As a former Governor, I sincerely doubt that the Governors who might like the welfare bill before us just the way it is—- which frees them from the obligation they have always had—would ever propose the same deal when they help communities in their States. Matching requirements, cost-sharing, burden-sharing, whatever you want to call it—this is a basic part of making sure that responsibility is spread around for government's functions.

The majority leader introduced some modifications to the Republican welfare package just before the recess, and one involves the claim that he added a ''maintenance-of-effort'' provision. It is very weak, too weak—we can and we must do better.

The majority leader's so-called compromise lasts for exactly 3 years, and asks States to put 75 percent of a portion of their AFDC spending in 1994 back into their future welfare reform system.

In fact, the Dole provision adds up to asking all states to invest $10 billion a year for just the first 3 years, with no basic matching requirements whatsoever for the last 2 years on this bill. This leaves a gaping hole in the state's share if compared to the current arrangement across the country. The result could be that $30 billion disappears from the safety net for families and children.

What is worse is the cleverness attempted in how a state's share is calculated. The Dole bill would allow states to ''count'' State spending on a whole bunch of programs simply mentioned in this bill—states would be able to get credit essentially for their spending on food stamps, SSI, and other programs that help low-income people toward meeting the requirement; that means that money for programs not specifically directed to financing basic welfare for children could easily count towards the so-called ''maintenance of effort.'' Again, this is an invitation to States to back out of keeping up their basic, historical responsibility for children.

Remember, it is the children who are two out of every three people who get basic welfare. It will be the children who will be hurt when states back out of their spending on welfare because Congress passed a bill that invites them to do just that.

Our amendment does not ask States to raise a penny more for welfare. Federal-state partnerships and matching arrangements are common sense—they promote accountability, and they are used to finance Medicaid, highways, clean water efforts, and education programs. And on this topic of welfare, here is a bill that now says Uncle Sam will write the billion dollar checks, but Governors can write all rules. If that means backing out of the States' responsibility for poor families and children, be our guest.

Right now, State revenues represent about 45 percent of the resources spent in America on welfare. If the Federal Government is about to send almost $17 billion a year to States in a block grant with tremendous flexibility, we should ask States to contribute their fair share. This is the way to promote fiscal accountability and responsibility.

Mr. President, we should simply correct this part of the bill with the BREAUX amendment—an amendment that requires States to maintain their historical responsibility for millions of children and families.

The stakes are high and serious. We know that when children are abandoned, the future of the rest of America is dimmed.

In other words, there are real consequences to rejecting this amendment. Without States maintaining this investment, there will not be enough money—not nearly enough—for child care for parents to move to work or for the job placement and training that some parents need to get into real jobs. A few years from now, we will be on this floor wondering how a bill packaged with such bold promises of change and reform resulted in so little—and perhaps we will be here trying to repair the damage of backing the country out of an honest, direct commitment to children.

The Breaux amendment calls for the preservation of a solid, honest Federal-State partnership for the long-term. We must change the welfare system and the rules. We are all ready to be tougher about who gets welfare. That means giving States much greater flexibility. But it is irresponsible to send checks to states accompanied with an invitation to back out of their own commitment to families and children.

Personally, I believe that taxpayers are willing to help feed and shelter the children who are not the ones to blame for their parents' unemployment or poverty. Surveys even show that 71 percent of Americans believe needy families should get benefits as long as they work. Time and time again, it is clear that work and responsibility are what the public cares about. They are not asking us to solve problems with slogans and gimmicks.

Real reform is what we should deliver. Let us be serious about welfare reform, let us be honest, and let us deal in the real world of America. We should make some necessary changes to the Dole bill to ensure that every parent who can work, does. We should keep needy children in our hearts, and keep compassion for them in this bill. And we should preserve the basic idea that states must do their part.

This should be a bipartisan amendment, and it deserves support. This is exactly when and where the political rhetoric should be put aside, and where the bill should be changed to continue into the future a true partnership between states and the Federal Government that will help determine what kind of country we will be.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, since there are no further Senators planning to offer their amendments tonight, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

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

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the skyrocketing Federal debt, now soaring toward $5 trillion, has been fueled for a generation now by bureaucratic hot air—and it is sort of like the weather—everybody talks about it but almost nobody did much about it until immediately after the elections in November 1994.

But when the new 104th Congress convened this past January, the U.S. House of Representatives quickly approved a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. On the Senate side, all but one of the 54 Republicans supported the balanced budget amendment—that was the good news.

The bad news was that only 13 Democrats supported it—which killed hopes for a balanced budget amendment for the time being. Since a two-thirds vote—67 Senators, if all Senator's are present—is necessary to approve a constitutional amendment, the proposed Senate amendment failed by one vote. There will be another vote either this year or in 1996.

Here is today's bad debt boxscore:

As of the close of business Tuesday, September 12, the federal debt—down to the penny—stood at exactly $4,964,465,905,748.40 or $18,845.20 for every man, woman, and child on a per capita basis.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, earlier this year, Congress overwhelmingly passed the Congressional Accountability Act which was signed into law by the President. The purpose of the act was to clarify that we cannot pass laws applying to the private sector that do not apply to us as well.

After many years of pursuing this legislative initiative, I was pleased with the final outcome of the act.

A concern has been raised that the welfare bill before us today is not clear on the issue of congressional coverage.

If the leader would indulge me, I would like to enter into a colloquy addressing this concern.

Mr. Leader, is it the intent of the legislation in section 453(a) of title 9, the child support enforcement title of the bill, to include Senators and Congressmen in the definition of ''any governmental entity''?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Are committees of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and joint committees included in