

young girls at the hands of the Boko Haram terrorists.

It has been 90 days since their taking from their school, their families, off to conditions unimaginable. So I once again rise and urge the Nigerian Government to do everything possible to negotiate the return of these beautiful children of humanity.

We have not forgotten. We will not forget. Bring the girls home.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5016, and that I may include tabular materials on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1237

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. LUCAS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 15, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. STIVERS. Chairman CRENSHAW, I rise today to address a proposed amendment I was going to offer related to the Securities and Exchange Commission's Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative, or the MCDC. This is a program that was announced by the Securities and Exchange Commission in March, which is related to the issuance of municipal securities.

Under the MCDC, the SEC is asking municipal bond issuers and underwriters to self-report potential technical inconsistencies associated with the financial information recording practices of State and local governments.

On its face, this seems to be reasonable. However, the States and localities that the SEC is trying to protect do not support this program and feel it is very punitive.

In fact, the Government Finance Officers Association, or GFOA, which represents the Nation's State and local government finance directors, supports my proposed amendment because the MCDC initiative is both costly and unreliable for government issuers, taxpayers, and underwriters. In addition, the proposal changed rules midstream, applying one standard when the regulators' reporting apparatus was not even operable.

I appreciate the chairman's time and his willingness to agree to work with me and the Financial Services Committee to find a resolution to this problem should the SEC not choose to curtail this program on their own. We want to make sure it is fair and equitable to our States and local municipalities.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this initiative to my attention.

As he said, the SEC recently announced that issuers and underwriters of municipal securities are required to self-report violations of the Federal securities laws relating to representations and bond offerings. I understand the gentleman's concern that this is a massive undertaking, and to identify all the series of bonds sold and to make sure that all disclosures are made accurately and timely is a huge undertaking.

So I look forward to working with you regarding your concerns and to find some solutions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be al-

ternate fuel vehicles—such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel—by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Financial Services Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

This amendment has been supported by the majority and minority on appropriations bills eight times over the past few years, and I hope it will receive similar support today.

Our transportation sector is, by far, the biggest reason we send \$600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them.

If they can do this in Brazil, then we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide what is best for them.

And let me say, my amendment, co-sponsored by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), would demand and mandate that all cars produced in America be flex fuel cars. It would cost less than \$100 per car to do that. And we are foolish, in my opinion, not to do that as well.

But here in the Federal fleet, expanding the role that energy resources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil market.

So I would ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with Mr. WENSTRUP from Ohio, and I yield to him.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The IRS has admitted to paying politics with our Tax Code, going as far as singling out certain groups for having “patriot” in their name. Unfortunately, much of the targeting that occurred happened in my district’s backyard, in the IRS field office in Cincinnati. Americans have the right to be outraged, and they deserve better.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for ensuring that free speech rights are protected in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wrote to you in April asking that we prohibit funding to implement proposed rules on 501(c)(4) organizations, and my constituents are appreciative that you acted. By prohibiting funding for certain IRS activities, this bill would prevent these IRS abuses from becoming law. Importantly, this bill is designed to make sure the government works for its citizens, not against them.

While the House continues its efforts to get to the bottom of the IRS political targeting, this is a meaningful action we can take now to make sure the behavior isn’t repeated. Every American has the right to participate and engage in civic debate and must be protected from partisan bureaucrats.

IRS targeting isn’t just an affront to the Constitution, but a threat to all Americans seeking to exercise their First Amendment rights. I thank the chairman and his committee again for their diligent work on this bill.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I share his outrage over the Internal Revenue Service giving extra scrutiny to certain 501(c)(4) groups based on their political ideology.

This bill includes numerous, but necessary, provisions in response to their numerous inappropriate activities. These activities must not be tolerated, and voting for this bill will go a long way toward making Congress’ and the public’s displeasure felt.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) designate any nonbank financial company as “too big to fail”;

(2) designate any nonbank financial company as a “systemically important financial institution”; or

(3) make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of such company, could pose a

threat to the financial stability of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in an attempt to prevent government regulators from expanding the corrupt doctrine of “too big to fail” into even greater parts of our economy. You see, under Dodd-Frank, FSOC, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, has the power to designate companies as SIFIs, systemically important financial institutions.

I have heard people say that SIFI status does not mean too big to fail, but that is a ridiculous claim—on par with the reassurances we used to get that there was no implicit guarantee with Fannie and Freddie, the GSEs.

In the real world, everyone knows that the Federal Government will never allow a SIFI to fail. It is basically the government’s stamp of approval, if you will, that says that we really care about this company. And every time FSOC designates a SIFI, it exposes all of us, the American taxpayers, to literally billions and billions of dollars in potential losses.

You see, first FSOC designates the megabanks as being too-big-to-fail SIFIs. Now they are claiming that nonbank firms such as insurance companies and asset managers also should be designated as SIFIs, as well. I really don’t think that FSOC will be satisfied until every company in this country is a SIFI. So, obviously, this has got to stop.

That is why I am offering an amendment to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury and the chair of the Securities Exchange Commission, both voting members of FSOC, from designating any additional nonbank companies as SIFIs. You see, SIFI status puts nonbank companies under Federal Reserve regulation. And then the Fed, which only understands banks, imposes its bank-type capital standards on them, and it doesn’t really seem to care if that makes no sense at all for these companies. I guess basically if all you have is a hammer, then everything else out there looks like a nail.

And so when companies become SIFIs, they cease to be part of the free market. Instead, they become something else. They become protected entities that are spared the costs and consequences that normal companies face. And, so, over time, the combination of this protected status and the Fed’s risk-averse regulation will sap the energy and also the competitiveness from these companies.

Do you know what? Creative thinking and management will be seen as too radical, and innovative business structures will be stamped out as too risky. Meeting some G-13’s definition of “safety” will take the place of building shareholder value. Instead, lobbying and political donations will become the biggest, highest, and best use of capital for these companies. And government will corrupt the private sector and, in turn, it will corrupt government.

You only have to look at the corporate culture over at Fannie Mae to see what sheltering a company from market discipline does to it. What do I mean by that? If you like the GSEs, then you are going to love SIFIs. And so we should not allow too big to fail to take root in the nonbank financial sector. These companies are too important as a counterbalance to the megabanks for us to ruin them with crony capitalism.

You see, Dodd-Frank was based on a faulty premise, and this is it: that the financial crisis was caused exclusively by the greed of large financial institutions and that intrusive government regulation could have prevented all this and prevented the crisis by keeping them from making all these risky investments.

So with these ideological blinders on, it is no surprise that we ended up today with FSOC and SIFIs. Instead of solving the problem of too big to fail, Dodd-Frank basically codified it.

FSOC is not working out as intended. And with every reckless designation of a nonbank company as a SIFI, FSOC steps in and makes our economy more dangerous and makes it more unstable. As they say, if you find yourself in a hole, you should do what? Stop digging.

So I respectfully request that you support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, Dodd-Frank does not designate any entity as too big to fail, as paragraph 1 of the Garrett amendment suggests. Instead, Dodd-Frank provides regulators with the tools to address the risks posed by large, complex, and interconnected financial institutions, both banks and nonbanks alike. This is crucial to addressing one of the main regulatory gaps we witnessed leading up to the 2008 crisis: too many nonbanks were in the shadows and escaped critical regulation that could have prevented the crisis.

The Garrett amendment is an attempt to roll back the critical rules of the road we passed in the wake of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Large financial institutions are fighting the SIFI designation because they know that being identified as SIFI

means being subject to regulation above and beyond current requirements, including living wills that will help regulators plan how to wind down the firms in an orderly fashion in the event they become insolvent.

The heightened regulation also includes the ability for regulators to stress-test the entity to see if it can withstand financial distress, demand more capital, or to demand more stringent reporting.

Former FDIC Chairman Sheila Bair, a Republican appointee, noted in congressional testimony after the passage of Dodd-Frank that “many institutions are vigorously lobbying against such a designation” and that being designated as a SIFI will in no way confer a competitive advantage by anointing an institution as too big to fail.

The capacity to designate nonbanks as SIFIs is critical to the U.S. financial system for appropriate regulatory oversight. The designation process already has in place multiple procedural safeguards and opportunities for appeal via a lengthy process. Therefore, we urge you to oppose the Garrett amendment as not necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, obviously the markets have already disagreed with the gentleman by the pricing of their shares.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment points out that you have got to have a thorough review, and if you don't consider the true implications on the U.S. economy and the U.S. taxpayers, then you have got a problem. So it is a good amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce Revenue Ruling 2012-18 (or any guidance of the same substance).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. As the Chair knows, I find several of the Federal agencies very frustrating, but among the most frustrating is the Internal Revenue Service.

One of the more interesting rulings of the Internal Revenue Service deals with the reclassification of certain gratuities as wages when they were meant to be tips. And having grown up in the restaurant business, I will tell you that there is a tremendous difference—not only to the employer, but to the employee—as to whether a wage is classified as a wage or whether it is classified as a gratuity. I know that firsthand from growing up in a family-run and local restaurant.

Revenue rule 2012-18 has forced businesses to change the way that they have traditionally handled consumer checks, and that has resulted in a burdensome and logistical challenge for small and local businesses across the country.

Mr. Chairman, for over 50 years, restaurants have had a longstanding practice of treating these automatic gratuities as tips. For example, if you have a large party of 50 people, then you want to make sure that your waiter or waitress is well taken care of. And for a while there it was 15 percent, now it is about 18 percent, that is added on as a gratuity. That gratuity is meant to go to the waiters and waitresses who have helped your party.

Yet, the way the IRS would treat that, the IRS would treat that not as a tip, not as a gratuity, but as part of their wage, which means it is counted against the employer for income purposes, and then it is counted again against the employee for income purposes. The revenue ruling clearly, clearly, clearly is against years and years and years of practice by the IRS.

Now, a lot of bigger restaurants may have the ability to forgo the automatic gratuities without experiencing any significant challenges, but for small and local restaurants, that is a big deal. Wait staff are often subject to inadequate tips on large parties. And if restaurants continue to utilize automatic gratuities, if they continue to say, please put an additional 15 percent on here for your waiter or waitress, then they can no longer take advantage of the Fair Labor Standards Act tip credit for employees who serve these tables, even if the restaurants distribute these gratuities to the employees. So even if the employee gets the money in the end, it is still counted against the restaurant as income and taxed in one place, and then it is again taxed as income to the employee.

For many small businesses, an inability to collect this tip is a really big burden. It is very difficult to determine wages for employees when they are si-

multaneously performing tipped and non-tipped work because you cannot add that gratuity for large parties without it being classified in one direction, but for smaller parties you can do a different thing.

Restaurants have treated automatic gratuities as tips for years, and they have been passed on to the employee. That is very important to the employees. It is a big part of the money that they make. And so as the champion of small and local businesses, I have very real concerns about the implications of the revenue rule 2012-18. I would like the IRS to delay it and reconsider their characterization of these tips and service charges.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me to step forward and raise my concerns, as well as the ranking member. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much for the opportunity.

At this point, because of the point of order, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including amounts made available under titles IV or VIII, may be used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to enforce any provision of the Firearms Registration Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Law 1-388), the Firearms Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19-170), or the Administrative Disposition for Weapons Offenses Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19-295).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would stop the District of Columbia from taking any action to prevent law-abiding citizens from possessing, using, or transporting a firearm.

Despite the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller* that struck down the D.C. handgun ban, as well as the unconstitutional gunlock provision, it is still difficult for D.C. residents to exercise their God-given right to bear arms.

Congress has the authority to legislate in this area pursuant to article I, section 8, clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the authority to “exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever” over the District of Columbia.

Through unreasonable regulation, arbitrary time limits and waiting periods, and a ridiculous registration renewal process for guns that have already been registered, the government bureaucrats in the District continue to interfere with the D.C. residents' rights to self-defense.

As The Washington Times reported earlier this year, the District of Columbia has passed the first law ever in the United States that requires a citizen who has already legally registered a gun to pay a fee for re-registration, go to police headquarters, and submit to invasive fingerprinting and photographing.

This is pure harassment. Why would the D.C. government want to punish and harass law-abiding citizens who simply want to defend themselves?

As everyone with even the smallest bit of common sense knows, criminals, by definition, do not follow the law. They will get guns any way they can. Does anyone actually believe that strict gun controls laws will prevent criminals from getting guns?

Strict gun control laws do nothing but prevent good people from being able to protect themselves and their families in the event of a robbery, home invasion, or other crime.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. It is amazing. Like President Reagan once said to President Carter in debate, here you go again.

I rise to oppose the amendment. We often hear people running for office rail against politicians who have gone Washington. This amendment is an interesting representation of that phenomenon. We are part of a group of folks here who would like to treat Washington, D.C., as their own little colony. Back home, they tell the world they want no part of Washington, but over here, they not only want part of it, they want to tell her how to act.

This amendment would limit commonsense gun regulation put in place by the elected representatives of the District of Columbia. Under our Constitution, States and localities, including D.C., have the ability to protect the health, safety, and welfare of their citizens.

Even the Supreme Court has recognized that some level of regulation is necessary in order to uphold those goals. The Republican Party usually stands for states' rights, but not when it comes to the District of Columbia.

Our former colleague, the great David Obey, used to say that if Members of Congress wanted to get involved in the District of Columbia's affairs, then perhaps they should run for the D.C. City Council. That may be an option that the gentleman from Kentucky would like to consider.

I strongly oppose the amendment. I think it continues to be more than just

a gun amendment. It is an anti-D.C. amendment, and we should stop this behavior once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. As John Lott, author of "More Guns, Less Crime," says:

The District of Columbia should have learned the problems with gun control the hard way. There is only 1 year after D.C.'s handgun ban went into effect in 1977 where its murder rate was as low as it was prior to the ban. The D.C. murder rate rose dramatically, relative to other cities after the ban, with its murder rate ranking either number one or number two among the 50 most populous U.S. cities for half the time the ban was in effect and always in the top two-thirds.

However, as soon as the ban and, more importantly, the gunlock regulations were struck down in 2008, the murder rate fell, dropping by 50 percent over the next 4 years. Indeed, every place in the world that has banned guns has seen an increase in murder rates.

This experience can be seen worldwide. Island nations supposedly present ideal environments for gun control because it is relatively easy for them to control their borders, but countries such as Great Britain, Ireland, and Jamaica have experienced large increases in murder and violent crime after gun bans.

For example, after handguns were banned in 1997, the number of deaths and injuries from gun crimes in England and Wales increased 340 percent in the 7 years from 1998 to 2005.

Mr. Chair, I would like to point out that the other side of the aisle, when we talk about voting rights, they are very opposed to voter ID and to photograph IDs for voting. I think they would be very opposed to fingerprinting and photographing in order to exercise that basic fundamental right to vote, which is what they often say.

Well, I would remind them that the Second Amendment says a right to bear arms is a basic right. If they argue that fingerprinting and photographing is invasive and disproportionately disenfranchises minorities from that basic right to vote, how can they not argue the same thing about the basic right to own and bear guns?

In closing, my amendment states that none of the funds made available in this bill to the District of Columbia will be used by the D.C. government to prohibit the activity of people in possessing, acquiring, using, selling, or transporting firearms.

It defunds four laws passed in the wake of Heller that constitute an attempt by the D.C. government to overrule and ignore the Heller decision. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. I would like to first say that we only oppose certain regulations about voting issues when they are meant to suppress the vote.

I would like now to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) who—get this—is the only elected Member from Washington, D.C., who is in this Congress at this time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky is not accountable to the residents of the District of Columbia, but he is offering an amendment to effectively wipe out all of the District's gun safety laws now and in the future.

Even if one were to agree with him, his is an entirely inappropriate amendment on an appropriation bill. A pending bill right now in this House would accomplish this end. He is a Member of the majority. If he wants to end gun laws, he has the authority to bring that bill to the floor.

This amendment is being offered by a Member who claims, at every turn, to support the principle of local control or local affairs, yet he is using the big foot of the Federal Government to overturn local laws.

Turning to the amendment itself, if this amendment passes, every gun law in this big city—which shares the same gun violence issues with other big cities and is also the Nation's capital—would be gone.

While we are still reviewing the full effects of this amendment, it appears to prohibit the District government, including the Metropolitan Police Department, from enforcing almost all of the gun laws of the District of Columbia, making the District perhaps the most permissive gun jurisdiction in the country.

The D.C. government would not be able to stop a person from carrying, openly or concealed, an assault weapon, including a .50-caliber sniper rifle with a magazine holding an unlimited number of bullets on any street and in any building except, of course, Federal buildings, like the one where we now stand.

You want to buy a gun in a private transaction without undergoing a background check? The D.C. government couldn't stop you if this bill passed. Angry, want to buy a gun right now with no waiting period? The D.C. government couldn't stop you.

Want to buy 100 handguns today? The D.C. government couldn't stop you. Want to carry a gun in a D.C. government building, including a polling place or the DMV? The D.C. government couldn't stop you. Convicted of a violent misdemeanor this week and want to buy and carry a gun? The D.C. government couldn't stop you.

Every single Federal court that has ruled on the constitutionality of the District's post-Heller gun laws has upheld them. They have upheld our assault weapons ban, upheld our ban on large capacity ammunition-loading devices, and upheld our registration requirements.

The Supreme Court only struck down D.C.'s effective gun ban law, holding only that a resident is entitled to have a gun in his home only. This bill goes well beyond the Supreme Court. It is a flagrant abuse of democracy by a Member who comes here with Tea Party principles that says power should be devolved to the local level.

He is playing with the lives of American citizens who are not accountable to him, who live in my city, and he is playing with the lives of the Federal officials and visitors from across the country who we are charged to defend and protect while they are in our city.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses", and increasing the amount made available for "The White House—Salaries and Expenses", by \$2.13.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, based on the debates and discussions we have had in this Chamber, I have come to the conclusion that my friends on the other side of the aisle believe that \$7.25 is enough to raise a family on in America. That is the current Federal minimum wage.

Since we haven't had any ability to change it, to move it up, I assume that they assume that it is good enough for people, but I can't imagine that they think \$2.13 is enough, but that is the Federal minimum wage for tip workers in America today. That is the Federal minimum wage for tip workers, and it is an appalling condition, and it should be an outrage for all of us.

Mr. Chairman, 3.3 million Americans are trying to make it on \$2.13 an hour, plus tips; and 75 percent of those, Mr. Chairman, are women.

□ 1315

What does it translate to? What does it all mean? It means that millions of

Americans go to work every day and are forced to interview every time they serve a customer for their money. Every time they meet a new customer and take an order, they have to do a tryout or an interview to see if they are going to get paid. It is wrong, and we shouldn't tolerate it in this society. Tip workers are twice as likely as other workers to fall below the poverty line and three times as likely to rely on food stamps to close the gap between what they are paid and what they have to survive on.

Mr. Chairman, the companies that pay them these tip wages in many cases are relying on us, the Federal Government, through the food stamp program, to make up the wages that they will not pay. At least we should make them pay their own freight for their own workers. People don't want to go to food stamps, but they need to, and the Federal Government helps them by setting food stamps.

What if the employers themselves were required to pay a better wage? Tip workers are likely to experience wage theft. From 2010 to 2012, the Department of Labor conducted investigations of full-service restaurants and found violations in nearly all, including tip violations. A tip violation might be when an employer refuses to "top up" the pay to ensure that they are getting at least \$7.25 when tips are low. Tip violations could also include making employees do work that doesn't earn tips, like cleaning or cooking, but still paying them \$2.13 an hour. It happens, and it shouldn't happen.

If we lifted the minimum wage to \$10.10 for all tip workers, 700,000 tip workers would be lifted out of poverty—half of whom would be people of color—and \$12.7 billion in more wages would be pumped into the economy.

Mr. Chair, in February, President Obama signed an executive order requiring Federal contractors, including those with contracts to provide concessions like restaurants, to pay \$10.10.

No one who works full-time should have to live in poverty. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I urge all Members of this body to at least demand that we don't have to make up wages that are not paid in the form of government supports.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think when you look at the amendment, the gentleman wants to take money away from the Supreme Court and give money to the White House. What he had to say didn't seem to bear any relevance to what the amendment said. It was entertaining talk. I know he is free to offer any amendment he wants to offer. He could come down and do a 1-minute and talk about what he just talked about, and he could do a 5-

minute Special Order and talk about what he talked about.

I am not sure that the amendment that he offered is serious in the sense of why he is tampering with Supreme Court funding and tampering with White House funding. I just would urge my colleagues to say we enjoyed the chat. I appreciate him bringing that to our attention.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROKITA

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, make, finalize, or implement any rule, regulation, interpretive rule, or general statement of policy issued after the date of enactment of this Act, that is issued pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to rules, regulations, interpretive rules, or general statement of policy excepted under section 553(a) of title 5, United States Code, or that are made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing under sections 556 or 557 of such title.

Mr. ROKITA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I understand my amendment is subject to a point of order due to scoring or budget concerns. While I intend to cooperate and withdraw this amendment, I would like to acknowledge that this body has a history of waiving points of order on similar legislation that would result in substantive regulatory reforms, which is exactly what my amendment could accomplish.

One specific example would be the REINS Act, of which I am a cosponsor, passed in this Congress and passed in the last Congress, which would very meaningfully overhaul our rulemaking system, much like this amendment would. Prior to the passage of that bill, we rightfully waived all points of order, including one being applied

against my amendment here this afternoon, presumably.

Mr. Chairman, I would propose that this body should wave points of order on legislation that would significantly and positively reform our regulatory process so that we can significantly help our economy by getting the boots of the regulatory and bureaucratic systems off the necks of those who create jobs in this country.

For too long, the executive branch has continued to build its power through expanding the regulatory state. The agencies that we in Congress have tasked with the execution of the laws we now pass is in contravention of our intent, acting improperly as legislative bodies, with no really direct accountability to the voter.

Whether through “interpretive rules,” “general statements of policy,” or through regulations themselves, administrative agencies have placed extreme burdens on all Americans without the transparency or electoral accountability that our Founders envisioned.

Today, that process has yielded nearly 175,000 pages of regulations, growing by roughly 1,500 pages per week, written by unelected people who rarely consider the impact on our economy or the lives of the people the rules impact. In fact, the only thing growing faster around here, Mr. Chairman, is our public debt load. This has been a decades-long abdication of duty by Congresses past, and we must correct it.

Currently, informal rulemaking is the method of choice for proposing rules and regulations around here and simply requires: one, publication of a rule; two, an opportunity for public comment, but has no requirement to give weight to those comments from the public. In fact, any time I have questioned an agency witness during my 3½ years here, not one has been able to answer one simple question, and that is: What weight do you give public comments during the rulemaking process? What formula do you use? They can't answer the question because the answer is this: they don't care; it doesn't matter. What everyone wants or what the comment may be, if it stands in the way of the agenda of the rule, it gets no weight.

So I am offering this amendment today to require all new rules and regulations to follow the formal rulemaking process which is already in law—it is in the Administrative Procedure Act—while leaving in place existing emergency exceptions to the rulemaking process, fully recognizing, though, that we have to address the definition of “emergency” at some point as well.

Several reforms passed by this House go a long way in providing relief to the end of the regulatory process—at least to improving it. My amendment provides relief at the beginning of the rulemaking process, slows the regulatory state, and increases transparency of this increasingly opaque and secret bureaucracy.

Formal rulemaking requires a trial-like procedure, requiring parties to make their case for or against a rule in public. As a result, the administration, no matter the party, must prove the worth of their rules and regulations on the Record rather than relying on a closed-door balancing of public comments. Again, there is a record made, so we know—just like all of America knows from the proceedings on the floor of this House, we know the reasons for the final makeup of the rule; and, if need be, we can further challenge the rule.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is consistent with the intent of the 79th Congress, which created this law for the agency rulemaking process. In the Judiciary Committee report of the law, the committee stated that:

Matters of great import, or those where the public submission of facts will be either useful to the agency or a protection to the public, should naturally be accorded more elaborate public procedures.

The formal rulemaking process, Mr. Chairman, does that. So while, Mr. Chairman, I think that, in order to protect the public and the Republic, the rampant regulatory state must be stopped and agencies must afford the public weighted input and transparency during rulemaking.

Out of respect for the chair and its appropriations process, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for “Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses”, and increasing the amount made available for “The White House—Salaries and Expenses”, by \$7.25.

Mr. CROWLEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment—and I say this in anticipation and hope that the Chair and the gentleman from Florida doesn't think I am tampering. Tampering has a very negative connotation to it. What I would like to think we are doing is leg-

islating today, and I would hope that it is taken in that light.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would decrease part of the bill before us by \$7.25 and increase the budget of the White House by that same amount.

Why would I offer this amendment? It is such a small amount of money after all—\$7.25. But just ask the millions of Americans who make only \$7.25 an hour, otherwise known as the current minimum wage.

What can the executive branch do with this money? They can buy pens, Mr. Chairman. They can buy pens that the President could use to keep signing executive orders focused on raising the wages of hardworking Americans.

Last February, in light of no action from this Republic-controlled Congress, the President took the small but legal step of raising the minimum wage of employees working on Federal contracting projects, such as fast-food employees in Federal buildings and on our military bases.

What has become crystal clear is that the Republican majority has no intention of putting forward an agenda focused on lifting hardworking Americans out of poverty. They have no intention of putting forward a jobs agenda. They have no intention of helping to foster economic growth in our country, but this administration wants to. And where Congress has failed, the administration has not faltered.

Today, let's give \$7.25 to the President so he can keep up that necessary work. If Republicans would join us in raising the minimum wage and lifting up American workers instead of putting language in this bill to forbid the President from trying to raise the wages of hardworking Americans, we wouldn't have this conversation today.

That is right. Apparently it is not enough for Republicans to refuse to bring legislation for a vote that would raise the minimum wage; now they are also trying to stop the President from taking the small steps that he can do to raise the wages of Federal contractors, like those in the fast-food industry.

They added sections 203 and 204 to this bill to specifically prohibit an executive order to do just that. I mean, come on, give us a break. Not only won't they allow a vote on the minimum wage, but now they want to tie the President's hands so that he can't help advance the issue either when they won't.

Why are they fighting so hard against supporting working people in American families? No one working full-time should live in poverty. At \$7.25 an hour, that is the reality facing 16.5 million Americans.

So, when you hear that Congress is debating another huge spending bill, I want America to know that the Republican majority has snuck in language into this bill that actually prevents working people from getting a raise in their hourly pay. Democrats have a bill to raise the minimum wage and it is

ready to go, but Republicans in Congress refuse to allow a simple up or down vote on that bill.

What would happen if the Congress raised the minimum wage for every American from \$7.25 an hour to \$10.10 an hour? 16.5 million American workers would see a raise, not just the 2 million workers on Federal contracts.

□ 1330

We would experience a boost to the economy, since more people with more money equals more spending in our economy; and we would be helping families and breadwinners, since the facts show adults make up 88 percent of the low wage workers. The average age of a minimum wage employee is 35 years of age.

Raising the minimum wage helps others as well. It also helps people who earn more by reducing the need for full-time workers to rely on public assistance such as food stamps and Medicaid. So raising the pay of our lowest paid workers is not only good for minimum wage workers, but for all taxpayers.

No one who works full-time should live in poverty. We need to raise the minimum wage, and we need to prevent any and every effort by House Republicans to roll back any incremental increases in pay the President can legally give to workers on Federal contracts.

Let's pass this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's effort in terms of minimum wage legislation, but I would simply remind him that this is an appropriations bill. The Appropriations Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction as it relates to minimum wage.

As he points out, if he has legislation ready to go, I would just encourage him to introduce that at the appropriate place, have the appropriate discussions, and move forward there. But this is not the time or the place. Again, I appreciate his effort to legislate.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to study, promulgate, draft, review, implement, or enforce any rule pursuant to section 913 of the Dodd-

Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act or amendments made by such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a study in unintended consequences.

This body determined that they wanted to have more oversight over people that are called broker-dealers of investment funds. They would be handled the exact same way as investment advisers that handle high-end, large investments from wealthy individuals across the country. So the two are trying to be merged together. The Department of Labor and SEC are both trying to come up with their own version of a set of rules.

Here is the unintended consequence that is coming at America: those folks on the lower end and the middle end of America are about to lose a lot of people that helped them with investment advisers.

Here is how it works:

Say you have a newlywed couple, just out of school, just getting started, making \$26,000 a year combined, as a couple, and determine they are going to do the responsible thing. They are also going to open up a retirement account and get started thinking about decades from now. We encourage that couple to start thinking about their retirement.

Would that couple making \$26,000 a year, with what they are going to put into retirement—\$15 a month, maybe—are they going to be attractive to an investment dealer? No, they are not going to be attracted to them. It is a very small amount; \$15, \$20. But one of these broker-dealers, that is what they love to do. They sign up couples just like that.

The rules coming down from Dodd-Frank will put a new set of standards on those individuals that are providing retirement investment opportunities for people at the very beginning of their investment time. This hits exactly the wrong people, and the benevolent thoughts at the beginning are now coming down to unintended consequences across our country that there will actually be a disincentive to provide retirement vehicles for those with lower and middle income.

The middle-income Americans should have every incentive and every opportunity to save. This simply says to the SEC they cannot promulgate that rule. They need to set it aside and keep the same standards that are already in place. This is not an unregulated industry. They are a heavily regulated industry already.

Keep the same standards in place, and do not discourage investments for retirement from going into lower- and middle-income Americans.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman may not remember the financial meltdown of 2007–2008, but one of the causes was lax oversight by the previous administration's financial regulators. Dodd-Frank has addressed many of these issues and restored safety and security in the marketplace. It has increased oversight over the financial sector in order to protect those on Main Street from abuses on Wall Street.

This is not the time or place to change that landmark legislation. Any attempt to do so will create greater uncertainty in the marketplace and among many Americans, including retirees, who depend upon Federal regulators to protect them. We should not undermine the much-needed reforms of Dodd-Frank, let alone in an appropriations bill.

This is yet another example of the other side attempting to add legislative riders to must-pass legislation that they could not pass through their regular legislative process. I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I would remind everyone that we continue to find ways to try to undo either the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, which is already law and approved by the Supreme Court, or Dodd-Frank, which is the law of the land. The sad part of it all is that we seem to have very short memories. We seem to forget that we are still suffering from the effects of 2007 and 2008 and what happened in my city on Wall Street and how it had the effect throughout the Nation.

We have to regulate, whether we like it or not. We don't have to overburden industry; we don't have to harm anyone; but we can't allow people to do what they did before, which is hurt the economy and put us in the bind we are still in.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I think we all believe in common-sense regulation—and we have plenty of that—but the gentleman has pointed out that so often well-intentioned rules and regulations have unintended consequences.

I don't think anybody believes that we don't have enough regulation. Any time there is a problem, somebody suggests that we spend more money, we pass another rule, we pass another law.

What I think we need and what this gentleman is talking about is that we need common sense. We need to protect investors, but we need to do it in a reasonable way.

So this is an amendment that I think makes the point that so often the rules

are bad for investors, they are bad for the economy, and that shouldn't be the case.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would just close by saying the 2008 financial meltdown was not caused because middle-income Americans didn't have access to retirement funds.

This is a way to be able to protect middle-income Americans, protect their retirement, and to encourage them to save in the future, not decreasing the number of options they have out there. I would like to have lots of folks out there encouraging lots of Americans to be able to save in not just the largest investment dealers in the country, trying to go after the largest, highest-income Americans. So this is something that we should support to maintain the regulations that are already in place and not decrease the options for Americans.

I yield back the balance my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to make any changes to its policies with respect to broadcast indecency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, last year, the FCC published a notice that stated they had greatly reduced their backlog of complaints on indecent and obscene language and images on TV and sought comments on whether they should change their policy on enforcement moving forward. However, they reduced their backlog by 70 percent by closing out roughly 1 million cases that seemed too old to pursue or, as they believed, not within their justification to enforce. The end result was that the FCC unilaterally decided to leave complaints of incidents where TV content was offensive or inappropriate to be aired at times children are likely to be in the audience to be uninvestigated and unenforced.

Moving forward, they asked the public if the FCC should make it the official policy of the Commission that they should only investigate the most serious violations of indecency on television. For instance, they wanted to know if a complaint against repeated

expletives in a program warrants enforcement, while maybe an incident of one or two expletives does not. To many parents, this is an unreasonable distinction to make.

As Chief Justice Roberts has mentioned in some of his opinions on this, this is not an incidence of only having a brief instance of nudity, that that shouldn't be warranted, when extensive nudity is not.

While the FCC has not acted to formally finalize this regulation, it is in the public's best interest that they not continue down this road. If they do institute it, it will give the FCC the ability to decide, on behalf of the viewing public, what is indecent and what is not based on the rules that they have now.

This is a significant shift away from the standards that have been set, and the American public wants to be able write in and complain about what their children have access to. Many of us as Americans have real concerns about what is happening in television and the enforcement now of existing law.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to even allow your children to watch commercials nowadays, much less the television during the children's viewing hour. This is simply a statement to say to the FCC that they should retain and continue the current enforcement they already have.

I understand that there are some issues with this amendment. I understand full well there are some issues we need to deal with in the FCC in days ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. MEEHAN of Pennsylvania to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the ayes have it and the amendment is adopted.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LUCAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 1411

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

An amendment by Mr. HECK of Washington.

An amendment by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

An amendment by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.