

taxes and over \$300 billion in new, unrelated mandatory Federal spending.

I don't see a lot of people down here who are exactly worried about this on the Democratic side. I hear people who are down here talking about that it's the right thing to do, and that is what the Democratic majority will get credit for with this bill: more taxing, more spending, more rules and regulations, more unemployment, more high debt, pushing jobs offshore.

Mr. Speaker, reforms are needed to make America more competitive. The reforms should be about making sure that the drilling that takes place in the gulf or anywhere else is done safely and that we do follow best practices and rules and regulations. It should be done to encourage the government to work successfully with business, with industry, with the American worker, but that's not what we have here. What we have is a bill designed to kill the industry, to diminish its effectiveness, to increase costs for consumers, and to make pump costs and costs on natural gas more expensive.

I think that this economic plan by the Democratic majority they should get full credit for: higher taxes, more spending, assault on the free enterprise system, more unemployment, more debt, more things that are not working.

I'm going to give the Democratic majority credit today. Good for you. Now we know what that is. I know you're two-tenths through this agenda of killing 10 million American jobs, but you need to know this. You're going to get credit for this, and I hope the American people, in just a few days, when we go home, talk to their Members of Congress about changing that, because we ought to have a jobs bill on this floor to create jobs, not kill jobs.

The Republican Party is for the creation of jobs. We are for balancing the budget. We are for stopping the assault on employers, and we're for empowering the American people to have a brighter future, not one that simply empowers Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers are stunning. Over the time that President Obama has been in office, we have lost 2.5 million free enterprise system jobs, and yet 500,000 Federal Government jobs have been added in that period of time. The assault on the common man of this country is unrelenting by the Democratic majority.

For that reason, I encourage a "no" vote on the previous question to bring some fiscal sanity and sense and restraint to this body, and I'm going to offer a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the facts of the case are simple. The American people have got it. It is time for a real change.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, throughout the spring and summer, the public outrage has been palpable—in Washington, among the pundits and talking heads, in my own State of Maine and, truly, everywhere in this country.

In Maine, we have a special understanding about the impact the BP oil spill is having on the people of the gulf coast. Just like them, our lives and livelihoods are closely linked to the ocean. Off the Maine coast, there is an amazing renewable resource—strong winds and tides that can power our economy and create good-paying jobs and reduce greenhouse gas pollution. I think it's time for us to start using it.

As someone from a community who relies on its working waterfront, I am asking that we stand with the hard-working men and women of the gulf coast in their time of need and make sure that those responsible are the ones that pay for the spill and that we strive to ensure that a spill like this never happens again.

I urge my fellow Members to vote for the rule and the underlying bill. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for the CLEAR Act which would, among other provisions, provide full and dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Congress created LWCF in 1965 on the principle that some funds from the sale and extraction of oil and gas from federal lands be used for the protection of important lands and waters; so they remain available for the enjoyment of all Americans. Only once in 45 years has LWCF received its full funding.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that the \$2.00 per barrel conservation fee will be an undue burden on consumers. One fourth of a cent per gallon at the pump, 2 cents per tank, is well worth it for preserving Yellowstone, the Everglades, a battlefield, or building a local park in Shrewsbury or a playground in Lawrence Township.

This bill ensures that \$900 million will be provided annually for LWCF without appropriation and achieve a long-awaited, much-needed balance between resource extraction and resource conservation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule allowing for consideration of H.R. 3534, the Consolidated Land, Energy, and Aquatic Resources Act of 2010.

Congress has a responsibility to take action to respond to the terrible tragedy in the Gulf region and work to ensure that such an event never happens again. However, in doing so, we must also be careful to only advance legislation that is narrowly focused on responding to the root causes of the Gulf Oil Spill. Unfortunately, that is not the case with H.R. 3534, which I believe is overreaching and will have negative effects on domestic onshore production and on independent oil producers' ability to continue operating offshore. Among my concerns is subjecting oil and gas wells to new and unnecessary Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, storm water discharge permitting requirements. A report from the Department of Energy has shown that should the storm water provisions pass, it could result in the loss of up to 10 percent of domestic oil and gas production.

My colleagues, Congressman HARRY TEAGUE and Congressman JASON ALTMIRE, offered amendment to this legislation in the Rules Committee to remove these problematic

provisions. However, it was not made in order. I believe that the inclusion of this amendment would have improved this bill by helping to more limit its scope towards responding to the oil spill and not place new unnecessary burdens on onshore development. Without this amendment, and because of my concerns about the impact these provisions will have on North Dakota's growing energy sector, I am voting against this rule.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1000

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN AMOUNT OF PREMIUMS CHARGED FOR FHA SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING MORTGAGE INSURANCE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5981) to increase the flexibility of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the amount of premiums charged for FHA single family housing mortgage insurance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5981

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

SECTION 1. MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

(a) FLEXIBILITY.—Subparagraph (B) of section 203(c)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(c)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i)—
(A) by striking "shall" and inserting "may"; and

(B) by striking "0.50 percent" and inserting "1.5 percent"; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking "shall be in an amount not exceeding 0.55 percent" and inserting "may be in an amount not exceeding 1.55 percent".

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary may adjust the amount of any initial or annual

premium charged pursuant to subsection (a) through notice published in the Federal Register or mortgagee letter. Such notice or mortgagee letter shall establish the effective date of any premium adjustment therein.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY.

The Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development who is the Federal Housing Commissioner shall appear before the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives within 270 days after the enactment of this Act to discuss the finances, including premiums, of the Federal Housing Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have for these couple of years now had a bipartisan effort that began in the Bush administration and has been continued in the Obama administration—and it's been bipartisan on the Committee of Financial Services—to make sure that the FHA is both an effective and an efficient means for housing finance. Having a reliable way to provide the funding needed for housing finance in its various aspects is important both for the citizens who benefit from it and for the economy.

The FHA had not been in a great shape. We have a package of measures and we have had administrations—and as I say it's been bipartisan on the two administrations in our committee—to improve the FHA's capacity, to increase its capacity, but also to provide that it will be done in a reasonable way.

This House passed earlier this year overwhelmingly, by a bipartisan vote, a comprehensive reform of the FHA. It may shock the Members to know, Mr. Speaker, that the United States Senate has not acted expeditiously on this noncontroversial measure, and there are a couple of pieces of it that cannot wait.

It is my intention—and I want to assure the gentlewoman from West Virginia, the ranking member of the subcommittee who put a lot of good work in this bill and who was responsible for some of its most important provisions and safeguards—that we do not intend to let those die. We will continue to press the Senate for the rest of this bill; and we will also, in accordance with what we have said, have the administrator of the FHA before us to talk about how this is being done.

But what we need to do now is to take the authority we gave the FHA to raise the fees—this is a bill when it had the CBO certification they say doesn't result in any direct spending. In fact, it will save money. It will price the FHA appropriately. People have been worried about the FHA's fiscal solvency. This helps it.

So it's a bill—and I will say finally, it's taken from the larger bill we have passed. We are reenacting today a small piece of a comprehensive bill because while I am still fully committed and I know others are to the comprehensive bill, it's important we do this now. We're about to be without legislative capacity for 6 weeks.

So I urge that the House pass the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I'm rising today in support of this bill, H.R. 5981, and as our chairman said, we have been working diligently, I think, to bring forth solid FHA reform. We passed that bill almost unanimously—I think it was 406–4—probably about a month ago, and so the majority, the large majority of this House is in agreement with a lot of the provisions in that bill.

One of the provisions, as he said, is raising the annual premium on FHA, and I think this is right and proper; and I think it's something we need to do because, as we know and as has been brought forth in our committee, the capital reserve fund has fallen, I believe, dangerously low. And what we're trying to avoid is a situation where we may be asked to bail or at least to help the FHA in some sort of infusion of dollars from the Treasury.

So I wholeheartedly will support this bill, but I do want to reemphasize, as the chairman said, we had a whole host of reforms in our original bill. We cannot forget the other important reforms that were in the original H.R. 5072, and we need to move forward with those after our district work period and recess. We need to move forward with this as expeditiously as we did before we left.

One thing in the short bill we're considering today, it does say that the commissioner has to come before the committee within 270 days. I would like to ask the chairman if we could have a hearing in September on this very topic so that we can see what the status, at least interim status, of the fund is.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CAPITO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. My answer is absolutely, we will have the commissioner. I have to say HUD, the Secretary and the commissioner have been very cooperative, and we will have such a hearing in September.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank the chairman for that.

I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material with regard to this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5981.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1025

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAMP. Is the House in session at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is in session. Does the gentleman have an inquiry?

Mr. CAMP. Thank you.

Is it in order to ask the Speaker the next order of business?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can consult with the leadership.

Mr. CAMP. Does the Speaker have an agenda with the next order of business before him?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a matter of scheduling. The gentleman can consult with the leadership.

Mr. CAMP. I understand there will be a suspension under the committee of jurisdiction of which I am ranking member. I have no information on that.

Does the Chair have any information on that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot speak to matters of scheduling.

Mr. CAMP. We understand that the measure may involve tax implications, which are, of course, of great importance to the American people.

Does this legislation have a bill number?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the Chair cannot speak to matters of scheduling.

Mr. CAMP. I am not asking about a matter of scheduling, Mr. Speaker. I am asking about a bill number for tax legislation of great importance to the American people which I understand may be up momentarily. However, we have no information on this side about that. And as the minority, I do believe we are entitled to some notice and understanding of the business that will be coming before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may speak with the clerks at the hopper—

Mr. CAMP. I'm sorry. Could the Speaker repeat that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may speak to the bill clerk regarding a particular bill's number.