In January of 2006, the Commission stood down and the GMC was created by another Executive Order to support the military in the State of Kansas. The GMC's membership consists of 25 individuals from the communities in which the state's four major installations are located, state legislators, the Adjutant General and representatives of the Kansas Congressional Delegation.

We thank you for your leadership on the issue of critical importance to our nation's military and the military installations in the State of Kansas.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOORE,
Chair, Governor's Military Council.

Mr. ROBERTS. This bipartisan support shows how important these funds are to our military. So underfunding BRAC MILCON by $3 billion, or even $1, sends a terrible message to our troops. It tears to shreds the bipartisan support involved with the BRAC process.

Isn't it ironic, I would say to the Senator from Texas, and to you, Mr. President, and to my colleagues, that at a time when many of our colleagues in the House and Senate are saying, bring the troops home now, and everybody wishes we could, these same colleagues in the House—again, either through ignorance or incompetence or politics—apparently do not think it is necessary to provide the facilities that will support these troops and their families.

There is no other option, I say to the Senator from Texas and to my colleagues. I urge the majority leader to support our troops and their families by allowing a vote on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding me this time for these many questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for pointing out some of the real problems delaying this BRAC funding are going to bring. I hope the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee will find a way we can move the BRAC military construction forward. It is essential that we do this, and we can do it. We have a week in which we can work out any details that need to be worked out. I think it is very important that we do what is right for our country. We have time to do it. There is no reason not to do it, and we can do it in a fiscally responsible way.

What has been suggested by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is that we will handle this in a supplemental, that we will put $3 billion into the supplemental. But, of course, that means we will be spending $3 billion outside of the budget and added to the deficit, which is not necessary. We can fix this with a very small cut across the board of all of the projects in the bill, except for Defense, Homeland Security, Veterans. I think anyone can put together a program that has less than a 1-percent cut, and I think most people would say our priorities should be the active-duty military, that we should have the ability to put the housing and the childcare centers and the training facilities in place that would accommodate the needs of the military. My goodness, look what our military people are doing for us and for our country.

The idea that we wouldn't give them what they need to do the job, and when they come home, to have a place to stay and live and do their training so they can be the very best, would be unthinkable. It would be unthinkable. So I do hope we can go forward. I don't remember ever taking up an Omnibus appropriations bill with no amendments in order. I hope it will be possible that we will be able to take it up in the normal process—or maybe not even the normal process. We would settle for not normal, but for some number of amendments.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would propound a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that during the period of morning business, Senators be permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the following Senators be recognized in this order: Senators HUTCHISON, INHOFE, CHAMBLISS, KENNEDY, and LEAHY; and following that, Senator SHELBY be recognized for up to 45 minutes; and that after this sequence, the sides alternate where appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is, as I am sure the Senator from Texas knows, somewhat unusual, and not the way this is normally done. Normally we would alternate from side to side. I have actually discussed this with some of the Senators on her side. However, in the interests of at least having some idea of where we are going to go so we won't have to do the procedural fix of having Senators stand up and propound speeches that are put in the form of a question as we have been seeing here for some time, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The unanimous consent request is granted.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, my remarks will not last 10 minutes, and I hope the Senator from Georgia will be able to have his time in turn, because he has been waiting for quite a long time.

ACCOMMODATING THE NEEDS OF THE MILITARY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, what we are asking with the amendment I have tried to put forward but which was ruled out of order is to simply restore the $3.1 billion that was cut from the Base Closing Commission military construction. We cut—not we, but the bill that is on the floor that we are not able to amend—$3.1 billion out of the Base Closing Commission military construction funding. Our amendment, the Hutchison-Inhofe amendment, has 27 cosponsors. That is almost one-third of the Senate, and there are many who said they would like to sponsor the amendment but in deference to their leadership did not feel they could, because so many States have major projects in this BRAC military construction funding.

These are not projects that any Member of Congress put in this bill or in the bill that passed the House and Senate. These are the Department of Defense projects, for them to be able to meet the congressionally mandated deadline of 2011 for finishing the BRAC process. So they are projects that were selected in order of priority by the Department of Defense. There is not one earmark, not one congressional add in the military construction budget that we are trying to restore. We are trying to restore the budget we have already passed so the Department of Defense can meet the deadline we have set.

I think this amendment should be in order. It is my great hope that the distinguished leader and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee will allow it to go forward with no further delay, because there is going to be a delay if we wait until the supplemental. Not only will the $3 billion be outside of the scope of the budget and add $3 billion more to the deficit, but it will, in fact, delay the building projects for yet another 2 months, which will be a whole half year that the Department of Defense will be strapped for the funds to do what it needs to do to have its synchronized movement of troops be able to accomplish what they are trying to accomplish.

I hope we will have a reconsideration. I hope the House will work with us. We have a whole week to do it. We have done things in 24 hours that were harder than this, and I believe that delaying the return of 12,000 troops to facilities they deserve to have is not a good bargain. So I am very hopeful we will eventually have true bipartisanship in the Senate, true bipartisanship in the Appropriations Committee, which has been the tradition in the Senate for all these years. I ask that the majority in leadership help work with us to accommodate the needs of the military.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me inquire as to how much time is left open from the 10 minutes of the Senator of Texas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 5 minutes 40 seconds.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those 5 minutes be divided between myself and Senator CHAMBLISS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. And that at the conclusion of the unanimous consent request wherein the last speaker, it is my understanding, is the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SHELBY, that the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, be recognized for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been watching this debate as it has taken place. I am disappointed that procedurally we dropped the ball. We were hoping to be able to speak all afternoon on probably the most immediate crisis we are facing in terms of the budget; that is, the BRAC process.

Let me share a couple of ideas as to what this is all about. A lot of people are not all that familiar with the process we are talking about. The BRAC process is the Base Closure Realignment Commission. It was brought to our attention and first voted on by a Congressman from Texas, Dick Armey. Prior to that time, it appeared that all of our military establishments that were in the United States had been looked at as economic bases. Consequently, it is very difficult to close down some that are either not efficient or not needed for defending the country.

It was the idea of Congressman Armey to put together a system to take politics out of the base-closure system and to allow some criteria to be put forth and have a base-closure commission make recommendations and then take those recommendations and put them into effect. The bottom line would be they may find, in my State of Oklahoma, that one of our installations should be closed or should be realigned and part of it moved somewhere else. If that is the case, we would have to vote on the overall picture. You could not pick or choose. That way, as nearly as you can take politics out of a procedure on this Senate floor, I believe they successfully did that.

We had the first BRAC round back in 1988. We have had four since then. The last one is the one we are talking about now.

I have to say that when we came to this fifth BRAC closure vote as to whether we are going to allow the Commission to reconvene and make determinations as to priorities, I voted against it. I led the opposition. In fact, we only lost it by two votes. We have had a BRAC round, after all.

I made a statement from this Senate floor, from this podium, that whatever recommendations they came up with on this independent, nonpartisan BRAC Commission, I would not object to, and that is exactly what has happened.

The problem we are facing—and I can remember so well saying in the Senate before this last round was decided upon, I said it may be that we will save $20 billion over a period of time with another BRAC round. We don't know that for sure, but there is one thing we do know; that is, it is going to cost us a lot of money in the next 3 or 4 years, right when we are going to need the funding for our military.

We went through the 1990s downgrading and downsizing the military. I remember this euphoric attitude that many people had—the Cold War is over, and we no longer need a military. Consequently, the attention was not given to the military.

I have a chart I have not used for quite a while. This is during the Clinton administration, from fiscal year 1993 through fiscal year 2001. If we take the black line, that shows that if we merely kept the budget we had for the military from fiscal year 1993 and added nothing but inflation, the black line would represent the amount of the budget and what it would have been at the end of that period of time. The red line represents what the President's budget—it was President Clinton at that time and what he was requesting. You can see the huge difference in there, about a $412 billion difference.

Congress, in its wisdom, increased the President's budget insofar as military spending is concerned to this line right here. Nonetheless, over that period of time, while we did bring it up a little bit, it still was $313 billion below what a static budget would have been from that year, in bringing that year forward.

That is the problem we are facing in the 1990s, the late 1990s. I remember so many times coming to the Senate and saying that we will rue the day we downgraded the military. And we did. We went down to about 60 percent of the force strength, did away with and slowed down a lot of our military modernization programs.

I remember watching other countries producing better equipment, so when we send our young people out to do battle, they don't have the kind of equipment someone else might have. A good example would be our non-line-of-sight cannon, artillery piece. The best piece we have today is the Paladin. That is World War II technology where you have to swab the breach after every shot—something that is totally unacceptable. There are five countries, including South Africa, that make a better cannon than we have. We are going to remedy that now, and we have future combat systems where we will start modernizing.

We also slipped behind in the Air Force. I remember when General Jumper at that time came to the Senate, in 1998, and he said that now the Russians are making the Su series, and he referred to the Su–35 and he said it was better than any strike vehicle we have, our F–15s and F–16s. Now we have an F–22 that will do a better job. This is what happened to us in the 1990s.

Now we come to the BRAC process. We had an opportunity to save $20 billion. But to do that, we have to build installations in different areas, divest ourselves of other installations. That is where we are today.

As has been said by several speakers in the Senate, we are in a position now going into a continuing resolution, that it would tie us to the 2006 budget. If this happens, the BRAC funding that is necessary to implement the changes to accommodate our fighting troops over there, in their rotations coming back home—all of these things that are taking place are things that can't be taking place now because we are $3 billion short.

My next chart shows we are scraping just to fund the BRAC process. The money the military needs to pursue the BRAC round in fiscal year 2007 is $5.6 billion. You can see that on the chart. That is the amount the President requested. That is also the amount in our authorization bill, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act. Those on the Senate Committee on Armed Services authorized this $5.6 billion. The Senate appropriators thought they could shave a little bit off, so they cut from that $.4 billion. That brings it down to $5.2 billion.

Because there is no appropriated amount, the BRAC was funded at the fiscal year 2006 level, which is $1.6 billion—far lower than what is required to even start the process of this latest BRAC round. Under the continuing resolution now being considered, the funding was increased by $1 billion, which puts us at a total of $2.5 billion less what the military is going to have to have. That means it is a $3.1 billion shortfall. I know it is confusing, so we put it on a chart so we can clearly understand it. That is what is necessary to carry out those requirements we had in the BRAC round.

We did get $1 billion. Let me tell Members where that came from. The Democrats scraped and squeezed all the unfunded amounts that were needed to be funded by the CR. They were able to get an extra $13 billion to fund their own priorities. We talked about those priorities, many of them social programs, many of them programs I would support, some programs I would oppose. To me, they were not in the league of necessity that we have in our military construction in carrying out and implementing BRAC.

The chart shows the amount of money, the $13 billion, and where this money went. If you go around the chart, you see Veterans' Administration, $4.5 billion—we supported that; defense health, $1.4 billion; State and Foreign Ops—this is HIV/AIDS, which has been talked about in the Senate—that is $1.25 billion; law enforcement, $1.35 billion—quite frankly, I am not sure what that is referring to; pay raise for Federal workers, $1 billion; Labor-HHS, Head Start, AIDS, Social Security, and so forth, Pell grants, that is $2.3 billion; Interior Department, $200 million. Finally, after everyone else is taken care of, everyone else has been funded, there is $1 billion left over to put toward BRAC. The need was $4.1 billion. It brings it down to the $3.1 billion. So the need is still there. That is how we got where we are today.

What this Senate needs to do is to evaluate and establish priorities as to

what is really significant. What do we need to add? We are at war. It is inconceivable to me, when we come along with a BRAC process that applies housing and other needs for our troops who are rotating back and forth, that we are not able to do that.

One of the concerns I have that I have not talked about in the Senate is the problems we have in the communities. One of the reasons my State of Oklahoma has always, throughout all BRAC processes, all five of them, benefited—and I am bragging a little bit here, and I know other States do a good job—Oklahoma has always done an excellent job on community support. In our five major military installations, we have the communities building hospitals, doing child health care, helping with roads, donating land. For that reason, we have always done a very good job of that in my State. A lot of people were concerned when the BRAC processes took place; that is something which has actually been a benefit to my State. However, in this case, there isn't a State that isn't involved either in pluses or minuses, but overall it is a way to take care of those kids when they come back, when they rotate through.

We have two things that are happening right now. We are trying to rotate our troops who were in battle, and the second thing is, we are trying to establish a program where, instead of sending some of our people overseas for 3 and 4 years with their families, to bring them back and let them rotate.

With that, I am going to yield the floor. It is my intention to come back. I have quite a few more things to talk about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Georgia is recognized for 12½ minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, let me say to my friend from Oklahoma, as well as to my colleague from Texas, we appreciate their leadership on this issue, restoring this funding for the transition as required under BRAC. The Senator from Oklahoma and I both went through some very difficult times under BRAC. Now, to not be able to carry out the direction of the Commissioners with the difficult decisions that were made is simply not right. Without his leadership, we would not be where we are today.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I yield.

Mr. INHOFE. The point I was trying to make in terms of community support, many communities in Georgia and Oklahoma have made commitments predicated on this next BRAC round coming forward. I ask the question, Aren't you a little concerned how to face the communities if we renege on what the Government's portion is?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The Senator is exactly right. I will address that in my comments in a few minutes. It is not fair to the taxpayers in general but specifically those communities that are affected, as communities in Oklahoma and Georgia are, that we now come back and say: I know you have made these plans and you were preparing to receive additional infrastructure, but now it will not happen because the folks in the Senate have decided they want to spend that money on social programs as opposed to spending it on our military.

I do rise today to support my colleagues in restoring funds for the Department of Defense fiscal year 2007 BRAC requirements in the continuing resolution. The fiscal year 2007 President's budget requested $16.7 billion for MILCON, which included $5.7 for fiscal year 2005 base realignment and closure actions required to meet a statutory deadline of September 15, 2011, to complete all realignments and closures.

The fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill authorized MILCON appropriations of $17.4 billion after accounting for $278 million in prior year rescissions proposed by appropriators in both Chambers. The final authorized amount was $17.1 billion—$400 million above the President's budget for fiscal year 2007.

The Senate passed a fiscal year 2007 MILCON appropriations bill at $434 million below the fiscal year 2007 President's budget by cutting the BRAC request and accounting for additional rescissions. The House version of the fiscal year 2007 MILCON appropriations bill is $803 million below the President's budget, and it cut BRAC and $500 million in projects requested in the President's budget. No conference allocation was provided and a conference agreement was never reached.

A continuing resolution was enacted through February 15, 2007, at levels equaling the fiscal year 2006 appropriations, but currently does not allow for military construction new starts in fiscal year 2007. In addition, the fiscal year 2006 BRAC appropriation is $4 billion below the request for fiscal year 2007. Therefore, over 90 percent of the authorized fiscal year 2007 MILCON projects will not be able to be constructed.

The new CR language proposed by House and Senate appropriators on January 30 would provide fiscal year 2007 MILCON funds at levels requested in the fiscal year 2007 President's budget, but would underfund BRAC in fiscal year 2007 by $3 billion, seriously jeopardizing the ability of the Department of Defense to carry out all BRAC actions by 2011.

Senator INHOFE offered a bill in early January that I cosponsored along with several other Members of the Senate that would appropriate funds for all MILCON projects authorized in the fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill.

The administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy on January 30, strongly opposing the reductions that are in the continuing resolution we are considering. The Secretary of Defense and the service chiefs and Secretaries have met with many of us to provide an assessment of the impact on military programs as well as military readiness. By cutting $3.1 billion in the fiscal year 2007 BRAC request, the proposed continuing resolution does not allow the Department to carry out the investments and the timing required to complete all BRAC initiatives by 2011. That is a statutory requirement established to assist communities affected by BRAC by mandating an accelerated transition to aid in economic recovery.

Deferring funds will result in higher contract costs as construction will be delayed and ultimately compressed in a tighter execution timeframe, forcing a greater demand for limited resources. Resolving this issue has the support of key members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as many military and local community advocacy groups.

I understand the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee intends to attempt to restore BRAC funding in the supplemental appropriations bill. But what kind of solution is this? Supplemental funds have been requested by the President for military operations in Iraq as well as Afghanistan. The funds requested in the supplemental are critically needed to purchase equipment for force protection and IED defeat initiatives. These funds would be used to train and equip Iraqi security forces. The funds will be used for military intelligence, coalition support, and other regional operations in the global war on terror.

Since when do base realignments and closures qualify as an emergency directly supporting the global war on terror? How do we explain to the American taxpayer that BRAC should be considered along with body armor, additional military end strength, and vehicles being used in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Furthermore, we are having this discussion because my colleagues who developed the resolution share with all of us the common goal to reduce overall Government expenditures. In that spirit, what critical warfighting requirement do we cut in the supplemental to pay for the BRAC increase that is proposed? What do we deny to our frontline fighting troops? While I heard the idea of funding BRAC in the supplemental, I have not heard one idea on how we pay for it.

Do they instead advocate for an increase in the supplemental? Why not just add funds to the resolution we have in front of us, as this is proper? Could it be they want to hide the additional funds they have inserted for domestic programs by pushing BRAC to an inappropriate method of funding? Is this how we propose to manage military appropriations for the future? By using budget gimmicks and shell games which will have devastating results for the military and for local communities? We must address full fiscal year 2007 funding for BRAC in this continuing resolution.

Including funds for BRAC in the CR is critical to modernizing and increasing the readiness of our Armed Forces.

The current CR provides $2.7 billion for Base Realignment and Closure programs, which is $3.1 billion below the President's request, as I previously stated. These reductions are inconsistent with congressional emphasis on force and readiness. Such a severe reduction to BRAC funding will force the Department to rephase BRAC implementation plans. This will have a negative ripple effect on the movement of troops and missions throughout our global defense posture restructuring.

This planned approach could delay force rotations to Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the Army's overall readiness posture, which relies on completing the Modular Force conversions on time. This move will impact readiness. And soldiers at Fort Campbell, Fort Drum, and Fort Stewart will not have adequate places to train, work, or sleep.

This move will devastate the Department's ability to complete BRAC actions within statutory deadlines. It will stymie efforts to construct facilities and move equipment and people to receiver locations, thereby impeding our ability to realize savings and organizational efficiencies. Over 82 percent of the fiscal year 2007 BRAC request is for construction that is required before these moves can occur. The current continuing resolution cuts funding for family housing by $300 million below the President's request. This will directly and adversely affect the quality of life of our servicemembers by perpetuating the continued use of inadequate facilities where they work, train, and live.

Regarding my home State of Georgia, the following projects will be in jeopardy—and these are going to have very serious consequences to the ability to train and give quality of life to the soldiers, which they deserve—a child development center at Fort Benning; two trainee barracks complexes at Fort Benning; training brigade complex at Fort Benning; fire and movement range at Fort Benning; modified record fire range at Fort Benning; brigade headquarters building at Fort Benning; stationary gunnery range at Fort Benning; Marine Corps Reserve center at Robins Air Force base; Marine Corps Reserve center in Rome, GA; three facilities to prepare Moody Air Force Base to receive A–10 aircraft; and relocation of a vehicle maintenance complex at Robins Air Force Base.

None of these improvements can be made for our fighting men and women without this funding. It is imperative we do so in this CR.

Mr. President, I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). There is 1 minute 55 seconds.

COMMENDING CONGRESSMAN CHARLIE NORWOOD

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, in that remaining minute 55 seconds, I will very quickly say a word of commendation about a good friend of mine, a good friend of all Members of Congress, who is now serving in the other body, Congressman CHARLIE NORWOOD.

Congressman NORWOOD has been in a severe battle for his life for the last 3 years, and he is having a tough time. He has made a decision to now go back to Augusta, GA, and spend the rest of his time with his family.

And, boy, what a great warrior CHARLIE NORWOOD has been. It was my privilege to be elected to Congress with Congressman NORWOOD in 1994. He is an avowed conservative. He does not back away from any of his positions in supporting conservative values. He is a strong supporter of our men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. He is a Vietnam veteran. He is a very professional dentist. And he is one of the greatest guys I have ever had the privilege of being associated with.

As CHARLIE and his wife Gloria return to Augusta to spend the rest of his time there, I want to say it has been a privilege to know him. It has been a privilege to serve with him. I hope to have the opportunity to spend some more time with him in the next several weeks, months, whatever it may be.

But he is a great trooper. He is a great American. And I hope all Members of this body, as well as all Americans, will keep Congressman NORWOOD and his wife Gloria in their thoughts and prayers.

Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one thing that should be noted, and has been noted on this floor today, is that the former chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and its members got all the appropriations bills passed out of Committee early on last year. Had they been brought up by the then-leadership in the House and the Senate we would not even be talking about a CR because, of course, they would have been passed and signed into law.

But 2 weeks ago, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees finished drafting H.J. Res. 20, the joint spending resolution. The House passed the joint resolution on January 31 by a bipartisan vote of 286 to 140. The current continuing resolution left to us by the last Congress expires on February 15. So we have to act.

Total funding in the joint resolution is within the ceiling imposed by President Bush and the Republican Congress last year for fiscal year 2007. There are, however, some adjustments from the fiscal year 2006 funding levels in the continuing resolution that the Republican Congress agreed to.

During the past month, we worked together on a bipartisan basis to make these adjustments so there would not be severe hardships to the most vulnerable people or layoffs of Federal employees.

As chairman of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee I am gratified by the additional funding that was included to meet urgent humanitarian needs that do not reflect any partisan interest. These are moral needs.

I thank Chairman BYRD and Ranking Member COCHRAN for their help and also the ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator GREGG of New Hampshire, and also his able staff for their support and cooperation during this process, and Tim Rieser and Kate Eltrich of my staff for what they have done.

The adjustments include additional funding to combat HIV and AIDS. Under the continuing resolution we enacted last year funding within State and Foreign Operations to combat HIV and AIDS totaled $2.57 billion, including $445 million for the Global Fund that fights also tuberculosis and malaria.

Under H.J. Res. 20, those amounts will go to $3.84 billion and $625 million, respectively, again, with bipartisan support. I thank Senators DURBIN and BROWNBACK and the others who supported me in this effort.

Currently, only 20 percent of the people needing AIDS drugs in poor countries get them, and only 10 percent of the people at risk of infection are receiving the services to help them protect themselves.

If we had continued funding at last year's level, we would not have been able to provide lifesaving antiretroviral drugs to an estimated 350,000 HIV-infected people.

According to the Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator, 110,000 to 175,000 people would die of HIV-related causes if the fiscal year 2006 funding levels had not been increased in the joint resolution. Funding to combat malaria would have been frozen at the fiscal year 2006 level under the continuing resolution passed last year.

Of course, malaria is something we do not have to worry about in this country. It is both preventable and treatable. Yet it kills more than a million people each year. Most of those who die are African children. An expansion of programs to combat malaria would have been stalled under the continuing resolution and the eight additional countries targeted for the next round of malaria prevention and treatment would have been placed on hold.

The additional funding will enable us to meet our commitment to cut malaria-related deaths by 50 percent in 15 of the hardest hit countries in Africa. These funds will go to support the purchase of lifesaving drugs, the distribution of insecticide-treated bed nets, and the treatment of pregnant women at risk for malaria.