

And these cuts, as painful as they are in regard to our House committees—indeed, 9.5 percent when we include this cut over all of the committees, although we do cut the House Committee on Armed Services by a lesser amount, and we plus-up the House Ethics Committee, and we think that's very important.

It is so crucial that we bite the same bullet that everybody else has to bite. And this bloated spending, this runaway spending that occurred during the previous majority in this House has got to stop. Spending \$850 billion on a failed stimulus program, increasing the deficit—doubling it, in fact—having over \$1 trillion worth of deficit spending for now 4 years in a row when we anticipate the President's next budget, this has got to stop.

So we have to put our money where our mouth is, we have to walk the same walk as everybody else, and we have to tighten our belt. So, Madam Speaker, that's why I stand here today as a member of the Committee on House Administration and one of the subcommittee chairs in strongly endorsing and supporting these necessary, painful cuts in H. Res. 496. I hope we will have support on both sides of the aisle. I'm confident we will.

I respect, as I say, the ranking member. He's a great Member, he works in a bipartisan way, and that's what this is all about.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), a distinguished member of the House Administration Committee and the Rules Committee.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. This is an important resolution because it brings us back to the greatest cut since the 104th Congress.

You know, in tough times like today where the American people are pinching pennies to get by, shouldn't they have the same expectation of those that serve them in this great House? I believe they should.

You know, when talking to people in my district, they ask and say, what are you doing to get your house in order? By supporting this piece of legislation, this truly talks about cutting the spending in D.C. While it's a small amount comparative to the whole budget, it is the right step in the right direction. It is about doing more with less. The American people are doing that today. So why shouldn't this government do the same thing? I appreciate where the chairman, Mr. LUNGREN, has brought us in regards to this important piece of legislation. It really moves us in the right direction.

Cuts across the board are tough; and if you notice what this committee did is it didn't cover everybody the same, didn't treat everybody the same. Under Chairman LUNGREN's leadership, and

also the ranking member, they did it, I believe, in a bipartisan way, that didn't take away from the minority in regards to funding as it relates, nor differently than it did from the majority.

So, Madam Speaker, I strongly support this resolution as we move forward to cut the budget of committees in this House, just like the American people have had to cut their budgets in their house.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to close out the debate. I have no other speakers. So if the gentleman would finish his time, I would be happy to as well.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman again.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution, and I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I would just say that this is an effort on our part to give an example to the rest of the government. This will be a culmination of about a 10 percent cut overall to the committees of this House. We have had combined cuts in terms of our own MRAs, that is, the amount that each Member has for his budget. And I think as we go forward and having to make some very difficult decisions with respect to future controls of spending on the Federal establishment in its entirety, it will serve us well that we have shown the way, that we can make difficult decisions in this regard, and that this is an appropriate, responsible action to take.

With that, I would urge my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 496.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 496.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE 25TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the printing of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 90

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 235,500 copies of the document, of which 220,500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$114,849, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

(c) DISTRIBUTION.—The copies of the document printed for the use of the House and the Senate under subsection (a) shall be distributed in accordance with—

(1) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the House; and

(2) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Concurrent Resolution 90.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO PRINT STANDARDS FOR ELECTRONIC POSTING OF HOUSE AND COMMITTEE DOCUMENTS AND DATA

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Standards for the Electronic Posting of House and Committee Documents and Data, which were adopted by the Committee on House Administration on December 16, 2011, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the Standards for the Electronic Posting of House and Committee Documents and Data.

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

There was no objection.

WELFARE INTEGRITY NOW FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ACT OF 2011

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3567) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement policies to prevent assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program from being used in strip clubs, casinos, and liquor stores, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3567

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Welfare Integrity Now for Children and Families Act of 2011" or the "WIN for Children and Families Act".

SEC. 2. SPENDING POLICIES FOR ASSISTANCE UNDER STATE TANF PROGRAMS.

(a) STATE REQUIREMENT.—Section 408(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 608(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(12) STATE REQUIREMENT TO PREVENT UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING OF BENEFITS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A State to which a grant is made under section 403 shall maintain policies and practices as necessary to prevent assistance provided under the State program funded under this part from being used in any electronic benefit transfer transaction in—

"(i) any liquor store;

"(ii) any casino, gambling casino, or gaming establishment; or

"(iii) any retail establishment which provides adult-oriented entertainment in which performers disrobe or perform in an unclothed state for entertainment.

"(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

"(i) LIQUOR STORE.—The term 'liquor store' means any retail establishment which sells exclusively or primarily intoxicating liquor. Such term does not include a grocery store which sells both intoxicating liquor and groceries including staple foods (within the meaning of section 3(r) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(r))).

"(ii) CASINO, GAMBLING CASINO, OR GAMING ESTABLISHMENT.—The terms 'casino', 'gambling casino', and 'gaming establishment' do not include a grocery store which sells groceries including such staple foods and which also offers, or is located within the same building or complex as, casino, gambling, or gaming activities.

"(iii) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER TRANSACTION.—The term 'electronic benefit transfer transaction' means the use of a credit or debit card service, automated teller machine, point-of-sale terminal, or access to an online system for the withdrawal of funds or the processing of a payment for merchandise or a service."

(b) PENALTY.—Section 409(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)) is amended by

adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(16) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO ENFORCE SPENDING POLICIES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If, within 2 years after the date of the enactment of the WIN for Children and Families Act, any State has not reported to the Secretary on such State's implementation of the policies and practices required by section 408(a)(12), or the Secretary determines, based on the information provided in State reports, that any State has not implemented and maintained such policies and practices, the Secretary shall reduce, by an amount equal to 5 percent of the State family assistance grant, the grant payable to such State under section 403(a)(1) for—

"(i) the fiscal year immediately succeeding the year in which such 2-year period ends; and

"(ii) each succeeding fiscal year in which the State does not demonstrate that such State has implemented and maintained such policies and practices.

"(B) REDUCTION OF APPLICABLE PENALTY.—The Secretary may reduce the amount of the reduction required under subparagraph (A) based on the degree of noncompliance of the State.

"(C) STATE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR INDIVIDUAL VIOLATIONS.—Fraudulent activity by any individual in an attempt to circumvent the policies and practices required by section 408(a)(12) shall not trigger a State penalty under subparagraph (A)."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 409(c)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(c)(4)) is amended by striking "or (13)" and inserting "(13), or (16)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

□ 1340

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, in support of H.R. 3567, a bill to ensure taxpayer dollars in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program are used as intended, and that is to provide support for low-income families and children and to help them move from welfare to work.

The TANF program was created in 1996, replacing the prior welfare program with one focused on work, providing short-term help, child care, and other work supports to get people back on their feet and earning a paycheck. In the years following, TANF was lauded as one of the most effective reforms in our social welfare system in American history. Employment rates of those on welfare surged, caseloads

plummeted, child poverty rates fell, and taxpayers were confident they were actually helping poor families, knowing that they were providing them with a hand up and not a hand-out.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, an issue has arisen in TANF that is eroding public confidence in the program. This is the issue of TANF funds, money meant to help poor children and their families, being accessed and used in liquor stores, strip clubs, and casinos. What started less than 2 years ago as research by one reporter in Los Angeles has grown into dozens of investigations across the country, with each new investigation adding to the story of how millions of dollars in TANF funds have been accessed in these locations.

Let me just mention some of what has been uncovered:

An Arizona investigation found welfare funds were accessed in liquor stores over 100 times in just 3 months;

A California reporter uncovered that welfare recipients cashed out over \$4.8 million in TANF funds in casinos over a 3-year period;

A Colorado news organization found cash was being withdrawn in strip clubs, casinos, and liquor stores, despite a State law on the books prohibiting such transactions;

An investigative report in Georgia revealed \$150,000 in TANF money was withdrawn in liquor stores, bars, and nightclubs;

KING 5 News in Seattle found 13,000 TANF recipients who had collectively withdrawn approximately \$2 million from casinos in 2010.

Madam Speaker, this is unacceptable. This is unacceptable to the American people.

When the L.A. Times revealed their shocking statistics on the millions in welfare that had been accessed in casinos, liquor stores, and strip clubs, the Governor of California took action to block these transactions immediately. Washington and New Mexico have prohibited access to welfare benefits in casinos. Texas prohibits the use of welfare benefit cards in liquor stores and casinos as well.

The legislation before us today would ensure that taxpayer dollars in the TANF program are being used as intended, and that is to assist poor families with their basic needs and to support them in their efforts to become self-sufficient. Under this bill, States would be required to block welfare benefit card transactions in casinos, liquor stores, and strip clubs and would be penalized if they do not implement such policies within 2 years of this bill becoming law.

This bill will also help restore the public's trust in the integrity of the program while ensuring families across the country continue to receive the assistance they need to move from government dependence to independence.

The bill we're considering today simply consists of one of the TANF provisions in H.R. 3659, the Welfare Integrity and Data Improvement Act that