

government. It intermittently had some self-government in the 19th century—and may I add, that the height of that self-government was about the same as the District has now: a Delegate Member of the House and the right to local government.

And who gave them that? It was the post-Civil War Congress, which was a Republican Congress.

The Republicans lost their way, and they are chiefly responsible now for the District's not having what their own party understood should happen after the Civil War. They had fought a Civil War for democracy for everyone, and they, indeed, began the home rule process that was lost after Reconstruction and renewed again almost 45 years ago with the 1974 Home Rule Act.

Here again in the 20th it wasn't the Democrats who were solely responsible. Yes, it was a Democratic Congress, but it was a Republican President, President Richard Nixon. He said, in signing the Home Rule Act: "As a longtime supporter of self-government for the District of Columbia, I am pleased to sign into law a measure which is of historic significance for the citizens of our Nation's Capital."

Remember, this is President Nixon talking, saying: "I first voted for home rule as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1948, and I have endorsed the enactment of home rule legislation during both my terms as President."

Then he went on to say: "... it is particularly appropriate to assure those persons who live in our Capital City rights and privileges which have long been enjoyed by most of their countrymen."

That was a Republican President and a Democratic House acting in a bipartisan way to give the District self-government, a self-government which it has handled better than most of the State and city governments since.

And that is not the only example of Republicans working with us to do what almost surely will take some bipartisanism. Representative Tom Davis of Virginia worked with me on a bill that, in fact, got a vote in both houses and, indeed, we would now have in the District, a House vote if that bill had passed.

I was in the minority. Representative Tom Davis was in the majority as a Republican. I regret that he has resigned from Congress to go on to higher and better things, as he saw it. He worked with me and had hearings. What he discovered was that the State of Utah, a very Republican State, had missed getting a vote it thought due that State, and Representative Davis discussed with me the possibility of pairing the District of Columbia with Utah—one Democratic vote and one Republican vote—and nobody would gain if the District got a House vote.

Now, Representative Tom Davis was not for statehood, but he did not believe that we would call it the people's House without giving the residents of

the District of Columbia a vote in that House.

The Governor of Utah came to testify for it. The Republican Members from the House and the Senate voted for it. It was a one-to-one, and it was perhaps the best chance for voting rights, certainly, that we have had since the creation of the Republic.

Well, if we got that kind of bipartisan support for at least the House vote, why doesn't the District of Columbia have a vote on the House floor as I speak? The answer is that the National Rifle Association succeeded in getting a Member to attach to the bill, in the House, an amendment that, in exchange for the House vote, the District would have had to give up all of its gun safety laws.

I have just indicated to you the kinds of sacrifice that would have meant. The assault weapons ban would be gone, just to name, perhaps, the worst of them. That is an offer we had to refuse, and it is the closest we have come to equal rights as a Federal district.

But it is not the closest we will ever come. We will give priority during the next Congress to budget autonomy, autonomy over our own budget; legislative autonomy, to keep our legislation from having to come to this floor.

A local prosecutor—the DA who everyone associates with your local jurisdiction is not who enforces criminal law in the District of Columbia. It is the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia who does both local law, local criminal law, and, of course, Federal law.

Mayoral control over the National Guard; your Governor can call out your National Guard because only he knows the ins and outs of safety when there are issues affecting the National Guard. The National Guard is usually used for things that are local in nature, such as hurricanes and flooding.

□ 1345

The President knows almost nothing about that or about the authority to grant clemency, as I mentioned earlier in these remarks. Also, of course, control over the appointment of local judges and the operations of the local courts. Yes, D.C. courts are title I courts. What that means is that these judges who handle only local matters—local criminal and civil matters—are appointed by the President of the United States and have to stand in line to get approved by the Senate of the United States.

I have simply summarized some of the hardships of not being treated as an equal jurisdiction under the Constitution of the United States and some of the benefits of citizenship that the District would obtain if such equality were indeed granted.

It is true that the District has never achieved this equality, but I do not fret that it is out of hand. When the next Congress resumes, I have indicated any number of things I will pursue. In addition,

if my party controls this Chamber, I will ask for a vote on the House floor. I will ask for that vote, even though I am not certain by any means that that vote would result in statehood. I will ask for that vote, because I want to put it to this body exactly what it means not to have the same rights they have.

When my party controlled this House, I did not get statehood, but I was able to get what is called the vote in the Committee of the Whole. That is a vote on some business on the House floor.

My Republican friends actually sued the House for allowing the District of Columbia, whose residents are number one per capita in Federal taxes, this vote on the House floor. They went to the Federal District Court, then to the Court of Appeals, but they did not have the gumption to go to the Supreme Court.

So I voted for my District at least on some matters in the Committee of the Whole. And I will seek that vote, even short of statehood.

I represent one of the Nation's oldest cities. I represent 700,000 residents who have overpaid their dues—have overpaid them in war, have overpaid them in taxes. We are overdue as we pursue democracy for other people around the world in assuring that there is democracy for everyone in our own country. We should begin with the residents of our own proud Nation's capital.

I ask the House to think deeply about what lies in your hands, and that is not only the ability, but the obligation to make the 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia whole by making the District of Columbia the 51st State of the United States of America.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS OF BELARUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-131)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the

emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine democratic processes or institutions of Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2018.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 2018.

#### IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I would say, first of all, I want to compliment the gentleman on the selection of his tie—the nice Washington Capitals red tie that he has on. Everybody behind me who is dressed in red and up there dressed in red, Mr. Speaker, has to be celebrating the jinx being broken and the Washington Capitals winning the Stanley Cup last night. The streets were full of people celebrating.

By the way, it was fairly calm, considering the exhilaration that drove all of that. A few people came here a little tired today, but with a big smile on their face. So a lot of happy, tired people in Washington, D.C. My congratulations goes out to them.

I came here today speak about a topic that has been essentially consuming a lot of our time here in these debates, Mr. Speaker, and that is this topic of immigration.

We had a 2-hour conference on Thursday morning from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.—it may have gone after that a little ways—to try to reach a resolution. It seems as though we got about the same kind of conclusion with our effort to reach a resolution as they did in the United States Senate when they debated on the floor of the Senate for 4 days on immigration issues, trying to get a consensus to bring any single bill out of the Senate that could get enough votes to pass. They fell short and nothing passed. That was Feb-

ruary. I think some people have a sense of a consensus from the meeting yesterday, but I do not believe that we have anything that gets to 218 votes.

So, generally, Mr. Speaker, the conservatives and Republicans would agree with four of the five pillars that President Trump has laid out. I don't know if I will get them exactly right, but one is to build the wall. Another one is to secure the border. Another one is to end chain migration. Another one is to establish merit-based immigration, instead of having it be the chain migration that we have experienced.

I recall witnesses before the Immigration Committee years ago who testified that between 7 and 11 percent of our legal immigration in America—the legal immigration in America—only between 7 and 11 percent is based upon anything that we have control over, which presumably would be merit.

The balance of the legal immigration, then, is really not in the control of the American people or in the control of the United States Congress. It is in the control of the people who are, I will say, utilizing the current policy that we have, that we can't find the consensus to reverse. And those who are coming in the country sometimes by hook, by crook, and shenanigan, and sometimes just simply exploiting the laws that we have.

So it has always been very simple for me, Mr. Speaker; that is, we need to secure the border. Without a border you don't have a nation. Any sovereign nation has to secure its borders and has to control those borders. That goes for any sovereign nation all over the world, including the Vatican.

I look at that big, 30-foot-tall wall around the Vatican and understand that they don't have an open borders policy there. Neither do other countries around the world, except for the United States of America, who, under the 8 of years of Barack Obama, watched the rule of law be so eroded that it has clouded the minds of a lot of Republicans here in the House of Representatives.

There was a question asked yesterday that I wrote down here that I think is really important to contemplate. I hadn't put it in those kind of words before, although I had thought about it and I actually did research on it. And the question is this: I'll put it this way—this discussion, by the way, on immigration, the sticking point is about DACA, Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals.

So the question that was posed was this: We stopped the entire political world for these people, DACA recipients. So the question was posed: Who are they? Who are they?

We hear continually they are valedictorians or they came across the border on their mother's arm when they were 3 years old. They know no country but this one. They only speak one language: English. They don't have a memory of any other country. They study hard and work hard and get good

grades. Some of them even say that they are as fine a group of people as we can select out of American citizens.

So I began asking some of those questions of our bureaucracy. I had actually begun asking those questions as far back as last September and intensified the request in January and focused on it very hard.

With a lot of work to try to get to the bottom of it, I found out a number of things about who are the DACA recipients. First, I want to characterize, just a little bit, about how we got here.

Barack Obama made DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, made it his tool for an unconstitutional amnesty. We should not forget, Barack Obama, on at least 22 different locations and times, said on videotape that he didn't have the constitutional authority to create this DACA policy.

He said at a school here in Washington, D.C., not that long ago, before he left office, before he implemented the DACA policy, he said: You are smart students here; you understand this. He said: I can't write the laws. Congress writes laws. The President and the executive branch carry out those laws, execute those laws, and the court interprets the laws. So it is up to Congress to change the policy.

But just a couple of months after that statement, President Obama implemented by executive edict a DACA policy that no thinking constitutionalist can really take the position that it is anything other than utterly, blatantly, and self-confessed by Barack Obama unconstitutional.

Yet, we have had a couple of Federal Judges who say that President Trump, who was elected to end the DACA policy—and we all expected that January 20, 2017, at noon, when President Trump took his oath of office, he would have already had the order ready to go that would have ended the DACA policy and stopped any new permits from being issued and stopped any renewals of existing permits, and perhaps even cancel the existing ones that were there, but that didn't happen.

Five to six weeks later, Mr. Speaker, we learned that the Trump administration was still issuing new DACA permits in just as unconstitutional a fashion as Barack Obama was. He just wasn't the author of it. He wasn't the creator of it. President Trump wasn't the creator of it. He was the continuer of the unconstitutional DACA policy created and established by Barack Obama.

So there were extensions, renewals of existing, and there were creations and new permits handed out for DACA. We all knew it was unconstitutional.

Then, as we went along, I want to really thank a number of States, but in particular, Texas, who put together a lawsuit, to file a lawsuit, on the unconstitutional policy of DACA, which is costing Texas taxpayers money and opportunity and every other State in the Union, as far as I know, money and opportunity.