

such as limits on inpatient days and outpatient visits and other out-of-pocket expenses such as copays, coinsurance, and deductibles. These limits result in denying millions of Americans needed treatment and/or incurring huge out-of-pocket costs.

The U.S. Government Accountability Office found in a May 2000 report that 87 percent of employers complying with the act merely substituted other restrictive limits on things already mentioned for the annual and lifetime limits prohibited under the 1996 act.

Today we must not only extend the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996 but also continue to work on building this act to achieve true parity by passing H.R. 1424, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act of 2007. The legislation has been favorably approved by all three committees of jurisdiction in the House.

Mental illness and alcohol and drug addiction are painful and private struggles with staggering public costs, not to mention the toll these conditions take on families and communities. Representatives KENNEDY and RAMSTAD have been faithful champions of the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996 and speak courageously of their own triumphs.

I urge my colleagues to vote to extend the authorization of the current protections already in place and to continue to work for more comprehensive parity.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4848. This legislation is an extension of the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996.

This bill requires that annual and lifetime dollar limits for mental health treatment under group health plans offering mental health coverage be no less than that for physical illnesses.

Mental disorders are the leading cause of disability in the U.S. for individuals between the ages of 15–44. In fact, 54 million Americans currently suffer from mental illness.

Unfortunately, the stigma of mental illness prevents millions of Americans from receiving the health care they need. Arbitrary limits on insurance benefits also serve as a significant barrier to many Americans seeking help.

The original Mental Health Parity Act of 1996 was an important first step toward mental health parity and mandated that annual and lifetime limits in mental health coverage be equal to those applied to medical and surgical benefits.

While I support this bill, I strongly believe that we must pass H.R. 1424, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2007.

The scientific community has long told us that mental illness and substance abuse are biologically-based, and the Surgeon General recognized that fact in the 1999 Surgeon General's report.

The sad reality, however, is that the health insurance market still does not provide true parity to mental health and substance abuse coverage.

Individuals who struggle with mental illness or substance abuse have no guarantee they'll get the treatment they need—even if they have health insurance.

Mental illness and substance abuse are serious issues for many Americans who too often do not receive the appropriate treatment. Twenty-six million Americans struggle with substance abuse addictions.

I hope that we will recognize the struggles that individuals with substance abuse addictions face in seeking treatment.

I strongly support H.R. 4848 and hope that we will build on this piece of legislation by considering H.R. 1424, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2007 sometime this session.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my support for H.R. 4848, the extension of the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996 (MHPA). This legislation would extend MHPA for 1 year, maintaining the current provisions for parity in the application of certain limits to mental health benefits.

For group plans that choose to offer mental health benefits, the MHPA requires those plans to provide benefits for mental health treatment subject to the same annual and lifetime dollar limits as their coverage of physical illnesses. Unfortunately, insurance plans may still limit the amount and type of mental health treatment covered. For example, an insurance company can cap the number of times a patient may visit the doctor's office, not only annually, but over the course of a lifetime.

"Partial parity" is an oxymoron. Rather than rely on stop-gap measures and patch-work fixes, the need for true mental health insurance parity must be recognized and acted upon. I strongly encourage my fellow members to quickly pass H.R. 1424, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act of 2007, which puts mental health coverage on an equal footing with medical and surgical coverage.

The inequity of coverage with regard to mental health and substance abuse treatment benefits is tantamount to discrimination against the mentally ill. It is built upon the insurance companies' strategy of denying rather than providing care in order to maximize profits. The notion that an insurance company can limit medical care based on cost is immoral. Only medical professionals should dictate the amount and type of care a patient receives. H.R. 676, the United States National Health Insurance Act, would provide health care coverage for all, including coverage of mental health and substance abuse treatment.

Madam Speaker, it is our duty to end this intolerable discrimination against the mentally ill, and provide timely, appropriate, and adequate health care for all, free of the loopholes, pitfalls, and entanglements which exist under the current fragmented, non-system of care.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4848, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman, one of his secretaries.

### DO-NOT-CALL REGISTRY FEE EXTENSION ACT OF 2007

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 781) to extend the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to collect Do-Not-Call Registry fees to fiscal years after fiscal year 2007.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 781

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Do-Not-Call Registry Fee Extension Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. FEES FOR ACCESS TO REGISTRY.

Section 2. of the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended to read as follows:

#### "SEC. 2. TELEMARKETING SALES RULE; DO-NOT-CALL REGISTRY FEES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission shall assess and collect an annual fee pursuant to this section in order to implement and enforce the 'do-not-call' registry as provided for in section 310.4(b)(1)(iii) of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, or any other regulation issued by the Commission under section 3 of the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6102).

"(b) ANNUAL FEES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall charge each person who accesses the 'do-not-call' registry an annual fee that is equal to the lesser of—

"(A) \$54 for each area code of data accessed from the registry; or

"(B) \$14,850 for access to every area code of data contained in the registry.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—The Commission shall not charge a fee to any person—

"(A) for accessing the first 5 area codes of data; or

"(B) for accessing area codes of data in the registry if the person is permitted to access, but is not required to access, the 'do-not-call' registry under section 310 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, section 64.1200 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any other Federal regulation or law.

"(3) DURATION OF ACCESS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall allow each person who pays the annual fee described in paragraph (1), each person excepted under paragraph (2) from paying the annual fee, and each person excepted from paying an annual fee under section 310.4(b)(1)(iii)(B) of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, to access the area codes of data in the 'do-not-call' registry for which the person has paid during that person's annual period.

"(B) ANNUAL PERIOD.—In this paragraph, the term 'annual period' means the 12-month period beginning on the first day of the month in which a person pays the fee described in paragraph (1).

"(c) ADDITIONAL FEES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall charge a person required to pay an annual

fee under subsection (b) an additional fee for each additional area code of data the person wishes to access during that person's annual period.

“(2) RATES.—For each additional area code of data to be accessed during the person's annual period, the Commission shall charge—

“(A) \$54 for access to such data if access to the area code of data is first requested during the first 6 months of the person's annual period; or

“(B) \$27 for access to such data if access to the area code of data is first requested after the first 6 months of the person's annual period.

“(d) ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) FISCAL YEAR 2009.—The dollar amount described in subsection (b) or (c) is the amount to be charged for fiscal year 2009.

“(B) FISCAL YEARS AFTER 2009.—For each fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2009, each dollar amount in subsection (b)(1) and (c)(2) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(i) the dollar amount in paragraph (b)(1) or (c)(2), whichever is applicable, multiplied by

“(ii) the percentage (if any) by which the CPI for the most recently ended 12-month period ending on June 30 exceeds the baseline CPI.

“(2) ROUNDING.—Any increase under subparagraph (B) shall be rounded to the nearest dollar.

“(3) CHANGES LESS THAN 1 PERCENT.—The Commission shall not adjust the fees under this section if the change in the CPI is less than 1 percent.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—Not later than September 1 of each year the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the adjustments to the applicable fees, if any, made under this subsection.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) CPI.—The term ‘CPI’ means the average of the monthly consumer price index (for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor).

“(B) BASELINE CPI.—The term ‘baseline CPI’ means the CPI for the 12-month period ending June 30, 2008.

“(e) PROHIBITION AGAINST FEE SHARING.—No person may enter into or participate in an arrangement (as such term is used in section 310.8(c) of the Commission's regulations (16 C.F.R. 310.8(c))) to share any fee required by subsection (b) or (c), including any arrangement to divide the costs to access the registry among various clients of a telemarketer or service provider.

“(f) HANDLING OF FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The commission shall deposit and credit as offsetting collections any fee collected under this section in the account ‘Federal Trade Commission—Salaries and Expenses’, and such sums shall remain available until expended.

“(2) LIMITATION.—No amount shall be collected as a fee under this section for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance by appropriations Acts.”.

### SEC. 3. REPORT.

Section 4 of the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended to read as follows:

### “SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—Not later than December 31, 2009, and biennially thereafter, the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission, shall transmit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce that includes—

“(1) the number of consumers who have placed their telephone numbers on the registry;

“(2) the number of persons paying fees for access to the registry and the amount of such fees;

“(3) the impact on the ‘do-not-call’ registry of—

“(A) the 5-year reregistration requirement;

“(B) new telecommunications technology; and

“(C) number portability and abandoned telephone numbers; and

“(4) the impact of the established business relationship exception on businesses and consumers.

“(b) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2009, the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission, shall transmit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce that includes—

“(1) the effectiveness of do-not-call outreach and enforcement efforts with regard to senior citizens and immigrant communities;

“(2) the impact of the exceptions to the do-not-call registry on businesses and consumers, including an analysis of the effectiveness of the registry and consumer perceptions of the registry's effectiveness; and

“(3) the impact of abandoned calls made by predictive dialing devices on do-not-call enforcement.”.

### SEC. 4. RULEMAKING.

The Federal Trade Commission may issue rules, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, as necessary and appropriate to carry out the amendments to the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 note) made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the bill we are considering on the House floor today, which is Senate 781, the Do-Not-Call Registry Fee Extension Act, is identical to H.R. 2601, which was introduced by my friend Mr. STEARNS, the former ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection.

On December 11 of last year, the House passed H.R. 2601 by voice vote, and I urge similar swift passage of S. 781 today.

Madam Speaker, this bill extends the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to collect the fees that administer and enforce the provisions relating to the national do-not-call registry. In 2003, Congress passed the Do-Not-

Call Implementation Act, which authorized the FTC to establish fees sufficient to implement the national do-not-call registry as originally authorized by the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act of 1994. As has been said on numerous occasions, this initiative has proven to be one of the most popular laws in history. Consumers have registered more than 145 million telephone numbers since the registry became operational in 2003. The FTC's authority to annually establish the appropriate level of fees to charge telemarketers for access to the registry expired several months ago, in 2007, and S. 781 restores that authority and renders it permanent. I will restate what I said back in December when we considered this legislation on the House floor. As Members of Congress, it is in our best interest to swiftly pass this bill in order to avoid the wrath of millions of angry constituents who are being called by telemarketers during dinner time. We need to facilitate the continuing operation of the do-not-call registry and vote for this bill.

As a result of an agreement reached with the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, we are sending to the President's desk for his signature the Senate-passed version of the bill introduced by Senator PRYOR. However, Senator PRYOR's bill is identical to Mr. STEARNS' bill, and my friend from Florida deserves all the credit for this fine piece of legislation. As is the case with the vast majority of bills passed out of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, of which I serve, this is a bipartisan measure that was crafted in consultation with the appropriate agency of expertise, in this case, the Federal Trade Commission. The original House bill passed the subcommittee by voice vote on October 23, and a week later on October 30 was unanimously approved in the full Energy and Commerce Committee. Majority and minority committee staff worked together on this bill. I am so proud of how they worked together. Mr. STEARNS, as well as the ranking member, Mr. BARTON of Texas, who is the ranking member of the full committee, should both be commended for their cooperation with Chairman JOHN DINGELL and Chairman BOBBY RUSH. I also would like to congratulate and welcome the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) as the new ranking member of the subcommittee on which we serve. I am positive that the track record of bipartisan cooperation will continue under Mr. WHITFIELD's leadership. Unfortunately, it is my understanding that Mr. WHITFIELD, I looked forward to seeing him on the floor today, but he is currently in Kentucky dealing with the frightening devastation wrought by last night's tornadoes. Our thoughts and prayers go out to him and his constituents and all those who were adversely affected by this tragedy, not only in that State but in other States as well.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me thank, first of all, the discerning, clairvoyant, highly observant and eloquent statements from the gentleman from North Carolina for his kindness in recognizing that it is, indeed, my bill. I appreciate his very eloquent statement.

Mr. WHITFIELD was supposed to be here, but, of course, with the tornadoes, he cannot be here. He flew back to Kentucky to take care of his constituents, so he is to be commended for that.

But I rise today also in support of this bill, which is my bill which came through my subcommittee, the Do-Not-Call Registry Fee Extension Act of 2007. The Senate bill is 781.

As pointed out, this bill is identical to H.R. 2601 which I introduced and which passed this Chamber by voice vote under suspension of the rules on December 11, last year. As the sponsor of the companion legislation to the Senate bill and as the former ranking member of the committee with jurisdiction over consumer protection, I assured all my colleagues that this legislation is necessary and, of course, very timely. The gentleman from North Carolina mentioned that it is one of the most popular bills we have passed in Congress, and indeed it is.

I can also assure each of you that it will have an immediate and meaningful impact on our constituents, much more so than many of the bills that we've passed this year.

The Congress originally passed the Do-Not-Call Act in 2003 in response to the growing concern about the persistent invasion of unsolicited telemarketing calls to consumers' homes. Now, at that point I was chairman of the Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection Subcommittee, and I took great pride that our committee came together with JAN SCHAKOWSKY, who was the ranking member, to put together the do-not-call registry. She is to be commended today, too, for her support and her enabling of this legislation.

The idea was very simple: Consumers could place their home phone numbers on a list, and telemarketers would then be prohibited from making unsolicited phone solicitation. In order to avail themselves of the tranquility afforded then by the registry, consumers simply call a toll-free number from the telephone line they wish to register, or they could add their number via the Internet. Telemarketers then access the registry at the Federal Trade Commission to obtain a list of registered numbers over the Internet and then remove their numbers from their call list. Pretty simple. These telemarketers then pay a simple fee for such access. It is those fees that fund

the registry, including the maintenance and, ultimately, the enforcement of the violators of this legislation.

□ 1700

The program has been a huge success, as the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out, with one recent polling finding there is over 150 million active telephone numbers on the registry. My colleagues, that's roughly 70 percent of Americans who avail themselves of the registry benefit. That poll also found over 90 percent of those registered with the do-not-call list do indeed receive fewer unsolicited telemarketing calls.

The Federal Trade Commission must also be commended for its part in making the registry a success. Without vigorous enforcement, a prohibition would be meaningless. Consumers who receive unwanted telemarketing calls log complaints via either a toll-free telephone number or the Internet. As a result, the commission has pursued 35 cases for violations of this do-not-call provision in the bill and has collected \$25 million combined in civil penalties and equitable relief.

Unfortunately, the commission's authority to collect the fees necessary to maintain the registry expired last September. This legislation restores the commission's authority to collect the necessary fees to maintain and simply update the registry in a timely manner. Further, this act provides businesses with certainty into the future regarding the fees they pay to access the registry.

So, my colleagues, while this bill sets specific access fees, it also ensures Congress will receive the information necessary to assess in the future whether those fees are simply sufficient and appropriate. The Senate bill requires the Federal Trade Commission and the SEC to submit two reports to Congress biennially. One report shall include information regarding basic registry statistics such as the number of consumers registered, number of persons paying for access, and the impact of new telecommunications technology on the registry. The second report addresses consumer reports of abuse of registry exceptions, including the recent reports of "lead generators," unsolicited mailers, and we've all gotten those unsolicited mailers through the mail, used to establish a business relationship. Then once that business relationship is established, they can come back and call you or otherwise trick you into answering these little lead generators. And most frequently the people who do answer them are seniors, who are very conscientious, and then that, in fact, involves waiving their do-not-call protections. As time passes and people think of new ways to circumvent these protections, we will want to ensure we have the necessary information to keep pace with these folks that are trying to trick our constituents, thereby protecting their

original intent of the do-not-call registry.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, many of our constituents still express their gratitude for enacting the original Do-Not-Call Act, simply enabling them to make their home hours more peaceful without irritating telemarketing interruptions, especially around suppertime. The popularity and success of the do-not-call registry is without question. It is successful and it is one area in which this Congress has acted in a bipartisan fashion, almost unanimously on the House floor with approval. So I urge all my colleagues' support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, as pointed out, this has been one of the most popular pieces of legislation that we could pass certainly during my short tenure in Congress. And, Madam Speaker, I would only point out that with a 10 percent approval rating, it is incumbent upon us to continue to pass legislation that is indeed popular.

I am an original cosponsor of the Do-Not-Call Registry Fee Extension Act, and as has been pointed out, this bill will extend the Federal Trade Commission's authority to collect fees and to administer and force the do-not-call registry. This registry is popular. This registry's effect has been profound.

Since the creation of this registry, as we heard testimony in our committee as we worked on the bill earlier this year, over 145 million telephone numbers have been registered. And as we heard from Ranking Member STEARNS a little while ago, that number is now up to 150 million telephone numbers.

As the Director of the Federal Trade Commission, Linda Parnes, eloquently stated in her testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee last October, the do-not-call registry "helps to restore the sanctity of the American dinner hour."

While I firmly believe in a free market and I believe that businesses should be able to and should be responsible for formulating their own business plans and business practices, I also believe that Americans have a right to privacy. People should be able to have the option of whether or not they want to receive telephone calls from telemarketers in the privacy of their homes. Thanks to the do-not-call registry, Americans can sign up and they are afforded this decision and this discretion.

To keep the registry working in the future, it is imperative that we act

swiftly and pass this important legislation to further extend the protection of privacy for all Americans. As Commissioner Parnes pointed out, let's help restore the sanctity of the American dinner hour once and for all.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on this measure, and let's send it on to the President's desk.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 781, the "Do-Not-Call Registry Fee Extension Act," and I urge its swift adoption by the House.

This bill is identical to H.R. 2601, which the House passed on December 11, 2007, to extend the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to collect fees to administer and enforce the provisions of law relating to the ever-popular national Do-Not-Call registry. The registry was established by Congress to enable citizens to place their personal phone numbers on a list that prohibits unwanted commercial solicitations over that number. By any measure, this program has been wildly successful—more than 145 million telephone numbers have been placed on the list, pesky phone calls from telemarketers have declined, and the FTC's enforcement has been vigorous—but the agency's ability to collect fees to fund this operation expired after September 2007. Therefore, we need to act.

By agreement with the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, we are sending the later Senate-passed bill to the President. At this time, I want to commend Representative STEARNS, the sponsor of the House-passed bill and then Ranking Subcommittee Member, for his leadership on this important consumer protection issue. I also commend Representative RUSH, a cosponsor of the House bill and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, for expeditiously bringing that bill, of which I am the lead Democratic sponsor, to the House floor last year. We would not be here today without their efforts.

I would note to the House that, as part of the agreement, the Senate today will take up and pass H.R. 3541, legislation also passed by the House on December 11, 2007, to eliminate the automatic removal of telephone numbers from the registry, thus clearing the bill for the President's signature. Current rules provide that telephone numbers be removed from the list after 5 years, thus requiring consumers to reregister their numbers in order to fend off telemarketing calls. Most consumers are unaware of this requirement. This places a particular burden on the elderly, the group most often victimized by telemarketing frauds. The House-passed bill contains common sense exceptions as well as requirements to ensure the accuracy of the list. I thank the Federal Trade Commission and the Direct Marketing Association for their improvements to the bill, and I commend Representatives DOYLE and PICKERING for their strong bipartisan leadership on this legislation.

This strong package of bipartisan consumer protection bills will serve the American public well, and will stand as a testament to what bipartisanism and good will across the Capitol can accomplish.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 781.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY RELATING TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-93)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, which states that the national emergency declared with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, as amended and expanded on February 26, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2008.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 6, 2008.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 867, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 942, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 943, by the yeas and nays.

Postponed votes on H. Con. Res. 283, H. Res. 947, and H.R. 4848 will be taken tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

COMMENDING THE HOUSTON DYNAMO SOCCER TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2007 MAJOR LEAGUE SOCCER CUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 867, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 867.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 0, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie	Camp (MI)	Drake
Ackerman	Cantor	Dreier
Aderholt	Capito	Duncan
Akin	Capps	Edwards
Allen	Capuano	Ehlers
Altmire	Cardoza	Ellison
Andrews	Carnahan	Ellsworth
Arcuri	Carney	Emanuel
Baca	Carter	Emerson
Bachmann	Castle	Engel
Bachus	Castor	English (PA)
Baird	Chabot	Eshoo
Barrett (SC)	Chandler	Etheridge
Barrow	Clarke	Everett
Bartlett (MD)	Clay	Fallin
Barton (TX)	Cleaver	Fattah
Becerra	Clyburn	Feeney
Berkley	Coble	Ferguson
Berman	Cohen	Flake
Biggart	Cole (OK)	Forbes
Bilbray	Conyers	Fossella
Bilirakis	Cooper	Foxx
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Courtney	Frelinghuysen
Blunt	Cramer	Garrett (NJ)
Boehner	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Bonner	Crowley	Giffords
Bono Mack	Cuellar	Gilchrest
Boozman	Culberson	Gillibrand
Boren	Cummings	Gohmert
Boswell	Davis (AL)	Gonzalez
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Goode
Boyd (FL)	Davis (KY)	Goodlatte
Boyd (KS)	Davis, David	Gordon
Brady (PA)	Davis, Lincoln	Granger
Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Broun (GA)	DeGette	Gutierrez
Brown (SC)	Delahunt	Hall (NY)
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Hall (TX)
Brown-Waite,	Dent	Hastings (FL)
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hayes
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Burgess	Dicks	Hensarling
Burton (IN)	Dingell	Herger
Butterfield	Doggett	Herseth Sandlin
Buyer	Donnelly	Higgins
Calvert	Doyle	Hill