

Human life is too precious not to recognize this devastating tragedy. One life lost is one too many. Sharon is a courageous woman who has refused to give up, despite losing her loved ones. Instead, she has chosen to fight on behalf of the hemophilia community for justice.

It is because of brave, resilient people like Sharon who are willing to share their story that we understand the true impact of hemophilia-associated AIDS. I ask my colleagues on the floor and in the House to join me in acknowledging Sharon Bryson for her bravery and willingness to help others. Sharing her story with me was an act of courage. It certainly brings this tragedy close to home.

We must realize that this tragedy does not only happen in the urban areas or to those who are most at risk. Families from all walks of life are suffering. I am hoping that Sharon's story helps other families and individuals who have been infected through tainted blood products. I also commend her daughter Shelley who, in the face of these difficult medical challenges, continues to want to devote the rest of her life to helping children in need.

As Sharon has so eloquently said:

There is no amount of money that can bring my husband and son back into my life. Perhaps the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act could bring some meaning to this chapter of my life and restore my faith in the belief that the little people of this great country of ours do matter.

My prayers are with Sharon and her family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TIAHRT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. FURSE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, when I came over today I did not plan to speak. But as I heard the discussion on the supplemental some moments ago, referrals were made to the government shutdown in 1995. The government shut down very briefly, I think it was in 1991, regarding virtually identical causes as was the case in 1995; that is, the unwillingness and/or the inability of the President on the one hand and the Congress on the other to agree on budgetary matters. It was universally

concluded in 1991 that President Bush shut her down. Oh, yes, he shut the government down. But guess what? When the government shut down in 1995, was it universally concluded that President Clinton shut her down? No. The Congress shut down the government in 1995. President Clinton's fingerprints were not to be found thereon, at least it was not reported.

TV talk show hosts, Mr. Speaker, weekend talk show hosts in particular, ask time and again of their weekend guests, well, are the Republicans going to shut down the government again during the 105th Congress? I have heard it asked dozens of times. A more even-handed question, Mr. Speaker, would be, do the President and the Congress intend to shut down the government again? Never heard that asked once.

I will admit we in the Congress sometimes become prisoners or victims of our own rhetoric. But keep in mind both the executive and the legislative branch must assume some blame when it comes to these matters. President Clinton, President Bush, President whoever, unlike Members of Congress, is elected by the American people, by all of the American people. He is the chief operating officer of the Federal Government, and as such, he is compelled to lead.

The media, and I generally am not critical of the media because I have been the beneficiary of pretty even-handed treatment by them, but the media has a way of portraying news this way or that way, and the way it is portrayed, that is the accounts of news, the way it is portrayed obviously has a direct result in the way that viewers or readers perceive it. You have heard it said, Mr. Speaker, and so have I, that perception is 90 percent of it.

So President Bush having closed down the government in 1991, that is the perception because in many instances that is the way the news was portrayed. But, no, not President Clinton in 1995. I repeat, I was not even going to get into this, but much was said about it today as we were getting into the discussion of the supplemental and I felt obliged to at least address it in this small way.

I hope the media will assume a more objective and therefore less subjective role in its subsequent reporting of these matters. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania Avenue runs two ways. We have the Congress at one end, President Clinton at the other end. President Clinton for this time, whoever it may be subsequently. But this is a two-way street. When government shutdowns occur, they involve both the President and the Congress. And the purpose of this message today from me, the gospel according to COBLE, is to remind people it is a two-way street.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing up this point. I think it is very important. We have had an appropriation bill before us, and we had legislative language on it.

But I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle have not been suggesting today that we are the first people in the history of the Congress to put riders on appropriation bills. For 40 years during Republican and Democrat administrations, the Democrats, when they were in the majority, used this as a legitimate exercise of the power of the purse. I think my friend from North Carolina will agree that we were fighting about some very, very important things on this spending bill.

Mr. COBLE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that is precisely my point. That is the way it needs to be portrayed.

ON THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when welfare reform was passed, Congress gave very little guidance to States for determining the applicability of existing employment laws to welfare recipients. This meant that States, counties, employers could use any kind of guideline in applying the welfare reform laws.

We all are in agreement, there should have been some reform of welfare. The time had come for that. But the time will never come when we take away some of the employment benefits from the Federal Government that every citizen of this country needs and desires and really should be given.

Congress never said that the Fair Labor Standards Act, which includes the minimum wage provisions, should not be applied to welfare recipients. Neither did they say it should be applied. So those were questions that were left open.

Each time this piece of legislation came to the floor, I questioned those things. I questioned because of the fact that the Federal Government, which has been sort of the person or the group of people who looked over these laws to be sure that everybody got fair treatment, equal treatment under the law, but with the Welfare Reform Act nothing was mentioned. Congress did not speak about the Fair Labor Standards Act in that particular piece of legislation.

The President and some Members of Congress have tried to determine that welfare recipients in work programs should indeed earn the minimum wage, but some in this Congress want to overturn that decision. For some reason they think, Mr. Speaker, that it is

OK for people who were on welfare to make less than minimum wage.

The Congress did a good thing. They want to see these people go from welfare to work. But they did not leave any guidelines to be sure that they when they went from welfare to work, they would be treated fairly, that they would be covered by the fair employment rules, that they would be covered by civil rights laws, this they would be covered by all kinds of Federal protection under the law. It was not there and it still is not there. But there is a great need.

I do not agree with that, Mr. Speaker, because I stand for fairness. I stand for equality, and most Members of this Congress do, if they really understood what they are doing with this, cutting down, being sure that people who are going from welfare to work now may not even get the minimum wage.

Welfare recipients deserve the dignity of equal treatment with their fellow workers. I repeat that. They deserve this dignity. The minimum wage does that. It gives them that dignity. Welfare recipients, Mr. Speaker, are entitled to the protection of wage and hour laws. They are not second class citizens. They deserve the same protection from wage and hour laws that each of us has today.

Minimum wages are not inflated wages. We call them decent wages. This workfare is supposed to provide income and create incentives and opportunities for people receiving welfare. We do know that Congress has enabled them now to be able in 2 years to go out and find a job. But what we did not do is to protect them with the Federal laws that have been there for a very long time.

Mr. Speaker, do not let it be corrupted into an oppressive system that forces workers to toil for cheap wages. It will bring us right back into the welfare syndrome that we just recently got out of because Congress passed these laws to make this happen throughout the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MORE ON THE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we have gone ahead and passed the supplemental bill today. I supported it, and there can be no question now as to our commitment to supporting the flood victims and the other needs that were contained in the bill.

My party and my political philosophy were forced to make a tactical retreat today. We abandoned two very key portions of this supplemental bill, and I want to address those in the time that I have today, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, we were trying in this bill to fashion a way to prevent another Government shutdown. The shutdowns of late 1995 and early 1996 were regrettable. The American people told us that they did not want that again. And in the legislation that passed earlier, we had a provision saying that if Congress and the President at the end of the fiscal year are unable to come to a resolution, then automatically the appropriation bills would be funded at 100 percent of the previous year until something could be worked out on a permanent basis.

I feel that that was reasonable. I am sorry we had to abandon that because of the President's veto. But I state to my colleagues and to the American people, Mr. Speaker, that it was a worthwhile goal. It was important and it had everything to do with the bill that we were discussing this week.

The second major issue was the issue of the census. The American people might ask us, Mr. Speaker, what does the census have to do with an emergency spending bill? It has everything to do with the future of our country. It has everything to do with abiding by the Constitution.

There are people in the administration, people in the Commerce Department, in the Bureau of the Census, who want to count about 90 percent of the people in the year 2000, and then guess at the other 10 percent. We are told by congressional studies that those guesses could be off by as much as 35 percent. In other words, a group of 100 people might be counted at 65. They might be counted at 135.

The Constitution of the United States, Mr. Speaker, says that there shall be an actual enumeration, an actual enumeration. That is what the Constitution says. That is what the Founding Fathers said when they fashioned the Constitution. I do not apologize for standing up for the Constitution, for standing up for an issue which is central to the franchise of voters.

Then one more point I want to make to the response to some of the accusations that were made by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

□ 1745

They say we do not need to put riders on appropriation bills. We do not need to appropriate money and then hold a gun to the President's head with these extraneous legislative riders.

For 40 years my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle utilized this tac-

tic. It is a legitimate exercise of the constitutional power of the purse. It is within the prerogative of the House of Representatives to initiate spending bills and to put requirements on those spending bills to make sure the money is spent according to the will of the American people and according to the will of this House. It is part of our responsibility.

As long as that power of the purse is here in this body, whether Democrats are in the majority, as they were for 40 years, or whether Republicans are in the majority, there will continue to be legislative riders. I want to point that out. We were fighting for important things, important principles that affect the future of this country.

I will be happy to yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi, and I thank him for all his hard work on this.

I hear what the gentleman is saying, and I know a lot of Americans hear what the gentleman is saying. It is deeply troubling to me to hear year in and year out from the other side talking in self-righteous tones that we are doing these awful things that have never been done before; talking about how we are gutting Medicare, and then a year later they vote 36 to 3 to support the same provisions that we were doing a year ago.

Now, supposedly, we are victimizing flood victims, who were fully funded through the State, anyway. And now we hear how we should have sent the President a clean CR. And I guess that is what is most troubling, when I hear the President get on the TV talking about this great need for a clean CR. What was clean about this CR?

AVOID ANOTHER GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying just a minute ago to the gentleman from Mississippi, it is frustrating to hear time and time again about the need for these clean CRs.

Now, if we wanted to address just how clean this CR was, and I may ask the gentleman from Mississippi in a minute or two to talk about some of the things that were in the bill, but the President said please do not jeopardize flood relief for these poor victims, just send me a clean CR, or a clean appropriations bill.

If we wanted to talk about a clean bill, that would add up to about \$750 million. If we were concerned about flood relief for the victims of the horrible floods up in the Midwest, we would have sent \$750 million. Unfortunately, by the time this bill got passed through the House and through the Senate and through the White House