

There is strong public support for this action. I have held two meetings in South Dakota on this issue. At both of these meetings over 250 citizens were in attendance. Such turnout clearly indicates that South Dakotans believe something needs to be done. This amendment achieves their goal.

AMENDMENT NO. 2073

(Purpose: To provide funds for a flood control project)

On page 5 insert the following between lines 16 and 17: "Arkansas City flood control project, Kansas, \$700,000, except that for the purposes of the project, section 902 of Public Law 99-662 is waived;"

AMENDMENT NO. 2074

On page 13, insert the following after line 23:

SEC. . Using funds appropriated herein the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to undertake the Coos Bay, Oregon project in accordance with the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of \$14,541,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,777,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,764,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 2075

(Purpose: To require the Army Corps of Engineers to take such actions as are necessary to obtain and maintain a specified elevation in Lake Traverse, South Dakota and Minnesota)

At the appropriate place in title I, insert the following:

**SEC. 1 . WATER LEVEL IN LAKE TRAVERSE, SOUTH DAKOTA**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers and using funds made available under this Act, shall, to the greatest extent practicable, take such actions as are necessary to obtain and maintain an elevation of 977 feet above sea level in Lake Traverse, South Dakota and Minnesota.

(b) LIMITATION.—No action taken under subsection (a) shall result in flooding at Mud Lake, South Dakota and Minnesota.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, we are down to one amendment on this bill. It seems to me that rather than call everyone back for one vote, if there is a vote on this, we could have that vote tomorrow morning. There is no request for a vote for final passage, as long as we have one on the conference report—either one on the bill or one on the conference report.

If that is satisfactory with the Senator from Minnesota, then I am willing to say—and the managers, of course—that there will be no more votes tonight, but we would have opening statements on DOD authorization yet tonight.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I think that is an excellent idea.

I wonder if we could get unanimous consent to close out all other amendments other than the Wellstone amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I want to say to the majority leader

that anything I can do to accommodate colleagues is fine with me. I am hopeful my colleague and I can work this out. It would be fine to have the vote tomorrow morning, if that is what we need.

Mr. DOLE. If it is all right with the Democratic whip, who is on the floor, Senator FORD, I announce there are no more votes this evening. If there is a vote required on the Wellstone amendment, maybe 9 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not, we might want to make sure, because I do not know what Senator GRAMS' desires are. He may want to amend the amendment. I think he ought to be permitted to do that.

The only thing left is your amendment and the possible second-degree amendment to it, if any.

Mr. DOLE. Whatever the disposition is—

Mr. FORD. Madam President, would the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. FORD. I understand the Senator is trying to move this along and get Members out. Did we get a unanimous-consent agreement that Senator Wellstone's amendment would be the only remaining amendment, or a second-degree to that amendment, that has already been offered?

Mr. DOLE. That was in the original list. We could make that request.

Mr. DOMENICI. There were no others allowed anyway, Madam President.

Mr. FORD. I wanted to be sure. There will be amendments in the second degree.

Mr. DOLE. I make that request, that the Wellstone amendment plus any second-degree amendments be the only amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FORD. I thank the majority leader.

One further question: Should the Wellstone amendment be worked out and no final passage vote requested, that we could finish this bill tonight, and there would not be any left for tomorrow, could that be understood?

Mr. DOLE. That would be understood. Obviously, if we finish tonight without a vote, I am sure the managers would be happy to do that.

Mr. DOMENICI. Delighted.

Mr. FORD. One, no more votes this evening; and two, probably no votes on this bill tomorrow. We will go to DOD authorization tonight with opening statements.

Mr. DOLE. In the event there is a vote, we request it be put over until tomorrow. In the event we complete action without it, obviously that is desired.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I just noticed on this list there are two Senators that I have not formally asked. I believe there will be no amendment, but we must check with Senator BURNS right now and Senator SPECTER.

We have nothing else pending. We have to wait for Senator GRAMS now.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Very briefly, I wanted to thank my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans alike. The managers' amendment includes funding for a flood control project in Marshall, MN, which was flooded three times in 1993.

This has been a project that for some time now, is very, very important to the people in Marshall. I know that the elected leadership of the people will be very, very grateful for the action that we have taken.

I thank my colleagues for their support. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**WELFARE IN AMERICA**

Mr. ASHCROFT. Madam President, I take this opportunity to raise important issues relating to a set of concerns which will be before the Senate next week, or perhaps even late this week.

I am talking about our responsibility to reform a welfare system, a welfare system which has been a tragic failure. All too frequently, we speak of this tragic failure as if it is a tragic failure in terms of dollars and cents. The tragedy of this failure is compounded. It is not just dollars and cents, or not even most importantly dollars and cents.

The tragedy of this failure is it is a failure in terms of human lives, the lives of children, the lives of families. It is a failure not only in terms of a single generation, but it is a failure that extends to lives that will exist in the future.

I will talk a little bit about that story. I have been talking about different stories in the welfare system, and the tragedies, the human face of this tragedy, for the last several days.

I might point out, you might think these are special cases I have somehow gained access to. The cases which I am addressing are cases which have appeared in the mainstream media. The first case was recorded in detail in the Chicago Tribune. Yesterday's case was reported in detail in the Boston Globe.

These cases are cases which have been a part of the mainstream reporting. A case which I will talk about today is the story of Rosie Watson and her successful 18-year endeavor to get welfare benefits for all seven members of her family. This is a story that is a vivid illustration of how the system entices people to try to game the system, even to be industrious in working the system, instead of working in the productive arena of American culture.

The Baltimore Sun reported in January that Rosie Watson, her common-

law husband, and their seven children live in Lake Providence, LA, and they receive annually, \$46,716 in tax-free income—\$46,716 in tax-free income. That is principally from a Federal supplemental security income payment.

Now, this woman, Ms. Watson, has an addiction to Federal welfare. That addiction began when she was 23 years of age. She started receiving Federal AFDC payment checks for herself and her two small children.

According to the Baltimore Sun, as the number of children in the family expanded, Ms. Watson soon discovered her family's income could be significantly expanded by switching from ordinary welfare to SSI, the supplemental security income. That is the Federal Government's welfare program that distributes payments to a broad range of beneficiaries that include disabled adults that cannot work and the families of children with so-called mental and learning disabilities. Since 1974, Ms. Watson has submitted no fewer than 17 applications to Social Security law judges. She submitted these applications on behalf of herself and members of her family in an attempt to receive the maximum Federal welfare allotment possible.

She claimed that she was too stressed out to work, and Ms. Watson was certified to receive Federal welfare benefits because of the disability, because she was too stressed out to work.

Her common-law husband likewise was approved to receive welfare payments after he successfully argued that he was overweight and his overweight condition constituted a physical disability that made him too heavy to work.

Moreover, since there is no limit to the number of times that anyone can ask for assistance, after even being turned down, Ms. Watson simply continued to file welfare petitions until she eventually secured payments of \$458 each for all seven of her children.

According to a feature in the Baltimore Sun, all of Ms. Watson's children were ultimately awarded full SSI benefits because they "lagged behind in school and scored poorly on psychological tests, which, under Government rules, translates in a failure to demonstrate"—and this is the term of art we use in the law—"age-appropriate behavior."

Madam President, it is no surprise that across the land citizens are irate and they derisively refer to these monthly SSI checks that go to these individuals who do not have age-appropriate behavior as "crazy checks," because if the children will act out aggressively, irrationally, will perform poorly, they can qualify themselves for \$458 a month.

But that is not all. Ms. Watson soon discovered that persistence pays off. In the case of our Federal welfare system, it pays off big. In the case of the Watson family, \$37,000 in tax-free, retroactive, lump-sum payments, because the lump sum was designed by our Fed-

eral system to say, "We probably should have granted you these payments earlier. Here is a check or here are checks totaling \$37,000 because you have finally convinced us that you are all incapable of functioning."

Madam President, as I mentioned earlier, the issue here is not the amount of money the Federal bureaucracy is sending to this family every month. The real issue, the real issue is the toll this cycle of dependency collects in terms of human lives. In this case, the real issue concerns Ms. Watson's children and the devastating impact that this life style has on their lives.

Next to me is a picture of her 16-year-old daughter, Oleaner. She is not encouraged to pursue any of the dreams normal to a 16-year-old child. She is not doing well in school, in sports, or any extra curricula activity. It seems that her main use to her mother is the check that she ensures will show up in the mailbox every month. At 13 years of age, she was officially classified as unfit to work or to study or to do anything but collect checks.

Oleaner has become ensnared in a system which her mother manipulates for financial gain at the expense of her children's futures. She brings the family \$458 per month and is paid \$20 a month in allowance because of it. In order to qualify for these benefits, the children have forsaken their educations, their dreams, their futures, all sacrificed to the monthly check in the mailbox, which in a very strange way becomes their representation of what they are worth. They are worth something in terms of welfare.

According to the principal of the children's former elementary school, the abuse of these "crazy checks" is very widespread. Mr. Willie Lee Bell receives a questionnaire from the Social Security Administration—he is the principal—every time a student applies for benefits. He estimates that half of the students have applied for the benefits. He believes that many of these students are encouraged or even coached by their parents in a manner that makes them eligible to receive the so-called "crazy checks." The children, he says, do not want to fail. They are just doing what mama wants.

Mrs. Watson's youngest son, George, was suspected of having been so coached. In 1991, the authorities alleged that he was not trying up to the best of his ability on the IQ tests. Ms. Watson denies the charge, saying she has never told any of her children to act crazy in order to get some money.

The effect on school performance is clear. Children must be disruptive, they must be noisy, they must be slow. If not, their checks will cease.

According to the Baltimore Sun, the message for this family and the message sent by this system is that it is not education that will provide advancement, it is not achievement, but it is disruption. Government assistance

checks follow this kind of counterproductive behavior.

The message to her son George from Mrs. Watson is clearly evident by a dispute last year in school. George's school books were taken from his locker. The principal told him he had to pay for them. Ms. Watson refused to pay. George then flunked all of his courses. George then would have to repeat the seventh grade, and Ms. Watson bragged about the additional year as a result and the ability to collect these kinds of payments.

Madam President, we are now days away from the welfare debate. There is a near unanimous consensus from Republicans that the tragedy of cases like these demands immediate reform. SSI must be reformed. But from President Clinton and from those on the other side of the aisle, we hear: No proposal. There is silence. It is a silence which is deafening.

The people of America have sent us to this Chamber to change the way business is done.

Madam President, silence and apathy are the twin evils that have allowed this Washington-based, Washington-knows-all system to stifle the poor, that have ensnared the poor. The answer from the Democrats is more spending, more bureaucracy, more rhetoric, less reform, and on this point, silence.

We cannot accept reforms that are little more than half measures designed to make the American people think they have done something about welfare. We have been down that road before.

In 1988 we passed a so-called revolutionary welfare bill that did two things. First, it ensnared more people in the web of dependency. Second, it increased the costs of welfare. You can see this on the two charts that are here behind me, a major welfare reform in 1988 and see the spike in the costs.

Here is a percentage chart showing the number of children, or the percentage of children in poverty in our country. Notice that the war on poverty began in the 1960's. We had a relatively low figure. But as we have waged our so-called war on poverty, we found out we were waging war on the future of our children, as larger and larger numbers of our children found their way into the despair of poverty, ensnared by a welfare system which captured them rather than liberated them.

It is time for us to reform a system which has sought, perhaps, noble objectives. But it has elicited the worst of behavior.

It is time, Madam President, for us to do real reform. No rearrangement of the deck chairs on the welfare *Titanic* will save us. We have to repudiate the current system. We have to institute reforms. We have to capitalize on the ingenuity and creativity and capacity of State and local governments, even governments like the District of Columbia which are addressing the

central problems of the absence of family and the absence of work in the welfare system.

They know that Government cannot solve this problem, cannot solve it alone, cannot solve it just with more money. The more money we have spent, the greater the problem has grown.

The real cost in this entire operation is not just a cost in terms of financial resources. It has been a cost in lost lives. It has been from those who have sought to use their families, to abuse the system. It has been a cost of the future of children, and it will be the cost of the future of America if we do not correct this.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1996**

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is my custom on every appropriations bill, whether I am the floor manager or not, to state succinctly as I can how it relates to the budget resolution and do some accounting for anybody that is interested in how the bill stacks up versus the budget resolution.

Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to discuss the budget impact of this bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

By CBO's scoring, this bill provides \$20.2 billion in new budget authority and \$12 billion in new outlays for the Department of Energy, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other selected independent agencies. With outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions, the Senate bill is within the subcommittee's section 602(b) allocation.

Mr. President, this year's budget resolution established separate binding caps on defense and nondefense funding. This bill contains both defense and nondefense funding and must meet separate allocations.

According to CBO, the Senate-reported bill is within the allocation of budget authority and outlays for the defense and nondefense funding in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask, unanimous consent that a table printed in the RECORD comparing the Senate-reported bill's budget authority and outlay levels to the subcommittee's section 602(b) allocation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY AND WATER SUBCOMMITTEE—SPENDING TOTALS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL [Fiscal year 1996, dollars in millions]		
	Budget authority	Outlays
<b>DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY</b>		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		4,039
H.R. 1905, as reported to the Senate	11,446	6,868
Scorekeeping adjustment		
Subtotal defense discretionary	11,446	10,907
<b>NONDEFENSE DISCRETIONARY</b>		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		4,171
H.R. 1905, as reported to the Senate	8,716	5,100
Scorekeeping adjustment		
Subtotal defense discretionary	8,716	9,271
<b>MANDATORY</b>		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		
H.R. 1905, as reported to the Senate		
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget Resolution assumptions		
Subtotal mandatory		
Adjusted bill total	20,162	20,178
<b>SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE 602(b) ALLOCATION</b>		
Defense discretionary	11,447	10,944
Nondefense discretionary	8,733	9,272
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory		
Total allocation	20,180	20,216
<b>ADJUSTED BILL TOTAL COMPARED TO SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE 602(b) ALLOCATION</b>		
Defense discretionary	-1	-37
Nondefense discretionary	-17	-1
Violent crime reduction trust fund	NA	NA
Mandatory		
Total allocation	-18	-38

Note.—details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

**SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT**

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy regarding the funding contained in the bill under general investigations for Susquehanna River Basin water management.

First, I want to thank the chairman for including \$290,000—the full amount requested in fiscal year 1996—for the Army Corps of Engineers to continue the reconnaissance study investigation of the Susquehanna River Basin that was initiated last year. The Susquehanna River is the largest river on the east coast of the United States and the largest tributary of the Chesapeake Bay. It is also one of the most flood prone river basins in the Nation. The Army Corps of Engineers operates 13 reservoirs on the upper Susquehanna and regulates the low and high water flow management. There are also three large hydroelectric projects on the lower Susquehanna. Under normal conditions, these reservoirs and dams serve as traps for the harmful sediments which flow into the river. During major storms however, they suddenly discharge tremendous amounts of built-up sediments, severely degrading the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay, destroying valuable habitat and killing fish and other living resources. Scientists estimate that Tropical Storm Agnes in 1982 aged the bay by more than a decade in a matter of days because of the slug of sediments

discharged from the Susquehanna River reservoirs. There is a real danger that another major storm in the basin could scour the sediment that has been accumulating behind these dams and present a major setback to our efforts to clean up the bay.

It was my understanding that it was the committee's intent in funding the reconnaissance study of the Susquehanna River Basin last year and again this year, that the corps was to investigate not only alternatives for managing water storage during high and low flow conditions and flood damage reduction needs in the basin, but also to address sediment related issues for the study area. Is this correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from Maryland is correct. It is the committee's intent that the Corps of Engineers conduct a basin-wide sedimentation assessment as part of this study, including a complete evaluation of potential sediment management strategies to reduce the impact on Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate these assurances and thank the chairman for his support.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT BEGINNING ON PAGE 12,

LINE 17

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, with reference to the bill, I have two housekeeping measures that I would like to get behind us now.

On page 12, starting at lines 17, section 102, continuing through page 13 until section 103, I ask unanimous consent that that committee amendment be tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCEPTED COMMITTEE AMENDMENT BEGINNING ON PAGE 38, LINE 19

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on page 38 of the bill, lines 19 through 25, that committee amendment remains not adopted because we just did not ask that it be adopted. At this point, I ask unanimous consent that committee amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. That is our error.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. As we consider the fiscal year 1996 energy and water development appropriations bill, I would like to express my great concern about the decision by the Senate to reduce funding for high-energy physics research by \$20 million for a total of \$657 million. This funding cut will impact the operating budgets of Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in my State of Illinois, the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center in California, and the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York.

I am aware that the deficit-driven decisions this Congress must make will have a real impact on Federal energy priorities. I also appreciate the support the committee has provided for high-energy physics research, and for Femilab, in previous years. Physicists commit decades of their lives, and, in many instances, their entire careers to