of the administration have endorsed the perpetual detention and torture of over 500 detainees held by the United States military in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Until the United States' foreign policy matches its rhetoric, no country should take these resolutions seriously.

I also oppose this resolution because it singles out and criticizes the European Union for its policies towards Cuba. Again, the United States hypocrisy is on show for the world. As Congress complains about foreign governments having commercial relations with the communist Cuban government, this same Congress has the audacity to pass free trade agreements and expand commercial relations with the communist government of China. Recent history shows that the Chinese government has consistently repressed its citizens. However, I have not seen one recent resolution condemning the Chinese government for its human rights abuses.

Further, the embargo of Cuba has been a failed policy that has only strengthened Fidel Castro's authority. For Congress to encourage other countries to implement a policy that has not worked for 40 years is as misguided as hiring a horse lawyer to run the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. If this Congress wants to be respected for its opposition against human rights abuses, then the government it should be condemning first for its practices is our own.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and I want to thank my good friend, Representative LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, for introducing it.

I wish I could say I was surprised when the Castro regime again arrested members of the Cuban opposition this July. But I wasn't.

In Cuba, every opposition member, human rights activist, or citizen who takes any step towards democracy is deemed a threat to the Cuban regime. These opposition members must live under a constant threat of arrest and persecution for themselves, and their families.

In Cuba, we see a persistent, long-term, calculated, and strategic abuse of human rights aimed at keeping any opposition from succeeding in Cuba.

Cuba remains the only dictatorship in our Hemisphere, and Castro must repress the opposition to stay in power.

In July 2005, Castro arrested 24 human rights activists for simply remembering those who had been killed by the regime in 1994. And he arrested many more later that month who were simply planning on attending a peaceful protest—they hadn't even actually attended the event yet.

But this is not the only recent example of Castro's brutal repression. In March 2003, the Cuban regime conducted one of the most repressive and violent actions against dissidents in recent history. We all remember how, with no provocation, 75 political dissidents were subjected to a farcical judicial process and imprisoned for nothing more than expressing a point of view not sanctioned by the Castro regime.

In May of this year, Cuban opposition leaders organized an historic Assembly on the 103rd Anniversary of Cuban independence. When we had the opportunity to recognize that Assembly here in this committee, I specifically said that we opposed any attempt by the Castro regime to repress or punish the organizers and participants of the Assembly, as Castro has done with so many others who have spoken out against repression.

I also made it clear to the Cuban opposition witnesses in our hearing in the subcommittee in March that we expected no retaliation against them for their work on behalf of freedom or for their participation in our hearing.

Unfortunately, it is my understanding that all three of those witnesses were then arrested during the July crackdown. While Martha Beatriz Roque and Felix Bonne were subsequently released, I believe that Rene Gomez Manzano remains in prison.

Given the recent arrests, I am still deeply concerned for the safety of all those who participated in the May Assembly and those who testified before this Committee.

Hundreds of political prisoners remain in Castro's jails today, and the world has recognized these injustices.

In March 2005, Amnesty International released a report on Cuba called Prisoners of Conscience: 71 Longing for Freedom. In this report, Amnesty states that they believe that, "the charges are politically motivated and disproportionate to the alleged offenses" and specifically note reports of ill-treatment and harsh conditions suffered by the prisoners of conscience.

Unfortunately, my friends in the European Union appear to have been deceived by Castro's conditional release of a few prisoners last year. I cannot understand why else they would think there was a reason to soften their diplomatic approach towards Cuba.

Instead of rewarding Cuba for pretending to take steps towards upholding fundamental civil rights, we should call for the unconditional release of all political prisoners in Cuba. I certainly hope that the European Union will review its policy towards Cuba, as is called for in this resolution.

And I hope that other multinational organizations, such as the UN Commission on Human Rights, join the rest of the world in strongly condemning the most recent crackdown in July by passing a strongly worded resolution against these violations of human and civil liberties, as is also called for in this resolution.

I know Members do not always agree with one another on issues relating to Cuba. And I know that this is, for many of us, a very personal issue.

But I also know that every one of my colleagues should be willing—and proud—to vote for this resolution, which simply states that the gross human rights violations committed by the Cuban regime are abhorrent.

Every one of my colleagues should be willing, and proud, to vote for the right of the Cuban people to exercise fundamental political and civil liberties that we enjoy here in the United States.

To my brothers and sisters who suffer in Castro's jails, to their families and friends both here in the United States and Cuba, and to the Cuban people, I say that Castro will not succeed in his vain attempt to suppress the spirit of the Cuban people. I look forward to the day, which is coming soon, when we will all celebrate a free and democratic Cuba. It is the spirit of the Cuban human rights activists and their courage that will ultimately be Castro's downfall.

So I ask each of you to join me in voting yes for this resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 388.

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. LANTOS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to 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:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

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), including 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—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "in excess of $250,000 at any one time" and inserting "at any one time in excess of the maximum amount for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance in effect under section 1967(a)(3)(A)(i) of this title"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "for less than $250,000 under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance" and inserting "under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance for less than the maximum amount for such insurance in effect under section 1967(a)(3)(A)(i) of this title"; and

(B) by striking "does not exceed $250,000" and inserting "does not exceed such maximum amount in effect under such section".

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

SEC. 4. SPOUSAL NOTIFICATIONS RELATING TO SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM.

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

''(f)(1) If a member who is married and who is eligible for insurance under this section makes an election under subsection (a)(2)(A) not to be insured under this subchapter, the Secretary concerned shall notify the member's spouse, in writing, of that election.

''(2) In the case of a member who is married and who is insured under this section and whose spouse is designated as a beneficiary of the member under this subchapter, whenever the member makes 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), the Secretary concerned shall notify the member's spouse, in writing, of that election—

''(A) in the case of the first such election; and

''(B) in the case of any subsequent such election if the effect of such election is to reduce the amount of insurance coverage of the member from that in effect immediately before such election.

''(3) In the case of a member who is married and who is insured under this section, if the member makes 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, the Secretary concerned shall notify the member's spouse, in writing, that such a beneficiary designation has been made by the member, except that such a notification is not required if the spouse has previously received such a notification under this paragraph and if immediately before the new designation by the member under section 1970(a) of this title the spouse is not a designated beneficiary of the member for any amount of insurance under this subchapter.

''(4) A notification required by this subsection is satisfied by a good faith effort to provide the required information to the spouse at the last address of the spouse in the records of the Secretary concerned. Failure to provide a notification required under this subsection in a timely manner does not affect the validity of any election specified in paragraph (1) or (2) or beneficiary designation specified in paragraph (3).''.

SEC. 5. INCREMENTS OF INSURANCE THAT MAY BE ELECTED.

(a) INCREASE IN INCREMENT AMOUNT.—Subsection (a)(3)(B) of section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''member or spouse'' in the last sentence and inserting ''member, be evenly divisible by $50,000 and, in the case of a member's spouse,''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of September 1, 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on July 14 of this year, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H.R. 3200, the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Enhancement Act of 2005. On July 26 of this year, the House passed the bill by a vote of 424–0.

Among other things, this bill would provide a permanent authorization for increases in maximum life insurance covered under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Program and the Veterans Group Life Insurance Program from $250,000 to $400,000.

□ 1330

Public Law 109–13, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act For Defense, the Global War on Terror, and the Tsunami Relief, 2005, increased the maximum coverage to $400,000 under these programs; however, the authorization expires in just 2 days, that is, September 30.

It is my understanding that during negotiations on the supplemental that the Senate included the termination date which was approved in the conference report to afford the legislative committees of jurisdiction the opportunity to hold hearings and further consider the specifics of the emergency authorization before it was made permanent.

The increased level of coverage was requested by the President because of concerns that death benefits for survivors of servicemembers were inadequate as our Nation fights the global war on terrorism. Further, Public Law 109–13 mandated spousal consent even in cases where the couple is estranged, as long as they are still legally married. The committee does not believe providing the spouse such a ''veto'' authority over life insurance elections is good public policy. The spousal consent requirement could also result, for example, in a servicemember's spouse excluding stepchildren as beneficiaries. The government should not interfere legally in a servicemember's highly personal choices about such family matters as this.

H.R. 3200, as amended, which the Senate passed yesterday, would instead require the military service secretary concerned to provide written notification to the spouse.

In an effort to expedite the passage of this bill as amended, we concur with the Senate's decision to drop the provisions stating that in cases of an unmarried servicemember, or a servicemember who marries while on active duty, notification be made to the next of kin or new spouse as to their insurance election.

The Committee believes notification is the preferable way of ensuring that the spouse is informed about this important financial decision while preserving the individual right of the servicemember to make decisions about life insurance coverage themselves.

Finally, Public Law 109–13 also provided for a new Traumatic Injury Protection program which goes into effect on the 1st of December this year. The committee has agreed to review this proposal in the coming year after having an opportunity to monitor the existing program. As amended, H.R. 3200 does not include this provision.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman BUYER, ranking member EVANS, and subcommittee chairman MILLER as well as Senator CRAIG and Senator AKAKA on the Senate side for moving forward on this bill.

As a result of our mutual cooperation, the men and women currently serving in the military will be able to retain insurance coverage of $400,000 on October 1 of 2005.

H.R. 3200, as amended, would make permanent the increase in maximum Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance, SGLI, to $400,000 passed earlier this year. That increase was provided as the gentleman from Florida has stated by Public Law 109–13, but is set to expire on September 30, 2005. Immediate passage of this legislation is necessary in order to prevent any gaps in coverage under the SGLI program.

I truly appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Florida as well as that of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs in addressing my concerns that spousal consent not be a part of this SGLI program.

We have heard time and time again from estranged spouses throughout the country that they were upset that under current law they must seek to obtain the consent of an estranged spouse before selecting less than the maximum amount of life insurance. I am also pleased that the compromise bill recognizes the importance of allowing service men and women to name a child as a beneficiary of their SGLI policy without notification of a present spouse. I believe we need to allow service men and women to make such decisions without any pressure to ignore the financial responsibility to their children of prior marriages.

The bill under consideration today strikes the right balance, in my opinion, for notification to spouses who would potentially be affected by the servicemembers' coverage and beneficiary decisions. This bill is urgently needed to provide continuous coverage to our service men and women. It will benefit the Nevadans that I represent as well as all Americans who are currently serving in the Armed Forces and their families.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 3200.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the wonderful ranking Democratic member on the committee.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3200, as amended by the Senate.

Earlier this year, Congress increased the amount of insurance available to servicemembers to $400,000. That provision is scheduled to expire September 30, 2005. We need to make the increase permanent now.

Under this bill, men and women currently serving will receive $400,000 in life insurance unless they choose to receive the lower amount.

H.R. 3200, as amended, will receive my full support. It deserves the support of every Member of this body.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for his extraordinary cooperation on this legislation.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, I would like to say thank you to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member, for their cooperation in this legislation. I also commend the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), the ranking member on our subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), for working with me and drafting this compromise agreement.

I particularly want to thank those on the Senate side, Senator CRAIG and Senator AKAKA, for ensuring that this important legislation was considered in the Senate and returned to the House to allow for final passage.

Congress has to act promptly to ensure permanent SGLI authorization is enacted before September 30, or else insurance coverage levels will revert to $250,000 on the 1st of October of this year. I do not think any Member of this body wants to see this happen.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3200, as amended.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the following is a joint explanatory statement describing the compromise agreement which we have reached with the other body.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3200

H.R. 3200, as amended, the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Enhancement Act of 2005, reflects a Compromise Agreement reached by the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs (the Committees) on the following bills considered in the House and Senate during the 109th Congress: H.R. 2046, as amended; H.R. 3200 (House Bills); and S. 1235, as amended (Senate Bill). H.R. 2046, as amended, passed the House on May 23, 2005; H.R. 3200 passed the House on July 26, 2005; and S. 1235, as amended, reported to the Senate on September 21, 2005.

The Committees have prepared the following explanation of H.R. 3200, as amended (Compromise Agreement). Differences between the provisions contained in the Compromise Agreement and the related provisions of H.R. 2046, as amended; H.R. 3200; and S. 1235, as amended, are noted in this document, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by the Compromise Agreement, and minor drafting, technical, and clarifying changes.

REPEALER

Current law

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), amended sections 1967, 1969, 1970, and 1977 of title 38, United States Code. The provisions in section 1012 of Public Law 109–13 expire on September 30, 2005.

House bills

Section 2 of H.R. 3200 would repeal, effective August 31, 2005, section 1012 of Public Law 109–13 as if that section had not been enacted.

Senate bill

Section 101(d) of S. 1235, as amended, stipulates that those elements of the Supplemental Appropriations Act that will not be extended, in whole, beyond the September 30, 2005, termination date would not be treated for any purpose as having gone into effect.

Compromise agreement

Section 2 of the Compromise Agreement follows the House language.

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

Current law

Sections 1967 and 1977(a) of title 38, United States Code, provide up to $400,000 in maximum coverage allowable under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) and Veterans' Group Life Insurance (VGLI). The maximum coverage of $400,000 is automatically provided unless the service member or veteran, as the case may be, declines coverage or elects coverage at a reduced amount. Declinations or elections of less than the maximum amount must be in writing. As of October 1,2005, the maximum coverage under both SGLI and VGLI will be reduced to $250,000 (section 1012 of Public Law 109–13).

House bills

Section 3 of H.R. 3200 would make permanent the maximum coverage allowable under sections 1967 and 1977(a) of title 38, United States Code, effective September I, 2005.

Senate bill

Sections 101(a)(I)(B)(i) and 101(c) of S. 1235, as amended, contain similar provisions.

Compromise agreement

Section 3 of the Compromise Agreement follows the House language with minor technical changes.

NOTIFICATION TO MEMBER'S SPOUSE OR NEXT OF KIN OF CERTAIN ELECTIONS UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

Current law

Section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, requires a married servicemember to receive written spousal consent prior to making a SGLI election for less than the maximum coverage amount. Similarly, the Secretary concerned is required to notify an unmarried servicemember's beneficiary or next of kin if the servicemember elects less than the maximum coverage amount.

Section 1970 of title 38, United States Code, prohibits a married servicemember from modifying a beneficiary designation without providing written notification to the spouse.

The consent and notification requirements of sections 1967 and 1970 of title 38, United States Code, expire on September 30,2005 (section 1012 of Public Law 109–13).

House bills

Section 5 of H.R. 2046, as amended, and section 4 of H.R. 3200, would require the uniformed services Secretary concerned to notify, in writing, a married servicemember's spouse, or an unmarried servicemember's next of kin, of an insurance election (1) not to be insured, (2) to be insured for an amount less than the maximum, or (3) to be insured if not insured or to change the amount of insurance coverage. The House bills would also require the Secretary concerned to notify, in writing, the spouse of a married servicemember if the servicemember designated anyone other than the spouse or child of the member as the beneficiary. When a servicemember marries, the Secretary concerned would be required to notify the new spouse whether the servicemember is insured under SGLI and when applicable, that the servicemember has elected less than the maximum amount of coverage or that the servicemember has designated someone other than the member's spouse or child as the policy beneficiary. Finally, section 4 of H.R. 3200 would provide that written notification shall consist of a good faith effort by the Secretary concerned to provide the required information to the servicemember's spouse or other person at the last known address of the spouse or next of kin in the records of the Secretary. Failure to provide such notification would not invalidate a servicemembers' election.

Senate bill

Section 101(a)(1)(A) of S. 1235, as amended, would require the Secretary concerned to make a good faith effort to notify the spouse of a servicemember if the servicemember elects to reduce amounts of insurance coverage or name a beneficiary other than the servicemember's spouse or child.

Compromise agreement

Section 4 of the Compromise Agreement generally follows the Senate language. The spouse of a married servicemember would be notified if the servicemember elects not to be insured under SGLI or if the beneficiary named by the servicemember is someone other than the spouse or child of the servicemember. The spouse of a servicemember would receive an initial notification if the servicemember elected less than the amount of maximum coverage available. Notice to a spouse concerning a subsequent decrease in the amount of life insurance or a change of beneficiary would be required only if the servicemember had previously designated the spouse as the beneficiary. When the spouse of a servicemember is not named as the beneficiary of the policy, the Committees find that no notice of additional changes is required.

INCREMENTS OF INSURANCE THAT MAY BE ELECTED

Current law

Section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, requires that a servicemember's SGLI election be evenly divisible by $50,000. On October 1, 2005, coverage will be divisible by $10,000 (section 1012 of Public Law 109–13).

House bills

Section 5 of H.R. 3200 would make permanent the requirement that SGLI for servicemembers be provided in increments of $50,000.

Senate bill

Section 101(a)(1)(B) of S. 1235, as amended, contains similar language.

Compromise agreement

Section 5 of the Compromise Agreement contains this provision.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION NOT ADOPTED

AUTHORITY TO ELECT NEW TRAUMATIC INJURY PROTECTION

Current law

Section 1032 of Public Law 109–13 added a new section 1980A (Traumatic Injury Protection) to chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code. Section 1980A becomes effective on December 1, 2005. Servicemembers insured under SGLI will be automatically enrolled in the Traumatic Injury Protection program and are required to participate in the program.

House bills

Section 6 of H.R. 3200 would permit a servicemember to elect in writing not to be covered under the Traumatic Injury Protection program. A servicemember who declines coverage would be able to elect coverage at a later date upon written application, proof of good health, and in compliances with terms or conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, but coverage would apply only with respect to injuries occurring after a subsequent election. In any case, a servicemember would be required to be insured under SGLI to participate in Traumatic Injury Protection.

Senate bill

The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

Compromise agreement

The Committees agree to further explore this provision during the course of their oversight responsibilities of the Traumatic Injury Protection program.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are considering this bill today. As my colleagues are aware, Public Law 109–13, the Emergency Supplemental, included provisions which made changes to VA's insurance program for active duty servicemembers and veterans. However, these changes expire on September 30, 2005.

H.R. 3200, as amended, would: Repeal section 1012 of the Supplemental, the section dealing with the insurance changes, and replace it with the text of H.R. 3200, as amended; make permanent the increase from $250,000 to $400,000 in maximum Servicemembers' Group and Veterans' Group Life Insurance coverage; make permanent the increments of SGLI coverage from $10,000 to $50,000; and require the military service Secretary concerned to notify a servicemember's spouse, in writing, if the servicemember declines SGLI or chooses an amount less than the maximum, as well as notify the spouse if someone other than the spouse or child is designated as the policyholders' beneficiary.

Similar language was included in H.R. 2046, which passed the House on May 23rd of this year.

The spousal notification language does not apply to the Veterans' Group Life Insurance program.

There were no public hearings prior to House and Senate passage of the defense emergency supplemental. In June, the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, chaired by JEFF MILLER of Florida, held a hearing on the provisions included in today's bill, and it is supported by the Administration and veterans groups.

H.R. 3200, as amended, will ensure the current $400,000 maximum level of insurance coverage is available to millions of active duty servicemembers, Reservists, and veterans, as well as commissioned members of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Public Health Service. I cannot underestimate the impact of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Chairman MILLER and Ms. BERKLEY, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, for their hard work and active participation in crafting this bill, as well as the subcommittee vice chairman, JEB BRADLEY. This has indeed been a team effort.

I also want to thank the subcommittee staffs on both sides of the aisle—Paige McManus, Chris McNamee, and Mary Ellen McCarthy.

Mr. Speaker, as the original increase in SGLI and VGLI expire at midnight this Friday, I urge my colleagues to support the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Enhancement Act.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3200.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3200.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1752) to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to reauthorize that Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1752

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

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 7(j)(4), 7A(l)(3), 7D, 19, and 21(e) of the United States Grains Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(j)(4), 79a(*l*)(3), 79d, 87h, 87j(e)) are amended by striking ''2005'' each place it appears and inserting ''2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on September 30, 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support S. 1752, a bill to reauthorize the U.S. Grain Standards Act. The other body passed this bill by unanimous consent last week, and I look forward to its swift approval today as the act expires September 30, 2005.

This bill is identical to the language that the administration provided Congress earlier this year. The bill is a simple 10-year extension of current law. It will reauthorize the Secretary's authority to charge and collect fees to cover costs of inspection and weighing services and to receive appropriated dollars for standardization and compliance activities.

The House Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management of the Committee on Agriculture held a hearing on May 24, 2005, to review the U.S. Grain Standards Act. Testimony provided on behalf of the National Grain and Feed Association and the North American Export Grain Association highlighted the need for the U.S. grain industry to remain cost-competitive for bulk exports of U.S. grains and oilseeds in the future.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Soybean Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Grain Sorghum Producers, and the American Association of Grain Inspection and Weighing Agencies all voiced support for this legislation.

The U.S. Grain Standards Act first became law in 1916. In the intervening 89 years, Congress has reauthorized and amended the U.S. Grain Standards Act so that the law could adapt to changes in grain production, grain marketing, crop diversity, competitive pressure, and fiscal constraints.

The U.S. Grain Standards Act has served agriculture and our Nation well. For nearly a century, it has provided for standard marketing terms, grades and weights and facilitated domestic and international marketing of our farmers' production. Among its many responsibilities, the Federal Grain Inspection Service establishes and maintains official grades for our Nation's crop production, promotes the uniform application of official grades, provides for the official weighing and grading at export locations, provides Federal oversight of weighing and grading done by States, and investigates complaints or discrepancies reported by importers. Passage of this bill ensures the continuity of these standards and the opportunity for our farmers to remain competitive in the world marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the committee, for his cooperation in working with us to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1752 is a bill to reauthorize the U.S. Grain Standards Act. The other body passed this bill by unanimous consent last week. Timely approval of this bill is important because the current law expires September 30, 2005.

This bill is identical to the language the Administration provided Congress earlier this year. This bill is a simple 10-year extension of current law.

The House Agriculture Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing on May 24, 2005 to review the U.S. Grain Standards Act. Testimony provided on behalf of the National Grain and Feed Association and the North American Export Grain Association highlighted the need for