timeline in which to execute these outstanding recommendations.

The final issue this bill addresses is a lack of a full-time subject matter expert at TSA to interact with general aviation stakeholders and handle general aviation security issues. The industry has been forced to rely on individuals who are often given this portfolio temporarily and struggles to find a reliable point of contact for matters that arise. This bill authorizes the appointment of a full-time employee to handle this portfolio, thus giving the industry a knowledgeable and reliable liaison with TSA.

General aviation and the commercial air charter industry are important components of the aviation community. I believe that their important safety concerns deserve to be heard and acted upon by TSA.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his help and assistance. I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3669, the Securing General Aviation and Commercial Charter Air Carrier Service Act of 2017, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, general aviation flights, such as those that fly out of Compton/Woodley Airport in my district, are integral to our Nation's aviation system.

The Securing General Aviation and Commercial Charter Air Carrier Service Act of 2017 seeks to improve and streamline security measures for general aviation and commercial charter air carriers. Importantly, H.R. 3669 incorporates two key Democratic amendments that were adopted with bipartisan support.

□ 1700

First, an amendment from the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) ensures that the Aviation Security Advisory Committee can continue to operate independently and clarifies that the TSA Administrator retains the authority to make security decisions.

As amended, the bill would drive TSA to move swiftly to act upon recommendations, with which it concurs, that the TSA's advisory committee issued regarding general aviation security.

Secondly, the bill incorporates an amendment by Representative BENNIE THOMPSON, our ranking member, to require TSA to conduct a feasibility study of requiring security threat assessments for all candidates seeking flight school training to operate large aircraft. Such a study would help inform our efforts in Congress to push TSA towards more effective and comprehensive vetting of flight students.

Under current TSA procedures, a student seeking flight training on aircraft weighing more than 12,500 pounds is not always vetted against the terrorist watch list prior to the commencement of such training. Sixteen years after 9/11 attacks, more must be done to block security loopholes that were exploited by the 9/11 hijackers. Making sure that anyone who wishes to pilot a large plane is subject to the same level of vetting that a passenger who boards the plane would receive is common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO).

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3669, the Securing General Aviation and Commercial Charter Air Carrier Service Act of 2017, which has been championed by my good friend and colleague, Mr. ESTES.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, I appreciate the significant security challenges facing all modes of America's transportation systems, including the often overlooked general aviation and commercial charter sectors.

As we saw this morning with the terrorist attack in New York City against a surface transportation hub, large commercial airliners are not the only target on terrorists' minds, and we must not allow ourselves to be negligent towards the security of all sectors of transportation security.

During his short time in Congress, Congressman ESTES has quickly become one of the most forward-leaning members of the Homeland Security Committee on issues relating to aviation security. Mr. ESTES' legislation will make significant strides in closing security vulnerabilities in general aviation's ability to screen and vet passengers and crew, while better protecting individuals' personally identifiable information from potential exploitation.

Additionally, this bill will hold the Transportation Security Administration accountable to important security recommendations from the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, including those relating to the security vetting for flight school applicants in the United States.

This bill will ensure that the general aviation community, which is often overlooked by TSA, will have a voice within the agency by requiring TSA to designate personnel to be responsible for stakeholder engagement within the general aviation community.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored to have Representative ESTES join me and other bipartisan colleagues on a recent congressional delegation to the Middle East and Europe where we examined a number of aviation security threats and mitigation efforts. Our delegation, combined with our continuous oversight efforts at home, have provided with us a stark, firsthand understanding of the security vulnerabilities facing our Nation's aviation systems.

Because of this, I am extremely pleased that Mr. ESTES' bill is being considered here before the House today. I urge my colleagues to support the bill and our efforts to improve the security of American aviation.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3669, is a sensible piece of legislation that seeks to ensure general aviation transportation in our country is secure. H.R. 3669 includes language which passed the House in a bipartisan fashion as part of the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act to ensure available TSA resources can be used to assist in securing commercial charter flights.

The bill also incorporates Democratic amendments to ensure the independence of the ASAC and to push TSA to study flight school student vetting. While large commercial aircraft operations receive the majority of TSA's attention and resources, we must not ignore the damage that could be inflicted by a terrorist attack on a general aviation flight.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3669, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3669, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CUSTOMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2706) to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2706

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Financial Institution Customer Protection Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.

(a) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or group of customer accounts or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer or group of customers unless—

(A) the agency has a valid reason for such request or order; and

(B) such reason is not based solely on reputation risk.

(2) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency believes a specific customer or group of customers is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity which—

(A) poses a threat to national security;

(B) is involved in terrorist financing;

(C) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list;

(D) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country specified in subparagraph (C); or

(E) does business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer or group of customers has used due diligence to avoid doing business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D),

such belief shall satisfy the requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the agency shall—

(A) provide such request or order to the institution in writing; and

(B) accompany such request or order with a written justification for why such termination is needed, including any specific laws or regulations the agency believes are being violated by the customer or group of customers, if any.

(2) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification described under paragraph (1)(B) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution.

(c) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided under paragraph (2) or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination described under subsection (b).

(2) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(A) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts based on a belief that the customer or customers pose a threat to national security, or are otherwise described under subsection (a)(2), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer or customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under paragraph (1) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall issue an annual report to the Congress stating—

(1) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered a depository institution to terminate during the previous year; and

(2) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making such requests and orders and the frequency on which the agency relied on each such authority.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency'' means—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ''depository institution'' means—

(A) a depository institution, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) an insured credit union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider an amended version of H.R. 2706, the Financial Institution Customer Protection Act, legislation I introduced in an effort to provide greater transparency and accountability among banking regulators.

Over the past few years, members of the Financial Services Committee and others in the House have expressed bipartisan concern surrounding Operation Choke Point, the Department of Justice and FDIC-led initiative that sought to separate legal businesses from financial services they need to survive.

People may think Operation Choke Point is limited to payday lenders or the banks serving them, but it is not. This initiative has spread to many industries, including tobacco shops, pawn brokers, ATM operators, even amusement gaming companies, to name just a few. Even attorneys and third parties that serve these industries have been impacted.

The underlying problem here is significant. The Federal Government should not be able to intimidate financial institutions into dropping entire sectors of the economy as customers, based not on risk or evidence of wrongdoing, but purely on personal and political motivations.

This type of program sets an incredibly dangerous precedent that shouldn't be permitted under any Presidential administration. There needs to be a process in place to ensure that the banking regulators have the ability to pursue bad actors, but not to punitively target specific businesses or products that operate and are offered within the confines of the law.

This legislation offers a straightforward approach to a complicated problem. It simply dictates that Federal banking regulators cannot suggest, request, or order a financial institution to terminate a banking relationship unless the regulator has material reason beyond reputational risk. It also puts in place the requirement that agency management sign off on any account termination request or order.

The provisions contained in H.R. 2706 are so reasonable, in fact, that the FDIC has already used its authority to put them in place. Effective 2015, agency policy now requires supervisory staff to track and document account termination recommendations. Such recommendations must now be made in writing and not through informal suggestion. FDIC regional leadership must be made aware of any such recommendation, and the basis for such recommendation cannot rely solely on reputational risk.

The original bill would have also struck the word ''affecting'' in FIRREA and replaced it with ''by'' or ''against.'' I maintain that this modest change would have helped to ensure that broad interpretations of the law are limited and that the original intent of the statute, helping to penalize fraud against or by financial institutions, is restored.

Attorney General Sessions announced the end of Operation Choke Point earlier this year, and we have noticed a dramatic decline in FIRREA subpoenas resembling those seen during the height of the initiative. The issues with FIRREA still need to be addressed, and while H.R. 2706 is not the opportunity to do that, I will continue to press for reasonable reforms and clarifications of the law.

Within the banking agencies, these account termination requests are still a significant problem. Just last week, I had a meeting with an industry that has seen a rash of account terminations in Missouri, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, California, Texas, and Wisconsin, to just name a few of the States that have been affected. We have to restore order, Mr. Speaker. Our goal should be to have more individuals and businesses in banks, not forced from them.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the House has passed by a voice vote two appropriations amendments prohibiting funding for Operation Choke Point. Members from both sides of the aisle have written letters and

talked to regulators about the dangers of such a program. This is a very real issue and one that must be addressed.

Again, I want to emphasize that it is essential that DOJ and financial regulators maintain the ability to pursue bad actors or anyone they think could be a bad actor. This amended version includes language offered by Ranking Member WATERS to ensure that customer account termination notices don't interfere with ongoing criminal investigations. The checks and balances in this legislation would help to ensure accountability among the regulators and would in no way hinder the ability of any executive branch agency from going after individuals or businesses suspected of fraudulent activity.

This legislation offers a responsible approach to curbing the malpractice we have seen in Operation Choke Point. I want to thank the many colleagues who worked with me on this legislation, in particular, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), Chairman HENSARLING, and Ranking Member WATERS for helping to get this considered on the suspension calendar today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who has been a wonderful person to work with, and the many members of the committee on our side of the aisle, particularly Ranking Member WATERS and Mr. HECK from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Most importantly, I want to express and extend my gratitude to the gentleman from Missouri. This has been a three-year journey for this particular legislation; not uncommon in this environment. But it was a difficult journey at times. At no step along the way did the gentleman from Missouri ever waiver from his commitment to working as collaboratively as possible, in a willingness to work to find a solution, and he did just that, and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Ranking Member WATERS for her efforts, without which this bill would never even have made it to the floor. I do believe that this bill is stronger as a consequence of the amendments that we have made, the changes that we have made to it; most importantly, those changes that will ensure that we do not interfere with the important work of law enforcement.

I have been very up-front about this. From my perspective, my interest in this bill grows out of my work on helping my State find ways to make sure our State-regulated marijuana businesses have access to banking services so that we can avoid the public safety risks that arise from huge cash stockpiles building up at these businesses.

Sadly, we have already seen these risks materialize. Before, on this floor, I had mentioned the name of Travis Mason, 23 years old, a Marine veteran, working as a security officer at a retail establishment for marijuana in Colorado, studying to become a law enforcement officer, who was, a year ago last summer, shot dead by perpetrators who believed that there was a stockpile of cash behind those doors.

□ 1715

Travis left behind a widow and, yes, three small children. He had a set of twins. So part of what this bill will help is that there be no more Travis Masons—no more Travis Masons. We are passing this bill, in fact, in part to prevent another tragedy like that.

Now, Mr. LUETKEMEYER and I worked together with the FDIC to provide clarity to their banks, and I think the FDIC's financial institutions letter of January 2015 was a key breakthrough for banks in Washington State and others. It simply said for banks worried about customer risks, like the Bank Secrecy Act and antimoney laundering—which is the main concern, frankly, around marijuana businesses—the FDIC does not expect them to avoid entire industries, but rather to make determinations on a customer-by-customer basis.

This was assurance that Washington banks needed to begin providing banking services to well-regulated, good-actor marijuana businesses. So now a handful of Washington banks and credit unions are serving marijuana businesses. Our State banking regulator is working closely with the State marijuana regulator. Scores of Washington marijuana businesses have set up bank accounts. We are getting cash out of those businesses and into the financial system, where it can be monitored. We draw down that cash stockpile. We reduced the public safety risk that I talked about earlier. We have an improved public safety condition. It is a model that needs to be spread to other States who have adopted, as it were, expanded marijuana legislation.

I view this bill as codifying the FDIC's financial institutions letter and expanding it to other bank regulators so that all lenders can operate under this same principle: that we judge consumers individually rather than by the industry they are in.

Let me repeat that: that we judge consumers individually rather than by the industry that they are in.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER has been dedicated to that principle for years. I have been honored to work with him in this endeavor and I am pleased to be at this point where we have broad bipartisan support for this legislation.

Again, my hat is off to Mr. LUETKEMEYER. To all of my colleagues, I urge a vote in favor of this underlying bill, in favor of a more balanced regulatory scheme, and a bill in favor of increased public safety.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), who is a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to lend my voice to an important piece of legislation. First, like others, I want to thank everybody who has worked very hard on this legislation. I know it is a matter of passion for many Members on both sides of the aisle in solving this problem for consumers.

One thing I am constantly asked about in the district is: In a democracy, why does it seem that the bureaucracy is in charge?

We keep coming back to this very same question with many pieces of legislation here in the House. I am excited that we are going to resolve some of that with this piece of legislation.

As was talked about earlier, what has been going on is that someone can be excluded from the U.S. Federal banking system simply because they are in an industry that might not have the best reputation. They can be excluded from the Federal banking system. This is not something that we take lightly. It is something that is very serious that we talk about in terms of sanctioning North Korea, sanctioning Iran, and now we are excluding U.S. businesses simply because they may be operating in a certain industry instead of because of the activities that individual business or that individual is actually in.

So this bill is really about looking, as my friend, Mr. HECK, said, to the individual business and to the individual themselves and saying whether they pose a national security risk, not painting with a broad brush because of the desire of some in bureaucracy to exclude certain industries from the banking system.

What Hoosiers talk about back home is how tired they are of electing officials only to see bureaucracy drive their own agenda forward, not the people's agenda forward. With this piece of legislation, we are rolling some of it back and enabling those bureaucrats to provide an annual list to Congress of the accounts that they have closed and why they have been closed. It is that level of transparency and accountability that a democracy demands.

I am excited to stand with so many other members of the House Financial Services Committee and with so many Members, I hope, later today on the House floor and say that we will deliver that transparency.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. Again, I would like to repeat what has already been said: this is a classic example of how this place is supposed to work. It takes a little time, but it works out in a bipartisan manner and in a thoughtful manner and deals with an issue that, though not important to some people, is very important to a handful of people in this country to simply level the playing field.

I want to, again, thank all of the people involved in this. It is nice to be involved in a piece of legislation that I can be proud of and that went through the process the right way and worked out the right way.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate that this bill is about greater transparency and accountability among the banking regulators.

The Federal Government should not be able to intimidate financial institutions into dropping entire sectors of the economy's customers based on personal and political motivations. It should be based on risk and evidence of wrongdoing.

Our new AG has stopped this practice, and the FDIC has incorporated many of the principles in this bill already into their standard operating procedures. But the importance of this bill is to codify in law for the regulators the guardrails that are necessary to keep this from happening to protect our citizens from this and many other activities by an overreach of the bureaucracy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2706, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

INVESTOR CLARITY AND BANK PARITY ACT

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3093) to amend the Volcker Rule to permit certain investment advisers to share a similar name with a private equity fund, subject to certain restrictions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Investor Clarity and Bank Parity Act''.

SEC. 2. NAMING RESTRICTIONS.

Section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', except that the hedge fund or private equity fund may share the same name or a variation of the same name as a banking entity that is an investment adviser to the hedge fund or private equity find, if—

''(I) such investment adviser is not an insured depository institution, a company that controls an insured depository institution, or a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978;

''(II) such investment adviser does not share the same name or a variation of the same name as an insured depository institution, any company that controls an insured depository institution, or any company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act of 1978; and

''(III) such name does not contain the word 'bank' ''; and

(2) in subsection (h)(5)(C), by inserting before the period the following: '', except as permitted under subsection (d)(1)(G)(vi)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3093, the Investor Clarity and Bank Parity Act. I would like to start by thanking my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) for his work on this important bipartisan legislation.

This bill makes a modest amendment to section 619 of the Dodd-Frank Act, also known as the Volcker rule, by correcting an unintended consequence that occurred during implementation.

When the regulators issued the final rule to the Volcker rule, they imposed severe limitations on the ability of bank holding companies and their affiliates, including investment advisers, to sponsor hedge funds and private equity funds, also known as covered funds. As a result, a covered fund cannot use the name of a sponsor.

For example, if XYZ investment adviser is an affiliate of XYZ bank and sponsors a real estate fund, that real estate fund could not be named XYZ real estate fund. Not only is such a restriction at odds with industry practice, it reduces transparency and confuses investors about who is actually managing a covered fund.

H.R. 3093 eliminates this prohibition and simply allows an affiliate of a bank holding company, such as an investment adviser, to share a similar name with a private equity fund. In doing so, this legislation clarifies the original intent of the Volcker rule and, most importantly, helps investors have better insight into who is actually managing a covered fund.

Finally, H.R. 3093 is consistent with recommendations provided by the Treasury Department in its recent report on banks and credit unions.

I want to again thank my friend from Massachusetts for his work on this bill. The Volcker rule is in need of additional reforms. I appreciate that Mr. CAPUANO has started on the naming issue and that our colleagues on the Senate Banking Committee have included modest Volcker reforms in Chairman CRAPO's regulatory relief legislation.

It is my hope, however, that this is the beginning of the conversation and that we can work again in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion to pass additional Volcker reforms, such as the designation of a single regulator to work with other regulators. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Missouri has stated everything that needs to be said. This is a simple bill that is a technical amendment to the Volcker rule that I strongly support. I know that many others have opposition to that. This is a minor change.

When you do a bill like Dodd-Frank, or any major bill, there are always things you make a mistake on and that you didn't see coming. This is one of them.

It is very simple. This simply allows a company to use names that they have been using forever. That is really all it is. I appreciate the gentleman's willingness and the committee's willingness to hear this simple bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3093.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING RELIGIOUSLY AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1730) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the protection of community centers with religious affiliation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1730

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,