It is one thing when it comes to a dustup about the size of the inauguration crowd; it is an entirely different story when it is the most sensitive activities undertaken by our Nation's government.

Much like the Muslim ban, this decision was poorly thought out and ill-conceived. It has put a filter on the information going to the President and, like the Executive order, makes us less safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my 10 minutes be extended to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 9 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAVEL BAN

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, in just a few weeks, our great country will mark the 75th anniversary of President Roosevelt's Executive order authorizing the internment of hundreds of thousands of Japanese, German, and Italian Americans during World War II. They were rounded up with their families and held behind barbed wire like war criminals. But they had done nothing wrong; their crime was being Japanese, German, or Italian. They were labeled ''enemy aliens.''

Mark Twain reportedly said that history doesn't repeat itself, but it does rhyme, and this seems to be the path the President has pursued with his Muslim ban. This ban has already harmed green card holders, students, business people, and those fleeing violence and persecution. Remember, these are the people fleeing the violence, not the perpetrators of the violence. They are the victims, not the criminals. They have been pulled from their flights, left stranded in the airports. They have been detained without the ability to talk with a lawyer. And they are wondering if the United States of America is still the beacon of hope, the lamp by the golden door, the shining city on the hill.

Iraqis who risked their lives to serve our country as translators saw their visas revoked. An 11-month-old baby was detained. That is disgusting. It is un-American. It is contrary to everything we stand for.

We stand for providing refuge for those who want to escape their own awful circumstances and live in freedom and opportunity. It is my grandparents escaping Ukraine. It is my wife's grandparents leaving China. It is the Schatzes. It is the Binders. It is the Kwoks. It is Albert Einstein. It is Madeleine Albright. This is who we are. We are people from all over the world. We are united not by our ethnic extraction or religious affiliation but tied together by our love for America.

Here is the thing: It is not even as though we are trading liberty for security. We are getting no additional security. This is all about being cruel to Muslims because it is good politics for some people.

This isn't just morally wrong, it is also guaranteed not to work. This ban is ridiculous as a homeland security measure.

First, zero people from the countries on the ban list have been involved in terrorist attacks in America. Zero people from the countries on the ban list have been involved in terrorist attacks on America. It is almost as though the criteria for picking the countries is something other than the threat of terrorism.

Second, this ban has the potential to strengthen violent extremist groups by playing right into their hands. It encourages everyone to be afraid of people we don't know from other places. That is not America, and it will not work.

When President Gerald Ford repealed the Executive order interning Japanese Americans, he asked citizens across the country to make a pledge. He said: ''I call upon the American people to affirm with me this American promise—that we have learned from the tragedy of that long-ago experience forever to treasure liberty and justice for each individual American, and resolve that this kind of action shall never again be repeated.''

That promise is being broken. It is broken for the American who came to this country as a lost boy from Sudan and who now cannot see his family. It is broken for the American married to an Iranian, whom the government is splitting from her husband. It is broken for the millions of Americans, the majority of us, who want us always to have the moral high ground.

The world is watching. History is watching. We have to ask ourselves: What do they see? Do they see Lady Liberty or do they see something darker? The choice is ours. We can fix this.

We start by following the wise words of Fred Korematsu, an outspoken voice against Japanese internment and an American hero who was born 98 years ago today.

He said: ''Protest, but not with violence, and don't be afraid to speak up.''

Today I call on every Member of the Senate to follow Mr. Korematsu's advice. Speak up, stand against this ban, and fight chaos and paranoia as official government policy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. CAPITO pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 10 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

NOMINATION OF SCOTT PRUITT

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, the Environmental Protection Agency, which bears most of the blame for regulations targeting energy jobs, is in dire need of a change of direction. The EPA under the Obama administration was unwilling to engage the people of West Virginia in public listening sessions or hearings about decisions that directly impacted our State's economy, and I have described what the result of that has been.

This failure to effectively engage resulted in a number of job-killing regulations, like the utility MATS rule for powerplants, the so-called Clean Power Plan, and the waters of the U.S. rule.

As the Presiding Officer knows, the waters of the U.S. rule is something that impacts not just mining but also agriculture, construction, and it really has far-reaching implications.

Scott Pruitt, who is President Trump's nominee to become the EPA Administrator, has gone through a thorough review process by the Environment and Public Works Committee. At Attorney General Pruitt's confirmation hearing, Senators from both parties were permitted to engage in as many as four rounds of questioning, and some of them were pretty tough. After the hearing, Attorney General Pruitt answered 1,078 questions for the RECORD. Combining both the hearing and the followup questions, Attorney General Pruitt answered more than 1,200 questions from our committees.

Through the process, Attorney General Pruitt has shown himself to be a person who cares about applying our environmental laws as they were written and intended by Congress. He has a

strong record of enforcing environmental statutes in a balanced way and ensuring clean air and clean water without unnecessarily sacrificing jobs or economic growth.

Attorney General Pruitt has been clear that he will work with State regulators and listen to the views of individuals who will be most heavily impacted by EPA's regulatory decisions.

I believe Attorney General Pruitt will keep his word and provide a refreshing change and direction for West Virginia coal miners, natural gas workers, manufacturers, farmers, and, indeed, for all of our communities struggling from the effects of overregulation.

I look forward to supporting Attorney General Pruitt's nomination in the EPW Committee, which will come before the committee on Wednesday morning, and I look forward to seeing him confirmed on the Senate floor soon.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 14 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF REX TILLERSON

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, shortly we are going to be taking up the cloture motion in regard to the confirmation process of Mr. Tillerson to be the Secretary of State for our country. I had the opportunity, as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to meet with Mr. Tillerson. I had a chance to talk with him concerning his vision for America. I participated in a lengthy committee hearing, where not only I had a chance to ask him questions but every member of the committee had a chance to ask questions and then had the opportunity to present questions for the RECORD and look at his responses to questions for the RECORD.

I wish to say, at the outset of this debate before the U.S. Senate, Mr. Tillerson is a successful businessperson. I am certain he has great negotiating skills, as he has shown as the CEO of ExxonMobil, and I think that is an important ability to have if he were confirmed as Secretary of State.

I do think he wants to serve our Nation, and he has put forward his ability to serve as Secretary of State for the right reasons. However, I have serious reservations, as a result of this process, this confirmation process, that leads me to the conclusion that I cannot support his nomination, and I will be voting against his nomination. I wanted to at least start this debate by giving some of the reasons I will not be supporting Mr. Tillerson to be the Secretary of State.

Mr. Tillerson's business orientation and his lack of moral clarity to questions that were asked during the confirmation hearing, to me, compromises his ability to forcefully promote the values and ideals that defined America's leading role in the world for more than 200 years. When I am referring to the values, they are the values of good governance, the values of standing up for human rights, the values of speaking up for a free press, the values of recognizing the importance of civil societies, which is lacking in so many places around the world.

When Mr. Tillerson was asked the question as to how he would characterize what Russia is doing in Syria in supporting a regime that has attacked humanitarian convoys, whether that should be considered as war crimes, Mr. Tillerson was less than clear as to how he would characterize Russia's conduct in Syria.

When I asked Mr. Tillerson how he would characterize Philippine President Duterte's extrajudicial killings—this is a President who has authorized individuals to be killed on site without judicial process, which has been well-documented—whether that was a gross violation of human rights, Mr. Tillerson was less than clear as to whether that in fact would elevate to a serious human rights violation.

When I asked the question, whether under any circumstances we could have a national registry for any group of religious or ethnic minorities in America, his answer was not as clear as I would have hoped it to be. The answer should have been a simple ''no,'' but he did not give that answer in that moral clarity.

For all those reasons, I have serious concern as to whether he will speak with a strong voice on American values or whether that will be compromised for narrow business interests or for other considerations that should not take priority to the values that have made America the great Nation it is.

I was concerned about this before what has happened in recent days, but when I take a look at President Trump's first 10 days in office and I look at the Executive orders he has issued as President of the United States, it is even more critical that the next Secretary of State speak with moral clarity as to the values of America.

The gag order that was reimposed by President Trump wasn't the same gag order that other administrations have imposed. It is far broader and could prevent U.S. participation with health workers around the world to stop the spread of HIV–AIDS or to deal with the Zika virus or to deal with issues concerning global health issues, maternal health. I want someone, as Secretary of State, to say that America stands for providing the leadership we need on global health issues.

More recently, when President Trump announced his Mexican policy; that it would build a wall, he not only asked the taxpayers to pay for it once but to pay for it twice, to build the wall, which almost anyone will tell you will not work. We do have tunnels that we already know could go under walls. It will be expensive, but he is also asking Americans to pay for it twice because he is going to impose a tariff, at least that is under consideration, that middle-income families will end up paying—starting a trade war with Mexico. And why? Why would you start this? Mexico is working with us to stop illegal immigration. They are working with us to stop the illegal trafficking of drugs. They are working with us to build a regional, natural economy that benefits both countries. Why would we pick a fight with our neighbor? It makes no sense whatsoever.

The last thing that was done over this weekend points out even more clearly why we need a Secretary of State who will speak with moral clarity, and that was this outrageous, reckless, and dangerous Executive order that would ban certain individuals from coming to America. It would put a hold on our refugee program and would establish a religious test for people coming to America—a Muslim ban. That is not what America stands for.

I believe that Executive order is illegal. I know that Executive order will put Americans at risk. I would like to know from our Secretary of State how he, if he is confirmed, would respond when other countries ask: Why should we help you when you will not allow people from Muslim countries the right to visit your country? Why should we give you that information? How will Americans, who are traveling abroad, be treated? It puts all at risk. Our next Secretary of State has to have that credibility to deal with other countries with moral clarity. Time and time again, when confronted with questions, Mr. Tillerson was not clear.

Let me give you one example that may sum up my concern on his moral clarity issues, and that is with Russia. We had asked several times whether he would support the existing sanctions, would he support stronger sanctions. After all, the sanctions were put on because Russia invaded Ukraine. They