

PBS NewsHour for June 23, 2016

PBS NewsHour (formerly The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer) PBS NEWSHOUR 6:00 PM EST

June 23, 2016 Thursday

Copyright 2016 MacNeil/Lehrer Productions All Rights Reserved

Section: NEWS; International

Length: 8900 words

Byline: Duarte Geraldino, Lisa Desjardins, Malcolm Brabant, Hari Sreenivasan, Judy Woodruff

Guests: David McMillan, David Cicilline, Jon Feere, Angela Maria Kelley, Marcia Coyle

Highlight: Supreme Court justices split 4-4 four on a challenge to President Obama's immigration policy and rule a decision that colleges can take race into consideration in deciding whom to admit. With official cameras turned off, Democrats turn to social media to document their sit-in protest on the House floor. In a closely divided vote, millions of Britons decide their future with the European Union. What are the losses all Americans face when big cities don't have enough housing? Why does the O.J. Simpson trial still matter today?

Body

JUDY WOODRUFF: Good evening. I'm Judy Woodruff.

HARI SREENIVASAN: And I'm Hari Sreenivasan.

JUDY WOODRUFF: On the "NewsHour" tonight: a big day at the U.S. Supreme Court. Justices split 4-4 on a challenge to President Obama's immigration policy, plus a decision that colleges can take race into consideration in deciding whom to admit.

HARI SREENIVASAN: Also ahead this Thursday: the politics of guns. with official cameras turned off, Democrats turn to social media to document their more-than-24-hour-long sit-in protest on the House floor.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And a fateful day for the U.K. In a closely divided vote, millions of Britons decide their future with the European Union.

HARI SREENIVASAN: All that and more on tonight's "PBS NewsHour."

(BREAK)

HARI SREENIVASAN: The Supreme Court weighed in on two politically charged cases today. The justices, in a 4-4 tie, effectively killed President Obama's executive actions on immigration. His program would have deferred deportation for more than four million undocumented immigrants, and allowed them to work legally in the U.S.

President Obama reacted to the court's decision at the White House this morning.

BARACK OBAMA, President of the United States: Good morning, everybody.

For more than two decades now, our immigration system, everybody acknowledges, has been broken. And the fact that the Supreme Court wasn't able to issue a decision today doesn't just set this system back even further. It takes

us further from the country that we aspire to be. This is part of the consequence of the Republican failure so far to give a fair hearing to Mr. Merrick Garland, my nominee to the Supreme Court.

HARI SREENIVASAN: And in another major decision, the justices ruled it is constitutional for universities, in this case, the University of Texas, to consider race in admissions. We will take a closer look at today's Supreme Court rulings right after this news summary.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Another police officer in Baltimore has been found not guilty in the 2015 death of a 25-year-old black man, Freddie Gray.

Caesar Goodson was driving the police van in which Gray suffered a broken neck while in custody. Goodson faced the most serious charges of all the officers involved. He was acquitted on all counts, including second-degree murder. Dozens of protesters gathered outside the courthouse in Baltimore today to voice their frustrations.

TAWANDA JONES, Protester: We are human beings. We deserve -- we deserve to have the right to walk in our communities, and ride in our communities and be safe by people we pay and send to serve and protect us. Who the hell are they serving? And who the hell are they protecting? Because it damn sure ain't Freddie Gray.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Six police officers have been charged in the case. But only Goodson was accused of committing murder. The first trial ended in a hung jury. The second officer was acquitted of all charges.

In the presidential campaign, Republican Donald Trump was forced today to defend claims he's made that Democrat Hillary Clinton's e-mails were hacked while she was secretary of state.

Yesterday, Trump said -- quote -- "Her server was easily hacked by foreign governments, perhaps even by her financial backers in communist China, putting all of America and our citizens in danger" -- end quote.

But, today, Trump took a step back when he was pressed by Lester Holt of NBC News.

LESTER HOLT, NBC News: You also made the claim that her e-mail, personal e-mail server, had been hacked, probably by foreign governments, suggesting that...

DONALD TRUMP (R), Presidential Candidate: Well, you don't know that it hasn't been.

LESTER HOLT: Well, wait a minute, suggesting that she would be compromised as president. What evidence do you have?

DONALD TRUMP: Well first of all, she shouldn't have had a personal server, OK? She shouldn't have had it. It's illegal. What she did is illegal. Now, she might not be judged that way because, you know, because we have a rigged system. But what she did is illegal. She shouldn't have had a personal server

LESTER HOLT: But is there any evidence that it was hacked, other than routine fishing?

DONALD TRUMP: I think I read that and I heard it and somebody...

LESTER HOLT: Where?

DONALD TRUMP: ... that also gave me that information. I will report back to you. I will give it to you.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Clinton's campaign has maintained there's no evidence hackers ever penetrated her private e-mail server.

HARI SREENIVASAN: In China, a powerful tornado has killed at least 78 people, and leveled a large number of buildings. Some 500 people were injured. It hit a densely populated area near the city of Yancheng, about 500 miles south of Beijing. The twister overturned cars. Roads were blocked with trees, downed power lines and other debris. There were reports of winds up to about 80 miles per hour in some parts.

JUDY WOODRUFF: It was a historic day for Colombia, as the government signed a cease-fire with leftist FARC rebels, closing a half-century-long chapter of bloodshed. At a ceremony in Havana, Cuba, the Colombian president and the leader of the FARC formally approved the agreement to settle longstanding obstacles to peace, including the FARC's disarmament.

That now clears the way for a final peace deal, which negotiators hope to clinch by July 20.

HARI SREENIVASAN: Back in this country, the federal government now says filtered tap water is safe for everyone in Flint, Michigan. The announcement lifts a recommendation that pregnant women, nursing mothers, and children under 6 only drink bottled water to avoid lead exposure.

The city's drinking water became contaminated when lead from old pipes leached into homes and businesses, triggering a public health emergency.

Volkswagen will pay more than \$10 billion to settle claims tied to its diesel emissions cheating scandal. It was widely reported the majority of the money will compensate owners of nearly 500,000 vehicles programmed to cheat on emissions tests. The rest will penalize government agencies and fund pollution offset projects. The final terms of the settlement will be released Tuesday.

Stocks surged on Wall Street today, as traders eagerly awaited the outcome of today's British referendum on whether to remain in the European Union. The Dow Jones industrial average gained 230 points to close at 18011. The Nasdaq rose more than 76 points, and the S&P 500 added nearly 28.

New data out today from the U.S. Census Bureau shows Asians continue to be the fastest growing racial group in the U.S. The Asian population rose 3.4 percent over the past year, while the white population, including those who chose white along with another race, showed the slowest growth, up just one half of a percent. There are 21 million Asians in the U.S. Their population has steadily surged since 2000, largely due to international migration.

And after decades of debate, a Los Angeles jury has ruled Led Zeppelin didn't steal the opening riff of their classic song "Stairway to Heaven." The rock band was accused of copying the chords from a song by the American band Spirit. The two groups played together in 1970, a year before "Stairway to Heaven"'s release.

Here's Led Zeppelin's iconic guitar opening, as heard in this 1973 performance.

(MUSIC)

HARI SREENIVASAN: And here are the chords in question from the band Spirit's song "Taurus," so you can judge for yourself.

(MUSIC)

HARI SREENIVASAN: The jury ruled the chords of the two songs were not intrinsically similar.

Still to come on the "NewsHour": big Supreme Court decisions on immigration and affirmative action; what will happen if Britain leaves the European Union; House Democrats sit in for more than 24-hours to push gun control legislation; and much more.

JUDY WOODRUFF: We return to the big day at the Supreme Court. A split on immigration puts millions in limbo. And justices uphold affirmative action.

We dig into both cases now with "NewsHour" regular Marcia Coyle, chief Washington correspondent of "The National Law Journal."

Marcia.

MARCIA COYLE, "The National Law Journal": Judy.

JUDY WOODRUFF: We know we need you here on days like this, especially on days like this.

(LAUGHTER)

JUDY WOODRUFF: Let's talk about the affirmative action case first.

MARCIA COYLE: OK.

JUDY WOODRUFF: What was it that the University of Texas case was about?

MARCIA COYLE: Well, actually, this was the second time the Supreme Court had looked at how the University of Texas uses race as a factor in its admissions policy.

Back in 2013, the case came to the Supreme Court by Abigail Fisher, a student who was denied admission to the university in 2008. And she claimed that the use of race as factor was why she was denied admission and that it violated the Constitution.

The Supreme Court, in 2013, led by Justice Kennedy, a 7-1 court, sent it back to the lower federal court, saying, you gave too much deference to the university's explanation. You have to give the toughest scrutiny we have under the Constitution, and the university has shown -- has to show there are no workable race-neutral alternatives.

Well, that lower federal appellate court held hearings, briefings, upheld the plan again. It came back to the Supreme Court. Abigail Fisher brought it back with a conservative organization that had backed her from the beginning. And the Supreme Court today, in a surprising 4-3 decision, upheld the university's use of race, as Justice Kennedy said, a factor of factor of a factor.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Why do you say surprising?

MARCIA COYLE: He had never voted to uphold an affirmative action plan, although he had written and spoken about the importance of diversity in higher education. So, he did believe that it was an important, compelling interest to have a diverse student body.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Now, this was -- there were some really strong opinions voiced here. Justice Alito wrote, this is affirmative action gone wild?

MARCIA COYLE: Gone berserk, that's what he said.

(LAUGHTER)

MARCIA COYLE: He actually read a summary of his very long dissent. His dissent was 51 pages.

He read a summary from the bench for 17 minutes, almost three times longer than Justice Kennedy's summary of his opinion. And he took issue with most of the points Justice Kennedy meant -- made.

By the way, Justice Kennedy said that this plan is really sort of one of a kind for the University of Texas. Under Texas state law, the university is required to admit students in the top 10 percent of their high school classes, and that has accounted for significant diversity.

But the university felt that the 25 percent places in the school that the 10 percent didn't cover didn't really create diversity in the classroom. So that's why it used race.

Justice Kennedy said that the 10 percent plan was really a blunt tool, that it just admitted students on the basis of class rank, and the other 25 percent were admitted under a holistic view that considered many things.

But Justice Alito, in his dissent, felt that this plan discriminated against Asian Americans, and he felt that the university had not provided the kind of evidence that it was required to provide to show that it had -- it needed race to achieve the type of diversity it wanted in the classroom.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Let me quickly move you to the other big decision the court handed down on President Obama's immigration executive orders. The justices were asked to rule on the legality of that. Tell us about how they came down.

MARCIA COYLE: Well, this was a plan that was announced in 2014 by the administration. And it did two things. It would delay temporarily the deportation of parents, undocumented parents of children who were American citizens and legal permanent residents.

And, also, it expanded a 2012 program that delayed the deportation of what we have come to call the dreamers, children who came to America with undocumented parents.

Texas and 26 other Republican-led states challenged that program in the lower federal court in Texas. It claimed that the president had exceeded his authority under federal immigration laws. A federal district court temporarily entered an injunction to halt it. A federal appellate court affirmed that injunction.

So it was the United States that came to the U.S. Supreme Court to try to get that injunction lifted, also to confirm that the president had this authority. Well, the court did split 4-4 today. And what that means is basically that the injunction that is halting the program remains in effect. The case goes back to the lower federal district court for a trial on the merits.

The court's 4-4 decision here only affirms the judgment of the lower court on the preliminary injunction. It wasn't a decision on the merits of the claims that Texas and the 25 other states made.

JUDY WOODRUFF: So, can you -- so, what can be read into this very brief statement the court made?

MARCIA COYLE: Nothing.

(LAUGHTER)

MARCIA COYLE: It -- as I said, it's not a decision on the merits. It's not a precedent going forward that other courts can look to.

The case may come back to the Supreme Court at some point once it goes to trial and appeal. The United States also has the option of filing a petition for a rehearing in the U.S. Supreme Court, which the court can hold until there is a ninth justice if it so chooses.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And just quickly, the presumption is the absence of the late Justice Scalia clearly had an effect.

MARCIA COYLE: Very much so, as well as today there was another 4-4 decision in a case involving Indian tribes, important to them and American businesses.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Marcia Coyle, thanks very much.

MARCIA COYLE: My pleasure, Judy.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And now we take a deeper look at that case, the impact of today's immigration split, on life outside the court.

Angela Maria Kelley is with the Center for American Progress. For a time, she advised the Obama administration on immigration. And Jon Feere is a legal policy analyst at the Center for Immigration Studies.

Welcome to both of you.

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY, Center for American Progress: Thank you.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Angela Kelley, let me start with you.

Your reaction to this one-sentence statement they handed down on this immigration?

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: Yes. Yes, nine paltry words, but, boy, what a big blow.

Well, look, as Monica just said, this is not a...

JUDY WOODRUFF: Marcia.

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: Marcia. Sorry.

It's a disappointment, but it's not a decision. And we're not done. We have 11 million people in this country. The average number of years that they have been here is 12. So these are not folks that are just stopping by. They're not accidental tourists. They are people who are living here.

And we can't send them all home, as some presidential candidates might want have happen, because they are home. So, the question is, what are we going to do about it? I think the president's plan is legal, and ultimately we will be back in front of the court. And I think that we will prevail. We do need a ninth justice. It's been 100 days since Judge Garland was nominated, and he has not yet had his day in court. He hasn't yet had his hearing.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Right.

But Jon Feere, it's true the justices didn't elaborate, but the effect of this is to send this back to the lower court.

JON FEERE, Center for Immigration Studies: Yes, and I think a lot of people are wondering why the court even took it up to begin with, because all this has done is delay an inevitable rehearing back at the Supreme Court a year or two from now.

So, it's unclear how long this is going to take, but, in some ways, a lot of folks were arguing that perhaps the court should have waited until the lower court actually had a hearing on the merits, so we would have some idea of exactly what issues we were looking at and where perhaps the White House was going to be successful and where they were not.

JUDY WOODRUFF: But they were dealing with, what, 26 some -- a large number of states that had asked them to rule on this.

JON FEERE: Twenty-six states, yes, but, as I recall, the states themselves requested to the Supreme Court that they not take the decision and, in fact, that they wait until there was a hearing at the lower court level.

JUDY WOODRUFF: What does this mean? You started to address this, Angela, in your first comment. What does this mean for the individuals who -- President Obama talked today about people coming out of the shadows.

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: Right.

JUDY WOODRUFF: What does it mean for them?

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: That's right.

I mean, look, their lives remain in limbo. But their lives remain here. As I said, people have already been here for nearly a dozen years, on average. We're talking about people who have U.S. citizen children, so clearly they have put down roots. Most of them work, of course, and pay taxes, and never perhaps ever see that refund. So, they're folks that are contributing to the economy as well.

So, I think, unfortunately, that they're stuck in the crosshairs of paralysis in Washington, which is in Congress and which unfortunately has now spilled to the court. But I don't see that they're going to all pack up and leave.

JUDY WOODRUFF: What about that, Jon Feere? Do you -- should they pack up and leave?

JON FEERE: I don't know that there has been a paralysis necessarily.

It's just that the advocates for amnesty and more immigration haven't got what they wanted, and President Obama himself knows that this policy is unpopular. If it were popular, he wouldn't have waited until after the midterm to announce this. He didn't want to have to have Republicans or Democrats defending something while voters were heading to the ballot box.

So, we -- the people have spoken. They have denied the Marco Rubio amnesty bill. They stopped the amnesty back under President Bush. And the DREAM Act, which has been introduced multiple times, went nowhere.

So it's not so much that we're in limbo. It's just that we have an administration, not that different from the previous administration, that isn't committed to enforcing our immigration laws.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And so you're saying that -- that, what, that -- what should happen to these individuals right now?

JON FEERE: Well, under federal law, they are supposed to go home.

It was noted a moment ago that they're not tourists, but, in fact, plenty of them actually did come as tourists. They just lied to the State Department and lied to the American people and overstayed their visas.

And if we're going to have any sense of rule of law in this country, people have to abide by the terms that we set forth when they come in.

JUDY WOODRUFF: What about that, Angela Kelley?

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: Well, we do have, look, a record number of people who have been deported under this president. He has hardly been a softy on illegal immigration.

And we have a tremendous buildup at the border, so that illegal immigration in the United States is basically at zero. The question is, what are we going to do about these folks? I think the president did wait very patiently. The Senate did pass a bipartisan bill on comprehensive immigration reform, and the House failed to act.

So it's a question of -- it's not an amnesty, but I think what we need is an answer. And, interestingly enough, polls that came out yesterday show that 78 percent of independents support with the 11 million, not deporting them, but giving them a path to citizenship.

So, we're talking about just very sensible, what are we going to do? What are some commonsense solutions?

JUDY WOODRUFF: But, in the meantime, the court -- we don't have an answer.

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: Correct.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And, in the meantime, Mr. Feere's point is that they are here illegally. They are here without documents.

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: Well, Mr. Feere should feel comfortable in the fact that immigration deportations are going to continue, that we have a robust ICE presence and Border Patrol forces.

But that, to me, isn't really the answer. Look, we have an immigration system that hasn't been updated since 1990. I mean, just think about that. And so until Congress does its job and appoints a ninth -- the appoints a ninth justice on the Supreme Court, passes immigration reform, we're going to have these dysfunctions, not just in our immigration system, but across many sectors of America.

And, clearly, we deserve better.

JON FEERE: Of course, if you look at actual ICE data, deportations have fallen dramatically over the past five or six years, and not just deportations of nonviolent people, but even deportations of criminal aliens has dropped down dramatically over the past five years.

What this administration has decided, outside deferred action, is that they're going to narrow the scope of deportation. And, virtually, you are not going to be facing deportation unless you are a violent criminal. And, in fact, Obama's former ICE director said that exact thing to The L.A. Times last year.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Well, let me just quote to you part of what President Obama said.

He said: "It's heartbreaking for the millions of immigrants who have made their lives here, who have raised their families here, who hoped for the opportunity to work, to pay taxes, to serve in our military, and more fully contribute to the country."

JON FEERE: I think the American people are the most generous people on the planet when it comes to immigration. We welcome in more people for permanent residency every year than any other country on the planet by a mile.

It's just that our generosity, I think, is being taken advantage of. I think Americans are starting to sour on even the concept of immigration, because they see people who are not playing by the rules, who are breaking the laws, who are actually lying to us, cutting in front of lines of people who are playing by the rules, taking the time and the money and the effort to do it the right way.

JUDY WOODRUFF: What about that?

ANGELA MARIA KELLEY: Well, look, life is messy. And the undocumented people don't live in an apartment building all by themselves. Right?

So they marry Americans. They have citizen children. They work shoulder to shoulder with other people. They go to mosque. They go to church. They go to synagogue with other folks.

So the idea that we're going to somehow take them all out and remove them, and that that is not going to upset the balance of this country, is just -- is just foolish and scary.

Here's what we do know, is that, in 2012, when the president announced deferred action for dreamers, that, since then, we have had over 700,000 young people come forward, get work authorization, pay taxes, get better jobs.

That, to me, is a program that makes sense, not just for those families, but for the country. So, that's the direction I would suggest we go in.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Very quick final word.

JON FEERE: Until we see an end to illegal immigration and an actual commitment from our policy-makers to actually enforce our immigration laws, any type of legalization program is just going to encourage more people to come across the border, to risk their lives, and to overstay visas.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Jon Feere, Angela Maria Kelley, and, earlier, Marcia Coyle, we thank you, all three.

JON FEERE: Thank you.

HARI SREENIVASAN: Should they stay or should they go? That's the question facing British voters today as they decide their place in Europe.

Special correspondent Malcolm Brabant has the story from London.

MALCOLM BRABANT: The signs went up and doors to polling stations across Britain opened for an historic day of voting. It's been a bitter campaign to decide whether Britain remains within or exits the 28-member European Union.

Given the momentous nature of the vote, Britons were on edge.

CLAYTON THOMAS, Bar Manager: I don't really know what to expect. And I think if a result comes in kind of early in the morning, everyone might be asleep still, and might wake up to a kind of different future or might wake up to just another day.

MALCOLM BRABANT: The most recent polls show the outcome is too close to call, but bookies are putting the odds on a remain outcome.

The referendum opened a chasm across Britain, stirring nationalist sentiments along the way.

MAN: Tell them to stop intimidation.

MALCOLM BRABANT: And the murder last week of pro-Europe British lawmaker Jo Cox could also influence the outcome.

Here at a market in Ipswich, the divide is clear.

Produce vendor Ian Buxton voted to leave, in the hope of reducing immigration.

IAN BUXTON, Produce Vendor: You see all the migrants. What they say, there's thousands of people waiting to come in. I think we will be strong enough on our own.

MALCOLM BRABANT: At a nearby stall, his former schoolmate Steve Singh warned that break would the economy.

STEVE SINGH, Market Vendor: Business-wise, it's easier then to obviously interchange with free Europe and on shipping, so, you know, my vote is to stay in.

MALCOLM BRABANT: Party leaders went to the polls to cast their votes, but refrained from campaigning outright.

And another major factor that's perhaps going to play into this referendum result has been the weather. More than a month's worth of rain has been dumped on London and the Southeast over the past day causing absolute chaos.

Ben Page is the chief executive office of Ipsos MORI, a major polling firm.

BEN PAGE, Ipsos MORI: It's difficult to see a very, absolutely certain pattern, but it is true that Brexit voters are much more determined than remain voters.

MALCOLM BRABANT: The British pound surged today to its highest level this year because of market speculation that the country will ultimately vote to stay.

The polls closed just over an hour-and-a-half ago. Voting -- counting is under way. We're in for a very long night. The final results should be in around about breakfast time tomorrow -- Hari.

HARI SREENIVASAN: Malcolm, so now that the polls have closed, what are you hearing? What's the latest?

MALCOLM BRABANT: Well, normally, in these sort of events, you have exit polls, but the broadcasters this time decided that they wouldn't have one, because there was no real model for them.

But we have heard that the United Kingdom Independence Party has had its own poll of about 10,000 people. And shortly around the time the polls closed, their leader, Nigel Farage, said he thought that the remain people had edged it, which seems to be very much like a concession.

He says, though, that the U.K. was a force to be reckoned with and the this independence move wouldn't be going away. Then, to actually consolidate what seems to be this concession, there was also a poll that had been carried out during the course of the day by an Internet polling company called YouGov, and they have been looking at around about 5,000 voters, tracking them during the course of this referendum.

And according to their on-the-day polling, their outcome is that it's 52 percent for remain and 48 percent for those people who want to leave. So, the indications are pretty clear.

Of course, you know, there are maybe sort of as many as 30 million or 35 million votes to be counted during the course of the night, and that could change. But these are pretty good indications. And so, certainly, in the remain camp at the moment, people are looking pretty confident.

HARI SREENIVASAN: How -- when you talked to the people in the last couple days as you were reporting this story out, the undecided, are they aware of the consequences? They were undecided voters even up to the polls today.

MALCOLM BRABANT: Yes, I think the undecided voters really have been absolutely critical in this.

And up until today, the opinion polls, which can't necessarily be trusted, are saying that it might be -- might have been as many as about 11 percent of the electorate who were undecided.

And last night, there was a very interesting debate on one of the British TV channels which had 100 people who were undecided, and it tracked their emotions during the course of the debate as various issues came up. And at the end of that debate, what happened was that most of those people who were undecided did vote to remain.

And what probably happened is that I think there are lots of people in Britain who have just been really bewildered by the arguments. They're not able to make up their minds at all. And it's a pretty momentous decision to have to go into that voting booth and to make up your mind, because the decision that was -- is made today is completely irrevocable.

To leave the European Union, there will be no sort of coming back. And, for many people, this has been a campaign of loathing and fear, loathing on the part of many of the really vehement Brexiters, who hate many of the things that the European Union stands for, especially the unelected and unaccountable representatives, who they believe are dictating to Britain and taking away its sovereignty.

And the fear element has been amongst those people who are worried in particular about the economy. And it is perhaps the economy which has actually driven the -- those people in the remain camp perhaps, because the easiest thing to do is to vote for the status quo.

People have been very worried about losing their jobs. They have been worried by predictions by fairly major individuals in industry, people like Sir Richard Branson, who say it would be a complete mistake to come out of the European Union.

So, not knowing what's going to be on the other side of this, that's why perhaps those people who have been undecided have gone into the voting booth and they have decided to opt for the status quo.

HARI SREENIVASAN: All right, special correspondent Malcolm Brabant joining us from London, thanks so much.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Stay with us.

Coming up on the "NewsHour": the losses all Americans face when big cities don't have enough housing; and a Brief But Spectacular take on why the O.J. Simpson trial still matters today.

But, first: It was a rare night and morning in congressional history.

Democrats staged an all-night sit in, demanding a vote on plan to ban anyone on the government's terrorist no-fly list from buying a gun.

Lisa Desjardins begins our coverage.

LISA DESJARDINS: House Democrats emerged from the Capitol in the early afternoon, giving up their 26-hour sit-in. They vowed to keep fighting for gun control measures after the July 4 break.

REP. JOHN LEWIS (D), Georgia: When we come back here on July the 5th, we're going to continue to push, to pull, to stand up, and, if necessary, to sit down.

LISA DESJARDINS: The scene outside was nearly as raucous as the one that played out yesterday and overnight inside.

MAN: The chair declares the House in recess at the hour of 12:00 noon.

LISA DESJARDINS: As Republicans recessed, triggering an automatic shutdown of the official House cameras, Democrats took to social media to broadcast the back-and-forth on the floor from their cell phones.

CONGRESS: No bill!

CONGRESS: No break!

CONGRESS: No bill!

CONGRESS: No break!

LISA DESJARDINS: 10:00 p.m.: House Speaker Paul Ryan tried to regain control over Democrats' chanting.

REP. PAUL RYAN (R-WI), Speaker of the House: The House will be in order.

LISA DESJARDINS: But order wasn't coming. The House cameras again went dark.

MAN: The House stands in recess.

LISA DESJARDINS: Democrats kept sitting and standing on the floor, until Republicans returned to a formal session again at 2:30 a.m., and not just any session. GOP leaders called for a big vote on a bill that included a billion dollars to fight the Zika virus. It passed without debate.

MAN: The motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

LISA DESJARDINS: And Republicans closed out the session until after July 4.

MAN: The House stands adjourned.

Speaker Ryan, facing this new test, had biting words for Democrats today.

REP. PAUL RYAN: We are not going to allow stunts like this to stop us from carrying out the people's business. Why do I call this a stunt? Well, because it is one. Let's just be honest here.

LISA DESJARDINS: Why a stunt?

Ryan pointed out that Democrats sent multiple fund-raising e-mails and flyers about the sit-in. He said it wasn't a proud moment for democracy. But Democrats point out that, eight years ago, then-minority Republicans also held the House floor in protest. One key difference? No cell phone video streaming then.

As the House closed with no action, there was a symbolic, but important vote about the no-fly list on the Senate side. A bipartisan plan from Susan Collins of Maine would ban gun purchases from those on the terror watch list. It survived a procedural vote, getting support from 52 senators. The issue for the Collins plan? It will likely need 60 votes, which it doesn't have, to make it out of the Senate.

For the "PBS NewsHour," I'm Lisa Desjardins.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And joining me now from Capitol Hill is one of the Democrats who helped organize the sit-in in the House. He's Congressman David Cicilline of Rhode Island.

Congressman, welcome to the program.

First of all, did you get any sleep at all last night?

REP. DAVID CICILLINE (D), Rhode Island: I did not.

I actually haven't pulled an all-nighter since college, so, after this show, I'm going to go home and go to bed.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Why did Democrats make what was, if not an unprecedented move, as we just heard, close to unprecedented?

REP. DAVID CICILLINE: Well, I think it was unprecedented.

We have been incredibly frustrated at the Republican House leadership's refusal to bring to the floor two very commonsense gun safety proposals, one to keep suspected terrorists who are on the watch list, to prevent them from buying a gun, and universal background checks to make sure that everyone that purchases guns has a background check.

And these with are two commonsense proposals. The Republican leadership in the House has refused to bring these bills to the floor. And we have been incredibly frustrated. And we thought it was important to try something new to bring attention to this issue, to demand that the Republicans bring these bills to the floor for a vote, to bring the attention of our country to this issue.

We just saw an event, the worst mass shooting in the history of the United States in Orlando, Florida, 49 people slaughtered by an assault weapon, 52 people injured. And we seem to see this kind of carnage on a regular basis.

And, so far, the Republicans have been unwilling to bring a single bill to the floor that would respond to it. And we felt this was really important to try something different, to demand that they move forward on these. And this was the beginning of what will be a protracted effort to really encourage and convince and persuade and ultimately force our Republican colleagues to address this issue and make our communities safer.

JUDY WOODRUFF: But if you don't have the numbers, how do you do that? I heard Speaker Ryan say today it actually did come up for a vote in committee. It just didn't pass out of committee in order to get to the floor.

REP. DAVID CICILLINE: Well, both of the proposals, the proposal to make sure that terrorists can't buy a gun and to make sure there are universal background checks, are supported broadly by the American people, 85 percent and 90 percent. That includes Republicans and Democrats and independents. So, the American people support this.

And what was most gratifying about last night is, we had a huge crowd outside the Capitol that was growing throughout the night, ordinary Americans that had come to Washington, to the Capitol grounds to support our effort.

This is going to require the outside engagement of folks all across this country to demand that Congress do what they think needs to be done to keep them safe. This is one of the issues where the American people are with us. We have got to keep them engaged in this fight and finally convince Republicans that they have a responsibility to move forward and keep individuals who are on the terrorist watch list from buying a gun, make sure that all gun sales are subject to a background check, and really continue to engage with people all across this country to demand that leaders in the Republican Party bring these bills to the floor for a vote.

JUDY WOODRUFF: But do you really think you are going to be able to do that?

I mean, for example, are there any Republicans who have come to you or any of your Democratic colleagues and said, I'm changing my mind?

REP. DAVID CICILLINE: Well, I think there are Republicans who heard from their constituents last night, and I think, as they go home for break -- imagine, in the middle of this argument, we're asking them, let's debate these bills. Tell us why you oppose them. Tell us why you think people on the terrorist watch list should be able to buy a gun. Tell us why you don't think there should be universal background checks.

They wouldn't come to the floor and debate those. Of course, there is no good argument against either bill. But what they did was, at 2:30 in the morning, in the dark of night, while America slept, they used a procedural maneuver to adjourn.

But they're going to have to go home. And they're home now. They are going to hear from their constituents, who I expect are going to say, you need to pass some commonsense gun safety legislation, so that, when we come back on July 5 and we resume our efforts, they will have heard from their constituents.

And look, this is going to be a long struggle, but I am confident, at the end of this, we will persuade our colleagues to do what's right for the American people and prevent people on the terrorist watch list from buying a gun, make sure we have universal background checks, both things which can really make our communities safer and keep guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them.

JUDY WOODRUFF: What do you -- what's your reaction to Speaker Ryan's comment that this is just a stunt designed to get Democrats in front of the TV cameras?

REP. DAVID CICILLINE: Well, look, despite the fact that Speaker Ryan turned off the cameras, shut off our microphones, we're not going to be silenced.

We were able to use social media and Periscope to make sure that the American people could see this debate, despite the fact that the Republicans didn't want them to see it.

But, look, I think if you speak to any of the family members who lost loved ones in Orlando, any of the parents of the children slain in Sandy Hook or Umpqua Community College or San Bernardino or Aurora, there's nothing that's a stunt about this.

This is about gun violence, which is an epidemic in this country, which is ripping families apart, which is a really serious public health crisis in this country. And we have a responsibility to fight hard to enact the proposals that will reduce gun violence in this country.

And we're going to use everything at our disposal, every tool that we have to continue to press hard to force the Republicans to take up these issues. The American people are demanding it. They expect us to do something. And I can assure you, for the families and victims of gun violence in this country, they don't think this was a stunt.

They were pleased that we were in this fight trying to ensure their voices were heard in the Congress of the United States.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Do you expect there will be more sit-ins?

REP. DAVID CICILLINE: I expect we're going to do lots more to force the Republicans to finally meet their responsibility and enact responsible gun safety legislation.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Representative David Cicilline of Rhode Island, who spent much of last night literally sitting on the House floor, thank you very much.

REP. DAVID CICILLINE: Thank you.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And we do hope to hear from Republican lawmakers in the coming days.

HARI SREENIVASAN: The cost of buying or renting a home in key American cities keeps on rising. A new study out finds more than 40 million households are spending a third of their income on rent.

And the housing shortage in cities like New York, Washington and San Francisco may be costing more than 100 million American workers thousands of dollars in lost wages.

Special correspondent Duarte Geraldino explains why as part of our weekly series on Making Sense of financial news.

DUARTE GERALDINO: You can hear so much in this old building, every sort of step.

BRIAN HANLON, Renter: Yes, it's like every creak.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Brian Hanlon has multiple graduate degrees, a steady job and a middle-class income.

BRIAN HANLON: This is it right here. It probably hasn't been renovated since the Eisenhower administration.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Yet, at 34 years old, he's the subtenant of a woman lucky enough to have a rent-controlled apartment. But Hanlon's time is running out.

BRIAN HANLON: I have been in this room for about four-and-a-half years.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Four-and-a-half years?

He worries the owner of his apartment house will offer the actual leaseholder a lot of money to move, meaning Hanlon will have to pay a lot more to live in this Mission District neighborhood.

BRIAN HANLON: Well, so market rate for this place, I'm guessing, is probably -- it would probably be about \$5,000 a month.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Five thousand dollars a month?

BRIAN HANLON: A three-bedroom in the Mission? Sure.

DUARTE GERALDINO: The situation is forcing a growing number of people low-, medium- and high-income workers into ever tighter living conditions, and some, with no income, out of their homes altogether.

CLAUDIA ROCHA, Homeless: I got here because I don't have nowhere to go.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Claudia Rocha has lived on this sidewalk since losing her assembly line job last year. And it was on this rapidly gentrifying, but still gritty street that she says she almost lost her life.

How tall were the flames?

CLAUDIA ROCHA: Oh, it was big. It was like this building. It took those windows.

DUARTE GERALDINO: A huge fire started by someone throwing gasoline on her tent at 3:00 a.m., with her inside.

CLAUDIA ROCHA: I just see the fire, boom, like a devil. Can't touch me. I just -- I was panicked, and I get up and I run with no shoes, nothing. Everything inside get in fire. It's like -- it's ugly. It's really ugly.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Helping Rocha or Hanlon find a stable place to live is complicated by a long list of roadblocks faced by developers who want to construct high-density homes.

LAURA CLARK, Founder, GrowSF: I run GrowSF.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Housing activist Laura Clark founded a group called Grow San Francisco to push for fewer restrictions, which even she admits were designed with good intention.

LAURA CLARK: It comes historically from a very good place. Originally, there was a lot of really good work done to say, we shouldn't be blasting highways through our cities. We really need to take an environmentalist perspective about a lot of the urban rejuvenation we were doing. And then it kind of went to kind of a toxic place.

DUARTE GERALDINO: One example?

LAURA CLARK: Shadow studies.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Shadow studies?

LAURA CLARK: Yes, where we research where all the shadows are going to fall.

DUARTE GERALDINO: It was hard to believe shadows, and other seemingly minor factors, could actually prevent the construction of new housing in a city that, by some estimates, needs tens, if not hundreds of thousands more homes.

So we tracked down Jeff Buckley at San Francisco city hall. He's the mayor's senior housing adviser.

JEFF BUCKLEY, Senior San Francisco Mayoral Adviser: As part of a voter mandate which was established in the '80s, there are some public open spaces that cannot have shadows in them and others where they have a shadow budget.

DUARTE GERALDINO: A shadow budget?

JEFF BUCKLEY: Correct, which is a small amount of shadow that is allowed in those areas during certain times.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Shadows, noise, environmental concerns, these are issues community groups and even individuals use to block new construction, often targeting market-rate or luxury housing.

But San Francisco is trying to cut the red tape and has an ambitious goal of adding 30,000 new housing units by 2020, half of them subsidized.

There are a lot of critics who will say, you should just be focused on total supply and not necessarily affordability.

JEFF BUCKLEY: Well, I think that works well in an economist think-tank, but in the reality of politics and the policy-making in an urban environment, you need to figure out, not just a total unit amount, but how to make those units affordable for people who live here in the city.

DUARTE GERALDINO: But, as economists point out, more total housing would lower rents for everyone.

ENRICO MORETTI, U.C. Berkeley: One of the most progressive policies that this progressive city could adopt would be to build more housing.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Enrico Moretti is an economist at U.C. Berkeley, where he studies the relationship between housing and employment.

ENRICO MORETTI: I think this is a perfect example of how broken the planning process is in San Francisco. There's a developer who would like to add 345 units on the top of the Walgreens and Burger King there.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Yet protesters have blocked this Mission District project for years, in part, yes, because of the shadows it would cast. The same goes for a 250-unit project on Market Street, which would replace this low-rise building and parking lot.

ENRICO MORETTI: The net result is that very few housing units get built in San Francisco relative to the demand.

DUARTE GERALDINO: And that, says Moretti, has far-reaching effects.

He and colleagues at the University of Chicago took a mathematical model normally used to study the economic effects of immigration restrictions between countries and applied it within the United States. Crunching decades' worth of data from 220 U.S. metro areas, they found five American cities didn't contribute as much to U.S. economic growth as they would have if they'd had more housing.

According to the research, the housing crunch in the Bay Area and in New York, Boston and Washington is not just stressing local renters, but also shrinking the incomes of every American worker, some 100 million people.

ENRICO MORETTI: There's a loss for the entire nation.

DUARTE GERALDINO: We met Moretti at the San Francisco Federal Reserve, where he's a fellow. He says restrictive land use policies are keeping people out of cities like San Francisco.

How much money would the average American worker actually earn if these policies weren't in place in these five cities?

ENRICO MORETTI: We estimate about \$5,000 in additional earnings for the average worker.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Five thousand dollars in lost wages, \$500 billion in missed GDP.

ENRICO MORETTI: Yes, if these five American cities were to lower the level of land use regulation to the level of the median American city, we would see increased economic growth, increased GDP, and higher wages, and not just in those cities, but across the country.

DUARTE GERALDINO: According to Moretti, these five cities are places where specialized workers cluster, making each member more productive and therefore better paid.

If they loosened development restrictions, so more homes could be built, rents would fall, making it easier for newcomers with high earning potential to break into the club.

ENRICO MORETTI: More people would relocate from different parts of the country to take advantage of this high productivity and these high wages. This would benefit those who move, because they would have better-paying jobs.

DUARTE GERALDINO: It would also benefit those who stay behind.

ENRICO MORETTI: Because there will be more available jobs in those communities than there is now.

DUARTE GERALDINO: But, as it stands, that is not happening. And even the most highly educated workers in cities like San Francisco are concerned about the roof over their heads.

KYLE HUEY, Software Engineer: I have a one-bedroom apartment. And, you know, if you want to have a family or something, that's kind of limiting.

DUARTE GERALDINO: Kyle Huey is a highly paid software engineer who feels stuck in his small, rent-regulated apartment.

KYLE HUEY: Simply to rent my current place would cost so much more money now that trading up to a better place seems, you know, even more -- even more daunting.

LAURA CLARK: Everybody talks poorly about the techies. The techies are also living with roommates or in converted living rooms. Yes, it's kind of ridiculous. Even the people who you want to hate who are making hundreds and thousands of dollars are struggling to find housing in this city. It's a real crisis.

DUARTE GERALDINO: So Kyle Huey can't trade up. Brian Hanlon may be pushed out.

BRIAN HANLON: There's a real chance that I would just leave the Bay Area.

DUARTE GERALDINO: And millions of American workers may be taking a \$5,000 hit they are not even aware of.

In San Francisco, Duarte Geraldino for the "PBS NewsHour."

JUDY WOODRUFF: And now to another in our Brief But Spectacular series, where we ask interesting people to describe their passions.

O.J. Simpson has been the subject of several TV and theatrical programs this year, including an ESPN documentary, an FX Channel series, and a play, "Watching O.J." by writer David McMillan.

Here, he explains why the 20-year-old verdict still matters today.

And warning: It contains some explicit language.

DAVID MCMILLAN, Playwright, "Watching O.J.": I remember the O.J. Simpson trial very vividly. I

will never forget the day that the verdict was announced, because I was hanging out with my friend, a white guy, Chris Brown (ph). We saw these two black friends of ours who were celebrating. And Chris was like, how can you guys be happy that O.J. was acquitted?

And one of the black girls said, "Oh, he didn't kill that white (EXPLETIVE DELETED)."

I will never forget that. And it was a moment where he realized he didn't know the people that he went to school with.

I decided to write a play about not the trial itself, but people watching the trial and their reactions to it.

Unfortunately, the play has become even more timely in the last couple of years. It speaks to where we are in our present moment. Race is a topic that is getting a lot of attention these days, but, at the same time, people are afraid to start that conversation and how to start that conversation.

"Watching O.J." takes place on the day that the O.J. Simpson verdict was announced. When these types of moments happen, suddenly, you realize, maybe I don't know my co-worker or my friend as well as I thought I did.

I tried to capture as many different points of view as I could. In one scene, you have two characters, Jamal and Allison, one black, one white. One is from Brentwood, one from the hood. They can't possibly believe that the other person thinks what they think.

ACTRESS: Please tell me you think he's guilty.

ACTOR: Why does my opinion matter?

ACTRESS: I suppose it doesn't, not in the grand scheme, but it's a good litmus test.

ACTOR: For what?

ACTRESS: To determine whether or not you're a sane, rational human being.

DAVID MCMILLAN: Another character, Derek, who's Asian American, shares his perspective on the trial, based on his parents, who are Korean American, and how they were affected by the L.A. riots.

ACTOR: Part of me wants him to get acquitted, because I don't want to see a repeat of what happened here three years ago. And if sparing my parents the heartache of seeing their store destroyed again means letting a guilty man go free, I'm willing to live with that.

DAVID MCMILLAN: For a lot of African-Americans, they saw the trial not as an indictment of O.J. Simpson, but really as an indictment of the LAPD.

One of the other characters in the play, Kim, she has two sons, one who's in school and the other who's in prison. And she's looking at this trial not caring whether or not O.J. did it. She just wants a win.

ACTRESS: That wouldn't just be a win for him. That'd be a win for all of us, for all the black men that's been railroaded by the system, and for all their mothers who've had to stand by and watch.

For once, we will finally get a taste of what justice feels like. And for once, we could finally say, yes, God damn it, we got one, you mother (EXPLETIVE DELETED)! Yeah, we got one.

DAVID MCMILLAN: Race is something that we will always have to deal with as a country. Our country was founded on de jure segregation, and racism, and slavery.

And so those issues are part of the fabric, whether we like it or not. And I thought the verdict and what it brought out in people, not -- again, not the trial itself, but what it brought out in people, was a moment, a moment where America got to see itself reflected back to itself.

We see the country that we are, as opposed to the country that we think we are.

My name is David McMillan, and this is my Brief But Spectacular take on the O.J. Simpson verdict and why it still matters today.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And you can find more episodes of our Brief But Spectacular series at PBS.org/NewsHour/Brief.

Also on the "NewsHour" online right now: How do U.S. officials regard the U.K. Brexit vote? Margaret Warner takes a closer look.

Plus, [self-driving cars](#) could improve public safety by limiting fatalities in traffic accidents. But a new study spotlights a moral quandary in how we choose to program those cars.

All that and more is on our Web site, PBS.org/NewsHour.

HARI SREENIVASAN: Tune in later tonight on "Charlie Rose": former acting CIA Director Mike Morell and former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff James Winnefeld on the fight against ISIS and extremism.

That's the "NewsHour" for tonight. I'm Hari Sreenivasan.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And I'm Judy Woodruff.

Join us online and again right here tomorrow evening with Mark Shields and David Brooks.

For all of us at the "PBS NewsHour," thank you, and good night.

Load-Date: June 23, 2016