

I feel our new President has some learning to do, and a lot of that learning has to do with the three branches of government, like what the executive branch should do when a Federal judge tells them to stop doing something they shouldn't be doing in the first place.

I think the new President has a lot to learn about the freedom of religion, the separation of church and State, and how our refugee policies work. I think the people of Chicago could teach him a lot about the Fourth Amendment and its ban on unreasonable search and seizure and the illegality of holding immigrants in jail without a warrant.

So I am offering to give the President my copy of the Constitution, autographed by Khizr Khan, the father of a U.S. Army captain killed in Iraq in 2004, who asked a question I don't think any one of us knows the answer to. That question is: Has the President ever read the Constitution? I am proud I will be standing with Mr. Khan and other leaders of different faiths later today at a press conference on the actions taken by our new dear leader.

We can all see through the emperor's new clothes and his Chinese-made tie, and the view isn't pretty, Mr. Speaker.

MUSLIM REFUGEE EXECUTIVE ORDER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just hours after the President's misguided, counterproductive, and objectively anti-American Muslim ban was signed, we saw the effects. Chaos erupted at airports around the country, including in my own district at Chicago O'Hare. Green card holders were held in legal limbo. Refugees fleeing violence and persecution were sent away before boarding U.S.-bound flights, even after enduring years of thorough screening and vetting.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time we have turned away innocent people seeking safety in our country. In 1939, the German ocean liner *St. Louis* Manifest and its 937 Jewish passengers, almost all Jewish refugees, were turned away from the Port of Miami and sent back to Europe. Of those passengers, 254 were murdered in the Holocaust.

We all bear a responsibility to learn from the evils of history so that we will never make the same mistakes again. It is our turn to step up and fight to protect the values of our Nation and ensure that we are on the right side of history. Because who can possibly forget the photo of Alan Kurdi, the 3-year-old Syrian boy who was washed up on a Turkish beach. Or Omran Daqneesh, the 5-year-old Syrian boy covered in blood as he waited for emergency care after being rescued from a building in Aleppo hit by an airstrike. These devastating images have become symbols of the refugee crisis.

We cannot let them symbolize our inaction, too.

The President's executive order creating this Muslim ban undermines the foundational ideas of this country, a Nation founded by immigrants with the intention of providing freedom, opportunity, and a better life to all who seek it. Making good on one of his most extreme campaign promises, the President signed this order with little or no input from his own national security advisers nor from specialists at the State Department, Homeland Security, or the Justice Department, once again signaling his strong and continued dismissal of facts, evidence, and advice from seasoned experts.

Contrary to the President's misguided belief, Islam is not the issue, and his decision to go after Muslims instead of terrorists only fuels our enemies' propaganda. The President's Muslim ban undermines our national security goals and is counterproductive in the fight against terrorism. The ban jeopardizes our strategic partnerships with allies in the Middle East who are on the very front lines in the fight against ISIS. Asylum seekers and foreign nationals have provided invaluable assistance to our military and diplomats in a variety of roles overseas. I agree with Senators McCain and Graham, who said this ban will become "a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism." Ultimately, this order is more likely to increase terrorist recruitment than to deter it.

Outrage over this ban extends far beyond national security and counterterrorism experts. For example, we are seeing sharp criticism from business leaders across the country, including CEOs of companies like Google, Apple, Facebook, and Airbnb. They recognize that immigrants play a huge role in fostering our Nation's entrepreneurial spirit, advancing new technology, creating startups, all which spur innovation and economic activity across the country.

Universities and academics across the country are also grappling with what the President's restrictions mean for their students and for scholarship and academia more broadly. Students benefit from the inclusion of all world views, which provide us with a deeper understanding of science, the arts, economic policy, national security, and all other aspects of our society.

Let's be clear. My own city of Chicago has been and will continue to be home to an immigrant and refugee community from all around the world, and we are forever enriched and grateful for the contributions that make this country great. I, along with the majority of American people who took to the streets to make their opposition heard loud and clear, demand that the administration rescind this shameful order before even more grave and lasting damage is done.

Let's call a spade a spade. Despite the White House's insistence that this is not a Muslim ban, the policy laid out

by the President will almost exclusively impact Muslims. In fact, the President went so far as to point out that this administration will prioritize the admittance for Christian refugees. If this is not a religious test, then what is?

Refugees of all faiths, creeds, race, and national origins have looked to America as a beacon of freedom. So long as this ban is in effect, that light shines less brightly. We will not etch a new inscription at the base of the Statue of Liberty. Instead, her golden lamp will continue to welcome those who are tired, poor, and yearning to be free, just as it always has.

TRUMP'S REFUGEE EXECUTIVE ORDER: SEPARATING FACT FROM FICTION

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my fervent support for President Trump's executive order: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry.

I, along with many other Members of Congress, have been speaking out for more than a 1½ years about the dangers posed by our U.N.-run refugee resettlement program. I applaud President Trump for following through on his promise by imposing strict vetting for seven countries that President Obama labeled in 2016 as countries of particular concern for terrorism.

Liberal activists and politicians are leveling baseless assertions about the Trump policy only to see a lazy and complicit media parrot their claims without exercising due diligence to validate it. To me, this is fake news. And in this incident, it is the mainstream media that is pushing this misinformation. Let's separate myth from fact and inject a little coolheaded commonsense into this national dialogue.

Friday's executive order does a few things: It pauses the entry of all refugees for the next 120 days; it caps refugee admissions for fiscal year 2017 at 50,000; it stalls, for 90 days, the admission of foreign nationals from seven countries that are well established as terrorist hotspot countries; and it puts priority on highly persecuted religious minorities when the refugee program resumes.

The media has echoed the protesters' assertion that this is somehow a Muslim ban. They are flat-out wrong. Remember, it was President Obama who created this seven-country list, not President Trump.

If it were a Muslim ban, then why doesn't it include restrictions on the other 40 majority Muslim nations? That makes no sense. That is because this is a targeted approach to deal with the threat posed by terrorists who operate freely in these failed states and pose a direct threat to the American people. There is absolutely nothing in this executive order that says anything

about banning any particular group of people.

Another shortsighted fallacy being propagated is that President Trump is the only President to ever implement restrictions on refugee admissions. Conveniently forgotten is the fact that in 2011, President Obama stopped processing refugees from Iraq for 6 months after a terrorist plot was uncovered involving two Iraqi refugees who had come into the United States.

□ 1015

Previous Presidents of both parties have responded to global threats with refugee admission limitations, so characterizing Trump's actions is unprecedented, is simply fiction and a gross demonstration of partisanship.

As ISIS has infiltrated the ranks of refugees in Europe, the President is similarly responding to global threats with the appropriate safeguards as he sees fit.

This is something that he should be praised for—not condemned.

The notion that the executive order is inherently un-American must be addressed as well. After all, America is the land made up of immigrants that has been a safe harbor to millions fleeing persecution around the world since her inception.

But in order for this to continue, we must be vigilant to protect our homeland.

America is the greatest Nation in the world, and if we let up on our pursuit of the highest national security standards, we will see this greatness slip away—to the detriment not only of all American citizens, but to the entire world.

Finally, I must address the false notion that having a Christian ethic demands that we accept all refugees with open arms. Well, if that is the case, why aren't we opening the doors wide to the 60 million refugees worldwide rather than only a fraction of 1 percent?

As a follower of Jesus Christ, I do believe that we should help those in need around us, and that America should be involved in helping the displaced and persecuted whenever we can.

Perhaps a more compassionate approach might be to take the money that we spend settling one refugee in the United States and, instead, for the same price, provide for 12, for a dozen, refugees in a safe haven near their own home countries.

Just as a father's primary responsibility is to care for his own children, the chief role of the President and other national leaders is to ensure the best interest of the citizens under their charge.

If President Trump were to overlook the safety of the American people, it would simply be an abdication of his own responsibility that the American people elected him to do.

It seems the President's opponents have cherry-picked particular Bible verses to suit their own political agen-

da, while ignoring other basic Biblical concepts of stewardship and responsibility out of sheer political convenience.

To conclude, the hysteria surrounding this national security executive order must come to an end.

After all, the main provisions of this executive order are temporary in nature and are in line with what many Presidents in the past have done.

ISIS presents one of the most extensive and complex threats to our Nation, and we do want our President to take every precaution to make sure that Americans are safe.

This—not the false narratives of Trump's opponents—must be the focus of the national dialogue, and we must share in what he is doing.

NSC APPOINTMENTS TO PRINCIPALS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce the Protect the National Security Council from Political Interference Act.

I would like to thank my House colleagues who have signed on as original cosponsors of this legislation.

I have worked at the Department of Defense, and I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I believe the most solemn responsibility of Federal policymakers is to keep the American people safe, and to do so in a way that is faithful to the moral and ethical principles that have made this country exceptional, and a force for good in a dangerous and unpredictable world.

Within the complex Federal bureaucracy, the National Security Council is, arguably, the most important institution when it comes to debating and deciding issues related to homeland security, foreign policy, intelligence collection, and the national defense. Choices about whether to deploy men and women into combat are made during the meetings of the NSC or its main subgroup, the Principals Committee. So, too, are decisions about how to defend the homeland against terrorism and how to support our allies and counter our adversaries across the globe. The NSC's deliberations are so serious because the stakes are so high.

Since the creation of this body by Congress in 1947, Presidents from Truman to Obama have prescribed the organizational structure and role of the NSC according to their personal preferences within the broad parameters set by Congress. This is how it should be. The NSC is a policymaking instrument, and the President is entitled to utilize this instrument in the manner that the President sees fit.

However, historically, there has been a bipartisan consensus that the NSC debates should be divorced from the world of electoral politics. The Presidents of both parties have sought to es-

tablish an NSC policy process that is not contaminated or perceived to be contaminated by political considerations.

Josh Bolton, chief of staff to President George W. Bush, may have put it best while explaining why President Bush excluded political counselor Karl Rove from all NSC meetings: "... the President ... knew that the signal he wanted to send to the rest of his administration, the signal he wanted to send to the public, and the signal he especially wanted to send to the military, is that, 'The decisions I'm making that involve life and death for the people in uniform will not be tainted by any political decisions.'"

I am filing this bill because I believe that President Trump's directive organizing the NSC breaks from this longstanding, bipartisan tradition of constructing a wall to separate national security policymaking from domestic politics to the greatest extent possible.

Specifically, the President's directive authorizes the Assistant to the President and Chief Strategist Stephen Bannon to be a permanent member of the NSC and to attend all NSC and Principals Committee meetings. Mr. Bannon's role in the administration has a strong political component. Indeed, it appears unprecedented for a political counselor so deeply enmeshed in politics to serve as a permanent member of the NSC.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, described Mr. Bannon's appointment as a radical departure from any National Security Council in history.

Therefore, my bill will amend Federal law to ensure that no individual, whose primary responsibility is political in nature, shall be designated as a member of the NSC or be authorized to regularly attend meetings of the NSC or the Principals Committee. This language would apply to Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents alike. Our men and women in uniform, our intelligence and homeland security professionals, and our citizens should feel secure in their knowledge that the critical decisions made by the NSC are free from political considerations. The American people deserve a national security policymaking process that inspires confidence, not cynicism.

My bill also contains a second provision. The President's directive prescribes a diminished role on the Principals Committee for the Director of National Intelligence and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The directive limits their attendance to only those meetings where issues pertaining to their responsibilities and expertise are to be discussed.

While this language is not unprecedented, it has caused concern among many experts of all political stripes, particularly when it is juxtaposed against the decision to give Mr. Bannon unfettered access to the NSC PC meetings.