

And to all readers who have written that they will not support the suppression of Chinese freedom by purchasing China-made goods, this column goes with respect and thanks. These people, they just do not know how to wriggle.

CREDIT OPPORTUNITY  
AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1997

HON. BILL MCCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 7, 1997*

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to reintroduce the Credit Opportunity Amendments Act which will fundamentally reform the Community Reinvestment Act [CRA] of 1977, and clarify the enforcement of our fair lending laws.

The original purpose of CRA was to encourage banks to loan into the communities in which they maintained deposit taking facilities.

In addition, the Members of the 95th Congress were concerned about redlining, the practice of denying loans in certain neighborhoods based on racial or ethnic characteristics. The enforcement mechanism chosen was to have CRA performance taken into account when regulators were deciding on applications by the banks.

When CRA passed in 1977, the Senate report stated that no new paperwork would be required under the new law. It was believed that examiners had all the information they needed on hand from call reports and their examination reports to enforce CRA. This is not the case. Instead of relying on existing information, regulators have created expansive new reporting requirements resulting in mounds of additional paperwork and many wasted hours that could have been used to serve the community.

CRA's enforcement mechanism has gone completely haywire. It has become what many refer to as regulatory extortion. By holding up

applications on the basis of CRA protests, some community groups hope to get sizable grants or other contracts from banks. This happens all too often.

Recently, the Clinton administration has linked the enforcement of CRA with other fair lending statutes. This has placed the Justice Department in the position of being an additional bank regulator. This new bank regulator caught the lending industry off guard by using the disparate impact test for proving discrimination. Disparate impact is a controversial theory for proving discrimination in employment law purely using statistical data. Under this scenario, a lender can be found to have discriminated without some element of intent or without proving that any harm resulted from a lending practice.

This legislation remedies these problems while ensuring that lenders reinvest in the communities in which they serve. First, it replaces the current system of enforcement and graded written evaluations with a public disclosure requirement. This will dramatically reduce unnecessary paperwork and end the extortion-like nature of the current enforcement mechanism.

This approach allows bank customers to decide whether the bank is doing an adequate job in meeting its community obligations; not bureaucrats in Washington or organized community groups. If not, consumers can take their business elsewhere.

This will not end the congressional requirement that banks invest in their community. Nor will it stop organized groups from being involved. They will have the enforcement from the public disclosure on the bank's intentions and performance. They can raise any concerns with the bank or the regulators at any time. Consumers and the groups representing their interests can make their concerns known without having the extraordinary authority to hold up mergers and other obligations.

The second change in this bill makes the practice of redlining a violation of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and the Fair Housing Act. Redlining will be defined as failing to

make a loan based on the characteristics of the neighborhood where the house or business is located. Currently no prohibition against redlining in fair housing or fair lending exists, however, courts have interpreted these statutes to prohibit redlining. By placing a prohibition on redlining in statute, we will be sending a clear message that we are opposed to discrimination in lending in all forms, whether based on an individual's race, gender, age, sex, or makeup of the neighborhood where the individual lives or works.

This will also clarify that the method chosen to enforce our antidiscrimination laws is clear and resides in the fair housing and lending laws. No longer will regulators be forced to confront laws to attempt to address problems that the laws are inadequate for the purpose.

Third, the Credit Opportunity Amendment Act adds two criteria to the current use of the disparate impact theory. First, it requires regulators show actual proof that the lender discriminated and that the discrimination caused harm to the victim. Second, this legislation requires the party bringing suit to prove the lender intended to discriminate when making its lending criteria.

Finally, by designating a lead regulator to enforce our fair lending and community reinvestment statutes, we will have more evenhanded enforcement of these laws. In turn, banks will be in a better position to know how to comply with them. Currently, confusion is the most prevailing reaction to the enforcement of CRA over the last 15 years and fair lending more recently.

The current bill makes substantial reforms to CRA which I strongly support. By enacting this legislation, we make a bold step to eliminate credit allocations in the guise of CRA and rationalize our regulation of the banking industry. At the same time, we make it absolutely clear that redlining is unacceptable and is against the law. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my legislation in the 105th Congress.