

physicians who can listen and develop their clinical skills as we try to work with patients to solve their healthcare problems.

ObamaCare has led to consolidation of physician practices. It has led to high prices as well for insurance products. It has led to \$12,000 deductibles for most families. It is no longer affordable. It is like having no insurance at all.

Eighty percent of Americans are not happy with the Affordable Care Act, but I want to assure the American public and my constituents that, for every 5 seconds I have spent thinking about repeal, I have spent 5 days thinking about replace.

Though quite often the press wants to talk about this as two separate books, this is one book in my life—a book of repealing and replacing as quickly and efficiently as possible.

I want to assure all my constituents back home that, if you are on an ObamaCare product right now, we are not pushing you off any cliff. We are going to give you a period of transition where you can have a truly affordable healthcare product that works for you without a \$6,000 or \$12,000 deductible.

We are a party of solutions. If you will look at Dr. PRICE's bills he submitted the last 6 years, you will see great alternatives and solutions that the party has presented. We do think there are good solutions out there.

Speaking of Dr. PRICE, I can't help but just stop and say we need to approve him, confirm him as quickly as possible. Dr. PRICE is a physician, an orthopedic surgeon from Georgia, who has served Congress in multiple ways, including leading the Budget Committee.

I have not met a man I would rather have serve as the Secretary of HHS than Dr. TOM PRICE, a mentor to me—a mentor to many of us—a kind man, a Godly man, a person who cares about patients, who understands health care, but he also understands government. Before we can take many more steps with health care, we need someone in that position. I believe with all my heart that Dr. PRICE will do a great job.

I look forward to continuing my next several weeks here working with the freshmen, working with the rest of Congress. We are so optimistic. We think that great days are ahead of us.

I am going to close with a memory today that I will have forever of going to the National Prayer Breakfast. I have had the privilege of going to many, many events, but this may have been the greatest event I ever attended in my life to see men and women, leaders across the world, praying for our President, praying for our Vice President.

I am just thrilled to be a part of this. I am proud to turn this country back in a positive direction.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. It is good to have Dr. MARSHALL here and be a part of bringing that vitality of some-

one in the health field, knowing and understanding that relationship between the patient and the doctor and finding the best way so that all can have that access. I think that is what we see.

He ended with something, and I will sort of end with that: the prayer breakfast. From my background as not only an Air Force chaplain but also a pastor for over 11 years, we can have disagreements. And we are going to have disagreements. But what I have found is, when you pray for each other, you can have disagreements, but you can't be mad.

I think that is what we have got to do as a country is we have our disagreements and we move forward and we look for what is best for the individuals and not best for what is this government.

I think that is what you brought to the table today and talked about, that passion to get it back to the individual who looks to Washington, knows it is there, and doing what the Constitution said, but not overreaching into the areas of their life that take them away from the things they want to do.

So I appreciate the gentleman's service. I appreciate him being here. It is going to be great as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, we have gotten a fast start. There are some things going on where we are doing what we promised. I had an interview just the other day, and the reporter asked me the question: Well, what do you think about X? They named off like two or three things. I said: What is surprising right now to many folks who have reported on this place for so long is the fact that things are getting done and being promised to get done, and they are happening.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are sent here for. And as we see that through the regulatory issues we have been dealing with this week, we are going to deal with again next week, and as we look ahead to the battles of repealing and putting together access to affordable health care for all Americans and not doing the scare tactics and not doing the straw man and not trying to push anybody off a cliff but saying: let's talk about this together; let's listen and work together, as opposed to the way it was done.

Then, we look into tax reform. We look into energy development. It is a time in America to be smiling. It is a time when we can look around and the rest of the world is saying: that is the country that we know. That is the shining light that we know. That is the place that the world looks to. Because we are the freest country in the world, and we gave our spirit to others.

□ 1645

So it is exciting for me, as part of my work for the Republican Conference, to bring the freshman Members up here to let them tell about their areas. And as we do so, it just shows you, I believe, that America, in many of these dis-

tricts, saw promise. And we are looking forward to continuing with our new Members and continuing to introduce them over the next weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 42 and 43 of title 20, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, reappoints the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy) as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

#### RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AGAINST UKRAINE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the day after our new President spoke to the President of Russia, Vladimir Putin, we saw a surge in Russian aggression and attacks in eastern Ukraine. Every American must realize, Russia is testing our new administration's resolve to stand up for liberty.

Since Russia invaded Crimea in February 2014, 10,000 innocent Ukrainians have been killed by Russian aggression, and this has increased over the past week. Dozens more have been displaced—17,000, in fact.

These actions violated the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances that stated: the Russian Federation would respect the independent sovereignty and existing borders of Ukraine.

Russia's new aggression is another step in its campaign to undermine the democratic order that has existed in our Transatlantic Alliance since the end of World War II and cold war.

America must stand up for the people of Ukraine and our European alliances and denounce the actions of President Putin. We have to stand up or we face—Russia will face condemnation by the world community. Russia should withdraw her heavy weapons from that region. They should stop financing separatists. They should allow repairs for critical infrastructure and fulfill all of their agreements under the Minsk accords.

What is happening is a global shame.

#### THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here with my colleague PRAMILA JAYAPAL from Seattle, Washington. We wanted to talk about what has been happening over the last week with the executive orders on immigration and asylum that have taken place, and we want to try to take a broad perspective on this; to put it in some historical, legal and constitutional context; and then also to talk very specifically about the executive orders and what has been taking place with them in different parts of the country; and about the multiple Federal judicial rulings imposing injunctions on enforcement of those orders.

But I wanted to begin, actually, by stepping back from the heat of the current crisis and looking, instead, at the idea of America.

Well, what is the idea of America? America was created, as the great Tom Paine said, as a haven of refuge for people fleeing political and religious repression from all around the world.

Remember the radicalism of the American Revolution and our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. We were the first Nation on Earth conceived in revolutionary insurgency against monarchy, dictatorship, autocracy, theocracy, and the merger of church and State.

The American colonists were rebelling against, not just the king and all of the whimsical depredations and abuses of the crown, but also against centuries of religious warfare in Europe between the Protestants and the Catholics, holy inquisition, holy crusades, witchcraft trials, endless wars between the Catholics and the Protestants.

Our forefathers and foremothers wanted to break from that history and put into our Constitution the separation of church and State—as Jefferson called it, the wall of separation between church and State, the establishment clause, the idea of free exercise of religion, freedom of speech, the right to petition for redress of grievances, the right of people to assemble, freedom of thought, freedom of conscience in the United States.

But it would be a land that would be open to people who were fleeing authoritarianism, who were trying to get away from repressive regimes, and kings, and monarchs, and princes, and tyrants, and dictators, and despots everywhere. That was the idea behind America.

Well, then in this Presidential campaign, then candidate Donald Trump said that he wanted to impose a Muslim ban, a ban on Muslims coming to America, which would cause our forefathers and foremothers to turn over in their graves to hear that somebody running for President of the United States wanted to impose a ban on the immigration of people based on their religious faith, in a country that was designed on the principle of free exercise of religion, designed on the principle of no establishment of religion,

designed on the principle of no religious tests for public office or political participation that suddenly we would say we are not going to accept people—in the 21st century—based on their religious heritage.

And of course, anybody can make up their religion anyway. Anybody can say what they are. So it is as futile and as silly as it is anathema and apathetical to our basic constitutional ideals.

Well, that Muslim ban has, in its bizarre way, become law now in the United States of America. The President issued an executive order as one of his first actions on people coming to our country from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen, those seven countries. And we have got to interrogate what exactly the logic of this is.

The President and his chief strategists of the alt-right, named Steve Bannon, have defended this order on the grounds of national security. The idea is that somehow we are defending the national security and the defense by banning people from those countries.

All right, we all support national security. If that would advance our national security, it is something we should look at.

Well, what is the evidence that that is going to benefit our national security? Our country now is no stranger to terror and to terrorism. All of us remember that shocking, fateful day, 9/11, back in 2001, when America changed forever.

Those 19 hijackers came from three countries. And which three countries on this list of seven did they come from? None of them. Those hijackers came from Saudi Arabia. The overwhelming majority of them came from Saudi Arabia, then Egypt then United Arab Emirates.

None of those three countries is on this list of seven. Why not? Well, a couple of different theories are out there. One is that President Trump has business interests in those countries. He is doing business with corporations in Saudi Arabia, in Egypt, and in the United Arab Emirates. So that is one leading theory that is out there. The other is that these are rich and powerful countries. So despite the fact that they were the lead exporters from this prism of terrorist hijackers to the United States, they get a pass.

And instead, we pick on Yemen, and Somalia, and Iraq—our presumed ally—that another Republican President sunk hundreds of billions of dollars into waging a war based on the mythology that there were weapons of mass destruction in that country, but now they are on our side. Yet, we have imposed a ban of people coming in as refugees from Iraq. But Saudi Arabia gets a pass; Egypt gets a pass; United Arab Emirates gets a pass because they are on the rich side.

So what exactly do these seven countries have in common if it doesn't have

anything to do with our national security? Because if you look at the other terrorist events that have taken place in our country, for example, the Boston Marathon bombers, those young men who were implicated in that crime against the people of the city of Boston and the people of the United States came from Russia originally.

Is there a ban on Russia being imposed here? Quite the contrary. Earlier today, President Trump relaxed sanctions on Russia, made it easier for American businesses to export information technology to Russian companies, according to news reports.

I haven't seen the exact order yet, but there is an executive order that is lessening sanctions on Russia, despite the fact that two of the most infamous terrorists against the United States originally came from there. So what do those seven countries have in common?

Well, they are all Muslim countries. They are poor Muslim countries. They are poor Muslim countries that Donald Trump doesn't do business with. And so maybe that is it. Maybe the idea is, we are going to wage a worldwide war on the poorest, most vulnerable Muslim countries, even if they don't pose any special threat to us, because that will conform to Steve Bannon's ideological world view of a major contest between the Christian west and radical Islamic terror.

I think that would be it. But President Trump, of course, puts his business interests even above the racism and White nationalism of Steve Bannon, because the business interests have to come first in all cases.

So that is the best that we can make of what has been imposed on the country, an Orwellian policy imposed with Kafkaesque incompetence all over the United States of America. So the airports are in an uproar, families have been dislocated, children agonized over the situation, panic spreading across America. And part of me wants to think, well, this is just the misfortunes of a beginning President. Maybe this is part of a design by Steve Bannon who has proclaimed himself a Leninist who wants to tear the system down, tear the government down; to start over again.

Maybe that is what is going on. Who knows? But all of this brings us back to the emoluments clause. Now the emoluments clause, Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution was inserted by our great Founders because they feared foreign monetary dominance of the United States Government.

They knew that kings and princes, dictators and despots, traitors and saboteurs all over the place would try to use their money to compromise the integrity of Republican government, Republican democracy.

Remember, we were trying something new here, what our great Republican President Abraham Lincoln would later come to call the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

That was the experiment that we launched then, and they knew that there was a basic problem, which is, the room will not hold all. We can't have a New England town meeting every time we need to make a decision, so we have got to elect people to go be our Governors.

But when you elect them, now you have got an agent. And the problem all of you lawyers know out there—in principal agent law—is how do you make sure the agent actually serves the client rather than the interests of the agent himself or herself?

And the Founders understood that, and they were afraid that the people who we elected might go to Washington and be corrupted by foreign money, by all of the diplomats and spies running around offering gifts, and gold, and snuffboxes, and diamonds, and so on. And so what they said was that no official in our government, no official could accept any gifts, or emolument, any payment of any kind at all from a foreign government, a king, a prince, or a foreign government. No foreign payments.

And that is something that has been observed scrupulously for more than two centuries by our Presidents. Nobody has even come close to the line of violating that.

When Benjamin Franklin was Ambassador to France, he received a snuffbox from the people of France. He came back, and he brought it to Congress and asked Congress to approve, because it is up to this body to decide whether or not a foreign payment is acceptable or not.

And Congress said: Mr. Franklin, because of your extraordinary reputation for integrity, for decency, and for honesty, we understand you have not been compromised by that snuffbox, and it is just a snuffbox, and you can keep it.

But today, what we have got now is a President who has hundreds of millions of dollars of interest all over the world—in Russia, in the Philippines—millions of dollars of loans from the Government of China, the Trump Hotel, which is renting out banquet rooms, dining halls, floors, hotel rooms, to foreign governments and embassies from all over the world who come here to try to influence our government.

And what do we hear about the emoluments clause? Has the President come to ask us whether or not we approve of these arrangements? Nothing. Nothing has happened. Is it affecting policy? Every single day.

And I come back—before I turn it over to my colleague—to what we are talking about, which is these executive orders which have this very bizarre quality, my fellow Americans.

□ 1700

They apply to poor Muslim countries where Donald Trump has no business interests. These executive orders don't apply to Saudi Arabia, they don't apply to Egypt, they don't apply to the

United Arab Emirates, they don't apply to any of the countries where Trump Industries has business. That is precisely why the Founders put in the emoluments clause. I know it is a bit of a mouthful, but every American has got to learn to say it. All it means is payments. This is the foreign bribery clause in our Constitution.

These terrible immigration orders, which have created chaos and pandemonium across the land, are a perfect demonstration of why we need to enforce the emoluments clause and why this President needs to divest himself immediately of all these foreign concerns, or this Congress must hear the appeals that are coming from our side of the aisle and must listen to the fact that these payments that are being received on a daily basis by the President are a threat to the American constitutional order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), my good friend and colleague from Seattle, Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my friend and colleague, and I thank my other colleagues also who are here today to shine a light on the abuses that happened last week and last weekend with the executive order that was passed and signed into law by this President.

Mr. Speaker, this order is in direct contrast with the values that this country was built on: foremost, to be a refuge. That is how so many people in the history of this country have come here. Instead, our President has chosen to close the doors on people who are fleeing violence in their home countries, and it is based on their religion.

This ban is discrimination in its purest form. It does not make us safer. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that doing what we did has actually put fodder into the hands of those who really do wish to do us harm by being able to say that America hates Muslims, that America hates Islam, and that America hates immigrants and refugees, none of which is true to the history and the founding of this country.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that the International Rescue Committee has said that it is more challenging for refugees to get into the United States than anyone else. They are the most heavily vetted group there is. As you can see here, there are 20 steps involved in the process, and those who do get approved have been through the most rigorous background checks, fingerprinting, and questioning.

Instead of making us safer, this ban is simply throwing people into chaos. Many of us over this last weekend went to our airports across the country—Dulles; New York; Seattle, Washington, my hometown. We were called to the airport because there was chaos that erupted across the country, chaos that erupted at the airports, because people who had legal documents to come to the United States were coming

in and being told that the executive order meant that they no longer could actually stay here in this country.

Mr. President, what happened then for me, when I went to the Sea-Tac Airport at 1 in the afternoon on Saturday, I found a Somali family who had been waiting, a U.S. citizen woman who had been waiting to be reunited with her husband. She believed that finally she was going to get to hold him in her arms. Instead, Mr. Speaker, what happened is that he was put on a plane and sent back to Heathrow, but perhaps somewhere else. We were not given any information about what was going to happen to that gentleman.

We found out that there were two additional individuals who were already put on a plane ready to be deported. We, along with the ACLU, the Northwest Immigrant Rights Project, and our governor, were able to file for a temporary restraining order. We were able to take that restraining order on our phone to the plane and say: Stop this plane.

That literally, Mr. Speaker, is how we were able to get those two people off of the plane. We were able to then get them legal counsel after much intervention.

Mr. Speaker, it should not be this way. This is a country that was built by immigrants. It is a country that has welcomed people from across the world to come here as a refuge, as a sanctuary. My State of Washington is one of the top States in the country for refugee resettlement. The reality is we are destroying the very principles of compassion, of humanity, of being a refuge, of building this country with immigrants and refugees.

Literally thousands of people came to the airport to say: We welcome refugees; we welcome immigrants.

This is not the America that we know and love. We are better than this.

This is not the first time I have had to fight against these illegal deportations. After 9/11, we had similar situations, not as bad as this, but we had the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System, NSEERS. It required that men from 25 Muslim and Arab countries were going to be fingerprinted and registered. This was under the Bush administration. At the time, Attorney General John Ashcroft said: You are either with the terrorists or you are with us.

That is a false choice, Mr. Speaker. The reality is that security and liberty do not oppose each other. They go hand in hand, and we cannot sacrifice one for the sake of the other.

Mr. Speaker, we were able to fight that, and we finally did end that special registration program, but now here we are again. We know the shame of history when we have not been on the right side of it. We know that in 1942, 125,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry were put into internment camps, and it took us a very long time to come back and apologize. Mr. Speaker, when we did, we said we will never do that

again. Yet, here we are for the first time again instituting a religious test as to who can get into this country.

Let us be clear that it is a Muslim ban. It does not mean that every single Muslim country necessarily has been targeted yet. But what it does mean is that Muslims are being scrutinized in a different way simply for being Muslim.

A constituent of mine called my office this week to tell me another very disturbing story, and she told me that I could tell it here on the floor. She was passing through immigration into Houston on her way back home from Seattle. Dr. Angelina Godoy was traveling back from Central America where she was doing research. She is a U.S. citizen. She said she was so alarmed by what happened to her that she wanted to call and get it on the record.

Angelina is a human rights professor and she has traveled through immigration many times. This was the first time she said she had experienced anything like this. Her immigration officer asked her about her political views. When she said that she was deeply concerned about the President's actions, he asked her why she wasn't concerned with all the refugees that were flooding into our borders. And he used that word "flooding." When she said she didn't think that they were flooding in, he told her that she can't tell him that based on the fake news she is seeing on television.

Mr. Speaker, this is incredibly disturbing. Are we going to now check the views of every U.S. citizen who is coming into the our borders to see whether they agree with these executive orders or not?

Well, I am here to tell you that it may be the thought that fear and patriotism together is the way to suppress dissent. We will not be suppressed with fighting for the very values that make us great.

In cities around the country, what gives me hope is that people stood up to stand up against this hatred. The Muslim ban is unconstitutional, and we are standing here today to demand that it be repealed.

You can see here the chart that I referred to earlier. There are 20 steps that you must go through in order to be screened. Syrian refugees are probably the most screened individuals in our country today. And there are 5 million Syrian refugees who are pouring out of the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a time to turn our backs on them. This is a time to make sure that we are taking care of the women, the children, the families, the majority of refugees to this country who are women and children and families. The majority who have family members here that they are waiting to be reunited with, that is who we are talking about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN)

and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) for their tremendous leadership. They have hit the ground running here in Congress in defense of our Nation's immigrants and refugees and for all who just seek to live the American Dream. So thank you very much for your leadership and for calling us together tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in his first week as President, Donald Trump issued an executive order essentially banning immigrants and refugees from the United States on the basis of religion. This action effectively shuts our gates to some of the most vulnerable people in the world fleeing danger and death.

This ban flies in the face of our fundamental values as Americans. It is, yes, morally reprehensible and will only serve to make the United States less safe. This executive order is also a direct threat to our national security. Banning Muslim immigrants and refugees only fuels ISIS propaganda by promoting the false idea that the United States is at war with Islam. This half-way ban is felt in our communities across the Nation.

In my district, one Iranian student at the University of California, Berkeley was not allowed to board the plane to return to the United States. She is now forced to withdraw from the semester. This is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is and has been and will always be a Nation of immigrants. This ban and this President and his executive orders do not reflect our values. This is not who we are.

As the President's divisive ban was implemented, we witnessed thousands of Americans bring what I call "street heat." Men, women, and children across the country stood up to the President and declared with one voice: Not on our watch.

These protests, the voice of the American people, give me hope. If we stand together and resist, we will prevail.

While the President continues his attack on immigrants, refugees, and Muslims, I vow to stand up for our communities with my colleagues with a clear message saying once again: This is not who we are. This Muslim ban is hateful, it is unconstitutional, and it is downright wrong.

Finally, let me just say that February is Black History Month. As an African American woman, I am reminded of the bans and exclusions of African Americans and my ancestors and the legacy of slavery where my ancestors were brought here in chains, built this country, and continued to fight for freedom and justice. As an African American, there is no way I can tolerate any ban on anyone seeking refuge in this great country.

Finally, and in conclusion, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I just want to say that I am going to fight tooth and nail to prevent funding for these misguided anti-immigrant and anti-refugee policies.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, I was at Los Angeles International Airport. I went out to show unity and stand with those that stand against this ban. I think it is wrong. I think it is unconstitutional and unAmerican. But what I saw there was startling.

I want to tell you the story of Fatema. Fatema is a legal permanent resident. She got a notice in the mail that she was about to be sworn in to become a U.S. citizen on February 13. She was traveling with her 1-year-old son who is an American citizen. She was the victim and was being detained. Reports from lawyers on the ground were that she was being pressured to sign away her right to be a legal permanent resident right after they had sent somebody back, a student, who had a visa to be here.

□ 1715

I was there, along with one of my colleagues, JUDY CHU, fighting, trying to get to the detainee to make sure that she had access to an attorney. I asked to go to CBC, the Customs and Border Protection. Conveniently, they were shut down. They had closed the office.

So I asked somebody: Can you walk me down to the arrivals so I could talk to somebody?

They wouldn't do it. I got a telephone number. I called. None of my questions were answered. They wouldn't answer a single question: Were any of my constituents being detained? Could I get a lawyer to somebody?

They wouldn't even say yes or no. All I was told was I had to call this Washington, D.C., number—a 202 number. Now, it was Saturday night. It was 7 p.m. on the Pacific Coast.

I called. I left a message, asking for a return call. I didn't get one. I demanded, with my colleague, that we get a briefing privately, behind closed doors, outside the press. We didn't get one.

As a matter of fact, when I called back, I asked: Who is your manager? Who are you answering to?

She said: The President.

Oh. You have talked to Donald Trump?

It was really disturbing. And then she hung up on me—and I am a Member of the United States Congress. I couldn't get any answers to try to protect the very constituents that we fight for, the constituents whom we represent. It was very disturbing.

These immigration orders are unsettling, but they are also a disservice to the Customs and Border Protection when you don't give a heads-up, when you don't have a warning on how things are going to be carried out. This led to mass confusion not just at LAX, but at airports across the country.

I hear often that this affected just a small number of travelers, but it affected a lot more than that. We saw the

masses of people coming out. We saw lawyers who had to go down there and give their time. A shout-out to the ACLU and to the attorneys at public counsel and to so many other attorneys who went down there and gave their evenings, their time, and who have been standing up and fighting for people in court to get people to come back.

Just today, at Los Angeles International Airport, there was a press conference held to welcome back the one person who was allowed to come back—an Iranian citizen who was deported and sent back, who was forcibly removed on Friday night even though he had a legal right to be here. Hopefully we are going to hear more of these stories, but it shouldn't be that way. People should not show up at the airport and get on a flight in a country in which they have a right to be just to have to turn around and be sent back after being detained for hours on end. This isn't right.

As a Member of Congress, I will work to ensure that the Federal Government obeys the Constitution, respects our history as a nation of immigrants, and does not unlawfully target anyone because of one's national origin or faith.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Congresswoman from New York, YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. I thank the gentleman from Maryland and the gentlewoman from Washington State for hosting this very important Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my outrage over Donald Trump's unconscionable, ill-conceived, horribly executed and implemented executive order that limits Muslim immigration and travel into the United States.

This order is an appalling affront to American interests. It is contrary to our ideals and values as a nation, and it flies in the face of our history and the core conviction of freedom from religious persecution that this Nation was built upon. It provides the fuel to our enemies and makes a mockery of our democracy and Constitution. Most importantly, it tears families apart by prohibiting people with valid travel documents from entering the country.

I saw this firsthand on Saturday when I visited JFK International Airport to witness the needless chaos and confusion that this order has created. One person who lives in my district who has been affected by this order is Dr. Kamal Fadlalla. Dr. Fadlalla is a Sudanese hospital resident in Brooklyn, New York. He is trained to save lives, not to take them. Yet, due to Donald Trump's egregious executive order, Dr. Fadlalla has been prevented from returning back to the United States to help heal our sick and save lives.

There is no justification for this shameful order, and it is no wonder that the Acting Attorney General,

Sally Yates, risked her job and reputation rather than act as Donald Trump's enforcer. I commend Ms. Yates for her personal integrity and fidelity to our Constitution. Ironically enough, during her confirmation hearing, it was Donald Trump's own nominee for Attorney General who suggested that Ms. Yates maintain the integrity of the Department of Justice at all times and that she must refuse to enforce orders that were unconstitutional. This week, Ms. Yates made good on her answer to Senator SESSIONS and upheld her oath to faithfully uphold our Constitution.

For these reasons, I will proudly introduce a resolution that commends Ms. Yates for her act of moral courage and for her adherence to the dictates of the United States Constitution. I call on all of my colleagues to sign on to this resolution and for House leadership to schedule a vote to commend Ms. Yates. Most importantly, though, I call on Donald Trump to rescind this egregious order that harms our economy, that contravenes our values, and that endangers our national security.

I thank the gentleman and gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the Congresswoman for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Congressman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank Congressman RASKIN, and I thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the House of Representatives has tremendously benefited by these two awesome freshmen who have come in here like gangbusters. I am sure that my classmate and friend of many years from New York, Ms. YVETTE CLARKE, will agree with me that we are always trying to welcome these folks who have come straight off the campaign trail, because you really know how people are feeling when they come straight off the campaign trail—fresh. I am sure the Congressman from Rhode Island, DAVID CICILLINE, agrees.

The people of this country are fundamentally fair folks. Our countrymen and -women believe that everybody ought to be treated with dignity and respect. Yes, we believe that we have to have an economy that works for everybody. Absolutely true. We also believe that people should be treated based on their behavior, based on who they are, based on what they bring, not based on their race, their sex, their gender, their religion. In fact, this idea is enshrined in the Constitution.

The first clause of the First Amendment reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Later on in the Constitution, it reads that Congress shall not impose any religious test for participating—serving—in public office.

In America, you don't have to have one religious belief or another. In America, you can be a Christian, a Muslim, a Jew, a Hindu, or of no faith

whatsoever. You can be Baptist; you can be Methodist; you can be whatever you want to be. That is up to you, and it is a private matter. Americans basically understand that this is right because the Framers of the Constitution, people like Thomas Jefferson and others, looked over at some of the Colonies and even looked at some of the conflicts in Europe and said that we don't need to be mixed up—fighting—with each other over religion.

Now, the Framers got a lot of things wrong. They got women's rights wrong; they got race wrong; they got Native American rights wrong. There were many things that they needed to correct in this Nation.

As the great Thurgood Marshall said, we were defective from the start, and we needed to have civil wars and civil rights movements and other movements to make this country the country that it is today.

Yet one thing we did decently in the beginning is with regard to religious freedom—until now. Donald Trump is introducing a religious test for whether or not people can be a part of this American story.

Donald Trump claims: Oh, I don't have a Muslim ban.

Wait a minute, President Trump. Wasn't it you who, on December 7, 2015, said that you were calling for a ban on all Muslims who enter into the United States? Wasn't it you who said it multiple times throughout your campaign? Didn't you say you wanted to have a Muslim database for all of the Muslims who were in the country? Didn't you say you wanted to shutter mosques? You said these things, and now, all of a sudden, you are shy about saying that you are running a Muslim ban.

These people who say, oh, it is not a Muslim ban surprise me because I am, like, I thought you all were proud of it. I thought you were bragging about it. I thought it was how you rode your way into office—by appealing to people's fears and trying to whip up hostility among different Americans of different faiths and traditions. Yet now, all of a sudden, you are shy about saying what you are doing, which is a Muslim ban. Yes, it is a Muslim ban. Just because it doesn't ban every Muslim everywhere does not mean that the people who are banned are not banned because they are Muslim. That is exactly why they are banned. That is why they are banned.

He was asked on a TV program: Would you give preferential treatment to people of another faith?

He said: Yes, I would give preferential treatment to another faith.

He said it. It is on the record. So don't come telling me how there is no Muslim ban. There is one, and these people who bragged so much about it—I mean Trump and Bannon and all of the rest of them—should not act like there is not a Muslim ban now. There is a Muslim ban. It is a religious test for entry into this country. It is unconstitutional; it is immoral; and it is wrong.

I just want to say to all of my fellow Americans right now, if they can ban Muslims, they can ban Jews; if they can ban Jews, they can ban Seventh-day Adventists; if they can ban Seventh-day Adventists, they can ban Mormons; and if they can ban Mormons, they can ban Catholics. It is wrong, and we should stand up and say that it is wrong and immediately demand that it be repealed right away. I think this is absolutely critical that we do so.

I want to share a story for a moment longer, if the gentleman doesn't mind, because I know we have some really excellent speakers coming right behind me, and I want to yield to them as quickly as I can. I want to share a story about one of the families that has been affected in my own home State of Minnesota.

One person who was prevented from flying to United States this week is a little girl from Somalia whose mother came to Minneapolis as a refugee in 2013. This child was stuck in Uganda without her family because she hadn't been born by the time her mother was granted refugee status. When her mother, Samira, was given permission to come to the United States 4 years ago, she was told to leave her daughter behind with friends of the family in Uganda and apply for reunification in the United States. This little girl was supposed to fly to Minnesota and rejoin her family on Monday. Instead, her flight was canceled because of the Muslim ban.

President Trump is not making our country safer. President Trump is reinforcing the narrative of people who don't like our country.

What does ISIS ultimately say? That America is at war with Islam.

I am here to tell everybody on the planet that America is absolutely not at war with Islam or with any other religion. The American people are of a peaceful nation. The people who live in the United States want to live in harmony with all of the other people of the world; but this particular person who happens to occupy the Presidency doesn't reflect the values that we represent. He doesn't reflect who we are. The thing that he is doing is actually reinforcing the narrative of the people who would mean to do all of us harm no matter what religion we may be.

I just want to sit down now and say: For the sake of this young woman and for the sake of Samira's daughter, who is languishing in Uganda right now and who wants to be reunited with her family, may we please get rid of this ban and get rid of this unlawful executive order?

□ 1730

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) and the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. JAYAPAL) for

organizing tonight's Special Order hour on this very important topic.

I join my colleagues in expressing my strong opposition to the President's Muslim ban, a religious test. It is the first time we have seen this in modern times.

We have been at war since 9/11 against terrorism, and our most urgent responsibility is to keep America safe, but President Trump's Muslim ban makes it harder to do this. The Muslim ban makes it harder to work with our allies. The Muslim ban makes it harder to recruit intelligence assets. The Muslim ban makes it harder to enlist allies in our fight against ISIS.

We should help people who are fleeing ISIS rather than slam the door in their faces. Instead, President Trump's Muslim ban likens these individuals to terrorists. This isn't a plan, and it won't keep America safe.

We need a real plan, a plan that honors our values and a plan that does not discriminate based upon a person's religion. We need a plan that keeps our country safe and respects freedom of religion, whether people are White, Black, Brown, Christian, Muslim, Jewish, young, or old. Immigrants and refugees have made incredible contributions to our great country, and it is time for our President to say this.

In my home State of Rhode Island, like so many places around the country, when we watched on television news reports of an executive order being issued and people who are lawfully authorized to return home to the United States being held in detention and being prevented from coming back into America, we were sick to our stomach.

People in Rhode Island rallied, like people did all across this country, to express their outrage, to say this is not America and these are not our values. This is inconsistent with our Constitution. While we saw this administration working to undo basic constitutional rights and civil liberties—including, most importantly, freedom of religion—people all across America spoke out.

In addition to recognizing that this didn't comport with our deeply held beliefs and faith and confidence in our Constitution, we also knew that these were families fleeing unspeakable violence as part of the refugee program who are also being denied access into the United States. People were fleeing ISIS and then coming to America only to have the door slammed in their faces.

As has been said, the refugee program that we have in place is the single most difficult way for someone to be allowed to enter the United States. It is a 10- or 12-step process.

If you go to the website, you can see what you have to go through to be authorized to come into the United States as a refugee, and included in that is a determination that you do not pose a danger to the national security or to the American people. So it is em-

bedded in the process already. It is a process that takes anywhere from 18 to 24 months. It is a process which has been in place and has worked successfully. There hasn't been a single Syrian refugee who has been charged with having been engaged in any terrorist activity.

By the way, the world is facing the largest refugee crisis since World War II. The U.N. estimates that 4.9 million refugees have registered, and there are about 6 million total if you include those that aren't registered. Turkey has taken 2.7 million refugees. Lebanon has taken 1 million refugees. Jordan has taken 655,000 refugees. Iraq has taken 228,000 refugees.

Do you know how many the United States accepted last year? About 16,000. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot more to do to meet our responsibilities with respect to accepting refugees who go through this very rigorous process.

I am here tonight to speak out as loudly as I can against the executive order that ends the Syrian refugee program that has worked so successfully and that puts in place a Muslim ban that is making us less safe.

This isn't a Democratic or a Republican issue. There have been a number of Republicans who have knowledge that this is making us less safe. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and Senator JOHN MCCAIN said this may well do more to help terrorist recruitment than improve our security.

There are a number of other national security experts who have said this will not make us safer. There are a number of veterans organizations that have said the same. Business leaders have said the same.

This will not make us safer, and it has really brought the scorn of the world, as people have seen an America that has always stood for values of welcoming people and of diversity and being a place that people come to—like my great-grandfather did—to build a better life to suddenly be slamming its doors and instituting a test based on religion. It does violence to our history and to our Constitution.

I want to just ask the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), who is not just an ordinary lawyer, but a scholar, a professor of law, whether or not he has done an analysis as to the constitutionality of the President's Muslim ban.

There have been, I think, four courts now who have, in fact, entered orders invalidating key parts of these orders based on their assessment that they don't comport with our Constitution.

I ask the gentleman to share his assessment as to whether or not my view of this—and, I think, the view of these courts—is the correct one.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief here because a number of our colleagues from around the country are waiting to weigh in.

Let me just say that this executive order is like a bad issue spotter on a constitutional law final exam. It



is riddled with so many constitutional errors and violations, starting with the ban on religious free exercise, equal protection of the laws. The way it has been implemented has been draconian and Kafkaesque around the country, violating due process and the right to counsel, which has been the source of a lot of the successful constitutional litigation that has already taken place.

It hasn't even been out on the street for a week, and I think five or six Federal district courts have struck down different aspects of it. So it is a Pandora's box, and it is going to be the gift that keeps giving to constitutional lawyers across the country.

Again, we are urging the President just to withdraw it at this point.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in urging President Trump to rescind both of these unconstitutional executive orders.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) as well as the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. JAYAPAL) for hosting this important Special Order hour. Congressman RASKIN and Congresswoman JAYAPAL are two of the newest members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I want to express my gratitude for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, last week, President Trump issued an executive order that violated America's basic commitment to projecting hope and tolerance around the world. With a stroke of his pen, he turned his back on a humanitarian crisis and shut the door on desperate families fleeing unspeakable violence. It has taken just 2 weeks for this administration to undermine our moral authority and weaken our role in promoting peace and stability in a volatile world.

In airports across the country, in streets of coastal cities and midwestern towns, in States that voted for Secretary Clinton and in States that voted for President Trump, the American people are expressing their outrage at the Muslim ban. Patriotic men and women are standing up for the compassionate, exceptional country we strive to be.

Religious leaders are standing up to say: This is not who we are.

Veterans are standing up to say: This is not what we fought for.

There was a time when Republican leadership stood with them. These two tweets to my right are a memorial to a time when Vice President PENCE and Speaker RYAN were prepared to publicly oppose policies they called un-American. Now, when faced with the reality of this policy, Speaker RYAN is choosing to support the ban. Our Vice President deleted his tweet. We had to search around to find the original tweet, and it is right over there.

The American people deserve better.

Let's be clear. The President's executive order makes America less safe. The only threat to America posed by Syrian refugees is to our conscience. Instead of protecting the homeland from terror, the President has gift-wrapped powerful propaganda for our enemies.

This is not just my opinion or the opinion of Democrats in Congress. This is what we have heard from dozens of national security experts from both parties. They are warning us that this executive order is a stain on our reputation and a setback for counterterrorism efforts around the world. Yet congressional Republicans remain silent.

Mr. Speaker, our democracy has endured and prospered for more than two centuries because of our system of checks and balances. Congress has a responsibility to act when the executive branch advances reckless and ill-conceived policies. We are failing to fulfill that duty by refusing to repeal the Muslim ban, by refusing to investigate the President's many conflicts of interest. And by refusing to stand up for America's most basic principles, my friends across the aisle are putting our global leadership and the integrity of our government at risk.

If ever there was a time to choose your country over your party, this is it.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have four more speakers. We have had an overwhelming response to the Progressive Caucus' Special Order on the executive orders here.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) and the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. JAYAPAL) for the Progressive Caucus' Special Order hour.

I was on the floor earlier today talking about my concerns very specifically around this, as it relates to the countries that were selected and the fact that these were not countries that were selected for any reason other than the fact that they are Muslim countries and that Mr. Trump has decided that they should be included.

What I want to talk about tonight is my district and how this affects it. We saw the crowds in New York, California, Chicago, Boston, and other big cities that have international airports and the activities this weekend; but in Madison, Wisconsin, we have had a very direct impact. We have 115 faculty, students, and staff, right now, impacted by this decision. In fact, there is one joint national Canadian-Iranian student who is in Brazil who has been advised not to come back.

What I want to do is read into the RECORD this statement. We are working on a case of someone who is an Iraqi national, and this is a letter written by someone who served with him in the military. I want to read this very quickly:

I am contacting you regarding John, an Iraqi national who earned a special immigration visa for his work with the U.S. Army over two different 3-year periods in Baghdad and another region of Iraq.

My personal acquaintance with him, where he is a translator in a small 12-man military training team I led. The recent executive order curtailing immigration from Iraq, along with six other countries, has halted his plan to emigrate with his family.

He and his fellow translators provided an invaluable service to the team. They braved the same dangers we all faced. They rode in the same vehicles, walked the same streets, met with the same people. The only difference is is they were unarmed and, after missions when we returned to secure FOBs, they had to return to live in their communities unprotected.

John was wounded while working with the U.S. Army, and he provided honorable service to the country for years.

This is who is the target of President Trump's executive order banning Muslims. This is wrong, and we need it to stop.

President Trump, rescind your order.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. JAYAPAL) and I thank all of the Members who have come pouring out in response for this Progressive Caucus Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

□ 1745

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, refugees that are fleeing for their lives are not the enemy. Look at this 3-year-old Syrian boy, Aylan Kurdi, who washed up on a beach in Turkey. He and his older brother and his mother drowned. They were among, literally, thousands of people who drowned escaping the violence that was certain in their home country of Syria.

Now the President is trying to keep them out of our country. He is condemning more children like Aylan to their death with this executive order. And in face of this immoral action by the administration, I have witnessed the decency and generosity of people in my district. I was proud to join people of all faiths in rallies to support our refugees and our Muslim neighbors.

I was with lawyers who rushed to O'Hare Airport to offer assistance to those who suddenly are detained under the executive order.

I have received hundreds of letters. One was from a couple who had joined with 13 friends to welcome and provide assistance to a family that wanted to resettle from Syria. They had collected money. They had collected furniture. They had worked for over a year in order to make this happen, and they finally got word that they were actually going to get a family to come.

Then, on January 30, they got official word that the family would not be allowed to enter. And now they don't know what happened to that family.

Let me just read the end of that letter. He said:

Now we don't know what happened to the family. Because they are Syrian, they are indefinitely banned from the United States.

Meanwhile, we have a warm apartment and \$12,000 waiting for them. We have rooms full of furniture stockpiled, and no way to get to them.

As a group of Chicagoans, as a second-generation American myself, we came together to aid a family in dire need and to affirm the quintessential American values of openness and inclusiveness.

I can't stop thinking about that couple, what they are telling their children right now, and where they will sleep tonight.

Turning our back on families and children who are fleeing a war is not our best strategic interest as a nation, nor is it in our best interest as decent human beings.

Thank you from Maria Demopolis, Chicago, Illinois.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise here to protest the deaths that are occurring, protest the horrible situation that our President has put upon us.

I include in the RECORD a letter that I have received from the University of California at Davis, and the Mayor of the City of Davis, California, who have so clearly laid out the impact that the immigration ban and the ban on refugees has put upon the university and the community.

[From Ralph J. Hexter, Interim Chancellor, University of California Davis, and Robb Davis, Mayor, city of Davis]

We have over 5000 international students and scholars at UC Davis, many of whom are actively questioning what future actions by this administration might mean for them. This is an incredibly disorienting time for all our international guests.

Here are some specific cases that illustrate challenges that students and scholars all over the country are facing at this time. These are specific to our community. (Note: as you know, F-1 status is for students at any degree level authorized to study in the US at accredited universities. J-1 can refer either to students or scholars in the US Visitor Exchange Program)

1. A former J-1 scholar from Iran is in the US arranging the move of his wife and son, while awaiting green card processing. He was to have left the US for final interviews and processing but is now uncertain. He has an appointment in UC Davis' Plant Sciences Department.

2. An Iranian PhD student who was to have started at UC Davis this spring (he was accepted), recently obtained his visa, was to arrive in March, 2017, to start classes April 4. His ability to start then is now in doubt. In addition, his proposed roommate, who is already here from Iran, was counting on him to share expenses. This person now finds himself in a difficult situation.

3. An Iranian F-2 (spouse of F-1) is concerned about her ability to change to F-1 status to become a student. She has been accepted at UC Davis.

4. An Iranian student applying for a Master's program in Engineering at UC Davis is asking about whether she should continue her application process.

5. The spouse of an F-1 student (F-2 status) is currently stuck outside the US and unable to be reunited with her family.

6. An Iranian F-1 PhD student, who started in Fall 2016 quarter had invited his father to visit. This student has a sister with two children in the US and she and they are American citizens. The father/grandfather had a visa interview scheduled in Yerevan, Armenia for February 8th so he could come on a

tourist visa to visit the student son and daughter and grandchildren. His visa interview has now been canceled. Attached are the pictures of the two grandchildren he will not be able to see. He has not been able to see his daughter for five years.

7. Scholar advisors at UC Davis are being asked by scholars of these countries if it is safe to travel within the USA. The fact that scholars must ask this shows the fear that exists.

8. Departmental staff is questioning whether to admit students or invite scholars from these countries for summer and fall arrivals. There is much confusion.

9. A high profile scholar from one of the countries (his profile might put him at risk) was set to come to UC Davis to do research on responses to humanitarian abuses in his country. Because of the order, UC Davis was not permitted to provide him with documentation necessary to obtain a visa. These stories were gathered in the past 5 hours WITHIN the City of Davis and the University. We are a small city of 65,000.

The fact that Iranians are the main nationality represented comes as no surprise. UC Davis and the City of Davis are home to many Iranians and have been for a generation at least. The fact that the Trump Administration can point to NO attacks by Iranians on US soil or against US interests makes their exclusion seem particularly arbitrary and cruel to us.

#### MAYOR DAVIS' LETTER TO GARAMENDI ON MUSLIM BAN

(By Vanguard Administrator)

REPRESENTATIVE GARAMENDI: Thanks for your interest in the challenges the City of Davis and UC Davis are facing in light of President Trump's executive order restricting entry for citizens from 7, predominantly-Muslim nations. UC Davis has 87 students or scholars from Iran, Iraq and Libya, with unknown numbers of Iranian faculty, family members and workers with permanent residency living in our City.

In addition, the following shows the large numbers of students and scholars from other predominantly Muslim countries currently at UC Davis. While these countries are not covered by the current Executive Order, students and scholars from them are very concerned about their future status and ability to travel home or receive visitors from home.

1. Bangladesh: 14 students, 9 scholars
2. Egypt: 14 students, 7 scholars
3. Indonesia: 147 students, 1 scholar
4. Malaysia: 49 students, 6 scholars
5. Morocco: 4 students, 1 scholar
6. Nigeria: 4 students, 2 scholars
7. Pakistan: 18 students, 14 scholars
8. Turkey: 31 students, 9 scholars

Beyond these numbers we have over 5000 students and scholars at UC Davis, many of whom are actively questioning what future actions by this administration might mean for them. This is an incredibly disorienting time for all our international guests.

Here are some specific cases that illustrate challenges that students and scholars all over the country are facing at this time. These are specific to our community. (Note: as you know, F-1 status is for students at any degree level authorized to study in the US at accredited universities. J-1 can refer either to students or scholars in the US Visitor Exchange Program)

1. A former J-1 scholar from Iran is in the US arranging the move of his wife and son, while awaiting green card processing. He was to have left the US for final interviews and processing but is now uncertain. He has an appointment in UC Davis' Plant Sciences Department.

2. An Iranian PhD student who was to have started at UC Davis this spring (he was accepted), recently obtained his visa, was to arrive in March, 2017, to start classes April 4. His ability to start then is now in doubt. In addition, his proposed roommate, who is already here from Iran, was counting on him to share expenses. This person, now finds himself in a difficult situation.

3. An Iranian F-2 (spouse of F-1) is concerned about her ability to change to F-1 status to become a student. She has been accepted at UC Davis.

4. An Iranian student applying for a Master's program in Engineering at UC Davis is asking about whether she should continue her application process.

5. The spouse of an F-1 student (F-2 status) is currently stuck outside the US and unable to be reunited with her family.

6. An Iranian F-1 PhD student, who started in Fall 2016 quarter had invited his father to visit. This student has a sister with two children in the US and she and they are American citizens. The father/grandfather had a visa interview scheduled in Yerevan, Armenia for February 8th so he could come on a tourist visa to visit the student son and daughter and grandchildren. His visa interview has now been canceled. Attached are the pictures of the two grandchildren he will not be able to see. He has not been able to see his daughter for five years.

7. Scholar advisors at UC Davis are being asked by scholars of these countries if it is safe to travel within the USA. The fact that scholars must ask this shows the fear that exists.

8. Departmental staff is questioning whether to admit students or invite scholars from these countries for summer and fall arrivals. There is much confusion.

9. A high profile scholar from one of the countries (his profile might put him at risk) was set to come to UC Davis to do research on responses to humanitarian abuses in his country. Because of the order, UC Davis was not permitted to provide him with documentation necessary to obtain a visa.

These stories were gathered in the past 5 hours WITHIN the City of Davis and the University. We are a small city of 65,000.

The fact that Iranians are the main nationality represented comes as no surprise. UC Davis and the City of Davis are home to many Iranians and have been for a generation at least. The fact that the Trump Administration can point to NO attacks by Iranians on US soil or against US interests makes their exclusion seem particularly arbitrary and cruel to us.

Finally, I wanted to share with you a joint statement from Interim Chancellor Ralph Hexter and me to our campus and community. Thanks for helping us get the word out on the challenges that we are facing in light of the Executive Order.

#### A MESSAGE TO THE COMMUNITY ON THE IMMIGRATION EXECUTIVE ORDER:

Our city and university host over 5,000 international students, faculty members and scholars, as well as their families. Many of them come from nations with majority Muslim populations. These are our neighbors, friends and colleagues. They have faces and stories we know well. They contribute in myriad ways to our community and our university. They are part of us. We are deeply concerned by the impact of the recent executive order that restricts the ability of students, faculty, staff and other members of our community from certain countries to return to the United States if they are currently traveling or plan to travel abroad. The threat of the order and the order itself are already having impacts on people in our town and university, on their academic, professional and personal lives.



We understand it is the federal government's role to maintain the security of the nation's borders. However, this executive order's impact on our friends and colleagues is inconsistent with the values of our community. It has created uncertainty and fear that hurts the University of California, Davis, and the city of Davis.

We have long been deeply enriched by students, faculty, scholars and health care professionals from around the world—including the affected countries—coming to study, teach, research and make our lives richer and better. Any effort to make these valuable members of our community feel unwelcome is antithetical to our mission of expanding learning and generating new knowledge. Nothing, however, will cause us to retreat from the shared principles of community we have developed together, and to all of our friends from here and abroad, you have our commitment to welcome you.

Sincerely,

RALPH J. HEXTER,  
*Interim Chancellor.*

ROBB DAVIS,  
*Mayor, city of Davis.*

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is a terrible situation, but I do want to—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Could we allow the gentleman to complete his statement just with 1 minute?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. RASKIN. I ask unanimous consent for just 1 minute to complete—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, I would just like to note that we knew where the clock was going on this, but I made a speech today in the Judiciary Committee, and I want to stand by my word and acknowledge the gentleman and not object so the gentleman can complete his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman. That is very gracious of the Congressman.

#### HORRORS OF THE IMMIGRATION BAN

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. I will just finish this up very quickly. I think we need to look to where this problem emanates. It emanates from the President's adviser, Mr. Bannon. He has been at this for some time talking about the nature of America being a White nationalist nation. So if we look beyond the horror that this ban places, we need to look to where it emanates, Mr. Bannon, clearly this comes from him, and we need to focus our attention on what he has done to this Nation's values.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. If the gentleman has a few seconds left, I would just say I

know the distinguished Congressman KING is going to go, and then we have a couple more people who were left over from the Progressive Caucus Special Order who will stay for 1-minute after.

#### REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I do now object because I have been waiting for a half hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER IS NOT A MUSLIM BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I regret I wasn't able to work with all of the speakers here tonight they wanted to pack within that hour. I understand that they have prepared themselves to give this speech tonight, and there will be opportunities in each succeeding day. I just wanted to recognize their right to speak on this floor under the rules and be as lenient as I can, and also, of course, defending my own rights at the same time.

But I would acknowledge that we did have a discussion before the Judiciary Committee today, and I want this Congress to have the level of comity so that we can exchange ideas and bounce them off of each other. And I have long believed that if I can't sustain myself in debate, I have got two choices. One of them is go back and do more research and build enough information that I can sustain myself; and the other is adopt the other fellow's position. I am not very inclined to do that, but I am inclined to listen to their positions.

So, as I have listened to these positions here for more than an hour here on the floor, things come to me and I hear these words recurring over and over again. I didn't get a full count on it, but I know I heard 7, 8, 10, or maybe even more, times saying that the President's executive order is a Muslim ban.

Now, looking through that executive order—and I haven't read it thoroughly word by word, but those who were vetting that executive order, to use that term, tell me the word "Muslim" is not used in that executive order. I am going to assert that is the case, that President Trump did not use the word "Muslim" in his executive order, and that the executive order is not a Muslim ban, but is a ban on travel from seven countries that are Muslim majority.

If it was his intention to try to block Muslims from coming into America, he would have started with Indonesia rather than Iraq and Syria and the war-torn countries.

So I will assert it is not a Muslim ban, except that the words "Muslim ban" are in the talking points of the Democrats, and they will repeat it over and over and over again, as if somehow they could amend the executive order to have the words "Muslim ban" in there so they can have their grievance to the executive order.

I saw this unfold on Friday, when the President issued his executive order. It was a big day, I admit. He has had a lot of executive orders, and they have been raining down pretty fast on this country, and I am glad of that.

We should objectively deal with the directive that is there. It is a temporary travel ban that focuses on the seven countries that President Barack Obama identified as the most dangerous countries, I call them terrorist-spawning countries. It is a prudent thing on the part of the President to temporarily suspend travel from those countries. I would have added a few more countries in the suspension of the travel to the United States.

It is his intention, and I think it is clearly stated within his executive order to evaluate the security circumstances coming from each of these countries and determine how we can have a better policy, especially to do extreme vetting on the travel people that are coming from not only these seven countries, but other countries that do send terrorists to us. And I won't start down that list, but we know it is extensive.

I will say some of the countries that are not on this list are Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and other countries that would be listed as Arab countries, but including Indonesia, which is the largest population of Muslims, but the lowest concentration of terrorist production per Islamic society that I know of in the world.

So I think this reflects the danger and the risk to Americans and a prudent approach to this. It is not only the ban on travel that is not a Muslim ban, not a Muslim ban—if I had to say that enough times to negate the times that that has been asserted here on the floor, I suppose I could; but we are going to hear it in the news every day because that seems to be what pays off politically.

The argument that it was a religious test; this executive order is not a religious test. It doesn't reference religion. In fact, when I have asked questions of the officials of the Obama administration, I have said to them: Why is it that Christians don't seem to be allowed into the United States as refugees under the Obama administration?

We saw one group that was 1,500-some-strong that had one Christian in there. So I traveled to Geneva, Switzerland, and sat down with the lead on UNHCR, the United Nations Council on