

Whether, in violation of the False Statements Act (18 U.S. Code 1001) and the Federal Perjury Statute (18 U.S. Code 1621) Mr. Franklin Haney, Mr. Peter Knight or Mr. James Sasser may have made false or deceptive statements or lied under oath before the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Commerce with respect to the nature of their fee arrangements on the Portals or and/or TVA leases; and

Whether Mr. Sasser may have violated 18 U.S. Code 203(a) by agreeing to and receiving compensation while a U.S. official for the representational services of another before a government agency with respect to a matter directly involving the Federal Government.

I also believe that the Department of Justice and the General Services Administration should take immediate steps to recover the \$2.5 million in fees paid by Mr. Franklin Haney to Mr. Peter Knight, Mr. James Sasser and Mr. John Wagster on the Portals as authorized by statute, and the more than \$17 million paid out to the Portals partnership for rent on a vacant building due to the fixed rent start date that Mr. Frank L. Haney and his representatives secured to facilitate his financing of the Portals.

The subcommittee's investigation into the Portals has been a difficult one, mainly due to the unprecedented lack of voluntary cooperation and the deliberate efforts at obstruction by Mr. Franklin L. Haney and his associates, virtually all of whom refused to be interviewed by committee staff or provide documents voluntarily. Mr. Franklin L. Haney's refusal to produce subpoenaed materials ultimately led to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Committee on Commerce and the full Committee on Commerce to hold him in contempt of Congress. A report detailing those proceedings against Mr. Franklin L. Haney recently was filed by the House by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. THOMAS BLILEY).

It is also my hope that the House will use this case to make much-needed changes to its rules governing investigations, including expediting enforcement of subpoenas and permitting subpoenas to be issued for staff depositions of witnesses who refuse to be interviewed voluntarily. These steps, among others, will permit the investigative subcommittees to do their important job in a more efficient, timely fashion in the future.

#### CHANGE IN ORDER OF TAKING SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD ALLOW EDUCATORS TO DEAL WITH PREJUDICE AND BROADEN DEFINITION OF HATE CRIMES TO INCLUDE SEXUAL ORIENTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, a very decent young man was brutally murdered by two savages. And I am particularly struck, Mr. Speaker, because given the reasons that those two deformed individuals, mentally and morally deformed, murdered that individual, it could have been me. Had I, alone and unarmed, confronted these two thugs, I could have been subjected to the same brutalization that Mr. Shepard was in Wyoming, because his crime was to be a gay man.

Something in the culture in which these two young men who murdered him grew up led them, without an ounce of humanity, without a scrap of decency, to set upon this young man with a weapon, beat him to death, and leave him not quite dead, but at the point of death, alone, and in a way, that added further to his torment.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the number of people who have spoken out against this savagery. I am optimistic, having spoken with leaders here on both sides in the House, that we will take an important step and add to the Federal hate crimes legislation a provision that would say that if a young man who happens to be gay, as I happen to be gay, were to be set upon by thugs in the future who are so consumed with prejudice as to lose any shred of their humanity and kill him, that in appropriate circumstances, if the Attorney General found that certain very stringent requirements were met, and if a Federal presence was necessary, the Federal presence could be there. So, I hope we will add this to the legislation.

But we need to go beyond that. I do not argue, Mr. Speaker, that those who have been critical of various proposals that gay and lesbian people have put forward are guilty of murder or even of creating the climate. But this savage murder does call us to the need to improve what we as a society do to protect other young Mr. Shepherds from this kind of brutality in the future.

In particular, we have debated on the floor of this House measures whereby Members of this House have sought to penalize schools, secondary schools, because they would set up programs to do two things. First of all, to offer protection to the 15- and 16-year-old Shepherds, to the young gay men and young lesbians who find themselves tormented and abused and sometimes physically assaulted in school.

Some of these schools would also try to teach young people in their teens that brutalizing people because they do not like their sexual orientation is not acceptable human behavior. And we have had people in this House try to stop that, try to penalize it.

I hope that one of the things that will come out of this terrible, terrible murder will be a cessation of those trying to prevent schools from trying in turn to prevent this. It is not random that the terrible murder was committed and it is shocking that a 21-year-old and a 22-year-old, that they could be so bestial in their attitude towards a fellow human being. These are people not long out of high school themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this underlies the importance of allowing educators to deal with prejudice. We talk about teaching values. But when some talk about teaching the value of tolerance, when some talk about condemning violence based on someone's basic characteristics, we are told we cannot do that. We have been told that we cannot let a school teach acceptance of the gay lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, think about that. What does nonacceptance mean? If acceptance is interpreted to mean approval, I and others do not care. There are bigots in this world whose approval holds no charms for me. But when nonacceptance means not accepting someone's right to live, we have a serious problem.

If the two murderers who so brutally beat Mr. Shepard to death and left him in this situation to ultimately to die, if they had been in a school system where people had taught that gay men and lesbians were human beings with a right to live, maybe this would not have happened. Maybe teaching people to accept differences, not in the sense of becoming their advocates or becoming their supporters, but in refraining from this sort of assault would be a good thing.

And so we will return to this. I hope we will, in the piece of legislation that is about to wrap up, adopt the hate crimes statute. But I hope also, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the Chair's indulgence for 10 seconds, I hope we will no longer see in this House efforts to harass educators and penalize educators who understand the importance of trying to remove from young people's attitudes the kind of hatefulness that led to this murder.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOSSELLA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

to claim the time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### AMERICAN AGRICULTURE NEEDS SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate my remarks with the comments of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE). Both of those gentleman represents States very similar to mine when it comes to agriculture and the prominence of agriculture in our economy in our home States.

Mr. Speaker, every day I receive calls from the people who sent me here to represent them, and every day I get letters and messages describing the need for relief from excessive regulation.

I am proud to represent the people of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, and I have done my very best to represent them well. The people of the High Plains are good, hard-working people who love their families and whose values I am proud to say coincide with my own.

So today, I want to say a few words in particular about the farmers and ranchers who live and work on the Eastern Plains of Colorado. These producers, for the most part, are descendants of the first settlers of the West. They work the same fields and provide the affordable food that makes America a great place to live.

They take a lot of things in stride with their heads held high. They persevere in the face of a lot of things they cannot change. Drought, excessive rains, low crop prices, and the actions of foreign governments are all things beyond a farmer's control.

Farmers get a sense of pride doing the work they do, helping to feed the Nation and seeing the result of a year's work at harvest time. Farmers only ask to be able to do the work and live like other Americans. And right now, they cannot do that for a couple of reasons. Reasons the Republican Congress is attempting to address. See, the relative economic prosperity that the country is enjoying right now has left agriculture behind in many sectors.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the President vetoed the Agriculture Appropriations bill. Without warning nor legitimate reason, he placed the financial condition and trade competitiveness of America's farmers in grave jeopardy. These people expect their elected officials to know and understand them, to

represent them in policy and in belief. I can tell my colleagues how challenging it is to face farmers at home and try to explain the behavior of our President in vetoing a bill so central to agriculture in America.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has been wholly unconcerned about the people who are now suffering because of White House politics, the farmers and ranchers in Colorado and throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, farmers face commodity prices that would drive any other business out of business. Take for example wheat, one of the staples of the American diet. It was priced at \$2.35 just last week, yet wheat costs over \$3 just to grow and harvest. Corn and cattle prices are yielding record low prices also.

Mr. Speaker, on October 2, this House of Representatives recorded 333 votes for the Agriculture Appropriations bill. Just a few days later, on October 6, the Senate voted the exact same measure off of the Senate floor. Yet when the President was given the bill, one of the only bills to pass with such a commanding bipartisan majority, sadly he let our farmers down.

Our bill provided \$4.2 billion, and I say \$4.2 billion to provide emergency aid. This money could be used to help people who have been victimized by declining crop prices, drought, flood, fire, disease and so on.

Pulling the rug out from under the Agriculture Appropriations bill, the farmers and ranchers of America, has a debilitating financial impact. There are many financial services, financial markets, insurance policies and provisions, bankers, that rely on the figures that are derived from the Agriculture Appropriations bill to set the planning prices, to set the financial figures for the next growing season. All of that, of course, is delayed now as Congress negotiates downstairs with the insiders from the White House and the Members of Congress who are negotiating with the White House to get this bill passed and concluded.

Every day that we engage in those kinds of debates we are delaying the ability of farmers and ranchers to move forward on financial planning and cash management on the farm.

Our approach in this bill was heavy on trade expansion. This is something that is very, very important, and a huge distinction between our values in a Republican pro-trade House and a White House that seems to be ignorant of the need to expand trade markets.

In fact, we have budgeted, set aside significant funds for the Export Enhancement program and this White House has refused to release those dollars in a way that can really help some of the hurting farmers throughout the country.

This bill is also heavy on research. Cutting-edge research is what has allowed American farmers to maintain

their competitive edge around the world. Let me give a perfect example: The Russian wheat aphid. It was introduced into North America not too long ago. It is a very resistant variety of aphid, of insect. It has a remarkable ability to modify itself to various chemical applications. This research is important.

We also need tax relief. Farms are where we look to preserve the American culture. Rural America is a place where every American ought to be concerned. Rural America is the part of the country today that preserves strong families, good schools, close communities, strong economies, where we still honor the values of honest hard work. And I think it is inward to rural America where we need to look today for the values that will carry us into the next century.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, having our President veto the agriculture appropriations bill in my estimation was a very bad mistake. I am confident that our Republican Congress will always keep the needs of farmers and ranchers in the forefront as we proceed in the closing days of this Congress and return home to those constituents that sent us here to operate faithfully and justly, not in a partisan sort of way. We will keep the farmers and ranchers foremost in our minds as we proceed.

#### THIS CONGRESS MADE PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there was this guy who was in hell and he was sentenced to go to hell and he was walking around down there and he was smiling. The devil says to him, what are you smiling about. He said, I am from South Georgia. It is 90 degrees. I do not feel so bad. I kind of feel like I am back home again.

The devil got mad. The devil cranked up the thermostat to 100 degrees and checked on the guy after a little while, walked over, the guy was not even sweating. Devil said, now what is the problem, why are you so happy now? He says, well, again, I am from South Georgia and 100 degrees is like July. This does not bother me a bit.

The devil got real mad, cranked up the thermostat to 110 degrees. And at this point the guy was smiling again. The devil runs over to him and says, I know, August, right. And guy says, you got it, devil, 110 degrees is not a problem.

The devil got real mad and turned the thermostat down to 15 degrees. Everything got blue and frozen. Devil ran over there and he saw the South Georgia boy smiling one more time and he said, what is it now? And he says, devil, I am smiling because apparently the