

we shop, we are driving the nail further into the coffin of American manufacturing jobs.

This bill does nothing to address artificially low prices. It does nothing to stop manipulation of currency to drive the United States further into a trade imbalance. It does nothing to save honest American workers from losing their jobs.

This bill weakens the ability of the United States to apply sanctions against China for unfair trade practices. Democrats have offered several much stronger proposals to deal with this issue, and the Republicans have refused to let them come to the floor. Not a single one has been considered.

To help U.S. workers, farmers and businesses, and America's long-term economic security, Congress should take decisive action to bring about fair trade with China, instead of squandering this opportunity on a weak Republican bill.

If Congress wants to take real action, it should pass comprehensive legislation to end currency manipulation; allow U.S. companies to challenge subsidized imports from China; and fix China safeguard statute and other import remedies to protect U.S. manufacturers against surges and other unfair imports from China.

I support American workers in saying, let's combat China's unfair trade practices by providing us with the tools to save American jobs.

It is an insult to American workers that, in the same week that Congress is considering CAFTA, it is bringing forth a weak China trade compromise bill. This demonstrates the majority's anti-worker agenda, that gives priority to Chinese workers instead of American jobs.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. Isn't it ironic that the proponents of "free trade agreements" like CAFTA are lining up squarely behind a bill like this that threatens a trade war with China, and at the least calls for the United States to initiate protectionist measures such as punitive tariffs against "subsidized" sectors of the Chinese economy? In reality, this bill, which appeared out of the blue on the House floor as a suspension bill, is part of a deal made with several Members in return for a few votes on CAFTA. That is why it is ironic: to get to "free trade" with Central America we first need to pass protectionist legislation regarding China.

Madam Speaker, in addition to the irony of the protectionist flavor of this bill, let me say that we should be careful what we demand of the Chinese Government. Take the demand that the Government "revalue" its currency, for example. First, there is sufficient precedent to suggest that doing this would have very little effect on China's trade surplus with the United States. As Barron's magazine pointed out recently, "the Japanese yen's value has more than tripled since the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system, yet Japan's trade surplus remains huge. Why should the unpegging of the Chinese yuan have any greater impact?"

As was pointed out in the Wall Street Journal recently, with the yuan tied to several foreign currencies and the value of the dollar dropping, China could be less inclined to purchase dollars as a way of keeping the yuan down. Fewer Treasury bond purchases by China, in turn, would drive bond prices down and boost yields—which, subsequently, would cause borrowing costs for residential and some corporate customers to increase. Does

anyone want to guess what a sudden burst of the real estate bubble might mean for the shaky U.S. economy? This is not an argument for the status quo, however, but rather an observation that there are often unforeseen consequences when we demand that foreign governments manipulate their currency to U.S. "advantage."

At the very least, American consumers will feel the strengthening of the yuan in the form of higher U.S. retail prices. This will disproportionately affect Americans of lower incomes and, as a consequence, slow the economy and increase the hardship of those struggling to get by. Is this why our constituents have sent us here?

In conclusion, I strongly oppose this ill-considered and potentially destructive bill, and I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3283, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. RANGEL. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of H.R. 3283, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

BRIAN P. PARRELLO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 904) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1560 Union Valley Road in West Milford, New Jersey, as the "Brian P. Parrello Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 904

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

SECTION 1. BRIAN P. PARRELLO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1560 Union Valley Road in West Milford, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Brian P. Parrello Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Brian P. Parrello Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the global war on terror is being fought at home and abroad by the bravest of Americans. Lance Corporal Brian Parrello, a 19-year-old serving with the Second Marine Division from Passaic County, New Jersey, was one of the most heroic of our fellow citizens.

Lance Corporal Parrello was killed in the city of Hadithah in Iraq on New Year's Day of this year.

I know I speak for all American citizens when I say that we have boundless appreciation for Lance Corporal Parrello's service to our Nation. There are many ways we can remember his immeasurable efforts to rid the world of the scourge of international terrorism. One small, but meaningful, way we can memorialize Brian's selfless courage and his priceless life is through this legislation.

To get a sense of Brian's patriotism, I want to impart some words that his older brother Matthew Parrello shared with the local newspaper following Brian's passing in January. Matthew told The Bergen Record newspaper that Brian "wanted to serve his country, and he loved what he was doing. He was proud to be a Marine, and he loved the guys he was serving with."

Matthew said Brian had considered joining the military during high school. During his senior year, in February of 2003, Brian enlisted in the Marine Corps. He began active duty September 22, 2003, three months after his high school graduation.

Sean Poppe, Brian's high school football coach, said Lance Corporal Parrello "possessed a strong desire to excel in whatever he did." Indeed, Lance Corporal Parrello gave his excellent life to this Nation.

Madam Speaker, America owes the greatest of debts to heroes like Brian Parrello. No reward, decoration, or compensation can approach what Brian Parrello devoted to his country. However, I appreciate the Senator from

New Jersey's efforts to remember Brian's life through this legislation that would name a post office after him in his hometown of West Milford, New Jersey.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support Senate 904.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of S. 904, a bill designating the postal facility in West Milford, New Jersey, after the late Brian P. Parrello. This measure, which was introduced by Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, a Democrat from New Jersey, on April 26, 2005, was unanimously passed by the Senate on June 29, 2005.

Lance Corporal Brian P. Parrello, 19, was killed Saturday, January 1, 2005, as a result of hostile action in Hadithah, a city along the Euphrates River. Brian Parrello is remembered by friends and family as being a "good guy," a young person who had dreams of one day becoming a teacher.

Lance Corporal Brian P. Parrello had an avid interest in history. His high school principal, Michael McCormick, recalled that Brian "took every elective history course that we have in our school."

Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the memory of the late Brian Parrello in this manner. Brian is to be remembered for his sacrifice and that he lost his life in furtherance of our freedom. We should not forget that he died in combat, and we would hope that we could end this conflict so that it would not be necessary that we take to the floor to honor young people whose lives are snuffed out far too quickly.

This is indeed a tribute to Brian, and I would urge passage of this bill.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the author of the House version of this honor for Brian Parrello.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I also humbly rise this morning as we support a bill to rename the post office in West Milford, New Jersey, up in my district, after Lance Corporal Brian P. Parrello who was killed in action, as we say, in Iraq earlier this year, in January. He was an honorable defender of liberty, and he deserves our gratitude and respect.

Brian joins that long list of our country's heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice so that each and every one of us can live free. After the attacks on September 11, 2001, Brian proudly joined the United States Marine Corps where he was assigned to the Second Marine Expeditionary Force in North Carolina. In Iraq, Brian

served in the Marine's swift boat unit where he patrolled the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

As indicated earlier, back in West Milford High School, he served on both the football and the hockey teams. His teachers and his coaches and his peers called him a real leader, a real role model, someone who always gave 150 percent to everything that he did, a guy with a big heart who led by example. That is why I am proud to have introduced the legislation in this House to rename the post office in West Milford after Brian.

I am sure that Brian would have been proud to see the Iraqi people vote in the fair and free elections this past January. Brian gave all he could to help secure those freedoms. The war on terror is global in nature, and Brian fought in Iraq so that we may end the scourge of radical Islam and keep terrorists from attacking our homeland and freedom-loving people around the entire world.

Now, we can never fully express our gratitude for his sacrifice, for the freedom and the security to our Nation; but I am proud that we can leave a lasting memorial so that his heroic actions can be remembered in this country for now and future generations as well.

Today, we also remember his family, and we send them our prayers and our comfort as well.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support S. 904.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 904.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3200) to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3200

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 "Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Enhancement Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. REPEALER.

Effective as of August 31, 2005, section 1012 of division A of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109-13; 119 Stat. 244), includ-

ing the amendments made by that section, are repealed, and sections 1967, 1969, 1970, and 1977 of title 38, United States Code, shall be applied as if that section had not been enacted.

SEC. 3. INCREASE FROM \$250,000 TO \$400,000 IN AUTOMATIC MAXIMUM COVERAGE UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE AND VETERANS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.

(a) MAXIMUM UNDER SGLI.—Section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(A)(i), by striking "\$250,000" and inserting "\$400,000"; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking "of \$250,000" and inserting "in effect under paragraph (3)(A)(i) of that subsection".

(b) MAXIMUM UNDER VGLI.—Section 1977(a) of such title is amended by striking "\$250,000" each place it appears and inserting "\$400,000".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on September 1, 2005, and shall apply with respect to deaths occurring on or after that date.

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION TO MEMBER'S SPOUSE OR NEXT OF KIN OF CERTAIN ELECTIONS UNDER SERVICEMEMBER'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Effective September 1, 2005, section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f)(1)(A) Whenever a member who is eligible for insurance under this section executes a life insurance option specified in subparagraph (B), the Secretary concerned shall notify the member's spouse or, if the member is unmarried, the member's next of kin, in writing, of the execution of that option.

"(B) A life insurance option referred to in subparagraph (A) is any of the following:

"(i) An election under subsection (a)(2)(A) not to be insured under this subchapter.

"(ii) An election under subsection (a)(3)(B) for insurance of the member in an amount that is less than the maximum amount provided under subsection (a)(3)(A)(i).

"(iii) An application under subsection (c) for insurance coverage under this subchapter or for a change in the amount of such insurance coverage.

"(iv) In the case of a married member, a designation under section 1970(a) of this title of any person other than the spouse or a child of the member as the beneficiary of the member for any amount of insurance under this subchapter.

"(2) Whenever an unmarried member who is eligible for insurance under this section marries, the Secretary concerned shall notify the member's spouse in writing as to whether the member is insured under this subchapter. In the case of a member who is so insured, the Secretary shall include with such notification—

"(A) if the member has made an election described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), notice that the amount of such insurance is less than the maximum amount provided under subsection (a)(3)(A)(i); and

"(B) if the member has designated a beneficiary other than the spouse or a child of the member for any amount of such insurance, notice that such a designation has been made.

"(3)(A) Notification of a spouse under paragraph (1) or (2), or of any other person under paragraph (1), for purposes of this subsection shall consist of a good faith effort to provide information to the spouse or other person at the last address of the spouse or other person in the records of the Secretary concerned.

"(B) Failure to provide such notification, or to provide such notification in a timely manner, does not affect the validity of any life insurance option referred to in paragraph (1)(B)."