Hammond. They should all be proud of their role in the Rams’ success.

I am honored to represent these excellent ballplayers in Congress, and I look forward to seeing the Rams take to the court for another season next fall.

THE KANOTIN CLUB

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 7, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest abilities demonstrated by people is their ability to come together on behalf of a common purpose. This joining takes place in many ways, but one of the most important to our society is through the formation of a club.

One of the oldest clubs within my congressional district is the Kanotin Club, dating back to the late 1800’s. This club is located in Lascos County, and is named for the Indian chief who signed treaties with the United States conveying land in what is now Lascos County, which was originally known as Kanotin County.

The purpose of this club is to provide a location and forum for political, economic, and social leaders of northeastern Michigan to exchange ideas, wisdom and knowledge to further the economic and social development and well being of the area. This laudatory purpose has succeeded in bringing together a diverse group of skilled and insightful community leaders who have keenly devoted themselves to the purpose of improving their community.

While many organizations like to identify a list of specific achievements, the Kanotin Club is truly interested in listing only one: Members working together to make the quality of life in their community better and better. They do not seek recognition for any specific project, preferring the satisfaction of knowing that what they did was right to the fleeting moment of notoriety in the Sun. This combination of humility and service is to be praised.

In this day of finding ways of forging new partnerships, of getting government officials, local businessmen, and other community leaders to work together. I strongly believe that we need look no further than the Kanotin Club for a model of what will guarantee strong and needed look no further than the Kanotin Club for a model of what will guarantee strong and needed look no further than the Kanotin Club for a model of what will guarantee strong and

THE CONSUMER FRAUD PREVENTION ACT OF 1995

HON. FREDERICK K. (FRED) HEINEMAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 7, 1995

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce my first bill today, the Consumer Fraud Prevention Act of 1995.

Last Friday, the North Carolina Attorney General filed another telemarketing fraud suit against individuals who prey on senior citizens. The victim, a 71-year-old woman. The cost—life savings of $57,000. An elderly man in Raleigh recently lost $37,000. In Durham, an elderly lady lost $212,000 in a scam directed at seniors.

Unfortunately, these have not been isolated incidents. Telemarketing scams are defrauding senior citizens and those who are especially vulnerable, like the mentally retarded, all across the United States. Another appalling story is that of the 79-year-old blind woman from Minnesota who lost her life savings in a sweepstake scam. She responded to a solicitation which invited her to enter a contest for large cash prizes. Along with a small entry fee she was required to answer a simple question. To advance in the contest she had to answer more questions and pay additional fees. In all, she lost $25,000.

These fraudulent activities are not performed by legitimate companies, but by those who prey on the vulnerability of certain groups. That is why I am introducing this legislation.

The Consumer Fraud Prevention Act directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to increase penalties for those who purposefully defraud the vulnerable in our society and those who utilize international borders to evade prosecution. The legislation also requires mandatory victim restitution first, then asset forfeiture. Once the victim is repaid, the property seized from the defendant will be used to fund the national hotline to combat fraud.

As a senior citizen myself, I am proud to offer this bipartisan legislation today on behalf of our Nation’s senior citizens.

THE LIMITED-PURPOSE BANK GROWTH CAP RELIEF ACT

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 7, 1995

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to lift an arbitrary, necessary and outdated regulatory burden from well-run financial services companies that provide much needed credit to American consumers. My colleague, Mr. LAPOYCE OF NEW YORK, and I am sponsoring this legislation to lift the 7-percent growth cap on the annual asset growth of limited-purpose banks. We are pleased to have Representatives BILL MCCULLUM, RICHARD BAKER, BARNEY FRANK, PETER KING, ED ROYCE, CAROLYN MALONEY, DICK CHRYSLER, and JOHN FOX join us as original co-sponsors of the Limited-Purpose Bank Growth Cap Relief Act.

Limited-purpose banks are specialized lenders—most of these banks are credit card lenders operating on a national basis. They make consumer credit more available to all Americans. The growth cap on these banks was imposed under the 1987 Competitive Equality Banking Act [CEBA]. At the time of CEBA’s enactment, it was argued that because limited-purpose banks could be affiliated with firms whose businesses were not permissible for bank holding companies (securities, insurance and commercial enterprises) they had a competitive advantage over full service banks. The cap was intended only to be temporary, and Congress would lift it when interstate banking and branching and expanded bank activities were approved. Interstate banking and branching became law in 1994, Federal regulators have already greatly expanded approved bank activities, and Congress is providing regulatory relief to commercial banks. Limited-purpose banks are not a competitive threat to commercial banks. The growth cap has become an unprecedented restriction on a healthy, well-regulated industry and it no longer serves any useful purpose. The cap is actually forcing these banks to turn away customers.

Will lifting the growth cap give these banks an unfair edge over their competitors? No, the CEBA banks are still subject to many other restrictions not applicable to commercial banks. For example, they cannot accept checking and demand deposits or engage in commercial lending. They can only offer certificates of deposit of $100,000 or more; and, they cannot cross market financial services with their affiliates. We are not proposing to lift those restrictions, but simply to lift the growth cap for the 23 existing CEBA banks. The original fear was that a proliferation of limited-purpose banks would be a competitive threat to full service banks. This was addressed in CEBA by prohibiting the creation of new limited-purpose banks. Allowing the assets of the surviving CEBA banks to grow by more than 7-percent annually will not result in the creation of new banks, change the limitations to which the grandfathered banks are subject, or otherwise threaten full service banks.

This legislation will simply allow limited-purpose banks to grow in response to their customers’ needs. It will not undermine the safety or soundness of any institution or pose an unfair competitive threat to any other financial institution. If you believe in regulatory relief and allowing well-run companies to freely serve their customers, we hope our colleagues will join us in supporting this legislation to lift the 7-percent asset growth cap to all limited-purpose banks.

SOCIAL SECURITY 1993 TAX INCREASE

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 7, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican tax cut bill. It will bust the budget and give most of the benefits to the very wealthy and to corporations that have historically tried to avoid paying taxes.

One part of the bill that I strongly support is the repeal of the Social Security tax increase from the 1993 deficit reduction bill. As you may recall, I fought against this increase in 1993 and I was successful in helping to increase the income threshold for this unfortunate tax. Nonetheless, I felt then, and I feel now, that many seniors with modest incomes are hit by this tax increase.

It is my hope that the Senate will moderate this tax giveaway to the very wealthy and keep the repeal of the Social Security tax increase so that I may vote for the Conference agreement. It is a shame that the Republicans decided to put one good item in a bill that is nearly all bad. We should repeal the Social Security tax increase, but not use it to blackmail Members to vote for a bad bill.

THE LIMITED-PURPOSE BANK GROWTH CAP RELIEF ACT