you have asked. A similar letter is being sent to Chairman Goodlatte.

Sincerely,
MIKE JOHANNS,
Secretary.

BREAST CANCER RESEARCH STAMP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to thank very much all of my colleagues for their support in extending the Breast Cancer Research Stamp for another 2 years.

This bill is a strong bipartisan support of Senator HUTCHISON and 68 other Senators from both sides of the aisle. Without congressional action, this extraordinary stamp is set to 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 1.3 million 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.

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 retains 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 Iowa.

My observation of the Commission's final deliberations raised some concerns about the information and reasoning used in making its decisions. I believe it is essential for the Commission to clarify these concerns and have recently received a response that did nothing to allay my concerns. As a result, I now have 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 urge my colleagues in 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 was essentially a footnote to a consolidation of what is called inventory control point functions from 11 separate organizations around the country that would now report to the Defense Logistics Agency. The consolidation of inventory control point functions would affect 52 people at TACOM Rock Island and was not challenged by the community. However, the DOD recommended then, puzzlingly, proposed to move the rest of the approximately 1,000 employees of TACOM Rock Island to the DOD Headquarters at the Detroit Arsenal in Michigan.

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 value 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 the tax-payers millions more to pay in the area, it will cost significantly more in the long term to pay those employees at the new location. You also lose some unique facilities currently used by TACOM, like a machine shop and live fire range. In addition, there will be no space to house the outside contractors currently embedded with TACOM Rock Island, who would also need to move but aren't counted in the BRAC data.

The Quad Cities community challenged this proposed move on the basis of military value, and the enormous costs both up front and in the long run.

In fact, the move would cost the taxpayers millions more to pay, and we would lose some unique facilities currently used by TACOM, like a machine shop and live fire range. In addition, there will be no space to house the outside contractors currently embedded with TACOM Rock Island, who would also need to move but aren't counted in the BRAC data.
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