

(1) the Senate—

(A) has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Dirk Kempthorne, former Member of the Senate;

(B) mourns the loss of Dirk Kempthorne and prays for his loved ones, including his children Heather and Jeff, and his wife of nearly 50 years, Patricia;

(C) remembers Dirk Kempthorne as a friend, a dedicated public servant, and an advocate for Idaho, veterans, the great outdoors, and more;

(D) directs the Secretary of the Senate—

(i) to communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(ii) to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Dirk Kempthorne; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stands adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Dirk Kempthorne.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3497. An act to establish a medal of service for law enforcement officers and first responders.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 71. An act to require Amtrak to install baby changing tables in bathrooms on passenger rail cars.

S. 3199. An act to instruct the Federal Communications Commission to initiate a notice of inquiry and instruct the Government Accountability Office to complete a study and report providing detailed recommendations to address challenges to transmitting geolocation information with calls to the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline, and for other purposes.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### SAVE OUR SHRIMPERS ACT

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2071) to prohibit Federal funds from being made available to international financial institutions for the purposes of financing foreign shrimp farms, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2071

*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 "Save Our Shrimpers Act".*

##### SEC. 2. VOICE AND VOTE REQUIREMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive

Director at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act) to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any financial assistance by such institution for any project to support shrimp farming, shrimp processing, or the export of shrimp in a borrowing country.

(b) *WAIVER AUTHORITY.*—The Secretary of the Treasury may waive subsection (a) with respect to a project upon notifying the Congress that the waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(c) *EXPIRATION.*—Subsection (a) shall have no force or effect after the end of the 7-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my friend, Mr. NEHLS', bill, the Save Our Shrimpers Act.

Across our coastlines, our communities believe it is crucial that we protect our domestic shrimping industry and the hardworking men and women who keep it alive every day, day in and day out.

For far too long, U.S. shrimpers along the Gulf and other coastal communities across our country have been put in a serious disadvantage by a wave of cheap, imported shrimp.

As the largest shareholder of multilateral lenders like the World Bank, the United States must ensure that these institutions are not financing competing shrimp producers with our domestic family growers. Representative NEHLS' bipartisan bill addresses this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it requires U.S. representatives at the international financial institutions to oppose financing activities related to shrimp farming, shrimp processing, or the export of shrimp from a foreign country.

I thank Mr. NEHLS for his leadership on this important issue and for helping ensure that our international financing policy prioritizes a level playing field for our shrimp producers here at home.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2071, the Save Our Shrimpers Act. Communities in places like Louisiana, Texas, Florida, and Georgia have deep, historic connections to the shrimping

industry. They have raised concerns that foreign shrimping projects funded by international financial institutions, that is IFIs, are helping to dramatically increase the farmed shrimp supply, causing a glut that is driving down the price of shrimp and harming American business.

This bill would direct the United States Government to oppose financial assistance by the World Bank and other international financial institutions to projects that support foreign shrimp farming, shrimp processing, or the export of shrimp.

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), who is the chairman of the T&I Subcommittee on Aviation, and who is the author of the bill we have before us this afternoon.

□ 1510

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2071, the Save Our Shrimpers Act.

For far too long, hardworking American shrimpers have been devastated by the flood of foreign shrimp imports entering our markets, driving down the prices, undermining fair competition, and forcing generation after generation of fishing families out of business.

For decades, billions of dollars tied to international development financing have helped support foreign shrimp production overseas.

According to publicly available data from the Department of the Treasury, U.S. executive directors at international financial institutions have voted in favor of nearly 89 percent of multilateral shrimp and aquacultural projects over the last 30 years. Think about that—89 percent.

American taxpayer dollars have effectively helped finance foreign shrimp industries while our own shrimpers are being forced to compete against foreign producers benefiting from the subsidies, unfair trade practices, and lower label and environmental standards, allowing imported shrimp to be sold below the cost of production. It is unacceptable.

Meanwhile, the men and women from our Gulf Coast and coastal communities wake up before dawn and work long hours in dangerous conditions to help feed this country. They deserve a level playing field, not a Federal Government helping bankroll their foreign competition.

The Save Our Shrimpers Act directs U.S. representatives at international financial institutions to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose projects that finance foreign shrimp farming, shrimp processing, or shrimp exports overseas.

The Save Our Shrimpers Act stands up for American jobs, American seafood producers, and the coastal communities that depend on the shrimping industry to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for our shrimpers and protect the American industry, and I ask them to vote “yes” on H.R. 2071.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I am supportive of American workers, including the shrimpers' communities. For that reason, I recommend that my colleagues support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. NEHLS has done good work on behalf of our hard-working men and women in the shrimping industry, particularly in his native Gulf Coast, who get up at the crack of dawn every day to make a living and serve a delicious product to Americans and neighbors alike.

Mr. Speaker, I witnessed something so similar 25 years ago in the Mississippi Delta when the Federal Government's policy was to subsidize importation of catfish from Vietnam. It literally put hundreds of family farms in Mississippi and Arkansas out of business and bankrupted the industry because we facilitated—through our trade policy, through our international financial institutions policy, through our import policy—a decision that was in contrast to the very policies of USDA, which were to increase family farms and increase farms diversifying their crop from row crop to domestically produced farm-raised catfish. These policies collided, Mr. Speaker.

I think what the gentleman from Texas is arguing is let's have common sense in our policy that supports our producers and our family shrimp growers, support them and put them first in this channel of providing high-quality seafood to the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS) for this bill. I urge a “yes” vote on both sides of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2071, 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. NEHLS. 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.

#### SUPERVISORY MODIFICATIONS FOR APPROPRIATE RISK-BASED TESTING ACT OF 2025

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4437) to reduce the regulatory

burden on certain well managed and well capitalized financial institutions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4437

*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 “Supervisory Modifications for Appropriate Risk-based Testing Act of 2025” or the “SMART Act of 2025”.*

#### SEC. 2. EXAMINATION RELIEF FOR CERTAIN WELL MANAGED AND WELL CAPITALIZED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

*(a) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—Section 10(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*“(1) EXAMINATION RELIEF FOR CERTAIN WELL MANAGED AND WELL CAPITALIZED INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—*

*“(A) IN GENERAL.—The following shall apply to a well managed and well capitalized insured depository institution with \$6,000,000,000 or less in consolidated assets:*

*“(i) ALTERNATING LIMITED-SCOPE EXAMINATIONS.—After an insured depository institution receives a full-scope, on-site examination from the appropriate Federal banking agency, the next examination of the insured depository institution by the appropriate Federal banking agency shall be a limited-scope examination, as determined by the appropriate Federal banking agency.*

*“(ii) COMBINED EXAMINATIONS.—If an insured depository institution is otherwise subject to separate safety and soundness examinations, consumer compliance examinations, and information technology and cybersecurity examinations, the appropriate Federal banking agency shall, upon request of the insured depository institution, combine two or three such examinations, as specified by the insured depository institution, and carry them out at the same time.*

*“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an insured depository institution if—*

*“(i) the insured depository institution is currently subject to a formal enforcement proceeding or order by the Corporation or the appropriate Federal banking agency; or*

*“(ii) a person acquired control of the insured depository institution since the most recent full-scope, on-site examination of the insured depository institution from the appropriate Federal banking agency.*

*“(C) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Federal banking agencies shall issue rules to carry out subparagraph (A), including, with respect to an insured depository institution described under subparagraph (A), to—*

*“(i) establish procedures for the limited-scope examinations described in subparagraph (A)(i);*

*“(ii) establish procedures for reviewing insured depository institutions that—*

*“(I) experience material changes in financial condition or operational risk profile between scheduled examinations; or*

*“(II) have failed to comply with Federal or State banking laws and regulations; and*

*“(iii) balance the goals of streamlining the examination cycle for individual insured depository institutions and reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens while maintaining sufficient oversight to ensure the continued safety and soundness of the insured depository institutions and compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.*

*“(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit the authority of a Federal banking agency to conduct off-site monitoring, targeted reviews, or additional full-scope, on-site examinations of an insured depository institution if the Federal banking*

*agency determines such monitoring, reviews, or examinations are necessary to ensure safety and soundness or compliance with applicable laws.*

*“(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:*

*“(i) CONSUMER COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION.—The term ‘consumer compliance examination’ means an examination to assess compliance with the requirements of Federal consumer financial law (as such term is defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010).*

*“(ii) WELL CAPITALIZED.—The term ‘well capitalized’ has the meaning given that term in section 38(b).*

*“(iii) WELL MANAGED.—With respect to an insured depository institution, the term ‘well managed’ means that, when the institution was most recently examined by the appropriate Federal banking agency, the institution was found to be well managed, and the institution’s composite condition was found to be satisfactory or outstanding.”.*

*(b) INSURED CREDIT UNIONS.—Section 204 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1784) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*“(h) EXAMINATION RELIEF FOR CERTAIN WELL MANAGED AND WELL CAPITALIZED INSURED CREDIT UNIONS.—*

*“(1) IN GENERAL.—The following shall apply to a well managed and well capitalized insured credit union with \$6,000,000,000 or less in consolidated assets:*

*“(A) ALTERNATING LIMITED-SCOPE EXAMINATIONS.—After an insured credit union receives a full-scope, on-site examination from the National Credit Union Administration, the next examination of the insured credit union by the National Credit Union Administration shall be a limited-scope examination, as determined by the National Credit Union Administration.*

*“(B) COMBINED EXAMINATIONS.—If an insured credit union is otherwise subject to separate safety and soundness examinations, consumer compliance examinations, and information technology and cybersecurity examinations, the National Credit Union Administration shall, upon request of the insured credit union, combine two or three such examinations, as specified by the insured credit union, and carry them out at the same time.*

*“(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an insured credit union if the insured credit union is currently subject to a formal enforcement proceeding or order by the National Credit Union Administration.*

*“(3) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the National Credit Union Administration shall issue rules to carry out paragraph (1), including, with respect to an insured credit union described under paragraph (1), to—*

*“(A) establish procedures for the limited-scope examinations described in paragraph (1)(A);*

*“(B) establish procedures for reviewing insured credit unions that—*

*“(i) experience material changes in financial condition or operational risk profile between scheduled examinations; or*

*“(ii) have failed to comply with Federal or State banking laws and regulations; and*

*“(C) balance the goals of streamlining the examination cycle for individual insured credit unions and reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens while maintaining sufficient oversight to ensure the continued safety and soundness of the insured credit unions and compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.*

*“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to limit the authority of the National Credit Union Administration to conduct off-site monitoring, targeted reviews, or additional full-scope, on-site examinations of an insured credit union if the National Credit Union Administration determines such monitoring, reviews, or examinations are necessary to ensure safety and soundness or compliance with applicable laws.*

*“(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:*

*“(A) CONSUMER COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION.—The term ‘consumer compliance examination’*