

that money in the fund cannot be used for anything other than victims' programs authorized under the law of the VOCA statute in 1984.

Victims must be rescued and taken care of. The bill ensures the money that victims are entitled to is in a safe place from pilfering hands. Give the victims a fighting chance, and do not continue to victimize them more by taking restitution money from them. It is just wrong to play this financial ledger mumbo-jumbo that Congress plays every year to take money away from victims and give it to other projects.

Don't touch victims' money. It is just wrong, Mr. Speaker.

And that is just the way it is.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a recent USDA report on "Foods Typically Purchased by SNAP Households" has sparked conversation in the press and on Capitol Hill about ways to promote healthy eating among those who rely on SNAP benefits. Quite frankly, I am troubled by the way the report has been characterized and by some of the responses.

Flashy headlines and convenient sound bites selectively highlighting findings that tell only half the story are damaging to what should be our shared goal of ensuring that our most vulnerable neighbors have the support they need for their families. In fact, one of the key findings in the report is that the spending habits by SNAP households and non-SNAP households are very similar.

I think it is safe to say that all of us could be making healthier choices when it comes to the food that we eat. But if we want to talk about promoting healthy eating among those who rely on SNAP, we need to start by enhancing and making further investments in nutrition education programs, increasing access to healthy foods in underserved communities, and expanding pilots that have proven effective in increasing fruit and vegetable consumption. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, we need to increase SNAP benefits so low-income families have the ability to purchase healthier foods.

Last Congress, the House Agriculture Committee completed a thorough review of SNAP—17 hearings. As ranking member of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I participated in each of these hearings, and we heard time and time and time again that the current SNAP benefit, which averages \$1.40 per person per meal, is inadequate. It is hard to buy a cup of coffee these days for \$1.40.

This meager benefit is often too low for families to stave off hunger during the month, and certainly does not provide enough support to allow families

to maintain healthy diets on a consistent basis. Without additional benefits, we know that people are making very difficult choices. They have to choose between food or medicine, between food for their families or stable housing.

Research from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has found that increasing SNAP benefits by a mere \$30 per month would lower food insecurity, decrease fast-food consumption, and increase vegetable consumption.

Similarly, USDA's Healthy Incentives Pilot provided SNAP recipients in Hampden County, Massachusetts, with additional benefits if they purchased targeted fruits and vegetables, and it was highly successful. The result was an increase in healthy food consumption. Participants in this pilot consumed 26 percent more targeted fruits and vegetables per day and spent more of their SNAP benefits on these items than did nonparticipants.

We know that low-income families who rely on SNAP have to make difficult choices in trying to stretch their meal budgets and often select cheaper foods that contain refined grains and added sugars and fats. This research from the Center on Budget and the results of projects such as the one in Massachusetts confirm what we know to be true: providing additional resources for food to families living in poverty will enable them to make healthier choices for themselves and their families.

We should not be demonizing the poor by policing their shopping carts, Mr. Speaker. It is far too easy and has become far too commonplace for those of us with steady incomes and paychecks that provide us with access to the healthiest foods to second-guess the choices of these families struggling to make ends meet. It is insulting and it is mean-spirited and more than a little hypocritical to suggest that we meal plan for those living in poverty while we continue feeding our families the same foods that some of us suggest we should limit in our antihunger programs.

Eating more nutritious foods should be a goal for all of us, Mr. Speaker. It will lead to better health, reduced medical costs, more engaged kids who are able to learn better, and also more productive adults.

But if we are going to promote healthier eating and work to end hunger now, we must start by increasing the current SNAP benefits. And I would say to any of my colleagues who dealt this: You try living on a SNAP budget. You try living on \$1.40 per person per meal. You will find it not only difficult to put food on the table, but especially challenging to make nutritious and healthy choices.

As we consider the next farm bill, let us enhance the SNAP benefit. It is the right thing to do.

MUSLIM BAN

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1947, Senator Arthur Vandenberg famously stated that politics stop at the water's edge. What that meant was that partisan fighting and attacks should cease when they compromise America's role in missions abroad and, indeed, when they compromise the safety and security of Americans abroad as well.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I sat in the Homeland Security Committee and heard over two dozen references from my esteemed colleagues across the aisle to a Muslim ban. When President Obama expanded its own screening for refugees for majority Muslim nations, he said it was because of "the growing threat from foreign terrorist fighters," and nary a peep was heard.

Our colleagues across the aisle said this Muslim ban will endanger Americans and serve as a recruiting tool to ISIS. Mr. Speaker, I agree, except there is no Muslim ban.

Talk of a Muslim ban makes Americans less safe at home, true; it makes Americans less safe abroad, true; and if politics stop at the water's edge and there is no Muslim ban, then why use partisan politics to perpetrate falsehoods that do just those very things.

Let's look at the facts:

Of the 2.3 billion Muslims on the planet Earth, 11 percent live in the countries named in Mr. Trump's executive order. Nine-tenths of 1 percent live in Syria, a single nation pulled out for heightened scrutiny.

The duration of the heightened scrutiny held to the Syrian refugee population is one-half that of the same action taken by Mr. Trump's predecessor, President Obama, as it related to Iraqis in 2011 when nary a peep was heard because politics are supposed to stop at the water's edge.

We hear questions: Does the President have a constitutional right to do this? I say, no, he has a constitutional duty to do this.

We look at Article II and see the clear and present danger clause. We hear the language of the Obama administration speaking of growing terrorist threats from abroad. We see in Article II and in the oath that the President takes that it is his duty to protect Americans from all threats, all enemies, foreign and domestic.

So what we know is that the executive order affects a scant 7 of well over 50 majority-Muslim nations. There is no religious test because it also affects millions of Christians living in these nations. It affects about 11 percent of the global Muslim population. There are exceptions granted.

We know that ISIS is using the refugee system to infiltrate Western nations. We know that first- or second-generation radical Islamists have killed over 70 Americans since Boston and wounded over 300 on U.S. soil.

□ 1015

We know that, just over a month ago, a dozen innocent individuals at a Christmas market in Berlin were murdered and 50 more were injured by a refugee. We know that the fallacious concept of a Muslim ban inflames and enrages our enemies and serves as a recruiting tool.

So the question then becomes: Why do some Members of this esteemed body continue to perpetuate what is willful ignorance at best and a falsehood at worst? Why say there is a Muslim ban when there is not?

Mr. Speaker, if politics stop at the water's edge, then Members won't play loose with the facts to score political points. Members won't advance a false narrative that endangers Americans. Members will support this President, as they did the last President, as he seeks to discharge his duty to defend the United States, its citizens, and our Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

TRUMP IMMIGRATION EXECUTIVE ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, a U.S. Army interpreter, who risked his life serving our country for over a decade in Mosul and Baghdad, was stopped at the airport and detained for 18 hours. His name was Hameed Khalid Darweesh.

Why was he detained?

Because he came from a country that was singled out by President Trump because of the religion of its people. He did so not to increase safety, but to instill fear.

When people are afraid, they tend to let their President and their elected leaders do anything they think will protect them, and they ignore just about everything else.

When the American people are afraid, they might ignore a President's promise that he would "drain the swamp." When they are afraid, they might forget that a President has treated Vladimir Putin better than he has treated the heads of state of our allies and trading partners. They might ignore his attacks on women, on minorities, on our environment, on our health care, on our civil rights, on our public education system; and they might even ignore investigations into his vast conflicts of interest.

They might be willing to overlook the very principles of our Constitution that, indeed, make us safe. One of these principles is freedom of religion, because our Founding Fathers knew that despots all over the world have used fear of another group's religion to do terrible, terrible things throughout the history of man. So when the President singles out who can come into this country and who cannot based on one's

religion, he is insulting and turning his back on our Constitution—a Constitution that keeps us safe, a Constitution that, by its own example, helps to keep the world safe.

Let's be clear. When Mr. Trump bars a man like Hameed, an interpreter who helped protect our troops from coming into our country, because of his religion, he is not protecting us; he is endangering us and he is endangering the world. We cannot let it stand. We must resist.

UPHOLDING OUR NATION'S VALUES OF A DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is only day 13 into the Donald Trump administration and we are already faced with yet another round of questions about President Trump's potential conflicts of interest over his business holdings.

The most recent issue to raise questions is President Trump's Muslim ban executive order. At face value, this action looks like yet another harmful step in his divisive agenda. Trump's hateful scapegoating of refugees will make us less safe, and it goes against our country's moral fiber and small "d" democratic values. It is hard to believe that these seven countries were targeted based on a serious threat that was posed by their citizens who were traveling to the United States.

The people responsible for some of the most egregious attacks on American soil in recent decades, including 9/11, the Times Square bombing, the Boston Marathon bombing, the Pulse nightclub shooting, and others did not come from these seven countries. In fact, refugees from these countries already face a lengthy and rigorous vetting process led by our security intelligence agencies. This 20-step process involves multiple background checks, interviews, and screenings, and it frequently takes between 18 and 24 months for approval.

However, these seven countries do have at least one thing in common. According to Bloomberg News, The Trump Organization does not have business or has not pursued business deals in any of them. President Trump does, on the other hand, have business ties to other countries in the region that were excluded from the ban. His FEC filings indicate The Trump Organization has development projects in Saudi Arabia and business projects possibly related to Egypt. These countries were excluded from the executive order despite their being home to many of the terrorists who carried out 9/11. In Turkey, President Trump has a licensing deal for two luxury towers to use his name—a deal he received up to \$5 million for just last year. He also has licensing agreements with businesses in other countries in the region.

I am not saying that we should ban people from these countries. I firmly

oppose any ban that is based on nationality or religion, but it is unacceptable that business interests have played potentially a role in such a destructive policy that also makes our country less safe in the long run. This move will likely damage relationships with our Muslim allies who are fighting ISIS militants, and be used as a tool by the Islamic State to increase their recruitment and radicalization efforts.

Of course, my friends in the majority and in the White House claim that the seven countries under this order were similarly targeted by our previous administration. In reality, President Trump's discriminatory ban is drastically different than President Obama's specific changes to the State Department Visa Waiver Program, in which the changes focused on expedited visa privileges for dual nationals and did not target all citizens from specific countries; but I will bet you didn't hear Sean Spicer make that distinction. Instead, the administration is busy downplaying the number of people who were impacted by this decision and is claiming that only 109 people were affected—aka alternative facts. At least 700 people were denied boarding after the order was issued, and 90,000 people in these countries already have visas but will not be able to travel to the United States.

It is time for the President to stop defending his divisive and unconstitutional executive order and start being transparent about his business interests. Every President who has been elected in the modern era has released his tax records to ensure the American people that his actions will not be impacted by financial holdings. After promising throughout the campaign to release his tax returns, President Trump's advisers recently announced that he will indefinitely hide this information from the public. These holdings potentially put President Trump in direct violation of the Emoluments Clause of the Constitution on day one.

The safeguard is designed to prevent corruption and foreign influence over policy decisions by not allowing Federal officials to take money from a foreign entity without there being congressional approval; but we have seen report after report of foreign leaders and diplomats choosing to stay at the Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C., in order to gain favor with the administration. They stand to profit from foreign governments, including a big paycheck from a Chinese bank, which is a large tenant at the Trump Tower. These are just tip-of-the-iceberg examples of direct conflicts in both domestic and foreign policy under this President.

Mr. President, it is time for you to fix this. One, divest your business holdings immediately to remove any suggestion of there being a conflict in your decisionmaking. Two, show us your tax returns so that your business and financial interests are transparent to the American people. Three, get rid