1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MILLER
3	HIF159170
4	
5	
6	DISRUPTER SERIES: IMPROVING CONSUMERS=
7	FINANCIAL OPTIONS WITH FINTECH
8	THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017
9	House of Representatives
10	Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer
11	Protection
12	Committee on Energy and Commerce
13	Washington, D.C.
14	
15	
16	
17	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., ir
18	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Robert Latta
19	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
20	Members present: Representatives Latta, Harper, Upton,
21	Lance, Guthrie, McKinley, Kinzinger, Bilirakis, Bucshon, Mullin,
22	Costello, Walden (ex officio), Schakowsky, Clarke, Cardenas,
23	Kennedy, Green, and Pallone (ex officio).
24	Staff present: Blair Ellis, Digital Coordinator/Press
25	Secretary; Melissa Froelich, Counsel, Digital Commerce and

Consumer Protection; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and
Coalitions; Jay Gulshen, Legislative Clerk, Health; Bijan
Koohmaraie, Counsel, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection;
Paul Nagle, Chief Counsel, Digital Commerce and Consumer
Protection; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs;
Michelle Ash, Minority Chief Counsel, Digital Commerce and
Consumer Protection; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Lisa
Goldman, Minority Counsel; Caroline Paris-Behr, Minority Policy
Analyst; and Matt Schumacher, Minority Press Assistant.

35 Well, good morning. I=d like to call the Mr. Latta. 36 Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection to 37 order, and the chair now recognizes himself for five minutes for 38 an opening statement. 39 Again, good morning, and welcome to our witnesses today. We 40 are very glad to have you with us today. 41 Today, we continue the Disrupter Series examining FinTech 42 and all the ways that entrepreneurs and established businesses 43 are looking to give consumers more tools and control over their 44 finances. 45 Families across the country strive to achieve financial independence and stability. Many no longer feel certain that 46 their children will be better off than they were at their age, 47 48 a change from just a few years ago. 49 Understanding how new technology can assist families in managing their finances, especially while we=re -- while on the 50 51 go is a conversation we need to have. 52 Improving consumers= financial options is a clear example of the new technology pushing and disrupting established 53 54 industries. While we must focus on protecting the consumers, it is also 55 important that we keep an eye on what matters to the consumer --56 57 what are their goals, what motivates them to use one service over 58 another.

How can we encourage innovation while keeping the consumer

60 protection bar high? In this conversation about improving access 61 to commerce it is important to remember that there are generally 62 three relationships people have with traditional institutions. 63 People have -- people have access to all the traditional 64 financial services; second, the under banked who have a checking 65 account and maybe a savings account but also use alternative 66 financial services like rent-to-own services or auto title loans; 67 and third, the 7 percent of Americans who are unbanked, who do 68 not have a checking or savings account and how use alternative 69 services. 70 There are a number of statistics demonstrating how large the opportunity is to reach more Americans with relevant services. 71 72 Twenty percent of the U.S. population -- over 60 percent of 73 Americans -- are under banked or unbanked. 74 Sixty-four percent of Americans earning less than \$30,000 per year own a smart phone, and finally, over \$12 billion were 75 76 invested in FinTech companies in 2016. 77 Increasingly, Americans are turning to online and mobile banking, according to a 2015 study from the Federal Deposit 78 Insurance Corporation. Over 31 percent of Americans used mobile 79 80 banking and that number has likely risen in the last two years. 81 82 There are tremendous opportunities for companies to reach 83 consumers with new products to help them create a rainy day fund

for the first time, securely pay their mortgage, rebuild their

credit budget, manage multiple income streams and invest their earnings.

One of the first questions that come to mind in any conversation about money is security. Cybersecurity is an ongoing challenge and one the Energy and Commerce Committee is tackling head on.

At this time, one of our other subcommittees in the Energy and Commerce is getting ready to start a hearing focused on healthcare cybersecurity.

In this subcommittee we have discussed how cybersecurity plays in development and life cycle of a number of connected devices through the Disrupter Series.

While there is no silver bullet, we do need to keep cybersecurity at the top of our minds because if consumers do not trust the products and services they use are secure then they will not use them.

I would like to thank our witnesses for joining us today and I look forward to your perspectives on how we can ensure that innovation in the FinTech space continues in the United States, how innovation can improve consumer protection and how the regulatory environment has impacted innovation.

Again, I want to thank all of our witnesses for rejoining us today for this very important discussion that we will have.

And at this time, I=d like to recognize the gentlelady from Illinois, the ranking member of the subcommittee for five minutes

110 for an opening statement. Good morning. 111 Ms. Schakowsky. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 112 Today, in the subcommittee, we are going to be looking into 113 the potential to provide consumers better options through 114 financial technology, or FinTech. On the floor this afternoon, the House will be debating 115 116 legislation to gut existing consumer protections for financial 117 products. These discussions can=t happen in isolation. 118 Consumers can only realize the full benefit of FinTech if 119 we have reasonable safeguards in place to prevent abusive 120 practices, secure personal information and protect consumers from 121 fraud. 122 The Financial CHOICE Act, what my Democratic colleagues and 123 I call the Wrong Choice Act, puts those safeguards in severe 124 jeopardy. One of the landmark achievements of the Dodd-Frank Wall 125 126 Street Reform Consumer Protection Act was the creation of the 127 Consumer Product Protection -- Consumer Financial Protection 128 Bureau. The CFPB is an effective consumer watchdog and it has 129 130 returned \$12 billion to 29 million harmed consumers. The Wrong Choice Act would gut this critical consumer watchdog. 131 132 make it harder for the CFPB to take action to protect consumers. 133 It would threaten the CPB=s funding. It would specifically 134 block the CFPB from pursuing consumer protections in areas like payday lending and it would block the CFPB=s proposed rule limiting arbitration to ensure that consumers can defend their rights in court.

Who benefits? Not consumers. Not responsible businesses. The winners are big banks like Wells Fargo that open up fraudulent accounts for their customers, pay lenders that trap consumers in unaffordable debt, credit card companies that engage in deceptive practices, for-profit colleges that prey on veterans and reverse mortgage companies that put seniors= homes at risk.

The CFPB has proven time and time again that it is a research and data-driven agency. It has been actively engaged in exploring how FinTech can be part of consumer-friendly innovation.

In October, the CFPB released its Project Catalyst Report on Innovation in Financial Services. The report highlighted the tremendous potential for FinTech to improve the lives of Americans. It also emphasized the importance of building consumer protections into new innovations from the outset.

Effective protections need to be flexible enough to apply to new financial products. That=s precisely what the CFPB did in its rule for prepaid products.

It requires protections against fraud and unauthorized charges as well as basic transparency regarding fees and balances.

The rules apply to both physical prepaid cards and mobile wallets because consumers deserve strong protections whether or

160 not they are -- whether they are swiping or -- swiping cards or 161 using smart phones. 162 I believe the CFPB=s valuable work should continue. 163 choose consumers over unethical companies that engage in unfair, 164 deceptive and abusive practices. 165 I will be voting against the Wrong Choice Act this afternoon. 166 If my colleagues really care about providing quality financial 167 options for American consumers, they will do the same. With proper protections baked in, I believe FinTech will have 168 169 great benefit for consumers. It provides new opportunities to reach the unbanked and under banked households. FinTech 170 171 companies have already made it easier than ever to make 172 person-to-person payments. 173 We will be hearing much more from our witnesses about some 174 of the specific innovations that FinTech companies are working 175 on. And as with other topics in our Disrupter Series, the policy 176 177 challenge for this subcommittee to consider is how we adapt today=s -- how we adapt today=s rules to tomorrow=s technology. 178 I look forward to hearing the insight from our panelists as 179 we continue efforts to make sure consumers can truly benefit from 180 the promise of new innovation. 181 182 And I yield back. 183 Mr. Latta. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. 184 At this time, the chair now recognizes the gentleman from 185 Oregon, the chairman of the full committee, for his opening 186 Good morning. statement. 187 Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Walden. 188 welcome to our panelists and to our guests today. 189 Today=s Disrupter Series takes an important look at how we 190 can ensure that innovation=s improving options and outcomes for 191 consumers and their financial health by way of financial 192 technology, more commonly known as FinTech. 193 Smart phone adoption has skyrocketed in recent years which 194 provides a new platform to reach consumers with basic services 195 such as online banking or more complex transactions like mortgage 196 applications. 197 In Oregon where I come from, the percentage of people 198 unbanked or under banked is slightly higher than the national 199 average. So if there is an opportunity to help folks engage in 200 201 commerce, start a savings account, become more financially 202 secure, we should be giving it serious consideration and FinTech 203 could provide that opportunity. Disruption or change can be uncomfortable. But if we remain 204 205 focused on the consumer and what is in the best interests of the 206 consumer we can move forward productively. 207 Startups, incumbents and partnerships are all critical components of this conversation. Now, ultimately we know that 208 209 if consumers do not find something useful, they won=t use it, given the choice.

The reality is that consumers are demanding better, faster, more secure services in every industry. The growth of new peer-to-peer payment services like PayPal and Venmo also show that the younger generations are quickly adopting these services and they will soon expect the same level of service and convenience for other traditional financial services as well.

Block chain is another important component within this industry as it has the potential to disrupt how we transfer assets digitally with increased transparency and security.

All of this is to say it=s clear that the FinTech world is all-encompassing and is quickly growing. The United States should continue to be a hub for this innovation and for this opportunity and FinTech=s rise in popularity demonstrates its fulfillment of both.

So I look forward to the testimony and your comments today and continuing to work to increase consumers= financial options with FinTech.

That is the charge this subcommittee has, among many others in the Disrupter environment -- innovation environment and it=s ably led by our chairman and ranking member.

So we thank you for being here. I will give you a heads up that I also have to go up to the Oversight Investigations

Subcommittee that=s meeting concurrent with this one.

So I=ve got your testimony and I appreciate your counsel and

235 your input and look forward to working with you in the future. 236 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. 237 Thank you very much. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Latta. 238 The chair now recognizes for five minutes the gentleman from 239 New Jersey, the ranking member of the full committee, for five 240 minutes. 241 Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This hearing is an 242 update to last Congress= hearings on mobile payments and digital 243 currencies. 244 Technological advances are making financial transactions 245 more convenient and efficient with nine in 10 Americans regularly connected to the internet and over 75 percent of us having smart 246 247 phones. Online access to banking has never been better. 248 New financial products may help people pay and receive goods 249 faster and consumers may have better and more secure access to their funds and these products also may help people have greater 250 251 control over their financial lives by giving them more and better 252 financial information. These potential benefits are important but these new 253 254 financial products should have consumer protections attached to 255 them just like protections attached to old and more traditional 256 financial products. Consumer protections are essential and I look forward to 257 258 hearing how we can help ensure there are appropriate safeguards 259 while at the same time encouraging this new marketplace to thrive.

260 One area that is ripe for improvement in the financial sector 261 is faster payments. In this day of technological advancements, 262 some Americans still have to wait days for their checks to clear. 263 Oftentimes, these consumers are then forced into turning to 264 high cost credit to access their own money. 265 In 2015, the Federal Reserve created a task force to review 266 the issue of faster payments and I am hoping today for an update 267 on the work of that task force. 268 People should be able to get real-time access to their money. 269 I realize that some actors in this space such as check-cashing companies, payday lenders or wire transfer services may lose out 270 271 on fees if real-time access is achieved. 272 However, with all of the technological advances that have 273 been made delays are really not acceptable anymore and they have 274 adverse effects on merchants and others waiting to be paid. A number of federal agencies play a critical role in the 275 success of financial technology including both the Federal Trade 276 277 Commission and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. These two agencies conduct research and analysis of consumer 278 financial interests, educate consumers and take enforcement 279 280 actions against the perpetrators of financial exploitation. 281 As some of the witnesses will discuss today, the CFPB is 282 working to ensure consumer protections are in place for prepaid 283 debit user cards and advising companies wanting to enter the 284 FinTech arena.

285 This is important work. Yet, today on the House floor the 286 Republican majority is trying to gut the CFPB with the CHOICE Act, 287 or what many of us are calling the Wrong Choice Act. 288 The timing of this hearing is interesting. While some may 289 think FinTech is just another disruptive technology that may or 290 may not help people, members should be mindful of the bigger 291 picture. 292 Taking the teeth out of the CFPB is not the answer. The CFPB 293 was created to protect consumers from fraud and financial products 294 and it has proven itself truly able to help people. 295 We should be working together to ensure the CFPB continues 296 its robust mission and I hope all the witnesses and those 297 interested in today=s financial technology hearing join me in 298 supporting the CFPB. I would like to yield the remaining two minutes to the 299 gentleman from California, Mr. Cardenas. 300 301 Mr. Cardenas. Thank you very much, Chairman Latta, and 302 thank you very much, Congressman Pallone, for having this hearing. Good morning, and thank you all so much for being here. 303 As some of you might know, my colleague, Congressman 304 305 Kinzinger, and I led a resolution that passed last Congress 306 highlighting some of the goals and responsibilities of the financial technology industry and how the government can support 307 308 innovation in this space.

It was the first legislation related to financial

310 technology, or FinTech, that has passed either chamber. 311 on the Financial Services Committee and I don=t come from a 312 strictly financial services background. 313 But let me tell you what brings me to be an advocate for smart 314 FinTech innovation. I represent Los Angeles, which has five of 315 the top 100 most unbanked Census tracks in the country. 316 That means that nearly three out of 10 Los Angeles County 317 residents -- and L.A. County is 10 million people -- are under 318 banked and may rely on short-term lending to pay their bills and 319 stay afloat. 320 FinTech innovation has the potential to help fix this. The reason I came to Congress is effect change that directly helps 321 our communities, and working on FinTech at the federal level is 322 323 a great example of very real potential for change at local -- at the local level. 324 FinTech could potentially give small businesses and 325 326 consumers an alternative way to bank that doesn=t force them to 327 rely on high-interest short-term loans or other risky money 328 management strategies. FinTech also has the potential to create hundreds of 329 330 thousands of U.S. jobs. United States is the world leader in software development and technology, and it is in our best 331 interests to develop a national policy on FinTech. 332 333 This national policy must drive innovation, boost economic 334 growth and ensure the protection of every American=s personal

335 information. 336 Above all, we must make sure this policy helps the people 337 that need it the most, like the people in my district. 338 Thank you, and I look forward to hearing your testimony and 339 answers to our questions today, and I yield back. 340 Thank you very much. The gentleman yields back Mr. Latta. 341 and that concludes today=s opening member statements. 342 The chair would like to remind all members that pursuant to committee rules, all members= opening statements will be made part 343 344 of the record. 345 And, again, I want to thank our witnesses today for being with us today to talk about this very important topic and today=s 346 347 witnesses will each have five minutes for their opening 348 statements. 349 Our witnesses today are Jeanne Hogarth, who=s the vice president at the Center for Financial Services Innovation; Javier 350 351 Saade, managing director at Fenway Summer Ventures; Ms. Christina 352 Tetreault, the staff director at Consumers Union; and Peter Van 353 Valkenburgh at the -- research director at Coin Center. 354 Again, we appreciate you all for being with us today and look 355 forward to your testimony, and Ms. Hogarth, we will start with 356 you for your opening statement. 357 Thank you very much. If you want to just press that button, 358 please, and pull the mic kind of close to you there.

Thank you.

360 STATEMENTS OF JEANNE M. HOGARTH, VICE PRESIDENT, CENTER FOR 361 FINANCIAL SERVICES INNOVATION; JAVIER SAADE, MANAGING DIRECTOR, 362 FENWAY SUMMER VENTURES; CHRISTINA TETREAULT, STAFF ATTORNEY, 363 CONSUMERS UNION; PETER VAN VALKENBURGH, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, 364 COIN CENTER 365 366 STATEMENT OF MS. HOGARTH Ms. Hogarth. Thank you. Chairman Latta, Ranking Member 367 Schakowsky and committee members, thank you for inviting us here 368 369 today to share some insights on the potential for financial technology to improve Americans= financial health. 370 The Center for Financial Services Innovation is a national 371 authority on consumer financial health and we lead a network of 372 373 financial services innovators committed to building higher 374 quality products and services. We believe that finance can be a force for good in people=s 375 376 lives and that meeting consumers = needs responsibly is good for 377 both the consumer and the provider. Nearly three out of five American households struggle with 378 379 their financial health. These households are banked but they are 380 not well served. What people want and need is more automation of good choices 381 382 combined with control and transparency. Unfortunately, most 383 tools today don=t provide this control and transparency, and 384 FinTech, with better data, better analytics and better advice can

385 ultimately provide that. CFSI is committed to working industry 386 wide with a range of both incumbents and start-ups to encourage and seed innovation. 387 388 In 2014, CFSI partnered with JPMorgan Chase to launch our 389 Financial Solutions Lab, which supports the development of 390 technology-based products that improve the financial health of 391 Americans. 392 The lab identifies challenges facing consumers and hosts an 393 annual competition. As an accelerator program, we provide 394 participants with capital and technical assistance from CFSI, 395 JPMorgan Chase and a diverse community of industry partners and 396 experts. We work with the lab companies to help them monitor the 397 398 financial health of their customers as well as that of their own 399 bottom lines. The first challenge for the lab was to solve for income 400 401 volatility. Our second challenge was to help families weather 402 financial shocks. Next week we=11 be announcing our third cohort of financial 403 404 tech companies who are trying to improve the financial health of 405 consumers with particular emphasis on products on aging Americans, individuals with disabilities, people of color and 406 407 women. 408 Let me share three examples from our first FinLab cohort. 409 Digit helps consumers automate savings by predicting their cash

410 flow and identifying savings opportunities. 411 Since launching in 2015, Digit has helped users save over 412 The average Digit user saves between \$80 and \$170 \$500 million. 413 a month, and while it=s difficult to know if Digit users have 414 enough liquid savings to cover an emergency, the use of automatic 415 transfers is on the right path toward building a savings reserve 416 to cope with an unexpected expense. 417 SupportPay believes that technology should be used to make Through an automated child support payment 418 family life easier. 419 platform, SupportPay is helping parents amicably settle child 420 support and alimony directly with each other. 421 Today, more than 41,000 people, whether separated, divorced 422 or grandparent custodians are using SupportPay and, as a result, 423 are 90 percent more likely to exchange child support. 424 SupportPay=s data show that late payment rates have dropped 425 from 33 to 25 percent. Even helps consumers stabilize volatile 426 income by guaranteeing a consistent amount of pay each pay period. 427 428 The team recently launched the 3.0 version of the app which 429 pairs cash flow smoothing with an ongoing financial plan, 430 improving consumer engagement and positive financial change. 431 Even its focus on rolling out its product to thousands of 432 employees of a large employer, which will be announced in the 433 coming months.

Beyond standalone products, it=s important for FinTech

435 providers to partner with banks, credit unions and other financial providers to offer products to a broader set of consumers. 436 437 We believe that responsible partnerships provide wins for 438 the credit unions and the banks, the FinTech providers and the 439 consumers, especially for consumers of smaller and rural banks who can expand the array of products they offer. 440 441 Consumer protection is still very much needed but policy 442 makers need to identify the right tools to reshape the regulation 443 of financial services to fit innovations in the 21st century. 444 It=s not a question of whether. It=s a question of how. 445 Importantly, we believe that FinTech can help consumers but 446 it alone is not sufficient enough to ensure financial health for 447 all Americans. 448 It takes better job structures, living wages, benefits 449 including sick leave and retirement plans and much more. Again, we appreciate this opportunity to share these 450 451 insights with the committee and I=m happy to answer any questions. 452 [The prepared statement of Ms. Hogarth follows:] \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 1\*\*\*\*\*\* 453

Mr. Latta. Thank you very much.

455 Mr. Saade, you are recognized for five minutes.

## STATEMENT OF MR. SAADE

Mr. Saade. Thank you. Good morning.

Chairman Latta, Ranking Member Schakowsky and distinguished members of the committee, thank you very much for the opportunity to participate here today.

My name is Javier Saade and I=m a managing director at Fenway Summer Ventures. Fenway Summer is a venture capital firm that backs young companies innovating at the intersection of finance and technology.

We capitalize fast-growing ventures and serve as a value-added partner to the entrepreneurs that lead them. Since 2013, we have backed over 30 companies and have co-founded three ourselves -- a credit card company, a tech-enabled mortgage lender and a private student lender.

I am honored to be here today and lend a voice to this important dialogueBchanging landscape in financial services.

It=s no secret, as all of you have said, that over the last few years the financial services industry has undergone a significant amount of disruption.

Many factors have contributed to this but the most important, in our view, are the global financial crisis and the regulatory response engendered; rapid technological advances; secular shifts in consumer behavior and evolving capital markets= dynamics.

Every sector of the financial services industry had been affected by these changes. FinTech has the potential to transfer the way that financial services are delivered and designed, widen credit and capital access funnels and reduce friction in the process of payments.

In the past few years we have seen a proliferation of digitally enabled financial products. Just as smart phones revolutionized the way in which we interact socially, FinTech is revolutionizing how we interact financially.

In our perpetually connected world, consumers, businesses and financial institutions are finding ways to engage in financial transactions that are more convenient, cost effective, timely and secure.

In addressing the traditionally excluded and underserved sectors of the population, FinTech companies are well positioned to drive innovation. It is estimated that around the world more than 2 billion adults are underserved and unbanked.

In assessing the inclusiveness of the U.S. banking system, the FDIC 2015 survey of unbanked and under banked households found that 30 million households either have no access to financial products or obtain products outside of the banking system.

By reducing loan processing and underwriting costs, all nine origination platforms can enable financial services providers to more cost effectively offer small balance loans to household and small businesses that have been previously feasible. This in

turn facilitates credit flow to individuals and firms that otherwise would not have access to credit. New technologies are also opening up efficient ways to manage money and control spending.

We have seen mobile technology and innovations in distribution that enable financial service firms to reach communities that were previously unserved because building a traditional brick and mortar outlet was not economical.

While financial innovation holds significant promise, it is crucial that all stakeholders understand and mitigate associated risks.

There is a tension between aligning pace of development and new products and services being brought to market and the duty to ensure that these risks are addressed.

This is precisely why we at Fenway Summer are focused on finding entrepreneurs who display what our firm=s founder refers to as paradoxical conservatism.

We look for entrepreneurs who have grand ambitions to effect positive change in the financial services industry but who understand that the fail fast and often approach typical of tech-driven start-ups in other sectors may not be well suited to the financial services industry.

Two examples of our companies -- one, EarnUp. It=s a company that offers automated repayment of consumer loans, and FS Card, whose sole product is a credit card targeted towards customers

531 seeking to establish, strengthen or rebuild our credit. helps consumers save money and reduce debt by intelligently 532 533 allocating income towards loan repayments. 534 Budget in outstanding loans -- EarnUp=s technology 535 integrates with thousands of services of home loans, student loans and auto loans and other asset classes in order to route consumer 536 537 payments automatically. 538 FS Card provides access to mainstream and reasonably priced credit to consumers in the 550 to 600 credit score range through 539 540 their product called the Build Card, which is an unsecured credit 541 card with a typical line of \$500. In the absence of a product like this, consumers would likely need to resort to much more 542 543 expensive alternatives like payday loans. 544 Thanks for listening and, again, I appreciate the 545 opportunity to be here with you and share my thoughts on this topic 546 and I=m happy to answer any questions you may have. 547 [The prepared statement of Mr. Saade follows:] 548 549 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 2\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Latta. Well, thank you for your testimony.

Ms. Tetreault, you are recognized for five minutes. Thank

you very much.

## STATEMENT OF MS. TETREAULT

Ms. Tetreault. Chairman Latta, Ranking Member Schakowsky, committee members, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

Consumers Union is the policy and mobilization arm of the independent nonprofit organization Consumer Reports. We research and report on financial services issues and engage in advocacy to encourage fair finance.

We appreciate your leadership in investigating FinTech as we believe that it holds promise to increase inclusion and choice without sacrificing safety and security.

FinTech holds this promise to increase financial inclusion by solving some of the problems that consumers report have kept them from using traditional financial services.

Innovative products may provide consumers greater control over their financial lives and be offered at a lower cost and be more convenient than traditional or alternative financial services, leading to greater integration of the unbanked, under banked and unhappily banked.

We encourage service providers to bake in consumer protections as technology often moves at a faster pace than regulation. We also believe that there=s role for lawmakers to ensure that appropriate safeguards are enacted while still being flexible enough to allow for new products to thrive in the marketplace when they provide meaningful value to consumers.

578 Contrary to complaints by industry that regulation kills 579 innovation, appropriately tailored regulation ultimately benefits businesses. 580 581 While financial services regulation is essential for 582 protecting consumers from harm, regulation and supervision of consumer financial services benefits industry by promoting 583 584 consumer confidence and thereby driving adoption. 585 Strong and consistent regulation also ensures that 586 businesses that take consumer protections and regulatory 587 compliance seriously are not at a competitive disadvantage to 588 those that do not. 589 590 591 592

Lawmakers and regulators should not hesitate to hold these new financial services businesses to the highest standards.

Some of the most exciting developments in financial technology are occurring in payments. Cashless payments, faster payments and virtual currencies and the technology behind them may pose additional risks to consumers unless there are clear rules of the road.

Cashless payments are improved by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau=s final prepaid rule. Our organization documented the unfair discrepancy between the protections afforded bank debit card users and prepaid card users for many years and we are pleased that the final rule no longer relegates prepaid cards to second tier bank account status.

In addition to prepaid cards, the final rule extends

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

28 603 protections to mobile wallets that store consumer funds. 604 this is a positive development, concerns around mobile payments 605 remain. 606 For example, consumers making peer-to-peer payments may find 607 the complex liability change make it -- complex liability chains 608 make it hard to know who to contact if something goes wrong. 609 We=ve also found that some providers do not offer a telephone 610 point of contact to resolve issues. We urge stakeholders to address these concerns. 611

Faster payments are another area where financial technology promises great improvement. A number of providers have announced plans to bring faster, potentially real-time payments to the United States.

Speed may help bring underserved consumers back into formal relationships with financial institutions by reducing or eliminating the unpredictable aspects of traditional banking that drive consumers away such as fees, surprise fees and overdrafts.

There are potentially unresolved questions about the applicable consumer protections and the faster payments environment such as when funds received must be made available to consumers and we urge stakeholders to work together to resolve outstanding issues so that the benefits of faster payments may be realized.

Virtual currencies and the technology behind them hold tremendous potential but also may pose consumer risks.

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

628 states are grappling with the question of whether these businesses 629 should be licensed as money transmitters. 630 The issue is complicated as this technology has uses beyond 631 financial services. For example, ledgers transactions are 632 recorded on may one day be used to protect intellectual or real 633 property rights. 634 Regulating those businesses as financial services is 635 inappropriate. Many proponents of virtual currencies have potential to increase financial inclusion. 636 It is precisely 637 because disadvantaged consumers may be the first to experience harm that strong protections must be in place. 638 639 At present the most pressing consumer protection concern around virtual currency is not technology specific. 640 641 because there are businesses built on virtual currency protocols 642 that act as financial intermediaries. 643 Whenever businesses come between consumers and their value, 644 they must be held accountable. We urge a thoughtful approach to 645 these technologies that ensures consumer value is protected. 646 We believe that new financial products and services should 647 be subject to appropriate public review and oversight by federal 648 and state financial regulators to ensure that financial services 649 are safe and transparent and we urge providers to do their part by baking in consumer protections at the outset. 650 651 Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify here today

and I=m available to take questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Tetreault follows:]

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 3\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Latta. Thank you very much for your testimony today.

And Mr. Van Valkenburgh, you are recognized for five minutes.

Thank you.

## STATEMENT OF MR. VAN VALKENBURGH

Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I=m Peter Van Valkenburgh, the director of research at Coin Center, an independent nonprofit focused on the public policy questions raised by digital currencies and open block chain networks.

I=m going to explain open block chain networks and then suggest why we need a unified federal approach to regulating some businesses in this space while also offering a safe harbor to other businesses.

Open block chain networks allow connected computers to reach a trustworthy agreement over shared data. The connected computers can be owned by anyone in the world.

The shared data could be a ledger of digital currency ownership or any other data for which widespread agreement and auditability are essential.

Notable open block chain networks include the original Bitcoin network for electronic cash as well as follow-on innovations such as Ethereum for smart contracts and Zcash for privacy.

Open block chain networks are permission lists. There=s no patent or copyright to license, no university or corporation from which to seek a job, no exclusive membership fee to pay.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Anyone with a computer or a smart phone and an internet

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

connection can use these technologies and even can help build them. Just as the PC democratized computing and the web democratized news and entertainment, open block chain networks are democratizing financial services.

This innovation is inevitable. What remains undetermined is whether America will remain a home for permissionless innovation, as a venture capitalist might ask, and whether there will be responsible innovation, as a regulator might ask.

Those aspirations are not irreconcilable but they are also not guaranteed. America pioneered home computing and the internet in part because of our deep cultural and constitutional reverence for free speech but also because of two laws passed by Congress in the last 1990s -- the Communications Decency Act and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

Both laws created safe harbors for infrastructure-building businesses. They protected companies that were building the new information superhighways from third party liability stemming from the actions of users on those highways. These safe harbors made the U.S. a friendly home for the leaders of the internet revolution. But today we are following, not leading.

A young innovator dreaming of building the future of financial infrastructure would be best advised to leave the U.S. not because she can do it on the cheap in a foreign jurisdiction that will look the other way but simply because instead determining what the U.S. regulatory landscape demands of her is

a Herculean undertaking.

Indeed, between 53 states and territories and several independent federal regulators, it=s a task that would be much simpler if she was in the United Kingdom and could ask one regulator, the Financial Conduct Authority, for an opinion.

In order to reestablish the U.S. as a leader we need to rationalize the chaos of financial services regulation starting with state by state money transmission licensing. Custodial businesses should be regulated but they should not need to repeat a licensing process 53 times over.

These businesses are by virtue of the internet interstate in their scope of operations and they should have similarly scoped regulators to avoid costly compliance redundancies and guarantee uniform consumer protection.

Congress should encourage the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to offer federal FinTech charters to custodial digital currency firms and Congress should also consider the creation of a new federal money transmission license as an alternative to state by state licensing.

We also need a safe harbor. In several states the definition of money transmission is broad and can be interpreted to require that noncustodial developers of the technology be licensed.

It is not reasonable to mandate licensure from a technologist who helps build the networks but is not holding consumer valuables. That=s like trying to stop speeding by requiring

734 costly licensing for highway construction personnel. make sense and it=ll only mean that fewer highways get built. 735 736 But amending over broad laws in every state is not a scalable 737 The commerce clause empowers Congress to fix this 738 Much as it did in the 1990s for internet infrastructure, problem. 739 Congress should craft a federal block chain safe harbor for 740 noncustodial developers. 741 Open block chain networks are the pipes for our future 742 We want this infrastructure built here without 743 unnecessary impediment and with reasonable protections for 744 consumers. 745 Innovation can be both permissionless and responsible but it will only happen in the U.S. if we take a unified national 746 747 approach to regulating custodians and create a safe harbor for 748 noncustodial developers. 749 Thank you. 750 [The prepared statement of Mr. Van Valkenburgh follows:] 751 752 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 4\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

753 Thank you very much for your testimony and that 754 concludes our testimony from our witnesses today, and I will begin 755 the questioning of our witnesses and I will recognize myself for 756 five minutes. 757 Ms. Hogarth, in your testimony you mentioned some of the less 758 mature aspects of FinTech innovation like insurance products and 759 block chain that have the potential to drastically improve 760 consumers= lives. 761 What are -- what are some of the emerging technologies that 762 are most exciting to you? 763 Ms. Hogarth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 764 We see a lot of opportunity for disruption in the insurance 765 arena and in insurance it=s more than just what you think of as, 766 you know, your house insurance, car insurance, health insurance. 767 As we think about older Americans getting -- and I will count 768 myself in that -- getting ready to approach retirement, thinking 769 about dissaving and helping Americans begin to decapitalize and 770 unsave the 401K and IRA money that they have in their portfolios, 771 finding new ways to create pensions that are going to be lasting 772 outside of perhaps what is traditionally an annuity system. 773 So the insurance market is certainly ripe for disruption for 774 the consumer products. 775 Thank you. Mr. Latta. 776 Mr. Van Valkenburgh, your group has focused on the block

chain technologies or the distributed ledger technologies. Will

778 you give us -- give the subcommittee some of the insights into 779 what you think are on the horizon for the industry in the future? 780 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 781 These are young technologies and as I said in my opening 782 statement they are fundamental infrastructure. They are pipes. 783 So many of the consumer-facing apps are still in their infancy and this is why I think we still see fairly little actual 784 785 consumer adoption from normal Americans. 786 However, what excites us most about the industry is that this 787 infrastructure is open for others to build applications on top 788 of. So, for example, a company could build an app that 789 790 facilitates international remittances. The company designs the 791 user interface so that it=s friendly, it=s useful, it=s compliant 792 with KYC requirements and has consumer protections baked in, as 793 my colleague suggested. 794 But rather than moving the money between the users via 795 correspondent banking systems, the app uses digital currency to 796 move value between the sender and the recipient. 797 Now, the value moves faster in that system -- an hour instead 798 of three or more days -- and the fees are potentially lower because 799 there are not multiple correspondent banks in between.

more friendly for the user -- lower fees, a smart phone application

There is two things that are important to point out in that

One is that the technology made the application

hypothetical.

800

801

803 that makes sense to them -- but second, that the technology, the 804 open block chain network, made it easier for the business to get 805 started. 806 It lowered the barriers to entry for competition. 807 previously they would have had to establish a banking relationship 808 or multiple banking relationships with correspondent banks and 809 several branch locations. 810 But now they can simply build their consumer-facing app on top of existing open block chain infrastructure and smart phones. 811 812 Mr. Latta. Thank you very much. 813 Mr. Saade, in your testimony you focused, of course, on the 814 FinTech innovation and in the last year what patterns or trends 815 have you seen for new entrants that are out there? 816 Thanks for the question. Mr. Saade. 817 The exciting part about what=s happening in financial 818 services is that it=s all -- it=s a confluence of events that have 819 led to all of this happening almost at the same time. 820 If you think about -- if you think about what the -- what 821 the iPhone or the smart phone did to basically everything, there 822 was a lot of capabilities to do that because there was no significant institutions that were divergent from a particular 823 824 technology. 825 In the case of financial services I agree with my colleague 826 here that there=s a lot of things we are starting to see in

insurance technology.

828 We are starting to see a lot of things in what=s termed legal 829 tech or reg tech, which is at the end of the day regulations are 830 ones and zeroes just like any other bit of information, and there=s 831 ways to comply and better ensure that consumers and small 832 businesses are safe. 833 So there=s a -- there=s a continuing amount of innovation 834 across the spectrum. 835 Thank you very much. Mr. Latta. 836 And my time has expired and I now recognize for five minutes 837 the gentlelady from Illinois, the ranking member of the 838 subcommittee. 839 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you so much. 840 Mr. Chairman, when I first saw the title of today=s hearing 841 I was really glad to see that we agree that there=s room to improve 842 the financial options currently available to consumers and it=s 843 our job then to ensure that the American people have access to 844 financial products that are fairly priced, innovative and not 845 abusive. 846 But I=m sorry that I=m really distracted or not -- maybe not 847 distracted -- I want to bring into this room the fact that I think 848 that we cannot do those things without the -- an empowered Consumer 849 Financial Protection Bureau and today on the -- on the floor we 850 are going to do a lot to undermine Dodd-Frank.

at it here -- Mr. Van Valkenburgh, you know, you seem to suggest

I wanted to ask -- let me say your name right so I can look

851

853 a kind of new federal regulatory scheme. 854 You talked about the OCC getting involved. But it seems to 855 me that the CFPB can play a role, too, in entering this arena and future arenas and having that institution in place is really 856 What do you think? 857 important. 858 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. One role that the CFPB has already played is enforcing unfair and deceptive and potentially abusive 859 860 acts and practices. This is a logical way, potentially, to regulate some of the 861 862 entities in this space because it=s an -- it=s an ex-post 863 regulatory scheme rather than ex-anti. 864 Our chief bugaboo, if you will, is the fact that companies 865 need to get licensed in several states before operating, not 866 necessarily that there aren=t adequate watchdogs who can -- who 867 can police their behavior once they=re running. 868 As far as creating a federal hub for regulation, we are 869 agnostic as to which agency takes on that authority. primarily want to see is coordination between the agencies because 870 871 as I -- as I remarked, things are much simpler in more unified 872 governments like in the United Kingdom where there=s one point 873 agency, the Financial Conduct Authority, that does all 874 regulation. 875 Ms. Schakowsky. Having all different rules across many 876 different states, I get it.

I wanted to ask Ms. Tetreault -- how do I say it?

878 Ms. Tetreault. Tetreault. 879 Ms. Schakowsky. Tetreault. Okay. Got it. 880 I wanted to ask about the CFPB. I know Consumers Union has 881 been an advocate and helped in our deliberations over that by 882 altering the CFPB structure and funding. 883 How does the Republican bill on the floor today undermine 884 the agency=s ability to do its job of protecting consumers in the 885 space that we are talking about? 886 Ms. Tetreault. So the CFPB has done amazing work for 887 consumers, returning \$12 billion to nearly 29 million Americans 888 who have been wronged. It also provides an essential channel for getting consumer 889 890 complaints resolved. They=ve helped hundreds of thousands of 891 consumers who have complained to the CFPB get resolution with the 892 companies who in many instances have ignored their complaints 893 leading up to that time. 894 There=s an amazing 97 percent resolution rate on the 895 complaints that come through the CFPB. 896 So it would be a tremendous loss to consumers to have its capacities diminished and particularly as my colleague here to 897 898 the left said about its UDAAP authority. So the proposed -- the Financial CHOICE Act would 899 900 significantly reduce if not entirely eliminate in some instances 901 the ability of the bureau to go after scammers and ripoff artists and that would be a huge loss for consumers. 902

903 Ms. Schakowsky. Right, and I wanted to follow up on that. 904 Bad financial actors that take a lot of money preying on seniors, 905 on military members, on low-income population, why would they be 906 disproportionately harmed then by the undermining of the CFPB? 907 Ms. Tetreault. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau 908 has speciality agencies within it. There are speciality units within it that focus on particular problem areas where consumers 909 910 have suffered incredible harm and that includes service members 911 as well as older Americans. 912 So these communities would really be devastated if the 913 protections and the oversight that the Consumer Financial 914 Protection Bureau offers are reduced, eliminated or otherwise 915 redirected. 916 Ms. Schakowsky. The CFPB rule also applies to digital 917 wallets such as PayPal, right. So under the rule what 918 requirements would be in place to protect users of digital 919 wallets? 920 Ms. Tetreault. Sure. So it=s really some pretty basic 921 safeguards -- ensuring transparency and right to recredit and 922 redress if errors or fraud are detected. So it=s really the same 923 safequards that apply when you swipe a plastic card for debit 924 purchase at point of sale. 925 Ms. Schakowsky. Let me just say that I see this subcommittee 926 as a place where we should be protecting the CFPB because we are

designated to do consumer protection.

928 Thank you. I yield back. 929 The gentlelady yields back and the chair now Mr. Latta. 930 recognizes for five minutes the -- you=re on -- the gentleman from 931 Kentucky. 932 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you very much. I appreciate that very 933 much. 934 First, Ms. Hogarth, the Financial Solutions Lab has some very 935 interesting stories based on the start-ups you highlighted in your 936 testimony, and I have a couple questions. 937 One -- and I will ask them both -- how are you working with 938 those companies to create any easier path to commercialization 939 and how many of the companies that you -- that won funding through 940 your application processes are offering products to customers? 941 Ms. Hogarth. So thank you very much. 942 We work both with industry incumbents as well as start-ups 943 and we have a network that provides introductions so that there 944 are opportunities not only for partnering where, you know, the 945 entities stay as individual entities but they=re partners -- third 946 party vendors to an incumbent -- but we also provide access through 947 additional venture capital and our network discussions to help 948 them grow and build their business independently. 949 And one of our companies in our first cohort, Prism, has been 950 acquired by a company called PayNearMe. So there=s a lot of different ways, you know, that you can think about partnering with 951

a financial institution. You know, you can acquire it. You can

953 partner with it. You can also just compete with it. 954 But I think the reality is is that we really do want to see 955 these ideas grow to scale and eventually the idea of partnerships 956 is really, really important for the companies in our lab. 957 Mr. Guthrie. Thanks. 958 Mr. Saade, in your testimony you mentioned that not only does 959 your firm invest in FinTech companies but you also have co-founded 960 three companies. In your experience, what were the biggest 961 hurdles launching your own start-ups and what was your experience 962 working with regulators across the country? 963 Mr. Saade. Starting a company is a leap of faith no matter 964 what, regardless of having the ability to raise the capital, 965 having an understanding of what the regulatory landscape is. 966 Entrepreneurs overall, no matter in what industry in this 967 country or around the world, really -- it=s a global ecosystem 968 of entrepreneurs -- need to be supported. 969 So I think really the biggest hurdle to start the companies 970 we started or for any entrepreneur to start companies is actually 971 having an environment which supports that and there=s no better 972 place I can think of. 973 There are pockets of -- there are pockets of innovation in which, for example, it was brought up that the FCA is a much easier 974 975 place and situation to deal with. 976 But the overall entrepreneurial ecosystem in the United

States bar none is the best one -- that there=s a tug of war which

978 policymakers always need to ensure that they=re dealing with and 979 that is that if you=re too easy on the capital formation side the 980 consumers get hurt and if you pull too much on the other side you 981 end up hampering innovation. 982 So at the end of the day -- that=s a very long answer to say 983 that taking a leap of faith is really what innovation and entrepreneurship is about with a backdrop that supports it. 984 985 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you. 986 And Mr. Van Valkenburgh, Coin Center testified before this 987 committee last Congress when we took a look at digital currency 988 and block chain technology. 989 What can you tell us about how the landscape has changed for 990 that technology in the last year and we heard a lot about potential 991 applications. Can you tell us about where you see the most 992 promise in the short term? 993 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Thank you, Congressman. 994 I think the biggest change has been the emergence of several 995 new networks based off of the original Bitcoin open block chain 996 technology. For example, I mentioned in my opening remarks Ethereum, 997 998 which is a decentralized network for creating smart contracts. 999 Smart contracts are a fancy word, basically, for more 1000 programmatic flows of funds through these networks. With Bitcoin, a transaction normally looks like I paid Mr. Chairman 1001 1002 some Bitcoin.

1003 With a smart contract, we could give each of you a device, 1004 have that device provision you with a key of sorts, like a 1005 password, and quite literally have you vote on the flow of funds 1006 through the network. 1007 And unless somebody can penetrate each one of your devices 1008 and make you vote against your will, the movement of funds will 1009 have fidelity with your opinions when you make that vote. 1010 That is a fantastic innovation. It exists to some extent 1011 in Bitcoin under the name multi-sig transactions -- multiple 1012 signatures from multiple people who are voting on the movement 1013 of funds. 1014 Ethereum makes programming those smart contracts even easier so you can imagine even more complicated decentralized 1015 1016 applications being built by supremely bright people on top of 1017 those networks. 1018 Additionally, Bitcoin is a very transparent network. not very private because all of the transactions are fully 1019 1020 auditable on the block chain. 1021 Another innovation that=s recently emerged is a technology called Zcash built on scientific research that allows for more 1022 1023 private but still fully verifiable block chains. That=s also 1024 very exciting. 1025 Thank you. My time has expired. Mr. Guthrie. I yield 1026 back. 1027 Mr. Latta. Thank you. The gentleman=s time has expired and 1028 the chair now recognizes the gentlelady from New York for five 1029 minutes. 1030 Thank you, Chairman Latta, and to our ranking Ms. Clarke. 1031 member, Jan Schakowsky, to our expert witnesses. Thank you for your testimony here this morning. 1032 1033 As the FinTech industry has grown, a number of our new 1034 companies, not just banks, have begun offering financial products 1035 such as e-lending and electronic payments. 1036 The Financial Protection -- excuse me, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Office of the Comptroller of 1037 1038 Currency have been active in trying to help these companies 1039 understand their regulatory responsibilities. 1040 In December of 2016, OCC proposed creating a special national bank charter for FinTech companies. 1041 State regulators and 1042 consumer groups including Consumers Union, however, have asked 1043 OCC to withdraw the proposal. 1044 Ms. Tetreault, the comments submitted to OCC consumer groups 1045 including yours expressed their concern that the proposed charter 1046 could preempt critical state consumer protections like caps on 1047 interest rates for loans. 1048 Can you expand on those concerns and if OCC does go forward 1049 with the new national charter, what are the baseline consumer 1050 protections that it needs to contain? 1051 Ms. Tetreault. Thank you. 1052 The OCC=s FinTech charter or special purpose charter

1053 unfortunately would abrogate many of the state laws that are 1054 really there to protect consumers against predatory loans and so 1055 that is the primary concern that the advent of such a charter would 1056 create a race to the bottom as businesses south to find the 1057 lightest approach to oversight to them. 1058 And so we=ve really expressed strong concern about this 1059 proposal, really thinking that state regulators are in a much 1060 better position to supervise and examine these banks and also that 1061 the protections that states have put in place should be honored 1062 to protect their citizens. 1063 So it=s really, you know, a concern about overriding these 1064 in many case very strong protections, although the protections 1065 vary greatly from state to state.

So to your second question, if there were to be such a special purpose charter extended, it would be the same strong oversight that the states provide. It would include no preemption of these state protections.

It would be extensive examination and then, of course, the safety and soundness of requirements that are so essential to ensuring consumer protection.

Drill down a little bit deeper on that and say Ms. Clarke. how the OCC=s proposed charter differs from existing bank charters and how they would be similar.

Ms. Tetreault. So right now I would actually draw a greater contrast between the way that states supervise financial

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1078 services, license financial services entities and why that=s the 1079 preferable model. To say that you have some states like California and New York 1080 1081 that really have extensive methods for examining the entities that 1082 they supervise. 1083 They can really go in there. They can see in a level of 1084 detail that perhaps might elude a federal regulator. 1085 seen instances in the housing crisis -- lead-up to the housing 1086 crisis where federally-regulated entities were made aware of problems and they were not -- action wasn=t taken and we know how 1087 1088 that resulted in, you know, many millions of foreclosures and a 1089 financial crisis that nearly took down the entire economy. So there are some pretty grave concerns about having the 1090 federal oversight that perhaps might not had the attention to 1091 1092 detail and then -- and that is I think the biggest contrast between 1093 what is done now and what might happen under this. 1094 And do most FinTech companies currently offer Ms. Clarke. 1095 their services independently or do they partner with banks or 1096 other traditional financial service providers? 1097 So it=s really a mixed back in that regard. Ms. Tetreault. 1098 So you have quidance to help banks and financial service companies 1099 that are nonbanks partner together and there are pretty extensive 1100 rules of the road for ensuring consumer protection in that regard. You also may see start-ups who seek licensure within the 1101 1102 states and you have some pretty successful examples and I will

1103	just cite one, which would be PayPal where they=re able to do the
1104	work that they do and by pursuing these state licensees.
1105	So it can really be you know, there also may be a start-up
1106	that happens within a state and that=s the first state that they
1107	seek out licensure, and so it=s a mixed bag.
1108	Ms. Clarke. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
1109	Mr. Latta. Thank you very much. The gentlelady yields
1110	back.
1111	And the chair now recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia
1112	for five minutes.
1113	Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1114	One way that consumers access FinTech is through their smart
1115	phone and for many individuals in rural areas it=s not a very
1116	reliable service.
1117	In West Virginia, the mountainous terrain is limits that
1118	ability for people to have access. So I=m curious as to how
1119	FinTech companies are addressing the needs of rural community
1120	rural areas as compared to those in more urban settings.
1121	Is there something that you=re focussing on that you would
1122	recommend we look towards for addressing rural areas as compared
1123	to the urban centers?
1124	Don=t all speak at once.
1125	Ms. Hogarth. So I will take a stab at that.
1126	Mr. McKinley. Thank you.
1127	Ms. Hogarth. I mean, I said that, you know, FinTech is
	NEAL D. ODOGO

1128 necessary but not sufficient and there are a set of infrastructure 1129 issues that clearly need to be addressed, not just in the 1130 mountainous regions but in any rural area. 1131 And we should also add even in urban areas, you know, wifi 1132 is not necessarily ubiquitous or cost-free. And so for many 1133 low-income households accessing data plans is a really tough pull 1134 on their budgets. 1135 So in addition to sort of thinking through some of the issues 1136 that you heard today this is really a whole cloth because you=re 1137 exactly right. 1138 There needs to be some sort of infrastructure program in 1139 place to be able to provide access to reliable high-quality 1140 broadband services whether that is a wired line, a fiber optic 1141 line or a wifi. 1142 Mr. McKinley. Thank you. 1143 Because I think far too often in this country we focus on 1144 our urban centers and our rural communities across this country 1145 are shortchanged on access and other opportunities whether it=s 1146 health care, growth, water, sewer. 1147 I could go on with it. So I=m hoping that through these 1148 services how helpful these can be with our smart phone. 1149 still limiting a certain number of people.

Mr. Saade, in your testimony you mentioned that -- how many Americans are underserved by existing products and services to help them with their finances. But there=s also been a discussion

1150

1151

1153 about the attention between bringing new innovations to market 1154 quickly and making sure consumers are protected because this is 1155 their financial health. 1156 So how has your firm attempted to address this tension and 1157 make sure that the consumers are getting safe, secure and 1158 innovative products? 1159 So one comment on your previous question. 1160 sense that the digital divide actually knows no -- the issues 1161 you=re facing in West Virginia are not dissimilar to what you see 1162 in the South Bronx. 1163 Even though it=s heavily populated -- heavily populated 1164 areas, the digital divide actually affects underserved 1165 communities in different ways. So there=s some threads across what you=re seeing in the 1166 1167 mountains of West Virginia with what you see in the canyons across 1168 the East River. 1169 When we look at businesses to invest in, we don=t believe 1170 that regulatory arbitrage is a business model and in fact a couple 1171 of the principals, myself included, actually served in the federal 1172 government in the executive branch as actual regulators. 1173 So we are very cognizant of the fact that innovation has to 1174 be done responsibly and a lot of innovation that we see there=s 1175 a -- there=s almost like a natural self-selection of people that 1176 approach us or we approach because they=re doing -- they=re doing 1177 innovative things in a way that doesn=t harm consumers.

1178 So we are -- I don=t think there=s a -- it=s a binary choice. 1179 I think you can actually accomplish -- you can accomplish all of 1180 It=s just a tug of war. It depends on where -- where in the it. 1181 spectrum you want to fall. But innovation can be done very 1182 responsibly. 1183 Mr. McKinley. Thank you. I yield back. 1184 Thank you. The gentleman yields back the 1185 balance of his time. 1186 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas for five 1187 minutes. 1188 Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, for Mr. Green. 1189 having the hearing today and as well for our witnesses to take 1190 the time to testify. 1191 FinTech has the potential to help not only entrepreneurs and 1192 investors but those who need financial help in their daily lives 1193 the most. Often the people with the least time and with the most 1194 things to juggle on day to day basis are those who come from less 1195 financially literate backgrounds. 1196 The help that FinTech can provide to the working class is 1197 especially important. Apps with the potential to help people pay their bills, improve their credit, provide guidance on how to 1198 1199 distribute limited resources across many needs represent a 1200 welcome development, for one, from which Congress must work to 1201 provide the necessary regulatory framework.

However, the testimonies of the distinguished witnesses also

1203 highlight the importance of consumer protections. 1204 potential benefits as consumers= financial data becomes available 1205 to an increasing number of service providers, consumers become 1206 more vulnerable to the theft and abuse of that data. 1207 have somewhere to turn in case that happens. 1208 I look forward to discussing on how the balance to the risks 1209 and rewards that FinTech can offer with witnesses. 1210 Ms. Tetreault, in your testimony you underline the 1211 importance of consumer protections when it comes to FinTechs and you lay out consumer safety guidelines which several types of 1212 1213 FinTech service providers should adhere. 1214 With the CHOICE Act on the floor this week, what impact if 1215 any do you see this having on the ability of the Consumer Finance Bureau to implement and enforce these guidelines? 1216 1217 Ms. Tetreault. Sure. So I think if the CHOICE Act passes 1218 it would be -- Financial CHOICE Act passes it would be devastating 1219 for consumers for a variety of reasons, specifically related to 1220 consumer harms. 1221 It gets rid of the monitoring function of the bureau and the 1222 market monitoring allows the CFPB staff to get a good insight into 1223 what=s happening within various segments within financial 1224 services and meet with those industry leaders and service

providers and also to monitor consumer complaints and concerns

long before they become system issues or widespread problems for

consumers.

1225

1226

1228 So that would disappear. You=d have the loss of the 1229 public-facing database, consumer conflate database that allows 1230 not only researchers but everyday people to go ahead and look and 1231 see where the issues are with particular service providers around 1232 particular products. 1233 It=s searchable in many dimensions. There would be a loss, 1234 presumably, of the specialty offices within the bureau or at least 1235 those are made optional so you potentially lose Project Catalyst, 1236 which is an initiative from the bureau to take a look at 1237 innovation. 1238 With that you lose the convening that the bureau does for 1239 financial technology companies and providers. You lose the 1240 opportunity for a no-action letter which is --I=m almost -- I only get five minutes. 1241 Mr. Green. 1242 -- we=ve heard today about FinTech=s potential for offering 1243 financial service for the unbanked and under banked populations, 1244 which tend to be lower income. 1245 But research shows that the majority of the people that are 1246 actually using FinTech products are wealthier customers. 1247 needs to be done so that the unbanked and under banked populations can also have full access to FinTech potential benefits and are 1248 1249 there obstacles preventing these populations from using these 1250 traditional financial services because of the lack of access to 1251 these new financial products?

Ms. Tetreault.

1252

So access to broadband is definitely an

1253 issue and one that=s been discussed here because so many of these 1254 innovative products and services are reliant on a secure, sound, 1255 continuous internet connection. That, I would say, is a very 1256 strong hurdle. 1257 I think the other is one of the things that we=ve seen a lot 1258 is consumer concerns. So, you know, the stories that we hear back 1259 when we ask people, for example, why aren=t you using mobile 1260 payments is they say, I=m worried about safety and security. 1261 And while the evidence may indicate that these services are 1262 quite safe, the consumer perception potentially was there because 1263 of these gaps that existed, for example, before the CFPB=s final 1264 prepaid rule. 1265 So, you know, there is I think any number of things that stand 1266 in the way of consumers engaging with these services and concerns 1267 that can be addressed by appropriate safeguards. 1268 I am almost out of my time. Last month, Energy 1269 and Commerce Democrats introduced the Lift America Act, a 21st 1270 century infrastructure package that includes \$40 billion to 1271 expand access to broadband internet not only in rural areas but 1272 also in the urban areas like I represent. 1273 Thank you for your time, Mr. Chairman. 1274 Mr. Latta. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. 1275 And the chair now recognizes the gentleman from Indiana for 1276 five minutes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bucshon.

A question for anybody really. I mean, technology is great.

My older kids use Venmo. They don=t have any cash, right. But so we know that people are under banked and unbanked now. What makes us optimistic that adding technology to that will substantially change that situation?

Just a hypothetical because a lot of people -- there=s reasons why people don=t have a bank or they=re -- or they=re under banked now and it could be access to a local -- you know, to a bank standing on the corner. But there=s other more complicated reasons why. And so when you add actually the -- I=m just playing a little devil=s advocate here -- you add the technology on board what makes us think that that will help? Be curious to -- anyone.

Ms. Tetreault. I will just -- thank you -- I will address that very briefly around faster payments. I will use faster payments as an example as that=s an area where the technology needs to move into -- it will need to move forward to bring us to real-time payment, and there are proposals out there.

And how I can see that bringing in underserved consumers is that it allows for real-time information for better money management and then there are potential aspects of the -- of the technology that would ensure that there wouldn=t be an opportunity for things like surprise fees or overdrafts for the way that the payments actually work.

So I see that. We know for a fact from consumers, due to extensive research, that it is surprise fees and overdrafts that

1303 often drive consumers out of the mainstream banking system and 1304 forces them to use, you know, more expensive products or rely on 1305 cash. 1306 So I see this -- I see that particular area as a tremendous 1307 opportunity. 1308 Okay. Mr. Bucshon. Yes. And I would add in addition to the faster 1309 1310 payments piece that the ability of financial technology to give 1311 consumers a 360-degree picture of their finances is really, really 1312 important because a lot of times you=re operating in one-off 1313 decisions when you don=t really understand the interaction of the 1314 decision X with decision Y and financial technology and many of the apps now are really trying to help consumers get that fuller 1315 1316 picture of their financial lives. 1317 Mr. Bucshon. Okay. Mr. Saade. I was going to say that just one example that 1318 1319 happens to be a relevant one here is that the biggest generation 1320 of Americans -- 76 million or something of them -- typically would 1321 rather not step foot in any one of the 100,000 or so, give or take, bank branches in the United States. 1322 So even though there=s sort of a dark side of technology kind 1323 1324 of making you anonymous, as we have seen in other industries --1325 Mr. Bucshon. Oh, yes. 1326 -- in the media recently, that sort of faceless 1327 ability enables you to access things with a lot less friction and the lack of friction leads to lower cost. So I think the question is not what but how.

It=s a very good question you ask but the -- and if you look at it from a business perspective, 2 billion people are not getting banked around the world. That is a huge business opportunity.

So there=s a lot of people thinking about this exact issue, not just venture capitalists or the people here but people across the spectrum.

Mr. Bucshon. Okay.

Mr. Van Valkenburgh. The only thing I would add is that the user interface matters a great deal with technology. Google was actually the fifteenth search engine thereabouts.

There were several that tried to make the web accessible to people and help them find the information they wanted but simply didn=t make it intuitive. It just didn=t make sense to people when they tried to use it. Rapidly prototyping and the ability of new people to come in with a fresh idea of how to get people excited about their financial futures is very important and to the extent that open block chain networks create infrastructure that they can build on top of minimizing the costs of trying something new I think will see much more rapid consumer adoption of these new tools because they=ll suddenly make sense when they=re finally built by the right people had the right vision.

Mr. Bucshon. Yes. My concern is that what do you -- what do you think will happen to more traditional ways that people

1353 access the banking system? 1354 Because as you know already technology is such where -- say, 1355 from example, my parents, you know, who have gone to a bank for 1356 What happens when there=s no longer a bank on 1357 So I think we need to think about that question also 1358 and I know -- and I=m all for technology. 1359 I think it=s great. But we need to be -- to your point, we 1360 need to make sure that the services that are available are 1361 intuitive, are easily accessible not only to my sons who are in 1362 their 20s but to my in-laws and my parents who are in their 80s 1363 if we are going to backtrack a little bit on more traditional type 1364 service availability. 1365 Thank you. I yield back. 1366 Mr. Latta. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. 1367 And the gentleman from California is recognized for five 1368 minutes. 1369 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Cardenas. 1370 Once again, I appreciate the opportunity for us to have this 1371 This question goes out to any of the individuals who 1372 want to chime in and answer. 1373 Could you give some examples of how often is a bank account 1374 needed to participate in these technologies and count as a 1375 traditional bank account? 1376 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Especially in the digital currency and 1377 open block chain space, despite the fact that the technology I

1378 described in some ways supplants the correspondent banking 1379 system, there will still be a need to onramp people into these 1380 new digital currency networks. 1381 So it will be very common for the company to have banking 1382 relationships that they process payments for and it will be 1383 necessary for the user to have a bank account that they can connect 1384 in order to exchange their dollars for digital currency. 1385 Unfortunately, many of the companies that are working in this 1386 very exciting space have had trouble getting and maintaining 1387 banking relationships because they=re seen as a money-laundering 1388 risk. That is despite the fact that all of the companies operating 1389 1390 in the U.S.=s exchanges are fully registered and compliant with anti-money laundering requirements from FinCEN. 1391 1392 1393

I think there is a bit of a cultural problem here where perhaps the examiners look at this as a fringe technology that should simply be ignored and banks take a derisking approach.

I think that approach may be misquided because we want these companies in the regulatory system because if these technologies exist outside of the regulatory system we=ll simply have less information about what people are doing with them and will not allow them to flourish as hubs for innovation in these services.

Mr. Cardenas. Well, Mr. Van Valkenburgh, how do you Okay. open block chain networks? How does open block chain networks encourage financial inclusion and diversity in the financial

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

marketplace?

Mr. Van Valkenburgh. So the primary mechanism, I think, is allowing for the rapid prototyping of new tools that can be intuitive for users and meet their goals.

So transactions can be faster when their back end is running through an open block chain network. It can be cheaper for the customer and it can also be cheaper for the business to try new approaches.

So I think in that competition you find more likely there will be an emergence of apps and services that speak to underserved communities, make them want to use those technologies and make it easier for them to use those technologies safely.

Mr. Cardenas. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Tetreault, are there occurrences of deceptive practices in the financial industry that consumers should be aware of and if there are what can -- what role can Congress play in helping to alleviate that issue?

Ms. Tetreault. There are many abusive practices.

Fortunately, we=ve seen a tremendous enforcement of consumer financial protection laws by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. So that=s where you have these 29 million Americans getting back \$12 billion in relief.

In terms of existing problems, they -- having a strong cop on the beat is really essential to ensuring the consumers are protected and we are very eager to see the strength and integrity

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau ensured by keeping a strong leadership structure, no attacks on funding and maintaining its singular focus on consumer financial protection as opposed to dissipating and across a number of federal regulators.

Mr. Cardenas. So having a cop on the beat is a good thing?

Ms. Tetreault. Absolutely, and I think, you know, you can

see every day it seems that there=s another example of a financial

institution or financial service provider behaving badly and to

see them held to account not only holds that business to account

but it sets an example so that other services providers know that

they need to mind their p=s and q=s.

So it=s incredibly important to consumers to have this cop on the beat, or as we like to refer to it, consumer watchdog so that folks, you know, are protected and make sure that there are protections in -- not only protections in place because of the rulemaking authority but also people watching out to ensure that there is -- there are safe financial service products available.

Mr. Cardenas. I mentioned earlier in my opening statement about the opportunity or idea that perhaps this technology -- this opportunity could give unbanked individuals and households an opportunity to get involved in access to capital and financial stability.

What does this technology bring to bear when it comes to underwriting and giving someone an opportunity to get access to

capital versus the old brick and mortar, you know, old-fashioned 1454 underwriting methods? 1455 Ms. Tetreault. So the one thing I would say that we do see 1456 a lot of attempts to -- from service providers to quantify the 1457 creditworthiness of consumers. I would just raise two quick 1458 concerns. 1459 In many instances there=s a lack of transparency and then 1460 there=s the concerns around the way that data is collected and 1461 used and would urge service providers to be considerably more transparent in the way that they quantify consumers. 1462 1463 Mr. Cardenas. Thank you. Yield back. 1464 The -- I=m sorry -- the gentleman=s Mr. Latta. Thank you. 1465 time has expired and the chair now recognizes for five minutes the gentleman from Illinois. 1466 1467 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you all for being here today. This is a very important hearing. 1468 1469 committee having jurisdiction over consumer affairs, I=m very 1470 pleased that we are continuing to shed light on the importance 1471 of financial technology and the benefits it can provide. 1472 FinTech is improving the speed, convenience, efficiency and 1473 accessibility of financial information for consumers. 1474 Congress I introduced a resolution with Congressman Cardenas 1475 highlighting the potential positive impact technology can have 1476 on a consumer=s financial health and expressing the sense of 1477 Congress that there should be a single national strategy to ensure

the development of FinTech.

In many cases we see out here technology always leads

Congress and government and we basically kind of wake up and see

what=s happening and then have to figure out a strategy to deal

with it.

So some of you have already answered to an extent this question but I just want to ask it of all of you and I will start with Mr. Van Valkenburgh because he has the coolest last name on the committee or on the -- on the panel. No offense to the rest of you.

But what are the issues and trends that we in Congress need to watch for to ensure that consumers benefit from innovation in a responsible and a secure way?

Because it sounds like developing the regulatory framework can obviously be a huge challenge. But this access to the financial account is very serious and should be treated as such. So I=d appreciate all your thoughts. I will start with you, sir.

Mr. Van Valkenburgh. So I think the key -- the key distinction to be made is between technologists who are building these technologies and holding other people=s value, playing that custodial role, and technologists who are simply building the future infrastructure, really -- the pipes for the future economy.

Making that distinction is key because I think you=re absolutely right that we need a unified approach to regulating those custodians to make sure consumers are protected and we very

much appreciate your and Congressman Cardenas= resolution
emphasizing that point.

But it=s also very important that people who are building

the fundamental infrastructure are not swept up in a burdensome regulatory regime that isn=t aimed at the risks they create because they don=t take custody, because they don=t actually hold other people=s valuables.

Mr. Kinzinger. That=s interesting. Okay.

Ms. Tetreault. I would say first the importance of strong rules of the road as exhibited with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau=s final prepaid rules.

So having that extend to digital wallets that hold funds I think is a great example of how regulations can be in place at the federal level.

And then to the question about any sort of streamlined oversight is so long as the state consumer financial protection rules are not preempted, you know, there=s opportunity there.

Mr. Saade. Yes, we=ve been, obviously, very focused on lending and kind of the debt side of the balance sheet. But just to highlight that, there=s a whole other side of the balance sheet which is equity and the SEC, for example -- I=m just going to answer it this way -- tried a lot of really interesting things to allow for common citizens to participate in let=s call them high-value potential investments and for otherwise companies raising capital or projects raising capital or people raising capital -- not loans

1528 but actual capital -- is Title 3 of the Jobs Act and they worked 1529 pretty diligently to get it -- to get it done but what it -- what 1530 it highlighted was that as they were going through that all of 1531 the states = regulatory entities for securities were doing their 1532 own fixes and they were doing them only with the hope that the 1533 SEC would then work with the preemption. 1534 So I think that the jobs all of you have is very difficult. 1535 But if you put things into the perspective -- into the perspective 1536 of what benefits -- what benefits consumers respond to you end up in a place that actually is solutions that could work. 1537 1538 Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you. 1539 Ms. Hogarth, I=m going to actually -- I have another question for you and since time is limited I will just ask that. 1540 You discussed seeing competition in the FinTech space around 1541 1542 savings products and financial health for employees where there=s 1543 been little innovation in the past. 1544 Can you talk a little further about what changed in that 1545 environment that spurred innovation and competition? 1546 Ms. Hogarth. Thank you. 1547 Breaking into the employer channel is very, very difficult and one of the things that we have found that is very, very helpful 1548 1549 is to just do proof of concepts and pilots. 1550 And by having somebody be bold, to go first and to try out something gives other people confidence that they too can do it. 1551

This actually gets to my answer to your original question,

1553 which is thinking about how bright lines used to work when we had 1554 a nice segmented marketplace, but there is significant blurring 1555 of lines right now. 1556 And thinking about in terms of trends, how we regulate in 1557 the 21st century not so much with specific rules but perhaps with 1558 principles and guidelines. For example, thinking about consumer 1559 outcomes as the metric of success, not whether or not your 1560 disclosure is in 18 point font. 1561 Mr. Kinzinger. Very good. Very interesting. 1562 Well, I thank all of you for your participation. Well, I 1563 thank all of you for your participation. I will yield back my 1564 negative 37 seconds, Mr. Chairman. 1565 Mr. Latta. The gentleman yields back. 1566 And the chair now recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey 1567 for five minutes. 1568 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 1569 My district in New Jersey has a lot of constituents who work 1570 in the financial services industry either in New Jersey or in New 1571 York itself. 1572 Are the innovations in FinTech being driven predominantly 1573 by start-ups or by the more traditional banking institutions and 1574 are there partnerships between the two -- between start-ups and

more traditional banking institutions and I defer to all members

Mr. Van Valkenburgh.

of the panel.

1575

1576

1577

Some very fruitful partnerships have

1578 emerged even in the open block chain space. I think in the early 1579 days many people believed Bitcoin was just a strange internet 1580 But that has radically changed as block chains phenomenon. 1581 become a popular almost buzzword in Wall Street and elsewhere. 1582 One particularly exciting partnership to highlight is the 1583 partnership between Ethereum, Zcash and innovators at JPMorgan 1584 to build a block chain that will be flexible for smart contracts 1585 like Ethereum=s open block chain network that will have some 1586 privacy elements taken from the Zcash network and that will serve potentially heavyweight enterprise type clients. 1587 1588 Thank you. Others on the panel, would you like Mr. Lance. 1589 to comment? Yes. 1590 So, obviously, JPMorgan Chase is clearly Ms. Hogarth. involved in trying to stimulate innovation not only outside of 1591 1592 the bank but certainly within it as well and there are a number 1593 of other incumbent banks who have their own innovators hubs. 1594 And I think there are a number of other entities like CFSI 1595 who are trying to stimulate in the start-up community. 1596 it is a both end, Congressman. 1597 Mr. Lance. And are these more traditional forms of banking 1598 the coordination -- are they the American banks or is this also 1599 true of banks in other parts of the world? 1600 Ms. Hogarth. Well, certainly, we=ve seen a lot of innovation across the globe. 1601 I think we need to look to our 1602 colleagues in Australia, Singapore, Hong Kong, beyond the U.K.

1603 The U.K. is always getting lifted up as the -- as the 1604 prototype here. But there are a lot of really great innovations 1605 coming out. 1606 But I would agree with Mr. Saade that the U.S. is, you know, 1607 bar none the leader in this arena. 1608 I, obviously, have a bias toward New York as 1609 opposed to London or Shanghai or Singapore. Is there something 1610 that we should be doing here in Congress to make sure that we are 1611 preeminent in FinTech? 1612 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. I would say, quickly, that for 1613 noncustodial developers of these technologies -- these open block 1614 chain networks -- the state by state money transmission framework 1615 is a bit of a maze to navigate. 1616 They are really not money transmitters. They build pipes. 1617 They don=t push the water through the pipes. But they=11 have 1618 to get an opinion from 53 different states and territories from 1619 the regulator in that jurisdiction that says that they=re safe 1620 and they won=t be on the hook for unlicensed money transmission, 1621 which carries a \$5,000 -- well, no, five years in jail and 1622 potentially multi-thousand-dollar fines. So those are very real liabilities and I think they frighten 1623 1624 people away to some extent from building their infrastructure here 1625 in the U.S. 1626 This is always a challenge regarding our dual 1627 sovereignty. What would you recommend that we do? Because we 1628 do have dual sovereignty in this country. 1629 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Yes, and I think the states have a 1630 valuable role to play as far as licensing custodian -- custodians 1631 of other people=s digital currency. 1632 However, I think we do need a federal safe harbor that would 1633 basically clarify the legal landscape across all the states saying that noncustodial businesses should not need to be licensed. 1634 1635 Are there others on the panel who have an opinion Mr. Lance. 1636 on that? Yes. I=m going to take a little bit of a different 1637 Mr. Saade. 1638 angle and that is something that the federal government has done 1639 for decades is invest in extremely basic seed money and basic R&D 1640 science and development, which at the end of the day, after Defense uses the technology or whatever the technology is being used for, 1641 1642 the private sector comes in and innovates on top of that. 1643 So one thing I think that, irrespective of are you developing 1644 clean energy technology or a cybersecurity thing that could be 1645 applied here or anywhere else to protect our borders, that=s 1646 something the federal government can do and is the only entity 1647 that can do it -- spend significant money looking into the future. 1648 Mr. Lance. Thank you. This is a very interesting and 1649 important topic and I hope that the Commerce Committee takes the 1650 lead on this issue as we have taken the lead in so many areas and it=s a very distinguished panel. 1651

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1653 Thank you very much. The gentleman yields back Mr. Latta. 1654 the balance of his time. 1655 And at this time, the chair recognizes the gentleman from 1656 Mississippi, the vice chairman of the subcommittee. 1657 Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to each of 1658 you for being here. 1659 Ms. Hogarth, I will start with you, please. The number of 1660 companies applying to be a part of the Financial Solutions Lab 1661 is remarkable -- 358 for this upcoming group of companies. In your testimony you mentioned three key trends from that 1662 1663 applicant pool, one of them being companies focused on products 1664 subject to complex regulatory oversight. Understanding that the 1665 finalists have not been announced yet, can you give us some examples of what sorts of services might fall in this category? 1666 1667 You know, just as consumers= lives are Ms. Hogarth. Sure. 1668 not sort of unidimensional, the products that our lab companies 1669 develop are cut across traditional financial services products. 1670 They=re not just a transaction card. They=re not just a 1671 credit card. They=re not just a savings product. They feature 1672 some of those multiple features. 1673 We -- in our last cohort we had a company that worked with 1674 freelance workers. We had a company that was in a loan servicing 1675 arena and we had a very interesting company called Remedy that looks at medical bills and errors on medical bills and how do you 1676 1677 structure the -- how do you help consumers understand what=s in 1678 their bill and protest any duplicative charges, things like that. 1679 That company actually saved their customers about a thousand 1680 dollars a year in mis-billing on medical products. That=s not 1681 That=s not a stock or a bond or a mutual fund. 1682 It=s not an insurance product. And so there are these kinds 1683 of really complex kinds of financial issues that consumers face 1684 where it doesn=t fit neatly into a regulatory box. 1685 Thank you. Mr. Harper. Okay. 1686 Mr. Valkenburgh, you know, we understand that innovations in the financial industry have incredible potential to offer great 1687 1688 benefits to consumers and we are also mindful of consumer 1689 protections and, of course, privacy concerns. 1690 Can you speak to the role the FTC can play to ensure the 1691 latter? 1692 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. I=m sorry, Congressman. That was the 1693 FTC? 1694 Mr. Harper. Yes. 1695 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. The FTC plays a valuable role 1696 enforcing unfair and deceptive acts and practices somewhat 1697 mirrored by the CFPB=s authority there. However, I think they play a valuable with respect to these 1698 1699 open block chain networks in that many of the applications that 1700 people build on these networks will not be custodial and, as I 1701 suggested, should not therefore be regulated as money 1702 transmitters.

1703 You might then ask okay, well, who=s going to check their 1704 code as a regulator, make sure that the app does what it says even 1705 if the money is not being held by the app designers. 1706 Unfair and deceptive acts and practices have a long track 1707 record in making sure that people build their tech right on the 1708 internet for nonfinancial website and I think the FTC can continue 1709 to play that role with respect to these new open block chain 1710 networks. 1711 Mr. Harper. You know, in your testimony you also talked about digital assets outside of digital currencies, of course. 1712 1713 Can you help us understand exactly what those digital assets could 1714 be and help -- you know, help me visualize what the future looks like if this technology can develop. 1715 1716 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Absolutely. So you can think of these 1717 things as bearer instruments and the bearer instrument we are most 1718 familiar with is, of course, cash. It=s a way of doing peer to 1719 peer money transfer. 1720 But there are other bearer instruments in our real world. 1721 There=s tokens for a fairground. There=s tickets for a concert. 1722 There=s vouchers for certain goods and services that won=t be used 1723 for other goods and services. 1724 One particularly exciting network that=s being developed is 1725 called the Interplanetary File System, which I=m really glad I 1726 get to say here in the subcommittee.

That is a decentralized cloud storage network that would

1728 allow people to just use the internet to store files without 1729 contracting with one or another company like Amazon or Dropbox. 1730 The way that the files would be stored would be encrypted 1731 for privacy and then they=d be verifiably stored at different 1732 places by people running computers who are rewarded for providing 1733 that storage with a voucher, Filecoin, that can only be spent on 1734 buying storage. 1735 I mean, it=s incredible to comprehend and I=m Mr. Harper. 1736 so glad you got to use that phrase, too. That=s very good. I see my time is almost up so with that I will yield back. 1737 1738 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Thank you, Congressman. 1739 The gentleman yields back the Mr. Latta. Thank you. 1740 balance of his time and the chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida for five minutes. 1741 1742 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bilirakis. 1743 appreciate it very much and I want to thank the panel for their 1744 testimony today. 1745 I will start with Ms. Hogarth. Maybe I mispronounced that. 1746 I apologize. Hogarth. 1747 In your testimony you talk about the Financial Solutions Lab which helps start-ups focused on improving consumers= financial 1748 1749 health and outline a few companies. 1750 One of those companies, Digit, uses an algorithm to help people automatically save money without having to move the money 1751

Would you tell us -- again, tell us more about how

themselves.

1753 they made it to your program and what their experiences have been 1754 so far. 1755 So they made it to our program by -- we have Ms. Hogarth. 1756 -- once you apply to our program there is a series of evaluations 1757 A number of, you know, like, sort of is this really 1758 helpful to consumers. CFSI bases a lot of our work on our compass 1759 principles, which are to build inclusion, build trust, promote 1760 success and create opportunity. 1761 And so we always ask people ourselves how much does this company help with inclusiveness, trust, opportunity and success. 1762 1763 We do financial due diligence so we look at the business model 1764 of the company and we also do sort of a -- what I will call a gut 1765 check in is this actually going to improve the financial health 1766 of U.S. households. 1767 Mr. Saade=s company has helped us in the past in reviewing 1768 so we are not just looking at these ourselves. We have a number 1769 of outside and expert reviewers including consumer advocacy 1770 organizations. The company Digit has grown substantially over time. Most 1771 1772 of the companies in our cohort, our labs, have grown. As a matter of fact, they now reach a total of about 10 million U.S. 1773 1774 households, which is 10 times what they were when they joined the 1775 program in the beginning. 1776 So it is really, I think, on the whole the companies find 1777 it a very positive experience.

Mr. Bilirakis. Okay. Thank you very much.

This question is for the panel. We=ll start with you, Ms.

Hogarth, if you wish. Many individuals own and run small businesses. These businesses powerB-they are a major part of the economy -- obviously, jobs, financial well-being. How is FinTech and the innovation you are seeing in this space going to help small businesses find capital, reduce paperwork or filing costs or any other examples you can share? We=ll start of with you, please.

Ms. Hogarth. Sure. Well, I think that one of the things you=ve seen in the market over the last several years is new business models.

The marketplace lenders and other kinds of opportunities for small businesses to get access to capital is really, really important and when we are talking about access to capital you have to remember that financial institutions -- the incumbent financial institutions often don=t want to make that \$25,000 loan.

They want to make the \$250,000 loan or the \$250 million loan. So having an opportunity to serve the market that the really small business guy needs -- the food truck guy, the guy that just needs a pizza oven or a dentist chair -- those become really, really important.

Mr. Bilirakis. That=s good. Anyone else, please?

Mr. Saade. Yes. I would say that 30 million or so U.S.

small businesses, half of them, when you=re looking to give them credit, it=s actually a person credit.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1803 So at the end of the day, a lot of these small businesses 1804 actually are basically personal guarantees and all this stuff. 1805 So that=s one thing is that helping consumers access credit 1806 means that they can start these micropreneurial businesses. 1807 The other thing is the, like she was saying, has to do with 1808 Typically, because pools of capital have become so big, 1809 especially banks and things of that nature, they don=t get out 1810 of bed for anything less than some big number. So there=s a huge swath of underserved small businesses not 1811 1812 for any macabre reason other than it doesn=t make any business 1813 So a lot of these innovations actually label you to scale sense. 1814 the ability to deliver capital to these tiny pipsqueak companies 1815 which, as you said, are the beating heart of our economy. -- it=s critical to small businesses. 1816 1817 Very good. Would you like to add something? Mr. Bilirakis. 1818 If I may, I just would want to emphasize that Ms. Tetreault. 1819 micropreneur is another thing that can be incredibly important 1820 is receipt of payment and that faster payments can really enable 1821 receipt of those funds so long as banks are held to make those 1822 funds available to consumers upon receipt. The gap needs to be 1823 closed. 1824 Mr. Bilirakis. Very good. Thank you. 1825 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. I would simply echo the rest of the

panel saying that the reduction in costs of provision of these

services and potentially the reduction in costs of having a robust

1826

1831 making trust and verifiability easier between those parties. 1832 Mr. Bilirakis. Very good. My time has expired, Mr. 1833 I yield back. Thank you. Chairman. 1834 Mr. Costello. Gentleman yields back. I will recognize 1835 myself for five minutes. 1836 Mr. Van Valkenburgh, I have a block chain company in my district in Berwyn, Pennsylvania -- AlphaPoint -- who prior to 1837 1838 this hearing echoed much of the details that you shared today. 1839 In fact, they=re doubling the size of their team and they expect 1840 that trend to continue. Preliminarily, I=m curious. When we talk about block chain 1841 1842 technology and job creation and GDP growth, is block chain 1843 technology creating new jobs or displacing old jobs? 1844 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. I think that=s an excellent question. 1845 I come from a legal background and when the term smart contracts 1846 started floating around, everyone started suggesting that well, we=ll be able to get rid of the lawyers -- that=s great. 1847 I think the reality is that=s simply either too optimistic 1848 1849 or foolhardy. Really, what you end up seeing is retraining. 1850 A lawyer, for example, in this space should now learn how 1851 They should learn how to write a contract that is not 1852 only embodied in legal terms in written language but also **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

in order to discover creditworthiness are things that open block

between, you know, persons, small businesses, big companies and

chain networks can deliver on by streamlining the pipes in

1828

1829

1853 potentially embodied in computer code that runs on top of a 1854 decentralized network. 1855 So I don=t think this leads to substantial job losses. 1856 think it does lead to challenges with retraining and I think 1857 education and efforts to make sure that people are aware of how 1858 things are changing are important to that end. 1859 Mr. Costello. I discerned a little bit of disagreement on 1860 the panel on the issue of FinTech charters and so I first wanted 1861 to ask you this question and then open it up to those who agree, disagree or maybe have a slightly different take. 1862 1863 You used an interesting phraseBissue of permissionless 1864 innovation versus responsible regulation. I think that=s what 1865 you characterized it as, and I get what you=re getting at because I think there=s always that tension when we talk about innovation 1866 1867 between making sure that regulatory barriers don=t get in the way. 1868 At the same point in time, you don=t want innovation to sort 1869 of take advantage of an outdated set of rules or laws that creates 1870 victims and I think that that=s what we are really focussing on 1871 when you talk about FinTech charters and this issue writ large. 1872 The question that I have for you on FinTech charters is why do you think that they=re needed versus why could it not just be 1873 1874 being a little bit additive to the existing regulatory or legal 1875 framework which already exists? 1876 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. So under existing --1877 Mr. Costello. It=s a little thing and it=s kind of a big step I would -- I would --

Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Yes. Thank you, Congressman.

I think under existing regulatory structures in general if you want a unified federal regulator you=re going to need to be what we traditionally consider a bank.

You=re going to need to take deposits, make loans and maybe do check paying or payments. If you don=t want to do deposit taking and maybe if you don=t even want to do loans -- you just want to do payments -- you have no choice for a unified federal regulator. You will have to go state by state and get money transmission licensing.

Now, that is a severe barrier to innovation from a permissionless innovation standpoint because you=re going to have to have 53 conversations across the states and territories and explain, well, in many cases what Bitcoin is and that is a difficult conversation to have with a state regulator.

Mr. Costello. Right.

Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Now, they may be on board with what you=re proposing long-term but it=s a lot of legwork. Now, the alternative would be can I get one federal regulator and I think the OCC=s FinTech charter presents an opportunity for that because they=ve suggested that they=re willing to charter banks or, you know, federal banks who do not do deposit taking -- who only do payments or only do lending.

I would add that the controversial nature of the charter with

1903 respect to some consumer groups I think often focuses on 1904 aggregation or preemption of state limits on interest rates. 1905 This is not an issue that we take a position on. 1906 At Coin Center, we are primarily concerned with payments 1907 companies getting federal charters, not lenders. 1908 Mr. Costello. And I don=t see what -- I mean, you can have 1909 preemption but it doesn=t mean everything is preempted. 1910 Mr. Van Valkenburgh. Precisely. 1911 Mr. Costello. So that would -- I tend to see the argument 1912 your way there. Others? 1913 Ms. Tetreault. I would emphasize that it is the preemption 1914 of those lending caps that raises a particular concern and then 1915 there also is a question about whether or not there will be enough oversight in particularly examination and supervision. 1916 1917 And then there are the concerns around, obviously, the safety 1918 and soundness requirements. I think also one other piece of it 1919 is when it comes to information sharing that there are tools 1920 available at the state level that may not exist presently at the federal level. So that would need to be addressed as well. 1921 1922 Mr. Costello. But safety, soundness, oversight -- could you 1923 make the argument, though, that given the sophistication of this 1924 that that might be done better at the federal level but you 1925 wouldn=t preempt issues such as interest rates, et cetera? Because I understand state banking law, state banking law, 1926 1927 but on some of this stuff it just strikes me that preemption might

1928 be the way to not have innovation be hampered by state patchwork. 1929 Ms. Tetreault. I understand around the duplicative efforts 1930 and the concerns there and, again, that could be something that 1931 is more streamlined with a national licensing systems. 1932 I would not rule that out provided that there are those 1933 essential safeguards in place and no preemption of those lending 1934 caps in particular. 1935 Mr. Costello. Anyone else? 1936 Ms. Hogarth. I would just like to point out that I have a driver=s license from the state of Virginia and it lets me drive 1937 1938 anywhere across the United States. 1939 And I recently drove in South Africa on the left. But I still have to obey the state speed limits and I 1940 1941 think there=s an interesting analogy there. 1942 Mr. Costello. Thank you. 1943 Seeing there are no further members wishing to ask questions 1944 for the panel, I would like to thank all of our witnesses again 1945 for being here today. 1946 Before we conclude, I would like to include the following 1947 documents to be submitted for the record by unanimous consent: 1948 a letter from Electronic Transactions Association, a letter from 1949 Competitive Enterprise Institute, a letter from Kaspersky Lab, 1950 a letter from Intuit. 1951 Pursuant to committee rules, I remind members that they have 1952 10 business days to submit additional questions.

1953	[The information follows:]
1954	**************************************
1955	Ms. Schakowsky. Without objection.
1956	Mr. Costello. Very good. And I ask that witnesses submit
1957	their response within 10 business days upon receipt of the
1958	questions. Subcommittee is adjourned.
1959	[Whereupon, at 11:54 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]