irrigate over 44,000 acres in western Merced and Stanislaus Counties with local and recycled water, and the San Luis-Delta Mendota Intertie project, which brings up to over 35,000 acre-feet of water annually to most of our rural Valley communities to advance efforts that are so important, that make a difference.

In addition, that doesn't include the success of the WIIN Act, bipartisan legislation which I helped lead through 4 years of tough negotiations. It became law in 2016. The WIIN Act creates more flexibility to move water based on real-time water realities and provides authorization for \$563 million in Federal funds for water projects, like expanding Shasta Reservoir, like raising San Luis Reservoir, and like creating Temperance Flat.

Just this month, legislation I introduced to allow local water districts to improve the efficiency of dams passed the House. I call on the Senate to move this bill to the President's desk.

In the Valley, this would allow the Merced Irrigation District to advance a project to raise the spillway at New Exchequer Dam. This would increase the supply of water, over 56,000 acre-feet of water—much needed.

However, it seems like every time we are able increase our drought resilience, State or Federal regulators decide that they need to take more water from the Valley. It is wrong and it is unfair.

The most recent attempt to repurpose the Valley water supplies came earlier this month by the California State Water Board. Staff released the final draft of a plan that is simply unacceptable. And I must say, it is pretty easy to reallocate water when it is not your water supply. That is what the State board did.

The plan, if adopted, will effectively double the amount of water that must