

about GATT. This is not about NAFTA. This is about something else which we ought to have a consensus on, which is, at this upcoming meeting in Geneva—I think our Government has given people in China every reason to believe that we would—and I guess I will quote Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's famous phrase, "Tell it like it is." We ought to tell it like it is. We ought to tell it like it is. The Post editorial is right on the mark, we ought to do it at this very important meeting of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. That is the time for the United States to speak out.

Silence is betrayal, and our country must not be silent in the face of these kinds of abuses of elementary human rights of citizens in China and, for that matter, in other countries as well.

I hope that I will be doing this on the floor with Senator MACK. I certainly am going to be bringing an amendment to the floor. We have to have a vote on this. I can't let one Senator block a committee from marking up this bill and then have it delayed a month, which will be too late for this U.N. Commission on Human Rights. We will take action on it before the Senate. I hope we get 98, 99 Senators voting in favor of it. It is the least we can do.

I yield the floor and 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. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today is the eighth annual National Sportsmanship Day—a day designated to promote ethics, integrity, and character in athletics. I am pleased to say that National Sportsmanship Day was a creation of Mr. Daniel E. Doyle, Jr., Executive Director of the Institute for International Sport at the University of Rhode Island. Participation this year will include over 10,000 schools in all 50 states and more than 100 countries.

Today, the Institute is holding a day-long town meeting in which athletes, coaches, journalists, students, and educators are engaged in an in-depth discussion of racial issues in sports. I believe that the Institute's work in addressing the issues of character and sportsmanship, and its ability to foster good dialogue among our young people is significant.

As part of the Day's celebration, the Institute selects Sports Ethics Fellows who have demonstrated "highly ethical behavior in athletics and society." Past recipients have included: Kirby Puckett, former Minnesota Twins outfielder and 10-time All Star; Joan Be-

noit Samuelson, gold medalist in the first women's Olympic marathon in 1984; and Joe Paterno, longtime head football coach at Penn State University. This year, the Institute will honor over 15 individuals including Mills Lane, district court judge of Reno, Nevada and internationally known professional boxing referee; Bud Greenspan, renowned Olympic cinematographer; Billy Packer, CBS sports commentator; and Ken Dryden, president and general manager, Toronto Maple Leafs.

Another key component of National Sportsmanship Day is the Student-Athlete Outreach Program. This program encourages high schools and colleges to send talented student-athletes to local elementary and middle schools to promote good sportsmanship and serve as positive role models. These students help young people build self-esteem, respect for physical fitness, and an appreciation for the value of teamwork.

If all those activities were not enough, the Institute has found another avenue to promote understanding and good character for youngsters. A new program called Renaissance Education was instituted in 1996 to expose students to the foundations of "total education." The Renaissance Education concept gives students the opportunity to contribute to a team effort and profit from the benefits of team participation. To kick-off this program, the Institute will host its first-ever Renaissance Games in April where students will participate in sports, leisure, cultural, and academic activities such as: basketball, volleyball, photography, public speaking, creative writing, chess, board games, spelling bees, and library research.

I remain very proud that National Sportsmanship Day was initiated in Rhode Island, and I applaud the students and teachers who are participating in the events of this inspiring day. Likewise, I congratulate all of those at the University of Rhode Island's Institute for International Sport, whose hard work and dedication over the last eight years have made this program so successful.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that S. 1173 will be the matter before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1173, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1173) to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill with a modified committee amendment in the nature of a substitute (Amendment No. 1676).

Mr. CHAFEE. It is my understanding the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has an amendment which he wishes to present. What we would like to do, if it is agreeable with him, is he could present his amendment and discuss it but we not proceed to a vote until we have had an opportunity to check with the Labor Committee, and check some other factors. So he and I could work together on when would be a good time to call it up for a vote.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have talked to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I will send an amendment to the desk, but I will not be asking for a vote until after we work together on this. I certainly hope there will be support for it. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his graciousness.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1679 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report on the number of former recipients of public assistance under the State temporary assistance to needy families programs that are economically self-sufficient)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 1679.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 309, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

#### SEC. 18. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF FORMER TANF RECIPIENTS.

Section 413 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 613) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) REPORT ON THE STATUS OF FORMER TANF RECIPIENTS.—

“(1) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to assess, to the extent possible based on all available information, the number and percentage of former recipients of assistance under the State programs funded under this part that are, as of the date that the assessment is performed, economically self-sufficient. In determining economic self-sufficiency, the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the number and percentage of such recipients that are, as of the date of the assessment, employed;

“(B) the number and percentage of such recipients earning incomes at or above 150 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 673(2) of the Community Services Block

Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)), including any revision required by such section for a family of the size involved); and

“(C) the number and percentage of such recipients that have access to housing, transportation, and child care.

“(2) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Beginning 4 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit biannual reports to the appropriate committees of Congress on the assessment conducted under this subsection. The reports shall analyze the ability of former recipients of assistance under the State programs funded under this part to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The Secretary shall include in the reports all available information about the economic self-sufficiency of such recipients, including data from quarterly State reports submitted to the Department of Health and Human Services (in this paragraph referred to as the ‘Department’), data from State applications submitted to the Department for bonuses, and to the extent the Secretary determines they are relevant to the assessment—

“(A) reports prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States;

“(B) samples prepared by the Bureau of the Census;

“(C) surveys funded by the Department;

“(D) studies conducted by the Department;

“(E) studies conducted by States;

“(F) surveys conducted by non-governmental entities;

“(G) administrative data from other Federal agencies; and

“(H) information and materials available from any other appropriate source.”.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be given to Mikki Holmes, who is an intern with me, during consideration of this amendment.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Both she and Kelly Ross have helped me a great deal on the amendment, so I would love for her to be able to be out on the floor, and I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me give my colleagues a bit of background on this amendment—some context. I am, if you will, changing the conversation. We are going to be getting into ISTEA amendments soon, and I will have some other amendments on ISTEA. But this is a vehicle out here on the floor and this is a time for me to raise another question, which I think is a very important one. This amendment would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report on the number of former welfare recipients, recipients of public assistance under the State Temporary Assistance to Needy Families programs, who are economically self-sufficient. In other words, what we want to do is have some clear understanding about what is going on in the country right now.

When we debated the welfare bill, I had an amendment which said something like: Let’s please get Health and Human Services to take a look at what is going on in the country. And if it should be the case—and I certainly

hope it will not be the case—that, as opposed to families being moved from welfare to work with more economic self-sufficiency, which is what our goal is, we are seeing families that are actually becoming more impoverished, children becoming more impoverished, then what we need to do is take corrective action. Let’s at least monitor what is happening. That amendment was defeated.

What I am saying to colleagues today is that by passing that piece of legislation, we have a certain responsibility to make sure that we know what is going on throughout the country. Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish sociologist, once said that ignorance is never random. I think we have to be very careful that we at least make an effort, as responsible policymakers, to understand what is happening.

What I mean by “economic self-sufficiency” is we just need to know whether or not, as the rolls drop—and we have heard reports about how the welfare rolls have dropped by 4 million—whether this reduction in the rolls or reduction in welfare caseload is a reduction of poverty. It can’t be viewed as reform unless we are talking about a reduction of poverty. We just need to know whether or not these parents, mainly women, are now working at jobs that provide them a decent wage. The operational indicator that I have in this amendment is we need to know whether or not these families are at 150 percent of poverty. Are they now out of poverty? We need to know whether or not there is child care available for the children. We need to know what the housing situation is. We need to know whether or not there is transportation available for people so they can get to jobs. We just do not know that.

What I am saying in this amendment is, at the very minimum—and I hope there will be support for it—we ask the Secretary of Health and Human Services, based upon the data that she has—some reports from States, some Census Bureau survey statistics, some agency data—to pull together all the available data—someone has to do that—and provide to the Senate, to the Congress, a report 4 months from enactment of this amendment, and then every 6 months, as to what is going on in the country—whether or not these families are reaching economic self-sufficiency.

Let me talk a little bit about some of my own travel, and why I bring this amendment to the floor, and also just let me draw from some documentation, empirical data, that I think will help colleagues as they make up their minds. This is very reasonable. This is very reasonable, Democrats and Republicans. The only thing I am saying is, please let us know.

Now, when I travel around the country—and I have spent some time in low-income communities—I am not just focused on welfare. Personally, I think the most important policy goal for us is to make work pay. I think if people work almost 52 weeks a year

and almost 40 hours a week, they ought not be poor in America.

I think some of that is skills development for people who are looking for work. Some of that is access to capital, especially for small businesses, whether it be in Kansas or Minnesota, so we can have more entrepreneurs and have more economic opportunities. And some of that is affordable child care and affordable health care. If you can put that package together, that is probably the best single thing you can do for families in America, especially families, if you will, in the bottom 50 percent of the population.

I hope that is the direction we will go. But as I travel the country—from Delta, MS, to East LA, Watts, to the Pilsin neighborhood in South Side Chicago, to public housing projects, the Ida Wells housing project, to the Robert Taylor Holmes housing project, to inner city Baltimore, to inner city Minneapolis, to rural Aitkin County, to Letcher County, Appalachia, eastern Kentucky—what I find is a bit of a disturbing picture. And I have been trying to check with people in other States.

I am finding another thing. First of all, what I do when I travel around the country is say, OK, now you have seen a drop in caseload and you have fewer people on welfare. That is being applauded. But can you tell me where they are? Where are the people? What kinds of jobs do they have? At what wages? How about the children? Is there decent child care for the children?

Generally speaking, the answer—and it will not just be what I am going to tell you on the basis of my own travel, but I also want to quote from some reports—is people do not know. People do not know. State by State they do not really know. There ought to be some way to assemble that data and at least get a report on what has happened.

I can tell you, I talked a little bit about this on the floor of the Senate before. This is why I bring this amendment to the floor. It is why I am changing the conversation on the floor of the Senate at least at the beginning of this bill. It is why I think this is a matter of urgent importance.

What I find is that I will go to a community, like in Delta, MS, or, for that matter—let us start with rural Aitkin County, MN, or, for that matter, maybe even more importantly, in Whitesburg, KY, and people will say in rural communities two things. No. 1—and in a lot of inner cities; I hope every colleague at some point in time can read William Julius Wilson’s book, “The Disappearance of Work,” just an eminent sociologist, African American sociologist, who has done superb work; rave reviews for his very careful research.

There are a lot of communities in our country where work still does not exist, even with a record low official unemployment rate. We have communities in our country where there are no jobs.

So there are two issues here. If you are going to tell people they are going to be off assistance, we have to make sure the job opportunities are there.

Now, a lot of people in rural America are saying, "Look, in our communities we don't have the jobs. And just as importantly, we don't have the transportation to be able to get to some of those jobs that are 50 or 60 miles away." So I think we need to know what is happening. I mean, in Whitesburg, KY, in Letcher County, KY, boy, I will tell you what—I say this to the Senator from Kansas—you want to talk about a group of people that are independent, you want to talk about a group of people that are self-reliant and self-sufficient—I am a little biased. That is where my wife's family is from. This is the community.

People say, "We want to be able to work. And if you give us the tools whereby we can have some access to capital, we can chart our own economic future." And there are jobs for people. We are all for this. But right now, in a couple of years from now, everybody please remember in that bill that we passed, there is a drop dead date certain where, depending upon the State, 2 years from now or 4 years from now or a year and a half from now everybody is going to be off assistance. All these parents—women; almost all women—and children will be cut off all assistance.

Before that finally happens, Mr. President, we need to know whether or not these families are now reaching economic self-sufficiency. We need to know what is going on. We cannot just cut all people off assistance without knowing whether or not there are jobs available, whether or not any will be available, or, worse—and I am visiting a lot of communities around the country, and I think Senators are probably hearing this now as we implement this legislation—they are telling me there are no jobs.

Same thing in a lot of inner cities I visit where people tell me in Baltimore. And you know what? I am in complete agreement on this. I want my conservative colleagues to know that I am now changing my ideology. I am becoming a conservative Democrat. I cannot go quite as far as being a Republican. But I am in complete agreement with the proposition that you can have all of the social services imaginable, you can have the WIC program, and you can have the Head Start Program, and you can have outreach programs, but it does not work unless people have an employment opportunity. That is dignity for people.

But you know, when I visit some just great people in Baltimore—they are doing great work—what they tell me is, "Look, all the social services in the world don't cut it unless there are job opportunities here. And the jobs are not available in our ghettos and boroughs. They are available in some of the suburbs, but people cannot get out to them. A lot of poor people do not

own cars. And a lot of people rely on the public transportation."

So what I am saying, colleagues, is, let us find out—find out—whether or not people are moving to economic self-sufficiency. Let us find out what this reduction in caseload means. Because I think otherwise we could be doing something here in Washington, DC, that could be unbelievably harsh and unbelievably cruel and just really unconscionable, which is eventually supporting the idea that all families are cut off all assistance even when people have tried to find a job and have not been able to find a job, even when the child care isn't available.

Now, as I travel the country—I wanted to also mention this to colleagues—I have met with entirely too many families who tell me that either their 3- or 4-year-olds, part of the time, are home alone because it is a single parent working because the child care isn't available, or their children, small children, age 2, age 3, one week are with a cousin, another week with another relative, another week with a friend somewhere, because there is no affordable child care.

Or I talk to parents—and I would like for every Senator to put himself or herself in the place of some of these parents—who tell me that before this legislation passed, they would go to school, and they would pick up their first grader—this happened to me in East LA—and this mother, who was just weeping, she was saying, "I work." She wanted me to know she was working. She wanted me to know that she wants to work. I was asking her, how was it going? And it was at that point that she broke down crying, when she said, "It's fine until about 3 o'clock every day," because that is when she would pick up her first grader—now a second grader—at school, and walk her home, sometimes passing gangs in a pretty violent neighborhood. Too much violence still. And she would walk her child home, and then she would be with her child. Now she tells her second grader, "You know, when you get home at the housing project, you're to lock the door, and you're to take no phone calls."

Colleagues, I want you to know that even when there is good weather, there are too many children in America who are not outside playing because there is no supervision for them. Now, we ought to know what is happening around the country to these children. Just because these children are low-income children, just because their mothers are low-income mothers does not make them any less important than anybody else. They are all God's children.

Mr. President, let me just read from a very important article that came out last week in the National Journal by Burt Solomon called "Monitoring Welfare Reform—Sort Of." This is why I want to see us at least call on the Secretary of Health and Human Services to assemble some data, to provide us

with reports as to what is going on. That is all. How many families are reaching economic self-sufficiency? Are people who are now off welfare, have they found jobs? At what wage level? Are the children OK? Is there decent child care? That is all that says. We all ought to want to know that. There should not be one vote against this. We should want to know. We should want to know.

Now, to provide some evidence or marshal some evidence for this amendment, let me just read from this very fine piece by Burt Solomon. In quoting one Federal official:

"I don't think we will be following enough people thoroughly enough—or long enough—to get a [strong] understanding of what's going on," a federal official steeped in welfare policy said. Queried about whether there are plans to better organize monitoring, the official replied: "I think the answer is, not really."

Mr. President, I think that is sort of an apt summary. We just do not right now have any coordination. We do not have anybody who is responsible for collecting the data to be able to tell us what is happening to these families.

Secretary Shalala gave a speech at the American Enterprise Institute on Friday, February 6. I will start out at the beginning of her speech. She said:

But we also have a moral obligation to keep making improvements in welfare reform, and in our social policies.

She is talking about how, now that we have had this law for a while, it is time to ask the questions and figure out where we need to go from here.

"Today, fewer than 4 percent of Americans are on welfare. What we don't know is precisely what is happening to all of these former welfare recipients." We know that some have married or moved in with family or friends. Others have left the rolls and are holding on to jobs that they were already going to—what is sometimes called the smoke out effect. But what's important is that many are looking for work—and finding it.

Many are looking for work and finding it. But the real issue is that we still do not know what is happening to these 4 million people who are no longer on the rolls.

I go on to quote from her speech:

States are working hard to enforce the mandatory work requirements in TANF. Sanctions were actually rising even before TANF. Still, most of the 33 states that were authorized by waivers to impose full-family sanctions rarely did so. Now, when sanctions are imposed, it's usually because recipients fail to show up for their initial appointments—not because they refuse to comply with work requirements.

Mr. President, I just want to make the point that one of the things that is happening—it is happening in my State of Minnesota—is a lot of people are basically getting cut off welfare because they are sanctioned. They do not show up for some of their initial appointments. But the question is whether they do not show up for their initial appointments because they do not want to work, or is it because they do not have transportation? Or is it because there is not adequate outreach?

Or it is because we are imposing a kind of stability in the lives of people who sometimes have to deal with crisis after crisis? Or is it because, with a lack of child care arrangements, they cannot be there?

I mean, we want to make sure that people are not just being eliminated from the rolls and then, not having any employment opportunities or having jobs that barely pay minimum wage, are worse off a year from now, and they no longer have any health care. I read from an editorial from the Minnesota Star Tribune entitled "Life After Welfare—States Must Ask the Right Questions." I just quote one relevant section.

The federal law requires states to submit lots of data on the number of clients who receive benefits and who find jobs, but it is almost silent on the issue of family well-being after clients leave welfare. As federal bureaucrats draft new reporting requirements, there's a danger that Washington and the governors will define "success" as merely cutting caseloads.

And this is the conclusion of the editorial:

It's worth remembering that Congress didn't tackle welfare reform because caseloads were rising—they were already falling by 1996. It wasn't because assistance costs were climbing—cash welfare to families has been stable at less than 2 percent of the federal budget since Richard Nixon was in office. It was because welfare was seen as a failed program that fostered other social pathologies: idleness, drug use, broken marriages and neglected children. Having blamed welfare for these problems, it seems only fair to find out whether welfare reform is solving them.

Again, what I am saying to my colleagues is that I think it is terribly important that at least we understand—and to ask the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide some reporting of data as to—what is happening around the country so that we have some understanding how many of these families have found work, how many of these families are reaching self-sufficiency. Or are matters worse off? What has happened to those parents? And what is happening to these children?

If it is, colleagues, the best-case scenario, I am all for it. If we pass this amendment and the Secretary provides us with some data, assuming she has the data—if she can't pull together data, then we have to figure out what we need to do in order to understand what is happening in the country—if she provides data that shows us that, as we look at this reduction of caseloads by 4 million, that many of these mothers and many of these children are better off, great.

But if, in fact, we find that people have been cut off but haven't found a job, or they find a job that barely pays minimum wage and there is not adequate child care and some of their children are in harm's way as a result of this legislation, then we need to know that as well. Certainly we can't just follow through on eliminating all assistance for all families until we under-

stand whether or not these families have reached economic self-sufficiency.

Mr. President, I quote from an article in the Philadelphia Inquirer on a recent study by Tufts University:

Despite numerous reports of welfare reform's early success, most states have enacted measures that hurt the families they're supposed to help, a national study at Tufts University pointed out that only 14 states have welfare policies that are likely to improve the economic conditions of poor families.

Let me read a hard-hitting statement by J. Larry Brown, who is director of the poverty center at Tufts University, which I concede has been controversial because they have issued reports over the years. They have been at this for decades, and they focus a lot on malnutrition, hunger and poverty, especially among children in America. Sometimes we don't like what they say because it is just unpleasant news. But I think their research is terribly important, and I will read from J. Larry Brown:

The evidence shows that as of now welfare reform is failing, and it is failing badly. The vast majority of states are not developing programs to improve the economic circumstances of the poor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an executive summary of the Tufts University study be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Tufts University Center on Hunger and Poverty, Feb. 1998]

ARE STATES IMPROVING THE LIVES OF POOR FAMILIES?—A SCALE MEASURE OF STATE WELFARE POLICIES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tufts Scale measures whether each state is making progress toward increasing the economic security of poor families under the newly "devolved" welfare system created by Congress in 1996. It also compares whether each state's progress toward this goal is better or worse than that of other states. Results of the study show that:

The majority of states have created welfare programs that ultimately will worsen the economic circumstances of the poor.

More than two-thirds of all states (35) have implemented state welfare policies that will make the economic situations of families worse than under the old welfare system.

Less than a third of all states (14) have implemented state welfare policies that are likely to improve poor families' economic conditions.

Overall, more states in the Northeast and Western region received positive scores on the Scale, indicating they have created state welfare programs that are more likely to help families achieve economic self-sufficiency, while more states in the South and Midwest received negative scores, indicating that their new welfare policies are likely to make self-sufficiency harder to achieve.

Of the fourteen states whose new welfare policies are likely to improve family economic well-being, seven (VT, RI, PA, NH, ME, CT and MA) are in the Northeast, four (OR, CA, WA, and UT) are in the West, two (IL and MN) in the Midwest, and one (TN) in the South.

Of the fourteen states whose new welfare policies are likely to worsen family eco-

nomics the most, seven (FL, NC, LA, MS, AL, GA and DC) are in the South, four (OH, IA, MO and KS) are in the Midwest, two (WY and ID) in the West, and one (NJ) in the Northeast.

Two states represent the extremes in measuring progress and failure to date:

Vermont, with a score of +12, is the state whose new welfare policies are most likely to improve the economic security of recipient families.

Idaho, with a score of -15.5, is the state whose new welfare policies are most likely to worsen the economic conditions of poor families.

The cornerstone of the newly decentralized national welfare system is the TANF Block Grant. Under TANF, states are given unprecedented flexibility to create and implement customized state welfare programs to help families become economically self-sufficient. Yet the Scale results show that the vast majority of states have adopted policies under their TANF Block Grants that are likely to worsen the economic security of poor families instead.

Forty-two states have adopted policies under their TANF Block Grants that are likely to worsen the economic security of poor families.

Eight states (VT, OR, NH, MA, WA, RI, ME, and CT) have implemented policies under their TANF Block Grants that are likely to improve poor families' economic security in comparison to the old welfare system.

Vermont received the highest score on the TANF section of the Scale (+7), indicating that it has implemented policies under its TANF Block Grant that are more likely than all other states to improve family economic security. Idaho received the lowest Scale score for TANF (-15.5), indicating that its TANF policies are more likely than those of any other state to worsen family economic security.

The Child Care and Development Fund was created under PRWORA to assist families in obtaining child care so that adults could engage in activities eventually leading to self-supporting employment. According to the Scale, all states except one have adopted child care policies which are likely to improve family economic security compared to their policies under prior law.

All states except Wyoming have implemented child care policies in their new state welfare programs that are likely to improve family economic security.

Six states (CA, MS, NE, PA, RI and VT) received the highest score on the child care part of the Scale.

The Tufts Scale was designed to provide early feedback to help evaluate the likely impact of state welfare program inputs on family economic well-being while the nation waits for longer-term measures of their outcomes. Each state's score provides a measure of whether that state is using its newly available flexibility to invest in the economic circumstances of poor families.

Concerns have been raised by some critics of the 1996 welfare reform law that ultimately it will further impede the economic viability of poor families. The data reported here suggest that these concerns may be well founded. While a few states have made choices which can improve the lives of poor families in their states, most are disinvesting in the poor.

COMPARING STATES' OVERALL TUFTS SCALE SCORES

Table 2 shows overall state scores ranked in descending order (highest to lowest). Recalling from Table 1 that the range of possible overall scores is -38 to +22, it is clear that no state did as little, or as much, as could have been done to change the impact of its welfare programs on the economic security of poor families with children. The

highest overall score of +12 points, received by VT, fell 10 points short of the maximum score. The lowest score of -15.5 points, received by ID, was also 22.5 points higher than the minimum.

TABLE 2.—OVERALL TUFTS SCALE SCORES WITH STATE RANKINGS

State	Rank	Score
VT	1	12.0
OR	2	7.5
RI	3	6.5
PA	4	4.5
NH	4	4.6
ME	4	4.5
CA	4	4.5
WA	8	4.0
CT	8	4.0
UT	10	2.5
IL	10	2.5
MN	12	2.0
MA	12	2.0
TN	14	1.5
NY	15	0.0
NE	15	0.0
VA	17	-0.5
TX	17	-0.5
MT	19	-1.0
DE	20	-1.5
NV	21	-2.0
HI	21	-2.0
CO	21	-2.0
AR	21	-2.0
AK	25	-2.5
NM	26	-3.0
ND	26	-3.0
MI	28	-3.5
MD	28	-3.5
WV	30	-4.0
WI	30	-4.0
SC	30	-4.0
AZ	30	-4.0
SD	34	-5.0
OK	34	-5.0
KY	34	-5.0
IN	34	-5.0
OH	38	-6.0
FL	38	-6.0
NC	40	-6.5
LA	40	-6.5
IA	40	-6.5
NJ	43	-7.0
MO	44	-8.0
MS	45	-9.0
AL	45	-9.0
GA	47	-9.5
DC	48	-10.0
KS	49	-11.0
WY	50	-12.0
ID	51	-15.5

Generally, states in the Southern region scored lower than states in the Northeast. Among the fourteen states receiving overall scores above zero, seven are in the Northeast region (VT, RI, PA, NH, ME, CT and MA), and four are in the Western region (OR, CA, WA and UT). Two states in the top fourteen are in the Midwestern region (IL and MN), and one (TN) is in the South. Of the fourteen states with lowest overall scores, seven are in the Southern region (FL, NC, LA, MS, AL, GA, and DC), four are in the Midwest (OH, IA, MO and KS), two in the West (WY and ID), and one in the Northeast (NJ).

During the 1996 policy debate over “devolving” welfare to the states, leaders in six states were particularly active in efforts to obtain greater state prerogatives. In the states of CA, MD, MI, NJ, OH, and WI, governors made welfare reform a major component of their policy agendas<sup>18</sup>. All of these states except one are doing worse than their peers in terms of promoting the economic security of recipient families. With one exception, all these states received scores at or below the median value of -3 points, while two (OH and NJ) scored among the worse in the nation. CA scored among the top fourteen states with an overall score of +4.5 points (though several of its newer policies were not implemented until after October 1997).

Overall, fourteen states created welfare programs demonstrating greater investment

in the economic security of poor families, while two states maintained the status quo under prior law. Thirty-five states (including DC) designed welfare programs which are likely to worsen the economic security of poor families.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me cite two other pieces of evidence to support this amendment and to explain to my colleagues why I have been out here from the word “go” trying to get us to go on record on this question.

This is a piece from the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. The title is “Few Leave Welfare Earning Above Poverty Level.” This is about a study of welfare recipients in Wisconsin.

Only about 1 in 6 families that left welfare in Milwaukee County in 1996 earned more than poverty-level wages. This is in Wisconsin, which has really put an all-out effort to invest in this reform.

Let me read again:

Only about 1 in 6 families that left welfare in Milwaukee County in 1996 earned more than poverty-level wages in a three-month period, according to the most conclusive examination yet of what is happening to local families under Wisconsin’s sweeping welfare initiatives.

It goes on to point out that “the turnover rate among those workers was extremely high—in part because the jobs were concentrated in industries that typically have plenty of part-time spots and a more transient work force.”

By the first quarter of 1997, welfare recipients had left most of the jobs for which they were hired the previous year.

So again, let’s just understand that this is a study that comes out based on what is happening in Milwaukee County in Wisconsin, saying one out of six families that left welfare earned more than poverty level wages—only one out of six. Moreover, a lot of the jobs are part-time jobs, jobs that people can’t count on, and a lot of people had to switch from one job to another.

Finally, Mr. President, an article that appeared in the Star Tribune in my State, “Parents Face Cuts In Welfare Checks.”

Hundreds of Minnesotan parents are in danger of having their welfare checks reduced starting March 1, the first wave of penalties meted out under the state’s new welfare law.

Interestingly, in Hennepin County about 50 percent of the parents converting to the new welfare system are showing up for orientation meetings at work; about 70 percent are showing up in Ramsey County.

A lot of these families are in crisis. Some don’t plan well—the bus can be late, they can’t work out arrangements for kids. The question is going to be whether or not we are going to basically be sanctioning people and cutting people off, even people who want to work.

Now, summarizing what this amendment says, we call on the Secretary of Health and Human Services to take a look at those families who have now been moved off welfare around the country and to provide us with some

data as to what the current situation is. The whole goal of this bill was to move families from “welfare” to “workfare,” to move families to economic self-sufficiency. That is what we said it was about.

I have said to colleagues today on the floor of the Senate that from articles that are now coming out, looking at what is happening around the country, we see some evidence that a lot of people who have been moved off welfare have not been able to obtain jobs that pay a decent wage, have not been able to obtain employment that gets a family anywhere close to 150 percent of poverty—out of poverty. I am saying to colleagues that Secretary Shalala, who has been very direct and honest herself, has said we need to know more about what is happening with these reform efforts.

I’m saying to colleagues today that there have been some pretty hard-hitting studies that have come out, the Tufts University study being one, which have said that actually it is pretty harsh what is happening around the country. I’m saying that as I travel around the country I have tried to spend time in low-income communities. I have tried to be with people. I have tried to understand what is happening. I don’t have all the empirical data, but I am just saying to colleagues what I have observed, and I think I have been honest in my observation. I have been in too many communities with long waiting lists for affordable child care for working poor, moderate income families, and now welfare. Therefore, a lot of these mothers go to work but there is not adequate child care for their children.

I don’t want to see, nor should any of my colleagues want to see, more children put in harm’s way because of action that we have taken. I am saying to colleagues that in too many inner-city communities and too many rural areas, people have said to me that the jobs aren’t there, nor is the transportation available to enable them to get to some of the jobs, that they would work, for themselves and their families.

I am saying to colleagues that you cannot argue that because there has been a reduction of 4 million recipients, that that represents reform if it hasn’t led to reduction in poverty. You can’t say something is working well if what is happening is that many of these families are economically worse off and many of these children are not better by what we have done.

I am saying to colleagues that I have heard enough speeches on the floor of the Senate about children. I have heard enough speeches about the very early years being very important for nurturing of a child, very important to fire up a child’s imagination. I am saying to colleagues that in a whole lot of cases these single parents—almost all women, even with children younger than 1—are being told they have to leave the home and take a job. We

<sup>18</sup>Norris, D.F., and L. Thompson, *The Politics of Welfare Reform*, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 1995.

don't know what is happening to those 1-year-olds, those 2-year-olds, the 3-year-olds and their 4-year-olds. It is our obligation to know what is happening to those children.

I am making a plea to my colleagues. This is, I say to Senator CHAFEE and Senator BAUCUS, a moderate PAUL WELLSTONE amendment. This is a moderate version. All this does is say, please, let's ask the Secretary of Health and Human Services to pull together some data and make reports to us every half a year as to how many of these families are reaching economic self-sufficiency so we have some understanding of what is going on in the country.

Before I yield the floor—and I am not prepared to yield the floor—might I ask the Senator from Missouri, because I don't want to keep him waiting long, but before yielding the floor, might I ask my colleague whether he is here to debate the amendment or intends to introduce another amendment.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am interested in knowing when I might have the floor. I have a brief statement on the measure.

I will have something to say about this, but I ask my colleague how long he intends to go on.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, if I understand my colleague from Missouri, if he has a statement on the overall legislation or something else aside from the amendment, then I want to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island as to whether or not this amendment will be accepted. If it will be accepted, then we can dispose of it and move on.

If the Senator from Missouri means he has another point of view and wants to speak on this amendment, I am glad to yield the floor and then come back and respond to some of his arguments. I am not quite sure what he has in mind.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator from Missouri is going to speak on the underlying bill. Is that correct?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am prepared to address the finance amendment that we reported out today and that will be brought up for debate, we hope, perhaps later today or tomorrow under the unanimous consent agreement. I wanted to speak briefly about that.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Might I ask the leader as to whether or not he has any additional information as to how he wants to proceed?

Mr. CHAFEE. What I suggest, Mr. President, is that the Senator from Missouri is not going to be very long. We will be in 45 minutes anyway, or more, before we recess. So I suggest if we could just let the Senator from Missouri go ahead, and then I have some comments I will direct to the Senator from Minnesota. That is my suggestion.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I don't want to keep my colleague from

Missouri waiting. It would be fine with me, I say to the Senator from Rhode Island. I await eagerly his response. I hope we can reach some agreement on this.

I do have more to say about this amendment, but I don't want to inconvenience my colleague from Missouri. I am pleased to relinquish the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has relinquished the floor.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I say in response to my colleague from Minnesota, be careful about relying on the Tufts study. The officials in charge of public assistance in my State and other States have pointed out some rather serious flaws in that study. We all share concerns about assuring there is adequate transportation, adequate day care, child care, for people moving from welfare to work, and I am not here to debate that amendment. At the appropriate time, we will review that amendment.

What I wanted to call to the attention of my colleagues is the fact that yesterday my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator CHAFEE, along with Senator BAUCUS, Senator GRAMM, Senator BYRD and the very distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, announced agreement on funding levels for the highway authorization for the next 6 years. It will be \$171 billion for highways.

Let me explain what that means for my State of Missouri. Under the formula that was passed out of the committee as a committee amendment today, Missouri would receive \$3.6 billion—that is billion dollars—compared to \$2.4 billion that Missouri received over the last 6 years of the 1991 transportation bill. Missouri's average allocation per year would be around \$600 million, as opposed to the \$400 million the State was receiving under the old.

That is tremendous progress. I am deeply indebted to the leadership of our committee and particularly to the budget chairman for making these dollars available. This is vitally important. Everybody in this Chamber knows how important funding for transportation is.

I was not a cosponsor of the Byrd-Gramm amendment, but I have always made clear and reiterated my support that highway money and transportation money should go for highways. In Missouri and across the country, when people go to the gas pump, buy gas and pay a tax, they think it is going to the highway trust fund. They think it is going for transportation purposes. And that is a reasonable assumption, except that in this body we have divorced the revenue from the spending stream and in the past we have had that money siphoned off to cover overspending elsewhere. In the 1993 major tax increase, a 4.3-cent tax was levied for deficit reduction.

Now, I believe that the transfer of the 4.3 cents back to the highway trust fund instead of deficit reduction has not only made a significantly increased amount of money available for transportation needs, but it has, I think, put the "trust" back into the highway trust funds. That is what we ought to be about; that is what we ought to be telling the people who are paying those taxes. We are recommitting ourselves to the basic principle and promise that we made, which is that when we provide the revenues to the Government under the dedicated gas tax money, we are going to use it for roads, bridges, highways and transportation when it's collected.

In Missouri, these funds are desperately needed. I daresay that I have heard stories from other States where they understand the importance of highway dollars. I came to the floor last week and explained that the debate over transportation funding and policy was not just an academic debate for Missourians. It is about, obviously, convenience and ease of transportation. It is about economic growth because, in our State, you can see where jobs occur. They occur where there are good highways. But most important, good highways and bridges are matters of life and death in Missouri. Highway fatalities in the State of Missouri increased 13 percent from 1992 to 1995, and many of us in Missouri know somebody or several people who have lost their lives on highways. And 77 percent of the fatal crashes during this timeframe occurred on two-lane roads.

Mr. President, it is a simple matter. When you have heavy traffic on two-lane roads, you have traffic delays, somebody gets anxious and pulls out to pass, and if there is a hill, if there is a curve, or if there is an unseen hidden spot in the road, a head-on crash occurs. That has happened too many times, and it happens because the two-lane roads that we are driving on are carrying traffic that everybody agrees should be carried on four-lane roads. This is why I say it is a matter of life and death.

In Missouri, 62 percent of the roads on the National Highway System, when you exclude the Interstate System, are two-lane roads—two-lane roads that are supposed to be part of our National Highway System. We are in the top 10, in terms of highway count, in the number of cars traveling those roads. Many of those National Highway System roads don't even have shoulders on them. So if somebody comes across the line and you are passing a large truck, if you move too far to the right, you are off on the shoulder, and that can be deadly.

In addition, my State of Missouri has the oldest—I repeat, the oldest—bridges in the country. There are a number of things that we like to be No. 1 in, but having the oldest bridges and some of the worst conditions in the country is not one of them. This is a dubious distinction. We are sixth from

the bottom in the condition of our bridges. These are the reasons that the highway funding formula and the transportation bill is so vitally important in my State. The potential funding that this bill provides is a huge step in the right direction to save lives on Missouri's highways, roads, and bridges. Last week, I told the story of driving across some of the bridges in our State where you can look down and see the water. That is not reassuring. They don't design them as "see-through" bridges. Years and years of decay have opened up gaping holes, which is a frightening prospect when you are crossing the Missouri River or the Mississippi River.

I urge my colleagues to work through the budget and the appropriations process to determine that we will make the real funding commitment and that we will meet that funding commitment that we put forward in this bill.

When I began this process, when I started work on it, I had two primary goals. One was for the transportation bill to increase the overall size of the pie for highways, and getting that 4.3 cents in is vitally important. Secondly, Missouri, as one of the donor States, needed to get its share up. I believe these two conditions are met.

You may recall last fall when filibusters held up the bill I crafted a bipartisan interim solution that enabled highway funding to continue through May 1 of this year, which means, as the distinguished occupant of the chair knows, we will be the bedeviled by those orange and white barrels this year. They will be springing up on our highways like the summer road flowers along the highways. They are going to be blossoming. I am pleased to be causing those headaches. But we need to continue the orange and white barrels; we need to continue that construction.

I know the funding debates are far from over. As I mentioned last Friday, there are reasonable people who have passionate differences, and there is nothing like a highway funding fight to bring out those differences. We hope that it is merely a matter of verbal debate. But when it comes to highway funding, these differences have been visible and audible. I want to express again my sincerest thanks to Senator CHAFEE, Senator BAUCUS, and Senator WARNER, for their leadership in working with committee members to avoid the "guerrilla warfare" that has been known to erupt on the highway bill in the past. I told the committee that I thought the leadership had achieved a rough system of justice that would make it possible for us to move this bill forward.

Nobody is going to get everything that they want, but I believe that reasonable compromises have been made, and there may still be more made. We need to get this bill moving. I look forward to working with the members of the committee and my other colleagues throughout this process to achieve the goals that we all have for

our States, that I have for my State of Missouri, but, most important, that we all must have for our national transportation policy.

Again, my thanks to the leadership and my congratulations for the great staff work. We look forward to working on it. It will be an interesting debate.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for those kind comments. We have worked closely together, and he has been a valuable member of the committee, not only on highway matters, but in other matters likewise. We look forward to his vigorous support as we move forward with this legislation.

Now, the Senator from Minnesota, I believe, has matters to discuss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me also associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. I think all of us owe a debt of gratitude to our colleagues, Senator CHAFEE and Senator BAUCUS, for their determination and doggedness in getting this bill on the floor. This is a very important piece of legislation, I think, for all of our States.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Rhode Island, in a moment or two, has some questions he wants to put to me. While I am waiting for that, let me just, for my colleagues' information, give the official poverty level income for a family of one woman and two children. It is \$12,516. And 150 percent is \$18,774.

This amendment, everybody should understand, doesn't dictate anything. It doesn't say that every family of three ought to be able to make that income of \$18,000. It doesn't mandate anything; it doesn't dictate anything. It simply says—look, I think people trust me, and I have traveled the country, and I am telling you that some of what is going on—I am not pointing the finger at any particular point, although it is uneven. It is harsher in some States than in others, but we do need to understand exactly what is going on, whether or not these families are able to find jobs and whether or not these are jobs with decent wages, and what is going on with their children. We need for the Secretary to kind of bring together some data and present reports to us so we have knowledge about this.

I see the majority leader on the floor. I would be happy to yield to the majority leader. Then if my colleague has questions he wants to put to me, I would be pleased to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding me this moment of time. It won't be long.

#### GOLDEN GAVEL AWARDED TO SENATOR PAT ROBERTS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, since the 1960s, the Senate has recognized those dedicated Members who preside over the Senate for 100 hours with the Golden Gavel Award. Today, we add to the list of Golden Gavel recipients the current Presiding Officer, Senator PAT ROBERTS of the great State of Kansas, whose presiding hours now total over 100 hours, effective as of today.

I want to say this, too: I have found that, as Presiding Officer, Senator ROBERTS is reliable and enthusiastic. He maintains order, sometimes running the majority leader from the floor of the Senate Chamber if he insists on talking when not properly recognized. He maintains order with a firm hand, but, most importantly, he is consistently willing to come to the Chamber and preside over the activities here in this Chamber. He is able to handle problems that arise in an appropriate way and without hesitation. So it is with sincere appreciation that I announce the newest recipient of the Golden Gavel Award, Senator PAT ROBERTS of Kansas.

I have already determined that when we have moments of really important legislation, and when rulings of the Chair are going to be necessary and need to be made rather quickly so we can complete the business of the day, we have a new suspect that can assume the position as Presiding Officer, Senator ROBERTS of Kansas. Thank you very much for the job you have done in helping us to preside and keep the Chamber in order.

[Applause.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer observes that under the Senate rules the Presiding Officer cannot participate in debate or comment from the dais. Should that rule not be in effect, the Presiding Officer would publicly state his thanks to the majority leader for the kind comments. But that is not permitted under the rules. The Presiding Officer is unclear about the majority leader's intent. Does the majority leader intend to introduce that in the form of a resolution, or does he intend that it be simply made part of the RECORD?

Mr. LOTT. I think it would be appropriate just to be made part of the RECORD. I appreciate the ruling of the Chair on this matter, which I did not ask a question about. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will add a half minute to what the majority leader said. I think one of the most important things that the Senator from Kansas does—and I mean this—is that, regardless of whether or not he is in agreement with you, he is looking at you. A lot of the times that doesn't happen. It means a lot when you have somebody presiding who has