

them are unprecedented in human history.

This is why we mourn those who lost their lives in one of history's darkest moments. This is why we recommit ourselves to upholding the principle of "never again." This is why we have an International Holocaust Remembrance Day.

A cruel irony is that on this very same day, Trump released his punishing Muslim ban that Bannon reportedly crafted to stop refugees from coming into our country. The executive order bans travel to the United States from seven predominantly Islam countries, though we are told that this is not a Muslim ban.

The bumbling rollout of the order and unmitigated chaos it caused, has drawn scorn from across the political spectrum, and from allies across the world. Fortunately, our legal system has acted as a check on this ban so far. But it is the Islamophobia at the root of it, which is what Mr. Bannon and the alt-right crowd have long promoted. The Jewish community was quick to see the disturbing historic similarities.

In May of 1939, the German liner *St. Louis* sailed to Cuba with 937 passengers, most of them Jews fleeing the Third Reich. The bulk of the Jewish passengers had applied for U.S. visas and planned to stay in Cuba, but anti-Semitic protests prevented them from even disembarking there. After intense negotiations to try to have Cuba accept the refugees failed, the United States turned the ship away, and the passengers were forced to return to Europe. One-third of them were ultimately exterminated by the Nazis.

□ 1015

It was a shameful chapter in our history. Those harsh forces are still at work around the globe, and it is those very same aspirational principles that drive so many immigrants to come to this great Nation.

The idea that someone such as Mr. Bannon has actively worked to oppose these values in the past sickens me. The idea that Mr. Bannon now sits on the principals committee on the National Security Council is also deeply troubling. The prospect that his alt-right views could politicize the decisions that put American troops and lives at risk is inexplicable and inexcusable.

But make no mistake, this outrage lies at the feet of Donald Trump, who allowed this oblique denial to go out in his name.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to say that I will not be silent. In the face of cruelty and suffering, I will stand with those who refuse to be bystanders. I will join my voice with those who courageously ask questions instead of thoughtlessly taking orders.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the Holocaust statement was never just a quibble about words. It is about the memory of 6 million murdered Jews. It is about making sure that no

one, especially in the United States of America, denies that its primary purpose was, at its core, about Jews. And if we are to make certain that this never happens again, we cannot erase them from history or allow history to repeat itself. Never again.

1982 VOTE MACHINE RIGGING

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, fake news by the leftist Washington Post has gotten even more shrill and more irrational since Donald Trump became President.

At a Republican meeting in Philadelphia, a felony was committed by the illegal tape recording and subsequent publication of my private conversation with Vice President MIKE PENCE about voter fraud. The Washington Post reported that I said: "In my first election in 1982, Democrats rigged about 25 percent of the voting machines to vote for everyone on the ballot but me. That's 11 of 45 machines."

Rather than reporting about my being a voter fraud victim or about something else I said that a Federal court decree opened the floodgates for illegal alien voting, The Washington Post did a partisan fake news hit piece and gave me, the voter fraud victim, a four-Pinocchio score on truthfulness.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly wear The Washington Post four Pinocchios like a red badge of courage. I know what the truth was. I was there. Here are the facts:

In 1982, I was a Republican candidate in Alabama House District 18 at a time when Democrats dominated Alabama. All 31 of Alabama's statewide elected officials were Democrats. Democrats held every partisan elected office in Alabama's Tennessee Valley.

On election day, angry voters called me nonstop about rigged voting machines that would not allow them to vote for MO BROOKS. As a former assistant district attorney, I knew how to conduct an investigation. I talked with witnesses. I examined documents. Another attorney did the same. When the polls opened, 11 of 45 voting machines registered votes for all candidates on the ballot except for MO BROOKS. Not once was my opponent or any other candidate blocked on any machine.

My hometown is the birthplace of America's space program and many of America's high-tech weaponry. We know math. Mathematically, if there were 26 candidates on the ballot, which there were, and only one name is blocked out, the odds of a particular candidate being blocked out are 1 in 26. If there are two machines that each has one name blocked out, the odds of MO BROOKS being blocked out both times is 1 in 26 squared, or 1 chance out of 676 chances.

If there are 11 machines that each have one name blocked out, the odds that all 11 blocked names are MO

BROOKS are 1 chance in 26 to the 11th power. Hence, the odds that my name, the only name, was accidentally blocked out on 11 different machines, as The Washington Post would have you believe, are 1 chance out of 26 to the 11th power, or 1 chance out of 3.6 quadrillion chances.

Conversely, the probability that these 11 voting machines were rigged is 3.6 quadrillion to 1. The evidence is overwhelming. There was no accident. The voting machines were rigged.

Who rigged the voting machines?

In 1982, every single elected official with control over voting machines was a Democrat. In 1982, I was campaigning in a hotly contested race to be the only Republican legislator in the northern third of Alabama. I was the breach in the Democratic Party dam.

Earlier in the campaign, the Democratic Alabama secretary of State, who is now serving hard time in Federal prison, notified me that I would be removed from the ballot because my paperwork was allegedly not in their files. Fortunately, I had date-stamped copies of the documents I filed, thereby forcing the Democrat secretary of State to back off.

The Democrats had motive. The Democrats had opportunity. The Democrats had control. It is fake news for The Washington Post to cover up Democratic sins by suggesting otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, The Washington Post's fake news hit piece begs a broader question: Why would The Washington Post even bother to write about an election they know nothing about that happened over 34 years ago? The answer: partisan paranoia. The Democrats and their media allies like The Washington Post are so paranoid and angry about President Trump's election that they are shrilly lying and lashing out against anybody, anytime, regardless of truth.

The Washington Post: fake news, sad.

As a footnote, despite the voter fraud, I won the election with 57 percent of the vote. In a court-ordered election just 1 year later, voters still angry about Democratic voter fraud re-elected me with 82 percent of the vote. That is 25 percentage points higher than when the Democrats rigged the voting machines.

COUNTRY BEFORE PARTY

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my serious concern regarding President Trump's respect for, and adherence to, the United States Constitution. In short, something is not right at the White House.

His behavior suggests that he has little regard for the judicial branch of our government. If the President has purposely acted in contradiction of a court's order, he would be in violation of the Constitution, and this Congress would be required to act.

Today, I am filing a resolution calling for the Department of Justice to appoint an independent counsel to investigate whether the President or his staff directed, or knowingly allowed, Customs and Border Protection to violate court orders designed to freeze the implementation of the January 27 Muslim travel ban executive order.

I strongly disagree with the contents of the executive order in question. It targets people based on their religion, and it instilled fear across the country. It violates our Nation's values and the idea that, in America, people aren't judged by the color of their skin or by the religion they practice but, instead, by their character. This plays right into the hands of terrorists who would use it as a recruiting tool around the world to inflame those who seek to do Americans harm at home and abroad.

Let me be clear, though. My disapproval of the President's unfair executive order did not motivate the introduction of this resolution. This resolution concerns only the President's adherence to a judicial order. The question is whether he knowingly allowed Customs and Border Patrol to violate that order.

I hope the investigation will find that the President and his administration fully complied with court orders concerning his executive order. However, if President Trump overstepped and purposely violated the judiciary, the Congress should censure him. If, after censure, the President again disregards our Nation's systems of checks and balances and separation of powers, the Congress should take steps to remove him from office.

During his campaign and in the time since his election, President Trump has promised to be a law-and-order President. Well, the court system is central to upholding the law and ensuring order in our Nation. It represents the way that we, as Americans, peacefully and civilly resolve disputes. Respect for the judiciary isn't just a constitutional requirement for the President, it is a requirement for all of us.

President Trump is no stranger to our judicial system. He spent his career using the courts to sue his foes and settle his broken promises. Now it is time for him to keep the promise he made to the American people when he took the oath of office last month. He must follow the law and abide by our Constitution.

Defending our democracy requires vigilance and stern action. Our Founders wisely designed our government so that no court, no Congress, and no President could gain a dangerous amount of power. If we in Congress cede our responsibility to keep the executive in check, we risk being complicit in creating a constitutional crisis.

My resolution seeks to defend our Republic and our precious founding documents. Each of us in Congress swore to support the Constitution.

I urge all Members of this body to put country before party and vote in favor of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from improper references to the President.

COMPETING VISIONS OF THE FUTURE

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has come to a crossroads between two competing visions for the future that don't easily reconcile. At such times as these, emotions run very high.

The good news is that our institutions are the best ever designed to resolve such political disputes. And it comes down to this: In other countries, the government is the sovereign and rights flow from it to the people; here in America, the people are sovereign.

In America, the sovereign does not govern; it hires help to govern during an election. In between elections, the sovereign people debate how the hired help is doing. That is the real debate, the one that goes on every day over backyard fences and family dinner tables wherever Americans gather. After that family discussion, we decide whether to fire the hired help or keep it for another cycle. As long as we are with each other and not shouting at each other, our system works very well.

Once in our history, we stopped talking with each other. That was the election of 1860. That election was marked not by reconciliation, but by rioting in those regions where the opposition dominated. The opposition party refused to accept the legitimacy of the election itself. Political leaders pledged resistance to the new administration by any means necessary. They asserted the doctrine of nullification, the notion that any dissenting State or city that opposed Federal laws could simply refuse to obey them. Finally came the secession movement, the ultimate rejection of our Constitution and our rule of law.

Have we not started down that road once again?

Even before the election, we saw violent mobs carrying foreign flags physically attack Americans for the sole reason that they wanted to attend a political rally for the candidate of their choice. The violence in Berkeley last week warns us that this behavior is rising.

Some prominent elected officials are again asserting the doctrine of nullification by declaring that their jurisdictions are sanctuaries where Federal immigration laws will simply be ignored. In California, the formal cessation movement is supported by nearly a third of the population of my own suffering State.

Now, I held more than a hundred townhall meetings in my district throughout the last 8 years, spanning the entire life of the Tea Party and the Occupy Wall Street movements. Through all of these heated debates, the police have never had to intervene, until this weekend in Roseville, when the Roseville Police Department determined that the size and temper of the crowd required a police escort to protect me as I left the venue.

□ 1030

Now, the vast majority of the people attempting to attend this meeting were peaceful, decent, law-abiding folks who sincerely opposed Donald Trump, and they wanted to make their views known to their elected representative. But, there was also a well-organized element that came to disrupt, and disrupt they did.

Now, in the last four elections, our country has turned dramatically away from the left. The Democrats have lost 67 House seats, 12 Senate seats, 10 Governors, more than 900 State legislative seats, and now the Presidency. That happened, in large part, because those who opposed their policies talked with their neighbors about the future of our country.

Instead of pursuing that successful example, the radical left seeks not to persuade their fellow citizens by reason but rather to impose its views by bullying, insulting, intimidating, and, as in Berkeley, by physically attacking their fellow citizens. This is not a tactic likely to change minds, but, if it persists, it could tear down the very institutions of democracy that have served us so well for so long.

I would ask the many sincere citizens who have been caught up with this disruptive element: Do you object because the President is breaking his promises, or do you object because he is keeping them?

If your objection is because the President is keeping the promises he made to the American people, is that not because the sovereign people, your neighbors and fellow countrymen, directed these changes over the last four elections?

If you love our country, and that love for our country is greater than your hatred of our President, I implore you to engage in a civil discussion with your fellow citizens. That is what true democracy looks like.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers believed that our constitutional system of checks and balances and separation of powers were the people's primary protection for their liberty, and they saw the usurpation of authority by a single branch to be dangerous to the constitutional system.