

We need to be able to buy insurance across State lines. We have it in property and casualty insurance. We have it in auto insurance. We ought to have it in health insurance. It ought to be portable, you take it with you. And you also have your health savings account that you can take with you and be portable.

These are some of the things that we can do, but we have to let the market work. That is my hope. And this is a tough issue. The Senate is working through it. They want to do the right thing. They want to make sure that Americans have affordable, high-quality health insurance coverage that they can buy. We need to work through that, and I think the Senate will get there. Hopefully, we will get a bill on the President's desk so my friend, whom I have known for over 30 years, can buy health insurance next year and not have to worry about the risk of what happens if she gets sick, or if she will have to go on Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, one out of four Americans today are on Medicaid. That is not really a good option. I am seeing some of our physicians are not treating Medicaid patients.

Do you know why that is?

Because they are a service business, and there are only so many hours in the day. So they have to have people with health insurance or self-payers, and they can't have too many people on their client portfolio that have Medicaid with reimbursements that are too low for the cost of service. That is what we have moved to.

PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listen to my friend from Ohio, and I am just kind of wondering how he gets to his position.

The Affordable Care Act didn't do away with health savings accounts, and that is a fact that can be easily verified. Or the notion that somehow Medicaid is a negative because it was expanded, and the gentleman's own Governor has been arguing here against the Republican plan because it would eviscerate Medicaid. Medicaid provides more healthcare than any other program in America.

Sadly, what we have seen is that the proposals that have been coming forward are way off the mark, just like my friend from Ohio a moment ago. The claims that it would not cut Medicaid, claims to make the system better, and save the Affordable Care Act from collapse are mythology.

The Congressional Budget Office report—these are the independents scorekeepers, and, in fact, the head of the Congressional Budget Office was appointed by the Republicans, their 49-page report that is available online to any Member of Congress, to the pub-

lic—pointed out that the health exchanges are not collapsing. They are actually in pretty good shape and they could be made stronger with relatively simple changes, because what we have seen for the last 7 years, the Republican plan has been to chip away at the Affordable Care Act, to make it worse, to create more uncertainty. Recently, the administration refused to advertise to help people join this year's enrollment period and eliminated enforcement of the mandate, making the market even more unstable.

How do we have such an alternative universe?

Well, I suggest that one of the problems is that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle who crafted the House bill and who are working in secret in the Senate crafting the Senate bill listen to the wrong people. They listen to a small group, some of whom benefit from the Republican approach because there are extra subsidies that go to them, or people who benefit from massive tax cuts that, frankly, they don't need. They listen to people who are all about political talking points and not about the facts of healthcare in America. Most of all, they don't talk to real people on the ground who would be affected.

In what universe is a \$773 billion cut over the next 10 years to Medicaid not a reduction?

Tell a 75-year-old widow who is looking at being in a nursing home for the rest of her life—6 percent of our Medicaid funding goes to people in nursing homes. It is almost half of the total funding. Tell them that that is not going to be a cut, that that is not going to reduce services, maybe not make it available at all. Sixty-four percent of people in nursing homes rely on Medicaid.

There are 15 million people who are not going to have healthcare if the Republican proposal goes into effect, according to the objective independent scorekeepers. But you can look at the calculations yourself as a member of the public. The Kaiser organization has a calculator where you can figure out if people are better off under the existing plan or under the Republican alternative. A person in Utah making \$15,000 would pay \$400 after tax credits, but have a \$6,000 deductible. They are not talking to real people.

A situation in Baker City, Oregon, a 40-year-old is going to face a 128 percent increase if the Republican proposal goes into effect.

A 60-year-old woman in Strong, Maine, making almost \$40,000 a year is currently eligible for a credit of about \$7,000, which means she gets a comprehensive policy in 2020 for \$4,500. But the Republican Senate plan would result in her costs in 2020 being \$15,000 a year, one-third of her income.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the public to investigate for themselves and see who the Republicans aren't listening to.

TRIO PROGRAM ESSENTIAL FOR STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about TRIO programs, which, for more than 50 years, have helped millions of low-income students attend college. Often, these students are the first in their family to earn a college degree. TRIO programs have helped low-income and disabled students who want to pursue a higher education, but thought college was unaffordable and out of reach.

Children from disadvantaged families often struggle to access important mentoring, tutoring, and other hands-on services designed to help encourage high school completion and the pursuit of postsecondary education.

Sadly, these students are often unprepared for college academics and require remedial courses that add to the challenges of completing a program. Too many disadvantaged students simply give up on even applying to college because they are confused by the application process, overwhelmed by the cost, or are unaware of the available financial aid options, despite our best efforts to ensure the information is available and understandable.

Recognizing these challenges, the Federal Government has created several programs to help disadvantaged students access the support necessary to realize the dream of a college degree. For example, college preparation and retention programs such as TRIO, Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Student Support Services provide a pipeline of support services that encourage low-income students to graduate high school and earn a postsecondary degree.

Mr. Speaker, just last week, the House unanimously approved the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Act and support skills-based career education. This bill will help close the skills gap that exists today and prepare students for in-demand jobs.

TRIO programs are just as important to help those who want to pursue a college degree have the resources necessary to do so.

As a senior member on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I am a strong supporter of TRIO. I am also a member of the House TRIO Caucus. I want all Americans to have higher education opportunities if that is the path that they choose.

The TRIO program dates back to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in response to the administration's War on Poverty. That is when Upward Bound was formed. In 1965, Talent Search, the second outreach program, was created as part of the Higher Education Act.

□ 1015

In 1968, Student Support Services, which was originally known as Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, was authorized by the Higher Education Amendments and became the third in a series of educational opportunity programs. By the late 1960s, the term TRIO was coined to describe these three Federal programs.

Over the years, the TRIO programs have been expanded and improved to provide a wider range of services and to reach more students who need assistance. In 1990, the Department created the Upward Bound Math and Science program to address the need for specific instruction in the fields of math and science.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, TRIO programs have a long history of helping low-income individuals, first-generation college students, and individuals with disabilities reach their full potential. I support these programs, and I want to see every American reach his or her educational goals.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, June is Immigrant Heritage Month in the United States, but to celebrate that, House Republicans have made this anti-immigration week in the Congress.

The advocates against legal immigration have their annual talk radio festival here in D.C. this week to extol the virtues of cutting off legal immigration.

Dozens of conservative talk radio hosts set up remote broadcasts here to talk about why criminalizing immigrants and turning misdemeanors into felonies is a good thing for America. They may trade stories, while broadcasting on the air, about immigrants doing horribly bad things to people in America, as if we were in a national crime spree of Brown people killing White people.

The goal of talk radio hosts is to reinforce the anti-immigration fever that has gripped the Republican Party and allowed a tough-sounding game show host to take over their party.

The main organization behind the gathering of talk radio hosts is FAIR, the Federation Against American Immigration Reform, which we should note is designated as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center. That is the organization in Alabama most directly responsible for suing the KKK out of the mainstream.

It is like D. W. Griffith might rise up from his grave to film “Rebirth of a Nation—the Sequel” because FAIR and its allies want to take our immigration policies back to the 1920s when the Klan marched openly in Washington and legal immigration was reduced to almost zero. They want to get rid of

anyone here who is deportable or could be deportable by passing new laws to criminalize them.

Now, to coincide with the talk radio anti-immigration week, Republicans are putting on a passion play of their own in the House of Representatives by bringing two anti-immigrant bills to the floor.

So we have a coordinated campaign from broadcasters, lawmakers, and the anti-immigration advocates to pressure Congress into passing bills to paint immigrants as a threat to our national and community safety—right out of the Trump playbook.

The question is not whether or not these bills will pass the House—they will pass—but whether Democrats will be tempted to vote for tough-sounding measures because they are afraid to be labeled by conservative talk radio hosts as weak on punishing the “murdering, rapist, drug-dealing Mexicans” they think are lurking in every alley.

Of course, that is not what these bills actually do at all. Truth and talk radio do not often go together—certainly not in the era of Trump.

Let's look at the two bills Republicans are bringing for a vote.

One bill is H.R. 3004, named for Kate Steinle, a young woman who was shot and killed by an immigrant nearly 2 years ago in San Francisco. It happened in July, and as you may remember, I was the first person to come to the floor and give a speech denouncing Kate's killer and calling for laws that keep people like him off the streets.

A week later, while talking about various immigration issues in Spanish with Telemundo, a quote was included in a story about Kate Steinle's killing. After it was aired, rightwing groups circulated it, alleging it was proof that I was insensitive to the Steinle family, when, in fact, I was not speaking about Kate Steinle at the time, and I had already spoken out specifically on Kate's death here on the floor.

But what is coming to the floor this week would not have kept Kate Steinle's killer off the streets. It would have had no impact on that case whatsoever. Instead, we are voting on a bill to put other people in different circumstances in jail for longer periods of time.

It is a bait-and-switch strategy: use a horrible tragedy to sell a policy that would not have prevented that death so that we put more immigrants in jail for longer periods of time and prevent them from ever living legally in the United States.

The other bill, H.R. 3003, is designed to take money away from America's largest cities and counties, specifically from efforts to fight crime—yes, take money away from them. Grants that would help local police fight crime would be eliminated under this bill from 600 of the country's largest jurisdictions. That doesn't sound like crime fighting, because it isn't.

So why are we doing this? Because Republicans in Washington think they

have a better idea of how to fight crime than the county executives, State legislators, mayors, and local police chiefs. “Do what we say or we will take away your money” is what the Republicans are saying to big cities and counties.

That is the approach being taken by the conservatives who always talk about how State and local people should be trusted more and protected from Federal mandates. Well, I guess, not when it comes to immigrants. This is why these types of bills are opposed by the National Fraternal Order of Police and other police organizations.

So to all the talk radio hosts and advocacy groups: Why are you on the side opposing the National Fraternal Order of Police? And why would any Democrat want to cross that blue line to stand with you?

MEGAN'S STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell Megan's story from her point of view and her beliefs.

She was smart, kind, ambitious, and funny. She loved other people.

After attending high school in Austin, Texas, she enrolled in the University of Alabama. She had a beautiful life—that is, until she was sexually assaulted in January of 2015.

After a night of drinking with her friends, Megan was ready to go home and go to bed. However, a finely dressed young businessman who referred to himself as “Sweet T” offered to give her a ride.

You see, Mr. Speaker, “Sweet T” was from the richest family in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and just so happened to be a big financial backer of that university.

Megan didn't remember climbing into his sleek Mercedes, but she woke up at his Southern mansion and knew something was wrong. Megan said she resisted his initial advances and repeatedly told him she wanted to go home. He refused to do so. Instead, he sexually assaulted her, and then he fell off to sleep.

She tried to get out of the room, but the door was locked. Desperate to escape, Megan climbed out of the mansion's second-story bedroom window and went to his car looking for her keys. It was there that she discovered a handgun Sweet T had in the car all the time but took it for her safety on her walk home.

Doing everything a rape victim should do, she immediately called the police and went to the hospital. But it is here, Mr. Speaker, that the system, she says, started to fail her.

The hospital wasn't sufficiently trained in sexual assault procedure and botched the rape kit. Megan then went to the police station to give her statement about what happened to her. But it was there she was treated with disdain and disbelief by Tuscaloosa's police department. After all, Megan was