

on 20 year ago weather forecasting capabilities.

I think we are all very well aware that over 70 percent of airplane flight delays are caused by weather. If FAA doesn't have the weather information it needs to safely and efficiently control the nation's air traffic, we face both increased delays and risks to the flying public.

We are potentially putting our lives, property, and critical infrastructure in danger. Without accurate and timely information, we would no longer see the 2-3 day advance warnings of extreme weather events on which we depend.

This will also make it extremely difficult to conduct safe and strategic evacuations of American people during extreme weather events, which have been faced by many regions of our country in recent years.

I could go on and on and cite some of the adverse consequences to each of our agencies and to vital governmental activities that will occur if this CR is adopted, but I think Members now have an idea of what is at stake.

And make no mistake, this is job-killing CR. What makes this bill so dangerous is that it won't just kill jobs today. It won't just kill jobs this year. These cuts to our research and development funding will kill jobs for years to come.

As President Obama noted in his State of the Union address, if an airplane is overloaded, you don't lighten the load by cutting off the engines.

That's exactly what this Republican budget plan does: it cuts the engine off of our economy.

Unfortunately, our children and our grandchildren will be the ones who ultimately pay the price for these efforts when they inherit an America that is no longer the world leader in innovation.

I urge my colleagues to reject the cuts being proposed in the Republican CR. We can do better.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 88, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

OPPOSITION TO McCLINTOCK AMENDMENT #287, TO ELIMINATE FUNDING TO INTER AMERICAN FOUNDATION (IAF)

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to amendment #287, introduced by our colleague Rep. McCLINTOCK of California. Amendment #287 would eliminate all funding for the Inter American Foundation in the proposed FY2011 Continuing Resolution. This devastating cut would have

severe immediate and long term impacts on the most vulnerable communities who share the same hemisphere as the United States.

The United States has a vested interest in assuring that the poorest communities have the resources to organize, develop, and advance. The IAF works to promote economic opportunity, reduce poverty and foster civic and social inclusion in Latin America and the Caribbean, consistent with U.S. foreign policy and national security interests.

Without such proactive measures in international economic opportunity and development, the United States would cripple its own internal interest in the areas of drug trafficking, immigration, and maintaining its role as a promoter of democracy globally. There are many adverse consequences if programs like IAF ceases to exist. Studies show that farmers and agricultural workers of poverty-stricken communities migrate far from their families to make a living, and in many Latin American countries, like Colombia, this often means driving small farmers into illicit coca cultivation. Cutting IAF funds will aid in forcing men and women into the dangerous, yet lucrative work of narcotics production just to provide basic needs for their families.

There is a myth that foreign assistance using public funds is ineffective and inefficient. That is farther from the truth. IAF is a conduit to creating future allies; future business partners, and future collaborators. Investing in self-help solutions which enable the poor to help themselves ultimately creates an intimate bond between nations. As our world becomes more competitive in everything from education to science to defense, we must not cut ourselves off from future relationships by cutting developing countries off from aid today.

One of the many countries that would be affected by this cut is Haiti. Haiti is a nation that suffered one of the greatest devastations in history, with a 7.4 magnitude earthquake that killed over 200,000 people, affected over 2 million Haitians, and destroyed their capitol, Port au Prince. While much aid has gone towards immediate disaster relief, the United States seeks to gain enormously by supporting sustainable solutions that IAF currently helps fund.

IAF provides grants for the Haitian Partners for Christian Development—an organization that continues its services as a business incubator, which includes reaching women entrepreneurs and supporting them with business endeavors. Such seed money literally produces economic leaders which are necessary to shape the Haiti of tomorrow.

Through a single grant, IAF also has a project which provides farmers displaced by the 2010 earthquake with agricultural training and technical assistance, as well as give education scholarships to 100 displaced children, and distributes food to another 150 quake victims.

With all the tremors the people of Haiti still are enduring, IAF is essential to ensuring these survivors do not experience a social aftershock due to cutting funding that ultimately has long-term benefits for both Haiti and the United States.

Being the leaders in international economic empowerment today is a wise investment for tomorrow.

I urge you to join me in opposing this amendment.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1 GARRETT AMENDMENT 34

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the amendments offered by Representative GARRETT to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, as well as the amendments by Representatives WALBERG and CANSECO to decrease such funding.

As a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I believe that the arts play a crucial role in our society, enhancing our creativity, promoting critical aspects of education, and providing Americans with the opportunity to view works of beauty and personal expression. Furthermore, the arts inspire our children to explore their own creativity and encourage positive development in the course of their educational careers. The arts are a fundamental component of our society and warrant federal funding.

As noted by Americans for the Arts in its report Arts and Economic Prosperity III, across the country "nonprofit arts and culture industry generates \$166.2 billion in economic activity every year." The report also details that the arts support 5.7 million jobs and generate \$29.6 billion in government revenue. In my district in New Jersey alone, as of January 2010, there were 1,841 arts-related businesses employing almost 10,000 people. So not only are the arts good for our cultural development as a society, they are good for our economic development as well.

I have heard from hundreds of my constituents on this matter, and nearly every one has pleaded with me to preserve as much funding as possible for the arts. As one of them said, poignantly, "a nation without culture is a nation without a soul."

I strongly oppose any cuts to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendments offered by Representatives GARRETT, WALBERG and CANSECO on this subject.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, I along with Representative GWEN MOORE from Wisconsin, submit the following statement on H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act for 2011.

As Co-Chairs of the bipartisan Women's Caucus, the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

is important to us. It is a program that has and continues to serve over 9 million women, infants, and children monthly, providing food, education and access to health care. Many of the women and children who use these services are at-risk for poor nutritional diets and WIC provides them with greater access to nutritious foods as well as preventative services to improve their families' health over the long-term.

At caucus meetings, we have discussed this program and the impact of reduced spending on women across the nation. It is important for this Congress to advance ways in the upcoming budget that can ensure benefits are provided to constituencies with the greatest need.

WIC is the largest discretionary program under the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and as such has been targeted for cuts in the continuing resolution. For the pregnant, postpartum and breast-feeding women who participate in WIC, as well as for their under-five children, we look forward to working together on solutions acceptable to both sides of the aisle.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 89, I missed the vote due to a previously scheduled satellite interview in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

BARLETTA AMENDMENTS AND WEINER-CHAFFETZ-CRAVAACK AMENDMENT

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. I rise today to oppose the Barletta amendments and the Weiner-Chaffetz-Cravaack amendment to eliminate funding for the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), should they be offered during floor consideration of H.R. 1.

The elimination of USIP would have strong, adverse impact on America's security interests. USIP is an important national security actor. The U.S. Government must have options for resolving international conflict other than military action. USIP—created by Congress and signed into law by President Ronald Reagan—is the only independent U.S. Government actor that is dedicated solely to conflict prevention and resolution.

USIP is the critical bridge between governmental and non-governmental actors to promote peace in volatile conflicts. Their Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution conducts work in a number of critical conflict zones in Africa, Middle East, and across the globe:

USIP is addressing a series of challenges and opportunities facing the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, with a focus on institutional capacity to make compromises, the capacity of the Israeli and Palestinian publics to build consensus and support for a negotiated agreement, and the role of U.S. policymakers

in encouraging and supporting these efforts toward a peaceful resolution.

USIP is addressing several issues in Nigeria, a country rife with conflicts over petroleum resources and religion. Amidst this situation, the Center is working on peace efforts for the Niger Delta region, including working collaboratively with local governments, oil companies, and Nigerian NGOs.

For nearly two decades, the United States Institute of Peace has been working in Sudan on peace processes. Its knowledge and expertise has helped shape the environment that has contributed, so far, to a relatively peaceful outcome of the referendum. USIP's work on prevention, power-sharing, constitutional reform and natural resources has made a critical difference in the country's local capacity.

USIP produces timely expert analysis on issues critical to policymakers and conflict prevention practitioners. Just last week USIP published the attached PEACE Brief report on the political stalemate in Côte d'Ivoire following the November 28, 2010 election and the broader issue of preventing electoral violence in Africa.

USIP is a small, agile center of innovation in support of America's national security interests in supporting peace and democracy in Africa and across the globe. USIP has been a very useful resource to policymakers for decades, we can not eliminate this critical institution.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on these amendments.

[From the PeaceBrief—United States Institute of Peace, Feb. 7, 2011]

CÔTE D'IVOIRE'S POLITICAL STALEMATE: A SYMPTOM OF AFRICA'S WEAK ELECTORAL INSTITUTIONS

(By Dorina Bekoe)

SUMMARY

The political stalemate in Côte d'Ivoire following the November 28, 2010, presidential election continues. The majority of the international community recognizes Alassane Ouattara as the winner, but Laurent Gbagbo, the sitting president, insists he won. Financial and diplomatic sanctions imposed on the Gbagbo administration have thus far not forced Gbagbo from power.

Maintaining international pressure and focus is critical to resolving the Ivorian crisis, but African states are increasingly divided on how to proceed.

The power-sharing arrangement settled on by five African nations in recent elections sets a dangerous precedent. Losers with a strong militia may find it easier to use threats of violence or actual violence to retain a critical power role, thus subverting the intent of the election.

African states will continue to experience violence during elections until the security sector is reformed, states refrain from holding elections while militias remain mobilized and armed, elections can be clearly and independently verified, institutions are politically independent, and policies exist to discourage the violent acquisition of power.

Following the November 28, 2010, presidential runoff election, the United Nations, charged with validating the electoral process, along with the Independent Electoral Commission, proclaimed Alassane Ouattara the winner, with 54.1 percent of the vote, over Laurent Gbagbo, the sitting president, who had received 45.9 percent of the vote. However, the Constitutional Council, headed by a Gbagbo supporter, annulled results in 13 departments, alleging fraud, and proclaimed Gbagbo the winner, with 51.4 percent of the vote; Ouattara was given 48.5 percent.¹ Both

Ouattara and Gbagbo were sworn in as president by their supporters.

Most in the international and regional communities recognized Ouattara as the winner, and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union (AU) suspended Côte d'Ivoire from membership. Gbagbo's calls to investigate election fraud, recount the ballots, and craft a power-sharing arrangement have been rejected by the international and regional institutions. Instead, ECOWAS and AU envoys have urged Gbagbo to step down, financial and travel sanctions have been placed on him and his associates, and ECOWAS threatened military intervention.² With the military and the Young Patriots militia supporting Gbagbo and the Forces Nouvelles rebels supporting Ouattara, many fear that the failure of diplomacy and sanctions will reignite the 2002 civil war. While the central conundrum is how to convince Gbagbo to leave office, larger questions loom about the role of elections, the state of democratization, and the strength of institutions in Africa.

POWER SHARING IN RESPONSE TO ELECTORAL VIOLENCE

In 2010, opposition candidates claimed electoral fraud and irregularities in every presidential election in Africa—in Guinea, Togo, Sudan, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Egypt, Comoros, Tanzania, and Rwanda. Historically, in many cases of electoral fraud, the challenger urges demonstrations or refuses to recognize the results. In prolonged and violent standoffs mediators have been dispatched, as occurred in Guinea 2010, or a power-sharing agreement has been negotiated, as occurred in Kenya and Zimbabwe in 2008, in Togo in 2005, in Madagascar in 2002, and in Zanzibar in 2001.

While the power-sharing arrangements in those five cases aimed to stop the violence and address some of its underlying causes, such arrangements could have longlasting implications, and shorter, transitional measures might be considered instead. Granted, an electorate can vote for a power-sharing or proportionally representative government. The problems arise when power sharing is imposed as a solution when there is a clear winner (it weakens the purpose of an election), when the winner cannot be determined (it can encourage fraud and other obfuscation), or when there is postelection violence (it may demonstrate that violence pays). In this sense, Gbagbo's power-sharing proposal is troubling and presents a critical philosophical decision for Africa's institutions: how to react to candidates who respond violently to election results. More broadly, how can leaders be encouraged to accept defeat? How should the international community respond to leaders who use violence to hold on to power? For the remainder of 2011, Africa faces nearly 40 elections and referenda in 23 countries, including some that have a history of violence and weak democratic institutions, such as Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and the Democratic Republic of Congo. A power-sharing norm, in the event of violently contested election results, will be a dangerous precedent.

LESSONS FROM MADAGASCAR AND TOGO

In 2003, a disputed first-run election left Madagascar divided between the supporters of incumbent president Didier Ratsiraka and challenger Marc Ravalomanana. The Organization of African Unity brokered the Dakar Agreement to pave the way for a resolution.³ But when Ratsiraka refused to concede, confrontations between the two escalated, and Ratsiraka fled to France.⁴ Six years later the mayor of Antananarivo, Andry Rajoelina, accused Ravalomanana's administration of corruption and mismanagement and, with the military's backing, assumed the presidency. Ravalomanana fled to South