

getting to the families as quickly as it should.

This bill would eliminate this loophole by doing away with the 10-day notice requirement. Providing 10 days' notice before pulling someone's consumer report might make sense in some circumstances, but in this situation, it only slows down the wheels of justice and gives delinquent parents an opportunity to further avoid paying their child support obligations.

I support this bill that was reported out almost unanimously, with only two people voting against it. I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) as well as Mr. ELLISON on the Democratic side for their hard work on this commonsense bill.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN). He has worked tirelessly on this piece of legislation. I appreciate his efforts.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am thrilled to stand before the House today as the author of the Child Support Assistance Act, H.R. 2091.

Across America today we have 17 million kids coast to coast who benefit from the child support program. In our great State of Maine alone, there are some 57,000 kids who need our help. As a single parent myself, I believe that the most important job in the world is taking care of our kids. Unfortunately, not every parent believes that.

After a court determines that a non-custodial parent owes financial support for his or her children, there currently is, as Mrs. MALONEY stated, a 10-day waiting period between the time when the court determines that money is owed for the kids and when the State agencies can start collecting that money. As a result, here across America there is about \$100 billion in unpaid child support. In the State of Maine alone, there is over \$500 million that is owed our kids.

This bill, H.R. 2091, the Child Support Assistance Act, fixes a technical part of this law that is a commonsense fix. As Mrs. MALONEY stated, it removes this 10-day waiting period.

Now, what that simply means is that a parent who is supposed to be responsible for his or her children will have less of an opportunity, less time to shift those assets or hide those assets, put them in the name of someone else or maybe even quit his or her job and be paid under the table.

That is not right, and that is certainly not fair. We need in this Chamber Republicans and Democrats to stand up and be compassionate and to help those 17 million kids across our country that need this support.

As a single parent myself, I know what it is like to work a demanding full-time job and to care for a child. In my case, it was one child, my son. I know what it is like to pick up my son after school and then to rush off to the

grocery store to do our shopping and get home quickly so I can start dinner and he can start working on his homework. When that is done, we have to clean up and I expect Sammy to do his reading or I read to him and then it is a bath and to bed.

Then while you are working on peanut butter and jelly sandwiches for the next day and thinking about what you have to do with your own job, you get a few hours' sleep after that before you have to do it all over again.

I cannot imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it must be like for a single mom or dad to do this with two, three, or four kids. The last thing our single parents need is to worry about child support payments that they are rightly owed, that the court says they are due, to help their kids have food on the table or buy a new pair of winter boots or to make sure there is lunch money the next day.

In this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, we speak about a lot of things—debt and spending and national security issues—but this bill is so close to the ground that it directly and immediately will help our kids and our single parents who are trying to raise our kids under very difficult circumstances for a lot of them.

I am thrilled to offer this bill, Mr. Speaker. I am greatly appreciative of the tremendous bipartisan support. I do thank Mr. ELLISON for all of his hard work on this bill. I encourage everybody to please support the Child Support Assistance Act.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I just urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill that Mr. POLIQUIN pointed out can make a real difference in the lives of single parents and their children. Again, I thank him for his leadership on it and his very eloquent statement today on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, too many children grow up in today's society without basic essentials: food, clothing, proper shelter. Many times this is the result of a lack of child support payments from an estranged parent.

I have a young boy, and I can tell you he takes a lot of energy out of my wife and me. We do everything we can to support him to our fullest with love and all the basic essentials, but not all children are that lucky. Some are due child support payments that they don't receive.

I know our local district attorneys do a lot in furtherance and sheriff's departments do a lot in furtherance of collecting those child support payments, but Congressman POLIQUIN's commonsense measure here, the Child Support Assistance Act, is going to help State and local enforcement agencies aid families in collecting child support payments in a timely manner.

How is that going to happen? It is going to allow enforcement agencies to obtain consumer reports on negligent parents in a more expeditious manner. Consequently, that is going to streamline the process and better enforce the collection of child support payments.

I believe Representative POLIQUIN stated it very eloquently just a moment ago. This is something that we can all get behind. It is for the good of this country. It is for the good of children across America. Let's be proud as we ensure that our children have the resources to succeed, with this legislation being a positive step in the right direction.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2091.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SMALL BANK EXAM CYCLE REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1553) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1553

*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 "Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. SMALLER INSTITUTIONS QUALIFYING FOR 18-MONTH EXAMINATION CYCLE.

Section 10(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "\$500,000,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000,000"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking "\$100,000,000" and inserting "\$200,000,000"; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by striking "\$100,000,000" and inserting "\$200,000,000"; and

(B) by striking "\$500,000,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1615

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. 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 bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative TIPTON for his hard work in advocating for community bank regulatory relief. This is a commonsense regulatory relief measure that has earned significant bipartisan support. It was reported out of the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 58-0.

This legislation is designed to allow additional well-managed financial institutions to qualify for an 18-month exam cycle. The longer exam cycle permits community banks to focus their time and resources on the surrounding community rather than on the exam process. This bill also allows bank examiners to spend their resources working with banks that need additional attention instead of with banks that are already considered well managed.

To qualify, an institution must have total assets of less than \$1 billion, and at its most recent examination, it must have earned an "outstanding" or "good" rating under the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System, or CAMELS. So only smaller, well-financed, well-rated financial institutions who pose very little risk would qualify for extended exam cycles.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1553, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act. This bill allows more small banks to qualify for a longer, 18-month exam cycle. This means that these banks would only have a full, onsite examination every 18 months, rather than every 12 months.

The logic behind this bill is simple: small community banks that are both well capitalized and well managed do not need as much regulatory scrutiny as larger, more complex banks. In addition, regulators need the ability to focus their limited resources on the banks that present bigger risks. That is why we have long allowed well-run small banks to have less frequent examinations than larger, more complex banks.

This bill simply increases the threshold for banks that qualify for the 18-month cycle from \$500 million to \$1 billion. Onsite examinations are time-consuming endeavors both for the regulator and the bank, and if the regulator is conducting exams of these well-run banks more frequently than he really needs to, then he is wasting precious government resources. In addition, he is also wasting the bank's resources, because the frequent exams require the time and attention of the bank's execu-

tives and staff, and it is costly. Therefore, banks with assets between \$500 million and \$1 billion that are well capitalized and well managed will receive real, meaningful regulatory relief as a result of this bill.

Not only is this bill supported by small banks, it is also supported by the regulators. The OCC has in fact advocated for this change for some time now.

I am very glad that we are moving this bill through the House today, and I hope that the Senate will act quickly on the bill as well so that we can get regulatory relief to some very deserving community banks. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I congratulate my colleague, LACY CLAY, for also being the lead Democrat and working very hard on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, community banks are a crucial source of credit for many across the Nation, but these banks are currently facing an ever-increasing regulatory burden that they can no longer shoulder. These misguided regulations are resulting in a devastating impact on small banks, forcing consolidation or failure and stifling creation of new banks in communities that need access to credit.

In rural areas, such as my district in western Colorado, oftentimes the only access to credit for small businesses is a community bank. Unfortunately, rising compliance costs and complicated regulatory requirements have dried up bank credit for those in need of it most.

For these reasons, I introduced, along with Representative LACY CLAY and Representative BARR, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act, a targeted relief effort designed to allow additional well-managed financial institutions to qualify for an 18-month exam cycle.

Full-scope, onsite examinations of insured depository institutions are a rigorous event for banks of all sizes, especially small banks that may not have dedicated compliance staff. These examinations require significant preparation leading up to the examination, as well as attention to the onsite examiner during the exam itself.

Whereas larger banks can absorb the work hours and compliance costs associated with these onsite examinations, community banks, much smaller institutions, do not have the economy of scale to deflect the burden. However, a longer exam cycle permits well-run community banks to focus their time and resources on the surrounding community rather than on the exam process, opening up opportunities for sustainable economic growth in towns across the United States.

The Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act amends the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the qualifying

asset threshold from \$500 million to \$1 billion for small banks. This relief measure is only for well-managed community banks that did not cause the financial crisis but are now living with regulatory blowback.

As part of the examination process, financial regulators rate financial institutions on several criteria, including safety and soundness and their compliance with legal and regulatory requirements. To qualify for the 18-month exam cycle, an institution must have earned an outstanding or good rating on their most recent examination. Only smaller, well-rated banks, those which pose little risk, can qualify for extended exam cycles.

The banking regulators also support an increase in the qualifying asset threshold. In February, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency sent draft legislative ideas for regulatory relief to the House Financial Services Committee, including a proposal that is the framework for H.R. 1553. The Comptroller of the Currency, Thomas Curry, publicly stated such a change would reduce burdens on well-managed community institutions. It also was applauded by the FDIC and the OCC during committee hearings earlier this spring.

Not only will this legislation provide relief for community banks, it will also allow examiners to focus their resources, working with banks that need the additional attention or present supervisory concerns.

This bipartisan legislation enjoys the support of the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers Association, the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, as well as 19 bipartisan cosponsors. The legislation was voted out of the Financial Services Committee with a unanimous 58-0 vote.

Congress last raised the threshold for outstanding-rated institutions in 2006 and granted agencies discretion to increase the threshold for good-rated institutions in 2007. It is time again to raise the threshold in statute so these small banks can continue to serve their important purpose in our communities: providing capital for small business growth and banking products for their local communities.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), who is also the ranking member on the Financial Institutions Subcommittee and the lead Democrat on this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Let me thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

I, too, rise today to support H.R. 1553, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) as well as Mr. BARR for their leadership on this important issue.

The overwhelming majority of banks in this country are community banks with less than \$1 billion in assets. As

the regulatory landscape has evolved for the Nation's financial institutions since the financial crisis, I have worked with my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to ensure that our community banks are not unduly burdened. H.R. 1553 is a part of that effort, as it will extend much-needed relief to Main Street banks by allowing well-managed, well-capitalized community banks an opportunity to take advantage of an extended 18-month examination cycle.

While bank examinations are vital to the safety and soundness of the American banking system, the time and resources that banks put into preparing for and responding to examinations can be extremely time consuming, particularly for smaller banks with limited staff and resources that cannot afford to divert key personnel away from their core business in order to prepare for examinations.

H.R. 1553 also allows banking regulators to better allocate their resources to financial institutions that warrant additional attention and away from community banks that have otherwise demonstrated that they are soundly managed and well capitalized.

I have heard from community bankers in Missouri and from across the country that straightforward, bipartisan, commonsense regulatory relief proposals like H.R. 1553 can contribute significantly to community banks' ability to lend to Main Street businesses and reinvest in our communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. CLAY. I look forward to working with Mr. TIPTON and my other colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to find additional opportunities to enact targeted relief for our community banks, and I would urge my colleagues to adopt H.R. 1553.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense piece of legislation. You talk about bipartisan; when it passes out of your committee with no opposition, that is bipartisan support. I think that says a lot about how important community banks are to America and how important this Congress thinks community banks are.

The fact is these organizations that are well managed and have good ratings will only have to get an examination every 18 months. So I encourage support for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1553.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1525) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1525

*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 "Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2015".

##### SEC. 2. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10-K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10-K to which such item relates.

##### SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S-K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S-K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 4 is necessary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S-K.

##### SEC. 4. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S-K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor

Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S-K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the recommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S-K by the Commission under section 3 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. 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 this bill.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee—that would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING)—for his leadership in helping to bring a number of bills, as we have just seen, to the floor today.

I would also like to thank all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee from both sides of the aisle—obviously, both sides—because they have voted unanimously, voted the Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act out of committee not just once, but twice, when you include passage last year as well.

I would also like to add this legislation passed the House of Representatives by voice vote in December of 2014.

So you ask what is the purpose of this bill, and why is it necessary.

Well, Mr. Speaker, look, if you step back about eight decades ago, Congress made the monumental decision in this country that disclosure, opening up, and transparency would be the centerpiece of our Nation's securities law.