

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 235, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 775) "An Act to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the year 1999 to the year 2000, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 106-214.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Chairman, I offer amendment No. 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. FOLEY:

Page 244, after line 18, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 198A. INTERSTATE BRANCHES AND AGENCIES OF FOREIGN BANKS.

Section 5(a)(7) of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3103(a)(7)), is amended to read as follows:

"(7) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR INTERSTATE BRANCHES AND AGENCIES OF FOREIGN BANKS, UPGRADES OF CERTAIN FOREIGN BANK AGENCIES AND BRANCHES.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a foreign bank may—

"(A) with the approval of the Board and the Comptroller of the Currency, establish and operate a Federal branch or Federal agency or, with the approval of the Board and the appropriate State bank supervisor, a State branch or State agency in any State outside the foreign bank's home State if—

"(i) the establishment and operation of such branch or agency is permitted by the State in which the branch or agency is to be established, and

"(ii) in the case of a Federal or State branch, the branch receives only such deposits as would be permitted for a corporation organized under section 25A of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), or

"(B) with the approval of the Board and the relevant licensing authority (the Comptroller in the case of a Federal branch or the appropriate State supervisor in the case of a State branch), upgrade an agency, or a branch of the type referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii), located in a State outside the foreign bank's home State, into a Federal or State branch if—

"(i) the establishment and operation of such branch is permitted by such State; and

"(ii) such agency or branch—

"(I) was in operation in such State on the day before September 29, 1994; or

"(II) has been in operation in such State for a period of time that meets the State's minimum age requirement permitted under section 44(a)(5) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 235, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is a States' rights issue. It is noncontroversial, we hope, an amendment that will fix an anomaly in Federal interstate banking laws. It will also help the flow of trade from the U.S. to countries all over the world.

This amendment would allow foreign banks currently operating in the United States to expand their operations as was intended by the Riegle-Neal Banking and Branching Act by allowing agencies to upgrade to branches.

In 1994, when the Riegle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching bill was passed, Congress sought to allow foreign banks to open additional branches just like domestic banks. This amendment would conform with the intent of the original act.

Unfortunately, not one foreign bank has been able to open additional branches under the Riegle-Neal Federal law provision. While the intention of the act was to allow expansion of foreign banks, the provision in current law has proved to be unworkable.

This amendment would allow foreign bank agencies to upgrade to a branch with the approval of the appropriate chartering agency, the OCC or the State bank supervisor, and the Federal Reserve Board.

In order to accomplish this upgrade, the agency would have to meet the State's minimum age requirement for entry, just like domestic banks. In addition, the agency must meet the requirements for consolidated home country supervision.

This change in Federal law that I am proposing today is a States' rights amendment. If passed, it would remove a Federal limitation that interferes with State law.

The amendment is supported by the Florida Banking Department, the New York Banking Department, the Texas Banking Department and the California Banking Department, as well as

the Florida International Bankers Association and Conference of State Bank Supervisors. This amendment has been fully vetted with the Federal Reserve Board, and they have indicated that they have no objection to it.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I should note that under the rules someone is entitled to 5 minutes in opposition. I would describe myself for these purposes as leaning against but open to persuasion, I would reassure my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY). I am not firmly committed on the subject.

I was interested in what the gentleman said and will listen some more, but I also wanted to use this occasion to address the general bill, Madam Chairman. It is a somewhat constricted debate situation.

What I wanted to do was to explain why I would be voting against this bill, although I think on the subjects that it deals with it does a good job. That is, I think this is a bill which suffers from incompleteness.

I think with regard to the regulation of the financial services industry, this is as good a product as we can expect from a broad representative body. I think the Committee on Banking and Financial Services on both sides worked seriously and well under the leadership of the chairman and the ranking member.

The problem is, in my mind, it carries out a pattern that is too much present in America today and that I think threatens great harm even as it makes some specific progress, and that is a pattern in which we do a good job of fostering conditions in which the capitalist system can flourish. It is in our interest that the capitalist system flourish.

Capitalism clearly has established itself as the superior way for a society to generate wealth, and the generation of wealth is very important. It is important in and of itself because it provides resources for individuals to enjoy themselves, and it is important as a way to provide the resources which help us deal with other problems.

On the other hand, we have learned that capitalism, as great an engine as it is in generating wealth, can have some downsides. In particular, the era of capitalism in which we now are, a kind of globally competitive world, is one where increased wealth is unfortunately accompanied by increased inequality in many cases and by an undermining of society's capacity to deal with some of the social problems that the market does not take care of.

This bill should have been an opportunity to deal with both aspects of