Representatives—by amendment, at least—that I and others have brought. Every time the rule of law prevailed.

Now we have elected a President on the rule of law, and this President will not blink. I will remind the public as I speak to you, Mr. Speaker, that when Ronald Reagan was elected President, the air traffic controllers decided they would go out on strike. The President warned them: If you go on strike, you have got a contract, and you are, by law, prohibited from striking because it puts too many people at risk.

They said: Too bad. If we don't get what we demand, we are going on strike anyway.

They challenged the President of the United States. And what did Ronald Reagan do? He said: If you don't go back to work on the date that I tell you, I will fire anyone that doesn't show up.

And so they called the President, thinking it was a bluff. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't a bluff. Ronald Reagan fired every air traffic controller that didn't show up for work in defiance of the Federal law, and he put the military air traffic controllers to work to control the skies over America without one single fatal accident brought about by any of that. Ronald Reagan was called out by the air traffic controllers. They thought he was bluffing. He was not bluffing.

Now we have jurisdiction after jurisdiction that think they are going to be leading a national movement to accelerate the sanctuary city jurisdiction endeavor, and they think that President Trump is going to back up from them because there are a lot of them and somehow he won't be able to take this on.

I will submit this: If Ronald Reagan had blinked in the stare down between the air traffic controllers union, his Presidency would have collapsed. His power base would have diminished. He would have been an asterisk in history except for the snickers behind the hand of people that would have laughed at him because he would have caved in the face of first adversity.

Donald Trump faces a similar circumstance here with sanctuary jurisdictions. He has no choice. If he is going to have an effective Presidency—and I guarantee you, he is committed to an effective Presidency—there will be no sanctuary jurisdiction left in this country within several months or a year as this grinds through and as people like Mayor Rahm Emanuel are brought to bear and they begin to be reminded by, hopefully, the new Attorney General, maybe as soon as tomorrow, JEFF SESSIONS, that 8 U.S.C. 1324 means what it says: It is a felony to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection or attempt to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection any such alien in any place, including a building or transportation—meaning anywhere. It is a serious felony.

8 U.S.C. 1373, sanctuary cities, just the policy is a violation of Federal law. And then when you have control of the purse strings, Mr. Speaker, and you cut off the Federal funds going to these jurisdictions, there isn't hardly anybody that is going to face this. I think I would start with maybe the mayor of Chicago, then the mayor of New York. I bet he can communicate with Mayor de Blasio.

The center of it all is this: Restore the respect for the rule of law. You have to enforce it if you are going to have laws. Once we do that, we will respect each other and America can go back to its constitutional foundation, and we can turn our focus to building our families, restoring our country, and helping other countries get up to speed into the first world.

Mexico can get to the first world, but they can't be there if it is going to be corrupt. They can't be there if they are going to be the main provider of $60 billion worth of illegal drugs in this country. They can't face another 100,000 people murdered, we can't face 55,000 drug overdose deaths in this country every year, and I haven't yet mentioned even the terrorists that are sneaking across that border on at least an irregular basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is serious business, and I urge that we get this done. I urge that the American people follow through and encourage the President of the United States, let's end DACA, let's end DAPA, and let's end the sanctuary jurisdictions. Build a wall. America will be in a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the attention and your ear this evening. It has been my honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WEEK

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate my friend, colleague—actually, dear friend—STEVE KING, and his points he is making—right on track.

I hesitated for a number of days now about making public reference to this, but it needs to be addressed and it needs to be looked at, and people need to be aware so that mistakes do not continue to be made. This is a story from John Stanton, February 2, 2017, BuzzFeed: ''Congressional IT Staff Under Investigation In Alleged Procurement Scam.''

And this is February 2, so several days ago—5 days ago. It says: ''A lawmaker briefed on the matter had said House officials had told staff from affected offices that contractors had been arrested, but late Thursday night US Capitol Police spokesperson Eva Malecki told BuzzFeed News that no arrest had been made. The USCP is investigating House IT support staff.''

Now, that is the technologically proficient staff members that work on congressional computers, that work on our technology, so it was quite disturbing to see this some days back.

This says: ''Five men who had access to the House of Representatives' entire computer network are under investigation Thursday evening following a months-long investigation by federal law enforcement officials, according to a lawmaker briefed on the raid.''

Well, it sure wasn't me because I didn't know anything about this until I read it a few days ago.

''Although the lawmaker said House officials had told staff from affected offices that contractors had been arrested, late Thursday night, US Capitol Police spokesperson Eva Malecki told BuzzFeed News that no arrest had been made, but that USCP are investigating members of the House IT support staff.

'' 'At the request of Members of Congress, the United States Capitol Police are investigating the actions of House IT support staff,' Malecki said in a statement. 'No Members are being investigated. No arrests have been made. It should be noted that, administratively, House staff were asked to update their security settings as a best practice. We have no further comment on the ongoing investigation at this time.'

''According to the member, the chiefs of staff for 20 lawmakers were summoned to a closed-door meeting with House administration officials, who briefed them on the incidents. The chiefs were told the men were conducting a procurement scam, although officials acknowledged the men—whose staff were told were brothers—had access to virtually all of the computer systems used by the affected lawmakers. Members were also told Thursday night to change the passwords to their email and other applications.

''The news has rattled nerves on Capitol Hill, especially after the series of high-profile political hackings over the last year. 'They said it was some sort of procurement scam, but now I'm concerned that they may have stolen data from us, emails, who knows,' the lawmaker said.''

Then this was added: ''This post has been updated and corrected with new information from US Capitol Police, which said no arrests have been made but there is an active investigation ongoing into IT staff who were involved in alleged procurement scam. A lawmaker briefed on the situation had told BuzzFeed News that arrests were made.''

And then yesterday we had this update from Politico, ''House staffers under criminal investigations still employed,'' by Heather Caygle.

''Multiple Democratic lawmakers have yet to cut ties with House staffers under criminal investigation for wide-ranging equipment and data theft.

''Imran Awan, a longtime House staffer who worked for more than two dozen Democrats since 2004, is still employed by Rep. Debbie Wasserman

Schultz, though his access to the House IT network has been blocked since last week.

''`At this time we are continuing to gather information from House officials and will determine the best approach to move forward once we have reviewed that information,' David Damron, communications director for Wasserman Schultz, said in an email when asked by POLITICO if Awan was still working for the Florida Democrat.''

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, I might insert parenthetically that although you can't judge much from a name, one can't help but wonder, because of all of the outcry about the Russians, if maybe these brothers—well, I started to ask—have some Russian connection, but there doesn't appear to be any.

''Multiple relatives of Imran Awan, including his wife Hina Alvi, Abid Awan and Jamal Awan—all House staffers until recently—are also being investigated in connection to the alleged procurement scam, according to a senior House official close to the investigation.

''Alvi has worked for more than a dozen House Democrats and the House Democratic Caucus since 2007. At least one member, Rep. GREGORY MEEKS, New York, is still employing her.

''`My office is in the process of gathering information to make a determination in the near future about the employment of Ms. Alvi with our office,' Meeks said Monday in a statement to POLITICO.

''Five House staffers are accused of stealing equipment from members' offices without their knowledge and committing serious, potentially illegal, violations on the House IT network, according to multiple sources briefed on the investigation.

''Top staffers for lawmakers impacted by the scam were briefed last Thursday. A source in the briefing said the Sergeant-at-Arms confirmed the U.S. Capitol Police is conducting an active criminal investigation but said no arrests have been made.

''Imran Awan was first employed on Capitol Hill by former Rep. Robert Wexler in January 2004 as an 'information technology director.' Awan has worked for at least 25 other House Democrats since that time as a shared employee providing technical support including to previous House Democratic Caucus Chairman Xavier Becerra, currently the California attorney general.

''Imran Awan has a longtime relationship with some members, including working for Meeks and Becerra starting in 2004 and joining Wasserman Schultz's office in 2005.

''Several Members who have employed Imran Awan and Alvi in the past confirmed to POLITICO they terminated their employment late last week.

''Jamal Awan worked as a House IT staffer for more than half-dozen House Democrats since 2014, according to LegiStorm, a website that tracks congressional employment. Abid Awan worked for more than a dozen House Democrats as a systems administrator since 2005, according to congressional records.

''Another House staff with connections to Imran Awan is also under investigation, according to the senior House official.

''No one named in this POLITICO report as being under investigation returned multiple calls and emails requesting comment over the past several days.''

Capitol Police have not returned calls.

So it is extremely disconcerting. All of us have to hire people to help us with our jobs, and most all of us need computer assistants. I can't help but reflect back, there is a new policy last year that was instituted that requires every employee that may have access to the computer systems, the massive databases and emails of Members, such confidential information, they need a background check, but at the same time, there was the requirement that had to be certified by the Member or the administration officer in a congressional office, you either certify that this person has had the required background check to be allowed to access this confidential information on computers in the congressional offices. Some of these Members were part of the Intelligence Committee having access to top secret information. So this is quite serious.

There was another—there were two possibilities. One, you certify this person had the proper background check done. And, number two—it was an ''or in the alternative''—if this person works for more than one person—which computer personnel often do because you don't need them full-time, you just need them when something goes wrong or perhaps when they're needing to break into your computer and steal your data—you could sign and certify that this person works for more than one Member of Congress. Therefore, I don't believe the background check is necessary.

So I hope all of my colleagues will make note that there may be people on the Hill that don't have the best intentions with our computer data, including access to classified information. So no matter who they are, even if somebody is worried, because of their background or where they were born, that somebody might scream bias or prejudice, we just need to have everyone who has access to classified information to have a background check even if they work for multiple people. We just need to do that. Lessons, apparently, are still being learned in that regard.

As we continue to hear from some friends here in Washington and some going nuts around the country about a Muslim ban, which is completely false and completely untrue, something we are not hearing a lot about is the horrors being experienced by Christians in the Middle East. Even Secretary John Kerry had acknowledged there was an effort, a genocide, in other words, an effort to wipe out every Christian because of their religious beliefs in the Middle East.

So you would think that if we were going to be the big-hearted nation, which we have repeatedly been throughout history—not always, but certainly most of the time, more than any other nation in history—then you would think that our hearts would go out to the Christians being persecuted in far greater percentages than any other religious or racial group in the Middle East.

Yet this story from Townhall, ''Christians Were Persecuted In Every Corner of Globe in 2016,'' points out: ''Not only did the persecution of Christians increase in 2016, it also spread to every corner of the globe, according to Open Doors USA's latest World Watch List.

''The annual report ranks the worst 50 countries for Christians trying to live out their faith, and while some findings are not surprising, like North Korea topping the list for the 16th consecutive year, the group is troubled by the overall rise in the number of incidents considered persecution.''

It is getting worse than ever. Of course, the current Secretary-General, when asked a year and a half or so ago why the percentage of Christian refugees from the Middle East being helped is so much lower than the actual percentage of Christians living in the area, his response was, in essence, that, well, they were so historically important to the areas in which they lived, it was important that they be left there. In other words, we need to leave them where they are being murdered to extinction.

Then that guy with that kind of sensitivity for a genocide gets promoted to be Secretary-General of the U.N., which, to me, is all the more reason it is time to get out of the United Nations. Since a Rockefeller Foundation of some kind controls the land and it is to be used by the U.N., as long as the U.N. remains the main headquarters, then all we have to do is start denying visas and privileges to come in until we have extreme vetting for people that may be improperly using their positions at the U.N. If that proves too much of a burden, then they can go to Brussels or Istanbul or wherever. We might as well let them go to Syria. That seems to be where they want to be most involved, I guess.

It was certainly worth noting Jordan Schachtel in Conservative Review has pointed out: ''The Middle East country of Kuwait issued its own 'Muslim ban' in 2011, citing the 'instability' from several terror hotbeds in the Middle East.''

That is rather interesting because the United States has not and does not have a Muslim ban at all. Christians,

atheists, Jews, and Hindus were all just as prohibited as any Muslim from the seven countries that the Obama administration named as being troubled. And the Trump administration didn't just name them as troubled; it actually took action and did something about it.

We have this story from Liam Deacon, Breitbart, that the Islamic State is paying migrants smuggling fees for them if they join a jihad. So more good news. As President Trump is trying to protect America, more stories emerge that make what President Trump did even more important.

I was hearing something on FOX News. They had a panel. There was one panel member that repeated—and I know she didn't mean it to intentionally misrepresent the facts, but she did in saying that no one has been arrested from one of those seven countries for any terrorist activity. Or maybe she said not committed any.

So it seems that it is worth taking a look at Neil Munro's article from Breitbart: ''Seattle Judge Was Ignorant About Jihad Convictions Prior to Imposing Refugee Reform Ban.''

''The Seattle judge who temporarily banned the White House's refugee reform plan acted after mistakenly claiming the federal government has not arrested jihadi migrants from the seven Muslim countries covered by the reform.

''But the federal government has arrested and jailed at least 76 people since 2001 from the seven countries covered in the first stage of the president's reform, which was announced late January.

''That fact means there is a huge error in the judge's rationale for imposing a 'Temporary Restraining Order' ban on the president's popular reform of the expensive refugee and immigration programs.

''In a hearing before the decision, Judge James Robart told a lawyer from the Department of Justice that the federal government has not arrested people since 2001 from any of the seven countries named in the reform, since the 2001 atrocity in New York. 'How many arrests have there been of foreign nationals for those seven countries since 9/11?' he asked.

''The justice department's lawyer replied, 'Your Honor, I don't have that information,' prompting Robart to answer his own question.''

The judge said: ''Let me tell, you, the answer to that is none, as best I can tell. You're here arguing on behalf of someone that says we have to protect the United States from these individuals coming from these countries and there's no support for that.''

□ 1945

All of us are ignorant of some areas. What is incredibly problematic is when you have a judicial official, a Federal judge with a lifetime appointment not only ignorant, but uses his ignorance as the basis of an illegal, unconstitutional order and then adds arrogance to his ignorance. This is shear, unadulterated, arrogant ignorance by Judge Robart.

So, as a former judge and chief justice, I can sure understand someone who is not a lawyer or somebody who was a lawyer and somebody who was a former judge or even a current judge saying this is a so-called judge.

You would like to think that judges, if they are going to be arrogant, they will be arrogant about their knowledge in some area that others don't have, instead of being arrogant about ignorance that puts the American public in jeopardy.

The Constitution and the laws passed by this Congress and signed by our President make clear that the President has the authority to do exactly what he did. Whether you like it or not, whether I like it or not, he does have that authority, based on our national security, because we gave it to him.

What we did not give the President was authority to do an amnesty program, as President Obama pointed out more than 20 times. He just didn't have authority to do what he ultimately did when he realized the Senate would not work with the House to stop him.

A judge who should know better and who is allowed to remain a judge only so long as he is acting in good conduct appears to be acting in very bad conduct.

A database was built by the Senate's Immigration Subcommittee. Why would they have to build this? Because President Obama made sure that his administration kept as much secret as they could about who was operating as terrorists in America.

Not only that, when some of us would try to gather such information like my repeated requests to the Obama administration and to the Justice Department, Would you let Congress have the documents that you gave to people convicted of terrorism in the Holy Land Foundation discovery phase, we repeatedly were shunned, and there was just repeated obfuscation. They did not produce what they should have, and America is more at risk now than it has been in a long time.

So what can we expect from the Ninth Circuit? Well, they have a history of not following the Constitution, not following precedent. They are rather liberal. I am hoping we can do something about that circuit. I would like to restrict their jurisdiction to controversies that arise in their building. We have total authority to eliminate them.

I see I am joined by my friend, Mr. ROHRABACHER. I didn't know if the gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I will speak after the gentleman completes, but I would also just like to note that I agree with everything that he has been talking about for the last 20 minutes. I hope the American people start paying attention.

The fact is, the two of us are in a very small cadre of patriots that have been here in Washington for the last 20 years trying to stop this massive flow of illegal immigrants into our country, realizing that this doesn't only mean that people's wages would go down because we have people bidding down the wages of our people, not only is the crime in our area worse, not only is the money being drained from our health systems and schools—money that should be going to our own citizens are going to illegals—as we have always realized, with a flood of illegals into our country, some of the people riding that wave of illegals are terrorists who mean to destroy the American way of life and would kill our people in order to terrorize our Nation into retreat from involvement in the world.

I have been very honored to stand with the gentleman from Texas in these battles over these last 20 years. I would hope that the election of President Donald Trump reflects the fact that the American people are waking up to the significance of this issue.

We see people on the Senate side shedding tears for a temporary halt in immigration from areas where terrorism is known to exist and radical Islamic terrorism exists there. But they are shedding tears that a couple of hundred people, yes, were put in a bad situation. A couple of other lives were disrupted. They were innocent people.

But in order to save American lives, we are not going to put foreigners who are trying to come here at some kind of discomfort? Well, I think Donald Trump has demonstrated his primary objective is to secure the safety of the people of the United States of America.

I have been so proud to stand with the gentleman from Texas in getting behind Mr. Trump on this very important goal.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am so grateful to my friend from California. We have traveled around the world and stood for people who weren't able to stand for themselves, and I look forward to continue doing that.

Just to continue on, Ken Klukowski has a terrific article, ''Travesty of Legal Errors in Immigration EO Lawsuit.'' It is a great article pointing out problems with Judge Robart's decision.

Then, this article from Hans von Spakovsky on February 6 from Daily Signal, he points out:

''This fact is obvious from an examination of his seven-page order, which contains absolutely no discussion whatsoever of what law or constitutional provision the president has supposedly violated. That temporary restraining order is now on an emergency appeal before a panel of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.''

It contrasts a 21-page opinion issued by Massachusetts District Court Judge Nathaniel Gorton. ''Unlike Robart, who totally ignored the federal statute, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), cited by Trump in his executive order, Gorton bases his decision denying the temporary restraining

order on an examination of the extensive power given to the president under that statute. . . . ''

The article goes on: ''That is exactly what the president has done.''

Whether you agree or disagree, he had the power to do it.

The order signed on January 27 on Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States suspends for only 90 days, unlike the 180 days President Obama did for Iran, the issuance of visas to anyone—not Muslims—just to anyone from those countries of concern as classified by the Obama administration.

And then Gorton goes on to make further notes, saying ''the decision to prevent aliens from entering the country is a 'fundamental sovereign attribute' realized through the legislative and executive branches that is 'largely immune from judicial control.' ''

And then it goes on in this article to quote the Supreme Court.

''Robart's opinion ends with a claim that seems like a joke.

''He says that 'fundamental' to his work is 'a vigilant recognition that—the court—is but one of three equal branches of our federal government. The work of the court is not to create policy or judge the wisdom of any particular policy promoted by the other two branches.

''Instead, says Robart, his job is 'limited' to 'ensuring that the actions taken by the other two branches comport with our country's law, and more importantly, our Constitution.' ''

That shows that he intentionally and knowingly abused his authority as a judge by not citing either one.

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

FEDERAL MARIJUANA POLICY

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to join me in the legislation that I have submitted today, which is the Respect State Marijuana Laws Act.

For too long, Washington's decision-makers have pursued the same policies over a whole range of issues without regard for whether those policies are actually beneficial to the American people. In fact, they continue to support policies that have utterly failed—many of these things—because the intent sounds so good.

So, over and over again, we see failed policies remain in place, wasting money. Rather than evaluating the reason for the policy failures and ultimately deciding to change course in Washington, the habit has been simply doubling down on regulations, personnel, and tax dollars spent, believing that that will have and bring a different outcome.

Last November, the American people registered their dissatisfaction with this way of thinking by electing Donald Trump to the Presidency.

President Trump's statements on the campaign trail loudly and aggressively challenged the status quo. We haven't had someone here shaking up the status quo for a long time, but he did so by promising to revisit a whole host of failed Federal policies that have been crying out for attention for years and, in some cases, decades.

Once such failed policy has been the U.S. Government spending billions of dollars and wasting the time of Federal employees—hundreds of thousands, if not maybe tens of thousands of Federal employees—in order to prevent adults from smoking a weed, marijuana.

Candidate Trump told the voters this was an issue to be left up to the States, especially when it comes to medical marijuana.

At a 2015 rally in Sparks, Nevada, then-Candidate Trump said:

''Marijuana is such a big thing. I think medical should happen—right? Don't we agree? I think so. And then I really believe we should leave it up to the states.''

It should be a State situation, I think.

''In terms of marijuana and legalization, I think that should be a state issue, state-by-state.''

I could not agree more with the President. Indeed, it is the very approach that I have advocated for several years.

In this vein, I have reintroduced today, as I said, the Respect State Marijuana Laws Act earlier today, along with Republican colleagues TOM MCCLINTOCK, TED YOHO, DON YOUNG, DUNCAN HUNTER, JUSTIN AMASH, and TOM MASSIE, as well as Democratic colleagues STEVE COHEN, MARK POCAN, EARL BLUMENAUER, DINA TITUS, JARED POLIS, and BARBARA LEE.

My bill, which has not received a designation yet but is entitled the ''Respect State Marijuana Laws Act,'' will permit residents to participate within the confines of a State's medical and recreational marijuana program without running afoul of Federal law.

Admittedly, my personal preference would be to lift the Federal Government's prohibition on marijuana entirely. However, I understand that this approach would be a nonstarter for many of my colleagues, which is why I have promoted an approach that simply gives the States and their residents the room they need to take a different approach to this issue, should they choose to take that different approach.

Under my proposal, if a resident or business acts outside the boundaries set by a particular State, or if a State has chosen not to allow medical or recreational use of marijuana by their residents, the Federal Government would still be empowered to enforce Federal law in those instances. If that is what the people of the State want—it to be legal—the Federal Government can still get involved.

Of course, the number of States that have resisted the shift in national opinion on this issue is small. To date, 44 States, including D.C., Guam, and Puerto Rico, have enacted laws that allow, to a varying degree, the cultivation, sale, and use of marijuana for medical or recreational purposes. For those States and territories that have discarded strict marijuana prohibition, my bill would align Federal policy accordingly.

□ 2000

This is to those States and the people of those States who have decided they don't want the marijuana prohibition. My bill would then make sure that Federal law is aligned with the States' and the people in those States' desires so that the residents and businesses wouldn't have to worry about Federal prosecution. For those few States that have thus far maintained a policy of strict prohibition, my bill would change nothing. I think that this is a reasonable compromise that places the primary responsibility of police powers back in the States and the local communities that are most directly affected.

Over the past few years, the disparity between State and Federal marijuana policies has confused and stifled banking, proper taxation, research, natural resources development, law enforcement, and related activities. A plethora of bills, many of which I have happily cosponsored, have been introduced in the House to tackle these problems on an issue-by-issue basis. However, my bill is the only one that would solve all these problems in one fell swoop.

My bill is short, straightforward, and easy to understand. It amends the Controlled Substances Act to add a new rule that reads as follows: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this subchapter related to marijuana shall not apply to any person acting in compliance with State laws relating to the production, possession, distribution, dispensation, or administration or delivery of marijuana.''

The major difficulties that landlords, dispensaries, banks, and others find themselves in in those States where the majority of people—maybe the vast majority of people—have voted to make marijuana legal in their borders stems from the fact that the Federal Government law considers that activity still illegal. By explicitly stating that as long as these folks are following the State law, their actions are, by definition, not illegal to the Federal Government, if we do that, many of these obstacles, many of these confusions that people have to deal with in those States, in the States where people have voted to make sure they don't want marijuana illegal, well, their problems and the complications, the banking rules and everything else would be solved immediately.