

And each time they have instructed: Don't bring any of those documents. We don't want to see any of that. We just want to talk to you. And as I understand, even this week, they continued to report—the FBI investigating—that, yeah, we still found no evidence of anything other than this false statement on a loan. Why? Because they have instructed: We don't want to see the documents that prove those cases.

They are readily available for anybody, any Federal officer who wants to see them, but they don't want to see them. So they can keep reporting to the new U.S. attorney that there is no evidence. No, there is just nothing there. They can tell the Attorney General, yeah, we have looked into it, and there is nothing there.

And yet we hear from the reporter, he continues to talk to the witnesses—Luke Rosiak—and it was 80 percent of the witnesses that have personal information about the crimes the Awan cartel—crime family, whatever you want to call it—have committed, was 80 percent; now between 70 and 80 percent of those witnesses have never been interviewed by the FBI.

That way they can still report to the new U.S. attorney, to the Attorney General; we looked into it. There is nothing there. There is no evidence. Yeah, because you don't want to look at it. It abounds. And then when we hear that Mr. Awan is spreading the word among his friends from Pakistan that: I have just got to get this deal done and work out a plea where I don't get jail time, and I am already assured I will be able to work back on the Hill.

I was staggered to find out when we took testimony that actually about 3 to 9 months of every year for the last 13 or 14 years that Mr. Awan has been doing work as a computer technician for 40 to 50 Democrats here on the Hill, that he had never had a background check, but 3 to 9 months out of each year he was in Pakistan, and he was using the Pakistani internet to work on three or four dozen Members of Congress' computer systems.

We also learned that, at one point, they put over 40 Members of Congress' data on one server so that anybody that Awan wanted to could access the server and get information on all of these other people. And what happened? Well, that server with that serial number has disappeared, but the FBI has no interest whatsoever—at least so far—in investigating what happened to the server on which Awan put 40-plus Members of Congress' data.

One, we do know some of the files that existed. We don't know what were in the files, but Awan had actually organized files that had Members of Congress' emails in them. Well, gee, why would Awan want to take Members of Congress' emails and put them in one file? That sure would make it easy if you were going to transfer somebody's emails to somebody else. You just put them all in a file. Put them on one server that lots of people have access to.

It is phenomenal the kind of breach that has occurred on the Hill. There are two kinds of justices, and it breaks my heart. There is the Hillary Clinton kind of investigation, and there is the Donald Trump investigation.

This is really tragic. So taxpayers are paying for Imran Awan's lawyer because he says he is destitute. Yet he sent \$100,000 or more over to Pakistan in one transaction, and we know that he has property listed in his bankruptcy. We know that he was in business, took a loan from a guy from Pakistan who has known ties to Hezbollah, and they owed him money.

We can't seem to get the FBI interested in that. There are too many hold-overs, apparently, from Mueller's day, and Comey's day. We need to know what was compromised.

And I don't care who the person works for, congressional computers should not be serviced from Pakistan. From information and belief, folks that should know, they tell me Pakistan would be one of the last places you would want somebody getting into congressional computer systems.

He said: Well, what difference does it make? It is just emails and calendars. Well, there are people that would pay a lot of money to have all of the emails from a Member of Congress. We just need the FBI more interested.

Again, I understand, the last guy that started making charges talking about FBI's lack of duty, he ended up being defeated by the FBI raid on his office and his daughter's office 2 weeks before the election. I understand, but somebody has got to stand up and say: Right is right. Wrong is wrong.

There are so many FBI agents that have given their lives, day after day, not making the kind of money they could elsewhere, but enforcing the law. And to have people like Mueller and Comey come along and put a blot on the reputation they poured their honest lives into is a travesty. And the only way we remove the blots is to call out those and make them responsible for the damage that they have done. And it is not happening.

Anyway, I realize I am running out of time. Luke Rosiak has great information here. He has done so much more investigation than the FBI has. I know there are a lot of FBI agents that I know personally that could take this case.

I mean, just not listing a piece of property in your forms here that you have to file, the financial disclosure, could be a crime if you do it intentionally. Sometimes you forget, but for heaven's sake, he didn't forget when he filed bankruptcy. He has got property. He has got all kinds of things that he has never listed, and those are the kinds of things that are important when people are servicing congressional computers. People need to know.

We need people that will be honest enough not to lie to the U.S. attorney and not to lie to the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General—I don't

guess it matters to them—but for other people who are honest and trying to follow and enforce the law and the Constitution as their oath requires.

We need a second special counsel. We need to investigate Rosenstein, Mueller, Comey, and Weissmann. And we need somebody assigned to the Awan case that will protect Congress from further breaches and from the Awan crime family for the future.

Now, today, there was a continuance filed moving Awan's hearing from this Thursday to July 3. It sounds like they are trying to do just what Awan has been bragging, that he is going to get a deal. It is not going to say anything about all of the breaches of security, all of the felonies committed in the forms that he filed, none of that. And so he is telling people—at least he has assured people—he can come right back and start servicing dozens of Members' computers on the Hill again. For heaven's sake, we need somebody in the FBI to step up and do their job.

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

AFFORDABLE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government became heavily involved in the Nation's postsecondary education system when Congress passed the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Over time, well-intentioned but misdirected policies and requirements have put special interests ahead of students' interests. It is time to develop a system designed to support students in completing an affordable postsecondary education that will prepare them to enter the workforce with the skills they need for lifelong success.

The Education and the Workforce Committee is moving us in that direction, Mr. Speaker, by passing last December the PROSPER Act. The PROSPER Act, the word "PROSPER" stands for: Promoting Real Opportunity, Success, and Prosperity through Education Reform.

□ 2045

It is a really apt title for what it is that the committee is proposing. I emphasize this is a work of the Education and the Workforce Committee and the 23 Republican Members who are on that committee.

What the PROSPER Act does is it expands student access to higher education in many different ways:

It allows students to use Federal student aid, including Pell grants, for shorter term programs that will help students get into the workforce more quickly.

It expands the availability of industry-led earn-and-learn programs that lead to high-wage, high-skill, and high-demand careers.

It improves early awareness of post-secondary Federal financial aid options for students in high school.

It makes the application for Federal student aid easier for middle class families by streamlining the Free Application for Federal Student Aid, or FAFSA, making the FAFSA available on a mobile application and ensuring both the app and the online form are consumer tested, clear, and easy to use. We hear from parents all the time about how difficult the FAFSA is to complete.

It repeals unfair requirements that limit low-income students' access to career-focused institutions.

It supports at-risk and minority students by reforming the TRIO programs to better evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, expand access to these programs for students, and encourage institutions to create programs using evidence-based innovations like P4Success.

The PROSPER Act improves student aid in the following ways: simplifying student aid into one grant program, one loan program, and one workstudy program to ease confusion for students who are deciding the best options available to pay for their college educations.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of the complications of the loan programs as they currently exist. There are six different loan programs, nine repayment options, and 32 deferment and forbearance options. What has that gotten us? It has gotten students \$1.4 trillion into debt. We find that unacceptable, and PROSPER will help change that.

We give a Pell grant bonus to recipients who enroll in the number of credits necessary to complete their education in what is considered on time. That will vary: for students in community colleges, 2 years; and for students in a baccalaureate program, 4 years.

We add \$14.5 billion back into students' pockets by eliminating hidden origination fees on Federal student loans that add unnecessary costs to college.

Mr. Speaker, I talk every day to Members who have been misled by colleges and universities in their districts about what PROSPER does. Many well-meaning, I am sure, administrators and college presidents are calling Members and saying: The PROSPER Act cuts financial aid for students.

Mr. Speaker, it does nothing of the sort. Because of the way we restructure the loan programs, however, it does

save the taxpayers, right now, based on CBO's score, \$15 billion. However, it makes available to students 12 million more dollars just in financial aid, not to count what we are talking about in the \$14.5 billion in origination fees.

By providing access to a new ONE Loan with reasonable loan limits and creating an easily accessible income-based repayment option, it offers an affordable monthly payment option to all borrowers, and it caps interest accrual. This is something else that the schools misunderstand. We do help the students with their loan programs not while they are in school, but when they are out of school.

Many people have misunderstood the legislation and the wording in the PROSPER Act, so I have encouraged my colleagues to share with me the concerns they hear from colleges and universities so we can make sure that what they are being told are the facts and not either a misunderstanding of the legislation, because people aren't used to reading the legislation, or an out-and-out fabrication of what is in the bill.

We reward the institutions in the workstudy program by helping the most vulnerable students complete their education and expand the ability of students to receive Federal workstudy dollars while gaining valuable work experience in a field of their choice.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in education for a long, long time. I know 40-some years ago we had studies that showed that students who participated in the workstudy program made better grades, made better use of their time, graduated at a higher rate, and were much more likely to get a job after graduation. What we do is we actually double the amount of money in the workstudy program and allow a portion of that money to be used by students in an industry- and institution-approved program in the private sector.

We all know that internships often turn into jobs, and we know it is much more likely that a student would get a job in the private sector if he or she is able to do an internship and workstudy funds can be used to cover those internships.

Another thing that the PROSPER Act does is it reimagines how institutions best serve students in these ways, providing students access to new providers of postsecondary education by allowing those providers to partner with traditional colleges and universities for up to 100 percent of a student's educational program.

We are living in a vastly changing world with all types of opportunities available now to students to gain an education and to gain the skills they need. We need to stop living in the 16th century, as much of education is doing in this country, and come up to speed with what is available to us through technology.

We, in the PROSPER Act, encourage competency-based education by cre-

ating a clear pathway for competency-based education programs to be eligible for Federal student aid to help students attain a less costly degree based on their own learning rather than time spent in a seat.

Mr. Speaker, when I taught many years ago at Appalachian State University, at Mayland Community College, and at Caldwell Community College, I often encouraged students to participate in activities outside the classroom because so much impressive learning can go on outside of sitting in a seat listening to a teacher lecturing. We need to do more of that.

Students, again, have access to so many opportunities where they could be deemed proficient in an area and be able to get credit for that which would speed up their earning a degree.

We repeal the antiquated and rigid definition of distance education making it possible for institutions to develop more creative methods of delivering postsecondary education.

We allow, through the PROSPER Act, minority-serving institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities to use grant funds for certain initiatives such as pay for success, dual enrollment, and the development of career-centered programs.

It is time, again, Mr. Speaker, for us to acknowledge that there are many, many opportunities out there for students to gain the skills that they need to be able to be certified and be able to get the credentials that they need to lead a successful life in our country, and what we are doing with the PROSPER Act is advancing those opportunities.

I want to quote from an article that was recently published that encourages the passage of the PROSPER Act. The article was written by Rachele Peterson, who is the policy director at the National Association of Scholars, and I am going to give a few quotes from that article.

She says: "It has been 53 years since President Lyndon Johnson signed the Higher Education Act into law, and 10 years since it was reauthorized, under President Obama. Over the years, the law—which touches nearly every aspect of higher education—has turned into a special interest bonanza. It shields traditional colleges from marketplace competition, weaves a labyrinthine web of student aid options, packs on the pork, and in the last administration served as a pretext for the Department of Education to invent politically charged regulations."

I couldn't have said it better myself, Mr. Speaker.

She goes on to say: "The PROSPER Act . . . would streamline Federal programs, relax burdensome regulations, forbid the Secretary of Education from acting outside the scope of the law, and protect the key principles of free speech and religious freedom."

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to get a package of legislation that would do all of those things, but she goes on: "Today,

my organization, the National Association of Scholars, released a top-to-bottom review of the PROSPER Act, concluding that it represents the best opportunity to reform higher education in decades. With a few tweaks, the PROSPER Act should be passed at once. Two especially important areas—Federal student aid reform and protections for freedom of speech and association—show why.”

I am very, very grateful to the National Association of Scholars and Rachelle Peterson for her kind words about the PROSPER Act.

She goes on to say: “Currently, Federal student aid is a complicated system that encourages students to take on unmanageable debt and incentivizes colleges to raise tuition.”

She mentions the different loan programs, grants, and ways to get loans forgiven. She talks about the PROSPER Act simplifying Federal student aid, reining in costs, and making it easier for students to see their options.

She goes on to say: “PROSPER also gives colleges ‘skin in the game’ by making them financial stakeholders in students’ success. Individual programs whose students have low loan repayment rates would become ineligible for accepting Federal student loans, forcing these low-performing programs either to improve their quality or to lower their costs. When students drop out, colleges would become liable to repay a portion of the students’ Federal aid, creating an incentive to adopt high admissions standards.”

She goes on to say: “. . . the PROSPER Act does a remarkable job of cutting bureaucratic overgrowth to return Federal student aid to its core purpose: helping students who are prepared for college find ways to afford it. . . .”

□ 2100

She goes on and on. I am not going to continue to quote from her, but I include in the RECORD this material so that every person reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has an opportunity to read her excellent article.

[From The Hill, May 23, 2018]

CONGRESS, PASS THE PROSPER ACT FOR
FEDERAL STUDENT AID REFORM

(By Rochelle Peterson)

It has been 53 years since President Lyndon Johnson signed the Higher Education Act into law, and 10 years since it was reauthorized, under President Obama. Over the years, the law—which touches nearly every aspect of higher education—has turned into a special interest bonanza. It shields traditional colleges from marketplace competition, weaves a labyrinthine web of student aid options, packs on the pork, and in the last administration served as a pretext for the Department of Education to invent politically charged regulations.

The PROSPER Act, introduced in December by Rep. Virginia Foxx (R-N.C.), would reauthorize the Higher Education Act and clean up the mess it has become. The bill would streamline federal programs, relax burdensome regulations, forbid the Secretary of Education from acting outside the scope of the law, and protect the key principles of free speech and religious freedom.

Today, my organization, the National Association of Scholars released a top-to-bottom review of the PROSPER Act, concluding that it represents the best opportunity to reform higher education in decades. With a few tweaks, the PROSPER Act should be passed at once. Two especially important areas—federal student aid reform and protections for freedom of speech and association—show why.

Currently, federal student aid is a complicated system that encourages students to take on unmanageable debt and incentivizes colleges to raise tuition. The system has six loan programs, numerous grants, and some four dozen options for paying off or getting loans forgiven.

The PROSPER Act simplifies federal student aid, reining in costs and making it easier for students to see their options. It caps the amount of money parents and students can borrow from the federal government. It streamlines federal student aid into a single loan program, a single grant program, and a single repayment program. It eliminates special interest projects, such as public service loan forgiveness, which privileged government employees by forgiving their loans after 10 years of payments.

PROSPER also gives colleges “skin in the game” by making them financial stakeholders in students’ success. Individual programs whose students have low loan repayment rates would become ineligible for accepting federal student loans, forcing these low-performing programs either to improve their quality or to lower their costs. When students drop out, colleges would become liable to repay a portion of the students’ federal aid, creating an incentive to adopt high admissions standards.

The bill misses some important elements of student aid reform, such as making income-share agreements enforceable and requiring colleges to spend a minimum percentage of endowment income. It also maintains the Department of Education’s monopoly on government student aid, rather than transferring financial authority to the states.

But overall, the PROSPER Act does a remarkable job of cutting bureaucratic overgrowth to return federal student aid to its core purpose: helping students who are prepared for college find ways to afford it, without driving up costs.

The PROSPER Act also takes an important stand for freedom of speech and association, principles that colleges have recently given scant attention. The Act prevents colleges from discriminating against religious student groups by denying them official recognition and other standard benefits, such as access to campus facilities. And it protects the rights of religious institutions to govern themselves in a manner consistent with their religious missions.

The PROSPER Act also addresses the need for free speech on campus, although its policy changes, while laudable, need to be shored up. Currently, many colleges designate “free speech zones” as the only places students and faculty can engage in public speech. In response, the PROSPER Act offers the “sense of Congress” that free speech zones are “inherently at odds” with the First Amendment—a principled though legally unenforceable statement.

A key amendment by Rep. Tom Garrett (R-Va.) requires colleges and universities to disclose any speech codes, providing sunlight that will help watchdog organizations and free speech litigators target bad campus policies. The amendment also authorizes the secretary of Education to investigate colleges that are accused of using unpublished rules or selective enforcement to target certain types of speech. This is important for

students whose free speech has been abridged, because they currently have little recourse but to file a lawsuit, an expensive and time-consuming endeavor.

These are key changes that go a long way toward restoring freedom of speech on campus. But no bill is perfect, and the PROSPER Act misses some opportunities. It should also authorize the secretary of Education to investigate whether colleges’ policies are actually conducive to free speech in the first place. Colleges should be required to report to Congress annually on the state of free speech on their campuses, including details on any violations of free speech, punishment for offenders, and steps taken to protect free speech going forward. Colleges repeatedly found to be malevolent at protecting free speech should lose eligibility for Title IV federal student aid.

Students deserve a college education that is rigorous, affordable, dedicated to intellectual freedom, and focused on scholarship, not politicization. The PROSPER Act is a step in the right direction.

Ms. FOXX. My reason for doing this is to say that it is not just members of the committee, it is not just Members of Congress who support the PROSPER Act. It is people who understand the situation that exists in our country and want to see us make things better for students.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up extraordinarily poor, but I knew that education was my key to getting out of poverty. I had to work hard, but I also had to get credentials. In this day and time, we know that having credentials is more important than ever.

So I want to say again, the PROSPER Act, which stands for Promoting Real Opportunities, Success, and Prosperity through Education Reform, is a key to doing that. This will do more to help poor students get out of poverty than almost anything that I have seen in a long, long time.

Every Member of Congress hears every day that employers do not have people to fill the 6 million jobs that are out there that are vacant right now. What we do with PROSPER is make it possible for 7 million more students to get Pell Grants. And part of our reason for doing that is to help students get into short-term programs that will give them skills, give them credentials, and allow them to build on those skills over time, hopefully, to create a degree.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, what we are doing with PROSPER is allowing people to be able to get to participate in short-term programs where they will gain skills that will make them employable. They will be able to build on their credentials over time and, we hope, become life-long learners and ultimately earn degrees.

But the main thing is, we have right now 6.6 million jobs vacant in this country. We have employers crying for people to fill those jobs. They cannot find those people now in this country. We have many people who could fill the jobs if they were able to gain the skills for them. By opening up Pell Grants to 7 million more students, we think we will get a match.

It is clear right now, Mr. Speaker, that post-secondary education is unworkable for far too many individuals trying to enter the workforce. Americans deserve a better system that works for them.

The PROSPER Act advances bold, commonsense solutions that will transform post-secondary education, better serve students, protect taxpayers, and set America up for long-term economic success.

We are doing things in the bill that colleges and universities asked us to do. We are getting the Federal Government out of the way by repealing outdated Federal regulations and prohibiting the Secretary from exceeding her authority under the law.

Again, the institutions have asked us for this. By doing this, everybody wins, Mr. Speaker. The PROSPER Act simplifies and improves Federal student aid by moving to one grant, one loan, one workstudy system, making it easier for students to understand their options. The bill encourages institutions to evolve, but holds them responsible by rethinking the post-secondary education accountability system.

The bottom line is this bill is about getting people into jobs with the skills they need to succeed. To do that, it cuts through the morass of Federal red tape, eliminates the maze of Federal aid programs, and unleashes innovation to a sector stuck in the 20th century—I would argue maybe even the 19th century.

I am going to make one or two more general comments about what PROSPER does, because I think it is so important that the American people understand what it is we are attempting to do here.

Since 2007, Mr. Speaker, the published in-state tuition and fees at institutions increased at an average rate of 3.2 percent beyond inflation. If that had happened with the average automobile in this country, the average car today would be costing \$80,000, instead of probably about \$27,000. That is the

inflation that has occurred in post-secondary education.

We have a 6-year completion rate of only 54.8 percent. That is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. Every year that a student is forced to stay in a college or university is costing that student \$68,000 in lost wages and tuition and fees.

The numbers go on and on. Eighty-one percent of parents say 4-year schools charge too much. Fifty-four percent of parents think 4-year schools are accessible to middle class Americans. In other words, many middle class Americans have given up on the hope of their child going on to school.

Only 13 percent of people in this country believe college graduates are well prepared for success in the workforce. Fewer than two in five managers believe college graduates are well-equipped for a job in their field.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I made my living for a long time in education. I love education. I want everybody to get a great education. I know that it is the ticket to success in this country. But our current system is not working. What we do with the PROSPER Act, Promoting Real Opportunity, Success, and Prosperity through Education Reform will give Americans a much better chance to gain the skills they need and be successful.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3249, PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2018; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5895, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. WOODALL (during the Special Order of Ms. FOXX), from the Com-

mittee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-711) on the resolution (H. Res. 918) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3249) to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 5, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 3663. To designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Huntington, West Virginia, as the Hershel “Woody” Williams VA Medical Center.

H.R. 4910. To amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 6, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SILVERBERG, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 28 AND MAY 3, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Silverberg	4/29	5/03	Saudi Arabia		1,450.00		11,983.00				13,433.00
	5/03	5/03	Somalia								
Committee total					1,450.00		11,983.00				13,433.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.