

leadership, which was so essential in achieving the conference report provisions governing proprietary trading and prohibiting conflicts of interest.

#### ASSESSING INDIVIDUAL ENTITIES

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I thank the Chairman for his continued work to ensure that appropriate resources are available to protect the economy from a future failure of a systemically risky financial institution and to help pay back taxpayers for the recent failures we experienced.

With regard to assessments under the orderly liquidation authority of the bill, the bill requires that a risk-based matrix of factors be established by the FDIC, taking into account the recommendations of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to be used in connection with assessing any individual entity. One of the factors listed in the bill's risk matrix provision would take into account the activities of financial entities and their affiliates. Is it the intent of that language that a consideration of such factors should specifically include the impact of potential assessments on the ability of an institution that is a tax-exempt, not-for-profit organization to carry out their legally required charitable and educational activities?

As the Senator knows, many Members of the Senate—like me—feel strongly that we must ensure that our constituents and communities continue to have access to these vital resources, and any potential assessment on tax-exempt groups which are charitable and/or educational by mission could severely hamper these groups' ability to fulfill their obligations to carry out their legally required activities.

Mr. DODD. Yes, that is correct. The language is not intended to reduce such charitable and educational activities that are legally required for tax-exempt, not-for-profit organizations that are so important to communities across the country. I thank the Senator for his continued help on these efforts.

#### SECTION 603 TRUST COMPANIES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, my colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, to clarify the types of trust companies that fall within the scope of section 603(a), a provision that prohibits the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from approving an application for deposit insurance for certain companies, including certain trust companies, until 3 years after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. DODD. I would be glad to clarify the nature of trust companies subject to the moratorium under section 603(a). The moratorium applies to an institution that is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by a commercial firm that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity and is exempt from the definition of a bank in the Bank Holding Company Act. It does not apply to a nondepository trust com-

pany that does not have FDIC insurance and that does not offer demand deposit accounts or other deposits that may be withdrawn by check or similar means for payment to third parties.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank my colleague for his clarification.

#### NONBANK FINANCIAL COMPANIES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as we move to final passage of this historic legislation, I would like to thank Senator DODD again for his leadership and strong support for my amendment to ensure that all insured depository institutions and depository institution holding companies regardless of size, as well as nonbank financial companies supervised by the Federal Reserve, meet statutory minimum capital standards and thus have adequate capital throughout the economic cycle. Those standards required under section 171 serve as the starting point for the development of more stringent standards as required under section 165 of the bill.

I did, however, have questions about the designation of certain nonbank financial companies under section 113 for Federal Reserve supervision and the significance of such a designation in light of the minimum capital standards established by section 171. While I can envision circumstances where a company engaged in the business of insurance could be designated under section 113, I would not ordinarily expect insurance companies engaged in traditional insurance company activities to be designated by the council based on those activities alone. Rather, in considering a designation, I would expect the council to specifically take into account, among other risk factors, how the nature of insurance differs from that of other financial products, including how traditional insurance products differ from various off-balance-sheet and derivative contract exposures and how that different nature is reflected in the structure of traditional insurance companies. I would also expect the council to consider whether the designation of an insurance company is appropriate given the existence of State-based guaranty funds to pay claims and protect policyholders. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. DODD. The Senator is correct. The council must consider a number of factors, including, for example, the extent of leverage, the extent and nature of off-balance-sheet exposures, and the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, and mix of the company's activities. Where a company is engaged only in traditional insurance activities, the council should also take into account the matters you raised.

Ms. COLLINS. Would the Senator agree that the council should not base designations simply on the size of the financial companies?

Mr. DODD. Yes. The size of a financial company should not by itself be determinative.

Ms. COLLINS. As the Senator knows, insurance companies are already heavily regulated by State regulators who impose their own, very different regulatory and capital requirements. The fact that those capital requirements are not the same as those imposed by section 171 should not increase the likelihood that the council will designate an insurer. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. DODD. Yes, I do not believe that the council should decide to designate an insurer simply based on whether the insurer would meet bank capital requirements.

#### PREEMPTION STANDARD

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am very pleased to see that the conference committee on the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act retained my amendment regarding the preemption standard for State consumer financial laws with only minor modifications. I very much appreciate the effort of Chairman DODD in fighting to retain the amendment in conference.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator. As the Senator knows, his amendment received strong bipartisan support on the Senate floor and passed by a vote of 80 to 18. It was therefore a Senate priority to retain his provision in our negotiations with the House of Representatives.

Mr. CARPER. One change made by the conference committee was to restate the preemption standard in a slightly different way, but my reading of the language indicates that the conference report still maintains the Barnett standard for determining when a State law is preempted.

Mr. DODD. The Senator is correct. That is why the conference report specifically cites the Barnett Bank of Marion County, N.A. v. Nelson, Florida Insurance Commissioner, 517 U.S. 25(1996) case. There should be no doubt that the legislation codifies the preemption standard stated by the U.S. Supreme Court in that case.

Mr. CARPER. I again thank the Senator. This will provide certainty to everyone—those who offer consumers financial products and to consumer themselves.

#### NONBANK FINANCIAL COMPANIES

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the conference report to accompany H.R. 4173, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform bill, creates a mechanism through which the Financial Stability Oversight Council may determine that material financial distress at a U.S. nonbank financial company could pose such a threat to the financial stability of the United States that the company should be supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and should be subject to heightened prudential standards. It is my understanding that in making such a determination, the Congress intends that the council should focus on risk factors

that contributed to the recent financial crisis, such as the use of excessive leverage and major off-balance-sheet exposure. The fact that a company is large or is significantly involved in financial services does not mean that it poses significant risks to the financial stability of the United States. There are large companies providing financial services that are in fact traditionally low-risk businesses, such as mutual funds and mutual fund advisers. We do not envision nonbank financial companies that pose little risk to the stability of the financial system to be supervised by the Federal Reserve. Does the chairman of the Banking Committee share my understanding of this provision?

Mr. DODD. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Size and involvement in providing credit or liquidity alone should not be determining factors. The Banking Committee intends that only a limited number of high-risk, nonbank financial companies would join large bank holding companies in being regulated and supervised by the Federal Reserve.

#### CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I understand that it is the intent of paragraph 7 of section 171(b) of this legislation to require the Federal banking agencies, subject to the recommendations of the council, to develop capital requirements applicable to insured depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, and nonbank financial companies supervised by the Board of Governors that are engaged in activities that are subject to heightened standards under section 120. It is well understood that minimum capital requirements can help to shield various public and private stakeholders from risks posed by material distress that could arise at these entities from engaging in these activities. It is also understood and recognized that minimum capital requirements may not be an appropriate tool to apply under all circumstances and that by prescribing section 171 capital requirements as the correct tool with respect to companies covered by paragraph 7, it should not be inferred that capital requirements should be required for any other companies not covered by paragraph 7.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I also understand that the intent of this section is not to create any inference that minimum capital requirements are the appropriate standard or safeguard for the council to recommend to be applied to any nonbank financial company that is not subject to supervision by the Federal Reserve under title I of this legislation, with respect to any activity subject to section 120. Rather, the council should have full discretion not to recommend the application of capital requirements to any such nonbank financial company engaged in any such activity.

Mr. DODD. I concur with Senator COLLINS and Senator SHAHEEN. Section 171 of this legislation came from an

amendment that Senator COLLINS offered on the Senate floor, and I truly appreciate the constructive contribution she has made to this legislative process. My understanding also is that the capital requirements under paragraph 7 are intended to apply only to insured depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, and nonbank financial companies supervised by the Board of Governors. I thank my friends from Maine and New Hampshire for this clarification.

#### INSURANCE COMPANY DEFINITION

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, first, I would like to commend Chairman DODD for his hard work on the Wall Street reform bill and for maintaining an open and transparent process while developing this legislation. With regard to the orderly liquidation authority under title II of the bill, an "insurance company" is defined in section 201 as any entity that is engaged in the business of insurance, subject to regulation by a State insurance regulator, and covered by a State law that is designed to specifically deal with the rehabilitation, liquidation, or insolvency of an insurance company. Is it the intent of this definition that a mutual insurance holding company organized and operating under State insurance laws should be considered an insurance company for the purpose of this title?

Mr. DODD. Yes, that is correct. It is intended that a mutual insurance holding company organized and operating under State insurance laws should be considered an insurance company for the purpose of title II of this legislation. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for this clarification.

#### INDEPENDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, I became acutely aware that our pension plans, governmental investors, and charitable endowments were falling victim to swap dealers marketing swaps and security-based swaps that they knew or should have known to be inappropriate or unsuitable for their clients. Jefferson County, AL, is probably the most infamous example, but there are many others in Pennsylvania and across the country. That is why I worked with Senator HARKIN and our colleagues in the House to include protections for pension funds, governmental entities, and charitable endowments in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Those protections—set forth in section 731 and section 764 of the conference report—place certain duties and obligations on swap dealers and security-based swap dealers when they deal with special entities. One of those obligations is that a swap dealer or the security-based swap dealer entering into a swap or security-based swap with a special entity must have a reasonable basis for believing that the special entity has an independent representative evaluating the transaction.

Our intention in imposing the independent representative requirement was to ensure that there was always someone independent of the swap dealer or the security-based swap dealer reviewing and approving swap or security-based swap transactions. However, we did not intend to require that the special entity hire an investment manager independent of the special entity. Is that your understanding, Senator HARKIN?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, that is correct. We certainly understand that many special entities have internal managers that may meet the independent representative requirement. For example, many public electric and gas systems have employees whose job is to handle the day-to-day hedging operations of the system, and we intended to allow them to continue to rely on those in-house managers to evaluate and approve swap and security-based swap transactions, provided that the manager remained independent of the swap dealer or the security-based swap dealer and met the other conditions of the provision. Similarly, the named fiduciary or in-house asset manager—INHAM—for a pension plan may continue to approve swap and security-based swap transactions.

#### FOREIGN BANKS

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I wish to engage my colleague, Senator DODD, in a brief colloquy related to the section 716, the bank swap desk provision.

In the rush to complete the conference, there was a significant oversight made in finalizing section 716 as it relates to the treatment of uninsured U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks. Under the U.S. policy of national treatment, which has been part of U.S. law since the International Banking Act of 1978, uninsured U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks are authorized to engage in the same activities as insured depository institutions. While these U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks do not have deposits insured by the FDIC, they are registered and regulated by a Federal banking regulator, they have access to the Federal Reserve discount window, and other Federal Reserve credit facilities.

It is my understanding that a number of these U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks will be swap entities under section 716 and title VII of Dodd-Frank. Due to the fact that the section 716 safe harbor only applies to "insured depository institutions" it means that U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks will be forced to push out all their swaps activities. This result was not intended. U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks should be subject to the same swap desk push out requirements as insured depository institutions under section 716. Under section 716, insured depository institutions must push out all swaps and security-based swaps activities except for specifically enumerated activities, such as hedging and other similar risk mitigating activities directly related

to the insured depository institution's activities, acting as a swaps entity for swaps or security-based swaps that are permissible for investment, and acting as a swaps entity for cleared credit default swaps. U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks should, and are willing to, meet the push out requirements of section 716 as if they were insured depository institutions.

This oversight on our part is unfortunate and clearly unintended. Does my colleague agree with me about the need to include uninsured U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks in the safe harbor of section 716?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I agree completely with Senator LINCOLN's analysis and with the need to address this issue to ensure that uninsured U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks are treated the same as insured depository institutions under the provisions of section 716, including the safe harbor language.

#### END USERS

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter that Chairman DODD and I wrote to Chairmen FRANK and PETERSON during House consideration of this Conference Report regarding the derivatives title. The letter emphasizes congressional intent regarding commercial end users who enter into swaps contracts.

As we point out, it is clear in this legislation that the regulators only have the authority to set capital and margin requirements on swap dealers and major swap participants for uncleared swaps, not on end users who qualify for the exemption from mandatory clearing.

As the letter also makes clear, it is our intent that the any margin required by the regulators will be risk-based, keeping with the standards we have put into the bill regarding capital. It is in the interest of the financial system and end user counterparties that swap dealers and major swap participants are sufficiently capitalized. At the same time, Congress did not mandate that regulators set a specific margin level. Instead, we granted a broad authority to the regulators to set margin. Again, margin and capital standards must be risk-based and not be punitive.

It is also important to note that few end users will be major swap participants, as we have excluded "positions held for hedging or mitigating commercial risk" from being considered as a "substantial position" under that definition. I would ask Chairman DODD whether he concurs with my view of the bill.

Mr. DODD. I agree with the Chairman's assessment. There is no authority to set margin on end users, only major swap participants and swap dealers. It is also the intent of this bill to distinguish between commercial end users hedging their risk and larger, riskier market participants. Regulators should distinguish between these

types of companies when implementing new regulatory requirements.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter that Chairman DODD and I wrote to Chairmen FRANK and PETERSON to which I referred.

#### INVESTMENT ADVISER

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss section 409 of the Dodd-Frank bill, which excludes family offices from the definition of investment adviser under the Investment Advisers Act. In section 409, the SEC is directed to define the term family offices and to provide exemptions that recognize the range of organizational, management, and employment structures and arrangement employed by family offices, and I thought it would be worthwhile to provide guidance on this provision.

For many decades, family offices have managed money for members of individual families, and they do not pose systemic risk or any other regulatory issues. The SEC has provided exemptive relief to some family offices in the past, but many family offices have simply relied on the "under 15 clients" exception to the Investment Advisers Act, and when Congress eliminated this exception, it was not our intent to include family offices in the bill.

The bill provides specific direction for the SEC in its rulemaking to recognize that most family offices often have officers, directors, and employees who may not be family members, and who are employed by the family office itself or affiliated entities owned, directly or indirectly, by the family members. Often, such persons co-invest with family members, which enable those persons to share in the profits of investments they oversee and better align the interests of those persons with those of the family members served by the family office. In addition, family offices may have a small number of co-investors such as persons who help identify investment opportunities, provide professional advice, or manage portfolio companies. However, the value of investments by such other persons should not exceed a de minimis percentage of the total value of the assets managed by the family office. Accordingly, section 409 directs the SEC not to exclude a family office from the definition by reason of its providing investment advice to these persons.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator. Pursuant to negotiations during the conference committee, it was my desire that the SEC write rules to exempt certain family offices already in operation from the definition of investment adviser, regardless of whether they had previously received an SEC exemptive order. It was my intent that the rule would: exempt family offices, provided that they operated in a manner consistent with the previous exemptive policy of the Commission as reflected in exemptive orders for family offices in effect on the date of enactment of the Dodd-Frank Act; reflect a recognition of the range of organizational,

management and employment structures and arrangements employed by family offices; and not exclude any person who was not registered or required to be registered under the Advisers Act from the definition of the term "family office" solely because such person provides investment advice to natural persons who, at the time of their applicable investment, are officers, directors or employees of the family office who have previously invested with the family office and are accredited investors, any company owned exclusively by such officers, directors or employees or their successors-in-interest and controlled by the family office, or any other natural persons who identify investment opportunities to the family office and invest in such transactions on substantially the same terms as the family office invests, but do not invest in other funds advised by the family office, and whose assets to which the family office provides investment advice represent, in the aggregate, not more than 5 percent of the total assets as to which the family office provides investment advice.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I appreciate the Senator's explanation and ask that the Senator work with me to make this point in a technical corrections bill.

Mr. DODD. I agree that this position should be raised in a corrections bill and I look forward to working with the Senator towards this goal on this point.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank the Senator for his leadership and his assistance and cooperation in ensuring the passage of this important bill.

#### VOLCKER RULE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to ask my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut and the chairman of the Banking Committee, to engage in a brief discussion relating to the final Volcker rule and the role of venture capital in creating jobs and growing companies.

I strongly support the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, including a strong and effective Volcker rule, which is found in section 619 of the legislation.

I know the chairman recognizes, as we all do, the crucial and unique role that venture capital plays in spurring innovation, creating jobs and growing companies. I also know the authors of this bill do not intend the Volcker rule to cut off sources of capital for America's technology startups, particularly in this difficult economy. Section 619 explicitly exempts small business investment companies from the rule, and because these companies often provide venture capital investment, I believe the intent of the rule is not to harm venture capital investment.

Is my understanding correct?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from California, for her support and for all the work we have done together on this important issue. Her understanding is correct.

The purpose of the Volcker rule is to eliminate excessive risk taking activities by banks and their affiliates while at the same time preserving safe, sound investment activities that serve the public interest. It prohibits proprietary trading and limits bank investment in hedge funds and private equity for that reason. But properly conducted venture capital investment will not cause the harms at which the Volcker rule is directed. In the event that properly conducted venture capital investment is excessively restricted by the provisions of section 619, I would expect the appropriate Federal regulators to exempt it using their authority under section 619(J).

## CAPTIVE FINANCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would like to discuss the derivatives title of the Wall Street reform legislation with chairman of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, Senator LINCOLN.

I would like to first commend the Senator and her staff's hard work on this critically important bill, which brings accountability, transparency, and oversight to the opaque derivatives market.

For too long the over-the-counter derivatives market has been unregulated, transferring risk between firms and creating a web of fragility in a system where entities became too interconnected to fail.

It is clear that unregulated derivative markets contributed to the financial crisis that crippled middle-class families. Small businesses and our manufacturers couldn't get the credit they needed to keep the lights on, and many had to close their doors permanently. People who had saved money and played by the rules lost \$1.6 trillion from their retirement accounts. More than 6 million families lost their homes to foreclosure. And before the recession was over, more than 7 million Americans had lost their jobs.

The status quo is clearly not an option.

The conference between the Senate and the House produced a strong bill that will make sure these markets are accountable and fair and that the consumers are back in control.

I particularly want to thank the Senator for her efforts to protect manufacturers that use derivatives to manage risks associated with their operations. Whether it is hedging the risks related to fluctuating oil prices or foreign currency revenues, the ability to provide financial certainty to companies' balance sheets is critical to their viability and global competitiveness.

I am glad that the conference recognizes the distinction between entities that are using the derivatives market to engage in speculative trading and our manufacturers and businesses that are not speculating. Instead, they use this market responsibly to hedge legitimate business risk in order to reduce volatility and protect their plans to make investments and create jobs.

Is it the Senator's understanding that manufacturers and companies that are using derivatives to hedge legitimate business risk and do not engage in speculative behavior will not be subjected to the capital or margin requirements in the bill?

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank the Senator for her efforts to protect manufacturers. I share the Senator's concerns, which is why our language preserves the ability of manufacturers and businesses to use derivatives to hedge legitimate business risk.

Working closely with the Senator, I believe the legislation reflects our intent by providing a clear and narrow end-user exemption from clearing and margin requirements for derivatives held by companies that are not major swap participants and do not engage in speculation but use these products solely as a risk-management tool to hedge or mitigate commercial risks.

Ms. STABENOW. Again, I appreciate the Senator's efforts to work with me on language that ensures manufacturers are not forced to unnecessarily divert working capital from core business activities, such as investing in new equipment and creating more jobs. As you know, large manufacturers of high-cost products often establish wholly owned captive finance affiliates to support the sales of its products by providing financing to customers and dealers.

Captive finance affiliates of manufacturing companies play an integral role in keeping the parent company's plants running and new products moving. This role is even more important during downturns and in times of limited market liquidity. As an example, Ford's captive finance affiliate, Ford Credit, continued to consistently support over 3,000 of Ford's dealers and Ford Credit's portfolio of more than 3 million retail customers during the recent financial crisis—at a time when banks had almost completely withdrawn from auto lending.

Many finance arms securitize their loans through wholly owned affiliate entities, thereby raising the funds they need to keep lending. Derivatives are integral to the securitization funding process and consequently facilitating the necessary financing for the purchase of the manufacturer's products.

If captive finance affiliates of manufacturing companies are forced to post margin to a clearinghouse it will divert a significant amount of capital out of the U.S. manufacturing sector and could endanger the recovery of credit markets on which manufacturers and their captive finance affiliates depend.

Is it the Senator's understanding that this legislation recognizes the unique role that captive finance companies play in supporting manufacturers by exempting transactions entered into by such companies and their affiliate entities from clearing and margin so long as they are engaged in financing that facilitates the purchase or lease of their commercial end user par-

ents products and these swaps contracts are used for non-speculative hedging?

Mrs. LINCOLN. Yes, this legislation recognizes that captive finance companies support the jobs and investments of their parent company. It would ensure that clearing and margin requirements would not be applied to captive finance or affiliate company transactions that are used for legitimate, non-speculative hedging of commercial risk arising from supporting their parent company's operations. All swap trades, even those which are not cleared, would still be reported to regulators, a swap data repository, and subject to the public reporting requirements under the legislation.

This bill also ensures that these exemptions are tailored and narrow to ensure that financial institutions do not alter behavior to exploit these legitimate exemptions.

Based on the Senator's hard work and interest in captive finance entities of manufacturing companies, I would like to discuss briefly the two captive finance provisions in the legislation and how they work together. The first captive finance provision is found in section 2(h)(7) of the CEA, the "treatment of affiliates" provision in the end-user clearing exemption and is entitled "transition rule for affiliates." This provision is available to captive finance entities which are predominantly engaged in financing the purchase of products made by its parent or an affiliate. The provision permits the captive finance entity to use the clearing exemption for not less than two years after the date of enactment. The exact transition period for this provision will be subject to rulemaking. The second captive finance provision differs in two important ways from the first provision. The second captive finance provision does not expire after 2 years. The second provision is a permanent exclusion from the definition of "financial entity" for those captive finance entities who use derivatives to hedge commercial risks 90 percent or more of which arise from financing that facilitates the purchase or lease of products, 90 percent or more of which are manufactured by the parent company or another subsidiary of the parent company. It is also limited to the captive finance entity's use of interest rate swaps and foreign exchange swaps. The second captive finance provision is also found in Section 2(h)(7) of the CEA at the end of the definition of "financial entity." Together, these 2 provisions provide the captive finance entities of manufacturing companies with significant relief which will assist in job creation and investment by our manufacturing companies.

Ms. STABENOW. I agree that the integrity of these exemptions is critical to the reforms enacted in this bill and to the safety of our financial system. That is why I support the strong anti-abuse provisions included in the bill.

Would you please explain the safeguards included in this bill to prevent abuse?

Mrs. LINCOLN. It is also critical to ensure that we only exempt those transactions that are used to hedge by manufacturers, commercial entities and a limited number of financial entities. We were surgical in our approach to a clearing exemption, making it as narrow as possible and excluding speculators.

In addition to a narrow end-user exemption, this bill empowers regulators to take action against manipulation. Also, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities Exchange Commission will have a broad authority to write and enforce rules to prevent abuse and to go after anyone that attempts to circumvent regulation.

America's consumers and businesses deserve strong derivatives reform that will ensure that the country's financial oversight system promotes and fosters the most honest, open and reliable financial markets in the world.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Chairman for this opportunity to clarify some of the provisions in this bill. I appreciate the Senator's help to ensure that this bill recognizes that manufacturers and commercial entities were victims of this financial crisis, not the cause, and that it does not unfairly penalize them for using these products as part of a risk-mitigation strategy.

It is time we shine a light on derivatives trading and bring transparency and fairness to this market, not just for the families and businesses that were taken advantage of but also for the long-term health of our economy and particularly our manufacturers.

#### STABLE VALUE FUNDS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, the pensions community approached me about a possible unintended consequence of the derivatives title of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. They were concerned that the provisions regulating swaps might also apply to stable value funds.

Stable value funds are a popular, conservative investment choice for many employee benefit plans because they provide a guaranteed rate of return. As I understand it, there are about \$640 billion invested in stable value funds, and retirees and those approaching retirement often favor those funds to minimize their exposure to market fluctuations. When the derivatives title was put together, I do not think anyone had stable value funds or stable value wrap contracts—some of which could be viewed as swaps—specifically in mind, and I do not think it is clear to any of us what effect this legislation would have on them.

Therefore, I worked with Chairman LINCOLN, Senator LEAHY, and Senator CASEY to develop a proposal to direct the SEC and CFTC to conduct a study—in consultation with DOL,

Treasury, and State insurance regulators—to determine whether it is in the public interest to treat stable value funds and wrap contracts like swaps. This provision is intended to apply to all stable value fund and wrap contracts held by employee benefit plans—defined contribution, defined benefit, health, or welfare—subject to any degree of direction provided directly by participants, including benefit payment elections, or by persons who are legally required to act solely in the interest of participants such as trustees.

If the SEC and CFTC determine that it is in the public interest to regulate stable value fund and wrap contracts as swaps, then they would have the power to do so. I think this achieves the policy goals underlying the derivatives title while still making sure that we don't cause unintended harm to people's pension plans.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I share Chairman HARKIN's concern about possible unintended consequences the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act could have on pension and welfare plans which provide their participant with stable value fund options. These stable value fund options and their contract wrappers could be viewed as being a swap or a security-based swap. As Chairman HARKIN has stated, there is a significant amount of retirement savings in stable value funds, \$640 billion, which represents the retirement funds of millions of hardworking Americans. One of my major goals in this legislation was to protect Main Street. We should try to avoid doing any harm to pension plan beneficiaries. When the stable value fund issue was brought to my attention, I knew it was something we had to address. That is why I worked with Chairman HARKIN and Senators LEAHY and CASEY to craft a provision that would give the CFTC and the SEC time to study the issue of whether the stable value fund options and/or the contract wrappers for these stable value funds are "swaps" or some other type of financial instrument such as an insurance contract. I think subjecting this issue to further study will provide a measure of stability to participants and beneficiaries in employee benefit plans—including those participants in defined benefit pension plans, 401(k) plans, annuity plans, supplemental retirement plans, 457 plans, 403(b) plans, and voluntary employee beneficiary associations—while allowing the CFTC and SEC to make an informed decision about what the stable value fund options and their contract wrappers are and whether they should be regulated as swaps or security-based swaps. It is a commonsense solution, and I am proud we were able to address this important issue which could affect the retirement funds of millions of pension beneficiaries.

#### VOLCKER RULE

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Chairman. With respect to the Volcker Rule, the conference report states that banking

entities are not prohibited from purchasing and disposing of securities and other instruments in connection with underwriting or market making activities, provided that activity does not exceed the reasonably expected near term demands of clients, customers, or counterparties. I want to clarify this language would allow banks to maintain an appropriate dealer inventory and residual risk positions, which are essential parts of the market making function. Without that flexibility, market makers would not be able to provide liquidity to markets.

Mr. DODD. The gentleman is correct in his description of the language.

#### EVENT CONTRACTS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank Chairman LINCOLN and Chairman DODD for maintaining section 745 in the conference report accompanying the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which gives authority to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to prevent the trading of futures and swaps contracts that are contrary to the public interest.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Chairman DODD and I maintained this provision in the conference report to assure that the Commission has the power to prevent the creation of futures and swaps markets that would allow citizens to profit from devastating events and also prevent gambling through futures markets. I thank the Senator from California for encouraging Chairman DODD and me to include it. I agree that this provision will strengthen the government's ability to protect the public interest from gaming contracts and other events contracts.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. It is very important to restore CFTC's authority to prevent trading that is contrary to the public interest. As you know, the Commodity Exchange Act required CFTC to prevent trading in futures contracts that were "contrary to the public interest" from 1974 to 2000. But the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 stripped the CFTC of this authority, at the urging of industry. Since 2000, derivatives traders have bet billions of dollars on derivatives contracts that served no commercial purpose at all and often threaten the public interest.

I am glad the Senator is restoring this authority to the CFTC. I hope it was the Senator's intent, as the author of this provision, to define "public interest" broadly so that the CFTC may consider the extent to which a proposed derivative contract would be used predominantly by speculators or participants not having a commercial or hedging interest. Will CFTC have the power to determine that a contract is a gaming contract if the predominant use of the contract is speculative as opposed to a hedging or economic use?

Mrs. LINCOLN. That is our intent. The Commission needs the power to, and should, prevent derivatives contracts that are contrary to the public

interest because they exist predominantly to enable gambling through supposed “event contracts.” It would be quite easy to construct an “event contract” around sporting events such as the Super Bowl, the Kentucky Derby, and Masters Golf Tournament. These types of contracts would not serve any real commercial purpose. Rather, they would be used solely for gambling.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. And does the Senator agree that this provision will also empower the Commission to prevent trading in contracts that may serve a limited commercial function but threaten the public good by allowing some to profit from events that threaten our national security?

Mrs. LINCOLN. I do. National security threats, such as a terrorist attack, war, or hijacking pose a real commercial risk to many businesses in America, but a futures contract that allowed people to hedge that risk would also involve betting on the likelihood of events that threaten our national security. That would be contrary to the public interest.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator for including this provision. No one should profit by speculating on the likelihood of a terrorist attack. Firms facing financial risk posed by threats to our national security may take out insurance, but they should not buy a derivative. A futures market is for hedging. It is not an insurance market.

#### COLLATERALIZED INVESTMENTS

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I would like to engage Senator LINCOLN, chairman of the Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee, in a colloquy.

Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which Chairman LINCOLN was the primary architect of, creates a new regulatory framework for the over-the-counter derivatives market. It will require a significant portion of derivatives trades to be cleared through a centralized clearinghouse and traded on an exchange, and it will also increase reporting and capital and margin requirements on significant players in the market. The new regulatory framework will help improve transparency and disclosure within the derivatives market for the benefit of all investors.

Under the bill, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, are instructed to further define the terms “major swap participant” and “major security-based swap participant.” The definitions of major swap participant and major security-based swap participant included in the bill require the CFTC and the SEC to determine whether a person dealing in swaps maintains a “substantial position” in swaps, as well as whether such outstanding swaps create “substantial counterparty exposure” that could have “serious adverse effects on the financial stability of the United States banking system or financial markets.”

The definition also encompasses “financial entities” that are highly leveraged relative to the amount of capital it holds, are not already subject to capital requirements set by a Federal banking regulator, and maintain a substantial position in outstanding swaps.

I understand when the CFTC and SEC are making the determination as to whether a person dealing in swaps is a major swap participant or major security-based swap participant, it is the intent of the conference committee that both the CFTC and the SEC focus on risk factors that contributed to the recent financial crisis, such as excessive leverage, under-collateralization of swap positions, and a lack of information about the aggregate size of positions. Is this correct?

Mrs. LINCOLN. Yes. My good friend from North Carolina is correct. We made some important changes during the conference with respect to the “major swap participant” and “major security-based swap participant” definitions. When determining whether a person has a “substantial position,” the CFTC and the SEC should consider the person’s relative position in cleared versus the uncleared swaps and may take into account the value and quality of the collateral held against counterparty exposures. The committee wanted to make it clear that the regulators should distinguish between cleared and uncleared swap positions when defining what a “substantial position” would be. Similarly where a person has uncleared swaps, the regulators should consider the value and quality of such collateral when defining “substantial position.” Bilateral collateralization and proper segregation substantially reduces the potential for adverse effects on the stability of the market. Entities that are not excessively leveraged and have taken the necessary steps to segregate and fully collateralize swap positions on a bilateral basis with their counterparties should be viewed differently.

In addition, it may be appropriate for the CFTC and the SEC to consider the nature and current regulation of the entity when designating an entity a major swap participant or a major security-based swap participant. For instance, entities such as registered investment companies and employee benefit plans are already subject to extensive regulation relating to their usage of swaps under other titles of the U.S. Code. They typically post collateral, are not overly leveraged, and may not pose the same types of risks as unregulated major swap participants.

Mrs. HAGAN. I thank the Senator. If I may, I have one additional question. When considering whether an entity maintains a substantial position in swaps, should the CFTC and the SEC look at the aggregate positions of funds managed by asset managers or at the individual fund level?

Mrs. LINCOLN. As a general rule, the CFTC and the SEC should look at each entity on an individual basis when de-

termining its status as a major swap participant.

#### SWAP DEALER PROVISIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today as a supporter of the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act, but also as one who has concerns over how the derivatives title of the bill will be implemented. I applaud the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee for his work on the underlying bill. At the same time, I am concerned that some of the provisions in the derivatives title will harm U.S. businesses unnecessarily.

I would like to engage the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee in a colloquy that addresses an important issue. The Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act will regulate “swap dealers” for the first time by subjecting them to new clearing, capital and margin requirements. “Swap dealers” are banks and other financial institutions that hold themselves out to the derivatives market and are known as dealers or market makers in swaps. The definition of a swap dealer in the bill includes an entity that “regularly enters into swaps with counterparties as an ordinary course of business for its own account.” It is possible the definition could be read broadly and include end users that execute swaps through an affiliate. I want to make clear that it is not Congress’ intention to capture as swap dealers end users that primarily enter into swaps to manage their business risks, including risks among affiliates.

I would ask the distinguished chairman whether he agrees that end users that execute swaps through an affiliate should not be deemed to be “swap dealers” under the bill just because they hedge their risks through affiliates.

Mr. DODD. I do agree and thank my colleague for raising another important point of clarification. I believe the bill is clear that an end user does not become a swap dealer by virtue of using an affiliate to hedge its own commercial risk. Senator COLLINS has been a champion for end users and it is a pleasure working with her.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we are poised to pass what some have termed a “sweeping overhaul” of our Nation’s financial regulatory system. Unfortunately, this legislation does little, if anything—to tackle the tough problems facing the financial sector, nor does it institute real, meaningful and comprehensive reform. This bill is simply an abysmal failure and serves as yet another example of Congress’s inability to make the choices necessary to bring our country back into economic prosperity.

What this bill does represent is a guarantee of future bailouts. In a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed titled “The Dodd-Frank Financial Fiasco,” John Taylor—a professor of economics at Stanford and a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution—wrote:

The sheer complexity of the 2,319-page Dodd-Frank financial reform bill is certainly



a threat to future economic growth. But if you sift through the many sections and subsections, you find much more than complexity to worry about.

The main problem with the bill is that it is based on a misdiagnosis of the causes of the financial crisis, which is not surprising since the bill was rolled out before the congressionally mandated Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission finished its diagnosis.

The biggest misdiagnosis is the presumption that the government did not have enough power to avoid the crisis. But the Federal Reserve had the power to avoid the monetary excesses that accelerated the housing boom that went bust in 2007. The New York Fed had the power to stop Citigroup's questionable lending and trading decisions and, with hundreds of regulators on the premises of such large banks, should have had the information to do so. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) could have insisted on reasonable liquidity rules to prevent investment banks from relying so much on short-term borrowing through repurchase agreements to fund long-term investments. And the Treasury working with the Fed had the power to intervene with troubled financial firms, and in fact used this power in a highly discretionary way to create an on-again off-again bailout policy that spooked the markets and led to the panic in the fall of 2008.

But instead of trying to make implementation of existing government regulations more effective, the bill vastly increases the power of government in ways that are unrelated to the recent crisis and may even encourage future crises.

Mr. Taylor then goes on to highlight the many "false remedies" contained in this legislation including the "orderly liquidation" authority given to the FDIC—which effectively institutionalizes the bailout process. Other examples are the new Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, the new Office of Financial Research, and a new regulation for nonfinancial firms that use financial instruments to reduce risks of interest-rate or exchange-rate volatility.

In addition to the "false remedies," the huge expansion of government, and the outright power-grab by the Federal Government contained in this so-called reform measure—recent press reports note that this bill has also become the vehicle for imposing racial and gender quotas on the financial industry. Section 342 of this bill establishes Offices of Minority and Women Inclusion in at least 20 Federal financial services agencies. These offices will be tasked with implementing "standards and procedures to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, the fair inclusion and utilization of minorities, women, and minority-owned and women-owned businesses in all business and activities of the agency at all levels, including in procurement, insurance, and all types of contracts."

This "fair inclusion" policy will apply to "financial institutions, investment banking firms, mortgage banking firms, asset management firms, brokers, dealers, financial services entities, underwriters, accountants, investment consultants and providers of legal services."

The provision goes on to assert that the government will terminate con-

tracts with institutions they deem have "failed to make a good faith effort to include minorities and women in their workforce."

Diana Furchtgott-Roth, former chief economist at the U.S. Department of Labor and senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, spotlighted the controversial section in an article on Real Clear Markets on July 8th. She wrote:

This is a radical shift in employment legislation. The law effectively changes the standard by which institutions are evaluated from anti-discrimination regulations to quotas. In order to be in compliance with the law these businesses will have to show that they have a certain percentage of women and a certain percentage of minorities.

This provision was never considered or debated in the Senate. I do not think it is unreasonable to expect that such a major change in government policy—indeed a complete shift from anti-discrimination regulations to a system of quotas for the financial industry—be fully aired and debated by both Chambers before it is enacted.

Finally, let me return to Mr. Taylor's piece from the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Taylor added:

By far the most significant error of omission in the bill is the failure to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the government sponsored enterprises that encouraged the origination of risky mortgages in the first place by purchasing them with the support of many in Congress. Some excuse this omission by saying that it can be handled later. But the purpose of "comprehensive reform" is to balance competing political interests and reach compromise; that will be much harder to do if the Frank-Dodd bill becomes law.

I could not agree more. It is clear to any rational observer that the housing market has been the catalyst of our current economic turmoil. And it is impossible to ignore the significant role played by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The events of the past 2 years have made it clear that never again can we allow the taxpayer to be responsible for poorly managed financial entities who gambled away billions of dollars. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are synonymous with mismanagement and waste and have become the face of "too big to fail."

During the debate on this financial "reform" bill, we heard much about how the U.S. Government will never again allow a financial institution to become "too big to fail." We heard countless calls for more regulation to ensure that taxpayers are never again placed at such tremendous risk. Sadly, the conference report before us now completely ignores the elephant in the room—because no other entity's failure would be as disastrous to our economy as Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's.

As my colleagues know, during Senate consideration of this bill, I offered a good, common-sense amendment designed to end the taxpayer-backed conservatorship of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac by putting in place an orderly transition period and eventually requiring them to operate—without

government subsidies—on a level playing field with their private sector competitors. Unfortunately that amendment was defeated by a near-party-line vote.

The majority, however, did offer an alternative proposal to my amendment. Was it a good, well thought out, comprehensive plan to end the taxpayer-backed free ride of Fannie and Freddie and require them to operate on a level playing field with their private sector competitors? Nope. It was a study. The majority included language in this bill to study the problem of Fannie and Freddie for 6 months. Wow! Instead of dealing head-on with the two enterprises that brought our entire economy to its knees—the majority wants to study them for 6 more months.

According to a recent article published by the Associated Press, these two entities have already cost taxpayers over \$145 billion in bailouts and—according to CBO—those losses could balloon to \$400 billion. And if housing prices fall further, some experts caution, the cost to the taxpayer could hit as much as \$1 trillion. And all the majority is willing to do is study them for 6 months. It is no wonder the American people view us with such contempt.

The Federal Government has set a dangerous precedent here. We sent the wrong message to the financial industry: when you engage in bad, risky business practices, and you get into trouble, the government will be there to save your hide. It amounts to nothing more than a taxpayer-funded subsidy for risky behavior and this bill does nothing to prevent it from happening all over again.

Again, I regret that I have to vote against this bill. I assure my colleagues, and the American people, that if this were truly a bill that instituted real, serious and effective reforms—I would be the first in line to cast a vote in its favor. But it is not. It serves as evidence of a dereliction of our duty and a missed opportunity to provide the American people with the protections necessary to avert yet another financial disaster. They deserve better from us.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have long worked for the continued viability of rural low-volume hospitals so that Medicare beneficiaries living in rural areas in Iowa and elsewhere in the country will continue to have needed access to care.

Today, I want to discuss another concern, one regarding low-volume dialysis clinics in rural areas and the kidney dialysis patients they serve.

Congress enacted a new end-stage renal dialysis, ESRD, bundled payment system in the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 that takes effect next year.

I support the establishment of a fully bundled payment system for renal dialysis services.

It is intended to improve payments for ESRD services and to ensure access

to critical renal dialysis services, including those in rural areas.

It will also improve the quality of care for dialysis patients by requiring ESRD providers to meet certain standards through a new quality incentive program that is established for ESRD providers.

It establishes a permanent annual update for ESRD providers.

It also provides for payment adjustments in certain circumstances, such as payments for low-volume facilities and for dialysis facilities and providers in rural areas that need additional resources.

Last fall, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, issued a proposed rule to implement the new ESRD bundled payment system. That rule will be finalized later this year.

I am concerned that overall some of the proposed adjustments that reduce payments for dialysis treatment may be unduly low.

But today I want to focus on one issue in particular—the adjustment that CMS has proposed for low-volume facilities.

The legislation that established this new bundled payment system specifically requires CMS to adopt a payment adjustment of not less than 10 percent for low-volume facilities to ensure their continued viability with other facilities.

The Secretary was given the discretion to define low-volume facilities.

Unfortunately, CMS has proposed a very restrictive definition and set of criteria to qualify as a low-volume facility so the payment adjustment would only apply to facilities that furnish fewer than 3,000 treatments a year.

According to CMS, “the low-volume adjustment should encourage small ESRD facilities to continue to provide access to care to an ESRD patient population where providing that care would otherwise be problematic.”

CMS also notes that low-volume facilities have substantially higher treatment costs.

Previously, CMS considered an ESRD facility with less than 5,000 treatments a year to be small.

But now CMS is proposing to limit eligible ESRD facilities to those with less than 3,000 treatments a year and requiring this limit to be met for 3 years preceding the payment year, along with certain ownership restrictions.

CMS has not proposed any geographic restriction that would limit the low-volume payment adjustment to dialysis facilities in rural areas.

Medicare reimbursement is already problematic for small dialysis organizations because they operate on very low Medicare margins.

According to the March 2010 report of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, MedPAC, large dialysis organizations have Medicare margins of 4.0 percent compared to other dialysis facilities with Medicare margins of only 1.6 percent.

MedPAC also found that rural dialysis providers have Medicare margins that average -0.3 percent compared to urban providers with positive margins of 3.9 percent, and they expressed concern that the gap in rural and urban margins has widened.

They project that Medicare margins will fall from an aggregate 3.2 percent margin in 2008 to an aggregate 2.5 percent in 2010.

If corresponding declines are seen in rural areas, negative margins for rural facilities will increase, and low-volume rural facilities will be hit even harder.

And this projection does not take into account any of the additional reductions that CMS has proposed as part of the new bundled payment system even though these reductions would have a significant adverse impact on small dialysis facilities.

Should the proposed restrictions on low-volume facilities be finalized, the continued viability of these small dialysis facilities will be questionable.

This will be especially true in rural areas, and beneficiary access to these critical dialysis services will be severely jeopardized.

Small rural dialysis clinics provide beneficiaries with end-stage-renal disease access to critically-needed dialysis services in medically underserved areas.

In some rural areas, a single clinic may be the only facility that furnishes this life-sustaining care.

Should the unduly restrictive treatment limit for low-volume facilities be finalized as proposed, small rural facilities with slightly higher treatment volumes will lose these essential low-volume payments.

Since rural dialysis facilities already face negative Medicare margins, many are likely to close, further limiting access to crucial dialysis services that these kidney patients depend upon to survive.

New facilities would not be eligible for low-volume payments until their fourth year of operation under the proposed rule, making it unlikely that other facilities would take the place of those that had closed.

The prospect of Medicare beneficiaries' losing access to these life-sustaining services is simply unacceptable.

I, therefore, urge CMS to modify the proposed restrictions for low-volume adjustments by raising the treatment limit to the existing 5,000 treatment definition for small rural dialysis facilities.

One of my constituents, Laura Beyer, RN, BSN, is the manager of dialysis at Pella Regional Health Center, a critical access hospital in rural Iowa. She has written an editorial about this problem and the financial crises that small outpatient dialysis facilities, such as Pella Regional Health Center, are facing. Her editorial will be appearing in *Nephrology News* in July.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* this editorial.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

WILL THE NEW ESRD BUNDLE CAUSE THE DEATH OF RURAL HOSPITAL-BASED DIALYSIS UNITS?

The new End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) Bundled payment system scheduled to begin in January, 2011 is expected to create a financial loss for dialysis clinics across the United States. According to the CMS Office of Public Affairs (2009) “MIPPA [Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act] specifically requires that the new system trim two percent of the estimated payments that would have been made in 2011 under the previous payment system” (§3). Although this is of concern to all dialysis clinics, it is particularly alarming to non-profit hospital based dialysis units which are already operating at a loss.

These small hospital-owned dialysis clinics are simply trying to provide a service to an underserved rural area. Patients would have no option but to let ESRD claim their lives because the resources are not available for them to drive the extended distances to urban areas where dialysis services are more available. Pella Regional Health Center (PRHC), a Critical Access Hospital (CAH) in rural Iowa, offers outpatient dialysis services. Robert Kroese, CEO of PRHC stated, “We choose to keep this dialysis clinic open despite the financial liability to the hospital for one reason only, people will have no choice but to die without it. Our community needs this service.”

Currently hospital-based dialysis units represent 13.6 percent of all dialysis facilities in the United States. Facilities classified as rural only make up 4.4 percent. The current CMS payment system defines a small facility as <5000 treatments annually as well as other control variables to include urban vs. rural and facility ownership. The proposed bundled payment system will decrease reimbursement further for these rural hospital-based units by decreasing the low-volume definition to <3000 treatments per year and eliminating rural facility payment adjustments (Leavitt, 2008). Considering the lack of buying power these small facilities face compared to the large dialysis companies, the hope of continuing this service in these rural areas is diminishing.

At what point is the financial burden going to be too much for these small rural hospitals to carry? The result will be thousands of patients without the healthcare services needed to sustain their lives. Please consider the effects on the unseen heroes in rural America trying to provide the best care possible to all Americans who need it. Help protect the dialysis patients who live in the underserved areas of America by contacting your state representatives regarding the preservation of Hospital-based rural dialysis units.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will oppose the conference version of the Dodd-Frank bill. While it includes some positive provisions, it fails its most important mission, namely to ensure that taxpayers, consumers, businesses, and workers won't be victims of another financial crisis like the one which a few years ago triggered the worst recession our Nation has experienced since the Great Depression.

The measure certainly contains many good things, but those positive provisions do not outweigh the bill's serious failings. Of the several significant flaws in the bill, I will focus on two—the failure to reinstate the well-



proven protections first established by the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 that were repealed a decade ago, and the failure to firmly and finally address the essential problem posed by too-big-to-fail financial institutions.

Earlier this year I was pleased to cosponsor a bill introduced by the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, to restore the safeguards that were enacted as part of the famous Glass-Steagall Act of 1933. And I was also pleased to cosponsor her amendment to the Financial Regulatory Reform bill, which was based on that legislation. It went to the very core of what the underlying bill we are considering seeks to address.

Unlike some other proposals we considered, that amendment had a track record we can review, because the economic history of this country can be divided into three eras—the time before Glass-Steagall, the Glass-Steagall era, and the most recent post-Glass-Steagall era.

In the first era—the time before the enactment of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933—financial panics were frequent and devastating. Even before the market crash in 1929, the panics of 1857, 1873, 1893, 1901, and 1907 wrecked our economy, putting thousands of firms out of business, and leaving family breadwinners across the country without jobs.

In the wake of the 1929 crash—the last great panic of that first era—4,000 commercial banks and 1,700 savings and loans failed in this country, triggering the Great Depression that eliminated jobs for a quarter of the workforce.

It was that last financial crisis that spurred enactment of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, which marks the beginning of the second of our financial history's three eras.

The Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 put a stop to financial panics. It stabilized our banking system by implementing two key reforms. First, it established an insurance system for deposits, reassuring bank customers that their deposits were safe and thus forestalling bank runs. And second, it erected a firewall between securities underwriting and commercial banking. Financial firms had to choose which business to be in; they couldn't do both.

That wall between Main Street commercial banking and Wall Street investment financing was a crucial part of establishing the deposit insurance safety net because it prevented banks that accepted FDIC-insured deposits from making speculative investment bets with that insured money.

The Glass-Steagall Act was an enormous success. It helped prevent any major financial crisis in this country for most of the 20th century, and that financial market stability helped foster the economic growth we enjoyed for decades.

And that brings us to the last of the three eras—the post-Glass-Steagall era.

All that wonderful financial market stability that we had enjoyed for dec-

ades began to unravel when, in the 1980s, Wall Street lobbyists spurred regulators to undermine financial regulations, including the very firewall between Main Street banking and Wall Street investing that Glass-Steagall had established, and that had worked so well. That firewall was completely torn down when Wall Street lobbyists convinced Congress to pass the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999.

We have seen the disastrous results of that ill-considered policy. It's a major part of the reason the financial regulatory reform bill was considered by this body.

I voted against the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, which eliminated the Glass-Steagall protections. The financial and economic record of that bill has been disastrous. If the financial regulatory reform bill before us did nothing else, it should have fixed the problems created by that ill-advised act.

Just a few weeks ago, at one of the listening sessions I hold in each of Wisconsin's 72 counties every year, a community banker from northwestern Wisconsin urged me to support restoring the Glass-Steagall protections. He rightly pointed out how the lack of those protections led directly to the Great Depression. And he argued that the bill we are currently debating doesn't go far enough in this respect. That community banker was absolutely right.

The bill before us tries to make up for the lack of a Glass-Steagall firewall by establishing some new limitations on the activities of banks, and gives greater power and responsibility to regulators. All of that is well intentioned, but we all know just how creative financial firms can be at eluding these kinds of limits and regulatory oversight when so much profit is at stake. No amount of oversight is an effective substitute for the legal firewall established by Glass-Steagall.

The era in our financial history in which the Glass-Steagall protections were in force was notable for the lack of instability and turmoil that had been a regular feature of our financial markets prior to Glass-Steagall, and that helped bring our economy to the brink after Glass-Steagall safeguards were repealed. Congress should have restored those time-tested protections, and reestablished the stability that brought our Nation half a century of remarkable economic growth.

We could have achieved that by adopting the Cantwell amendment. But, as we know, the Cantwell amendment was not even permitted a vote, such was the opposition to that commonsense reform by those who were guiding this legislation. So our financial markets will continue to remain adrift in the brief but ruinous post-Glass-Steagall era.

The other flaw I will highlight is the measure's failure to directly address what in many ways is the reason we are here today, namely the problem of too big to fail.

During the Senate's consideration of the measure, several amendments were offered that sought to confront that problem. Two of them, one offered by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, and one offered by the Senators from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, and Delaware, Mr. KAUFMAN, took the problem on directly. Only one of those amendments even got a vote, and that proposal, from Senators BROWN and KAUFMAN, was strongly opposed, and ultimately defeated, by those who were shepherding the bill through the Senate.

As I noted, the problem of too big to fail is the reason we are considering financial regulatory reform legislation. It was the threat of the failure of the Nation's largest financial institutions that spurred the Wall Street bailout. I opposed that measure as well, in part because it was not tied to fundamental reforms of our financial system that would prevent a future crisis and the need for another bailout. There can be no doubt that we could have had a much tougher reform package if the bailout had been tied to such a measure.

Nor should there be any doubt about the role Congress has played in aggravating the problem of too big to fail. Fifteen years ago, the six largest U.S. banks had assets equal to 17 percent of our GDP. Today, after the enactment of the Riegle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching bill and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley bill, the six largest U.S. banks have assets equal to more than 60 percent of our GDP.

Years ago, a former Senator from Wisconsin, William Proxmire, noted that as banking assets become more concentrated, the banking system itself becomes less stable, as there is greater potential for system wide failures. Sadly, Senator Proxmire was absolutely right, as recent events have proved. Even beyond the issue of systemic stability, the trend toward further concentration of economic power and economic decisionmaking, especially in the financial sector, simply is not healthy for the Nation's economy.

Historically, banks have had a very special role in our free market system: They are rationers of capital. While in recent decades we have seen changes in the capital markets that provide the largest corporations with other options to access needed capital, small businesses still remain dependent on the traditional banking system for the capital that is essential to them. So when fewer and fewer banks are making the critical decisions about where capital is allocated, there is an increased risk that many worthy enterprises will not receive the capital needed to grow and flourish.

For years, a strength of the American banking system was the strong community and local nature of that system. Locally made decisions made by locally owned financial institutions—institutions whose economic prospects were tied to the financial

health of the communities they served—have long played a critical role in the economic development of our Nation and especially for our smaller communities and rural areas. But we have moved away from that system. Directly as a result of policy changes made by Congress and regulators, banking assets are controlled by fewer and fewer institutions, and the diminishment of that locally owned and controlled capital has not benefited either businesses or consumers.

Beyond the problems to our capital markets created by this development, there is Senator Proxmire's warning about the increased risk of system wide failure. Taxpayers across the country must now realize that Senator Proxmire's warning about the concentration of banking assets proved to be all too prescient when President Bush and Congress decided to bail out those mammoth financial institutions rather than allowing them to fail.

Some may argue that instead of imposing clear limits on the size of these financial behemoths, the bill before us seeks to limit their risk of failing by tightening the rules that should govern their behavior. And, they might add, the measure also permits regulators to address these matters more directly than ever before. But we have seen how Wall Street interests can maneuver around inconvenient regulations. Moreover, the track record of the regulators themselves has been troubling at best, and yet this bill relies on that same system to protect taxpayers and the economy from another financial market meltdown.

Today, the 10 largest banks have more than \$10 trillion in assets. That is the equivalent of more than three-quarters of our Nation's GDP. And no one believes that, if one or more of those financial institutions were to get into trouble, they would be allowed to simply fail. The risk to the financial markets and the economy is seen as too great. They are literally too big to fail. And that is the problem.

As economist Dean Baker has noted, too big to fail implies two things: First, knowing the government will stand behind the debt-of-too-big to fail institutions, creditors will view those institutions as better credit risks and lower the cost of credit to them; and second, too-big-to-fail firms are able to engage in riskier behavior than other firms because creditors know the government will stand behind a too-big-to-fail firm if it gets in trouble, they will keep the money flowing when they otherwise might have closed it off. Baker is exactly right when he says that this is a recipe for many more bailouts.

Too big to fail has been a growing problem for more than a decade. Yet nothing in the Dodd-Frank bill requires that those enormous financial firms be whittled down to a size that would permit them to fail without disastrous consequences for financial markets or the economy. In fact, as Peter Eavis noted in the Wall Street Journal,

the bill actually "enshrines the bailout architecture, and thus the 'too-big-to-fail' distortions in the economy." And those distortions are not limited to the kind of massive, systemic collapse of the financial markets, which we just experienced. Too-big-to-fail distortions occur daily. They happen whenever a smaller community bank is competing with an enormous too-big-to-fail bank. Dean Baker calculated that the credit advantage the very biggest banks have over smaller institutions because of too-big-to-fail distortions is worth possibly \$34 billion a year. Those who doubt such a distortion need only talk to a community banker for a few minutes to understand just how real it is.

Some suggest we should pass this bill because, despite the failings I have just described, it contains some positive reforms and that we should enact those improvements and then work to achieve the critically needed reforms that remain. That analysis assumes there will be some second great reform effort which will build on the work begun in this legislation, and that simply isn't going to happen. This is the bill. In the wake of the financial crisis and bailout, Congress essentially gets one shot to correct things and prevent a future crisis and bailout. There will be no financial regulatory reform, part two. Nobody seriously thinks the White House is planning a second reform package to go after too big to fail and to reinstate Glass-Steagall protections. Nor does anyone believe the Senate Banking Committee or the House Banking Committee is drafting a followup bill to deal with those issues. For that matter, I know of no advocacy groups that are seriously planning a followup reform effort to go after too big to fail or to reinstate the Glass-Steagall firewalls between commercial banking and Wall Street investment firms. It is not happening, because this is the moment and this is bill. To minimize the failings of this bill by suggesting there will be another one coming down the pike is at best misleading and at worst dishonest.

Mr. President, in this case, we have to get it right—completely right, not just make a good start. This bill fails the key test of preventing another crisis, and I will oppose it.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to speak regarding the auto dealer exclusion in section 1029 of H.R. 4173, the Restoring American Financial Stability Act of 2010.

I am pleased that my amendment excluding auto dealers from the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, CFPB, was included in the conference report to H.R. 4173. This proposal attracted bipartisan support because the auto dealers should not have been regulated in this bill in the first place. They are retailers. They should not be regulated as bankers. They did not cause the Wall Street meltdown. They didn't bring down Lehman Brothers or Bear Stearns.

The purpose of my amendment was to protect third party auto financing.

The CFPB could have abolished that kind of financing, but keeping these provisions in the bill will preserve a variety of auto financing choices for consumers, and we know that more choices result in lower prices. And the provisions of my amendment keep auto loans convenient and affordable while retaining existing consumer protection laws and policies.

The end result is a balance between consumer protection and the availability of affordable and accessible credit for consumers to meet their transportation needs. Except for subsection (d), Section 1029 is the result of a lot of debate and discussion in both houses of Congress dating back to last year. During the House Financial Services Committee's markup of this legislation, Representative JOHN CAMPBELL of California offered an amendment to exclude auto dealers from the jurisdiction of the CFPB. The Campbell amendment passed on a bipartisan vote of 47-21. A modified form of the Campbell amendment was included during floor consideration of H.R. 4173, which passed by a vote of 223-202 on December 11, 2009.

I offered an amendment during Senate consideration of H.R. 4173 to serve as a companion to the Campbell amendment. Although my amendment did not receive a direct vote, on May 24, the Senate voted to instruct its conferees to recede to the House on this matter, subject to the modifications of the Brownback amendment. This motion passed on a bipartisan vote of 60-30.

The final conference committee agreement incorporates the Brownback-Campbell language with some modifications. I want to discuss those provisions specifically and highlight some significant points.

First, section 1029(a) provides that the CFPB "may not exercise any rule-making, supervisory, enforcement or any other authority, including any authority to order assessments, over a motor vehicle dealer that is predominately engaged in the sale and servicing of motor vehicle, the leasing and servicing of motor vehicles, or both." This is a clear, unambiguous exclusion from the authority of the CFPB for motor vehicle dealers.

Three exceptions to the exclusion for dealers are enumerated in section 1029(b). Subsection (b)(1) describes activity related to real estate transactions with consumers. Subsection (b)(2) describes motor vehicle transactions in which the dealer underwrites, funds, and services motor vehicle retail installment sales contracts and lease agreements without the involvement of an unaffiliated third party finance or leasing source so-called "buy-here-pay-here" transactions. Subsection (b)(3) describes the consumer financial products and services offered by motor vehicle dealers and limits the exclusion to those activities or any related or ancillary product or service. The combination of

1029(a) and 1029(b) ensures that motor vehicle dealers providing financial products or services related to the activities described in subsection (b)(3) are completely excluded from the CFPB.

Section 1029(c) preserves the authority of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission and any other Federal agency having authority to regulate motor vehicle dealers.

Section 1029(d) provides that the Federal Trade Commission, FTC, will have the authority to write rules to address unfair or deceptive acts or practices by motor vehicle dealers pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Administrative Procedures Act instead of the Magnuson-Moss Act. Motor vehicles dealers are set to become the only businesses in America singled out for regulation in this manner. I want to emphasize that this specific provision was neither in the House or Senate bill and was not under consideration in either chamber. It was added by House-Senate conferees. Section 1029(d) was included without any evidence to justify its inclusion, or any debate for that matter. I do not support this provision, as I believe it invites the FTC to again engage in regulatory overreach. I am concerned that the removal of the well-established "Magnuson-Moss" safeguards gives the FTC free rein to conduct fishing expeditions into any area of automotive finance it perceives as "unfair."

The present leadership of the FTC has promised that if Magnuson-Moss were repealed, they would use their new power prudently. I hope that this is the case, because we do not want to repeat the kind of excessive FTC regulation that occurred in the 1970s. For that reason, Congress must monitor the FTC very closely to ensure the vast power Congress will now bestow on this agency is not once again abused.

Section 1029(e) requires the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Trade Commission to coordinate with the Office of Service Member Affairs to ensure that any complaints raised by men and women in the armed services are addressed effectively by the appropriate enforcement agency.

Section 1029(f) defines certain terms in the bill. My amendment expanded the House language to also exclude similarly situated RV and boat dealers.

The concept of excluding auto dealers from the jurisdiction of the CFPB gained bipartisan support, but there was some debate about its effect on members of the U.S. Armed Forces. Because we all share the utmost concern for our service men and women, I think it is appropriate to revisit that argument briefly and to reiterate my strong belief that this exclusion will not hurt members of the military.

On February 26, Under Secretary of Defense Clifford Stanley wrote a widely distributed letter contending that excluding auto dealers from the CFPB would have a harmful effect on servicemembers. On May 14, I sent a letter to

Under Secretary Stanley asking him to further clarify and substantiate the claims he made in his letter to ensure that the Senate would not take action that would harm military members.

Under Secretary Stanley's May 18 response to my letter offered a series of anecdotes about finance practices that were already illegal. In addition, Under Secretary Stanley's letter related the results of a survey of military members regarding auto financing. That survey, which was informal and unscientific, unfortunately failed to specify the sources of the problems some servicemembers encountered. It gave no indication that auto dealers were responsible for bad loans made to military members and made, and I think it is unfortunate that auto dealers were blamed for problems they did not cause on the basis of this survey.

In fact, I was surprised that Pentagon officials cited this survey instead of relying on their comprehensive 2006 report on abusive lending practices. This study, entitled "Report on Predatory Lending Practices Directed at Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents" did not include dealer-assisted financing among its list of predatory lending practices. In the end, in my view, the best information available indicates that servicemembers will not be harmed by exempting dealers from the jurisdiction of the CFPB. I am glad that argument carried the day.

I am very concerned that the CFPB, which will not be overseen by the Office of Management and Budget and will not depend on Congress for its funding, will at some point in the future engage in regulatory overreach that will hurt our economy. Excluding auto, boat and RV dealers from the CFPB jurisdiction will ensure that these Main Street small businesses are protected from such harmful regulation. For consumers, my amendment guarantees that access to affordable credit is preserved, and all consumer protections laws are maintained. While I am very concerned about the implications of H.R. 4173 overall, I am pleased that at least in this instance we have found a way to limit the threat of regulations that hurt consumers and strangle our economy.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010.

The American people often are cynical, with good reason, about the success that powerful corporate interests have in trumping the interests and rights of everyday Americans, on Wall Street, in Congress and even on our Supreme Court. Backed by multimillions of dollars that ordinary Americans cannot match, the lobbying pressure that was sharply focused on trying to shape this bill at every step, including the conference, was almost without parallel. Yet the bill that emerged from conference truly reflects the Nation's interests in real Wall Street re-

form. This is a great, unheralded victory for the American people and one that should serve as an example again and again.

The recent financial crisis clearly exposed several flaws in our current regulatory system. Many large Wall Street investment banks and insurance companies hid their shaky finances from stockholders and government regulators. Corporate executives saw their salaries rise to extreme heights, even as their companies were failing and seeking government assistance. Through it all, Federal regulatory agencies failed to provide the necessary oversight to rein in these reckless actions. If this crisis has taught us anything, it is that the look-the-other way, hands-off deregulatory policies that were in vogue in recent times can jeopardize not only private investments but our entire economy.

The conference report we are voting on today goes directly to the heart of the Wall Street excesses that brought our economy to the brink. For far too long Wall Street firms made risky bets in the dark and reaped enormous profits. Then, when their bets went sour, they turned to America's taxpayers to bail them out. This bill is about changing the culture of rampant Wall Street speculation and doing what needs to be done to get our economy back on track. We need more transparency and oversight of Wall Street. These improvements will increase transparency in and oversight of the financial sector. These historic reforms will set clear standards and real enforcement—including jail time for executives—to finally curb the fraud, manipulation, and riotous speculation that punctured confidence in our markets and derailed our economy.

I commend Chairman BARNEY FRANK and Chairman CHRIS DODD for their excellent leadership of the conference. As a conferee, I know full well the pressure that powerful Wall Street special interests put on all Members to water down the bill, and I appreciate the difficulty the two chairmen have endured corralling the votes needed for final passage. Despite heavy and expensive lobbying from those who support the status quo, the conference committee put together a strong and balanced bill that will clean up Wall Street abuses, build confidence in our economy, and continue our progress toward economic recovery.

This bill makes several significant improvements to our financial services regulations. Specifically, it will create a new systemic regulatory council to watch for broad economic bubbles and red flags; end taxpayer bailouts of Wall Street institutions by establishing a new resolution authority to wind down failing megafirms outside of bankruptcy; create a new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to oversee financial products on the market and rein in subprime lending; set new capital and leverage limits for financial institutions; give the SEC and CFTC

new authorities and resources to protect investors; bring the massive derivatives market under Federal regulation for the first time; require hedge fund and other private investment advisers to register with the SEC; establish reasonable and fair swipe fees for debit and credit cards; and provide new resources for unemployed homeowners who are having trouble making their mortgage payments.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am particularly pleased that the conference report also includes provisions I authored, working with Senator GRASSLEY, Senator SPECTER, and Senator KAUFMAN, to ensure law enforcement and Federal agencies have the necessary tools to investigate and prosecute financial crimes and to protect whistleblowers who help uncover these crimes. I am pleased that the conference report preserves meaningful antitrust oversight in the financial industry. I also am heartened that the conference agreement includes provisions I put forward to introduce true transparency into the complex operations of large financial institutions and the Federal agencies that regulate them. It has seemed to me that promoting transparency should be a vital element of Wall Street reform. Transparency is a cleansing agent for healthy markets. Open information helps investors make sound decisions. When information is murky, market decisions must be based on guesses or rumors that corrode trust and that encourage fraud and deception.

Another major step forward is the derivatives section of the conference report, crafted by the Agriculture Committee on which I serve. I applaud our committee chair, Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN, who fought tirelessly for these reforms. These changes will finally bring the \$600 trillion derivatives market out of the dark and into the light of day, ending the days of backroom deals that put our entire economy at risk. The narrow end-user exemption in the bill will allow legitimate commercial interests, such as electric cooperatives and heating oil dealers on Main Street, to continue hedging their business risks, but it will stop Wall Street traders from artificially driving up prices of heating oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, and other commodities through unchecked speculation.

The conference report also includes a provision by Senator DICK DURBIN and Representative Peter Welch that I supported to protect our small businesses from complicated predatory rules that big credit card companies could otherwise impose on Vermont grocers and convenience stores. The Durbin-Welch amendment will ensure that a small business will be able to advertise a discount for paying cash or for using one card instead of another. I do not want Vermonters to pay more for a gallon of milk just because the credit card companies are demanding a high fee on small transactions and are not allow-

ing the grocer to ask for cash instead of credit.

Another amendment I offered that is included in the final agreement is of particular importance to small States such as Vermont. My amendment will guarantee that Vermont and other small States each receive at least \$5 million of the \$1 billion in new Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds in the bill. Originally created in 2008, this program is designed to stabilize communities that have suffered from foreclosures and abandonment. My amendment overrode language proposed by the House that expressly prohibited a small-State-minimum from being used to allocate funds.

The extractive industries transparency disclosure provision that I sponsored is another major step forward for protecting U.S. taxpayers and shareholders and increasing the transparency of major financial transactions. This provision is about good governance and transparency so the American people and investors can know if they are investing in companies that are operating in dangerous or unstable parts of the world, thereby putting their investments at risk. This provision also will enable citizens of these resource-rich countries to know what their governments and governmental officials are receiving from foreign companies in exchange for mining rights. This will begin to hold governments accountable for how those funds are used and help ensure that the sale of their countries' natural resources are used for the public good.

I am also pleased that the bill includes a provision I cosponsored with Senator BERNIE SANDERS to increase transparency on the bailout transactions made by the Federal Reserve. Under this bill, we will finally have an audit of all of the emergency actions taken by the Federal Reserve since the financial crisis began, to determine whether there were any conflicts of interest surrounding the Federal Reserve's emergency activities. It is time we know more about the closed-door decisions made by the Federal Reserve throughout this financial crisis.

Mr. President, the Senate has before it today a conference report that will rein in Wall Street abuses, end government bailouts, and give everyday Americans the consumer protection they deserve and expect. It will help restore faith in our markets, which are part of the vital foundation of our economic progress. Taking this broom to Wall Street abuses will help build confidence in our economy and continue our progress toward economic recovery.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on June 29, 2010, the House-Senate conference committee completed its deliberations on the most significant financial regulatory legislation since the 1930s. And, now, this conference report is before the Senate for final enactment. It will fundamentally change how we protect consumers, families, and small busi-

ness from the reckless and abusive practices of the financial sector, and it will provide a framework for economic growth without the peril of periodic taxpayer bailouts of the financial sector.

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 is a significant achievement. The legislation before the Senate declares that big banks cannot continue to take enormous risk, reaping billions in profits and rewarding their executives with hefty bonuses while counting on taxpayers to bail them out when they get in trouble. Unregulated mortgage lenders will no longer be able to make loans they know will not be repaid; loans that cripple families and communities. And, banks will no longer operate in an unregulated, opaque, and dangerous market for derivatives that helped lead us to the brink of financial catastrophe last year.

However, the events of the last decade and, particularly, the last several years should caution all of us with respect to the efficacy of any single legislative initiative. This bill must be thoughtfully and vigorously implemented. Indeed, the regulators must be particularly vigilant to ensure that this legislative effort is not undone by powerful interests who will be constrained by its provisions. In the years ahead, regulators must have the resources and the will to enforce these provisions to protect consumers and to protect the economy. The Congress must be prepared to provide rigorous oversight and move quickly to ensure that regulatory supervision will keep pace with a dynamic global marketplace.

More than a decade of excessive risk taking and lax regulation culminated in financial collapse in the autumn of 2008. The ensuing economic chaos has left millions unemployed and underemployed, precipitated a foreclosure crisis that still haunts neighborhoods throughout the country, and shattered the dreams of millions of American families.

With this new legislation, we create for the first time a consumer watchdog—the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—that will solely focus on protecting consumers from unscrupulous financial activities. The law gives this agency independent rulemaking, examination, and enforcement responsibilities, and clear authority to prohibit unfair, deceptive, and abusive financial activities against middle-class families. And it consolidates the existing responsibilities of many regulators to ensure that there is a less fragmented, more comprehensive, and a fully accountable approach to protecting consumers.

The new Bureau represents a fundamental shift in how we inform Americans about abuses by banks, credit card companies, finance companies, payday lenders, and other financial institutions. It will focus these companies on doing their job of providing responsible

and constructive financial products to help families and small businesses succeed, rather than destructive products that cause them to fail by draining their income and savings.

I am also pleased that the Senate voted 98 to 1 to approve the bipartisan amendment I offered with Senator SCOTT BROWN to create an Office of Service Member Affairs within the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This office will educate and empower members of the military and their families, help monitor and respond to complaints, and help coordinate consumer protection efforts among Federal and State agencies.

Although I would have preferred for the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to have sole authority over consumer protection matters for all banks and nonbank financial companies, the final bill represents a strong regime for consumer protection, including rulewriting authority over all entities. It also provides the Bureau with authority to examine and enforce regulations for banks and credit unions with assets of over \$10 billion; all mortgage-related businesses, such as lenders, servicers, and mortgage brokers; payday lenders; student lenders; and all large debt collectors and consumer reporting agencies.

One glaring exception is the carve-out for auto lenders. I opposed the Brownback amendment that created a special loophole for auto dealer-lenders, and I also opposed the compromise that is included in the conference report. The original protections in the bill were not meant to vilify auto dealers. The vast majority of dealers in my State of Rhode Island and across the country are hard-working business owners who operate responsibly. Rather, this debate was about ensuring fair and consistent scrutiny of all lending institutions. We cannot ignore the abuses that service members and others have endured because of predatory auto loans. We have learned from the debate that the abuse of service members by some auto dealers is an epidemic. During the debate I received a memo citing 15 recent examples of auto finance abuses just at Camp Lejeune alone. This problem will require close scrutiny after the bill is implemented.

I am also pleased that the legislation includes provisions from the Durbin amendment that will protect small business from unreasonable credit card company fees by requiring the Federal Reserve to issue rules ensuring that fees charged to merchants by credit card companies for debit card transactions are both reasonable and proportional to the cost of processing those transactions. These provisions will allow small businesses to invest more and pass on greater savings to their customers rather than spend their earnings on unreasonable interchange fees.

The Dodd-Frank Act also creates a new Financial Stability Oversight Council, comprised of existing regu-

lators, to identify and respond to emerging risks throughout the financial system. This new council represents another significant improvement to protect families from devastating economic trends by, for the first time, creating one single entity responsible for looking across the financial system to prevent and respond to problems.

This section of the conference report also puts in place a new rigorous system of capital and leverage standards that will discourage banks from getting so large that they put our financial system at risk again. The new Financial Stability Oversight Council will make recommendations to the Federal Reserve to apply strict rules for capital, leverage, liquidity, and risk management so that firms that grow too big will face stricter rules that will likely deter the bigger is better mentality of too many banks. The council will also make recommendations for nonbank financial companies that have grown so large or complex that their activities pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States. No financial institution, bank or otherwise, will be able to take risks to multiply their gains without holding adequate capital. And, more importantly, such institutions will be on notice that the taxpayers will not bail them out.

The conference report includes a new Office of Financial Research, a proposal that I developed to provide an entity capable of researching, modeling, and analyzing risks throughout the financial system. For too long, those charged with keeping the banking system stable have lacked the data and analytical power to keep up with complex financial activities. This office ends that situation and takes a bold step forward to understand the factors that threaten to rip holes in our financial system, provide early warnings, and allow regulators to act on that information. As we create this new office, I will ensure that it retains its independence and broad data collection, budget, and hiring authority, so we are sure to better identify and mitigate economic challenges in the future. The challenge presented by the task of understanding the financial markets and monitoring systemic risk will require a sustained, integrated research effort that brings together some of the top researchers and practitioners in the country from a diverse range of relevant disciplines. The Office of Financial Research must become a world class institution that can go “toe to toe” with the top Wall Street banks.

In addition, this law creates a safe way to liquidate large financial companies, so that taxpayers will never again have to prop up a failing firm to avoid sending shockwaves through the financial system. Shareholders and unsecured creditors, not taxpayers, will bear losses, and culpable management will be removed. Financial institutions will pay for their failures, not taxpayers. Indeed, the existing rules on

emergency lending authority and debt guarantees will be substantially changed to ensure that such tools cannot be used to bail out individual firms. This will send an important message to Wall Street: operate at your own risk since the taxpayers will no longer be in the business of bailing you out.

The Dodd-Frank Act also establishes important new limits on banks engaging in proprietary trading and in owning and investing in hedge funds and private equity funds. These provisions are known as the Volcker rule or the Merkley-Levin amendment. These new rules will help ensure that banks are not betting with consumer bank deposits on risky activities for the banks' own profit.

Until the last few decades, commercial banking and investment banking were largely conducted by separate institutions. However, in recent years, banks have engaged in a multitude of higher risk activities, such as short-term trading for a bank's own profit, and the sponsoring of hedge funds and private equity funds. The law changes that and prohibits any bank, thrift, holding company, or affiliate from engaging in proprietary trading or sponsoring or investing in a hedge fund or private equity fund. It also prohibits activities that involve material conflicts of interest between banks and their clients, customers, and counterparties.

The conference report also includes two provisions in this area that I authored. One requires the chief executive officer at a banking entity to certify annually that it does not, directly or indirectly, guarantee, assume, or otherwise insure the obligations or performance of the hedge fund or private fund. The other provision requires banking entities to set aside more capital commensurate with the leverage of the hedge fund or private equity fund.

Although the final provisions included in the bill represent a stronger and more targeted approach to reducing risk in our banking system, I believe the change during the conference to allow for a 3 percent de minimus exclusion from the ban on sponsoring or investing in hedge funds or private equity funds was unwise. The original Merkley-Levin proposal did not include such an exclusion. Congress and the regulators will need to monitor bank activities very closely in the coming years to ensure that this exclusion is not abused.

The bill also makes some changes to consolidate our country's fragmented and inefficient system for supervising banks and holding companies. It eliminates the Office of Thrift Supervision, a particularly lax supervisor, and redistributes responsibilities for bank oversight and supervision to bring greater consistency and more effective oversight to all firms. These changes are an important step forward, although additional consolidation and streamlining of our regulatory agencies could have

further improved the effectiveness of the system.

The Dodd-Frank bill also closes a significant gap in financial regulation by requiring advisers to hedge funds and private equity funds to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Based on legislation that I introduced, we will for the first time bring advisers to those funds within the umbrella of financial regulation. This will allow regulators to obtain the basic information they need to prevent fraud and mitigate systemic risk, while at the same time providing investors with more information and greater transparency.

Advisers to hedge funds and private equity funds—called “private funds” in the legislation—will have to register with either the SEC or a State, depending on the size of the funds they manage. Fund advisers with assets under management over \$150 million must register with the SEC. Advisers to other types of funds will continue to have similar requirements, but the threshold for SEC registration will be \$100 million. I also successfully included language in the conference report to ensure that State registration is only available to eligible fund advisers if the State has a registration and examination program.

From the beginning of this process I fought against any carve-outs in this title for private equity, venture capital, and family offices. While I successfully convinced the conferees to drop a carve-out for private equity advisers, the bill still contains problematic exemptions for venture capital firms and family offices. Through hearings and other means, I will continue to work to create a regulatory system in which none of the fraud and systemic risks that may lurk within private pools of capital remain out of view and reach of regulators.

On derivatives, the bill closes another huge set of regulatory gaps by overturning a law that prevented regulators from overseeing the shadowy over-the-counter derivatives market and, as a result, bringing accountability and transparency to the market. As we have learned from AIG and Lehman Brothers, derivatives were at a minimum the accelerant that complicated and expanded the financial crisis.

A major problem with derivatives is that they have not been regulated nor well-understood by even those buying and selling them. The legislation changes that and brings transparency and greater efficiency to the marketplace for swaps—derivatives in which two parties exchange certain benefits based on the value of an underlying reference like an interest rate—by requiring the reporting of the terms of these contracts to regulators and market participants. It will move as many swaps as possible from being opaque, bilateral transactions onto clearinghouses, exchanges, and other trading platforms. This should help make the

marketplace fairer and more efficient by providing companies and investors with complete information on the market. Firms will also be required to put forward sufficient capital to engage in these transactions, which should help rein in the excessive speculation we saw in the past.

I successfully offered several amendments during the conference to correct potential opportunities for regulatory arbitrage between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. One of my improvements requires the SEC and the CFTC to conduct joint rulemaking in certain key areas rather than create potential gaps by conducting them separately. Other amendments clarify the definitions of mixed swap, security-based swap agreements, and index—which are all important terms that fall at the nexus of the two agencies’ oversight—to ensure that the new swaps rules cannot be gamed and manipulated.

In a significant improvement to public transparency of swaps data, I successfully included another amendment that will ensure that regulators can require public reporting of trading and pricing data for uncleared transactions, not just aggregate data on transactions, just as they can for cleared transactions.

Also important are provisions to give the Federal Reserve a role in setting risk management standards for derivatives clearinghouses and other critical payment, clearing, and settlement functions, which has been a priority of mine given their importance to the financial system and their potential vulnerability to both natural and man-made disruptions.

The Dodd-Frank conference report also makes important improvements to the Federal Reserve System to ensure that as a financial regulator, it is accountable to the American public rather than to Wall Street. Among other governance improvements, the bill incorporates my proposal to create a new position of Vice Chairman for Supervision on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, which should help ensure that supervision does not take a back seat to other priorities. The new Vice Chairman will develop policy recommendations for the board regarding the supervision and regulation of depository institution holding companies and other financial firms supervised by the board. He or she will also oversee the supervision and regulation of such firms.

Although the Senate bill included my proposal to require the head of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to be Presidentially appointed and Senate confirmed, the provision was stripped out during conference. If the Governors of the Federal Reserve System in Washington are required to be confirmed by the Senate, then the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, who played a pivotal and perhaps more powerful role in obli-

gating taxpayer dollars during the financial crisis, should also be subject to the same public confirmation process. Wall Street should not have the ability to choose who is in such a powerful position. Although the final bill limits class A directors—who represent the stockholding member banks of the Federal Reserve District—from participating in the process, it still allows the other directors, who could be bankers or represent other powerful interests, to vote for the head of the New York Reserve Bank. I believe that more still needs to be done to make this position truly accountable to the taxpayers.

The Dodd-Frank Act also includes a number of strong investor protection provisions that represent a significant step forward in how we oversee our capital markets and ensure that investors have the best information available for their decisionmaking. This title reflects strong proposals I have put forward as the chairman of the Securities, Insurance, and Investment Subcommittee, including robust accountability provisions for credit rating agencies, and provisions to strengthen the tools and authorities of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The conference report includes strong new rules I helped write to address problems we saw at credit rating agencies leading up to the financial crisis. It creates an Office of Credit Ratings at the SEC to increase oversight of nationally recognized statistical rating organizations, and contains strong new rules regarding disclosure, conflicts of interest, and analyst qualifications. Perhaps most significantly, it includes a strong new pleading standard I crafted that will make it easier for investors to take legal action if a rating agency knowingly or recklessly fails to review key information in developing a rating.

I also worked with the chairman and my colleagues in conference to incorporate more than a dozen improvements to the securities laws that will protect investors by strengthening the SEC’s ability to bring enforcement actions, addressing issues revealed by the Madoff fraud, and modernizing the SEC’s ability to obtain critical information. In particular, these provisions would enhance the ability of the SEC to hire outside experts, strengthen oversight of fund custodians, modernize the ability of the SEC to obtain information from the firms it oversees, and clarify and enhance SEC penalties and other authorities. I am particularly pleased that the conference report contains extraterritoriality language that clarifies that in actions brought by the SEC or the Department of Justice, specified provisions in the securities laws apply if the conduct within the United States is significant, or the external U.S. conduct has a foreseeable substantial effect within our country, whether or not the securities are traded on a domestic exchange or the transactions occur in the United



States. I also support the establishment of a program to reward whistleblowers when the SEC brings significant enforcement actions based upon original information provided by the whistleblower, and I look forward to the SEC rules that will detail the framework for this program.

Although I would have preferred the proposal in the Senate bill by Senator SCHUMER to provide the SEC with self-funding, I am pleased that the amendment on SEC funding that I offered with Senator SHELBY during conference was included in the conference report. These provisions would keep the SEC budget within the annual appropriations process, but change how the funding process would work for the Commission. Our proposal includes budget bypass authority, under which the SEC would provide Congress with its assessment of its budget needs at the same time it provides this information to the Office of Management and Budget. In addition, the President, as part of his annual budget request to the Congress, would be required to include the SEC's budget request in unaltered form. The language will also have the SEC deposit up to \$50 million per year of the registration fees into a new reserve fund, which can be used for longer range planning for technology and other agency tools. The SEC will have permanent authority to obligate up to \$100 million in any fiscal year out of the reserve fund.

One important investor protection that was also supported by Senators LEVIN, COBURN, and KAUFMAN but not included in the final bill was language that would have corrected what we and many others, including legal scholars, regard as the mistaken Supreme Court decision in *Gustafson v. Alloyd*. Before the Supreme Court's decision in this case, the rule was simple but clear: be careful not to mislead when selling securities in both public and private offerings. After *Gustafson*, this simple rule was needlessly complicated and limited just to public offerings.

Our amendment, which we will continue to work on a bipartisan basis to add to another legislative vehicle in the future, would have put investors in private offerings on the same level as investors in public offerings, thereby restoring congressional intent and a standard that was in place for 60 years before the Supreme Court decided *Gustafson*.

One of the lessons learned from the Bush era financial collapse is that too often rules were ignored and information was hidden. That is why I am extremely disappointed that the conference report includes an exemption for companies with less than \$75 million in market capitalization from the requirements of Sarbanes-Oxley section 404(b). This change will exempt more than 5,000 public companies from audits, despite the fact that small companies have often been shown to be more prone to both accounting fraud and to accounting errors, including

among the highest rates of restatements. Enacting this exemption in the name of reducing paperwork, when extensive evidence indicates that the costs of compliance are reasonable and dropping, is unnecessary and unwise. I think there will be a price in the future as fraud increases and investors suffer.

I am also disappointed that conferees included a provision that overturns a recent court case regarding equity indexed annuities. Equity indexed annuities are financial products that combine aspects of insurance and securities, but are sold primarily as investments. This language will preclude State and Federal securities regulators from applying strong disclosure, suitability, and sales practice standards to these often risky and harmful products. I believe this is bad policy.

Clearly with the State securities regulators on one side of this issue, and the insurance regulators on the other—this is not a matter which should have been resolved in a conference committee. The regulation of equity indexed annuities deserves more consideration through hearings and the development of a legislative record that informs the Congress of what changes should happen in this area.

I am pleased that the conference report makes it clear that after conducting a study, the SEC has the authority to impose a fiduciary duty on brokers who give investment advice, and that the advice must be in the best interest of their customers. It also includes language that gives shareholders a say on CEO pay with the right to a nonbinding vote on salaries and golden parachutes. This gives shareholders the ability to hold executives accountable, and to disapprove of misguided incentive schemes. I am also happy that after much dispute, the bill makes it clear that the SEC has the authority to grant shareholders proxy access to nominate directors. These requirements can help shift management's focus from short-term profits to long-term stability and productivity.

I am pleased that the conference report includes several provisions to discourage predatory lending and provide much needed foreclosure relief. To reduce risk, this legislation requires those companies that sell products like mortgage backed securities to hold onto at least 5 percent of what they're selling so that these companies have the incentive to sell only those products they would own themselves. In other words, we make sure that there is some "skin in the game".

The conference report also further levels the playing field by enacting some commonsense proposals to protect borrowers. Lenders will now have to ensure that a borrower has the ability to repay a mortgage, and they can no longer steer borrowers into a more expensive mortgage product when the borrower qualifies for a more affordable one. The bill outlaws pre-payment penalties that trapped so many borrowers into unaffordable loans, and

those lenders who continue their predatory ways will be held accountable by consumers for as high as 3 years of interest payments and damages plus attorney's fees.

Additionally, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau will have the authority to investigate and enforce rules against all mortgage lenders, servicers, mortgage brokers, and foreclosure scam operators so that hard-working Americans have a strong financial cop on the beat that has the interests of consumers in mind.

Finally, I am particularly pleased that the conference report includes several provisions, some of which come from legislation I first introduced last Congress and revised this Congress, to provide much needed foreclosure relief to those who have borne the brunt of this crisis. First, it provides \$1 billion for loans to help qualified unemployed homeowners with reasonable prospects for reemployment to help cover mortgage payments. Second, I worked with my colleagues to ensure that the additional funding for HUD's Neighborhood Stabilization Program would reach all States, including Rhode Island. Third, I not only supported the inclusion of legal assistance for foreclosure-related issues, but I also fought to ensure that Rhode Island, which has one of the highest rates of foreclosure and unemployment, would be in a better position to receive priority consideration for this assistance. Lastly, I worked to include a national foreclosure database to give regulators an important tool to monitor and anticipate issues stemming from foreclosures and defaults in our housing markets and better pinpoint assistance to struggling homeowners.

Before I conclude I would like to take a moment to thank Kara Stein of my staff, who also serves as the staff director of the Securities, Insurance, and Investment Subcommittee, which I chair, and Randy Fasnacht, a detailee to the subcommittee from the GAO. They did a remarkable job and worked tirelessly. I also want to recognize the contributions of James Ahn of my staff as well as the foundation that Didem Nisanci, formerly of my staff, helped lay for this process. I also want to acknowledge the contributions of many others, including Chairman DODD and his staff.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation. But the Senate's work does not end with the bill's passage. It will have to monitor and oversee the law's implementation very closely. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act will make significant improvements to consumer protection that will benefit families and communities in my own State of Rhode Island and across the country. It will help create more transparent, fair, and efficient capital markets in our country, which will help create jobs and support American businesses. And it will provide a more secure and stable economic footing for the decades ahead.

Mr. AKAKA Mr. President, while I strongly support the Dodd-Frank conference report, I am concerned and disappointed that the legislation includes a particular provision that would exempt indexed annuity products from securities regulation. I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying letters in opposition to this provision from AARP, the North American Securities Administrators Association, the Consumer Federation of America, and the Financial Planning Association be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. AKAKA. Indexed annuities combine aspects of insurance and securities and are sold primarily as investment products. Consumers across the country, including some in Hawaii, have been harmed by the deceptive manner in which these products are being sold. For example, a seller in Hawaii pushed equity indexed annuities to collect unreasonably high commissions at the expense of senior citizens. Those investors were harmed by these financial products. Exempting indexed annuities from securities regulation would establish a dangerous precedent that promotes the development of financial products not subject to regulation and investor protection standards.

Opponents might argue that federal regulation is unnecessary or distracts from state regulation. However, Federal regulation is necessary to help protect investors by providing consistency and uniformity because securities laws can vary across states. Others are concerned that Federal regulation will limit access to indexed annuities. I counter that these products should only be sold when they are subject to the strong disclosure, suitability, and sales practice standards provided within the context of our Nation's securities laws.

I welcome further debate on and examination of this matter, including hearings to learn more about the consequences of this provision.

AARP,

Washington, DC, May 19, 2010.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER DODD,  
U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking, Housing  
and Urban Affairs, Dirksen Senate Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: AARP writes to strongly oppose Harkin Amendment #3920, which would deprive investors in equity-indexed annuities of needed protections provided by state and federal securities laws.

These hybrid products combine elements of insurance and securities, but they are sold primarily as investments, not insurance, especially to people who are investing for their own retirement. Growth in equity-indexed annuity value is tied to one of several securities indexes (e.g. the S&P 500 or the Dow Jones Industrial Average), and comparing and choosing suitable products can be difficult for investors. These products also come with high fees and have long surrender periods, which may make them unsuitable as investments for most seniors.

In the fall of 2008, the Securities and Exchange Commission adopted a rule to regu-

late equity-indexed annuities as securities (Rule 151A). The rule was later challenged, and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld the legal foundation for the SEC's action.

Because seniors are a target audience for these products, AARP submitted comments to the SEC supporting the rule, stating it was important that Rule 151A supplement, not supplant, state insurance law. In fact, the rule applies specifically to annuities regulated under state insurance law. AARP also submitted a joint amicus brief, along with the North American Securities Administrators Association and MetLife, supporting Rule 151A.

The Harkin amendment would overturn the SEC rule, which is designed to provide disclosure, suitability, and sales practice protections afforded by state and federal securities laws. The amendment would preempt any further ability of the SEC to regulate in this area. This not only deprives investors of needed protections against widespread abusive sales practices associated with these complex financial products, it also sets a dangerous precedent. If this amendment is adopted, the industry will be encouraged to develop hybrid products in the future specifically designed to evade a regulatory regime designed to protect consumers.

Regulating indexed annuities as securities is long overdue and vitally important for our nation's investors saving for a secure retirement.

The SEC's rule on indexed annuities accomplishes this goal in a thoughtful and reasonable fashion, and it should be allowed to take effect. AARP therefore opposes the Harkin amendment.

Sincerely,

DAVID SLOANE,  
Senior Vice President,  
Government Relations and Advocacy.

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES  
ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2010.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER DODD,  
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and  
Urban Development, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Banking, Housing  
and Urban Development, Washington,  
DC.

OPPOSE ATTEMPT TO NULLIFY SEC  
RULEMAKING ON EQUITY INDEXED ANNUITIES

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS: On behalf of state securities regulators, I am writing to oppose an attempt to deprive investors in indexed annuities of the strong protections afforded by our nation's securities laws. A provision to nullify SEC Rule 151A was not included in either the House or the Senate bill. I would argue that it is not germane to the conference, and the provision should not be accepted by the conferees. Furthermore, efforts such as this one that will ultimately deprive investors of important protections should not be allowed to succeed.

Indexed annuities are securities, and they are heavily marketed as such. All too often, deceptive sales practices have been used to promote these complicated investment products. As a result, investors—and senior citizens in particular—can fall prey to sales pitches designed to make these investments seem safe and straightforward when in fact they may be neither. Accordingly, it is vitally important that indexed annuities be regulated as securities and subjected to the

strong standards afforded by our nation's securities laws.

To ensure that investors receive these protections, the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") adopted Rule 151A, which would subject indexed annuities to regulation as securities. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld the legal foundation for Rule 151A. Although remanding with respect to certain procedural requirements, the court upheld the rule on substantive legal grounds, finding it was reasonable for the SEC to conclude that indexed annuities should be subject to federal securities regulation.

Attempts to disparage the SEC's rule as a federal attack on state regulation are unfounded. Critics who level that charge ignore the fact that the rule will NOT interfere with the authority of state insurance commissioners to continue regulating indexed annuities and the companies that issue them. In fact, in order to be covered by the rule, a contract must be subject to regulation as an annuity under state insurance law.

Nor will the rule impose unreasonable burdens on industry. It will simply require compliance with essentially the same regulatory standards that for 75 years have applied to all companies that issue securities. Moreover, the rule is strictly prospective, applying only to indexed annuities issued after the effective date, and it does not take effect for two years, affording the industry ample time to prepare for compliance. In short, the rule will provide much needed protections for investors without unfairly burdening industry.

Indexed annuities are hybrid products that supposedly offer investors the combined advantages of guaranteed minimum returns along with profits from stock market gains. Although indexed annuities may be legitimate vehicles for some people, they have many features, including high costs, significant risks, and long surrender periods, that make these products unsuitable for many investors. Investors have a difficult time understanding these hazards because indexed annuities are hopelessly complex. Compounding the problem are the generous commissions that agents can earn from the sale of these products.

The problems associated with the marketing of indexed annuities are a matter of record in countless news articles, government warnings, regulatory enforcement actions, and lawsuits filed by innumerable investors seeking damages for the unsuitable and fraudulent sale of indexed annuities. Indeed, these products have become so infamous that they were featured in a prime time Dateline NBC report entitled "Tricks of the Trade."

Without question, the single most effective way to address abuses in the sale of indexed annuities is to regulate them as securities. This is legally appropriate because indexed annuities shift a significant degree of investment risk to purchasers, and therefore pose the very dangers that the federal securities laws were intended to address. Licensing standards under the securities laws will help ensure that agents have the requisite knowledge and character to sell these complex investment products. Under the securities laws, those agents will also be subject to strong supervision requirements. Mandatory registration of indexed annuities as securities will vastly increase the amount of information available to investors concerning the terms, risks, and costs of these offerings. Perhaps most important, the strong investor protection standards that have been a part of securities regulation for decades will deter abuses in the sale of indexed annuities and provide more effective remedies for those who are victimized.

The goal of financial reform is to strengthen investor confidence in our markets and regulating indexed annuities as securities under federal law is vitally important to meeting this objective. The SEC's Rule 151A on indexed annuities is a step in the right direction and it should be allowed to take effect. Any attempt to reverse this important regulatory initiative should not be adopted.

Sincerely,

DENISE VOIGT CRAWFORD,  
Texas Securities Commissioner,  
NASAA President.

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES  
ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Washington, DC, June 23, 2010.

PROTECT INVESTORS: REJECT SENATE  
PROPOSALS INCLUDED IN TITLE IX

DEAR CONFEREES: State securities regulators are profoundly disappointed that the Senate conferees approved a Title IX counteroffer that includes two provisions that seriously weaken investor protections in a bill purportedly written to strengthen them. I urge you to reject the Senate fiduciary duty study/rulemaking language and the amendment to exempt certain hybrid annuity products from securities regulation.

Fiduciary Duty. Instead of the strongest possible fiduciary duty for every financial intermediary providing investment advice, the "compromise" study in the Senate offer has been modified to lessen the chances that investors will ever realize the benefits of a fiduciary duty, the single most important investor protection in the reform package. For the following reasons, NASAA must strongly oppose it.

The study is nothing more than a delay tactic and should be rejected outright.

It is wasteful of the SEC's resources in that it requires the agency to review and study issues that have already been repeatedly studied.

If the study remains in place, it should be significantly streamlined so as to avoid needless repetition of prior studies. Further, if there must be a study, it should be required to be conducted on a fully-cooperative basis by both governmental regulators, the SEC and the states, in order to maximize resources and insure its completion within the one-year time frame.

To make matters worse, the rulemaking language proposed by the Senate fails to achieve the original goal of both the Senate Banking Committee and the House Financial Services Committee to impose the Investment Advisers Act fiduciary duty on broker-dealers when providing personalized investment advice to retail customers about securities. Our specific opposition to the Senate rulemaking language includes the following:

The two year rulemaking provision would mean that it could be three years before the SEC even undertakes an attempt to implement a rule to address the study findings. Further, and as more fully discussed below, the conditions imposed by this amendment on any such rulemaking process are so arduous that it is highly doubtful that a rule of any kind would be promulgated.

The new rulemaking language would not result in a fiduciary duty for broker-dealers providing investment advice. The House language authorizing the SEC to adopt rules imposing the full Investment Advisers Act fiduciary duty on brokers when they give personalized advice about securities to retail investors has been removed. It has been replaced by language authorizing the SEC to adopt rules requiring brokers to act in their customers' "best interests" which is far short of the fiduciary duty.

That weakened authority provided to the SEC is subject to such burdensome condi-

tions and limitations that it is unlikely ever to be exercised. Before the SEC could even adopt a rule it would have to complete the study required above and then, as part of the rulemaking, show that no other approach could address the findings of the study. These draconian conditions would make any rule promulgated by the Commission subject to a legal challenge the agency would be unlikely to win.

The provisions requiring the SEC to harmonize enforcement of the standard, so that it is applied equally to brokers and advisers, have also been deleted.

Equity Indexed Annuities. The Senate conferees also approved an amendment to preempt securities regulation of equity-indexed annuities and future hybrid products that have both securities and insurance features. State securities regulators have actively pursued enforcement cases involving sales practice abuses of agents selling equity indexed annuities. These state enforcement actions are in danger of being preempted by the Harkin amendment and investors, especially seniors, would be left without the protection of vigorous securities enforcement activity.

The problems associated with the marketing of indexed annuities are a matter of record in countless news articles, government warnings, regulatory enforcement actions, and lawsuits filed by innumerable investors seeking damages for the unsuitable and fraudulent sale of indexed annuities. It was these problems that led the SEC to adopt Rule 151A after a fair and open rulemaking process.

The best way to ensure adequate investor protections in the sale of equity indexed annuities is to allow the SEC to exercise its appropriate authority over these products. State securities regulators urge you to reject this amendment as it has no place in a bill intended to strengthen investor protections.

In closing, we are extremely dissatisfied that the provisions in the Investor Protection title continue to be weakened. We urge you to reverse this trend, reject the Senate counteroffer and insist on strong protections for our nation's investors.

Sincerely,

DENISE VOIGT CRAWFORD,  
NASAA President,  
Texas Securities Commissioner.

NASAA & CFA,  
May 14, 2010.

OPPOSITION TO HARKIN/JOHANNIS/LEAHY  
AMENDMENT NO. 3920

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to oppose the Harkin/Johannis/Leahy amendment, which deprives investors in indexed annuities of the strong protections afforded by our nation's securities laws. Indexed annuities are securities, and they are heavily marketed as such. All too often, deceptive sales practices have been used to promote these complicated investment products. As a result, investors—and senior citizens in particular—can fall prey to unsuitable sales. Accordingly, it is vitally important that indexed annuities be regulated as securities and subjected to the strong disclosure, suitability, and sales practice standards afforded by our nation's securities laws.

To ensure that investors receive these protections, the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") adopted Rule 151A, which would subject indexed annuities to regulation as securities. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld the legal foundation for Rule 151A. Although remanding with respect to certain procedural requirements, the court upheld the rule on substantive legal grounds, finding it was reasonable for the SEC to con-

clude that indexed annuities should be subject to federal securities regulation.

Attempts to disparage the SEC's rule as a federal attack on state regulation are unfounded. Critics who level that charge ignore the fact that the rule will NOT interfere with the authority of state insurance commissioners to continue regulating indexed annuities and the companies that issue them. In fact, in order to be covered by the rule, a contract must be subject to regulation as an annuity under state insurance law.

Nor will the rule impose unreasonable burdens on industry. It will simply require compliance with essentially the same regulatory standards that for 75 years have applied to all companies that issue securities. Moreover, the rule is strictly prospective, applying only to indexed annuities issued after the effective date, and it does not take effect for two years, affording the industry ample time to prepare for compliance. In short, the rule will provide much needed protections for investors without unfairly burdening industry.

Indexed annuities are hybrid products that supposedly offer investors the combined advantages of guaranteed minimum returns along with profits from stock market gains. Although indexed annuities may be legitimate vehicles for some people, they have many features, including high costs, significant risks, and long surrender periods, that make these products unsuitable for many investors. Investors have a difficult time understanding these hazards because indexed annuities are hopelessly complex. Compounding the problem are the generous commissions that agents can earn from the sale of these products.

The problems associated with the marketing of indexed annuities are a matter of record in countless news articles, government warnings, regulatory enforcement actions, and lawsuits filed by innumerable investors seeking damages for the unsuitable and fraudulent sale of indexed annuities. Indeed, these products have become so infamous that they were featured in a prime time Dateline NBC report entitled "Tricks of the Trade."

Without question, the single most effective way to address abuses in the sale of indexed annuities is to regulate them as securities. This is legally appropriate because indexed annuities shift a significant degree of investment risk to purchasers, and therefore pose the very dangers that the federal securities laws were intended to address. Licensing standards under the securities laws will help ensure that agents have the requisite knowledge and character to sell these complex investment products. Under the securities laws, those agents will also be subject to strong supervision requirements. Mandatory registration of indexed annuities as securities will vastly increase the amount of information available to investors concerning the terms, risks, and costs of these offerings. Perhaps most important, the strong anti-fraud provisions and suitability standards that have been a part of securities regulation for decades will deter abuses in the sale of indexed annuities and provide more effective remedies for those who are victimized.

Regulating indexed annuities as securities under federal law is long overdue and vitally important for our nation's investors. The SEC's Rule 151A on indexed annuities accomplishes this goal in a thoughtful and reasonable fashion, and it should be allowed to take effect. The Harkin/Johannis/Leahy amendment would reverse this important regulatory initiative and should not be adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

DENISE VOIGT CRAWFORD,  
President, NASAA.  
BARBARA ROPER,

*Director of Investor  
Protection, CFA.*

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,  
FUND DEMOCRACY,  
June 12, 2010.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER DODD,  
*Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and  
Urban Development, U.S. Senate, Wash-  
ington, DC.*

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,  
*Chairman, Financial Services Committee, House  
of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Banking, Hous-  
ing and Urban Development, U.S. Senate, Wash-  
ington, DC.*

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,  
*Ranking Member, Financial Services Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

PROTECT INVESTORS AND THE LEGISLATIVE  
PROCESS: REJECT EQUITY-INDEXED ANNU-  
ITIES PREEMPTION AMENDMENT

DEAR CHAIRMAN DODD, RANKING MEMBER  
SHELBY, CHAIRMAN FRANK, AND RANKING  
MEMBER BACHUS: We understand that mem-  
bers of the insurance industry continue to  
press for inclusion in the conference report  
of anti-consumer legislation to exempt equity-  
indexed annuities from securities regula-  
tion. We are writing to urge you to resist any  
such efforts.

Equity-indexed annuities are hybrid prod-  
ucts that combine elements of both insur-  
ance and securities, but they are sold pri-  
marily as investments. Indeed, as docu-  
mented in a seven-part Dateline NBC hidden  
camera expose, they are among the most  
abusively sold products on the market today.  
Responding to a rising level of complaints,  
the Securities and Exchange Commission  
voted in late 2008 to adopt rules regulating  
equity-indexed annuities as securities, a  
move that was immediately challenged in  
court by the insurance industry. In deciding  
the case, a U.S. Court of Appeals sided with  
the agency on the basic issue of whether equity-  
indexed annuities should be regulated as  
securities while remanding the rule with  
respect to procedural issues.

Having failed to prevail in court, the insur-  
ance industry has turned to Congress to pre-  
empt legitimate securities regulation of this  
product. We urge you to resist these efforts  
for the following reasons:

Equity-indexed annuities are complex  
products whose returns fluctuate with per-  
formance of the securities markets. Absent  
regulation under securities laws, they can be  
sold by salespeople with no more under-  
standing of the markets than the customer.

Although the National Association of In-  
surance Commissioners has developed a  
model suitability rule for annuity sales, it  
has not been adopted in all states. Regula-  
tion under securities laws would provide na-  
tional uniformity, would bring to bear the  
added regulatory resources of the SEC, state  
securities regulators, and FINRA, and would  
provide additional investor protections in  
the form of improved disclosures and limits  
on excessive compensation.

Exempting equity-indexed annuities from  
securities regulation would set a dangerous  
precedent and encourage the development of  
additional hybrid products designed specifi-  
cally to evade a more rigorous form of regu-  
lation.

This highly controversial measure—which  
is opposed by consumer advocates as well as  
state and federal securities regulators—was  
not included in either the House or the Sen-  
ate bill and is not germane to the underlying  
legislation. To include it in the conference  
report would be a gross violation of the in-  
tegrity of the legislative process. We urge  
you to protect investors and the legislative

process by preventing the equity-indexed an-  
nuities provision from being added to the  
conference report.

Respectfully submitted,  
BARBARA ROPER,  
*Director of Investor  
Protection, Con-  
sumer Federation of  
America.*

MERCER BULLARD,  
*Executive Director,  
Fund Democracy.*

FINANCIAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, June 15, 2010.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK, *Chairman,*  
Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Ser-  
vices, House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.*

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, *Chairman,*  
Hon. RICHARD C. SHELBY,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Banking, Hous-  
ing and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Wash-  
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK, CHAIRMAN DODD,  
RANKING MEMBER BACHUS, AND RANKING  
MEMBER SHELBY: I am writing to oppose ef-  
forts to strip the Securities and Exchange  
Commission (SEC) of authority to oversee  
sales practices in connection with indexed  
annuities that are marketed as investment  
products. At a time when Congress is seeking  
ways to improve consumer protections in the  
financial services sector, the Financial Plan-  
ning Association (FPA) believes it would be  
completely inappropriate to preempt the  
SEC from exercising its existing authority to  
protect consumers from well-documented  
abuses.

Indexed annuities have a minimum guaran-  
teed return, but the actual return will vary  
based on the performance of a securities  
index, such as the S&P 500. FPA members  
are very familiar with indexed annuities,  
with many financial planners specializing in  
retirement planning and more than half of  
our membership licensed to sell insurance  
and annuity products. They may recommend  
annuities, including indexed annuities, as an  
important component of a client's overall fi-  
nancial plan. As with other financial prod-  
ucts, however, proper oversight is needed to  
help protect consumers from the few who  
would take advantage of them. FPA urges  
you to reject any efforts to strip the SEC of  
authority to protect purchasers of indexed  
annuities in the same way they protect those  
who purchase variable annuities.

In 2008, the SEC promulgated rules that  
would have brought indexed annuities under  
the same sales practice standards as variable  
annuities and other securities if they are  
marketed as investment products. Applying a  
two part test in accordance with Supreme  
Court precedent, the SEC sought to exercise  
oversight based on the allocation of invest-  
ment risk between the insurance company  
and the customer, and on how the annuity is  
marketed. Notably, the SEC left regulation  
of the product itself to state insurance regu-  
lators and sought to merely oversee sales  
practices when the insurer chooses to mar-  
ket indexed annuities as an investment prod-  
uct.

FPA supported the SEC rule, as a meas-  
ured and appropriate move to address a very  
real problem (See comment letter at  
[www.fpanet.org/GovernmentRelations/](http://www.fpanet.org/GovernmentRelations/)). Op-  
ponents challenged the rule in court arguing  
that the SEC lacked authority, but the rule  
was vacated on other, technical grounds.  
Now they are seeking to preempt the SEC  
from overseeing the sales practices of these  
products, as it has effectively done so for  
variable annuities.

But the calculus is simple: if a product is  
marketed and sold as an investment product,

and if the purchaser is bearing a certain in-  
vestment risk, applying standard investor  
protections is common sense. Any issues par-  
ticular to indexed annuities can be addressed  
through the normal rulemaking and com-  
ment process.

Consumer confidence and consumer protec-  
tion are two of the most important consid-  
erations as you deliberate over important  
changes to our financial regulatory system. I  
urge you to resist any attempts to handcuff  
the SEC before it has even had an oppor-  
tunity to bring its consumer protection re-  
sources to bear in this area.

Thank you for your consideration. If you  
have any questions, or if FPA can provide  
additional information, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL J. BARRY,  
*Director of Government Relations.*

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, as I  
have previously discussed, section 737  
of H.R. 4173 will grant broad authority  
to the Commodity Futures Trading  
Commission to once and for all set ag-  
gregate position limits across all mar-  
kets on non-commercial market par-  
ticipants. During consideration of this  
bill we all learned many valuable les-  
sons about how the commodities mar-  
kets operate and the impact that high-  
ly leveraged, and heretofore unregu-  
lated swaps, have on the price dis-  
covery function in the futures markets.  
I believe the adoption of aggregate po-  
sition limits, along with greater trans-  
parency, will help bring some normalcy  
back to our markets and reduce some  
of the volatility we have witnessed  
over the last few years.

I also recognize that in setting these  
limits, regulators must balance the  
needs of market participants, while at  
the same time ensuring that our mar-  
kets remain liquid so as to afford end-  
users and producers of commodities the  
ability to hedge their commercial risk.  
Along these lines I do believe that  
there is a legitimate role to be played  
by market participants that are willing  
to enter into futures positions opposite  
a commercial end-user or producer.  
Through this process the markets gain  
additional liquidity and accurate price  
discovery can be found for end-users  
and producers of commodities.

However, I still hold some reserva-  
tions about these financial market par-  
ticipants and the negative impact of  
excessive speculation or long only po-  
sitions on the commodities markets.  
While I have concerns about the role  
these participants play in the markets,  
I do believe that important distinc-  
tions in setting position limits on  
these participants are warranted. In  
implementing section 737, I would en-  
courage the CFTC to give due consid-  
eration to trading activity that is  
unleveraged or fully collateralized,  
solely exchange-traded, fully trans-  
parent, clearinghouse guaranteed, and  
poses no systemic risk to the clearing  
system. This type of trading activity is  
distinguishable from highly leveraged  
swaps trading, which not only poses  
systemic risk absent the proper safe-  
guards that an exchange traded,  
cleared system provides, but also may  
distort price discovery. Further, I

would encourage the CFTC to consider whether it is appropriate to aggregate the positions of entities advised by the same advisor where such entities have different and systematically determined investment objectives.

I wish to also point out that section 719 of the conference report calls for a study of position limits to be undertaken by the CFTC. In conducting that study, it is my expectation that the CFTC will address the soundness of prudential investing by pension funds, index funds and other institutional investors in unleveraged indices of commodities that may also serve to provide agricultural and other commodity contracts with the necessary liquidity to assist in price discovery and hedging for the commercial users of such contracts.

Mr. President, as the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, I am proud to say that the bill coming out of our committee was the base text for the derivatives title in the Senate passed bill. The Senate passed bill's derivatives title was the base text used by the conference committee. The conference committee made changes to the derivatives title, adopting several provisions from the House passed bill. The additional materials that I am submitting today are primarily focused on the derivatives title of the conference report. They are intended to provide clarifying legislative history regarding certain provisions of the derivatives title and how they are supposed to work together.

I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The major components of the derivatives title include: 100 percent reporting of swaps and security-based swaps, mandatory trading and clearing of standardized swaps and security-based swaps, and real-time price reporting for all swap transactions—those subject to mandatory trading and clearing as well as those subject to the end user clearing exemption and customized swaps. Swap dealers, security-based swap dealers, major swap participants and major security-based swap participants will all be required to register with either the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, or the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, and meet additional requirements including capital, margin, reporting, examination, and business conduct requirements. All swaps that are “traded” must be traded on either a designated contract market or a swap execution facility. All security-based swaps must be traded on either a national securities exchange or a security-based swap execution facility. It is a sea change for the \$600 trillion swaps market. Swaps and security-based swaps which are not subject to mandatory exchange trading or clearing will be required to submit transaction data to swap data repositories or security-based swap data repositories. These new “data repositories” will be required to register with the CFTC and SEC and be subject to statutory duties and core principals which will assist the CFTC and SEC in their oversight and market regulation responsibilities.

There are several important definitional and jurisdictional provisions in title VII. For

instance, the new definitions of “swap” and “security-based swap” are designed to maintain the existing Shad Johnson jurisdictional lines between the CFTC and the SEC which have been in place since 1982. Under the Shad Johnson accord, the CFTC has jurisdiction over commodity-based instruments as well as futures and options on broad-based security indices (and now swaps), while the SEC has jurisdiction over security-based instruments—both single name and narrow-based security indices—and now security-based swaps. The Shad Johnson jurisdictional lines were reaffirmed in 2000 with the passage of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act, CFMA, as it related to security futures products. Maintaining existing jurisdictional lines between the two agencies was an important goal of the Administration, as reflected in their draft legislation. This priority was reflected in the bills passed out of the Senate and House agricultural committees and through our respective chambers and now reflected in the conference report.

As noted above, the conference report maintains the Shad Johnson jurisdictional accord. We made it clear that the CFTC has jurisdiction under Section 2(a)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act, “CEA”, over both interest rate swaps and foreign exchange swaps and forwards. The definition of “swap” under the CEA specifically lists interest rate swaps as being a swap. This is CEA Section 1a(47)(A)(iii)(I). This is appropriate as the CFTC has a long history of overseeing interest rate futures. The futures exchanges have listed and traded interest rate contracts for nearly 40 years. The CME has listed for trading quarterly settled interest rate swap future contracts. In the last 24 months, some designated contract markets have listed futures contracts which mirror interest rate swaps in design, function, maturity date and all other material aspects. In addition, some of the CFTC registered clearing houses have listed and started to clear both these interest rate swap futures contracts as well as interest rate swap contracts. This is on top of the nearly \$200 trillion in interest rate swap contracts which have been cleared at LCH.Clearnet in London.

Also, under this legislation, foreign exchange swaps and forwards come under the CFTC's jurisdiction under Section 2(a)(1) of the CEA. We listed in the definition of “swap” certain types of common swaps, including “foreign exchange swaps” so it would be clear that they are regulated under the CEA. See CEA Section 1a(47)(A)(iii)(VIII). In addition, the terms “foreign exchange forward” and “foreign exchange swap” are defined in the CEA itself. See CEA Section 1a(24) and (25). One should note that foreign exchange forwards are treated as swaps under the CEA.

The CEA as amended permits the Secretary of the Treasury to make a written determination to exempt either or both foreign exchange swaps and or foreign exchange forwards from the mandatory trading and clearing requirements of the CEA, which applies to swaps generally. Under new Section 1b of the CEA, the Secretary must consider certain factors in determining whether to exempt either foreign exchange swaps or foreign exchange forwards from being treated like all other swaps. These factors include: (1) whether the required trading and clearing of foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forwards would create systemic risk, lower transparency, or threaten the financial stability of the United States; (2) whether foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forwards are already subject to a regulatory scheme that is materially comparable to that established by this Act for other classes of swaps; (3) the extent to which bank regu-

lators of participants in the foreign exchange market provide adequate supervision, including capital and margin requirements; (4) the extent of adequate payment and settlement systems; and (5) the use of a potential exemption of foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forwards to evade otherwise applicable regulatory requirements. In making a written determination to exempt such swaps from regulation, the Secretary must make certain findings. The Secretary's written determination is not effective until it is filed with the appropriate Congressional Committees and provides the following information: (1) an explanation regarding why foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forwards are qualitatively different from other classes of swaps in a way that would make the foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forwards ill-suited for regulation as swaps; and (2) an identification of the objective differences of foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forwards with respect to standard swaps that warrant an exempted status. These provisions and this process related to exempting foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forwards from swaps regulation will be, and should be, difficult for the Secretary of the Treasury to meet. The foreign exchange swaps and foreign exchange forward market is approximately \$65 trillion and the second largest part of the swaps market. It is important that the foreign exchange swaps market be transparent as well as subject to comprehensive and vigorous market oversight so there are no questions about possible manipulation of currencies or exchange rates.

I would also note that we have made it clear that even if foreign exchange swaps and forwards are exempted by the Secretary of the Treasury from the mandatory trading and clearing requirements which are applicable to standardized swaps, that all foreign exchange swaps and forwards transactions must be reported to a swap data repository under the CFTC's jurisdiction. In addition, we have made it clear that to the extent foreign exchange swaps and forwards are listed for trading on a designated contract market or cleared through a registered derivatives clearing organization that such swap contracts are subject to the CFTC's jurisdiction under the CEA and that the CFTC retains its jurisdiction over retail foreign exchange transactions.

We have made some progress in this legislation with respect to clarifying CFTC jurisdiction and preserving SEC enforcement jurisdiction over instruments which are “security-based swap agreements.” Security-based swap agreements are actually “swaps” and subject to both the CFTC and the SEC's jurisdiction. One will notice that we have inserted the definition of “security-based swap agreements” in both the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities and Exchange Act—section 1a(47)(A)(v) of the CEA (7 U.S.C. 1a(47)(A)(v)) and section 3(a)(78) of the SEA of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(78)). The term “security-based swap agreement” is a hold-over term from the CFMA of 2000. In the CFMA, Congress chose to exclude “swap agreements” from regulation by the CFTC and “security-based swap agreements” from regulation by the SEC. While the CFMA exclusions were broad, the SEC retained limited authority—anti fraud and anti manipulation enforcement authority—with respect to security-based swap agreements. The Agriculture Committee and Congress chose to preserve that existing enforcement jurisdiction of the SEC related to those swaps which qualify as security-based swap agreements. The swaps which will qualify as security-based swap agreements is quite limited. It would appear that non narrow-based security index swaps and credit default swaps may be

the only swaps considered to be security-based swap agreements. The rationale for providing the SEC with enforcement authority with respect to security-based swap agreements in the CFMA was premised on the fact that the CFTC didn't have as extensive an anti-fraud or anti-manipulation authority as the SEC. This lack of CFTC authority was remedied in the title VII so that the CFTC now has the same authority as the SEC. It is good policy to have a second set of enforcement eyes in this area. The SEC can and should be able to back up the CFTC on enforcement issues without interceding in the main market and product regulation. In the new legislation, we repeal the specific exclusions related to swap agreements and security-based swap agreements in both the CEA and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, "SEA". One should note that the definition of "security-based swap agreement" in the SEA specifically excludes any "security-based swap", which means that SBSAs are really swaps. This point is made clear in the definition of "swap" under the CEA. Under Section 1a(47)(A)(v) it states that "any security-based swap agreement which meets the definition of 'swap agreement' as defined in Section 206A of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of which a material term is based on the price, yield, value or volatility of any security, or any group or index of securities, or any interest therein." Regulators should note that Congress chose to refer to security-based swap agreements as swaps at several points in the CEA. Further, the CFTC and the SEC, after consultation with the Federal Reserve, are to undertake a joint rulemaking related to security-based swap agreements. The regulators should follow Congressional intent in this area and preserve the SEC's anti-fraud and anti-manipulation enforcement authority for that limited group of swaps which are considered to be security-based swap agreements.

We have introduced a new term in this legislation, which is "mixed swap". The term is found in both the CEA and the SEA—CEA Section 1a(47)(D) and SEA Section 3(a)(68)(D). The term is subject to a joint rulemaking between the CFTC and the SEC. The term "mixed swap" refers to those swaps which have attributes of both security-based swaps and regular swaps. A "mixed swap" is somewhat similar to a "hybrid product" under the CEA which has attributes of both securities and futures. CEA Section 2(f). Hybrid products must be predominantly securities to be excluded from regulation as contracts of sale of a commodity for future delivery under the CEA. While there is no "predominance" or "primarily" test in the definition of "mixed swap" the regulators should ensure that when deciding the jurisdictional allocation of such mixed swaps in the joint rulemaking process, that mixed swaps should be allocated to either the CFTC or the SEC based on clear and unambiguous criteria like a primarily test. A de minimis amount of security-based swap attributes should not bring a swap into the SEC's jurisdiction just as a de minimis amount of swap attributes should not bring a security-based swap into the CFTC's jurisdiction. While there will be some difficult decisions to be made on individual swap contracts, it will be fairly clear most of the time whether a particular swap is more security-based swap or swap. We expect the regulators to be reasonable in their joint rulemaking and interpretations.

The mandatory clearing and trading of certain swaps and security-based swaps, along with real-time price reporting, is at the heart of swaps market reform. Under the conference report, swaps and security-based swaps determined to be subject to the mandatory clearing requirement by the regu-

lators would also be required to be traded on a designated contract market, a national securities exchange, or new swap execution facilities or security-based swap execution facilities. To avoid any conflict of interests, the regulators—the CFTC and the SEC—will make a determination as to what swaps must be cleared following certain statutory factors. It is expected that the standardized, plain vanilla, high volume swaps contracts—which according to the Treasury Department are about 90 percent of the \$600 trillion swaps market—will be subject to mandatory clearing. Derivatives clearing organizations and clearing agencies are required to submit all swaps and security-based swaps for review and mandatory clearing determination by regulators. It will also be unlawful for any entity to enter into a swap without submitting it for clearing if that swap has been determined to be required to clear. It is our understanding that approximately 1,200 swaps and security-based swaps contracts are currently listed by CFTC-registered clearing houses and SEC-registered clearing agencies for clearing. Under the conference report, these 1,200 swaps and security-based swaps already listed for clearing are deemed "submitted" to the regulators for review upon the date of enactment. It is my expectation that the regulators, who are already familiar with these 1,200 swap and security-based swap contracts, will work within the 90 day time frame they are provided to identify which of the current 1,200 swap and security-based swap agreements should be subject to mandatory clearing requirements. The regulators may also identify and review swaps and security-based swaps which are not submitted for clearinghouse or clearing agency listing and determine that they are or should be subject to mandatory clearing requirement. This provision is considered to be an important provision by senior members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, as it removes the ability for the clearinghouse or clearing agency to block a mandatory clearing determination.

The conference report also contains an end user clearing exemption. Under the conference report, end users have the option, but not the obligation, to clear or not clear their swaps and security-based swaps that have been determined to be required to clear, as long as those swaps are being used to hedge or mitigate commercial risk. This option is solely the end users' right. If the end user opts to clear a swap, the end user also has the right to choose the clearing house where the swap will be cleared. Further, the end user has the right, but not the obligation, to force clearing of any swap or security-based swap which is listed for clearing by a clearing house or clearing agency but which is not subject to mandatory clearing requirement. Again the end user has the right to choose the clearing house or clearing agency where the swap or security-based swap will be cleared. The option to clear is meant to empower end users and address the disparity in market power between the end users and the swap dealers. Under the conference report, certain specified financial entities are prohibited from using the end user clearing exemption. While most large financial entities are not eligible to use the end user clearing exemption for standardized swaps entered into with third parties, it would be appropriate for regulators to exempt from mandatory clearing and trading inter affiliate swap transactions which are between for wholly-owned affiliates of a financial entity. We would further note that small financial entities, such as banks, credit unions and farm credit institutions below \$10 billion in assets—and possibly larger entities—will be permitted to utilize the end user clearing exemption with approval from

the regulators. The conference report also includes an anti-evasion provision which provides the CFTC and SEC with authority to review and take action against entities which abuse the end user clearing exemption.

In addition to the mandatory clearing and trading of swaps discussed above, the conference report retains and expands the Senate Agriculture Committee's real time swap transaction and price reporting requirements. The Agriculture Committee focused on swap market transparency while it was constructing the derivatives title. As stated earlier, the conference report requires 100% of all swaps transactions to be reported. It was universally agreed that regulators should have access to all swaps data in real time. On the other hand, there was some outstanding questions regarding the capacity, utility and benefits from public reporting of swaps transaction and pricing data. I would like to respond to those questions. Market participants—including exchanges, contract markets, brokers, clearing houses and clearing agencies—were consulted and affirmed that the existing communications and data infrastructure for the swaps markets could accommodate real time swap transaction and price reporting. Speaking to the benefits of such a reporting requirement, the committee could not ignore the experience of the U.S. Securities and Futures markets. These markets have had public disclosure of real time transaction and pricing data for decades. We concluded that real time swap transaction and price reporting will narrow swap bid/ask spreads, make for a more efficient swaps market and benefit consumers/counterparties overall. For these reasons, the Senate Agriculture Committee required "real time" price reporting for: (1) All swap transactions which are subject to mandatory clearing requirement; (2) All swaps under the end user clearing exemption which are not cleared but reported to a swap data repository subject; and, (3) all swaps which aren't subject to the mandatory clearing requirement but which are cleared at a clearing house or clearing agency—under permissive, as opposed to mandatory, clearing. The conference report adopted this Senate approach with one notable addition authored by Senator Reed. The Reed amendment, which the conference adopted, extended real time swap transaction and pricing data reporting to "non-standardized" swaps which are reported to swap data repositories and security-based swap data repositories. Regulators are to ensure that the public reporting of swap transactions and pricing data does not disclose the names or identities of the parties to the transactions.

I would like to specifically note the treatment of "block trades" or "large notional" swap transactions. Block trades, which are transactions involving a very large number of shares or dollar amount of a particular security or commodity and which transactions could move the market price for the security or contract, are very common in the securities and futures markets. Block trades, which are normally arranged privately, off exchange, are subject to certain minimum size requirements and time delayed reporting. Under the conference report, the regulators are given authority to establish what constitutes a "block trade" or "large notional" swap transaction for particular contracts and commodities as well as an appropriate time delay in reporting such transaction to the public. The committee expects the regulators to distinguish between different types of swaps based on the commodity involved, size of the market, term of the contract and liquidity in that contract and related contracts, i.e.; for instance the size/dollar amount of what constitutes a



block trade in 10-year interest rate swap, 2-year dollar/euro swap, 5-year CDS, 3-year gold swap, or a 1-year unleaded gasoline swap are all going to be different. While we expect the regulators to distinguish between particular contracts and markets, the guiding principal in setting appropriate block-trade levels should be that the vast majority of swap transactions should be exposed to the public market through exchange trading. With respect to delays in public reporting of block trades, we expect the regulators to keep the reporting delays as short as possible.

I firmly believe that taking the Senate bill language improved the final conference report by strengthening the regulators enforcement authority dramatically. The Senate Agriculture Committee looked at existing enforcement authority and tried to give the CFTC the authority which it needs to police both the futures and swaps markets. As I mentioned above, we provided the CFTC with anti-fraud and anti-manipulation authority equal to that of the SEC with respect to non narrow-based security index futures and swaps so as to equalize the SEC and CFTC enforcement authority in this area. The CFTC requested, and received, enforcement authority with respect to insider trading, restitution authority, and disruptive trading practices. In addition, we added in anti-manipulation authority from my good friend Senator Cantwell. Senator Cantwell and I were concerned with swaps participants knowingly and intentionally avoiding the mandatory clearing requirement. We were able to reach an agreement with the other committees of jurisdiction by providing additional enforcement authority that I believe will address the root problem. Further, I would be remiss in not mentioning that we provided specific enforcement authority under Section 9 for the CFTC to bring actions against persons who purposely evade the mandatory clearing requirement. This provision is supposed to work together with the anti-evasion provision in the clearing section. Another important provision is one related to fraud and an episode earlier this year involving Greece and the use of cross currency swaps. We gave new authority to the CFTC to go after persons who enter into a swap knowing that its counterparty intends to use the swap for purposes of defrauding a third party. This authority, which is meant to expand the CFTC's existing aiding and abetting authority, should permit the CFTC to bring actions against swap dealers and others who assist their counterparties in perpetrating frauds on third parties. All in all, the CFTC's enforcement authority was expanded to meet known problems and fill existing holes. It should give them the tools which are necessary to police this market.

A significant issue which was fixed during conference was clarifying that in most situations community banks aren't swap dealers or major swap participants. The definition of swap dealer was adjusted in a couple of respects so that a community bank which is hedging its interest rate risk on its loan portfolio would not be viewed as a Swap Dealer. In addition, we made it clear that a bank that originates a loan with a customer and offers a swap in connection with that loan shouldn't be viewed as a swap dealer. It was never the intention of the Senate Agriculture Committee to catch community banks in either situation. We worked very hard to make sure that this understanding came through in revised statutory language which was worked out during conference. There were some concerns expressed about banks being caught up as being highly leveraged financial entities under prong (iii) of the major swap participant definition. This

concern was addressed by adding language clarifying that if the financial entity had a capital requirement set by a federal banking regulator that it wouldn't be included in the definition under that prong. This particular prong of the major swap participant provision was intended to catch entities like the hedge fund LTCM and AIG's financial products subsidiary, not community banks. We also clarified in Section 716 that banks which are major swap participants are not subject to the federal assistance bans. These changes and clarifications should ensure that community banks, when acting as banks, are not caught by the swap dealer or major swap participant definitions.

Section 716 and the ban on federal assistance to swap entities is an incredibly important provision. It was agreed by the administration, and accepted by the conference, that under the revised Section 716, insured depository institutions would be forced to "push out" the riskiest swap activities into a separate affiliate. The swap dealer activities which would have to be pushed out included: swaps on equities, energy, agriculture, metal other than silver and gold, non investment grade debt, uncleared credit default swaps and other swaps that are not bank permissible investments. We were assured by the administration that all of the types of swaps enumerated above are not bank permissible and will be subject to the push out. Further, it is our understanding that no regulatory action, interpretation or guidance will be issued or taken which might turn such swaps into bank permissible investments or activities.

It should also be noted that a mini-Volcker rule was incorporated into Section 716 during the conference. Banks, their affiliates and their bank holding companies would be prohibited from engaging in proprietary trading in derivatives. This provision would prohibit banks and bank holding companies, or any affiliate, from proprietary trading in swaps as well as other derivatives. This was an important expansion and linking of the Lincoln Rule in Section 716 with the Volcker Rule in Section 619 of Dodd-Frank.

Section 716's effective date is 2 years from the effective date of the title, with the possibility of a 1 year extension by the appropriate Federal banking agency. It should be noted that the appropriate federal banking agencies should be looking at the affected banks and evaluating the appropriate length of time which a bank should receive in connection with its "push out." Under the revised Section 716, banks do not have a "right" to 24 month phase-in for the push out of the impermissible swap activities. The appropriate federal banking agencies should be evaluating the particular banks and their circumstances under the statutory factors to determine the appropriate time frame for the push out.

The Senate Agriculture Committee bill revised and updated several of the CEA definitions related to intermediaries such as floor trader, floor broker, introducing broker, futures commission merchant, commodity trading advisor, and commodity pool operator as well as adding a statutory definition of the term commodity pool. We note that the definition of futures commission merchant is amended to include persons that are registered as FCMs. This makes clear that such persons must comply with the regulatory standards, including the capital and customer funds protections that apply to FCMs. The Senate Agriculture Committee wanted to ensure that all the intermediary and other definitions were current and reflected the activities and financial instruments which CFTC registered and regulated entities would be advising on, trading or holding, especially in light of Congress add-

ing swaps to the financial instruments over which the CFTC has jurisdiction. We note that in addition to swaps, we added other financial instruments such as security futures products, leverage contracts, retail foreign exchange contracts and retail commodity transactions which the CFTC has jurisdiction over and which would require registration where appropriate.

With respect to commodity trading advisors, CTAs, commodity pool operators, CPOs, and commodity pools, we wanted to provide clarity regarding the activities and jurisdiction over these entities. Under Section 749 we have provided additional clarity regarding what it means to be "primarily engaged" in the business of being a commodity trading advisor and being a commodity pool. To the extent an entity is "primarily engaged" in advising on swaps, such as interest rate swaps, foreign exchange swaps or broad-based security index swaps, then it would be required to register as a commodity trading advisor with the CFTC. On the other hand, to the extent an entity is primarily engaged in advising on security-based swaps it would be required register as an investment adviser with the SEC or the states. We would note that under existing law the CEA and the Investment Advisers Act have mirror provisions which exempts from dual registration and regulation SEC registered IAs and CFTC registered CTAs as long as they only provide very limited advice related to futures and securities, respectively. This policy is continued and expanded to the extent it now covers advice related to swaps and security-based swaps.

With respect to commodity pools, the SEC has long recognized that commodity pools are not investment companies which are subject to registration or regulation under the Investment Company Act of 1940. Alpha Delta Fund No Action Letter (pub avail. May 4, 1976); Peavey Commodity Futures Fund I, II and III No action letter (pub avail. June 2, 1983); Managed Futures Association No Action Letter (Pub Avail. July 15, 1996). To be an "investment company" under Section 3(a) of the Investment Company Act an entity has to be primarily engaged in the business of investing, reinvesting, or trading securities. In the matter of the Tonopah Mining Company of Nevada, 26 S.E.C. 426 (July 22, 1947) and SEC v. National Presto Industries, Inc., 486 F.3d 305 (7th Cir. 2007). Commodity pools are primarily engaged in the business of investing, reinvesting or trading in commodity interests, not securities. For this reason, commodity pools are not investment companies and are not utilizing an exemption under the Investment Company Act. A recent and well know example of commodity pools which the SEC has recognized as not being investment companies, and not being required to register under the Investment Company Act, comes in the commodity based exchange traded funds (ETF) world. While recent ETFs based on gold, silver, oil, natural gas and other commodities have registered their securities under the 1933 and 1934 Acts and listed them on national securities exchanges for trading, these funds, which are commodity pools which are operated by CFTC registered commodity pool operators, are not registered as investment companies under the Investment Company Act of 1940. See the Investment Company Institute 2010 Fact Book, Chapter 3. We have clarified that commodity interests include not only contracts of sale of a commodity for future delivery and options on such contracts but would also include swaps, security futures products, leverage contracts, retail foreign exchange contracts, retail commodity transactions, physical commodities and any funds held in a margin account for trading such instruments. I am pleased that

the Conference Report includes these new provisions which were in the bill passed out of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

I would also note the importance of Section 769 and Section 770. These sections amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 so that certain terms in the CEA are now incorporated into both of the 1940 Acts, which are administered by the SEC. We believed it was appropriate to incorporate these important definitions from the CEA into the two 1940 Acts as it relates to advice on futures and swaps, such as interest rate swaps and foreign exchange swaps and forwards, as well as what constitutes being a commodity pool and being primarily engaged in the business of investing in commodity interests as distinguished from being an investment company which is primarily engaged in the business of investing, reinvesting, holding, trading securities. I am pleased that the Conference Report includes these new updated definitions as it should help clarify jurisdictional and registration requirements.

Another extremely important issue which originated in the Senate Agriculture Committee was imposing a fiduciary duty on swap dealers when dealing with special entities, such as municipalities, pension funds, endowments, and retirement plans. The problems in this area, especially with respect to municipalities and Jefferson County, Alabama in particular are very well known. I would like to note that Senators Harkin and Casey have been quite active in this area and worked closely with me on this issue. While Senators Harkin, Casey and I did not get everything which we were looking for, we ended up with a very good product. First, there is a clear fiduciary duty which swap dealers and major swap participants must meet when acting as advisors to special entities. This is a dramatic improvement over the House passed bill and should help protect both tax payers and plan beneficiaries. Further, we have expanded the business conduct standards which swap dealers and major swap participants must follow even when they are not acting as advisors to special entities. I'd make a very important point, nothing in this provision prohibits a swap dealer from entering into transactions with special entities. Indeed, we believe it will be quite common that swap dealers will both provide advice and offer to enter into or enter into a swap with a special entity. However, unlike the status quo, in this case, the swap dealer would be subject to both the acting as advisor and business conduct requirements under subsections (h)(4) and (h)(5). These provisions will place tighter requirements on swap entities that we believe will help to prevent many of the abuses we have seen over the last few years. Importantly, the CFTC and the SEC have the authority to add to the statutory business conduct standards which swap dealers and major swap participants must follow. We expect the regulators to utilize this authority. Among other areas, regulators should consider whether to impose business conduct standards that would require swap dealers to further disclose fees and compensation, ensure that swap dealers maintain the confidentiality of hedging and portfolio information provided by special entities, and prohibit swap dealers from using information received from a special entity to engage in trades that would take advantage of the special entity's positions or strategies. These are very important issues and should be addressed.

Section 713 clarifies the authority and means for the CFTC and SEC to facilitate portfolio margining of futures positions and securities positions together, subject to account-specific programs. The agencies are required to consult with each other to ensure

that such transactions and accounts are subject to "comparable requirements to the extent practicable for similar products." The term "comparable" in this provision does not mean "identical." Rather, the term is intended to recognize the legal and operational differences of the regulatory regimes governing futures and securities accounts.

Title VII establishes a new process for the CFTC and SEC to resolve the status of novel derivative products. In the past, these types of novel and innovative products have gotten caught up in protracted jurisdictional disputes between the agencies, resulting in delays in bringing products to market and placing U.S. firms and exchanges at a competitive disadvantage to their overseas counterparts.

In their Joint Harmonization Report from October 2009, the two agencies recommended legislation to provide legal certainty with respect to novel derivative product listings, either by a legal determination about the nature of a product or through the use of the agencies' respective exemptive authorities. Title VII includes provisions in Sections 717 and 718 to implement these recommendations.

It does so by establishing a process that requires public accountability by ensuring that jurisdictional disputes are resolved at the Commission rather than staff level, and within a firm timeframe. Specifically, either agency can request that the other one: 1) make a legal determination whether a particular product is a security under SEC jurisdiction or a futures contract or commodity option under CFTC jurisdiction; or 2) grant an exemption with respect to the product. An agency receiving such a request from the other agency is to act on it within 120 days. Title VII also provides for an expedited judicial review process for a legal determination where the agency making the request disagrees with the other's determination.

Title VII also includes amendments to existing law to ensure that if either agency grants an exemption, the product will be subject to the other's jurisdiction, so there will be no regulatory gaps. For example, the Commodity Exchange Act is amended to clarify that CFTC has jurisdiction over options on securities and security indexes that are exempted by the SEC. And Section 741 grants the CFTC insider trading enforcement authority over futures, options on futures, and swaps, on a group or index of securities.

We strongly urge the agencies to work together under these new provisions to alleviate the ills that they themselves have identified. The agencies should make liberal use of their exemptive authorities to avoid spending taxpayer resources on legal fights over whether these novel derivative products are securities or futures, and to permit these important new products to trade in either or both a CFTC- or SEC-regulated environment.

Section 721 includes a broad and expansive definition of the term "swap" that is subject to the new regulatory regime established in Title VII. It also provides the CFTC with the authority to further define the term "swap" (and various other new terms in Title VII) in order to include transactions and entities that have been structured to evade these important new legal requirements. The CFTC must not allow market participants to "game the system" by labeling or structuring transactions that are swaps as another type of instrument and then claim the instrument to be outside the scope of the legislation that Congress has enacted.

Section 723 creates a "Trade Execution Requirement" in new section 2(h)(8) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA). Section 2(h)(8)(A) requires that swaps that are subject to the mandatory clearing requirement under new CEA Section 2(h)(1) must be exe-

cuted on either a designated contract market or a swap execution facility. Section 2(h)(8)(B) provides an exception to the Trade Execution Requirement if the swap is subject to the commercial end-user exception to the clearing requirement in CEA Section 2(h)(7), or if no contract market or swap execution facility "makes the swap available to trade." This provision was included in the bill as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee and then in the bill that was passed by the Senate.

In interpreting the phrase "makes the swap available to trade," it is intended that the CFTC should take a practical rather than a formal or legalistic approach. Thus, in determining whether a swap execution facility "makes the swap available to trade," the CFTC should evaluate not just whether the swap execution facility permits the swap to be traded on the facility, or identifies the swap as a candidate for trading on the facility, but also whether, as a practical matter, it is in fact possible to trade the swap on the facility. The CFTC could consider, for example, whether there is a minimum amount of liquidity such that the swap can actually be traded on the facility. The mere "listing" of the swap by a swap execution facility, in and of itself, without a minimum amount of liquidity to make trading possible, should not be sufficient to trigger the Trade Execution Requirement.

Both Section 723 and Section 729 establish requirements pertaining to the reporting of pre-enactment and post-enactment swaps to swap data repositories or the CFTC. They do so in new Sections 2(h)(5) and 4(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, respectively, which provide generally that swaps must be reported pursuant to such rules or regulations as the CFTC prescribes. These provisions should be interpreted as complementary to one another and to assure consistency between them. This is particularly true with respect to issues such as the effective dates of these reporting requirements, the applicability of these provisions to cleared and/or uncleared swaps, and their applicability—or non-applicability—to swaps whose terms have expired at the date of enactment.

Section 724 creates a segregation and bankruptcy regime for cleared swaps that is intended to parallel the regime that currently exists for futures. Section 724 requires any person holding customer positions in cleared swaps at a derivatives clearing organization to be registered as an FCM with the CFTC. Section 724 does not require, and there is no intention to require, swap dealers, major swap participants, or end users to register as FCMs with the CFTC to the extent that such entities hold collateral or margin which has been put up by a counterparty of theirs in connection with a swap transaction. In amending both the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) and the Bankruptcy Code to clarify that cleared swaps are "commodity contracts," Section 724 makes explicit what had been left implicit under the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000. Specifically, we have clarified that: 1) title 11, Chapter 7, Subchapter IV of the United States Bankruptcy Code applies to cleared swaps to the same extent that it applies to futures; and 2) the CFTC has the same authority under Section 20 of the CEA to interpret such provisions of the Bankruptcy Code with respect to cleared swaps as it has with respect to futures contracts.

Section 731 prohibits a swap dealer or major swap participant from permitting any associated person who is subject to a statutory disqualification under the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) to effect or be involved in effecting swaps on its behalf, if it knew or reasonably should have known of the statutory disqualification. In order to implement

this statutory disqualification provision, the CFTC may require such associated persons to register with the CFTC under such terms, and subject to such exceptions, as the CFTC deems appropriate.

The term “associated person of a swap dealer or major swap participant” is defined in Section 721 as a person who, among other things, is involved in the “solicitation” or “acceptance” of swaps. These terms would also include the negotiation of swaps.

Section 731 includes a new Section 4s(g) of the CEA to impose requirements regarding the maintenance of daily trading records on swap dealers and major swap participants. To reflect advances in technology, CEA Section 4s(g) expressly requires that these registrants maintain “recorded communications, including electronic mail, instant messages, and recordings of telephone calls.” Under current law, Section 4g of the CEA governs the maintenance of daily trading records by certain existing classes of CFTC registrants, and is worded more generally and without expressly mentioning the recorded communications enumerated in CEA Section 4s(g). The enactment of this provision should not be interpreted to mean or imply that the specifically-identified types of recorded communications that must be maintained by swap dealers and major swap participants under CEA Section 4s(g) would be beyond the authority of the CFTC to require of other registrants by rule under Section 4g.

Sections 733 and 735 establish a regime of core principles to govern the operations of swap execution facilities and designated contract markets, respectively. Certain of these swap execution facility and designated contract market core principles are identically worded. Given that swap execution facilities will trade swaps exclusively, whereas designated contract markets will be able to trade swaps or futures contracts, we expect that the CFTC may interpret identically-worded core principles differently where they apply to different types of instruments or for different types of trading facilities or platforms.

Section 737 amends Section 4a(a)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) to authorize the CFTC to establish position limits for “swaps that perform or affect a significant price discovery function with respect to registered entities.” Subsequent descriptions of the significant price discovery function concept in Section 737, though, refer to an impact on “regulated markets” or “regulated entities.” The term “registered entity” is specifically defined in the CEA, and clearly includes designated contract markets and swap execution facilities. By contrast, the terms “regulated markets” and “regulated entities” are not defined or used anywhere else in the CEA. This different terminology is not intended to suggest a substantive difference, and it is expected that the CFTC may interpret the terms “regulated markets” and “regulated entities” to mean “registered entities” as defined in the statute for purposes of position limits under Section 737.

Section 737 also amends CEA Section 4a(a)(1) to authorize the CFTC to establish position limits for “swaps traded on or subject to the rules of a designated contract market or a swap execution facility, or swaps not traded on or subject to the rules of a designated contract market or a swap execution facility that performs a significant price discovery function with respect to a registered entity.” Later, Section 737 sets out additional provisions authorizing CFTC position limits to reach swaps, but without utilizing this same wording regarding swaps traded on or off designated contract markets or swap execution facilities. The absence of this wording is not intended to preclude the

CFTC from applying any of the position limit provisions in Section 737 in the same manner with respect to DCM or SEF traded swaps as is explicitly provided for in CEA Section 4a(a)(1).

Finally, Section 737 amends CEA Section 4a(a)(4) to authorize the CFTC to establish position limits on swaps that perform a significant price discovery function with respect to regulated markets, including price linkage situations where a swap relies on the daily or final settlement price of a contract traded on a regulated market based upon the same underlying commodity. Section 737 also amends CEA Section 4a(a)(5) to provide that the CFTC shall establish position limits on swaps that are “economically equivalent” to futures or options traded on designated contract markets. It is intended that this “economically equivalent” provision reaches swaps that link to a settlement price of a contract on a designated contract market, without the CFTC having to first make a determination that the swaps perform a significant price discovery function.

Section 741, among other things, clarifies that the CFTC’s enforcement authority extends to accounts and pooled investment vehicles that are offered for the purpose of trading, or that trade, off-exchange contracts in foreign currency involving retail customers. Thus, the CFTC may bring an enforcement action for fraud in the offer and sale of such managed or pooled foreign currency investments or accounts. These provisions overrule an adverse decision in the CFTC enforcement case of *CFTC v. White Pine Trust Corporation*, 574 F.3d 1219 (9th Cir. 2009), which erected an inappropriate limitation on the broad mandate that Congress has given the CFTC to protect this country’s retail customers from fraud.

Section 742 includes several important provisions to enhance the protections afforded to customers in retail commodity transactions, and I would like to highlight three of them. First, Section 742 clarifies the prohibition on off-exchange retail futures contracts that has been at the heart of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) throughout its history. In recent years, there have been instances of fraudsters using what are known as “rolling spot contracts” with retail customers in order to evade the CFTC’s jurisdiction over futures contracts. These contracts function just like futures, but the court of appeals in the *Zelener* case (*CFTC v. Zelener*, 373 F.3d 861 (7th Cir. 2004)), based on the wording of the contract documents, held them to be spot contracts outside of CFTC jurisdiction. The CFTC Reauthorization Act of 2008, which was enacted as part of that year’s Farm Bill, clarified that such transactions in foreign currency are subject to CFTC anti-fraud authority. It left open the possibility, however, that such *Zelener*-type contracts could still escape CFTC jurisdiction if used for other commodities such as energy and metals.

Section 742 corrects this by extending the Farm Bill’s “*Zelener* fraud fix” to retail off-exchange transactions in all commodities. Further, a transaction with a retail customer that meets the leverage and other requirements set forth in Section 742 is subject not only to the anti-fraud provisions of CEA Section 4b (which is the case for foreign currency), but also to the on-exchange trading requirement of CEA Section 4(a), “as if” the transaction was a futures contract. As a result, such transactions are unlawful, and may not be intermediated by any person, unless they are conducted on or subject to the rules of a designated contract market subject to the full array of regulatory requirements applicable to on-exchange futures under the CEA. Retail off-exchange transactions in foreign currency will continue to

be covered by the “*Zelener* fraud fix” enacted in the Farm Bill; further, cash or spot contracts, forward contracts, securities, and certain banking products are excluded from this provision in Section 742, just as they were excluded in the Farm Bill.

Second, Section 742 addresses the risk of regulatory arbitrage with respect to retail foreign currency transactions. Under the CEA, several types of regulated entities can provide retail foreign currency trading platforms—among them, broker-dealers, banks, futures commission merchants, and the category of “retail foreign exchange dealers” that was recognized by Congress in the Farm Bill in 2008. Section 742 requires that the agencies regulating these entities have comparable regulations in place before their regulated entities are allowed to offer retail foreign currency trading. This will ensure that all domestic retail foreign currency trading is subject to similar protections.

Finally, Section 742 also addresses a situation where domestic retail foreign currency firms were apparently moving their activities offshore in order to avoid regulations required by the National Futures Association. It removes foreign financial institutions as an acceptable counterparty for off-exchange retail foreign currency transactions under section 2(c) of the CEA. Foreign financial institutions seeking to offer them to retail customers within the United States will now have to offer such contracts through one of the other legal mechanisms available under the CEA for accessing U.S. retail customers.

Section 745 provides that in connection with the listing of a swap for clearing by a derivatives clearing organization, the CFTC shall determine, both the initial eligibility and the continuing qualification of the DCO to clear the swap under criteria determined by the CFTC, including the financial integrity of the DCO. Thus, the CFTC has the flexibility to impose terms or conditions that it determines to be appropriate with regard to swaps that a DCO plans to accept for clearing. No DCO may clear a swap absent a determination by the CFTC that the DCO has proper risk management processes in place and that the DCO’s clearing operation is in accordance with the Commodity Exchange Act and the CFTC’s regulations thereunder.

Section 753 adds a new anti-manipulation provision to the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) addressing fraud-based manipulation, including manipulation by false reporting. Importantly, this new enforcement authority being provided to the CFTC supplements, and does not supplant, its existing anti-manipulation authority for other types of manipulative conduct. Nor does it negate or undermine any of the case law that has developed constraining the CEA’s existing anti-manipulation provisions.

The good faith mistake provision in Section 753 is an affirmative defense. The burden of proof is on the person asserting the good faith mistake defense to show that he or she did not know or act in reckless disregard of the fact that the report was false, misleading, or inaccurate.

Section 753 also re-formats CEA Section 6(c), which is where the new anti-manipulation authority is placed, to make it easier for courts and the public to use and understand. Changes made to existing text as part of this re-formatting were made to streamline or eliminate redundancies, not to effect substantive changes to these provisions.

Title VIII of the legislation provides enhanced authorities and procedures for those clearing organizations and activities of financial institutions that have been designated as systemically important by a super-majority of the new Financial Stability Oversight Council. Title VIII preserves

the authority of the CFTC and SEC as primary regulators of clearinghouses and clearing activities within their jurisdiction. Title VIII further expands the CFTC's and SEC's authorities in prescribing risk management standards and other regulations to govern designated clearing entities, and financial institutions engaged in designated activities. Similarly, Title VIII preserves and expands the CFTC's and SEC's examination and enforcement authorities with respect to designated entities within their respective jurisdictions.

Title VIII sets forth specific standards and procedures that permit the Council, upon a supermajority vote of the Council, and upon a determination that additional risk management standards are necessary to prevent significant risks to the stability of the financial system, to require the CFTC or SEC to impose additional risk management standards regarding designated financial market utilities or financial institutions engaged in designated activities.

Thus, the authorities granted in Title VIII are intended to be both additive and complementary to the authorities granted to the CFTC and SEC in Title VII and to those agencies' already existing legal authorities. The authority provided in Title VIII to the CFTC and SEC with respect to designated clearing entities and financial institutions engaged in designated activities would not and is not intended to displace the CFTC's and SEC's regulatory regime that would apply to these institutions or activities.

Whereas Title VIII is specifically addressed to payment, settlement, and clearing activities, Title I is addressed to consolidated entity supervision of complex financial institutions. Accordingly, to prevent coverage under two separate regulatory schemes, clearing agencies and derivatives clearing organizations are generally excepted from Title I. Also excepted from Title I are national exchanges, designated contract markets, swap execution facilities and other enumerated entities.

Title X of the legislation, which establishes a new Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, maintains the supervisory, enforcement, rulemaking and other authorities of the CFTC over the persons it regulates. The legislation expressly prohibits the new Bureau from exercising any powers with respect to any persons regulated by the CFTC, to the extent that the actions of those persons are subject to the jurisdiction of the CFTC. It is not intended that Title X would lead to overlapping supervision of such persons by the Bureau. In this respect, the legislation is fully consistent with the Treasury Department's White Paper on Financial Regulatory Reform, which proposed the creation of an agency "dedicated to protecting consumers in the financial products and services markets, except for investment products and services already regulated by the SEC or CFTC." (See Treasury White Paper at 55-56 (June 17, 2009) (emphasis added)).

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about my interchange fee amendment that was incorporated into the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. There are some important aspects of the amendment that I want to clarify for the record.

First, it is important to note that while this amendment will bring much-needed reform to the credit card and debit card industries, in no way should enactment of this amendment be construed as preempting other crucial steps that must be taken to bring competition and fairness to those indus-

tries. For example, a key component of the Senate-passed version of my amendment was a provision that would prohibit payment card networks from blocking merchants from offering a discount for customers who use a competing card network. This provision was unfortunately left out of the final conference report, but the need for this provision remains undiminished. It is blatantly anticompetitive for one company to prohibit its customers from offering a discounted price for a competitor's product, and I will continue to pursue steps to end this practice.

Additionally, in no way should my amendment be construed as preempting or superseding scrutiny of the credit card and debit card industries under the antitrust laws. Section 6 of the Dodd-Frank act conference report contains an antitrust savings clause which provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to modify, impair, or supersede the operation of any of the antitrust laws. I want to make clear that nothing in my amendment is intended to modify, impair, or supersede the operation of any of the antitrust laws, nor should my amendment be construed as having that effect. Vigorous antitrust scrutiny over the credit and debit card industries will continue to be needed after enactment of the Dodd-Frank act, particularly in light of the highly concentrated nature of those industries.

With respect to the new subsection 920(a) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act that would be created by my amendment, there are a few issues that should be clarified. The core provisions of subsection (a) are its grant of regulatory authority to the Federal Reserve Board over debit interchange transaction fees, and its requirement that an interchange transaction fee amount charged or received with respect to an electronic debit transaction be reasonable and proportional to the cost incurred by the issuer with respect to the transaction. Paragraph (a)(4) makes clear that the cost to be considered by the Board in conducting its reasonable and proportional analysis is the incremental cost incurred by the issuer for its role in the authorization, clearance, or settlement of a particular electronic debit transaction, as opposed to other costs incurred by an issuer which are not specific to the authorization, clearance, or settlement of a particular electronic debit transaction.

Paragraph (5) of subsection (a) provides that the Federal Reserve Board may allow for an adjustment of an interchange transaction fee amount received by a particular issuer if the adjustment is reasonably necessary to make allowance for the fraud prevention costs incurred by the issuer seeking the adjustment in relation to its electronic debit transactions, provided that the issuer has demonstrated compliance with fraud-related standards established by the Board. The standards established by the Board will en-

sure that any adjustments to the fee shall be limited to reasonably necessary costs and shall take into account fraud-related reimbursements that the issuer receives from consumers, merchants, or networks. The standards shall also require issuers that want an adjustment to their interchange fees to take effective steps to reduce the occurrence of and costs from fraud in electronic debit transactions, including through the development of cost-effective fraud prevention technology.

It should be noted that any fraud prevention adjustment to the fee amount would occur after the base calculation of the reasonable and proportional interchange fee amount takes place, and fraud prevention costs would not be considered as part of the incremental issuer costs upon which the reasonable and proportional fee amount is based. Further, any fraud prevention cost adjustment would be made on an issuer-specific basis, as each issuer must individually demonstrate that it complies with the standards established by the Board, and as the adjustment would be limited to what is reasonably necessary to make allowance for fraud prevention costs incurred by that particular issuer. The fraud prevention adjustment provision in paragraph (a)(5) is intended to apply to all electronic debit transactions, whether authorization is based on signature, PIN or other means.

Paragraph (6) of subsection (a) exempts debit card issuers with assets of less than \$10 billion from interchange fee regulation. This paragraph makes clear that for purposes of this exemption, the term "issuer" is limited to the person holding the asset account which is debited, and thus does not count the assets of any agents of the issuer. However, the affiliates of an issuer are counted for purposes of the \$10 billion exemption threshold, so if an issuer together with its affiliates has assets of greater than \$10 billion, then the issuer does not fall within the exemption.

It should be noted that the intent of my amendment is not to diminish competition in the debit issuance market. I will be watching closely to ensure that the giant payment card networks Visa and MasterCard do not collude with one another or with large financial institutions to take steps to purposefully disadvantage small issuers in response to enactment of this amendment.

Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) exempts from interchange fee regulation electronic debit transactions involving debit cards or prepaid cards that are provided to persons as part of a federal, state or local government-administered payment program in which the person uses the card to debit assets provided under the program. The Federal Reserve Board will issue regulations to implement this provision, but it is important to note that this exemption is only intended to apply to

cards which can be used to transfer or debit assets that are provided pursuant to the government-administered program. The exemption is not intended to apply to multi-purpose cards that mingle the assets provided pursuant to the government-administered program with other assets, nor is it intended to apply to cards that can be used to debit assets placed into an account by entities that are not participants in the government-administered program.

The amendment would also create subsection 920(b) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, which provides several restrictions on payment card networks. Paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of 920(b) are intended only to serve as restrictions on payment card networks to prohibit them from engaging in certain anticompetitive practices. These provisions are not intended to preclude those who accept cards from engaging in any discounting or other practices, nor should they be construed to preclude contractual arrangements that deal with matters not covered by these provisions. Further, nothing in these provisions should be construed to mean that merchants can only provide a discount that is exactly specified in the amendment. The provisions also should not be read to confer any congressional blessing or approval of any other particular contractual restrictions that payment card networks may place on those who accept cards as payment. All these provisions say is that Federal law now blocks payment card networks from engaging in certain specific enumerated anti-competitive practices, and the provisions describe precisely the boundaries over which payment card networks cannot cross with respect to these specific practices.

Paragraph (b)(1) directs the Federal Reserve Board to prescribe regulations providing that issuers and card networks shall not restrict the number of networks on which an electronic debit transaction may be processed to just one network, or to multiple networks that are all affiliated with each other. It further directs the Board to issue regulations providing that issuers and card networks shall not restrict a person who accepts debit cards from directing the routing of electronic debit transactions for processing over any network that may process the transactions. This paragraph is intended to enable each and every electronic debit transaction—no matter whether that transaction is authorized by a signature, PIN, or otherwise—to be run over at least two unaffiliated networks, and the Board's regulations should ensure that networks or issuers do not try to evade the intent of this amendment by having cards that may run on only two unaffiliated networks where one of those networks is limited and cannot be used for many types of transactions.

Paragraph (b)(2) provides that a payment card network shall not inhibit the ability of any person to provide a discount or in-kind incentive for payment by the use of a particular form of

payment—cash, checks, debit cards or credit cards—provided that discounts for debit cards and credit cards do not differentiate on the basis of the issuer or the card network, and provided that the discount is offered in a way that complies with applicable Federal and State laws. This paragraph is in no way intended to preclude the use by merchants of any other types of discounts. It just makes clear that Federal law prohibits payment card networks from inhibiting the offering of discounts which are for a form of payment—for example, a 1-percent discount for payment by debit card. This paragraph also provides that a network may not penalize a person for the way that the person offers or discloses a discount to customers, which will end the current practice whereby payment card networks have regularly sought to penalize merchants for providing cash, check or debit discounts that are fully in compliance with applicable Federal and State laws.

Paragraph (b)(3) provides that a payment card network shall not inhibit the ability of any person to set a minimum dollar value for acceptance of credit cards, provided that the minimum does not differentiate between issuers or card networks, and provided that the minimum does not exceed \$10. This paragraph authorizes the Board to increase this dollar amount by regulation. The paragraph also provides that card networks shall not inhibit the ability of a Federal agency or an institution of higher education to set a maximum dollar value for acceptance of credit cards, provided that the maximum does not differentiate between issuers or card networks. As with the discounts, this provision is not intended to preclude merchants, agencies or higher education institutions from setting other types of minimums or maximums by card or amount. It simply makes clear that payment card networks must at least allow for the minimums and maximums described in the provision.

Paragraph (b)(4) contains a rule of construction providing that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize any person to discriminate between debit cards within a card network or to discriminate between credit cards within a card network on the basis of the issuer that issued the card. The intent of this rule of construction is to make clear that nothing in this subsection should be cited by any person as justification for the violation of contractual agreements not to engage in the forms of discrimination cited in this paragraph. This provision does not, however, prohibit such discrimination as a matter of federal law, nor does it make any statement regarding the legality of such discrimination. In addition, this provision makes no statement as to whether a payment card network's contractual rule preventing such discrimination would be legal under the antitrust laws.

Finally, it should be noted that the payment card networks as defined in

the amendment are entities such as Visa, MasterCard, Discover, and American Express that directly, or through licensed members, processors or agents, provide the proprietary services, infrastructure and software that route information to conduct credit and debit card transaction authorization, clearance and settlement. The amendment does not intend, for example, to define ATM operators or acquiring banks as payment card networks unless those entities also operate card networks as do Visa, MasterCard, Discover and American Express.

Overall, my amendment contains much needed reforms that will help increase fairness, transparency and competition in the debit card and credit card industries. More work remains to be done along these lines, but this amendment represents an important first step, and I thank my colleagues who have supported this effort.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act which the Senate will pass today. After 2 years of work, the reckless practices of Wall Street firms that resulted in terrible losses for people in Wisconsin and across the nation will finally be ended.

These events showed us that maintaining the current regulatory system is not an acceptable option. Wall Street needs accountability and transparency to avoid future financial meltdowns. Congress has the duty to ensure that this kind of failure never happens again. The Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act takes vital steps to end "too big to fail," bring unregulated shadow markets into the light, and make our financial system work better for everyone.

This bill has been thoroughly deliberated in both the House and the Senate. The Banking Committee held more than 80 hearings since 2008 on the financial crisis, addressing its causes, grave impacts and potential remedies. These hearings explored all of the elements of this legislation in detail, and also looked at the specific regulatory failures that contributed to the crisis.

The information gathered at these hearings laid down the foundation for the current bill. The bill was carefully debated and deliberated while on the Senate floor for 3 weeks—almost as long as the debate on health care reform.

After the bill passed in the House and the Senate it was then negotiated by the Conference Committee. I was pleased with the Conference Committee's ability to address Members' concerns in both Chambers. The conference lasted 2 weeks and was televised and open to the public for viewing. This all brought welcome transparency to the legislative process.

Throughout the consideration of financial reform, I met with people, banks and businesses in Wisconsin to better understand their needs so that our businesses and families can be protected from future recklessness. I have

worked hard to make sure that this bill protects Main Street and its businesses by focusing on Wall Street—the source of this crisis.

I am proud to say that we now have a bill that will change our regulatory system in a way that will prevent and mitigate future crises. The bill will ensure that a Federal bailout will never again be an option for irresponsible businesses. The bill creates a council of regulators to monitor the economy for systemic threats. It will institute new regulations on hedge funds and over-the-counter derivatives and create a Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection that will oversee mortgage, credit cards and other credit products.

Consumers will now have a single entity to report their concerns about abusive financial practices, allowing regulators to address these issues in a timelier manner—before more consumers are harmed. The bill improves access to credit, increases protections and expands financial education programs enabling consumers to make smart financial decisions and reducing widespread predatory practices.

In addition to providing consumers with adequate protections against fraud and predatory practices, I also believe that consumers need affordable alternatives to predatory lending products like pay day loans. Senator DANIEL AKAKA shares this belief which is why we worked together to draft title XII of this bill.

Title XII will help to improve the lives of the millions of low- and moderate-income households in America that do not have access to mainstream financial institutions by providing grants to community development financial institutions so that they can give small dollar loans at affordable terms to people who are currently limited to riskier choices like payday loans. This grant making program will dramatically help to increase the number of small dollar loan options to consumers that need quick access to money so that they can pay for emergency medical costs, car repairs and other items they need to maintain their lives. This legislation is modeled in part after the FDIC's Small Dollar Loan Pilot Program.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust, I am pleased to see that this bill will preserve the ability of the Federal antitrust agencies to protect competition and American consumers in the financial services industries. The legislation includes a broad antitrust savings clause that makes clear that nothing in the act will modify, impair or supersede the operation of any of the antitrust laws. It also includes more specific antitrust savings clauses in key provisions, further ensuring the continued ability of the antitrust agencies to fully enforce the relevant laws in these critical sectors in our economy. In addition to strengthening the oversight of mergers and acquisitions involving financial services firms, the bill specifi-

cally maintains the ability of the antitrust agencies to perform a thorough competition review of the transactions between these firms.

This robust merger review authority ensures that the Federal antitrust agencies can continue to play their key role in protecting competition and ensuring consumers have choices for financial services and products at competitive rates and prices. Competition is the cornerstone of our Nation's economy, and the antitrust laws ensure strong competitive markets that make our economy strong and protect consumers. This bill will ensure that the antitrust laws retain their critical role in the financial services industry.

This bill is another step in a long process of financial overhaul. The Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act provides regulators with flexibility to implement a number of new rules. They will have to make decisions on issues ranging from determining fair charges on debit card swipe fees to deciding when a risky firm should be taken over. We need to make sure that our regulators have the tools and resources they need to get the job done right. As a member of the Banking Committee, I am going to keep a watchful eye on the regulators to make sure they are given adequate resources and oversight to do the job that they have been charged with.

Clearly we would not have this bill without the hard work and effort of Senator CHRIS DODD. It has been an honor to work with him and I hope he is as proud of this great accomplishment as I am.

Finally I would like to take a moment to recognize the staff that worked so hard on this bill. I would like to acknowledge the staff of the Banking Committee for all of their exceptional work: including Levon Bagramian, Julie Chon, Brian Filipowich, Amy Friend, Catherine Galicia, Lynsey Graham Rea, Matthew Green, Marc Jarsulic, Mark Jickling, Deborah Katz, Jonathan Miller, Misha Mintz-Roth, Dean Shahinian, Ed Silberman, and Charles Yi.

I also express my appreciation for all of the work done by the Legislative Assistants of the Banking Committee Members including Laura Swanson, Kara Stein, Jonah Crane, Linda Jeng, Ellen Chube, Michael Passante, Lee Drutman, Graham Steele, Alison O'Donnell, Hilary Swab, Harry Stein, Karolina Arias, Nathan Steinwald, Andy Green, Brian Appel, and Matt Pippin.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to clarify the intent behind one of the provisions in the conference report to accompany the financial reform bill, H.R. 4173, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010. Section 204(d) contemplates that the FDIC, as receiver, may take a lien on assets of a covered financial company or a covered subsidiary. With respect to assets of a covered subsidiary that is an insurance company

or a direct or indirect subsidiary of an insurance company, I believe that the FDIC should exercise such authority cautiously to avoid weakening the insurance company and thereby undermining policyholder protection. Indeed, any lien taken on the assets of a covered subsidiary that is an insurance company or a direct or indirect subsidiary of an insurance company must avoid weakening or undermining policyholder protection. As a result, the FDIC should normally not take a lien on the assets of such a covered subsidiary except where the FDIC sells the covered subsidiary to a third party, provides financing in connection with the sale, and takes a lien on the assets of the covered subsidiary to secure the third party's repayment obligation to the FDIC. I understand that the FDIC intends to promulgate regulations consistent with this view.

Mr. President, I would also like to clarify the intent behind another of the provisions in the conference report to accompany the financial reform bill, H.R. 4173, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010. Section 1075 of the bill amends the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to create a new section 920 regarding interchange fees. This is a very complicated subject involving many different stakeholders, including payment networks, issuing banks, acquiring banks, merchants, and, of course, consumers. Section 1075 therefore is also complicated, and I would like to make a clarification with regard to that section.

Since interchange revenues are a major source of paying for the administrative costs of prepaid cards used in connection with health care and employee benefits programs such as FSAs, HSAs, HRAs, and qualified transportation accounts—programs which are widely used by both public and private sector employers and which are more expensive to operate given substantiation and other regulatory requirements—we do not wish to interfere with those arrangements in a way that could lead to higher fees being imposed by administrators to make up for lost revenue. That could directly raise health care costs, which would hurt consumers and which, of course, is not at all what we wish to do. Hence, we intend that prepaid cards associated with these types of programs would be exempted within the language of section 920(a)(7)(A)(ii)(II) as well as from the prohibition on use of exclusive networks under section 920(b)(1)(A).

Mr. President, I want to clarify a provision of the conference report of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, H.R. 4173. Section 1012 sets forth the executive and administrative powers of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, and section 1012(c)(1)—Coordination with the Board of Governors—provides that “Notwithstanding any other provision of law applicable to the supervision or examination of persons with respect to Federal



consumer financial laws, the Board of Governors may delegate to the Bureau the authorities to examine persons subject to the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors for compliance with the Federal consumer financial laws." This provision is not intended to override section 1026, which will continue to define the Bureau's examination and enforcement authority over insured depository institutions and insured credit unions with assets of less than \$10 billion. The conferees expect that the board will not delegate to the Bureau its authority to examine insured depository institutions with assets of less than \$10 billion.

Throughout the development of and debate on the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, I have insisted that the legislation meet three requirements—*independent rule writing, independent examination and enforcement authority, and independent funding for the CFPB.* The CFPB, as established by the conference report, meets each of those requirements. I want to speak for a moment about section 1017, which establishes the independent funding mechanism for the CFPB.

The conference report requires the Federal Reserve System to automatically fund the CFPB based on the total operating expenses of the system, using 2009 as the baseline. This will ensure that the CFPB has the resources it needs to perform its functions without subjecting it to annual congressional appropriations. The failure of the Congress to provide the Office of Federal Housing Enterprises Oversight, OFHEO, with a steady stream of independent funding outside the appropriations process led to repeated interference with the operations of that regulator. Even when there was not explicit interference, the threat of congressional interference could very well have served to circumscribe the actions OFHEO was willing to take. We did not want to repeat that mistake in this legislation.

In addition, because many of the employees of the CFPB will come from existing financial regulators, the conferees take the view that it is important that the new entity have the resources to keep these high quality staff and to attract new equally qualified staff, and to provide them with the support that they need to operate effectively. To that end, the conferees adopted the employment cost index for total compensation of State and Federal employees, ECI, as the index by which the funding baseline will be adjusted in the future. This index has generally risen faster than the CPI, which was the index used in the Senate bill. However, the ECI has typically risen at a more gradual rate than the average operating costs of the banking regulators, which was the index proposed by the House conferees.

In the end, the conferees agreed to use the ECI and provide for a contingent authorization of appropriations of \$200 million per year through fiscal

year 2014. In order to trigger this authorization, the CFPB Director would have to report to the Appropriations Committees that the CFPB's formula funding is not sufficient.

Section 1085 of the legislation adds the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, to the list of agencies authorized to enforce the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, ECOA—15 U.S.C. §1691c(a)(9). The legislation also amends section 706(g)—15 U.S.C. §1691e(g)—to require the CFPB to refer a matter to the Attorney General whenever the CFPB has reason to believe that 1 or more creditors has engaged in a "pattern or practice of discouraging or denying applications for credit" in violation of section 701, 15 U.S.C. §1691(a). The general grant of civil litigation authority to the CFPB, in section 1054(a), should not be construed to override, in any way, the CFPB's referral obligations under the ECOA.

The requirement in section 706(g) of the ECOA that the CFPB refer a matter involving a pattern-or-practice violation of section 701, rather than first filing its own pattern-or-practice action, furthers the legislation's purpose of reducing fragmentation in consumer protection and fair lending enforcement under the ECOA. The Attorney General, who currently has authority under section 706(g) to file those pattern-or-practice ECOA actions in court on behalf of the government, receives such pattern-or-practice referrals from other agencies with ECOA enforcement responsibilities and will continue to do so under the legislation. By subjecting the CFPB to the same referral requirement, the legislation intends to avoid creating fragmentation in this enforcement system under the ECOA where none currently exists.

Title XIV creates a strong, new set of underwriting requirements for residential mortgage loans. An important part of this new regime is the creation of a safe harbor for certain loans made according to the standards set out in the bill, and which will be detailed further in forthcoming regulations. Loans that meet this standard, called "qualified mortgages," will have the benefit of a presumption that they are affordable to the borrowers.

Section 1411 explains the basis on which the regulator must establish the standards lenders will use to determine the ability of borrowers to repay their mortgages. Section 1412 provides that lenders that make loans according to these standards would enjoy the rebuttable presumption of the safe harbor for qualified mortgages established by this section. These standards include the need to document a borrower's income, among others. However, certain refinance loans, such as VA-guaranteed mortgages refinanced under the VA Interest Rate Reduction Loan Program or the FHA streamlined refinance program, which are rate-term refinance loans and are not cash-out refinances, may be made without fully reunder-

writing the borrower, subject to certain protections laid out in the legislation, while still remaining qualified mortgages.

It is the conferees' intent that the Federal Reserve Board and the CFPB use their rulemaking authority under the enumerated consumer statutes and this legislation to extend this same benefit for conventional streamlined refinance programs where the party making the new loan already owns the credit risk. This will enable current homeowners to take advantage of current low interest rates to refinance their mortgages.

There are a number of provisions in title XIV for which there is not a specified effective date other than what is provided in section 1400(c). It is the intention of the conferees that provisions in title XIV that do not require regulations become effective no later than 18 months after the designated transfer date for the CFPB, as required by section 1400(c). However, the conferees encourage the Federal Reserve Board and the CFPB to act as expeditiously as possible to promulgate regulations so that the provisions of title XIV are put into effect sooner.

I would like to clarify that the conferees consider any program or initiative that was announced before June 25 to have been initiated for the purposes of section 1302 of the conference report. I also want to make clear that the conferees do not intend for section 1302 to prevent the Treasury Department from adjusting available resources that remain after the adoption of the conference report among such existing programs, based on effectiveness.

Mr. President, I also wish to explain some of the securities-related changes that emerged from the conference committee in the conference report.

The report amends section 408 to eliminate the blanket exemption for private equity funds and replace it with an exemption for private fund advisers with less than \$150 million under management. The amendment also requires the SEC in its rulemaking to impose registration and examination procedures for such funds that reflect the level of systemic risk posed by midsize private funds.

Section 913 has been amended to combine the principle of conducting a study on the standard of care to investors in the Senate bill with a grant of additional authority to the SEC to act, such as is contained in the House-passed bill. The section requires the SEC to conduct a study prior to taking action or conducting rulemaking in this area. The study will include a review of the effectiveness of existing legal or regulatory standards of care and whether there are regulatory gaps, shortcomings or overlaps in legal or regulatory standards. Even if there is an overlap or a gap, the Commission should not act unless eliminating the overlap or filling a gap would improve investor protection and is in the public interest. The study would require a review of the effectiveness, frequency,

and duration of the regulatory examinations of brokers, dealers, and investment advisers. In this review, the paramount issue is effectiveness. If regulatory examinations are frequent or lengthy but fail to identify significant misconduct—for example, examinations of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, LLC—they waste resources and create an illusion of effective regulatory oversight that misleads the public. The SEC, in studying potential impacts that would result from changes to the regulation or standard of care, should seek to preserve consumer access to products and services, including access for persons in rural locations. In assessing the potential costs and benefits, the SEC should take into account the net costs or the difference between additional costs and additional benefits. For example, it should consider not only higher transaction or advisory charges or fees but also the return on investment if an investor receives better recommendations that result in higher profits through paying higher fees. After reporting to Congress, the SEC is required to consider the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of its study.

New section 914 requires the SEC to study the need for enhanced examination and enforcement “resources.” The study of resources should not be limited to financial resources but should consider human resources also. Human resources involves whether there is a need for enhanced expertise, competence, and motivation to conduct examinations that satisfactorily identify problems or misconduct in the regulated entity. For example, if examinations fail to identify misconduct due to insufficient staff expertise, competence, or motivation, the study should conclude that there is a need for more effective staff or better management rather than merely more financial resources devoted to hiring additional staff of the same caliber.

New section 919D creates the SEC Ombudsman under the Office of the Investor Advocate. The Ombudsman can act as a liaison between the Commission and any retail investor in resolving problems that retail investors may have with the Commission or with self-regulatory organizations and to review and make recommendations regarding policies and procedures to encourage persons to present questions to the Investor Advocate regarding compliance with the securities laws. This list of duties in subsection (8)(B) is not intended to be an exhaustive list. For example, if the Investor Advocate assigns the Ombudsman duties to act as a liaison with persons who have problems in dealing with the Commission resulting from the regulatory activities of the Commission, this would not be prohibited by this legislation.

Title IX, subtitle B creates many new powers for the SEC. The SEC is expected to use these powers responsibly to better protect investors.

Section 922 has been amended to eliminate the right of a whistleblower

to appeal the amount of an award. While the whistleblower cannot appeal the SEC’s monetary award determination, this provision is intended to limit the SEC’s administrative burden and not to encourage making small awards. The Congress intends that the SEC make awards that are sufficiently robust to motivate potential whistleblowers to share their information and to overcome the fear of risk of the loss of their positions. Unless the whistleblowers come forward, the Federal Government will not know about the frauds and misconduct.

In section 939B, the Report eliminated an exception so that credit rating agencies will be subject to regulation FD. Under this change, issuers would be required to disclose financial information to the public when they give it to rating agencies.

In section 939F, the report requires the SEC to study the credit rating process for structured finance products and the conflicts of interest associated with the issuer-pay and the subscriber-pay models; the feasibility of establishing a system in which a public or private utility or a self-regulatory organization assigns nationally recognized statistical rating organizations to determine the credit ratings of structured finance products. The report directs the SEC to implement the system for assigning credit ratings that was in the base text unless it determines that an alternative system would better serve the public interest and the protection of investors.

The report limits the exemption from risk retention requirements for qualified residential mortgages, by specifying that the definition of “qualified residential mortgage” may be no broader than the definition of “qualified mortgage” contained in section 1412 of the report, which amends section 129C of the Truth in Lending Act. The report contains the following technical errors: the reference to “section 129C(c)(2)” in subsection (e)(4)(C) of the new section 15G of the Securities and Exchange Act, created by section 941 of the report should read “section 129C(b)(2).” In addition, the references to “subsection” in paragraphs (e)(4)(A) and (e)(5) of the newly created section 15G should read “section.” We intend to correct these in future legislation.

The report amended the say on pay provision in section 951 by adding a shareholder vote on how frequently the compare should give shareholders a “say on pay” vote. The shareholders will vote to have it every 1, 2, or 3 years, and the issuer must allow them to have this choice at least every 6 years. Also in section 951, the report required issuers to give shareholders an advisory vote on any agreements, or golden parachutes, that they make with their executive officers regarding compensation the executives would receive upon completion of an acquisition, merger, or sale of the company.

The report required Federal financial regulators to jointly write rules requir-

ing financial institutions such as banks, investment advisers, and broker-dealers to disclose the structures of their incentive-based compensation arrangements, to determine whether such structures provide excessive compensation or could lead to material losses at the financial institution and prohibiting types of incentive-based payment arrangements that encourage inappropriate risks.

In section 952, the report exempted controlled companies, limited partnerships, and certain other entities from requirements for an independent compensation committee.

Section 962 provides for triennial reports on personnel management. One item to be studied involves Commission actions regarding employees who have failed to perform their duties, an issue that members raised during the Banking Committee’s hearing entitled “Oversight of the SEC’s Failure to Identify the Bernard L. Madoff Ponzi Scheme and How to Improve SEC Performance,” as well as circumstances under which the Commission has issued to employees a notice of termination. The GAO is directed to study how the Commission deals with employees who fail to perform their duties as well as its fairness when they issue a notice of termination. In the latter situation, they should consider specific cases and circumstances, while preserving employee privacy. The SEC is expected to cooperate in making data available to the GAO to perform its studies.

In section 967, the report directs the SEC to hire an independent consultant with expertise in organizational restructuring and the capital markets to examine the SEC’s internal operations, structure, funding, relationship with self-regulatory organizations and other entities and make recommendations. During the conference, some conferees expressed concern about objectivity of a study undertaken by the SEC itself. We are confident that the SEC will allow the “independent consultant” to work without censorship or inappropriate influence and the final product will be objective and accurate.

The report also added section 968 which directs the GAO to study the “revolving door” at the SEC. The GAO will review the number of employees who leave the SEC to work for financial institutions and conflicts related to this situation.

The report removed the Senate provision on majority voting in subtitle G which required a nominee for director who does not receive the majority of shareholder votes in uncontested elections to resign unless the remaining directors unanimously voted that it was in the best interest of the company and shareholders not to accept the resignation.

The report added the authority for the SEC to exempt an issuer or class of issuers from proxy access rules written under section 971 after taking into account the burden on small issuers.

In section 975, the report added a requirement that the MSRB rules require

municipal advisors to observe a fiduciary duty to the municipal entities they advise.

In section 975, the report changed the requirement that a majority of the board "are not associated with any broker, dealer, municipal securities dealer, or municipal advisor" to a requirement that the majority be "independent of any municipal securities broker, municipal securities dealer, or municipal advisor."

In section 978, the report authorized the SEC to set up a system to fund the Government Accounting Standards Board, the body which establishes standards of State and local government accounting and financial reporting.

The report added section 989F, a GAO Study of Person to Person Lending, to recommend how this activity should be regulated.

The report added section 989G to exempt issuers with less than \$75 million market capitalization from section 404(b) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 which regulates companies' internal financial controls. This section also adds an SEC study to determine how the Commission could reduce the burden of complying with section 404(b) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 for companies whose market capitalization is between \$75 million and \$250 million for the relevant reporting period while maintaining investor protections for such companies.

Section 989I adds a follow-up GAO study on the impact of the Sarbanes-Oxley section 404(b) exemption in section 989G of this bill involving the frequency of accounting restatements, cost of capital, investor confidence in the integrity of financial statements and other matters, so we can understand its effect.

The report added section 989J, which provides that fixed-index annuities be regulated as insurance products, not as securities. This provision clarifies a disagreement on the legal status of these products.

In section 991, the report changed the method of funding for the SEC so that it remains under the congressional appropriations process while giving the SEC much more control over the amount of its funding. The report also doubled the SEC authorization between 2010 and 2015, going from \$1.1 billion to \$2.25 billion, which will provide tremendous increase in SEC financial resources. These resources can be used to improve technology and attract needed securities and managerial expertise. However, the inspector general of the SEC and others have reported on situations where SEC financial or human resources have not been used effectively or with appropriate prior cost-benefit analysis. While the SEC is receiving more resources, we expect that it will use resources efficiently.

Mr. President, Senator DORGAN wishes to be heard, which pretty much will end the debate. I will take a minute or so to conclude, and then the votes will occur around 2 o'clock.

I ask unanimous consent that even though time may be expired, at least 10 minutes be reserved for the minority to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will vote for the conference report on financial reform. Before I describe why I think it is essential to vote in favor, let me compliment Senator DODD. We have had some differences on some issues, but that is not unusual. What is unusual is when a piece of legislation this complicated, this consequential, and this large gets to this point so we will have a final vote and it will go to the President for signature. It is going to make a difference. It is not all I would want. I would have written some of it differently. But there are provisions in this legislation that will prevent that which happened that nearly caused this country to have a complete economic collapse. That was the purpose of writing the legislation.

This bill on financial reform establishes a new independent bureau, housed at the Federal Reserve Board but not reporting to it, dedicated to protecting consumers from abusive financial products and practices. It puts in place systems to ensure taxpayer funds will not be used for Wall Street bailouts in the future. It creates an advanced warning system, looking out for troubled institutions to make sure we understand who they are and where they are, those whose failure would threaten financial markets and the economy. It imposes some curbs on proprietary trading and hedge fund ownership by banks. There are a number of things that are salutatory and important.

The vote this afternoon is a starting point, not an ending point. I make the point by showing the headlines that exist in the newspapers these days about the fact that there will be substantial amounts of work done to try to curb activities even in the executive branch with respect to rules and regulations which are now essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time under the control of the majority has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask the Senator from Connecticut, my understanding is Republicans have 10 minutes. I began the process because the Republican Senator was not here to claim that. I will be happy to cease at this point, if he wishes to take his 10 minutes, and then complete my statement, or I could complete my statement with more time.

Mr. DODD. How much more time would my colleague require?

Mr. DORGAN. Probably 7 more minutes or so.

Mr. DODD. I think it follows more naturally that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska.

We all understand why this legislation is trying to prevent this from ever happening again. I have shown this on the floor many times. This was from a credit company called Zoom advertising mortgages. We ran up to a near collapse of the economy with companies advertising this: Credit approval is just seconds away. Get on the fast track at Zoom Credit. At the speed of light, Zoom Credit will preapprove you for a car loan, a home loan, a credit card, even if your credit is in the tank.

Then it says: Zoom Credit is like money in the bank. We specialize in credit repair and debt consolidation. Bankruptcy, slow credit, no credit? Who cares?

We wonder how this country got in trouble. Today on the Internet this exists. Nothing has changed. Speedy, bad credit loans. If you want to get a loan, you have bad credit, go to the Internet to this site. I am not advertising for them because clearly it is probably a bunch of shylocks running this operation. Bad credit, no credit, bankruptcy, no problem, no downpayment, no delays. Come to us, if you want money. Unbelievable.

This is on the Internet today. It describes why we have to pass this legislation and what we are trying to do to protect the American consumer and why regulations that come from this are so important. Easy loan for you. Instant approval. Regardless of your credit score or history, approval is guaranteed.

This sort of nonsense is not good business. It is not a sensible way to do things. It is what nearly bankrupted this country.

Wall Street Journal, July 14, let me read the first sentence: Shirley Davis, 66 years old, retired phone company administrator, lives in Brooklyn, NY, is more than \$33,000 dollars in debt, earns \$2,400 a month, filed for bankruptcy last month. Shortly before that, she ripped open an envelope from Capitol One Financial Corporation which pitched her a credit card, even though it sued her 4 years ago to recover \$4,400 she owed on a different credit card from the same bank.

She is quoting now from the letter from Capitol One:

At some point we lost you as a customer, and we would like to get you back.

Mrs. Davis said she was stunned. "Even I wouldn't give me a credit card at this point."

It is still going on. It is why passing this conference report is so essential.

Would I have written it differently? Yes. I would have restored part of Glass-Steagall. Ten years ago that was taken apart. Those protections were put in place after the last Great Depression, and they protected this country for 70 years or so. It should have been put back together.

I would ban the trading of naked credit default swaps. That is betting, not investing. I would have done that.

I would have imposed more aggressive curbs on proprietary trading by

banks. If the taxpayer has to underwrite you as a commercial bank, you ought not have a casino atmosphere in your lobby.

Having said that, what was done in this legislation is a very substantial beginning. It is not an ending, No. 1. No. 2, the regulatory agencies now have to do a lot of work to make this bill work, to make this bill effective, to stop what happened from ever happening again.

Finally, I believe there will be an additional need to legislate in the future to address some of the things I mentioned.

I believe the work done to get to this point in a Chamber in which it is very difficult for us to accomplish anything is a success. I commend my colleague, Senator DODD from Connecticut, and others who worked on this legislation in a thoughtful way to try to decide how we can stop this sort of thing. We all understood it. We heard these things on the radio and television. Massive loans, they would securitize them. They would trade the securities back up in derivatives and credit default swaps. Everybody was making money on all sides, but they were building a house of cards that came down and nearly collapsed this entire country's economy.

A lot of people, as I speak today, are still paying the price. They got up this morning without a job, millions and millions of them. They can't find work. They are the victims of this cesspool of greed we have watched for far too long. This legislation has great merit in advancing solutions to these issues. That is why I will vote yes. Is it perfect? No. Is it an end point? No. It is a starting point in a process that is very important.

I hope in the months ahead those who are charged with creating the regulatory environment to fix this, to implement this legislation, will get it right because they have the opportunity the way this is written to get this right if they are smart and effective and want to protect this country's economy.

Thanks to those who put this together. I intend to cast my vote as yes. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Briefly, I thank my colleague from North Dakota. He has been an outspoken advocate on behalf of working families in the time we have served together. The concerns he has expressed consistently in this process are ones I appreciate very much. We did have a couple of disagreements over how to proceed, but that is the normal process of doing business. It was done with civility during the debate and consideration of the legislation. But I am deeply grateful to him for his contributions and those of his staff. He made some good suggestions, and I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. JOHANNES pertaining to the introduction of S. 3593 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if there is no one on the minority side waiting to speak, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for too long, too many firms on Wall Street have had free rein to profit at the expense of their own clients, to engage in the riskiest sorts of speculation, to prosper from their risky bets when they pan out, and to have the taxpayers cover the losses when they do not pan out. For too long, there has been no cop on the beat on Wall Street.

That must end, and we can end it today by passing the Dodd-Frank bill. The legislation before us will rebuild the firewall between the worst high-risk excesses of Wall Street and the jobs and homes and futures of ordinary Americans.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair, spent 18 months and held four hearings investigating the causes of the financial crisis. The bill Senator DODD and so many others have crafted will do much to rein in the problems we identified in our four hearings and during our investigation, and I greatly appreciate the recognition of the role of our work on the subcommittee in Senator DODD's remarks last night.

This bill will prevent mortgage lenders such as Washington Mutual, the subject of our first hearing, from making "liar loans" to borrowers who cannot repay, from paying their salespeople more for selling loans with higher interest rates, and from unloading all the risk from their reckless loans on to the rest of the financial system.

This bill will dissolve the Office of Thrift Supervision, which looked the other way despite abundant evidence of Washington Mutual's abuses, as our second hearing showed.

This bill will bring new oversight and accountability to credit rating agencies, which, as our third hearing showed, issued inaccurate ratings that misled investors. Those ratings were paid for by the very same companies that produced the products being rated, which is a clear conflict of interest.

The bill before us will rein in the abusive practices of investment banks such as Goldman Sachs, the subject of our fourth hearing. It will sharply limit their risky proprietary trading. It will stop the egregious conflicts of interest that result when these firms package and sell investment products,

often containing junk they want to dispose of, and then make a bundle betting against those very same products.

Those who claim this bill fails to rein in Wall Street cannot explain the massive amounts of effort and money Wall Street has spent to defeat this bill. If Wall Street likes this bill, it sure has a funny way of showing it.

The evidence from our investigation and from so many other sources is clear: We must put an officer back on the beat on Wall Street so the jobs, homes, and futures of Americans are not again destroyed by excessive greed. I commend Senator DODD and his staff and all those who have brought us to this historic moment. More than anything else, it is the power of Senator DODD's arguments and the deep respect for him among the Members of this body that have brought us to the finish line.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me again say to my great friend, we have served here a long time together, Senator CARL LEVIN of Michigan and I. He does a remarkable job as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Governmental Oversight Committee, which he also handles as well.

I am not sure my colleague was here, but I pointed out yesterday that the hearings the Senator held just prior—I am sure people think we orchestrate all these things; we look more organized than we usually are around here, but the fact is, the Senator from Michigan went off and had planned the hearings for months. The amount of work he and his staff did for months in preparation for those hearings threw a tremendous amount of light and great clarity on the subject so that the average citizen in this country could actually see—not just read something but see—a moment occurring during those 2 days when the exposure of what had occurred was so vivid and so clear. Then, frankly, it was a matter of days after that when we were on the floor considering the legislation.

As I said, I would love to tell people that was a highly organized set of events. It was purely coincidental the way it occurred. Again, those hearings that occurred publicly involved weeks and months of preparation before they were actually conducted.

So I say to my friend from Michigan, I thank him immensely for his work, for his contribution to this bill as well, not for just the set of hearings but then working to include the provisions that are a part of this legislation. The Senator has made a very valuable contribution and has highlighted a very important point.

It was fascinating to me, by the way, as to the number of former chief executive officers from major financial firms in the country who strongly endorsed what the Senator was doing. This was not merely a suggestion coming from consumer groups or labor organizations

or others that one might associate with the Senator's idea. But people who literally had spent their careers in the financial services sector were strongly recommending the contributions the Senator made to the bill.

I do not think that was said often enough, that this was a significant contribution endorsed by those who understood, had worked, had earned livelihoods in this industry, who had watched an industry change dramatically over the years which subjected this country to the exposure that we are suffering from today.

So I thank my friend from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank my dear friend from Connecticut. He has made such an extraordinary contribution, not just to this bill but to this Senate over the years. I cannot say enough about him, his extraordinary integrity and passion that he brings to these subjects.

Senator MERKLEY, on the proprietary trading language, of course, as the Senator from Connecticut has already recognized, is in the lead there and has been an absolutely great partner and leader on that.

But I want to especially thank the Senator from Connecticut for his passion and for his—and I was very serious about the respect with which the Senator is held in this body. Without it, without that feeling about the Senator, as well as the cause the Senator espouses with others, obviously, we would not be where we are today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my friend.

We are about to wrap up this long journey, now going back a long ways.

Let me mention a couple things. First of all, yesterday I included the names of the Senate Banking Committee staff who have made such a difference in the bill. I am not going to go back over all their names. They are arrayed in the Chamber. A couple of them are sitting next to me on the floor. Others are in the back. They are led by Eddie Silverman, who worked with me 20 years ago, as I arrived in the Senate. He spent decades with me and then left Senate service and went off and did other things in his life. At my request, he came back for the last year or so to be a part of this effort. So I thank a great personal friend, Eddie Silverman, for the job he did.

I thank Amy Friend, who was also deeply involved in this legislation. If I start down the list, I am going to miss somebody. That is always a danger. But I thank all of the Members for the tremendous work they have contributed to this legislation.

I thank HARRY REID, the majority leader. Again, I know I have talked about him on a couple of occasions. But if we do not have someone to help bring this all together, it does not happen.

I see my colleague from the State of Washington. I do not know if she cares to be heard. I was sort of filling in time for the next few minutes.

Let me thank the Senator. She has been an advocate with great passion on these issues. She brought a great deal of knowledge. She is someone who has spent a career herself in the area of financial services and understands this issue beyond just the intellectual and theoretical standpoint but has lived it. She saw the successes of it and the failures of it. So she brings a great wealth of information and ability to the issue.

I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

I thank the Senator for his diligence, particularly in the area of the derivatives market and the fact that this legislation will be the first time—the first time—the over-the-counter derivatives market in this country will be regulated.

The fact that Congress made a mistake and said hands off to derivatives in 2000, and then an \$80 trillion market exploded into what is today a \$600 trillion dark market—the chairman has now made sure that for the first time ever, over-the-counter derivatives will be regulated. That means for the first time over-the-counter derivatives will have to be exchange-traded, which means there will be transparency. It is the first time over-the-counter derivatives will have to be cleared, which means a third party will have to validate whether there is real money behind these transactions.

It is the first time the CFTC will be able to enforce aggregate position limits across all exchanges, which means you cannot hide this dark market derivative money on some exchange that is not properly regulated or try to make the market across all exchanges. It is the first time things like the London Loophole will be closed so we cannot have markets and exchanges that are not regulated. So the American people will know something as dangerous as credit default swaps—which brought down our economy—that now for the first time we will have regulation of these over-the-counter derivatives.

I thank the chairman for his efforts in that area.

A \$600 trillion market, which is greater than 10 times the size of world GDP, is a danger to our economy if it is not regulated. Thank God we are going to be regulating it for the first time. I would encourage all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who at one point in time said these are too complicated to understand—understand, they brought down our economy and understand we are going to, for the first time, regulate over-the-counter derivatives.

I thank the chairman for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington. Again, I thank her for her contribution.

Mr. President, we have arrived at that moment. Let me make a parliamentary inquiry. There are two votes, as I understand it. One is on the waiver of the budget point of order, and the second vote that will occur will be on adoption of the conference report. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the waiver of the budget point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

Mr. DODD. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on adoption of the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in conclusion, I express my thanks to all. I want to thank the floor staff as well, both on the minority and majority side. We have spent a lot of time together over the last year, and I am deeply grateful to them for the orderly way in which they conduct their business and how fair and disciplined they are about making sure the floor of the Senate runs so well. So I thank them immensely for their work.

I urge my colleagues to waive the point of order and to support this historic landmark piece of legislation that we hope will set our country on a course of financial stability and success in the generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.]

#### YEAS—60

Akaka	Franken	Murray
Baucus	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Inouye	Reed
Bingaman	Johnson	Reid
Boxer	Kaufman	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Kerry	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Schumer
Burr	Kohl	Shaheen
Cantwell	Landrieu	Snowe
Cardin	Lautenberg	Specter
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Lincoln	Udall (NM)
Dodd	McCaskill	Warner
Dorgan	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden

#### NAYS—39

Alexander	Bennett	Brownback
Barrasso	Bond	Bunning

Burr	Graham	McCain
Chambliss	Grassley	McConnell
Coburn	Gregg	Murkowski
Cochran	Hatch	Risch
Corker	Hutchison	Roberts
Cornyn	Inhofe	Sessions
Crapo	Isakson	Shelby
DeMint	Johanns	Thune
Ensign	Kyl	Vitter
Enzi	LeMieux	Voinovich
Feingold	Lugar	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been conferring off and on throughout the day with the Republican leader. There will be no more votes today following final passage. That will be the last vote today.

We are going to swear in the new Senator from West Virginia at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday. Immediately after that, as soon as that is over, at 2:30, we will vote on extending unemployment benefits.

The Republican leader and I are working on a way to move forward on small business. I think we have a pretty good path figured out on that.

After that, it is my intention to move to the supplemental appropriations bill. It appears that we are going to have to have a cloture vote. I think we can work out the time on that and not spend too much time.

I have conferred with the Republican leader at the beginning of the work period, on Monday. We have a list of things we need to accomplish before we leave here. As everybody knows, we are going to be here either 4 or 5 weeks. The leaders—Democrat and Republican—are betting on 4 rather than 5 weeks. But we need cooperation to get that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Leg.]

#### YEAS—60

Akaka	Franken	Murray
Baucus	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Inouye	Reed
Bingaman	Johnson	Reid
Boxer	Kaufman	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Kerry	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Schumer
Burr	Kohl	Shaheen
Cantwell	Landrieu	Snowe
Cardin	Lautenberg	Specter
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Lincoln	Udall (NM)
Dodd	McCaskill	Warner
Dorgan	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden

#### NAYS—39

Alexander	DeMint	LeMieux
Barrasso	Ensign	Lugar
Bennett	Enzi	McCain
Bond	Feingold	McConnell
Brownback	Graham	Murkowski
Bunning	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Gregg	Roberts
Chambliss	Hatch	Sessions
Coburn	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Inhofe	Thune
Corker	Isakson	Vitter
Cornyn	Johanns	Voinovich
Crapo	Kyl	Wicker

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### NOMINATION OF ELENA KAGAN

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to state my position on the nomination of Solicitor General Elena Kagan to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and to comment about the appropriate role of the Senate, what is happening to the doctrine of separation of powers, and how institutionally the Senate might assert itself to stop the erosion of powers from this body to the Court and from the Congress to the executive branch.

I am supporting Ms. Kagan because of her intellect, her professional background, her academic background, and because I think she will be an effective balance in the ideological battle which is being waged in the conference room of the Supreme Court—the ideological balance which is so sorely needed at the present time.

The hesitancy I have had, as I have expressed it in the hearings, has been on the failure of Ms. Kagan to respond with substantive answers so that Senators would have a realistic idea as to where she stands philosophically on some of the very important questions of the day—not how she would decide cases but what standards she would apply if confirmed, and I will be very specific about that.

It has been especially troublesome because Ms. Kagan has been outspoken in the past about the importance of having substantive answers in nomination proceedings. She wrote a now-famous article for the University of Chicago Law Review criticizing Supreme Court proceedings on nominations by saying that they were vacuous and a farce and by name criticized Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Justice Stephen Breyer for not answering questions and, in effect, criticized the Senate and Senators for not asking and pressing questions to find out where nominees stood. There was a similar article written by a young lawyer in Phoenix, AZ, named Bill Rehnquist, back in 1958, for the Harvard Law Record, where he criticized the con-

firmation proceeding of Supreme Court Justice Whittaker, saying that the Senate did not ask questions about the important substantive matters. During the confirmation of Chief Justice Rehnquist, I asked him a series of questions which he declined to answer; I cited his own words, and then he answered a few—not very many, just about enough to be confirmed. Which has been my conclusion, generally, having been a party now to 13 confirmation hearings. Nominees answer just about as many questions as they think they have to.

When Justice Scalia came up for confirmation in 1986, he answered virtually nothing. When the question came up about *Marbury v. Madison*, he said: Well, I can't answer that question. It might come before the Court.

May the RECORD show the look of amazement on the face of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota who is presiding. I was frankly amazed by it myself.

But, with the tenor of the times, following the very contentious nomination proceeding of Chief Justice Rehnquist, and other factors, Justice Scalia was confirmed handily, 98 to nothing.

I have seen him frequently at social events. I saw him at one a couple of weeks ago. I commented to a group standing with him that prisoners of war give their name, rank, and serial number, but in the Scalia nomination proceeding he would only give his name and rank. It just about amounted to that.

Following the hearing on Justice Scalia, Senator DeConcini and I were formulating a resolution which would establish standards that Senators would insist on, or could insist on—some guidance to try to get more forthcoming answers. Then we had the confirmation hearing of Judge Robert Bork, who answered questions. Judge Bork did so in a context of having very extensive legal writings, an article in the *Indiana Law Journal* in 1971 on original intent. In the context of that article, and books, many speeches, law review articles, I think it is realistic to say that Judge Bork had no alternative but to answer questions.

Since the Bork hearings, the pattern has evolved where nominees do not give substantive answers. It is a well-known fact of confirmation life that there are murder boards. That is what they call them, when the nominee goes down to the White House and they have practice sessions. Since that time it has been pure prepared pabulum. That is what we get in these hearings.

So there had been reason to expect more from Ms. Kagan. We didn't get it. I had expressed at the hearings the concern as to how we could get answers on substantive issues and was there any way to find that out short of voting "no," and rejecting a nominee? I decided it would not be sensible to vote no to issue a protest vote in the context of what has regrettably become