

Limited Version of Trump Travel Ban Supported by US Supreme Court

Jared Roy

June 29, 2017

This Fall, they'll <u>take up</u> the entire case, on whether the <u>travel ban</u> executive order covering six Muslim-majority countries is lawful. The Republican leader first introduced it for seven Muslim nations, but later brought down to six, with a view to restrict terrorism and enhance the national security. The rollout was thoroughly botched, too.

And so there's a lot of gray area and we do expect to see some litigation about this, because it's it's one thing if you have a relative in the USA who is trying to claim you. The president got a little help to protect the nation from terrorists, schoolyard safety was held to be as important for children in private schools as in public schools, and the court hinted that help might be on the way for a Colorado wedding-cake baker who doesn't want to join the celebration of same-sex weddings. The <u>ban</u> on entry to the United States was supposed to have been *temporary:* 90 days for citizens of Iran, <u>Sudan</u>, Somalia, <u>Libya</u>, Yemen and Syria, and 120 days for refugees. That order also was blocked - until the <u>Supreme Court's</u> Monday action. They still can enter.

Denying entry to immigrants with no connection to the country "does not burden any American party", the court said. The same ground rules <u>apply</u> to another part of the order putting a 120-day stop to the USA program for admitting refugees. Refugees, legal USA residents and visa holders were turned back at airports or barred from boarding US -bound planes.

Meanwhile, supporters of the President's <u>attempt</u> to limit <u>travel</u> from the six countries were enthusiastic about the <u>high court's</u> ruling.

Gorsky said the standard is likely to sow confusion among US consular officials who have to make visa decisions and could require another court decision to determine what constitutes a connection to the United States sufficient to allow entry.

America's global image has plummeted under Trump, a survey has found.

After being blocked by the courts, the **Trump** administration revised the order in March that included the same countries except Iraq and did not apply to visa and green card holders.

DAVID COLE: In order for the court to rule for President **Trump**, they would essentially have to blindly defer to the president and close their eyes to what the world knows, which is that the president sought to put in place a Muslim ban. **Trump** wrote on Twitter this month. But often his verbosity is irrelevant to his job responsibilities.

"This is a major win for <u>Trump</u>", <u>said</u> David Bier, an immigration expert at the Cato Institute who drafted immigration legislation as senior policy adviser for Rep. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho.

The ruling would remain in force until the court hears the case in full in October. In the meantime, the administration doesn't have to sit on its hands. John McCain of Arizona and Lindsey Graham of SC said in a statement at the time. Then again, there is no reasoning with those who want open borders at the expense of national security.

"First of all, it proves that the president in fact was right, despite all the news media attacks", the Georgia Republican said on "Fox & Friends". It is based on a memo issued by the **Trump** administration on June 14.

"It leaves open a number of questions of interpretation and implementation", said Kate Shaw, ABC News' Supreme Court contributor.