This is one of those issues in which there are some differences in priorities. It certainly is not that we want to see children starving. We could take all of the money in defense and in intelligence and spend it on other programs, and to many that would not be enough. And, certainly, we cannot do that.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about a balanced budget. This Congress passed, and it may have been over the objection of many who have spoken, a budget earlier in the year and we conform to that budget. We fit within it. We will take those reductions as they come.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we are substantially below where we were when this House passed this bill some months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on what the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] said. There is no Member of the House that has more of a concern, a very dedicated concern in the areas that she has those concerns in our foreign relations policies. I have stated on this floor as well that we should not, and we cannot, justify expending money in the intelligence budget on economic intelligence. I would have a very difficult time coming and suggesting that that is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, if there is information in the bigger national security issue that we would gain and glean from that, I think that is as well, as the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RCHARDSON] so ably pointed out, an area in which we can be very helpful to our own commerce. But it is not company-specific; it is not giving one company advantage over the other.

Mr. Speaker, it is not that just the agencies within the intelligence community are going out and searching for new roles in order to justify their existence. They are being asked to do these things.

The Vice President is very concerned about the role that intelligence can play, and past intelligence information that has come together, on the environment. And if there is information that we can get on the environment, and information we can get about economic intelligence and other areas, I think that is a very legitimate cause. I think it would be very difficult to justify expenditures solely for those purposes. They are not the major priority and role of the intelligence community. They are an offshoot. The country is better served by it. And as long as it does not infringe upon or become more significant or important than that dealing with national security and the intelligence community, I will continue as well to support it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington only had 1½ minutes remaining. Does the gentleman need additional time?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, no. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 319, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 319

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, of course, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 319 waives points of order against the conference report accompanying H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1995; that is, the Welfare Reform Act, and against its consideration. The resolution provides, further, that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is a traditional rule for conference reports and I know of no controversy about the rule. It was voted out of the Committee on Rules last night around midnight by a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, today this rule will allow the House to vote on legislation which literally overhauls the Nation's dilapidated and failed welfare system. When I opened the debate on this measure back on March 21 of 1995, many months ago, I suggested then that the American people should measure welfare reform proposals based on how they would affect the status quo. That is what this debate is all about here today: the status quo. Do we want the status quo? Has it worked, or do we want to change it?

Mr. Speaker, most everyone in this country agrees the current system has failed. It has failed our families. It has failed our children. And they also agree it has not been for a lack of spending.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 35 years, taxpayers have spent $5.4 trillion in Federal and State spending on welfare programs. This welfare reform bill honestly and compassionately addresses the key problems of poverty in America, and that is illegitimate births, welfare dependency, child support enforcement, and putting low-income people back to work. That is one of the basics of this legislation, putting welfare people back to work; giving them the work ethic that literally is what built this great country of ours over all the years.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this legislation encourage responsibility and work among single mothers that are the vast majority of welfare recipients, and that is the saddest thing in the world, but this bill contains tough measures to crack down on these deadbeat fathers who have deserted their families.

The conference agreement before us today establishes uniform State tracking procedures for those who owe child support and refuse to pay it. It promotes automated child support procedures in every State of this Union; contains strong measures to ensure rigorous child support collection services; and, according to the testimony in the Committee on Rules last night by the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], the child support title of their conference agreement enjoys broad bipartisan support in this Congress and, incidentally, in the Clinton administration as well, which is why this President ought to sign this bill.

Mr. Speaker, on this particular title of the bill, I would like to relate a conversation I had recently with a constituent of mine to emphasize its importance. A member of my district office staff informed me that she had received a call from a woman who explained, in between sobs, she was literally crying, that she desperately needed to speak with me.

Mr. Speaker, I have been tied up down here for several weeks and have not been able to get home. But when I went back to my office late that night, I reached my constituent by telephone and she explained to me that she was holding down two jobs to support an 8-year-old son who had a learning disability. She told me public schools do not provide her son with adequate attention to that particular disability and he needed the care of a special tutor, but, she said, that her two small salaries that she has worked at, and she has never taken 1 day or taken 1