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 tactic. 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

requests, this $750 million quickly became $8.4 billion.

The same Democrats that have stood on this floor earlier today arguing about how horrible it was that we would not send a clean emergency appropriations bill, were the same Democrats that threatened to derail this measure if we did not put in things such as a parking garage in Ohio that had absolutely nothing to do with what the flood victims were suffering from; or who threatened to strike this down if we did not put in provisions pertaining to apple orchard subsidies.

If they can somehow come to the floor and explain to me how subsidies for apple orchardists had anything to do with this flood, I would certainly welcome their arguments. I would like to hear those arguments.

I guess what I am saying is, I just, as a Member of this House, get a little bit tired of this self-righteous indignation from our friends on the other side who talk about how they want this clean bill and yet they fill it up, they load it up with what a lot of Americans would call pork. Their hands certainly are not clean.

I agree also with the gentleman regarding the continuing resolution. For 3 years we have heard the President and our friends on the left whine about how horrible it is that the Republicans were awful enough to shut down the Federal Government and this must never happen again.

I remember all the Democrats flooding to the floor afterwards, where they checked with their pollsters and the pollsters told them this is a really good issue, and they all came down when we were having our morning hour and they are all lining up and saying, ''Mr. Speaker, this must never happen again. This must never happen again. It is the most awful thing that has ever occurred. Mr. Speaker, how could they be so cold-hearted? Let us ensure in America today that it will never happen again.''

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker? Guess what, America? They had that opportunity this past week to make sure that the Federal Government would never be shut down again. Not only that, we bent over backwards. We said, okay, not only are we going to pass an insurance policy to make sure that the Federal Government does not get shut down again, we are going to go the extra mile and we are going to allow the government to be funded fully at last year's level.

Now, that is so unbelievably reasonable that I find it astounding that Democrats can still slouch towards the microphone on this floor in self-righteous indignation telling us that they really are concerned about a government shutdown or telling us that we have done this great disservice to the flood victims in the Midwest because we wanted to ensure that the Federal Government was never shut down again.

I mean let us talk about reality for a second. The reality is the flood victims were fully funded. They were fully funded. This was an emergency appropriation to help them a month or so down the road. And yet, and yet, they come in and try to tell us that it is like we are kicking people out of tents or out of trailers because we are trying to ensure that the Federal Government does not get shut down again with this insurance policy.

The real threat to flood victims, not only in the Midwest but the threat to the flood victims in my region in Florida, the threat to earthquake victims in California, the threat to Americans from coast to coast is if this government ever does shut down again and we cannot fund their needs. That is all we were trying to do.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BARCIA, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COBLE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, for 5 minutes, on June 18.
Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, on June 17 and 18.
Mr. COBLE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WICKER, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. POSHARD.
Ms. CARSON.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. WEYGAND.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. ROEMER.
Mr. SCOTT.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. THOMPSON.
Mr. BARCIA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COBLE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.
Mr. BLUNT.
Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
Mr. CASTLE.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. PAPPAS.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. PAUL in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. PAPPAS.
Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. PAUL.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. ROEMER.
Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. POSHARD.
Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. MEEHAN.
Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. HOYER.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1997, at 12 noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 State.22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United