

Mr. RASKIN. Again, that is very gracious of you, and I appreciate the spirit with which you engage in this dialogue. I think it is something we really do need to get to the bottom of. To my knowledge, Trump Industries is not doing business in the poor Muslim countries that were targeted like Somalia, Libya, and so on, but perhaps I can be corrected.

In any event, the fact that he has done business in Saudi Arabia, in Egypt, and United Arab Emirates—in the wealthier Muslim countries—it may be logical as a matter of business practice, but I don't think that can become the basis for American foreign policy. I think that is the reason why this policy has created such outrage in America and around the world because it doesn't seem to have any national security logic to it. It is not about terrorism unless you can convince me that those seven countries actually generated terrorism.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, it is conjecture that any of the Trump businesses had anything to do with this decision. It is pure conjecture. If the argument is that Donald Trump didn't do business in Somalia, I wouldn't blame him one bit. If anybody watched "Black Hawk Down" then they would know a good reason. It is essentially a terrorist state in Somalia.

So I will thank the gentleman for his comments, and I am going to turn then to Judge Neil Gorsuch and see if I can make that point yet this evening, and it is this: We had this vacancy in the Supreme Court. It is a vacancy that is brought about by the tragic death of Justice Antonin Scalia, a man whom many of us have admired for a long time and enjoyed his friendship, his company, his sense of humor, his gregariousness, and also especially his dissenting opinions that were written for the law school students whom he always understood would have to read the dissent when they studied the cases. He wanted to write them in such a way that they would read them, hopefully enjoy them, and remember them. He has been a speaker before the Conservative Opportunity Society which I have chaired for some time, and he has done it a number of times. We really enjoyed his company. We had very engaging debates and discussions.

There is a huge hole in the United States Supreme Court created by the loss of Justice Scalia. I am grateful that we have taken serious time in filling that hole and seeing a nominee come forward that has the chance to grow into the shoes of Justice Scalia.

□ 1815

As I went to the White House a couple of nights ago to be there to witness the ceremony of the nomination of Judge Neil Gorsuch, we were all briefed on a lot of things that had to do with his bio. I am just quickly going to touch on some of the high points in Judge Gorsuch's bio.

His undergraduate school was Columbia University, with honors, Phi Beta Kappa; Harvard Law School, cum laude; a Truman Scholar, where he received his juris doctorate; then went to Oxford as a Marshall Scholar and received another doctoral degree, a Ph.D. in philosophy. Then he became a clerk for Justice White, and then, later on, for Justice Kennedy.

If he is confirmed, it will be, we think, the first time that there has been a clerk that became a Justice on the Supreme Court serving with the Justice whom he clerked for. So that is a unique component of Judge Gorsuch.

He is a man of the West. He has a strong work ethic and common sense. He is an outdoorsman. He loves to fly-fish, and he raises animals in his barn at home.

His background, he was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth, but worked blue-collar jobs and worked his way up. We know that he accelerated his education very well.

For his 10 years on the bench, he clerked for the judge on the D.C. Circuit, and then from there, clerking for the Supreme Court Justices, whom I mentioned, White and Kennedy.

He was then appointed by George W. Bush on May 10, 2006, after a decade in private practice where he became a partner in a large law firm. They must have liked him there. They took him in as an associate, and he became a partner for a decade.

Then in his heart was that he wanted to be a judge, and he wanted to protect the Constitution and the rule of law. After a year at the Department of Justice, George W. Bush appointed him to the D.C. Circuit. There, he was confirmed by the United States Senate, without dissent, by a voice vote on July 20, 2006. He served for more than a decade as a district court judge. His record is stellar.

When I asked questions about Judge Gorsuch, I learned a number of things. One of them was that, of the 21 candidates that were listed by, first, President-elect Trump and, now, President Trump—he would draw from that list and nominate, and then seek confirmation and appoint from that list—each candidate was asked the question as they were interviewed: Who would you name for this position if it isn't going to be you?

A tough question.

So, it is like saying, I would interpret that as: Who do I think is second best? That is the only reason I would be there is if I thought I was the best choice. I would think that is what all of them must have thought as they were interviewed.

There were 21 candidates. You take one out of that number, because that is Judge Gorsuch himself. We don't know how he answered this question. When the other 20 were asked, if it is not to be you, who shall it be, everyone said Judge Neil Gorsuch.

There can't be a stronger endorsement than that. It shows a respect

from all of his competing peers. I believe that they believe he will do the best and the clearest job of preserving, protecting, and defending our Constitution and read the letter of the Constitution and interpret it, as Judge Scalia did, to mean what it says and to be understood to mean what it says and was understood at the time of ratification of the body of the Constitution or the various amendments, whichever the case may be. That is the strongest and most profound.

When I asked the question what is his level of respect for stare decisis, the people who know him and studied him say he has more respect for the text of the Constitution than the decisions that have been made along the way. I think that he will recognize those decisions.

I asked that question, would he look into them to determine if that rationale has helped his rationale but always anchor it back to the Constitution and the original understanding. This is secondhand of the people that know him, but the best answer I can get from that is yes.

The next one is the Chevron doctrine. He has written about the Chevron doctrine. It is pretty clear that he thinks that the Chevron doctrine is unjustly created by the courts and that you shouldn't give administrators of undue legislative authority the benefit of the doubt.

So those things sound really good to me. I am looking forward to the confirmation hearings. Hopefully, an expeditious confirmation of Judge Gorsuch. I am very, very happy with the selection that President Trump has made, and I really appreciate what I saw there that night as I watched Judge Gorsuch.

In the middle of his speech, he turned and looked at his wife, Marie Louise, and there was that significant eye contact that told me that they are a bonded couple that are a team together. The friends of the family tell me she is more conservative than he is.

So I look forward to his confirmation. I think the President of the United States has made a terrific choice. Let's get the judicial branch of government up and running again, along with the executive branch, and let's keep up pace here in the House. We have got some work to do, too.

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

#### OPPOSITION TO MUSLIM BAN

(Ms. JAYAPAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to just conclude our earlier Special Order where many of my colleagues spoke out in strong opposition to the Muslim ban that was just signed by President Trump.

I would like to read a short paragraph from the letter that we have now

submitted to Secretary Kelly. It has been signed by over 110 of my colleagues in the House. It requests that we have an immediate emergency meeting and briefing. I include in the RECORD the entire letter, and I will just read a short portion.

“The Executive Order is both controversial and confusing. For example, the International Rescue Committee called the Order ‘harmful and hasty’ noting ‘America has the strongest, most successful resettlement program in the world.’ Over 4,000 academics, including 25 Nobel Laureates, have signed a petition denouncing the Order, writing ‘this measure is fatally disruptive to the lives of these immigrants, their families, and the communities of which they form an integral part. It is inhumane, ineffective, and un-American.’”

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 1, 2017.

Hon. JOHN F. KELLY,  
*Secretary of Homeland Security, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC.*

SECRETARY KELLY: We write to strongly condemn the President’s executive order issued January 27, 2017, titled “Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States,” and the ensuing actions taken by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and its agencies, in particular Customs and Border Protection (CBP), to implement the order, and to request an urgent briefing regarding the same. We hope you will urge the President to immediately rescind the Executive Order, which has created profound chaos and fear among refugees and immigrants who have been admitted to the United States, as well as their families. As a nation of immigrants that has been a refuge for people fleeing persecution from around the world, these actions are contrary to who we are as a nation.

We understand that you met yesterday at 4:30 PM with Chairs and Ranking Members of relevant Committees to discuss “recent executive actions.” You should understand that such a time limited meeting with a subset of Members and Senators in no way obviates the need for the briefing we are requesting for all Members. Such full Member briefings are a frequent occurrence on Capitol Hill after important events such as the issuance of the January 27 Executive Order. They allow all Members to benefit from the knowledge and experiences of the executive branch so that we may be well informed in our legislative and oversight affairs and serve our constituents best. The full Member briefing regarding the Executive Order is particularly needed given the unsettling events of last evening—the abrupt firing of Acting Attorney General Sally Yates and the termination without explanation of Daniel Ragsdale as acting Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The need to brief the full Democratic Caucus is also necessary as we now understand that guidance concerning the January 27 Executive Order has been provided to Members of the Republican Conference, but not the Democratic Caucus. According to yesterday’s Washington Post, “substantive guidance [concerning the Executive Order was given] to congressional Republicans . . . late Saturday. . . . In a two-page memo that offered some details on the policy . . .”

The Executive Order harms our families, economy, and national security. Over the weekend, individuals—some of whom have been lawful permanent residents for decades—were found stranded outside the

United States, leaving families in turmoil. Technology companies, including industry leaders like Microsoft, Google, and Apple, report that the Executive Order could directly impact their employees and hinder their ability to attract the best talent from around the world. In addition, the policy reflected in the Executive Order is counterproductive to our national security. We understand that scores of American diplomats stationed across the globe are drafting a formal “dissent memo” to register their objections, stating that the order will “not achieve its aim of making our country safer” and will instead result in a “drop in international good will towards Americans and a threat to our economy.” We need to develop relationships with Muslim countries and others seeking to combat terrorism. Unfortunately, the Order alienates many of the groups we need to have working alongside us.

The Executive Order is both controversial and confusing. For example, the International Rescue Committee called the Order “harmful and hasty” noting “America has the strongest, most successful resettlement program in the world.” Over 4,000 academics, including 25 Nobel Laureates, have signed a petition denouncing the Order, writing “[t]his measure is fatally disruptive to the lives of these immigrants, their families, and the communities of which they form an integral part. It is inhumane, ineffective, and un-American.” The Order has resulted in widespread confusion, as hundreds of individuals have been improperly detained at our airports, at least four federal courts have issued stays concerning the Order, and protests have broken out at airports and other venues nationwide. At the time this letter was sent, 16 State Attorneys General have condemned the Executive Order.

In the interest of exercising proper Congressional oversight of DHS and CBP and of holding agencies accountable, we write to urgently request an emergency briefing this week with you and others at DHS and the Administration concerning the Executive Order. Among other things, we would like to receive the following, either at or in advance of the briefing:

Any DHS guidance, directive, or policy regarding interpretation and implementation of the Executive Order, specifically is it pertains to current visa holders seeking entry into the United States, visa applicants, lawful permanent residents, dual citizens, and U.S. citizens, as well as clarification on the status of the individuals from the seven designated countries in the Order who are applying for or renewing immigration benefits.

Details on individuals who have been prevented from entering the country, including the airport at which they arrived, location of detention, number provided with interpretation services, number who have been released broken down by airport, number of individuals who were sent back broken down by nationality, and a breakdown of the immigration status of those being detained and those who were sent back.

The manner in which DHS is complying with the various court-issued stays of removal, including the number of individuals who have been provided access to counsel.

What, if, any accommodations are being considered for interpreters and translators from the seven designated nations who have worked with our military and intelligence, as well as notable academics coming to do research in the U.S.

The manner in which the exceptions to the Executive Order’s application with respect to “religious minorities” will be applied, particularly given Mr. Trump’s series of statements concerning his preference for Christian refugees.

In addition, and among other things, we would like to be briefed by you on the accuracy of President Trump’s assertion that the Executive Order can be justified because then-president Obama had “banned visas for refugees from Iraq for six months” in 2011. It is our understanding that in 2011 the Iraqi resettlement program was subject to a simple reduction for a short time while new security measures were added. In stark contrast, Mr. Trump’s Executive Order calls for a suspension of all refugees, not just one category, in addition to suspending the Syrian program indefinitely.

For decades both Democratic and Republican Presidents have supported granting safe haven to families fleeing persecution, violence, terror, sexual slavery, and torture. At a time of unprecedented forced migration across the world, the need for American leadership in these areas has not subsided.

Given the urgency, widespread confusion and dangerous impact of the Executive Order, we would appreciate hearing from you as quickly as possible so that we may ensure the briefing occurs by no later than Friday, February 3. The lives and well-being of many individuals, as well as our ability to partner with foreign governments to fight terrorism, depends on it.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, JR.  
*Member of Congress.*  
ZOE LOFGREN,  
*Member of Congress.*  
PRAMILA JAYAPAL,  
*Member of Congress.*  
(And an additional  
111 Members of  
Congress.)

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 3.

## PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR  
THE 115TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, DC, February 2, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to submit for printing in the Congressional Record, pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on February 1, 2017.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interests of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,  
*Chairman.*