the PATRIOT Act became law. As a result, the American people have no idea how often the FBI is using this controversial power to obtain their sensitive personal records, including library records.

I asked our Nation’s librarians for defending our Constitution and leading the fight to reform the PATRIOT Act. Unfortunately in the past this Justice Department has criticized librarians for exercising their first amendment rights. Now they have gone even further—their attempt is preventing a librarian from speaking publicly about a legal challenge to the national security letter power.

In our democracy, the government is supposed to be open and accountable to the people and the people have a right to keep their personal lives private. This Justice Department seems to want to reverse this order, keeping their activity secret and prying into the private lives of innocent American citizens.

The President has asked Congress to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act. In order to have a fully informed public debate, the American people should know how often the national security letter authority has been used and they should be able to hear from librarians and others who are concerned about this power.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On June 1, 2004, a man was attacked and stabbed by three men in the downtown area of Seattle, WA. The apparent motivation for the attack was sexual orientation.

I believe that the Government’s first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

U.S. GRAIN STANDARDS ACT

Mr. CHAMBLS, Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate passed S.1752, a bill to reauthorize the U.S. Grain Standards Act. I understand that the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider this legislation today and look forward to its swift approval, as the act expires September 30, 2005.

This reauthorization bill is identical to the administration’s requested language provided to the committee earlier this year, a simple 10-year extension of current law.

The Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee held a hearing to review the U.S. Grain Standards Act on May 19, 2005, provided on behalf of the National Grain and Feed Association and the North American Export Grain Association highlighted industry’s desire to be cost-competitive and remain viable for bulk exports of U.S. grains and oilseeds in the future.

Specifically, these organizations proposed the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s, USDA, utilization of third-party entities to provide inspection and weighing activities at export facilities with 100-percent USDA oversight using USDA-approved standards and procedures. Support for this proposal in the hearing was provided by the American Farm Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Sorghum Producers, and the American Association of Grain Inspection and Weighing Agencies. Testimony provided by USDA stated that the “proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture for exchanging the delivery of services without compromising the integrity of the official system.”

During the hearing, the Committee also learned challenges currently facing the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, GIPSA. The majority of official grain inspectors will be eligible for retirement over the next several years. Testimony presented explained that transitioning the delivery of services through attrition would minimize the impact on Federal employees.

Since the hearing, I have extensively reviewed legislative proposals and discussed the proposal’s competitiveness with various Senators, organizations, and USDA. Chairman BOB GOODLATTE of the House Agriculture Committee and I wrote to USDA to determine if they had existing authority to use private entities at export port locations for grain inspection and weighing services. The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) has reserved this authority to supplement the current Federal workforce if the workload demand exceeded the capacity of current staffing.

The letter clearly states that the U.S. Grain Standards Act currently authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with private persons or entities for the performance of inspection and weighing services at export port locations. The person(s) awarded the contract would be required to adhere to all applicable provisions of the Act and remain viable for bulk exports of U.S. grains and oilseeds in the future.

The person(s) awarded the contract would adhere to all applicable provisions of the Act to ensure the integrity of the official inspection system during the delivery of services to the export grain industry. The person(s) awarded the contract would adhere to all applicable provisions of the Act to ensure the integrity of the official inspection system during the delivery of services to the export grain industry. The person(s) awarded the contract would adhere to all applicable provisions of the Act to ensure the integrity of the official inspection system during the delivery of services to the export grain industry. The person(s) awarded the contract would adhere to all applicable provisions of the Act to ensure the integrity of the official inspection system during the delivery of services to the export grain industry.

Contract terms would require reimbursement to GIPSA for the cost of supervising the contractor’s delivery of official inspection and weighing services.

GIPSA would comply with OMB Circular A-76 for any contracting activity that may replace or duplicate Federal employees. The Circular would not apply if the contract for outsourcing services intends to fill workforce gaps, not affect Federal employees, or supplement rather than replace the Federal workforce. The A-76 process typically takes two years and involves an initial cost-benefit analysis, an open competitive process, and an implementation plan.

I hope that the explanations provided above are fully responsive to the questions.
With this stamp every dollar we continue to raise will help save lives until a cure is found.

Again, I thank my colleagues for supporting this important legislation to extend the breast cancer research stamp for 2 more years.

THE 2005 BRAC PROCESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Base Realignment and Closure, or BRAC, process that occurred this year. I have always voted to authorize base closure rounds in deference to the Department of Defense’s stated need to restructure our military facilities to meet current and future needs. Nevertheless, the ceding of significant authority by Congress to an independent commission is an extraordinary step that should not be undertaken frequently or lightly. When Congress does lend its power to an independent commission, it must retain the responsibility to closely monitor the commission’s deliberations and actions. I have done so with respect to the 2005 BRAC Commission, naturally paying the closest attention to the issues before the Commission that affect Tows.

My observation of the Commission’s final deliberations raised some concerns about the information and reasoning used in making its decisions. I followed up with the BRAC Commission to clarify these concerns and have recently received a response that did nothing to allay my concerns. As a result, I have now concluded that I do not have full confidence that this was a thorough and fair process.

A joint resolution to disapprove the 2005 BRAC recommendations has been introduced in the House and has just been marked up by the House Armed Services Committee. It will now be considered under expedited procedures. I would encourage the House to approve this resolution. Obviously, if this resolution is not approved by the House, Senate action will be meaningless. But, if the Senate does take up such a resolution, I will vote to disapprove the 2005 BRAC recommendations.

The BRAC Commission is charged with reviewing the recommendations of the Department of Defense and altering those recommendations if they are found to deviate substantially from the BRAC criteria. On that basis, the Quad Cities community in Iowa and Illinois challenged some recommendations for the Rock Island Arsenal and did not challenge others.

One issue on which I thought we had a clear-cut case of a substantial deviation of the BRAC criteria was the proposed move of the U.S. Army Tank Automotive and Armaments Command, or TACOM, organization at the Rock Island Arsenal to the Detroit Arsenal. This move was estimated as a 70 percent relocation of TACOM’s work force. It would be the largest relocation of a major military organization in the history of the Department of Defense, substantially more in the long term to pay the associated costs. Between the Rock Island Arsenal and the Detroit Arsenal, the move would cost a total of $13 million to $14 million. The costs both up front and in the long run. In fact, the move would cost the taxpayers more than the Rock Island Arsenal.

With respect to the Rock Island Arsenal, the facilities at the Detroit Arsenal are already strained to capacity. The base is encroached on all sides and has no room to grow. In fact, the Detroit Arsenal is rated far lower in military facilities than the Rock Island Arsenal. Moving in 1,000 new employees will require major military construction. That includes building two parking garages to replace the already limited parking space that would be used up. That’s in addition to building extra facilities to meet current and future needs. Without congressional action, this extraordinary step will expire on December 31 of this year.

During the past 7 years, the U.S. Postal Service has sold over 650 million semipostal breast cancer stamps—raising $47.4 million for breast cancer research.

These dollars allow the National Institutes of Health, NIH, and the Department of Defense, DOD, to conduct new and innovative breast cancer research.

So far the NIH has received approximately $31 million, and the DOD about $13 million for breast cancer research—helping more people become cancer survivors rather than cancer victims.

In addition to raising much needed funds, this wonderful stamp has also focused public awareness on this devastating disease and provided hope to breast cancer survivors to help find a cure.

The breast cancer research stamp is the first stamp of its kind dedicated to raising funds for a special cause and remains just as necessary today as ever. For example: breast cancer is considered the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in every major ethnic group in this country; over 2 million women in the U.S. are living with breast cancer, 1 million of whom have yet to be diagnosed; this year, approximately 21,240 women in this country will get breast cancer and about 40,410 women will die from this dreadful disease; and about 1,300 men in America are diagnosed with breast cancer each year though much less common.

Extending the life of this remarkable stamp is crucial so that we can continue to reach out to our women and men who do not know of their cancer and to those who are living with it.

This bill would permit the sale of the breast cancer research stamp for 2 more years—until December 31, 2007.

The stamp would continue to have a surcharge of up to 25 percent above the value of a first-class stamp.

Surplus revenues would continue to go to breast cancer research programs at the National Institutes of Health, 70 percent of proceeds, and the Department of Defense, 30 percent of proceeds.

This bill does not affect any other semipostal proposals under consideration by the Postal Service.

With this stamp every dollar we continue to raise will help save lives until a cure is found.

Again, I thank my colleagues for supporting this important legislation to extend the breast cancer research stamp for 2 more years.
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