AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

ASSESSING U.S. FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES AND NEEDS AMIDST ECONOMIC CHALLENGES

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 1, 2011

Serial No. 112–33

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

64–869PDF WASHINGTON : 2011

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
RON PAUL, Texas
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
GUS M. BILIRAKIS, Florida
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
BILL JOHNSON, Ohio
DAVID RIVERA, Florida
MIKE KELLY, Pennsylvania
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
ANN MARIE BUERKLE, New York
RENEE ELLMERS, North Carolina
VACANT

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
BRAD SHERMAN, California
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
DENNIS CARDOZA, California
BEN CHANDLER, Kentucky
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
ALLYSON SCHWARTZ, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY, Connecticut
FREDERICA WILSON, Florida
KAREN BASS, California
WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island

YLEEM D.S. POBLETE, *Staff Director*
RICHARD J. KESSLER, *Democratic Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page

WITNESS

The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State 9

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

The Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, and chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs: Prepared statement 4
The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton: Prepared statement 13

APPENDIX

Hearing notice 72
Hearing minutes 73
The Honorable Gerald E. Connolly, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia: Statement 75
The Honorable Howard L. Berman, a Representative in Congress from the State of California: Material submitted for the record 76
Questions submitted for the record to the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton by the Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen 84
Written responses from the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton to questions submitted for the record by:
- The Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen 93
- The Honorable Howard L. Berman, a Representative in Congress from the State of California 168
- The Honorable David Rivera, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida 174
- The Honorable Gregory W. Meeks, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York 177
- The Honorable Jeff Duncan, a Representative in Congress from the State of South Carolina 179
- The Honorable Russ Carnahan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri 183
- The Honorable David Cicilline, a Representative in Congress from the State of Rhode Island 195

Questions submitted for the record to the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton by:
- The Honorable Dan Burton, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, and chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia 201
- The Honorable Gerald E. Connolly, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia 207
- The Honorable Edward R. Royce, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, and chairman, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade 208
- The Honorable Karen Bass, a Representative in Congress from the State of California 209
- The Honorable Michael T. McCaul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas 212
- The Honorable Gus Bilirakis, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida 215
- The Honorable Mike Kelly, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 218

Page

The Honorable Tim Griffin, a Representative in Congress from the State of Arkansas 220

The Honorable Renee Ellmers, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina 221

ASSESSING U.S. FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES AND NEEDS AMIDST ECONOMIC CHALLENGES

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2011

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:04 a.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. The committee will come to order.

Madam Secretary, it is a pleasure to welcome you to our committee for the first time as chairman. In order to maximize our time for discussion, after my opening remarks and those of my good friend, the ranking member, Mr. Berman, I ask that you summarize your written testimony and then we will move directly into questions from members.

Madam Speaker, we must maintain firm ties with our allies, and enemies must be clearly identified. I hope that this administration can tell who's who.

In Lebanon, we have witnessed the conquest of the country by the Iran-Syria-Hezbollah axis. The U.S. should never have been supporting a government with Hezbollah. Now, with Hezbollah in control, what is the justification for continued U.S. taxpayer investment? In Egypt and elsewhere, successive U.S. administrations failed to move beyond the status quo and prepare for the future. We should not associate the protests in Jordan and Bahrain with events transpiring in Tripoli, Cairo, and Beirut.

But there is one constant. We have failed to effectively use our resources to help build strong, accountable institutions that protect basic human rights. This administration's prior decision to cut support from pro-democracy civil groups in Egypt and to only fund groups pre-cleared with the Mubarak government is a mistake we must never repeat.

Then there is the mistake of the Bush administration, continued under the current administration, to conduct business as usual with the Libyan regime following the lifting of U.N. Security Council sanctions imposed in response to Libya's state-sponsored attacks, which claimed the lives of many, including Melina Hudson and John Cummock.

John's wife Victoria, my constituent, and Melina's father and aunt are in the audience today. Madam Secretary, I have a letter that they have written requesting yours and Director Mueller's help in securing information on the role of Qadhafi and others in attacks on Western targets in the '80s and the '90s.

Some of us objected to the normalization of relations with the Libyan regime, raising its deplorable human rights record. Regrettably, Libya's deployment of fighter jets and tanks to murder those daring to express a desire for freedom is proof that the oppressors cannot be coddled or engaged.

Then, the U.N. Human Rights Council refused to do anything about Libya's gross human rights abuses. On the contrary, Libya was elected to the Human Rights Council last year. Days ago, the Council was forced to act due to the Qadhafi regime's slaughter of hundreds of people in the streets. However, another U.N. entity, the Security Council, did find time just weeks ago to target our democratic ally, Israel. The United States needs to condition its funding for the U.N. on real reforms. Just as administration officials talk about smart power and smart sanctions, when it comes to the U.N., we need smart withholding.

In our hemisphere, the U.S. approach is one of misplaced priorities. The Havana tyranny has again ramped up its assault against the democracy movement in Cuba, detaining dozens of peaceful protestors, beating mourning mother Reina Luisa Tamayo, and this weekend sending its shameless thugs after the Ladies in White. Yet the administration has repeatedly eased regulations on the Castro regime. Just weeks after the latest appeasement, the dictatorship announced its intention to seek a 20-year prison sentence for U.S. citizen Alan Gross, whose trial starts on Friday.

When it comes to those countries that do share our values and our priorities, there appears to be no end to the stall tactics and empty rhetoric. Our partners in Colombia and Panama have gone above and beyond meeting the politically determined and ever-changing benchmarks placed in the way of long-awaited free trade agreements. Hondurans who fought for their Constitution and rule of law against Mel Zelaya's attack on their democracy are still suffering under the veiled reprisals of our State Department.

These examples crystallize the complaints that the American people have about foreign assistance programs. My constituents in letters, e-mails, and talks with me and through our new interactive feature on the main committee Web site, ForeignAffairs.house.gov, keep asking: What is the return on our investment?

Rafael Santana, from Miami, whose letter was published in the Miami Herald on Monday, wrote,

> "We are the most generous nation in the world and foreign aid should go to those countries that are friendly to us. When was the last time we heard of good will toward America? The majority of us haven't—and don't expect to."

Some attempt to obscure the facts through novel ways of slicing and dicing the numbers. But the budget request for International Affairs continues the significant increases of recent years. The cumulative $61.4 billion International Affairs request is a 42 percent increase over Fiscal Year 2008 levels. The increases are more dramatic when we focus on the State Department's own salaries and operations. The $12 billion State Programs request is a 25 percent increase over 2010 actual levels and a nearly 75 percent increase since 2008.

There is also a problem of misplaced priorities. The administration should not propose massive increases in global health and climate change programs while cutting key programs such as the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership and the Partnership for Regional East Africa Counterterrorism, particularly as al-Qaeda affiliates in Africa set their sights on American targets and American citizens are being captured and killed by Somali pirates.

The safety of our men and women serving with distinction in Afghanistan, Madam Secretary, and the country's transition to a more stable and Democratic future must forever guide us. Pakistan must also do more to meet the pressing United States concerns, including the release of Raymond Davis, our detained American diplomat, and shifting its approach to Afghanistan, away from armed proxies and toward constructive and legitimate political partners.

We must make those decisions in light of the unfortunate fiscal realities facing our Government and every American family.

Those who complain about diminished levels of International Affairs funding need to ask themselves how much less would an insolvent United States of America be able to do? Our funding baseline has to change. The real question is not, "Is this activity useful?" but, rather, "Is this activity so important that it justifies borrowing money to pay for it and further endangering our Nation's economy?"

At this point, Madam Secretary, I would like to recognize my good friend and partner, the ranking member, for his opening remarks.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Ros-Lehtinen follows:]

Remarks by Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Chairman
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
For hearing:
"Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges"
Tuesday, March 1, 2011, 10:00 a.m., 2172 Rayburn

Madam Secretary, it is a pleasure to welcome you to the Committee for the first time as Chairman. In order to maximize our time for discussion, after my opening remarks and those of the Ranking Member, I will ask you to summarize your written testimony, and then we will move directly to questions from Members.

We must maintain firm ties with our allies, and enemies must remain clearly identified. I hope this Administration can tell who's who.

In Lebanon, we have witnessed the conquest of the country by the Iran-Syria-Hezbollah axis. The U.S. should never have been supporting a government with Hezbollah. Now, with Hezbollah in control, what is the justification for continued U.S. taxpayer investment? In Egypt and elsewhere, successive U.S. administrations failed to move beyond the status quo and prepare for the future. We should not associate the protests in Jordan and Bahrain with events transpiring in Tripoli, Cairo and Beirut.

There is one constant: We have failed to effectively use our resources to help build strong, accountable institutions that protect basic human rights.

This Administration's prior decision to cut support to pro-democracy civil society groups in Egypt, and to only fund groups pre-cleared with the Mubarak government, is a mistake we must never repeat.

Then there's the mistake of the Bush Administration and continued under the current Administration to conduct business as usual with the Libyan regime, following the lifting of UN Security Council sanctions imposed in response to Libya's state-sponsored attacks, which claimed the lives of many, including Melina Hudson and John Cummock. John's wife, Victoria, my constituent, and Melina's father and aunt are in the audience today. Madame Secretary, I have the letter they have written requesting yours and Director Mueller's help in securing information on the role of Qaddafi and others in attacks on Western targets in the 80s and 90s.

Some of us objected to the normalization of relations with the Libyan regime, raising its deplorable human rights record. Regrettably, Libya's deployment of fighter jets and tanks to

murder those daring to express a desire for freedom is proof that the oppressors cannot be coddled or engaged.

Then, the UN Human Rights Council refused to do anything about Libya's gross human rights abuses. On the contrary, Libya was elected to the Human Rights Council last year. Days ago, the Council was forced to act due to the Qaddafi regime's slaughter of hundreds of people in the streets.

However, another UN entity, the Security Council, did find time just weeks ago to target our democratic ally, Israel. The United States needs to condition its funding for the UN on real reforms. Just as Administration officials talk about "smart power" and "smart sanctions," when it comes to the UN, we need smart withholding.

In our Hemisphere, the U.S. approach is one of misplaced priorities. The Havana tyranny has, again, ramped up its assault against the democracy movement in Cuba by detaining dozens of peaceful protestors, beating mourning mother Reina Luisa Tamayo, and, this weekend, sending its shameless thugs after the Ladies in White. Yet, the Administration has repeatedly eased regulations on the Castro regime. Just weeks after the latest appeasement, the dictatorship announced its intention to seek a 20-year prison sentence for U.S. citizen Alan Gross, whose show trial starts on Friday.

When it comes to those countries that do share our values and priorities, there appears to be no end to the stall tactics and empty rhetoric. Our partners in Colombia and Panama have gone above and beyond meeting the politically determined and ever-changing benchmarks placed in the way of long-awaited free trade agreements. Hondurans who fought for their constitution and rule of law against Mel Zelaya's attacks on their democracy are still suffering under the veiled reprisals of the State Department.

These examples crystallize the complaints that the American people have about foreign assistance programs. My constituents, in letters, emails, and talks with me; and through our new interactive feature on the main Committee website, foreignaffairs.house.gov, keep asking: What is the return on our investment?

Rafael Santana from Miami, whose letter was published in The Miami Herald last Monday wrote:

> 'We are the most generous nation in the world, and foreign aid should go to those countries that are friendly to us. When was the last time we heard of good will toward America? The majority of us haven't – and don't expect to.'

Some attempt to obscure the facts through novel ways of slicing and dicing the numbers. But the budget request for International Affairs continues the significant increases of recent years. The cumulative 61.4 billion dollar International Affairs request is a 42% increase over Fiscal Year 2008 levels.

The increases are more dramatic when we focus on the State Department's own salaries and operations. The 12 billion dollar State Programs request is a 25% increase over 2010 Actual levels, and a nearly 75% increase since 2008.

There's also a problem of misplaced priorities. The Administration should not propose massive increases in global health and climate change programs while cutting key programs, such as the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership and the Partnership for Regional East Africa Counterterrorism—particularly as al Qaeda affiliates in Africa set their sights on American targets, and American citizens are being captured and killed by Somali pirates.

The safety of our men and women serving with distinction in Afghanistan, and that country's transition to a more stable and democratic future, must further guide us. Pakistan must also do more to meet pressing United States concerns, including the release of Raymond Davis, our detained American diplomat, and shifting its approach to Afghanistan away from armed proxies and toward constructive and legitimate political partners.

And we must make those decisions in light of the unfortunate fiscal realities facing our government and every American family. Those who complain about diminished levels of International Affairs funding need to ask themselves: How much less would an insolvent United States of America be able to do? Our funding baseline has to change. The real question is not: Is this activity useful? But rather: Is this activity so important that it justifies borrowing money to pay for it and further endangering our nation's economy?

At this point, I would like to recognize my good friend the Ranking Member for his opening remarks.

Mr. BERMAN. Well, thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

Before I start my opening remarks, I would just like to acknowledge the tremendous work of Rich Verma, sitting behind the Secretary. He is the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, and he will be leaving the State Department shortly. He was a tireless advocate for the Secretary's agenda and the administration's agenda and for issues of tremendous interest to this committee, including Iran sanctions. I want to thank him for his service and wish him all the best in his next endeavor.

Madam Secretary, thank you very much for being with us here today. Geneva yesterday, Washington today. It sounds like just a repeat of your regular schedule. We appreciate this opportunity to discuss the International Affairs budget and the various policy initiatives you have championed as Secretary of State.

Madam Secretary, in these challenging economic times it is critical that we make the most of every taxpayer dollar; and although the International Affairs budget makes up only 1 percent of the entire Federal budget, it funds some of the most essential elements of our national security. I know you are committed to getting the most bang for the buck.

In the first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, completed last December under your leadership, the State Department places a welcome emphasis on improving monetary evaluation of programs, increasing transparency of aid projects, and on aligning priorities and resources.

With all due respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the responsible approach taken in the QDDR to achieve cost

savings stands in stark contrast to the Republican appropriations bill passed by the House 2 weeks ago. The reckless cuts in that legislation weren't chosen because they looked at programs and said, here's something that is not working, or here's something we don't need to do. No, the total level of reduction was purely arbitrary, plucked out of a hat, and totally unrelated to any thoughtful calculation of what was actually needed and how much it should cost.

Their bill isn't about making government more cost effective or more efficient. It doesn't promote the kind of reforms and streamlining needed to ensure that our aid reaches those who need it most in the most efficient possible manner. It is simply a slash-and-burn process, with no consideration for all the critically important work that is being destroyed or how it undermines our national security.

The bill savages nearly every program that protects the poorest and most vulnerable people: Humanitarian assistance for victims of natural disasters, Pakistan, Haiti—I could go on and on—slashed by 50 percent, massive cuts in refugee aid. Look what is going on in Tunisia and Egypt right now, Libya. Food aid. Water and sanitation. Programs to fight AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis. Meanwhile, funding for the diplomats and aid workers that carry out these programs is also slashed.

If there is anything we have learned over the past few years, it ought to be that we don't just hand over money to contractors and other governments without adequate oversight and accountability.

Supporters of the Republican bill overlooked two critical facts.

First, as you, Madam Secretary, Secretary Gates, and our senior military leadership have said repeatedly, America's national security depends not only on our men and women in uniform but also on the diplomats and aid workers who risk their lives every day to support America's interests abroad. In fact, 15 percent of the Fiscal Year 2012 International Affairs budget request is dedicated to supporting critical U.S. efforts in the frontline states of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. In the face of mounting deficits here at home, it is important to remember that these civilian efforts are much more cost effective than deploying our military.

And, second, aid to others isn't a gift. The United States provides foreign assistance because it serves our interests. Helping countries become more democratic, more stable, more capable of defending themselves, and better at pulling themselves out of poverty is just as important for us, our national security, and our economic prosperity as it is for them. The more we slash our foreign assistance, the more we cede the playing field to China, which is more than happy to fill the vacuum in Africa, Latin American, and Asia.

Madam Secretary, over the past month we have witnessed a stirring series of popular revolutions across the greater Middle East. As Americans, we are inspired to see the people of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, and other countries rise up to fight for the universal values that all of us hold dear: Freedom, democracy, and human rights. We all hope that the upheaval in the Middle East will lead to a brighter future for the people of the region, but we also must guard against the possibility that these movements for change will be hijacked by those determined to restore an autocratic form of govern-

ment or by forces hostile to the United States and our allies in the region.

Madam Secretary, as we all know, the Iranian regime is continuing its efforts to develop a nuclear weapons capability, and this remains one of the most pressing foreign policy challenges facing our Nation and the international community. When you testified before this body 2 years ago, you pledged that the administration would pursue crippling sanctions against Iran; and we have certainly moved in that direction. Last year, the Obama administration had unprecedented success in building the diplomatic support for tougher sanctions on Iran at the U.N. Security Council. Congress followed by passing the comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act, the most rigorous sanctions ever imposed on Iran. That legislation, which was signed into law 8 months ago, helped galvanize international opinion on Iran's nuclear weapons program and laid the groundwork for other countries to impose their own national sanctions.

Madam Secretary, we appreciate the fact that you have pursued the Iranian nuclear threat with great urgency and look forward to working with you to ensure that our sanctions laws are fully implemented, including against Chinese firms that, as you have indicated, continue to engage in sanctionable activity.

My concern is this. We have not yet sanctioned any non-Iranian bank or energy company, even though we know several are engaged in sanctionable activity. Companies need to know that there are consequences for these types of activities. So far, no company has any reason to think there are such consequences.

Finally, I do want to express my appreciation for the administration's recent veto of a Security Council resolution targeted at Israel, which was a powerful reaffirmation of your support for Israel and for direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations leading to two states living side by side and a permanent Israeli-Palestinian peace.

Once again, it is a pleasure to have you with us today, and I look forward to your presentation.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Berman.

Madam Secretary, Mr. Berman and I are honored to welcome you before our committee today.

The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton has served as the 67th Secretary of State for the United States since January 21, 2009, the latest chapter in her four-decade career of public service. She has served previously as a United States Senator from the State of New York, as First Lady of the United States and of the State of Arkansas, and as an attorney and law professor.

Madam Secretary, without objection, your full written statement will be made part of the record. If you would be so kind as to summarize your written remarks, we can then move directly to the question and answer period under the 5-minute rule in the hopes of getting all our members to have a question before you depart.

Madam Secretary, the floor is yours. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman, and congratulations on your assuming this post. I want to thank you publicly for traveling to Haiti with our team on behalf of the efforts that the United States is pursuing there. I also want to thank the ranking member for his leadership and support over these last years.

Late last night, I came back from around-the-clock meetings in Geneva to discuss the unfolding events in Libya. I would like to begin by offering a quick update.

We have joined the Libyan people in demanding that Qadhafi must go—now, without further violence or delay—and we are working to translate the world's outrage into action and results.

Marathon diplomacy at the United Nations and with allies has yielded quick, aggressive steps to pressure leaders. USAID is focused on Libya's food and medical supplies and is dispatching two expert humanitarian teams to helping those fleeing the violence and who are moving into Tunisia and Egypt, which is posing tremendous burdens on those two countries. Our combatant commands are positioning assets to prepare to support these critical civilian humanitarian missions, and we are taking no options off the table so long as the Libyan Government continues to turn it is guns on its own people.

The entire region is changing, and a strong and strategic American response is essential. In the years ahead, Libya could become a peaceful democracy, or it could face protracted civil war, or it could descend into chaos. The stakes are high. This is an unfolding example of using the combined assets of smart power, diplomacy, development, and defense to protect American security and interests and advance our values. This integrated approach is not just how we respond to the crisis of the moment. It is the most effective—and most cost-effective—way to sustain and advance our security across the world, and it is only possible with a budget that supports all the tools in our national security arsenal, which is what we are here to discuss.

The American people are justifiably concerned about our national debt. I share that concern. But they also want responsible investments in our future that will make us stronger at home and continuing our leadership abroad. Just 2 years after President Obama and I first asked you to renew our investment in development and diplomacy, we are already seeing tangible returns for our national security.

In Iraq, almost 100,000 troops have come home, and civilians are poised to keep the peace. In Afghanistan, integrated military and civilian surges have helped set the stage for our diplomatic surge to support Afghan-led reconciliation that could end the conflict and put al-Qaeda on the run. We have imposed the toughest-ever sanctions to rein in Iran's nuclear ambitions. We have reengaged as a leader in the Pacific and in our own hemisphere. We have signed trade deals to promote American jobs and nuclear weapons treaties to protect our people. We have worked with northern and southern Sudanese to achieve a peaceful referendum and prevent a return to civil war. We are working to open up political systems, econo-

mies, and societies at a remarkable moment in the history of the Middle East and to support peaceful, orderly, irreversible democratic transitions in Egypt and Tunisia.

Our progress is significant, but our work is far from over. These missions are vital to our national security, and I believe with all my heart now would be the wrong time to pull back.

The Fiscal Year 2012 budget we discuss today will allow us to keep pressing ahead. It is a lean budget for lean times. I did launch the first-ever Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review to help us maximize the impact of every dollar we spend. We scrubbed this budget and made painful but responsible cuts. We cut economic assistance to Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia by 15 percent. We cut development assistance to over 20 countries by more than half.

And this year, for the first time, our request is divided into two parts. Our core budget request of $47 billion supports programs and partnerships in every country but North Korea. It is essentially flat from 2010 levels.

The second part of our request funds the extraordinary, temporary portion of our war effort the same way that the Pentagon's request is funded, in a separate overseas contingency operations account, known as OCO. Instead of covering our war expenses through supplemental appropriations, we are now taking a more transparent approach that reflects our fully integrated civilian military efforts on the ground. Our share of the President's $126 billion request for these exceptional wartime costs in the frontline states is $8.7 billion.

Let me walk you through a few of our key investments.

First, this budget funds vital civilian missions in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq. In Afghanistan and Pakistan, al-Qaeda is under pressure as never before. Alongside our military offensive, we are engaged in a major civilian effort that is helping to build up the governments, economies, and civil societies of both countries and undercut the insurgency. These two surges, the military and civilian surge, set the stage for a third—a diplomatic push in support of an Afghan process to split the Taliban from al-Qaeda, bring the conflict in an end, and help to stabilize the region.

Our military commanders are emphatic they cannot succeed without a strong civilian partner. Retreating from our civilian surge in Afghanistan with our troops still in the field would be a grave mistake.

Equally important is our assistance to Pakistan, a nuclear-armed nation with strong ties and interests in Afghanistan. We are working to deepen our partnership and keep it focused on addressing Pakistan's political and economic challenges as well as our shared threats.

As to Iraq, after so much sacrifice we do have a chance to help the Iraqi people build a stable democratic country in the heart of the Middle East. As troops come home, our civilians are taking the lead, helping Iraqis resolve conflicts peacefully and training their police.

Shifting responsibilities from soldiers to civilians actually saves taxpayers a great deal of money. For example, the military's total OCO request worldwide will drop by $45 billion from 2010 as our

troops come home. Our costs, the State Department and USAID, will increase by less than $4 billion. Every business owner I know would gladly invest $4 to save $45.

Second, even as our civilians help bring today's wars to a close, we are working to prevent tomorrow's. This budget devotes over $4 billion to sustaining a strong U.S. presence in volatile places where our security and interests are at stake.

In Yemen, it provides security, development, and humanitarian assistance to deny al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula a safe haven and promote the kind of stability that can lead to a better outcome than what might otherwise occur. It focuses on these same goals in Somalia. It helps northern and southern Sudan chart a peaceful future. It helps Haiti rebuild. And it proposes a new Global Security Contingency Fund that would pool resources and expertise with the Defense Department to respond quickly as new challenges emerge.

This budget also strengthens our allies and partners. It trains Mexican police to take on violent cartels and secure our southern border. It provides nearly $3.1 billion for Israel and supports Jordan and the Palestinians. It helps Egypt and Tunisia build stable and credible democracy, and it supports security assistance to over 130 nations.

Now, some may say, Well, what does this get us in America? Let me give you one example. Over the years, these funds have created valuable ties with foreign militaries and trained in Egypt a generation of officers who refused to fire on their own people. And that was not something that happened overnight. It was something that happened because of relationships that had been built over decades. Across the board, we are working to ensure that all who share the benefits of our spending also share the burdens of addressing common challenges.

Third, we are making targeted investments in human security. We have focused on hunger, disease, and climate change and humanitarian emergencies because these challenges not only threaten the security of individuals, they are the seeds of future conflicts. If we want to lighten the burden on future generations, we have to make investments that make our world more secure for them.

Our largest investment is in global health programs, including those launched by former President George W. Bush. These programs stabilize entire societies that have been and are being devastated by HIV, malaria, and other diseases. They save the lives of mothers and children and halt the spread of deadly diseases.

Global food prices are approaching an all-time high. Three years ago, this led to protests and riots in dozens of countries. Food security is a cornerstone of global stability, and we are helping farmers grow more food, drive economic growth, and turn aid recipients into trading partners.

Climate change threatens food security, human security, and national security. Our budget builds resilience against droughts, floods, and other weather disasters, promotes clean energy and preserves tropical forests. It also gives us leverage to persuade China, India, and other nations to do their essential part in meeting this urgent threat.

Fourth, we are committed to making our foreign policy a force for domestic economic renewal and creating jobs here at home. We are working aggressively to promote sustained economic growth, level the playing fields, and open markets. To give just one example, the eight Open Skies Agreements that we have signed over the last 2 years will open dozens of new markets to American carriers. The Miami International Airport, Madam Chairman, which supports nearly 300 jobs, including many in your district, will see a great deal of new business thanks to agreements with Miami's top trading partners, Brazil and Colombia.

Fifth and finally, this budget funds the people and the platforms that make possible everything I have described. It allows us to sustain diplomatic relations with 19 countries. It funds political officers who are literally right now out working to diffuse political crises and promote our values, development officers who are spreading opportunity and promoting stability, and economic officers who wake up every day thinking about how to help put Americans back to work.

Several of you have already asked our Department about the safety of your constituents in the Middle East. Well, this budget also helps fund the consular officers, who evacuated over 2,600 people thus far from Egypt and Libya and nearly 17,000 from Haiti. They issued 14 million passports last year and served as our first line of defense against would-be terrorists seeking visas to enter our country.

I would like to say just a few words about the funding for the rest of 2011. As I told Speaker Boehner, Chairman Rogers, and many others, the 16-percent cut for State and USAID that passed the House last month would be devastating for our national security. It would force us to scale back dramatically on critical missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. And as Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen, and General Petraeus have all emphasized to the Congress, we need a fully engaged and fully funded national security team, and that includes State and USAID.

Now, there have always been moments of temptation in our country to resist obligations beyond our borders. But each time we have shrunk from global leadership, events have summoned us back, often cruelly, to reality. We saved money in the short term when we walked away from Afghanistan after the Cold War, but those savings came at an unspeakable cost—one we are still paying 10 years later, in money and lives.

Generations of Americans, including my own, have grown up successful and safe because we chose to lead the world in tackling the greatest challenges. We invested the resources to build up democratic allies and vibrant trading partners; and we did not shy away from defending our values, promoting our interests, and seizing the opportunities of each new era.

I have now traveled more than any Secretary of State in the last 2 years, and I can tell you from firsthand experience the world has never been in greater need of the qualities that distinguish us—our openness and innovation, our determination, our devotion to universal values. Everywhere I travel, I see people looking to us for leadership. Sometimes I see them after they have condemned us publicly on their television channels and then come to us privately

and say, We can't do this without America. This is a source of great strength, a point of pride, and I believe an unbelievable opportunity for the American people. But it is an achievement. It is not a birthright. It requires resolve, and it requires resources.

I look forward to working closely together with you to do what is necessary to keep our country safe and maintain American leadership in this fast-changing world.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Clinton follows:]

TESTIMONY
SECRETARY OF STATE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
2012 STATE AND USAID BUDGET REQUEST
HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
WEEK OF FEB 28, 2011

Thank you. I want to congratulate Chairman Ros-Lehtinen on her new post and thank her for traveling to Haiti in January. I also want to recognize Ranking Member Howard Berman, a friend and a leader on many of the issues we will discuss this morning.

Late last night, I came back from around-the-clock meetings in Geneva to discuss the events unfolding in Libya. I would like to begin by offering you a brief update.

We have joined the Libyan people in demanding that Qaddafi must go—now, without further violence or delay—and we are working to translate the world's outrage into action and results.

Marathon diplomacy at the UN and with our allies has yielded quick, aggressive steps to pressure and isolate Libya's leaders. USAID is focused on Libya's food and medical supplies and dispatching two expert humanitarian teams to help those fleeing the violence into Tunisia and Egypt. Our combatant commands are positioning assets to prepare to support these critical civilian missions. And we are taking no options off the table so long as the Libyan government continues to turn its guns on its own people.

The entire region is changing, and a strong and strategic American response will be essential. In the years ahead, Libya could become a peaceful democracy, or it could face protracted civil war. The stakes are high. And this is an unfolding example of how we use the combined assets of diplomacy, development and defense to protect our interests and advance our values. This integrated approach is not just how we respond to the crisis of the moment. It is the most effective — and cost-effective—way to sustain and advance our security across the world. And it is only possible with a budget that supports all the tools in our national security arsenal—which is what we are here to discuss.

The American people today are justifiably concerned about our national debt, but they also want responsible investments in our future. Just two years after President Obama and I first asked you to renew our investment in development and diplomacy, we are already seeing tangible returns for our national security:

In Iraq, almost 100,000 troops have come home and civilians are poised to keep the peace. In Afghanistan, integrated military and civilian surges have helped set the stage for our diplomatic surge to support Afghan-led reconciliation that can end the conflict and put al Qaeda on the run. We have imposed the toughest sanctions yet to rein in Iran's nuclear ambitions. We have reengaged as a leader in the Pacific and in our own hemisphere. We have signed trade deals to promote American jobs and nuclear weapons treaties to protect our people. We worked with northern and southern Sudanese to achieve a peaceful referendum and prevent a return to civil war. And we are working to open political systems, economies and societies at a remarkable moment in the history of the Middle East and to support peaceful, irreversible democratic transitions in Egypt and Tunisia.

Our progress is significant, but our work is ongoing. These missions are vital to our national security, and now would be the wrong time to pull back.

The FY 2012 budget we discuss today will allow us to keep pressing ahead. It is a lean budget for lean times. I launched the first-ever Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review to help us maximize the impact of every dollar we spend. We scrubbed this budget and made painful but responsible cuts. We cut economic assistance to Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia by 15 percent, and we cut development assistance to over 20 countries by more than half.

This year, for the first time, our request is divided in two parts: Our core budget request of $47 billion, which supports programs and partnerships in every country but North Korea, is essentially flat from 2010 levels.

The second part of our request funds the extraordinary, temporary portion of our war effort the same way the Pentagon's request is funded: in a separate Overseas Contingency Operations account known as "OCO." Instead of covering our war expenses through supplemental appropriations, we are now taking a more transparent approach that reflects our fully integrated civilian-military effort on the

ground. Our share of the President's $126 billion request for these exceptional wartime costs is $8.7 billion.

Let me now walk you through a few of our key investments.

First, this budget funds vital civilian missions in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq.

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, al Qaeda is under pressure as never before. Alongside our military offensive, we are engaged in a major civilian effort to help build up the governments, economies and civil society of both countries and undercut the insurgency. These two surges set the stage for a third: a diplomatic push in support of an Afghan process to split the Taliban from al Qaeda, bring the conflict to an end, and help to stabilize the entire region.

Our military commanders are emphatic that they cannot succeed without a strong civilian partner. Retreating from our civilian surge in Afghanistan—with our troops still in the field—would be a grave mistake.

Equally important is our assistance to Pakistan, a nuclear-armed nation with strong ties and interests in Afghanistan. We are working to deepen our partnership and keep it focused on addressing Pakistan's political and economic challenges as well as our shared threats.

After so much sacrifice in Iraq, we have a chance to help the Iraqi people build a stable, democratic country in the heart of the Middle East. As troops come home, our civilians are taking the lead, helping Iraqis resolve conflicts peacefully and training police.

Shifting responsibilities from soldiers to civilians actually saves taxpayers a great deal of money. The military's total OCO request worldwide will drop by $45 billion from 2010, while our costs will increase by less than $4 billion. Every business owner I know would gladly invest $4 to save $45.

Second, even as our civilians help bring today's wars to a close, we are also working to prevent tomorrow's.

This budget devotes over $4 billion to sustaining a strong U.S. presence in volatile places where our security and interests are at stake. In Yemen, it provides security, development and humanitarian assistance to deny al Qaeda a safe haven and to

promote stability and progress. It focuses on those same goals in Somalia. It helps northern and southern Sudanese chart a peaceful future. It helps Haiti to rebuild. And it proposes a new Global Security Contingency Fund that would pool resources and expertise with the Defense Department to respond quickly as new challenges emerge.

This budget also strengthens our allies and partners. It trains Mexican police to take on violent cartels and secure our southern border. It provides nearly $3.1 billion for Israel and supports Jordan and the Palestinians. It helps Egypt and Tunisia build stable and credible democracies. And it supports security assistance to over 130 nations. Over the years, these funds have created valuable ties with foreign militaries and, for example, trained a generation of Egyptian officers who refused to fire on their own people. Across the board, we are working to ensure that all who share the benefits of our spending also share the burdens of addressing common challenges.

Third, we are making targeted investments in human security. We have focused on hunger, disease, climate change and humanitarian emergencies because these challenges not only threaten the security of individuals—they are the seeds of future conflict. If we want to lighten the burden on future generations, then we must make the investments that will leave them a more secure world.

Our largest investment is in global health programs, including those launched by President George W. Bush. These programs stabilize entire societies that have been devastated by HIV, malaria and other diseases. They save the lives of mothers and children and halt the spread of deadly diseases.

Global food prices are approaching an all-time high. Three years ago, this led to protests and riots in dozens of countries. Food security is a cornerstone of global stability, and we are helping farmers to grow more food, drive economic growth, and turn aid recipients into trading partners.

Climate change threatens food security, human security and our national security. Our budget builds resilience against droughts, floods and other weather disasters, promotes clean energy and preserves tropical forests. And it gives us leverage to persuade China, India and other nations to do their essential part to meet this urgent threat.

Fourth, we are committed to making our foreign policy a force for domestic economic renewal. We are working aggressively to promote sustained economic growth, level playing fields, open markets, and create jobs here at home. To give just one example, the eight Open Skies Agreements we have signed over the last two years will open dozens of new markets to American carriers. The Miami International Airport, which supports nearly 300,000 jobs—including many in the Chairman's district—will see a great deal of new business thanks to agreements with Miami's top trading partners, Brazil and Colombia.

Fifth and finally, this budget funds the people and platforms that make possible everything I've described. It allows us to sustain diplomatic relations with 190 countries. It funds political officers defusing crises and promoting our values; development officers spreading opportunity and stability; and economic officers who wake up every day thinking about how to put Americans back to work.

Several of you have asked the Department about the safety of your constituents in the Middle East. Well, this budget also helps fund the consular officers who evacuated over 2,600 people from Egypt and Libya—and nearly 17,000 from Haiti last year. They issued 14 million passports last year and served as our first line of defense against would-be terrorists seeking visas to enter our country.

I'd also like to say just a few words about our funding for the rest of 2011. As I told Speaker Boehner, Chairman Rogers and many others, the 16 percent cut for State and USAID that passed the House last month would be devastating to our national security. For example, it would force us to scale back dramatically on critical missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

As Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen, and General Petraeus have all emphasized to you, we need a fully engaged and fully funded national security team – including State and USAID.

Now, there have always been moments of temptation in our country to resist obligations beyond our borders. But each time we have shrunk from global leadership, events summoned us back to reality. We saved money in the short term when we walked away from Afghanistan after the Cold War. But those savings came at an unspeakable cost—one we are still paying, ten years later, in money and lives.

Generations of Americans have grown up successful and safe because we chose to lead the world in tackling its greatest challenges. We invested the resources to build up democratic allies and vibrant trading partners in every region. And we did not shy away from defending our values, promoting our interests and seizing the opportunities of each new era.

The world has never been in greater need of the qualities that distinguish us – our openness and innovation, our determination, our devotion to universal values. Everywhere I travel, I see people looking to us for leadership. This is a source of strength, a point of pride and a great opportunity for the American people. But it is an achievement, not a birthright. It requires resolve—and it requires resources.

I look forward to working closely together with you to do what is necessary to keep our country safe and maintain American leadership in a changing world.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I will begin with my questions.

Madam Secretary, former Libyan officials are coming forward claiming to have proof that Qadhafi personally ordered the attack on Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie. What is the Obama administration doing to depose and secure proof for the criminal prosecution of Qadhafi and his henchmen? Also, will the United States support the implementation of a no-fly zone over Libya? And when will the United States expand the asset freeze to include those who have been identified on the United Nation's sanctions list? And, also, when will we institute a travel ban? What is the role of our U.S. military in the region? Is it humanitarian support along with our allies, and limited to that?

On Iran, Madam Secretary, I remain concerned that the Department is not fully implementing the Iran sanctions law. Can you comment on the status of the five companies that the administration waived sanctions against through the utilization of a special rule in CISADA based on their pledge to cease all investment in the Iranian energy sector? How many investigations are currently open? And will you commit to us to brief the committee or staff on all investigations that the administration is undertaking on Iran sanctions law?

I ask for U.S. protection for the many residents of Camp Ashraf, many of whose family members are here today in the audience and are concerned about their relatives.

Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

Let me begin by saying that, when it comes to Libya, the United States has led the way in imposing very strict sanctions that are finding assets and preventing those assets from going to the Qadhafi family or the Qadhafi leadership. We have also worked closely with the European Union and member countries, because they also have many assets from the Libyans that they are tracking and freezing.

We also, as you know, passed in a very quick, aggressive manner a strong Security Council resolution on Saturday, which gets the entire world behind targeted sanctions, arms embargo, humanitarian assistance; and yesterday in Geneva I had the opportunity to discuss further what more could be and needed to be done. There will be additional announcements coming from other countries, coming from the EU; and the United States continues to look at every single lever it can use against the Qadhafi regime.

We are well aware of the ongoing efforts by Colonel Qadhafi to defend the area of Tripoli and a few other places that he continues to hold. The opposition forces have been working to create more of a military presence so that they can not only defend the places that they have already taken over but even try to take Tripoli away from Colonel Qadhafi.

We are also very conscious of the desire by the Libyan opposition forces that they be seen as doing this by themselves on behalf of the Libyan people, that there not be outside intervention by any external force because they want this to have been their accomplishment. We respect that. But we have also with our NATO allies and with the Pentagon begun to look at potential planning prepared-

ness in the event that we feel it is necessary for both humanitarian and other reasons that there would have to be actions taken. One of those actions that is under review is a no-fly zone. There are arguments that would favor it, questions that would be raised about it, but it is under active consideration.

With respect to Iran—and I know the time is so short and I want to be able to supplement any of these questions with written material—we are seeing the difference that coordinated sanctions can make. It is not only what the United States did with the cooperation and leadership of Congress with the CISADA legislation that added to the Iran Sanctions Act, gave the United States many more tools, but it is also because of the international cooperation through the United Nations Security Council and through additional add-on sanctions from many of our partners, including the EU, Japan, and others.

Because when you are trying to sanction Iran, no matter how powerful the United States is economically and no matter how much we can do on our own, it is imperative that we get the international community to support it. Otherwise, there is just too much leakage. We have really limited that. I feel strongly that we are making an impact on that.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary. I respectfully request written responses as you offered to the questions that you were not able to answer because I asked so many, including the deposition of the Libyan officials, which is so timely.

My good friend, the ranking member, Mr. Berman.

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

I do want to commend to my colleagues on the committee the speech that Secretary Clinton gave, in addition to her excellent testimony today, but yesterday going to the Human Rights Council, where she discussed Libya, Iran, and other issues. It is really quite a remarkable presentation, particularly pointing out the hypocrisy of Iran's condemnations of violence in Libya and what they do to their own people and protestors in Iran.

I would like to try to get into two issues in this short time. One, the Israeli-Palestinian process. And I ask that because I struggle in my own mind with the right approach at this particular point. Has the emergence of protest movements throughout the Arab world altered the dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian peacemaking?

Given Egypt's preoccupations with its internal issues, I assume Egypt in the immediate future is not going to be very involved in Israeli-Palestinian diplomacy. How important is the removal of Egypt from the peace process equation? Is this a time when we should be pushing forward with peace efforts or should we wait for the regional dust to settle—sort of a bad metaphor, I guess, here—before making another push? What do you anticipate from the next Quartet meeting, which as I understand is likely to take place this month?

And I have one other question after that.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, thank you very much, Congressman Berman.

We believe that a continuing effort on behalf of the two-state solution is first and foremost in Israel's interest and, in addition to

that, in the interest of presenting a very affirmative effort in the midst of all of this turmoil and change. So our work continues.

We understand the changed landscape very well. One thing that both the Israelis and the Palestinians depended on was Egypt's support for Camp David, Egypt's support for the peace process. I was pleased that the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces in one of its earliest actions declared that it would respect the Camp David Accords. That was a very important message. We have made it clear to our Egyptian counterparts that we expect that, and we will do everything that we can to support it.

I think it is fair to ask, given what is going on in the region, what is the chance for any kind of break-through or resolution of these ongoing matters. We know that it is difficult at any time, but we believe that this is an opportunity for Israel. There was a speech that Prime Minister Netanyahu gave yesterday that is reported in our press today in which he says he is well aware of the growing isolation of Israel in the international community. That is not good for Israel. That is not good for Israel's economy. That is not good for Israel's position and leadership.

So I know that the Prime Minister recognizes that we have some very tough decisions ahead of us. So we work extremely closely with the Israeli Government, and we will continue to do so. As you and others have noted, the Security Council of the United Nations is not the place for these kinds of negotiations, but trying to get the parties back to direct negotiations remains our highest priority.

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you very much.

Across the Middle East and North Africa, as we have all noted, we are witnessing a transformational moment. These countries will need external support as they undertake successful transitions to democratic governments. Will the United States be able to provide sufficient support to transitional governments in Egypt and Tunisia and be prepared to assist in other countries as needed? We look at what is going on in Libya, Bahrain, Jordan, and Yemen, and are we going to keep in place a current policy that restricts USAID from providing democracy and governance support to NGOs that are not registered under the Egyptian NGO law?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, first, Congressman Berman, we are going to do everything we can to support this transition to democracy that is under way. Each country is different; and, very candidly, each country wants different things from us. They want either economic aid or they want the full menu of support on politics, governance, human rights, and the like. It is our intention, as we have already communicated with teams that we have sent out. Under Secretary Bill Burns has just finished an intensive tour of the region, talking to the leadership in the key countries, that we will stand ready, as we have already announced, with $150 million of reprogrammed money in Egypt, for example. We are trying to better coordinate with our European and other partners around the world so that we don't duplicate what is being done.

But with respect to the question about getting money into certain organizations and individuals——

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Secretary, I am going to be a little ruthless, because we want to get all our members in. Thank you. I know my good friend understands.

I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, Chris Smith of New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Secretary, welcome to the committee.

I just returned from visiting our friend and ally, Japan, where I spoke with members of the Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Justice, and the Diet, regarding the fact that Japan has become a destination country, a haven, for international child abduction. I want to note parenthetically our Foreign Service Officers were extremely competent, as well as our Consul General, and empathetic.

As you know, there are at least 171 abducted children and 131 brokenhearted parents who are worried sick and have no access in most cases to even see their children. All of us, of course, want Japan to sign the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. But, as you know, that treaty will not solve the current cases, and they stand a great risk of being left behind a second time.

My question is, what is the administration's plan to resolve the current cases? On at least five occasions President Obama has met with both Prime Minister Kant and Hetoyama. Did he personally raise the issue of those children and their left-behind parents?

Secondly, I would like to ask you, if you would, since 1979, brothers and sisters have been illegal in China as part of the barbaric one-child-per-couple policy. For over 30 years, the U.N. Population Fund has vigorously supported, funded, defended, promoted, and even celebrated these massive crimes against humanity. The facts are these—and they are uncontested—any Chinese woman, Tibetan woman, or Uighur mother without a birth permit is put under coercive pressure to abort; if need be, physically forced to do so. All unwed moms are compelled to abort their child. And in what can only be described as a search-and-destroy mission, disabled children are aborted as part of a nationwide eugenics program. Each day, Chinese family planning cadres impose huge compensation fees on any woman who lacks permission to give birth or somehow evades detection.

There is no doubt that the UNFPA-supported one-child-per-couple policy in China has led to the worst gender disparity in any nation in human history. Where are the missing girls? Dead. Aborted because they were female. Systematically destroyed over 30 years by sex selection abortion. Today, there are as many as 100 million missing girls in China—gendercide, the evil twin of genocide.

The societal implications of the UNFPA-supported one-child-per-couple policy are absolutely staggering. According to the World Health Organization, about 500 Chinese women commit suicide every day in China. China has become a magnet for sex trafficking, in large measure due to the missing girls of China.

In light of this massive ongoing crime against women, I would like respectfully to know if you or the President raised directly in a face-to-face manner the issue of forced abortion in China when President Hu Jintao was in Washington.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, let me start with your visit to Japan and thank you for bringing greater visibility to this very painful problem that I am deeply concerned about.

In fact, I, for the first time, created in the Department the position of Special Adviser on Children's Issues. It is something that I have worked on for my entire adult life, and we are actively engaging foreign governments to go ahead and join the Hague Conventions both on child abduction and on adoption. And I have raised it in every meeting that I have had with my Japanese counterparts—and I have had many Japanese counterparts because the government has changed in the 2 years I have been involved. And I know the President has also raised it.

I appreciate your going to Japan, and I thank you for the kind words about the consular affairs officers there, because this is at the highest priority level in the administration.

It is not only Japan. But Japan, unfortunately, has many more of these cases. We are also concerned about South Korea and many other countries in Asia. And in fact our Special Adviser hosted a meeting for all of our chiefs of mission from Asian countries, including Bangladesh, China, Japan, Laos, Nepal, the Philippines, South Korea, and Timor to encourage that this be put on the top of the list.

With respect to the pending cases, it is my belief that if we can get the conventions approved, we will have a stronger argument on the pending cases. I think that there will be a recognition that Japanese society has changed its views about how these cases should be handled; and I think that will open more possibilities for the families that are, unfortunately, suffering from the abduction of their children.

With respect to China, its one-child policy, its forced sterilization, its forced abortion——

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. I am sorry, Madam Secretary. Thank you so much.

Mr. Ackerman, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Just when it was getting good.

Madam Secretary, it seems like just yesterday that a faceless, frustrated fruit vendor devoid of a future set himself afire and now tomorrow ain't what it used to be. Certainly not for millions of people in the Middle East, certainly not for most of the rest of the world. We have seen amazing things happen and taking place—things that we didn't necessarily anticipate.

Others are watching it carefully as well. We see people demonstrating in the streets in countries which, to our amazement, are not holding up signs that say death to America or death to Israel or death to anybody else there. They are raising their own flags proudly, without trampling or burning ours. They are holding up signs—signs that are in English.

You referred to meeting with people who made statements on TV and told you different things. These are people who are—publicly, their prayers may be going upward, but their hopes and dreams are directed to us. They are talking to us in our language. It is fascinating.

We have to have a plan. They are looking westward. Others have been caught flat-footed, as well as have we. We see a young man who was one of the leaders in Egypt, an Islamic but secular young

man, when asked who he wants to meet, he doesn't say Muhammad, the Prophet. He says, "Mark Zuckerberg, the Jew."

There is an opportunity here that we have never sensed. This is a new generation of people. People have not been sent out into the streets by their parents to die, but parents are willing to die for the next generation. They have dreams, and they are looking to us to help them.

What are we going to do? The opportunity is here. Why don't we come up with something out of the box, something creative? Pick 500 of the finest young men and women from some of our business schools, give them each $10,000. Maybe the Israelis will do the same. Let them start businesses with these young people. Let them work together. Let them find their own future. Let them find the way that they have indicated in the streets in which they are demonstrating that they want to go.

This is a new direction. Let's not wring our hands and say, Oh, my God, others are going to take advantage. The future isn't there for us to react to. The future is to be made. Do we have a plan?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, we do. We have lots of plans. I am very excited by your idea, and I would welcome every member of this committee to offer ideas that would give us additional ways of interacting with the—particularly young people who are at the base of these transformational movements.

Let me just say three quick things. We do have a lot of ongoing efforts that have been funded by this Congress over the last many years for entrepreneurial training. The President had an entrepreneurial conference last year, where we brought people from Muslim majority countries. I run into them all the time as I am traveling in the region. We have a Web site that keeps them in contact that helps to mentor them. We can take that and build on it and make it even greater.

We have a lot of the MEPI programs and the so-called NERD programs, the Near-East programs, that have played a major role in bringing a lot of these young people to the United States on international visitors programs, on reaching out to them where they were in their own countries. We have to continue that. This is a labor-intensive, person-by-person kind of outreach program; and it is one of our hopes that we will get the resources to do that.

We have increased dramatically what I call 21st century statecraft so that we have a social network connections system where we are talking to people in Arabic and Farsi, never done by our Department before; and I have empowered a lot of people to go and get this under way and be connected to their counterparts around the world.

We do have to be conscious and aware of what people want from us and what they don't want from us. And, again, that is evolving. So our Embassy and Bill Burns and others who have been visiting have been meeting with representative groups of young people who come from the entire political spectrum because we do not want to make the mistake of not including in our dialogs those with whom we have some difficulties because we want them also to feel that they can realize democratic aspirations, which is more than just having an election.

So there is a lot to be done, and I think your idea is a very good one, and I will follow up on that, Congressman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you. I am glad you are there.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Burton of Indiana, subcommittee chair on Europe and Eurasia, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Madam Secretary, we take an oath of office when we become Congressmen and you, as Secretary of State, to protect the United States from enemies both domestic and foreign. One of the big concerns that I have is our dependence on foreign energy. Right now, we import about 65 percent of our energy from outside the United States. When we had the oil embargo back in 1972, the early '70s, we imported about 28 percent. So we are importing more than double the amount of energy we did back then.

The concern I have is the unrest in Libya, in Egypt. If you look all the way across the northern tier of Africa and into the Persian Gulf, you will see that the potential for unrest is really, really severe. And I know you are doing your best. But, nevertheless, there is still that problem. If the Straits of Hormuz is bottled up, if the Persian Gulf is bottled up, if they do something in the Suez Canal, we could lose at least 30 percent of our energy. We are dependent on that part of the world.

Now, this country has not moved toward energy independence at all in the last 40 years. We were importing 28 percent back in 1970, 1972, and now it is 65 percent. Our dependency has continued on. And we have said we want energy independence.

T. Boone Pickens was in to see me a couple of weeks ago, and I have talked to others that say we have the ability to become energy independent if we really want to do it. But because of environmental concerns, we are not moving. We are not drilling off the Continental Shelf. We are not drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. We are not drilling in the ANWR. We have got millions and maybe trillions of coal shale that can be converted into oil, and we are not doing a darn thing about it. We are increasing and continuing to depend on foreign sources of energy.

This administration is doing absolutely nothing to deal with it. As a matter of fact, they are impeding our ability to become energy independent. Now we have got to do something about that.

If we have everything go to hell over in the Middle East and if our good friend in Venezuela, Mr. Chavez, who is working with Tehran right now—they have flights going back and forth every week—if they decide to put the kibosh on us, we are really in trouble. Can you imagine what it would be like to lose 30 to 40 percent of our energy from foreign sources because we are not drilling and getting energy right here in the United States?

So my question very simply is this. Why is this administration—and you as Secretary of State are one of the leaders who is supposed to make sure that we are protected from enemies, both domestic and foreign—and right now, you know because you have been over the problems that we have in the entire Middle East. You know of the problems that we have in Venezuela. You know of all these problems, and you know of our increased dependence on foreign energy. Why is it? And can you take a message back to

the President and just say, Look, it is time to get on with it. We need to do what is necessary to become energy independent.

And the experts with whom I have talked—and I have talked to many of them—tell us we can become energy independent in the next decade if we really want to. As a matter of fact, T. Boone Pickens said if we do one thing, and that is convert our 18-wheel tractor-trailer units to natural gas, we could cut our dependence on foreign oil by 50 percent in the next decade; that one thing, and we are not doing a thing about it.

And this administration, in my opinion, is being derelict in its responsibility, and you as Secretary of State, I implore you to go back to the President and say, This is just not just an economic issue; this is a national defense issue that we are not doing a thing about and we need to get on with it.

And I would like to have your response.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I actually agree that our energy dependence is a national security issue. When I served on the Armed Services Committee, I authored some of the earliest legislation so that we would begin to look at alternatives, that we could begin to use the large Defense Department budget to try to explore what could be done.

I don't think there is any one answer, however. I do believe—and I followed up on that by having the first-ever international energy coordinator. In the QDDR, I recommended that we have a whole bureau devoted to energy because I do see it as you do, as a critical part of our national defense.

I would take issue, as you might expect me to, with respect to your characterization of what this administration has done. There is a lot that can be done right now that would make us more energy efficient. There were a lot of programs and a lot of funding to move toward energy efficiency, which every expert I talk to, says can have a dramatic impact on reducing our use of foreign and domestic sources. That doesn't mean that we don't need to look carefully at what else we can do in terms of drilling and the like. That is a longer-term prospect.

I am worried about right now, and I think some of the short-term decisions that are being made by the Congress undermine our march toward energy independence, and I think we have to look at a whole menu of what needs to be done.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much. Mr. Faleomavaega, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Secretary, it is always a pleasure and a personal honor for me to welcome you before this committee. I am sure our Nation deeply appreciates your service and outstanding demonstration of your leadership as the President's chief diplomat in representing our Nation throughout the world.

Just yesterday, you made a very important speech before the United Nations Human Rights Council in Europe, and now this morning you will be making a serious effort to save what is left of the State Department's proposed 2012 budget, which, in my humble opinion, with a machete and a sledgehammer our friends in the majority are proposing to cut by as much as 50 percent of what the

administration is requesting in order for your Department to carry out your many responsibilities throughout the world.

How ironic, Madam Secretary, that here you are as the President's most senior member of his Cabinet, and yet your Department's budget is less than half a percent of the U.S. gross domestic product, or 1 percent of the entire Federal budget.

Madam Secretary, it is my understanding that some of our colleagues in the majority have suggested that we should utilize the 2008 budget operations as the benchmark for the 2012 budget cycle, which means a reduction of about 42 percent in the administration's proposed budget.

My question is, will your department be able to function with these kinds of proposed cuts that we are now considering seriously in the Congress?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I hope we don't get to that, because it would seriously affect the missions that the State Department and USAID have been assigned, not only by this President but by the prior President. When President Bush and the Bush administration signed, for example, the Strategic Framework Agreement with Iraq, it was filled with the kinds of work that was supposed to be ongoing in order to solidify the relationship that had been built after our military leaves Iraq.

I cannot stress to you how strongly I think it is imperative that we continue the mission in Iraq. We are talking about democracies in the Middle East. Forget about how we got there. The fact is they are trying to figure out how to have a democracy.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Secretary, in other words, you are going to be hurting.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, it is not me personally. It is our country and our interests and our security that will be devastated, in my opinion.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. The chairman has a very strong hand with the gavel here, but Madam Secretary, I do have my laundry list for your consideration.

Two months ago, as a member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I submitted a strong letter to Assistant Secretary Arturo Valenzuela in your Department concerning the current crisis of the abuse and mistreatment by the Chilean military forces against the people of Easter Island, or Rapa Nui. Unfortunately, I have not received any response from Secretary Valenzuela's department or agency. I don't know what—maybe he is sick or just didn't care or bother to respond.

And secondly, Madam Secretary, I want to know if the State Department has any information or details concerning the plight and the suffering of some tens of millions of indigenous Indians living throughout Latin America, their problems economically, especially economically and socially, in terms of their critical situation.

Also, the administration's recent announcement that you were going to bring USAID back to the Pacific, and with the budget cuts now, does this mean that there is going to be no USAID for the Pacific region? And I am talking about some 16 island Nations that I am sure really have a need for this program.

Also, the unexploded ordnance cluster bomb issues for the countries of Laos and Cambodia, the debt reduction also for Cambodia

that has been going on now for 30 years and still don't understand what happened there. I think my time is about ready to go, Madam Secretary.

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, I will get answers on all of these. But specifically, let me just respond on USAID's presence in the Pacific. Here is an area where, number one, we are finding large energy deposits. I am sorry that Congressman Burton is gone, because also Papua New Guinea and in the land mass, there is a huge deposit that ExxonMobil is developing. We are in a competition with China that is unbelievable. They are expending enormous amounts of money. They have a huge diplomatic presence across the Pacific. The very least we could do is have a USAID office in either Fiji or Papua New Guinea so that we fly the flag and people know we care about them. That will be on the chopping blocks. It is one thing, but it really stands for a much bigger challenge that we are facing in that region of the world.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I might also mention China has about a $600 million development program for these Pacific island nations. And what do we have in response? Zero. My time is up

Secretary CLINTON. Also, they will vote with us in the United Nations consistently, and China is trying to undo that.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you. Five minutes for Mr. Rohrabacher, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, is recognized.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. First of all, Madam Secretary, let me compliment you on your energy and clarity after arriving here from meetings in Europe and arriving late last night. I don't know how you do it. You have done a terrific job in advocating what your administration wants you to advocate.

Let me ask you, I would like to be specific and give you a chance to answer this. Did President Obama confront President Hu during his visit to Washington on the issue of forced abortion? I think that could be answered with probably a yes or no.

Secretary CLINTON. We consistently raise that with the Chinese and I want to just say——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is that a yes; President Hu was actually confronted by President Obama?

Secretary CLINTON. I cannot answer that—I cannot answer that yes or no on that particular visit. I can tell you that we consistently raise it in our highest diplomatic encounters with our Chinese colleagues.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would that include the highest—has President Hu been confronted with the issue of forced abortion by our President?

Secretary CLINTON. I will have to get an answer for you, but let me say that this is an issue that I started raising in 1995.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay.

Secretary CLINTON. And I continue to raise it, and I am the chief diplomat and I raise it in every setting that I can.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. Can you get back to me? You can't give us a yes or no now, but maybe you can get back to us, and we will call you on this, as to whether President Hu has been confronted himself on the issue of forced abortion.

Secretary CLINTON. I will certainly do that, and let me just quickly add, because Congressman Smith's question——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You know what, Madam Secretary, I only have a couple of minutes to ask you some questions, and I agree with the question, but I was also doing Mr. Smith a favor.

I would like to ask you a little bit about the nature of foreign aid. It seems to me that we give—when we are talking about the amounts of money that is being spent, the billions of dollars we spend, does it make any sense at all for us to be borrowing money from China and giving it to other countries, especially giving it back to China?

I have noticed that you will be asking in your budget request for $1.3 billion to the—let's see, it says here the global fund and the global fund assistance program. China happens to be the fourth largest recipient and has received almost $950 million. Now, what sense does it make for us to borrow money from China and then give it back to them in a grant, and then we are paying the interest, of course, on the money that we have borrowed from them? This is insane.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, first, you are not going to get an argument from me. I was part of, in an indirect way, the last administration that balanced the budget, and I wish we had stuck with it. And we find ourselves in a very challenging position now because of what happened between 2001 and 2009. So I am one of those who believe we have to be smart and tough and do what is necessary to balance the budget, and I don't think it can all be done by slashing our foreign aid and our State Department budget.

With respect to your specific question, we do support the global fund. It has been an efficient way for the United States to amplify our own efforts with respect to PEPFAR. And yes, China is a recipient, and China is stepping up and assuming greater responsibility than when we started, when they would deny they even had an HIV/AIDS problem. And from our perspective, HIV/AIDS is a communicable disease that actually affects the world, and therefore we want to stamp it out wherever we can find it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And your answer to my question is, yes, it does make sense for us to borrow money from China and give it back to them as a grant as part of this global fund assistance.

Let me just note that we can disagree as to who caused the problems for our economy. Let us just note that we are $1.5 trillion more in debt this year and the year before since this administration has taken power as compared to the last year of the Bush administration. Whether or not who is responsible for that, we can talk about later.

Let me ask about aid to Pakistan, and again, we have only got a few seconds here. Pakistan has received billions of dollars' worth of aid; yet they have a U.S. citizen, Raymond Davis, who is now being held under very questionable circumstances. Are we going to demand—are we still going to give our money away to people who support the Taliban and put our intelligence assets at risk?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, we are working very hard in order to achieve the release of Mr. Davis. It is one of our highest priorities across our Government.

We do believe that the combination of military and civilian aid that we have pursued with Pakistan is in America's interests and that is our first and most important——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yeah, we develop the plan, give to Pakistan, and Pakistan creates nuclear weapons——

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher. I would like to recognize Mr. Payne, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. If you didn't give the whole title, I might have had 4 or 5 seconds more.

But let me just rest and say that it is so great to see you again, and let me commend you, Madam Secretary, for the outstanding work that you continue to do with your firmness and your knowledge of world affairs.

I am also very distressed that H.R. 1, as it relates to our whole foreign affairs, issues at the National Family Planning, cutting $200 million; 83 percent less for debt restructuring for Haiti; 49 percent reduction in international disaster assistance funds which helps with clean water, emergency shelter, health care, et cetera, rape prevention; 41 percent reduction in refugee and migration assistance; 17 percent decrease in the Peace Corps, which everyone says is the greatest program in the world, what we get back for our investment; 29 percent reduction in the Millennium Challenge Corporation. And we can go on and on.

It is absolutely to me insane. Whereas it has been indicated 1 percent of our budget goes to foreign affairs and we are slashing it. This is not going to solve our problem in this country by taking 1 percent and cutting that in half to make you have one-half of 1 percent going to alleviate problems in the world. So I would hope that there can be some changes made on the way to the budget question.

Let me just ask quickly some questions in regard to south Sudan with the recent elections. Will cuts prevent us from really getting in there and assisting that new government? I am concerned about Darfur, that we don't give up tough sanctions on the Bashir regime until Abyei is concluded in south Sudan, which it should be a part of south Sudan and the whole Darfur situation.

I also would hope that we can step up our support for the transitional Federal Government in Sudan. I think there is a new offensive going on, and if we can support the African peacekeepers that are going to try to have this new offensive, I think that we can secure that area in Somalia.

I will stop there for a minute and maybe try to give you a minute to answer a couple of those questions.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman Payne, I appreciate your listing the cuts that are in H.R. 1 because obviously those will have a dramatic impact on our ability to wield our power. I mean, that is what I am interested in. I am interested in results for America. And if we are basically going to people empty-handed or we are having to close offices and cut back programs so that we don't have that relationship that enables us then to turn around, as we did with the Egyptian military, and say, "Hey, guys, remember us, we

trained you, we worked with you, here is how we think you can do this," we will be weakened. I mean, that is the bottom line.

I mean, it is not a pleasant thing to say because I think at this moment in history, as much as any, it is not like there is no competition out there. Iran is competing with us. China is competing with us. We have people who are more than happy to step forward and fill the void that we leave behind.

I was struck, for example, that the conservative government in the United Kingdom actually increased their development budget. While they were cutting everything else, they said, you know, if we don't compete, if we are not present, we are really going to be off the map. And so they are actually increasing their development budget.

So on these issues, like you mentioned, south Sudan, Darfur, Somalia, the United States is the major player, and I think we deserve a great deal of the credit for helping the Sudanese referendum for south Sudan to go peacefully. We are deeply engaged in working to resolve Abyei. We are still focused on Darfur.

You mentioned Somalia and the transitional Federal Government. We are the largest supporter of the African Union forces that are in there taking the fight to al-Shabab Chicago which is allied with al-Qaeda.

I mean, I could go around the world and point to where our aid and our diplomatic effort coincide with our security challenges, and what our military is doing and places where our military is not present, where we are the only representation of American power. You know, look, it is up to the Congress to make this decision, but as I said in my opening remarks, every time we pull back, we have paid a bigger price, and that is what I worry about.

Mr. PAYNE. Even in Cote d'Ivoire where Bagwell is still staying in office, it has an impact on our chocolate industry, which is a big industry in New Jersey. So we are interconnected financially.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Payne. Mr. Manzullo, subcommittee chair on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. MANZULLO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Secretary, it is good to have you here this morning. I represent the 16th Congressional District of Illinois, not too far from Park Ridge, and 26 percent of our manufactured items are exported. We have over 10,000 jobs directly related to foreign direct investment from Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Italy, Israel, and other countries.

And this past week, I led the largest congressional delegation ever to New Zealand and to Australia to discuss the Trans-Pacific partnership, and appreciate your going there in December of last year, signing the Wellington Declaration. It strengthens our ties with that part of the world. We got out 2 hours and 21 minutes before the earthquake hit, and it was fortuitous on our part.

Our relationship with New Zealand and Australia is extremely important, and I am delighted that the Prime Minister will visit the United States next week and speak before a joint session of Congress.

As a result of our discussions, I learned that the New Zealand Government is in the process of reauthorizing the patent system which will actually remove patent protection for software, and we

discussed that at length with the Trade Minister, Tim Groser, and the Australians are in the process of adopting a so-called plain packaging rule for tobacco which adversely impacts the use of trademarks, and many people see the use of the patent system to enforce social change as being inimical to the United States' strength in the patent laws as we know it.

These issues concerning loss of patent protection for software and also for trademark protection are really disturbing to the nine countries that have been involved in those negotiations which, as you know, go back probably 10 years through several different administrations, especially in light of China's continuous theft of intellectual property, closure and outright theft of American businesses, including a couple from my congressional district.

My question to you is, are you aware of these patent issues and trademark issues involved in the TPP? And I would like to hear your thoughts on them and what America is going to do to try to turn around New Zealand and Australia to a higher level of patent protection.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, first let me say how pleased I am that you and your large delegation were safe. We had some very tense moments there trying to make sure that everybody, all the Americans as part of this large delegation, were accounted for. So thank you.

And with respect to the TPP, although the State Department does not have the lead on this—it is the United States Trade Representative—we work closely with the U.S. TR. It is absolutely essential that we work with our friends and allies, particularly countries like Australia and New Zealand, to make sure they understand the implications of some of their internal domestic legislative changes. And we are doing so because I share your concern. We obviously have the biggest stake in the world in improving the protection for intellectual property, not seeing close friends and allies begin to remove those protections.

You point out that China remains the largest violator, and part of what we have tried to do is to push them to recognize that as they develop they, too, will want the protection for their own intellectual property, and they need to be part of an international regime. So we are aware of this. We are working on it, and I will keep you informed about how the negotiations proceed.

Mr. MANZULLO. Thank you and I yield back my time.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Wow. Thank you, Mr. Manzullo, Man of the Year.

Mr. Sherman, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. SHERMAN. I join with Mr. Rohrabacher and his amazement at your energy, which is exceeded only by my amazement of Don yielding back part of his time. And of course, Mr. Rohrabacher would be even more amazed if you reflected on the fact that I think this is your first of four hearings before various congressional committees over the next 2 days.

I have got so many areas to pursue that I will mostly propound questions for the record so you will have a few minutes of relaxation.

The Korea Free Trade Agreement. What worries me is goods coming into this country duty free, manufactured by North Korean or Chinese labor. For example on automobiles, the automobile could be 65 percent made in China, then taken to South Korea where it would be finished by Chinese guest workers residing in barracks in South Korea, and then this car could enter the United States duty free, having never been touched by a South Korean worker.

Of greater concern is outlined in my letter of February 9 to the President, which I know your staff is already working on a response to, dealing with the special industrial zones in North Korea, in which North Korean slave labor is provided to South Korean companies. The South Korean Ambassador to the United States is on record as saying that he believes that the Korea Free Trade Agreement will pave the way for goods entirely produced in these slave-labor zones to enter the United States duty free.

And if you review my letter, you will see that it looks like the South Korean Ambassador has a very good legal point, all the more reason why we need to change this agreement before we submit it to Congress, particularly the annexes described in my letter.

I applaud your efforts to liberalize our export controls without hurting our national security. The goal has got to be jobs, but sometimes liberalization leads to exporting the jobs. If something is taken off the munitions list, then it could be manufactured in China and imported into the United States. If you license the export of tools and dyes and plans and technology, that can lead to goods being produced abroad. So I hope that prioritization in the liberalization is given to those projects that will provide more jobs rather than more offshoring to the American economy.

As to Iran sanctions, I think the ranking member did an outstanding job in propounding the questions and pointing out how important this is. The State Department began a number of investigations, particularly of Chinese companies, back in September. Under the law, the State Department is supposed to complete that within 6 months—that means next month—and a question there for the record is whether the U.S. is actually prepared to sanction a firm located—and a major trading partner of the United States, also known as China. And if we are not willing to sanction any company in China, if we are looking to delay decisions where 6 months ought to be long enough to make a decision, then we make a mockery not only of our policy toward Iran but of the rule of law in the United States, since the law does require certain action.

As to the Caucasus, the Defense Ministry of Azerbaijan stated recently that his country is seriously preparing for war. I hope you could outline for the record the serious repercussions that Azerbaijan would face if it renewed the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

As to an organization known as the MEK, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has required the State Department to review its decision. A number of well-respected foreign policy experts have said the MEK ought to be taken off the list. This is the only thing that Howard Dean and John Bolten agree on, not to mention General James Jones, Bill Richardson, and Lee Hamilton recently.

I asked for a classified briefing of the relevant subcommittee. The State Department refused because of the litigation. The Intelligence Committee provided it, and frankly, after that classified briefing, I thought that perhaps there was nothing done this century that justified the MEK being on that list, and it provided substantial ammunition to the belief that MEK is on the list as part of a peace offering or a concession to Tehran. So I hope that you will personally review the decision that the court has ordered your department to review.

Finally is the issue of Libya. It may in the future, depending upon developments, be good policy for us to arm the Benghazi Army, if it ever organizes itself, if they have a functioning provisional government. And I wonder if you have begun the review of the recent U.N. sanctions and of U.S. law to make sure that America could legally do that should you decide it to be good policy. If, God forbid, there is a major conflict around Tripoli, let's make sure the right side wins.

I yield back.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you, Congressman.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Without objection, members may have 5 calendar days to submit questions for the record for the Secretary, Mr. Sherman, so we hope to get some answers to those important questions.

I am pleased to recognize——

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that my letter of February 9 be made part of the record.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Absolutely, without objection.

Mr. Royce, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Secretary, on the question of Libya, I think that one of the important resources could be Libyans and Libyan Americans for their input. Omar Turbi, who has testified before the committee before, is here today. I talked with him this morning. I know that Samantha Power, you know, in the administration had some observations. Some of those observations have to do with what we didn't do in Bosnia in terms of jamming Milosevic's radio stations. I actually carried legislation on doing this, but we couldn't get it through until the bombings started.

So I think right now if we look at the lesson of Rwanda, right, I mean one of the lessons is if we can—when a dictator is telling people to kill his own people, there is an opportunity, especially given the fact that he is jamming al Hararya anyway. So he jams; why don't we put the assets up to take care of that?

And one of the things, for example, that al Hararya could do if they were broadcasting would be interviews with Egyptian soldiers saying why they didn't shoot, why they didn't fire on their own people. This kind of thinking—because in a way it is an information war, isn't it? And so I just wanted your response to that.

And I was also going to ask you briefly in terms of another problem on the African continent that you are very well aware of, the LRA, Joseph Kony. Myself and a colleague had legislation basically, you know, to put the assets, deploy the assets. This is a fellow, you know, who just exists to pillage, and he grabs child sol-

diers out of the villages, or grabs children and converts them into soldiers.

So we now have passed the authorization over, you know, for the plan, and I was going to ask you also about implementation of that plan to remove him from the equation.

Thank you.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I think that the ideas that you have offered regarding Libya are ones that we are seriously considering as part of the package of potential actions that are being looked at by both our civilian and our military teams.

I also think that this is an information war to a great extent, and what we have been trying to do in the last 2 years is to rebuild our credibility so that what we had to say would be listened to. I did a Web chat with an Egyptian Web site, and we gave them 2 days' notice, and they went out in Tahrir Square and elsewhere. They got 7,000 questions.

So people are really anxious to hear from us. And they are also, as you I think rightly point out, anxious to hear from each other, like the Egyptian soldier idea which I think is a terrific one. So we will follow up and give you more feedback about what we are doing.

I could not agree more about the horrors of the LRA. This is one of the great criminals of the last 50 years who has pillaged, raped, abducted, kidnapped, killed in every way known in the worst of barbarism. So we are very focused on that.

As you know, because you have followed this closely, he unfortunately has been harder to get than we would have thought. We have had a lot of support from allies and partners, but he unfortunately has escaped accountability. But we are going to continue to do that, and we appreciate your keeping that in the spotlight.

Mr. ROYCE. Thank you.

I had a last question I was going to ask you, and that went to the request that North Korea is making of the administration for food aid. We have had hearings here in which a French NGO testified that they traced the food aid that they had previously given and found that it ended up on the Pyongyang food exchange, basically being sold for hard currency for the regime. What she was testifying to us, as a representative of this NGO, was the same information that we had also received from Mr. Yop who was the minister of propaganda, I guess you would call him, for like 50 years, and he defected. And I saw that one of his former employees, a central committee member in North Korea, had told the press yesterday the same thing he had once told us.

And the quote is, "We must not give food aid to North Korea." This is from a former Politburo member. "Doing so is the same as providing funding for North Korea's nuclear program."

What had transpired is Hwang Jang-Yop explained to us how they basically took hard currency. That is what they needed to build their weapons program, and they would get it any way they could. And one of the ways they get it is by the financial support, you know, that they receive.

And so I was going to say that I think it is wise counsel from North Korean defectors that we not do that. I was going to ask for your opinion.

Secretary CLINTON. We agree with——

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Madam Secretary. Thank you, Mr. Royce.

Mr. ROYCE. I am glad you agreed. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Meeks of New York is recognized, He is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Secretary, it is so great to see you, and I want to first commend you and all the diplomats under your charge for the tremendous efforts at the State Department to ensure U.S. security and prosperity in these challenging times globally. Through your skilled advocacy around the world to rebuild partners and to—reliable partners and bilateral engagement, you are making indeed America a safer and a stronger Nation.

I also want to thank you. We have within our office a Pearson Fellow by the name of Nancy Cohen who is a Foreign Service officer, and she has done a tremendous job and just exemplifies the great people you have in the Foreign Service.

Now, there are too many questions to ask and time is limited, so I am going to ask some questions that later that group can put down for the record, but before I get to the questions I also want to preference my statement by an overarching concern with the current budget that has been proposed by the Republican majority.

The current administration inherited a geopolitical reality riddled with anti-Americanism. Now that our reputation is being restored and there is such an opportunity for positive change, is this the time that we really want to pull back funds that support critical programs and initiatives? This is more than just, in my opinion, penny-wise and pound-foolish. It is downright dangerous to our national interests. And you know, when you talked earlier in regards to Europe, even though they are tightening their belt, you know, they are also putting more money into foreign aid.

One of the questions I would have is the partnership we have with Europe, whether or not—there is a perceived—you know, there is a perceived—whether or not we then begin holding up our end of the bargain. And we are talking about foreign aid, which brings me to the specific point of, you know, almost half of the funding is being cut from the population refugee and migration budget.

You know, I am deeply concerned about vulnerable populations like Afro-Colombians and the indigenous that Mr. Faleomavaega was talking about, that live in the crossfire conflicts that are not of their own making, and to renew any of the progress we have made to make their lives more secure as a result of our own hemisphere, or our own hemisphere more secure.

So my question, Madam Secretary, is since the United States is a leader in protection of displaced populations, what impact could funding cuts for the migration and refugee assistance account have on assistance of refugees overseas? How could reducing funding for assistance and programs that serve forcibly displaced populations impact the United States' interests in such areas as Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Sudan? And what are the major concerns the

Department of State has regarding the consequences of drastically reducing assistance to refugees?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, thank you so much, Congressman, and thank you for raising the refugee assistance issue. The United States has been, and I hope will remain, the leader in dealing with refugee challenges, internally displaced people, people fleeing from conflicts; and it has been one of the areas where we are able to claim that we put our values into action because we are there on the ground.

You have been in refugee camps. You see the USAID big sign there. You know what it means to have experienced development experts who provide the base for a safe place, whether it is in eastern Congo or from a flood in Pakistan or in Haiti or anywhere else. So this is a particular concern, that we be prepared to continue the humanitarian work that undergirds a lot of what people know about us around the world.

Now I have fought to be sure that when we go into these post conflict, post disaster situations, the United States' brand is front and center. You know, there was when I got there, a feeling that maybe we shouldn't be, so to speak, trumpeting our own horn. My attitude is, if the American taxpayers that are putting that money out there, if people don't want American aid, if they don't want USAID and our programs to be there helping them, then we won't be there, but if they are going to take it, then we are going to be advertising it.

So I think it is a big part of what we are doing, because what I found as I started traveling around the world is that a lot of people didn't know what we did. You know, they said, "Well, wait a minute, you know, the Chinese are doing this and the Saudis are doing that and so and so are doing that." I said, "Yeah, we have got more money in there than those guys combined, and we are going to get credit for it."

So it is not only doing the right thing, which should be the primary reason we do it, but frankly, I want to build the American brand again so that when people get food, clean water, shelter, they know where it came from. It came from the generosity of the American people. And so this is for me a big issue and we are doing even more to try to get that message out so that we can be the leader that I think the American people, with their generosity, want us to be.

Mr. MEEKS. Let me just ask this. I know you won't get a chance to answer because of the time. The other concern I wanted to raise was of the northern distribution network and how effective it has been for the U.S. efforts in Afghanistan and what can be done in utilizing the network to improve U.S. relations more broadly in central Asia. Again, with Mr. Faleomavaega and being on this trip recently with him, we haven't connected with all of those countries. It is such an important part of the world.

Secretary CLINTON. Absolutely. That is a big part of it. Thank you.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, and now I am pleased to give 5 minutes to Mr. Chabot of Ohio, our new Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia chairman. Mr. Chabot.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Before beginning my questions, Madam Secretary, let me remind some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who keep bemoaning the cuts in the CR that we are broke, and the only reason that this Congress is even dealing with the CR is because the last Congress couldn't even pass a budget for the first time in 34 years, at least in the House, and then couldn't pass appropriations bills to keep the government functioning.

So that being said, let me begin my first question with Libya. Madam Secretary, it is difficult to look at the initial U.S. response to the unrest in Libya and think of any word other than "tepid." Although the administration has suggested that its initial reaction was tempered in order to avoid provoking a hostage situation, such fears did not seem to hinder other nations. The Chinese dispatched a frigate and the British dispatched at least two warships and employed C–130s during their evacuation operation. At the same time, our rented ferry was stuck in port because it could not initially make the journey across the Mediterranean.

Everything that we have learned about the Qadhafi regime over the past decade indicates that its leadership responds to force or the threat of force. For example, back in 2003 when Qadhafi, after looking at the ease with which the U.S. military—at least at first—dispatched the Iraqi Army, they feared that he might be next. His response was to agree to renounce all terrorism and hand over to the United States his entire WMD program.

By sending ships to the Libyan coast, the British and Chinese effectively told Qadhafi that there would be a steep price in intervening in their evacuation. Why did we not do the same? Although we are now repositioning forces off the Libyan coast, our unwillingness to use or to threaten to use force to protect our own citizens has left many around the world pointing to this incident as a sign of weakness of America's will.

What led the administration to believe that threatening force to protect our own citizens would have been provocative?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, first, let me say that other countries don't have the same history with Libya that we do. And if you look at some of the early statements that were coming out of Qadhafi and his leadership team, they didn't talk about the Chinese. They talked about the Americans.

Our Embassy was overrun in Libya in 1979. We feel that we did this in a prudent and effective manner, and we did it in a way that did not raise the alarm bells around the region and the world that we were about to invade for oil. If you follow, as we follow, all of the Web sites that are looking at what is happening in the Middle East, you see a constant drum beat that the United States is going to invade Libya to take over the oil and we can't let that happen.

Well, we are not going to do that and we are going to side with the Libyan people in their aspirations, but the last thing in the world we wanted was to start off with military assets when we very effectively got our people out. Yeah, the seas were high; the seas were high for the other evacuators as well.

I disagree fundamentally with your assumption. I see no evidence that anybody thinks less of us because we were smart about how we got our people—not only Embassy people but American citizens who were working in Libya—out safely. And as soon as we

did, we pivoted very quickly and led the way at the Security Council, have led the way in pushing beyond rhetoric with the Europeans and the others. It is easy to make a speech. It is harder to actually impose a sanction, freeze the assets, target the arms, et cetera, and I think we handled this in a very effective way and without a single problem for any American.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Secretary, let me move on. We have limited time, obviously.

On the Iranian nuclear program, I would like to talk about that next, briefly. During the latest round of negotiations with the Iranian regime in Istanbul, the Iranians were adamant in emphasizing their right to indigenous enrichment. A recent bipartisan letter from numerous Senators reflects the overwhelming view of Congress on this question. It is still, however, unclear what the administration's position on this issue is. The letter cited reports suggesting that the administration is open to an indigenous Iranian enrichment capability, albeit under certain conditions.

The so-called Einhorn Plan would allow Iran to maintain 4,000 centrifuges. The U.N. even went so far as to suggest during an interview with the BBC that Iran has a right to enrichment. Article IV of the on the Nonproliferation Treaty, the source of the Iranian claim, is not clear on this point. What is the administration's position on Iran's claim that they have a right to an enrichment program on their soil, and does the administration believe that the current regime should be allowed to enrich or reprocess domestically?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, it has been our position that, under very strict conditions, Iran would sometime in the future, having responded to the international community's concerns and irreversibly shut down its nuclear weapons program, have such a right under IAEA inspection. I think that is the position of the international community, along with the United States.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Thank you. Mr. Carnahan, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. And the reason I interrupt is we have got limited time, and everyone wants to ask questions. So I apologize, Madam Secretary.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and welcome, Secretary Clinton.

Personally, for the work that you do on behalf of the people I represent in Missouri, we really appreciate you being a one-person voice of America at a time when we really need it. So thank you.

I wanted to submit two questions to you in writing, one about our continued work. We had an Oversight Subcommittee hearing last year. We heard from Stewart Bowen, and would like to get an update on the transition efforts in terms of reconstruction, how that process is going, and also would like to get a written question in to you about the ongoing engagement with Bosnia for constitutional reforms and the need for U.S. engagement with the EU.

But I would like to focus my question about the voices of democracy that are really rising across the Middle East, North Africa and elsewhere, and the need to reevaluate our public diplomacy tools.

Certainly, looking beyond our traditional state-to-state diplomatic efforts but about citizen-to-citizen diplomacy, the cost effec-

tiveness of that—I am especially reminded of that. This past week I had a bipartisan town hall meeting with Congresswomen Emerson and Clay at Washington University. And a student came up to me there who studied in Cairo the previous year, was continuing to have contact with students there in Cairo, and how these kinds of engagements are so critical in those countries. Could you talk about that?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, I agree with that completely, Congressman. If I could double or triple our student exchanges, particularly into this region right now where we have more of our students going to Cairo, to Tunis, to Oman, to places where young people are voicing their desire for democracy and more people coming from those regions, we have tried to increase our international visitors program and specialized programs, but I am a big believer in people-to-people diplomacy, and I would like to see us do even more of that.

Mr. CARNAHAN. And what about the use of new media?

Secretary CLINTON. We are moving very rapidly on the use of new media. I have an extraordinary team of young people, as you might expect, who are leading the charge on this, and it has totally changed how we are communicating; because, you know, Twitter, Facebook, they are in real-time, and you can't overlook broadcasting, and frankly, I wish we were doing a better job in our broadcasting efforts.

I met with Walter Isaacson, who is the new chair of the Broadcasting Board of Governors. Aljazeera is a 24/7 entity. The Chinese have started an English language television network. The Russians have started an English language television network. We should be by far the most effective in communicating.

So, yes, social media is very important, but still most people in the world get their news and their images from television and radio. So we can't forget old media while we try to break new ground in new media.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you. And finally, I wanted to touch on another hearing we had last year. We had Ambassador-At-Large Verveer here talking about women's empowerment worldwide. I really have serious concerns about the recently passed CR, the reinstatement of the global gag rule, the reductions in international family planning and global health assistance; as you mentioned, some of the programs that President George W. Bush was so supportive of. Could you talk about how this will impact women who are so vital to development, how it will impact those communities and, in fact, translate to our national and our economic security?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, thank you, Congressman. This is very close to my heart, and as you know, a woman dies from complications in childbirth every minute, about 529,000 each year, and we have made a lot of progress but we have a long way to go. And I am worried that, you know, the House 2011 budget proposes more than $1 billion in cuts to global health.

What that means is that 5 million children and family members will be denied treatment or preventive intervention; on malaria, 4,500 others; and more than 40,000 children under 5, of which 16,000 are newborns, will not get access to effective child survival intervention. PEPFAR will have to turn away 400,000 people who

require lifesaving treatment against HIV/AIDS. More than 16 million people will be denied treatment for debilitating tropical diseases. More than 40,000 children and family members will be denied treatment for tuberculosis, and we will have 18.8 million fewer polio vaccinations and 26.3 million fewer measles vaccinations. That affects us.

I woke up this morning and was listening to the news and heard about the effort to find some woman who is wandering around Washington with measles. So this is not just what we fail now to do for others; it is how that will come back and affect our own health here at home.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Mr. Paul of Texas.

Mr. PAUL. I thank you, Madam Chairman, and welcome, Madam Secretary.

I want to comment first about the demonstrations and the change of governments going on in the Middle East and the Mediterranean. I think everybody is excited about that and always hopeful. I am hopeful, but not overly optimistic, because of the long-term history of 1,000 years that they don't readily adapt to true liberty.

The one thing, though, that might be different is the use of the Internet, and that is very positive. And yet governments are very strong, and that was the first thing they closed down over there, because the last thing governments want is information to get out.

But a lot of people in this country have come to the conclusion that our policy overall has been inconsistent; that sometimes we support the bad guys and the bad guys become our enemies. For instance, you know, we worked with Osama bin Laden when he was fighting the Soviets. We were allies with Saddam Hussein when he was fighting the Iranians. We certainly propped up the Shah of Iran for 26 years, and that bred resentment and hatred that ushered in an age that now you are dealing with because we have radicals, you know, in Iran. So it goes on and on.

We now have propped up Saudi Arabia for a long time, sold them a lot of weapons, and yet 15 of the Saudis were part of the 9/11 disaster, and even the 9–11 Commission said that our presence there had a lot to do with that.

We keep supporting Algeria and Morocco and Yemen and all these dictators, and yet we pretend that as soon as it looks like the dictator might fall, oh, we are all for democracy and we are for freedom and we are against these dictators. I don't think the people there understand. I don't think our people in this country quite understand either.

You mentioned in your comments about Libya, that nothing should be taken off the table, which is to me a little frightening, because the previous administration would say that when they would be asked questions about first strikes, preemptive war, nuclear first attacks. That scares the living daylights out of me when nothing is taken off the table, and I dread the fact that we might be considering military activity in Libya. I mean, we are flat-out broke. We are in all these countries. War is expanding. We are bombing in Pakistan. We are dealing in Yemen. We really don't

have total control of Iraq, and partial control of Afghanistan, and it goes on and on.

But the question I have is, isn't there a limit to supporting these dictators? And I, of course, take a position which the least involvement, the better; and deal with people on different terms rather than saying, you know, we will buy our friends. I think a friend bought is not a friend, and I think a friend that is coerced by military power is not a friend and breeds resentment.

What is wrong with swearing off support for and aid for all dictators? Just think what might happen in the Middle East, if we did that—I mean, here we have supported Egypt, $70 billion. They have a lot of weaponry there, and who knows what kind of friends they are going to be with Israel? Has this been beneficial to Israel with all these weapons here? Why wouldn't Israel be a lot better off if we swore off all aid to all dictators in that country as a moral position, and as a good position for our national defense and our national security, as well as a good position for Israel.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, you make a very passionate argument, and my response is that the United States over the course of its entire diplomatic history has had to make some very difficult decisions. We try to balance what we believe to be in our interests. Sometimes, and I would argue most times, we get it right; sometimes we don't.

Take Egypt, for example. I believe that it was in America's interests and in Israel's interests to support Egypt following the Camp David Accord. Thirty years of peace between Egypt and Israel, albeit not a warm and fuzzy peace but nevertheless a peace, was an essential element of Israel's ability to develop and continue to strengthen itself and in a very tough neighborhood.

The fact that we did have those relationships in Egypt made it possible for us to have very, very frank conversations and prevent what we now see going on in Libya.

Mr. PAUL. May I interrupt just a second to ask, is there no chance in the world that Israel might not be better off under these conditions? It seems like they could be worse off with what is happening over there, mainly because these dictators will have our weapons and they may well be turned against Israel?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, you know, I think the qualitative military edge that we guarantee Israel protects against that. I think Israel, certainly in my conversations at the highest levels, prefer predictability, prefer stability, do not want vacuums created that could lead to very bad outcomes for them.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Mr. Sires of New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Madam Secretary, I want to thank you for the service that you give this country, all these years that you have, and the way you carry and represent the country throughout the world. Thank you very much.

I have a couple of questions. I hope I get them in. The other day, Defense Secretary Gates made a statement that was certainly very curious. He said that any Secretary of Defense that can recommend that we use ground forces, to the President, should have his head examined.

The wars that we are in, all the billions of dollars that lead to part of the deficit that we are carrying in this country, is that a recognition that, really, unless it comes from the people of those countries, that we really shouldn't go in with armies into some of these countries because we are just going to squander our resources and we are not going to really get anywhere?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, I think that what the Secretary of Defense was saying should be heeded. It is a very strong warning. But I also believe that there are situations where we have no choice, but we need to be very clear that it is the only and best choice available to us.

Mr. SIRES. Because I am concerned about this package that we have now in Libya and some of these countries. So I hope we don't get ourselves into a ground war.

My second issue has to do with Cuba. Obviously, we seem to be making concessions and we seem to be doing all the things that the Government of Cuba wants. And yet, at the same time, they are one of the biggest abusers of human rights. Just last week, they put more people in jail. They beat up Zapata's mother, who is the political prisoner dying in jail, and yet we have appropriated $20 million for human rights activities in Cuba, and we haven't spent a dime of it.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, we are committed to spending that money. We are trying to do so in a way that will strengthen direct engagement with the Cuban people. I know you are very aware not only of the terrible abuses by the Castro government against Cubans but the holding of Alan Gross, one of our USAID personnel who was trying to get aid into Cuba to help the Cuban people. So we remain committed to advancing policies that will assist Cubans on the ground, and we are committed to freedom and democracy for the Cuban people.

Mr. SIRES. Madam Secretary, I happen to have gone to Colombia for the swearing in of the new President. I have to tell you it was a great moment for me, a great honor to be there. But I thought that it was a little weak in terms of representation from our State Department that we have this neighbor, that we have this great ally, and yet there was a delegation of Congress people that went but we didn't see too many people from the State Department representing this country.

And now I see that the President of the United States is going to fly from Brazil, right over Colombia, into El Salvador and is not stopping in Colombia. I have been hearing what a great neighbor, what a great friend, what a great ally Colombia is, and yet we seem to basically don't do the right thing. They have made remarkable changes in their country over the last few years. As you talk to different people—I go to Colombia just about every year—I see the changes. Isn't it about time we move on Colombia and Panama and some of these issues?

Secretary CLINTON. First, Congressman, thank you for going. The representation by the United States is only part of our engagement with Colombia and in particular with President Santos. We have maintained very close relations with him and with his government. We think he is doing an extraordinary job, and we are very proud that the United States has been a partner for the Colombian people

now for a long time so that they can realize the benefits of the development that you have attested to.

We are strong supporters of the Colombia and the Panamanian Free Trade Agreement. I would like to see those two, plus Korea, passed this year. I think it is in America's interest, and we are working very closely with the Colombians and with the Congress to try to make sure we can do that.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Sires.

Mr. Pence, the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia, is recognized.

Mr. PENCE. Thank you, Chairman.

I want to thank the Secretary of State for her testimony and for her service to the country. It is good to see you back before the committee.

I also want to thank you specifically for the efforts by the administration and your offices to further isolate Libya during a time of extraordinary tragedy in the streets, tragedy of which I think we are probably only partially aware. I want to continue to encourage and urge the administration to stand with those that are standing in that now-bifurcated country to use all means at our disposal to provide support and certainly associate myself with Mr. Royce's comments about isolating radio communications and would express appreciation for your efforts at Geneva and elsewhere to facilitate a coordinated international response, including a no-fly zone. Qadhafi must go. I am grateful to hear the Secretary of State and the administration take that position unambiguously.

I also want to thank you for mentioning President George W. Bush's PEPFAR initiative in your testimony. We haven't gotten quite as much praise about that in the last couple of years as I think is warranted. Your comments are most welcome.

Let me take you back. In your testimony today, Madam Secretary, on page 5 you make reference to the 16-percent cut for State and USAID as potentially being "devastating to our national security." I allow you your opinion on that, of course.

Let me say, though, that I am more associated with your statement on September 10, 2010, in which you were quoted as saying: "Our rising debt levels pose a national security threat." It was in remarks that you made to the Council on Foreign Relations.

A couple of facts, and then I would love to get your response to them.

You used the number 16-percent cut, and I won't question your staff's arithmetic on that. We had a pretty long debate over the continuing resolution. But as we have broken it down, the projects that were eliminated in the base text, for your information, include $300 million in contribution to the Clean Technology Fund; $75 million eliminated in the Strategic Climate Fund; $55 million eliminated from the United Nations Population Fund, a fund that has been a source of great controversy; $5.75 eliminated from Cultural Preservation. Global Diversity Trust took a $10 million hit. You will forgive me, Madam Secretary, if I see none of those as devastating to our national security.

Also, in terms of the reductions of programs, even after you factor in the programs that were eliminated and those that were re-

duced, as the chairman pointed out earlier there is still a rather significant increase in spending over 2008 levels. And at a time when we are facing a $1.65 trillion deficit—a deficit contributed to by leadership of both political parties, let me stipulate—we are facing a $14 trillion national debt, which could well double over the next 10 years, I find myself more associating with your September comments before the Council on Foreign Relations than with the assertion that a 16-percent cut in a State and USAID budget that has been greatly expanded in the last 3 years is in fact, to use your words, devastating to our national security.

So I raise that by way of asking for your response about where do we cut, where do we begin? If we can't do without programs like the Clean Technology Fund, the Strategic Climate Fund, the Fund for Cultural Preservation, if we can't suffer a modest reduction that still leave us above the 2008 levels, I would welcome your response to where we do begin to put our fiscal house in order.

Because I was one of the members of this committee that helped to engineer a couple of times the passage of the PEPFAR program. Despite my cheerful conservative record, I believe that the compassion of the American people is expressed in the manner in which we come alongside other nations, particularly those in the two-thirds world, particularly those at the point of the need.

But we are in trouble here. This country is going broke. We have to ask every department of this government—with the exception, I would allow, of people that are downrange in the field wearing our uniform and our veterans—I think we have got to look at every aspect of the government and say, Where can we save?

So where is the right place to start in what remains at the time?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, I really appreciate your thoughtful question, and I recognize the dilemma. I guess my plea would be that we look hard at what we are doing that is part of national security. I would like to see what we are doing in the frontline states, for example, treated in the same way as the military overseas contingency operations are treated. Because what will happen is that the obligations that we face in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, which are really in support of the courage of our military that has sacrificed so much, is either going to save the gains or lose the gains over the next few years.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary. I do apologize.

My Florida colleague, Mr. Deutch of Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Welcome, Madam Secretary. I would like to add my voice as well to thanking you for your passionate defense of American values as you travel throughout the globe as our top diplomat.

There were reports that surfaced last week about the IAEA quarterly report that has disclosed new information that Iran is exploring ways to militarize its nuclear weapons program, including ways to affix atomic weapons on long-range missiles. Further, the report stated that Iran is trying to move advanced centrifuges into Natanz that could reduce the amount of time needed to produce weapons-grade fuel. Iran is continuing to expand its production of nuclear fuel, according to the IAEA. They now possess over 8,000 pounds

of low-enriched uranium, enough to build two to three nuclear weapons should they proceed with weaponization.

The President stated in his first press conference as President of the United States that Iran's development of a nuclear weapon is unacceptable and that we have to mount an international effort to prevent that from happening. I would ask, Madam Secretary, as a start, if you could speak to the efforts of the administration and the State Department specifically in enforcing CISADA's successes to date, and then I will have a follow-up.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you very much, Congressman.

We have, we think, put together, thanks to the work of this committee and others, a very effective sanctions regime which we are constantly looking to improve, to tighten, to strengthen; and we welcome the advice from this committee particularly.

When we passed CISADA, it was on top of the Iran Sanctions Act. Last fall, I imposed sanctions for the first time in the history of the Iran Sanctions Act on the Swiss-based, Iranian-owned firm NaftIran Intertrade Company, so-called NICO. It was a major investor in a number of oil and gas projects in Iran. We also took the advantage of what was in CISADA to begin to sanction on human rights. We got more designations in addition to what we have already done coming.

We have used CISADA to convince Shell, State Oil, ENI, Total, and Impex to withdraw from Iran and promise not to do any further business in Iran's oil sector. We have worked with a number of our partners to see these kinds of developments. A number of shipping companies have discontinued services to Iran. Several maritime shipping insurers have announced they will not provide coverage for Iran-bound vessels. Major energy traders have discontinued the sale of refined products to Iran.

As a result of restrictions on gas exports, it has been forced to convert lucrative petrochemical plants to produce low-quality gasoline, costing them millions in revenue. They have reduced their gasoline subsidies, increasing the prices 400 percent and 2,000 percent for diesel fuel. That has all had an amplifying effect on negative trends in the Iranian mismanaged economy. And we continue our international outreach. We have informed firms that we are going to add additional sanctions.

So we think we have made progress with international support, but we have more that we think we need to do.

Mr. DEUTCH. I appreciate that, Madam Secretary.

Along those same lines, China recently announced a $2.5 billion new investment in Iran's oil production. How is the Department dealing with China's continued evasion of sanctions and what leverage do we have with the Chinese to urge, if not force, compliance?

Secretary CLINTON. We actually have worked closely with the Chinese, but it is a never-ending effort. They are hungry for energy. They do not see Iran particularly as a threat to them. So they, after much diplomatic effort and arm-twisting, went along with the Iran Sanctions Act in the Security Council, but it is a constant, committed, determined effort for us to keep them abiding by the sanctions they agreed to. We literally work on it every day.

Mr. DEUTCH. Finally, the Office of Terrorism Finance and Economic Sanctions Policy, the office that is charged with enforcing these sanctions, runs on, at least with respect to Iran, a staff of essentially four people. So the question I have is, won't we be jeopardizing national and international security if they don't have the appropriate funds, if the cuts go through, in order to enforce these sanctions that exist?

Secretary CLINTON. We have had such a terrific team both at the Treasury Department and in the State Department. I was the first person who set up a designated sanctions operation inside the State Department because we went to all this trouble to pass sanctions on North Korea, pass sanctions on Iran, and then we just didn't follow through the way I wanted to see. So it is important we keep doing that.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the chair of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Mr. Mack of Florida.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Madam Chair; and, Madam Secretary, it is great to see you again.

Just a quick statement. As I have listened to my colleagues on both sides and your opening statement, Madam Secretary, more money is not leadership. Leadership comes from within one's character and a clarity of purpose. Let me suggest that America's leadership lies in freedom and in an understanding that freedom is the core of all human progress. So as we talk about budget issues, I think it is important to understand that it is America's leadership in freedom that matters around the world.

I was interested to hear your responses to my colleagues' questions in particular about the Iran Sanctions Act and how you have applied sanctions already. My first question is, if Venezuela is in violation of U.S. sanctions on Iran, will you act?

Secretary CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. MACK. Have you seen the published, signed contracts that guarantee the transfer and liability of two cargos of gasoline from Venezuela to Iran?

Secretary CLINTON. We have seen a lot of statements and contracts coming out of Venezuela, but we don't see much follow-through yet.

Mr. MACK. Madam Chair, I would like to submit this for the record.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Without objection.

Mr. MACK. Assistant Secretary Valenzuela testified before the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee that Iran is in violation of sanctions. Let me ask you this question again. Will you act on this violation?

Secretary CLINTON. Of course, if there is a violation. Currently, our best information is that their relationship is largely diplomatic and commercial and has not moved in the direction they keep talking about. But we follow it closely. If there is evidence that they have violated the sanctions, we will come down on them.

Mr. MACK. Well, again, I would suggest that you look back at the documents where I think it shows that they are in violation; and your own Assistant Secretary Valenzuela testified that they are in violation of the Act. As part of the Iran Sanctions Act—I think it

is section 7 of the Iran Sanctions Act—that the Secretary of State may issue an advisory opinion explaining whether an action is in violation. And myself, the citizens of the United States, and people around the world are looking forward to your advisory opinion on whether you think Venezuela is in violation.

I think it is pretty clear that Hugo Chavez supports regimes, dictators, the destruction of human rights. This is not someone that we want to align ourselves with. In fact, I was disturbed to hear that he was asking Qadhafi—or letting Qadhafi come to Venezuela. Whether that is true or not, the fact that he thinks that that is a good thing is shocking to me. So I look forward to your response on this. I think the evidence is pretty clear.

The Assistant Secretary also talked about Chavez supporting international terrorist organizations. In fact, he agrees with me that Chavez is supporting international terrorist organizations. Do you believe Mr. Valenzuela's statement that Chavez is supporting terrorist organizations?

Secretary CLINTON. First, Congressman, I agree with your description of his statements, his rhetoric, which is deeply troubling and deplorable. We constantly look for evidence. We have a certain evidence standard that we have to meet that the Congress has set.

Mr. MACK. Madam Secretary, I think it is out there, and we are dying for you to act. We cannot continue to wait. Action must be taken on this.

Let me ask you another question, since I only have about 45 seconds. Joe Kennedy, who draws about a $600,000 salary from his supposed nonprofit Citizens Energy, is a public relations shield for Hugo Chavez. We all know the record of Chavez, but Joe Kennedy continues to promote this dictator while lining his own pockets. I have condemned Joe Kennedy. Are you prepared to condemn Joe Kennedy for continuing to support and be a shill Hugo Chavez?

Secretary CLINTON. I am not going to condemn him. I have no information that leads me to that conclusion. But we will get back to you, and we will certainly brief you and your staff on what we actually know. And if you have additional evidence on Chavez——

Mr. MACK. Madam Secretary, on Joe Kennedy, all you need to do is watch the nightly news and see the commercials that he is running in support of Chavez.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Mack.

I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to Mr. Cardoza of California.

Mr. CARDOZA. I would like to thank my friend, the chairwoman of this committee, and thank her for the great job that she does.

Madam Secretary, thank you for being here with us. Thank you for your continued outstanding service to our country.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you.

Mr. CARDOZA. I am a huge fan; and, because of that, I am going to actually allow you to answer the question that I ask.

Madam Secretary, at least 70 people were killed during an attack last October in Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad, making it the worst massacre of Iraqi Christians since 2003. Less than 2 months later, extremists bombed the homes of more than a dozen Christian families in Baghdad as well. On New Year's Eve, 23 people were killed by a suicide bomber in Alexandria, Egypt, while coming out of Mass at St. Mark's and St. Peter's Coptic Church.

Since these tragic incidents, the Middle East has been rocked by wide-ranging democratic protests and regime changes, as we have seen in the last few weeks. How has this ongoing instability affected the already heightened risk to vulnerable religious minority groups like Assyrians, Jews, Copts, and others?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, thank you for asking that question. I think this has not gotten the level of attention and concern that it should. We immediately went into action when the bombings took place in Baghdad. Our Ambassador was deeply involved with the government, making sure that there was protection and security. The Ambassador went to Mass in order to show solidarity with Iraqi Christians. But there is no doubt that Christians and other minority groups are feeling under pressure and are leaving countries from North Africa to South Asia because they don't feel protected.

I think we need to do much more to stand up for the rights of religious minorities. And, obviously, I am deeply concerned about what happened to the Christians in Iraq and the Christians in Egypt. I am also concerned about what happens to minority Muslim groups in Pakistan and elsewhere. So you have raised an issue that I think is one of deep concern, and we have to be speaking out more, and we have to hold governments accountable.

When I spoke with the prior Egyptian Government after the Alexandria bombing, they expressed the same level of outrage that I felt. They said that the Copts are part of Egyptian history. As you recall from Tahrir Square, there was a lot of interfaith efforts with Copts and Muslims worshipping together. Let's hope that continues and let's do whatever we can to make that the future, instead of what I am fearful of, which is driving out religious minorities.

The final thing I would say on that, because it is an issue I have paid a lot of attention to, we want to protect religion and religious believers, but we don't want to use some of the tools that other countries are proposing, which is to criminalize defamation, criminalize in the broadest possible definition blasphemy, and then use it to execute, harass, and otherwise oppress religious minorities.

So we have to come up with an international consensus about what we are going to do to protect those who are exercising their conscience.

Mr. CARDOZA. Thank you very much.

My second question deals with the events again that have highlighted the unique role Israel plays in the Middle East as a reliable, stable, and democratic ally that shares our values and interest. Likewise, there is no question that the tumult throughout the region and especially in Egypt raises strategic questions for Israel.

My question is this. Is the administration in close contact with the Government of Israel about the impact of recent events on Israel's QME and possible new threats it faces? In light of the current uncertainty, is the administration reconsidering the massive sales of advance weaponry in the region, some of which were already notified, in order to protect the quality military advantage?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, first let me say we are in constant, probably daily, contact with our counterparts in the Israeli Government at all levels of our Government.

Secondly, the Qualitative Military Edge is absolutely a commitment that this administration has followed up on. Secretary Gates has said publicly and privately on numerous occasions that in the last 2 years we have probably done more to enhance Israel's defense than at any previous period. This administration has delivered for Israel. It is not maybe as well known because it is both public and classified, but I want to make sure that members of the committee know that this administration time and again has made sure that Israel has what it needs to protect itself.

Of course, we discuss with Israel other actions that we take in the region. I think right now we are all in agreement about what we need to be doing.

Mr. CARDOZA. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Cardoza, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Fortenberry, the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Madam Chair; and thank you, Madam Secretary, for joining us today. I just read your remarks to the Human Rights Council from yesterday. Well done.

Madam Secretary, as we consider the administration's nearly $61 billion in International Affairs budget request, I believe we must balance two factors: First is the threat posed by unprecedented levels of national debt; second, with the essential necessity to engage with other nations for our national security purpose while also upholding our noblest ideals. But our primary responsibility is to the American people. They must know that the Federal Government is wisely spending their tax dollars and ensuring that our programs reflect their core values.

I think we also must do the right thing by standing with those throughout the world who need and merit our support. The historic upheavals in recent weeks in the Middle East demonstrate before the world an operative American principle that the legitimacy of government derives from the consent of the governed. Our policies must reflect this Nation's enduring commitment to legitimate government, to human dignity, as well as to economic engagement for the well-being of persons.

Madam Secretary, for decades, U.S. policy has assumed that political and human rights gains would inevitably flow from economic liberalization. That assumption, however well-intended, sometimes is lacking. It has it its drawbacks.

Look at China, for instance. China gives cover to North Korea's nuclear weapons programs; China trades with Iran; China does not respect human rights, including the barbaric practice of forced abortion and sterilization. China is probably jamming coverage of this hearing today, and they have jammed coverage of the events throughout the Middle East.

Let's look at Iran. In Iran, human dignity is trampled in the name of religious dictatorship and autocracy. Iran is also seeking aggressively nuclear weapons capability, and it crushes dissent.

So, Madam Secretary, three questions.

Is it time for the United States and members of the responsible international community to speak boldly, clearly, and frequently in support of the people of Iran who are seeking a more just and mod-

erate government? Why do people have the right to live free from fear in Tripoli but not in Tehran?

Secondly, is it time for the United States to singularly elevate the role of human rights, universal rights, in our bilateral relationship with China?

And, third, as you touched upon in the last question, what will the administration do to emphasize to governments in transition throughout the Middle East that religious freedom is a universal and indispensable aspect of a vibrant democracy?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, thank you very much, Congressman. Thank you for your leadership on these important issues. I agree that it must be a constant and loud chorus coming from not only the United States but like-minded countries in favor of human rights in Iran.

I do think that we have seen the active opposition crushed and oppressed. Our latest information is that Mousavi and Karoubi may be imprisoned. There is dispute about that, but they are certainly under house arrest, if they are not actually in prison.

What many had advised before, that we not throw ourselves into the middle of their legitimate uprising, may be moot. Therefore, as I said yesterday, as a statement that I issued a few days ago, we have to go chapter and verse about everything that Iran is doing that abuses the rights of its own people and exposes their hypocrisy as they try to somehow identify with the legitimate aspirations for democracy and human rights in the region.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. This is a shift or new emphasis in our policy?

Secretary CLINTON. We have always taken that position, but we have tried to modulate it to some extent, Congressman, because of the warnings we were receiving from within Iran and outside Iran. You speak to some of the same experts who were worried that the regime would basically paint everybody who opposed them as American stooges. So we have done a lot of messaging, but I think it is fair to conclude that at this point in time the more we can point out their double standard and their hypocrisy the better off we will be.

Secondly, on China, we always raise human rights. I raise it all the time. The President, I know, raises it. I was jammed in 1995. My Internet speech was jammed a few weeks ago. So I am well aware of how they try to control information. We will continue to raise these issues, and we will continue to try to help those who are inside.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Sorry to jam you, Madam Secretary, and interfere with the transmission as well.

Mr. Chandler of Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. CHANDLER. Madam Secretary, I want to join with some of my colleagues up here and thank you very much for your service. I think that your representation of our country is carried out very thoughtfully, very ably, and with a great deal of class. I thank you for that.

By the time you get to where I am in the order here of questions, most of the important questions have been asked. But I actually have a couple that I think are particularly important.

With what is going on in Tunisia now, I think it is safe to say that this is one of the most important times in that country's his-

tory. It is also a country that has been a very important ally of ours. And yet our budget requests and what is happening with our budget suggests that we are getting ready to administer an enormous cut in aid to Tunisia, I think from the neighborhood of $22 million down to $6 million. I am concerned about that, and I would like you to address what kind of message that sends at this critical juncture.

Secondly, Syria. There are those who believe that peace with Syria is absolutely essential and would be a tremendous turning point in the peace process, and there are those who are of the school of thought that that is a possibility and that it would be beneficial to the Bashar Assad regime. There are others who believe that Syria has—well, that the Alawi minority government there, the regime there, is utterly dependent upon casting the United States and Israel in the role of the enemy, that their regime maintenance depends upon it. And in fact the actions of the Syrians and their rhetoric seems to bear this out.

Obviously, they have spent a great deal of time in efforts to have a stronger alliance with Iran. They have been helping terrorists across the board, it seems like, from Hezbollah to terrorists within Iraq to Palestinian terrorist groups.

What do you think about the Syrian situation? Do you see any signs that the Syrians are improving their behavior? And has Syria taken any steps to improve its relationship with us?

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you, Congressman.

If I could, before Congressman Fortenberry leaves, I just wanted to make sure the record reflects that Function 150, Congressman, is $50.9 billion. That includes Treasury money, MCC, Peace Corps. State-USAID is $47 billion. Then the overseas contingency operation is $8.7 billion. So we get a total of $55 billion. I just wanted to make sure that we are talking apples and apples here. Because you are right that there are other funding streams. Treasury supports our commitments to the World Bank, obviously, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps, and then other small agencies.

Thank you, sir.

Congressman, first, on Tunisia, I think Tunisia has to work. Tunisia is a much smaller country. It is in many ways a more middle-class country. It has a great potential because of the way that it has dealt with its transformation, and we need to be on the ground helping. So I agree with you that cutting aid to Tunisia right now would be maybe penny wise but pound foolish.

Although there are Europeans who wish to assist in Tunisia, the Tunisians, as I heard directly from the Tunisian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs yesterday in Geneva, the Tunisians remember when the United States stood for their independence in the 1960s. They remember that many of our European friends were colonizers in North Africa. They want the United States there helping to support them in their transition to democracy. We could make a real model in the Middle East by assisting Tunisia.

Mr. CHANDLER. You need to amend your budget request.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, we do. We do. But first I have got to figure out what I have got left after you guys get done with me. I keep putting up these warning signals.

With respect to Syria, you outlined very well the differing currents that are at work inside Syria, in Syria's relationship with the region, particularly Syria's relationship with Israel. Obviously, we would support anything that Israel would decide is in Israel's best interest in dealing with Syria.

We caution and raise a lot of concerns about what we see as Syria's relationship with Iran, Syria's relationship with Hezbollah. That is not in Israel's interest, it is not in America's interest, and, frankly, we don't think it is in Syria's long-term interest.

So we sent back an ambassador, as you know, because we think it is better to be on the ground talking, picking up information, conveying messages, and we hope that we will get a clearer view forward.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary.

Mr. McCaul, the vice chair of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Madam Chair; and, Madam Secretary, welcome.

Two questions, one with respect to Iran, one and with respect to Mexico.

You mentioned Israel prefers stability over a power vacuum, and I agree with that. I think what we are seeing in the Middle East is a power vacuum; and the question is, who is going to fill that void? Is it going to be filled by a secular movement or by forces like the Muslim Brotherhood? Or, as we look at Iran, is Iran going to take this opportunity to fill the vacuum?

We know two Iranian vessels were in the Suez Canal, the first time since 1979. We support emerging democracies. I think that is the correct policy for this country. And we are supporting the forces in Egypt and Libya. But when it comes to Iran, who has, as you mentioned earlier, oppressed its own people and fired tear gas and shot its own people, at least there is the appearance that the administration has been sort of silent on the issue, and yet I think there is a golden opportunity for us at this point in time to support the resistance movement in Iran. Why aren't we doing this more forcefully?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I would argue that we are, that we are doing it forcefully, in many ways, and we will continue to do so.

But I want to underscore the first point you made, which is that there is no doubt in my mind that if we are not present, and present in resources, not just in rhetoric, not just saying what we are for, but being able to deliver on that, others will fill that vacuum. The Middle East abhors a vacuum. We know that from long experience.

So while we message against Iran, if that is all we do, we are not going to be in the game. We have got to be on the ground. That is why we need diplomacy and development to be viewed as national security, so that when these young people on the street say, Well, how do we write a Constitution?, it is the United States and our allies who are there to help, not the Iranians.

But if anybody doubts that, despite all of the sanctions and the best efforts of the international community to isolate, condemn

what Iran has done, that they are not in there every single day with as many assets as they can muster trying to take hold of this legitimate movement for democracy, you are sadly mistaken. We are in a competition. I just stress that over and over again, that we have got to be there. We have got to fight back.

Mr. MCCAUL. I agree with you. I think that diplomacy with Iran, in my view, is naive. I think the best thing we can be doing, both from the State Department and from an intelligence effort, is to do everything within our power to support these freedom fighters who want to overthrow the ayatollah and the mullahs who are oppressing these people.

Moving to Mexico, we had two U.S. law enforcement agents for the first time in 25 years shot in an ambush with 83 rounds from an AK–47 after they have said they were American diplomats. Now the Mexican Government seems to be saying it is a case of mistaken identity. I personally don't buy that. I will take the testimony of our agent over the three Zetas now in custody who are talking about the incident.

My question with respect to the State Department is several. The Merida Initiative that we passed in the Congress had $1.3 billion to provide primarily military assistance, and yet only 25 percent of that has gone to that assistance in Mexico. The rest seems to have been bottlenecked up in the State Department. I was hoping you could explain why and perhaps give me your assurance that we are going to try to move that money as quickly as possible.

Two more quick items. Extradition. I hope this administration fights hard to get these killers extradited to the United States.

Then, lastly, there is a 1990 agreement that prohibits our law enforcement in Mexico when we put them down in a war zone, as President Calderon calls it, and we don't allow them to carry weapons. I would like this administration to revisit that agreement in light of the new conditions down in Mexico.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you for raising Mexico, Congressman. Because, again, this is an area that doesn't get enough attention and there it is, right on our border.

The U.S. Congress has appropriated $1.5 billion since the Merida Initiative began in Fiscal Year 2008, and by the end of 2011 we expect to have obligated over half of this funding. Your question is a fair one: Why does it take so long? The complexities of negotiating technical requirements with Mexico, what we expect to get for our money, what we expect to get from them when we give them our money, and the need to ramp up staffing to support a program of this magnitude has taken time. But we have also decided that what works best is providing professional training, which we are doing for 4,500 new Mexican police investigators, training for 3,000 Mexican prosecutors. We will give you have chapter and verse about what we are doing.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to Mr. Higgins of New York.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Madam Secretary. First of all, thank you for your work on behalf of America throughout the world. You should know that Buffalo still misses you very much.

The two most powerful forces in the world today are youth and technology. We understand in the Arab world 60 percent of the

population is under the age of 30. They call it the youth bulge; they call it the youth quake. And they are empowered by new media and not only for organizational purposes but for aspirational purposes as well.

When you think about the extraordinary convergence of an 82-year-old man living in his modest home in Boston who wrote books and pamphlets on civil resistance, on nonviolent resistance, his work is disseminated throughout the entire Arab world as a primary source for their organizational efforts. So it says that America has two unique roles here. One is clearly aspirational. Because this individual from America, this 82-year-old man, his experiences in his writings were borne out from his experience in the civil rights movement of this country, and that that is now serving as a beacon for the Arab world I think says extraordinary things about the times that we are living in and the extraordinary opportunities that are before us.

The other thing is America's role in what comes of the Middle East and these revolutions. Everybody is asking the question now: Will Egypt be more like Iran or will it be more like Turkey? And we have a role in that, as you have stated, with this budget.

So when you hear folks talking up here about America's role in helping to influence what the next steps are in Egypt and at the same time support a continuing resolution that cuts 30 percent in a development assistance account that specifically supports democracy in places like Egypt, we can't have it both ways. A lot of bad things can happen to the world without America, but not a lot of good things can happen in the world without this country as well.

So I just ask you to respond to that.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, first, say hello to every one in Buffalo and tell them I miss them, too.

I think you made a very important point. When I became Secretary of State, I looked at all of the research analysis I could find, and two things stuck out to me. One, that most people, whoever they are and wherever they live and under what kind of regime, want the same thing: They want a good job with a good income that gives them and their kids a better future. That is universal. And so focusing on that became one of my goals, as to how we help to lift up the bottom.

Secondly, that we have this huge youth bulge, not just in the Middle East—in Latin America, in Asia—and when you look at countries where 25, 35, sometimes 50 percent of the population is under the age of 25, they are totally ill-prepared to educate those people, provide them health care, guide them to the kind of future that we would like to see for them, which happens to be in our interest as well.

So we have focused on trying to figure out how best to message to young people. That is why I set up this unit inside the State Department about how we use social media, how we try to connect. There I am doing Web chats. We are trying to do everything we can to go where people are getting their information and to put the American story out there.

We did such a great job during the Cold War. American communication about democracy and freedom was universal. And then the Berlin Wall fell and we all said, Okay, great, we don't have to do

that anymore. And we have slowly but steadily receded from the information communication competition.

Others are filling that. As I said, they are filling it with Aljazeera, they are filling it with Chinese English, they are filling it with Russian English, et cetera. I think that is one arena we cannot afford to be out of. Maybe to some it looks like a luxury, but to me it undergirds our message.

I can make a speech, a Member of Congress can go to the floor and make a speech and say we stand for freedom. That is one speech which will probably not even be heard by the vast majority of young people we are trying to influence. But if we have that message going out day in and day out on new media, old media, our diplomats, our development experts, everybody is out there saying the same thing about who we are as Americans and what we stand for, we can really infuse this moment of transformation with American values and the American spirit and the American experience.

As you can tell, I feel passionately about it because I believe in it. That is what I was raised on. That is what I saw as a young girl. When Congressmen McCaul or Fortenberry said diplomacy with Iran is naive, we always had diplomacy with the Soviet Union while we were sending messages behind the Iron Curtain every minute of every day about what the alternatives were. That is what we need to be doing.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Madam Secretary.

Judge Poe, the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. POE. Madam Secretary, thank you for being here, and thank you once again for the time that Deputy Secretary Corbin spent with me, over an hour, talking about a lot of issues. I will try to keep it down to 5 minutes, which is not really fair for those of us in the south who talk slower.

Secretary CLINTON. But I don't need a translator.

Mr. POE. You don't need a translator.

I believe, like you, that deep down in our soul everybody in the whole world has this burning desire for freedom. However you want to call that or define it, that is the way people are. I believe that it exists probably as well as anyplace in the country of Iran. We have a lot of Americans here who are of Iranian descent. Many of them have family at Camp Ashraf. Many have lost families who have been killed in Camp Ashraf. They have family in Iran. I believe those young people in Iran have that spirit of freedom.

I have a question that I certainly don't know the answer to, but the United States throughout history takes the position usually that we support a country and then eventually we support the rebels or those who want to come in and take over that country. We have made that decision in Libya. I think the administration used actually the term "we support the rebels." Sometimes we do, and sometimes we don't.

I think there is no greater tyrant on Earth than the little fellow from the desert, Ahmadinejad, and the way he treats his people, the way he has declared war really on everybody. When do we get to a point as a country in making these decisions like we did with

Libya? When do we get to the point that we say, You have got to go? We made that decision in Libya. When do we make that decision in Iran, you have got to go?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I think we have to support those who are struggling and fighting for their own freedom inside countries, and we do that in Iran. But it is unfortunate that this regime has exercised such oppression against its own people, has done everything possible to destroy the opposition. So we do support and we will continue to support and we will be very vocal in our support. But we also look at those moments, those hinges in history, where there is an adequate critical mass of people that are willing to stand up for their own rights.

Unfortunately, in many countries—it took a long time in the Soviet Union, as you know—and then countries began to move and we were there with support for them. We see that now in the Middle East, in North Africa. Iran is a tougher case, but we are going to do everything we can to support those who want that freedom.

Let me just for the record say, too, because there have been several references during the hearing to the MEK. I know there are many representatives here in the audience. As the committee is well aware, on July 16, 2009, the district court here in DC ordered the Department to allow the MEK to respond to unclassified portions of the administrative record in reviewing the designation of being on the foreign terrorist organization list. And, as such, we are again reviewing the designation in accordance with the court's decision and applicable law, and this review will result in a de novo decision concerning the designation of the MEK

Mr. POE. When do you think you will have that decision?

Secretary CLINTON. It is proceeding. These are very important considerations and reviews. As soon as we can, we will make such a decision, Congressman.

Mr. POE. Myself and others have met with State Department, CIA in classified briefings. And I would just encourage the State Department, based on everything I know, to make that decision.

I am one that, of course, thinks we ought to take them off the list. I would hope Congress wouldn't have to make that decision. I hope the State Department would. But I would ask that, if any information comes forward either way, that the Department of State would share that with us in a classified briefing so that we have that information.

The last question I was going to comment on and concern was the residents of Camp Ashraf. They are nervous. Their relatives are nervous because of the way that time is really not, in my opinion, on their side. How do you, just your opinion, think this is going to play out once we are gone, the people in Camp Ashraf? Are they going to be moved from the border, go to Iran, go to Europe? How do you see that playing out?

Secretary CLINTON. First, let me say that we monitor this situation very closely. We try to investigate all of the assertions that are made. We know that adequate food and fuel under our supervision and pushing gets in. But we also know there are constant provocations that exist. So we are in a daily dialogue with the Government of Iraq, and we will continue to do everything we can to protect them.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Keating is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Thank you in light of your enormous schedule and where you were yesterday and still taking the time this morning to address issues at our committee.

A couple of weeks ago you laid out our country's priority on Internet freedom around the world, and I join you certainly in those efforts to maintain an Internet meeting place that promotes the greatest possible benefits that can be really for democracy around the world. I liked your analogy in your speech about the Internet has become the churches and the union halls of yesteryear.

We saw in Egypt and Iran, using technology from companies based in the United States, what a tremendous element it can be to advance democracy. I am certainly pleased that you created a new Office of the Coordinator of Cyber Issues.

Along those lines, I wanted to address one issue.

It has a tremendous capacity for democracy and freedom, but also therein lies a great danger, I believe. And I am working on legislation right now to establish end use agreements for sensitive technology that we export abroad. We have to make sure that the government clients like Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan understand that American innovation should not be used for violence.

So along those lines I would like to ask you if you anticipate the new Office of Coordinator of Cyber Issues to play a role with the private sector in determining best practices so that U.S. technology is not used abroad, and I would love your thoughts on any creative solutions we can employ to advance our innovation without stifling progress toward democracy.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, thank you for that question, because it is something that no Secretary of State has had to address before. And here we are talking about it and realizing that it is as important as the town square or any other setting for expression and assembly. We would be pleased to work with you and our new Office of Cyber Security to look at how we would create such end use agreements.

A lot of the technology that we manufacture, that we invent here in the United States has dual uses, even triple and quadruple uses. It is difficult to know exactly how an end user will use it. So I think this deserves some very careful attention, and we would welcome your ideas about that.

We also are working hard to come up with new technology all the time. We are incentivizing entrepreneurs, tech companies, and innovators to help us figure out how to help people get around whatever end use. Because we could take any kind of technology and we could say, you know, that may be okay to go through, and then some clever government figures out how to use it against people.

So circumvention technology is a part of our ongoing Internet freedom agenda. We have funded significant advancements in the development of about a dozen circumvention technologies in the last few years. But, in itself, that is not enough. We also have to be looking at what Egypt did, which is unprecedented—shut down the whole Internet.

So there is a lot of work still ahead of us, but it is an area that the United States is uniquely positioned to lead on, and it helps us get through all of those nets of repression and censorship and shutdown that governments are using to keep their people down and in place.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Madam Chair, in view of the lengthy morning, I will yield the rest of my time.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Second Man of the Year. Thank you.

Mrs. Schmidt of Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here.

I would like to focus my attention first on Sri Lanka and second on Colombia, if I have time.

As you are aware, in 2009, thousands of Tamils were killed in Sri Lanka. They are being housed right now in subhuman conditions without proper food, plumbing, water, and creating life-threatening events. With the geographic location of Sri Lanka and the government's placing of this ethnic group in these deplorable conditions, with the historic ties that the Tamils have had with the United States, shouldn't the U.S. lead in taking steps before either the U.N. Human Rights Council or the U.N. Security Council in asking Sri Lanka what the grounds were for these mass killings?

And, secondly, I know that you received letters from people in the House and the Senate asking what steps, if any, the United States is taking as the U.N. Secretary General maps out his agenda for this year regarding this group that appears to be being wiped out by those in charge.

Secretary CLINTON. Congresswoman, thank you very much.

Initially, following the end of the war, the United States assistance focused on humanitarian needs—food, aid, shelter, and the like. We also put a considerable effort into de-mining because of what had been done in the north during the war.

As the humanitarian needs began to recede, we have focused on working with the Tamils and the Sri Lankan Government on reconciliation, on representation, providing training on human rights to the Sri Lankan military, helping to address shortcomings in their criminal justice system and law enforcement, and trying to assist them on resettling and reintegrating the people who were displaced by the 26-year civil war. We have also been trying to support enterprise in the north so people can get back to making a living and supporting themselves and their families.

We are constantly watching what is happening in Sri Lanka. We share your concerns that the end of this very bloody terrible war that lasted for so long be put behind Sri Lanka so that they can move forward and have a society that answers the needs of all of their people.

There is still a ways to go. There is this reconciliation process, this commission that has been set up. I have personally spoken with leaders of Sri Lanka to express strong American support for it. But this is a matter we keep close look on because we share the concerns you have raised.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you.

Now I would like to focus on Colombia. As you well know, it has been a long time since we have had a Colombian Free Trade Agree-

ment. Just yesterday, in my own district, I spoke before about 60 folks in the greater Cincinnati, southern Ohio area, business people that have economic relations with Colombia and would like to have a free trade agreement, and yet they are saddled with something much less. When will this administration push for that agreement, not just for Colombia but for Panama and other places in the Western Hemisphere?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, we strongly support action on the three trade agreements that have been negotiated but not yet finalized. Korea has been, but both Colombia and Panama are finishing up. We have urged that both our Government and their governments move expeditiously. We would like to submit them to this Congress for action.

We think that there could be a grand bargain. There is a lot of work. We have not continued the trade adjustment assistance, which I know affects some people in your district. We have not continued the generalized trade preferences, the Andean trade preferences.

I think if we look at all the opportunities we have and remember that the Western Hemisphere is our biggest trading partner and as we see what is going on in the world, the more we can work with our friends to the south and really help them increase their economies, create jobs here, create jobs there, enhance economic commerce and trade, the better off we will be.

So as soon as we can get final signoff on Colombia and Panama, we would like to be moving forward with them, as well as with Korea.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you.

Madam Chairman, I will yield back.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you. Woman of the Year.

Mayor Cicilline of Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Welcome, Madam Secretary. It is a great honor to welcome you to our committee and to have the opportunity to discuss many of these important foreign policy issues. I thank you for your brilliant and wise leadership. Our entire Nation is in your debt.

I just want to ask one question and make one plea. As you know, my district has a very vibrant Cape Verdean community, and I am very concerned about potential cuts to the Cape Verdean Millennium Funding. That has been very important in helping to transform the Cape Verdean economy; and I would just ask that, as you review that, you pay close attention to it and recognize how important it has been to the Cape Verdean community, certainly in my district.

I recently returned this past Sunday from Iraq and Afghanistan; and I think, while there is some division in this country about what our role should be in Afghanistan and whether a protracted presence in that part of the world is wise policy, every military leader that we met with stressed the importance of both the diplomatic and development prongs of our strategy there and really confirmed everything you shared with the committee today.

I have grave concerns about the level of expenditures that we will have to sustain in Afghanistan in road building and schools and police officers at a time when we are cutting those very same

investments here in our country, but I think we are going to have a policy debate on that long term in the Congress of the United States.

But one thing I learned on the trip and I learned from the briefings that we had—and your foreign policy staff was spectacular—is the growing threat of Pakistan in this region of the world. And I wonder if you would speak to how we balance our interest in strengthening our relationship with Pakistan and at the same time respond to what is clearly a growing threat as it becomes a sanctuary, particularly along the border of Afghanistan.

I invite your thoughts on that

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you so much, Congressman. I am glad you went to Iraq and Afghanistan. I appreciate the kind words for our national security team, military and civilian alike.

I share your enthusiasm about Cape Verde. They did an excellent job with the Millennium Challenge Account, and we want to see them continue the second compact.

Pakistan has to be put into historical context whenever we talk about it in the United States Government. I do think it is fair to say that our on-again, off-again relationship going back 30, 40 years has been to our detriment.

We enlisted the Pakistani people and government in our efforts to push out the Soviet Union out of Afghanistan, which was one of the contributing factors to the fall of the Soviet Union. Then we accomplished that and we left—and we left them with jihadis and with drugs and awash in guns and money. Unfortunately, we saw some of the results that flowed from that.

We also had a difficulty with them regarding what was called the Pressler Amendment. Admiral Mullen is fond of saying that every single soldier in the Pakistani military knows what the Pressler Amendment was and not a single American soldier does, because it had such an impact on ending training and ending mil-to-mil relationships—and, again, to our detriment.

There is nothing easy about this, and striking the right balance is a constant calculation. But we think that we have no way forward other than to continue to engage both civilian and military with the Pakistanis.

If you look at what they have done since the first time I testified before this committee in early 2009, and I said then that the Pakistanis were ceding territory to the terrorists. They were not going after them in their own country with their own military. That has been 180 degrees. They have taken a lot of losses. They have pursued those extremists who are attacking them. They have worked with us to go after extremists who are attacking our troops and our interests.

But it is a constant calculation about how best to work with the Pakistani Government. They have a lot of internal pressures that make it difficult for them. But I would say, sitting here testifying before this committee, that in the last 2 years we have made progress, but we have a long, long way to go before we can see the kind of stability that we think is necessary for the region and for American interests.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you. Out of deep respect for the Secretary and in my ongoing effort to curry favor with the chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much. I just love it because we are going to get all of our members to ask their questions.

Mr. Rivera of Florida.

Mr. RIVERA. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Madam Secretary, thank you for your distinguished service to our country. The last time I saw you was down at the Biltmore in Coral Gables. I hope you will come visit us again very soon.

My question is regarding our Government's reaction to the treatment or mistreatment of American citizens abroad, particularly the treatment of the Cuban Government to American citizens. Last week marked the 15th anniversary of the Brothers to the Rescue shoot-down in which four American citizens were murdered over international airspace. I am wondering, did the State Department or the White House issue any statement marking that day and condemning that heinous act?

Secretary CLINTON. I will have to check on that, Congressman. I remember it well. Your description of it is accurate. It was a terrible, terrible injustice and murder of four Americans who were peacefully protesting the Cuban regime.

Mr. RIVERA. I appreciate those remarks.

I also want to ask you about American citizens who could avail themselves of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, otherwise known as Helms-Burton. As you are aware, Title III of Helms-Burton allows U.S. nationals to sue foreigners for damages in U.S. courts if those foreigners traffic in property confiscated by the Castro dictatorship. Now there is also a provision in Helms-Burton that says the President may suspend Title III for a period of not more than 6 months if the President reports in writing to the appropriate congressional committee at least 15 days before such suspension that it is necessary to the national interest of the United States and—and I emphasize—and will expedite a transition to democracy in Cuba.

Now Helms-Burton, that Title III of Helms-Burton has been suspended every 6 months since former President Clinton and former President Bush, and now President Obama have done so. Can you tell us how such suspensions have expedited a transition to democracy in Cuba?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, I think, Congressman, obviously we do not have democracy and freedom in Cuba. There is no doubt about that. But we do believe that the current regime is having to face the reality of its mismanagement of its economy, of its repressive policies. We saw the release of political prisoners, some of whom were imprisoned the last time I testified before this committee. We still see terrible abuses like the reaction to Mr. Zapata's mother and so much else.

But it has been the assessment of three Presidents, as you rightly point out—two Democrats, one Republican—that continuing to suspend Title III is in the national security interest of the United States. It is predicated on many different factors, but the ultimate conclusion has been the same for the last 16 years.

Mr. RIVERA. So can you give an example of the second part of that requirement, expediting a transition to democracy? I understand in the national interest of the United States, but it doesn't say "or." It says, "and will expedite a transition to democracy." Is there any example of that recently?

Secretary CLINTON. Let me respond to you for the record, because I don't want to misspeak. But I will get you additional information, Congressman.

Mr. RIVERA. Thank you very much.

Finally, with respect to the recent lifting of sanctions on the regime, we know that in the history of the United States we have seen some lifting of sanctions when President Carter reestablished diplomatic relations with Cuba. We saw the results. For example, the Mariel boat lift, when former President Clinton established the Track 2 People-to-People Contacts. We saw the results in the 1996 shoot-down of four American citizens. Why would we expect a different reaction now from the Castro regime in terms of reforms—democratic reforms in reaction to our lifting of sanctions if we have never seen it before?

Secretary CLINTON. I think, Congressman, our goal is to assist the people of Cuba themselves. We are not aiming our lifting of sanctions in any way to please the Castro regime. We are trying to help the people of Cuba.

With some of the economic changes that are going on in Cuba—the unemployment, the laying off of hundreds of thousands of workers, as you know—we think maintaining a very positive approach to the people of Cuba, letting them know that the United States Government, that the American people—not just Cuban Americans but all Americans—support their freedom, support their eventual democracy we think is in their interest. And that is why we do it.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Engel of New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Madam Chair; and welcome, Madam Secretary. I want to second what Congressman Higgins said about Buffalo. Because you now that in the Bronx, Westchester, and Rockland, we feel the same way about you as well.

I am so happy you raise the 16-percent cut for State and USAID that passed the House last month. I am glad you said it would be devastating to our national security, because it would be. I want to emphasize that. Thank you for saying that.

I want to also mention a few other things and ask you to comment on any or all of them.

I am very pleased, as the former chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee and now the ranking member, that the President is traveling to Brazil, Chile, and El Salvador. I think it shows the administration's commitment to the region that you and I have discussed many, many times. I just wanted to say how important I think that is as well.

I want to talk about the Mideast peace process. I have been very much chagrined because for the past 2 years the Palestinian leadership has refused to enter into direct talks with Israel. They use every excuse under the sun—settlements, expansion of neighborhoods—and have all these preconditions. Meanwhile, they mount

an effort to delegitimize Israel at the U.N. and seek support for unilateral declaration of statehood outside of a negotiating process. I was very pleased that the administration vetoed that resolution in the U.N. Security Council.

Are we telling the Palestinians that this is not helpful and that they really potentially face a loss of aid, loss of support? There has got to be some penalty for their behavior.

Finally, I want to mention an issue that when you were senator in New York you worked very hard on, and that was the Kosovo issue, which is very, very important. We worked on that a lot together. I would like to see Kosovo admitted to the EU and admitted, of course, to the U.N. But they have been blocked. The people there feel that if the United States doesn't play an active role that they really can't count on Europe for helping them. I would also like to eventually see them as a NATO member.

What are we doing to ensure that the fragile democracy there—and you know they love the United States and they really count on us—that we are doing everything we can to push our European friends into integrating them fully into the EU?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, of course, our veto spoke very loudly; and we also conveyed very clear messages not only to Palestinians but to the region. But thank you for raising Kosovo, because it is unfinished business. It is unfinished business in Europe and for us.

I visited early—end of last year and made it clear that the United States was working to elicit additional pledges of recognition from other nations. That continues. We are going to be doing everything we can do increase it.

I have also met several times with the EU, because we think that the EU has to help the Kosovars make progress.

There will be starting in a few days a conciliation process run by the EU between Serbia and Kosovo primarily looking at northern Kosovo where the Serbian population is located, looking for ways to try to resolve some of the issues on the ground. Deputy Jim Steinberg was just in Kosovo and the region looking for ways that we can support Kosovo. They have a ways to go, but we want to see Europe holding out that big carrot. We want them to be there with visa liberalization, with development assistance, with support for Kosovo to go on the road to membership in the EU.

Obviously, we want to see them in the United Nations and maybe someday in NATO. The Kosovars have a lot to do themselves. They have to continue to improve their democracy. They have to crack down on violence and criminal elements that are, unfortunately, too present amongst them. They have to make their peace with Serbia—not selling out but working in a mediating way to try to resolve it so that they can enhance trade and commerce between the two countries. There is a lot to be done. But this remains a very high priority for me personally because of much of the work that we did together. It is a high priority for our Government.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I will turn back my 17 minutes to the chair.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much.

Mr. Kelly, vice chair of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. KELLY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Madam Secretary, thanks for being here. After watching you and knowing what you have done lately, you talk about marketing and the American brand and also reaching frequency, I think I am going to suggest that you be the poster girl for Red Bull or the Fubar Energy Drink.

My question, though, goes to this—and I think your husband's stepfather was a Buick dealer. I am a Chevrolet dealer. We are always looking for a return in investment. Certainly, in the State of the Union Address the President talked about investments, investments, investments. And we know that we have good investments and bad investments.

My question then, based on what we have done for Palestine, we have spent about $2.5 billion in the last 5 years and again now this year we are looking for another $400 million to help them out in their cause. But this is a group that, for some reason, and I don't understand, people who loudly and publicly criticize us and then come quietly back and say, Well, but we still need your help. At what point do we decide this was a good investment or a bad investment? And certainly when we look at Israel, who is fighting so hard, and see Palestine, who is working so hard just for the absolute opposite, at what point do we say to them, we can't continue to fund you. We can't reward bad behavior.

And I wonder about this. Because as we go through these budget cuts—and they are real. And my colleagues on the other side decry the fact that this H.R. 1 is going to do so much to destabilize and we just can't afford to make these cuts. My question is, when do we decide which investments are good investments and at what point do we cut off and penalize bad behavior?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, I think that is a really important question, and it is one I ask myself practically every day.

Let's take the example that you have put forth.

I would argue strongly that the need to continue to support the Palestinians and their state-building is in Americans' interest. Why is that? Because the Palestinian Authority, which has control over the West Bank, is demonstrating that it can control extremists, that it can cooperate to protect Israel, that it can give a better economic life to their people. It stands in stark contrast to Hamas, which has done nothing but increase the misery of the Palestinian people in Gaza.

It is often frustrating for me—and I think you pick up on that—to deal with any country or any group of people that see the world differently than we do. Sometimes I do try to put myself into their shoes because it helps to figure out, okay, so why do they see what I see so opposite of how I interpret it.

If you look at the Palestinians, they believe that they had close to a deal with former Prime Minister Olmert. Israeli politics change, just like our politics changes. A new administration comes in, a new prime minister, a new coalition, and then they have to start all over again. So they get a little put out. But the Israelis rightly say, Look, we're a new government. We want to start differently.

So there is always some kind of explanation. Whether you believe it or whether you credit it is certainly up to the individual who is

assessing it. But, from my perspective, when you look at the region right now, where are the secular regimes, where are the regimes that are actually producing benefits for their people. The Palestinian Authority is doing that.

Between President Abbas and Prime Minister Fayyad, no matter how frustrated one can get with them, what they have done really speaks for itself, because you don't see demonstrations. Why? Because life is actually improving. Why is it improving? Because below the headlines they have a very positive arrangement with Israel where they are working together.

So it is immensely complicated, and we do have to ask ourselves are we getting the best return on the investment we are making. And sometimes it takes a little explanation because it is not so self-evident. But when we look at that region and we are competing against Iran with Hezbollah, we are competing against Iran's influence in Syria, we are competing against extremist Islamic elements that could move into the vacuum, I think it is in America's interest to continue to support what has turned out to be an effective regime to promote benefits for people. Whether that pays off down the road or not is something we are going to have to try to keep influencing in every way we can.

Mr. KELLY. Well, I appreciate that. I know that as we go forward in these budget cuts—and it is really a very serious thing—and you said about penny wise and pound foolish. There is also another axiom out there: Measure twice, cut once. So I think we will pursue that. But thank you so much for your time.

I do yield back the rest of my time.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, you are so generous with your time. We only have three more questioners. If you keep them brief, we will get to all three of them. Mr. Connolly and then we will have Mr. Marino and Ms. Buerkle.

Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Welcome again, Secretary Clinton. I have to tell you I have known nine Secretaries of States and I can't remember a performance as impressive as yours. Your stamina, breadth of knowledge, and your experience make all of us proud. Thank you for serving.

I am going to ask a series of quick questions without speeches.

The Muslim Brotherhood sort of reappeared in the vacuum in Egypt. Do we consider that the Muslim Brotherhood has in fact evolved into a more moderate, democratic-oriented organization with a contribution to make both in Egypt and other places in the Middle East?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, we are watching that closely. We are trying to suggest certain guidelines that should be used for determining whether a political party or any organization should be included in elections, included in government. And the jury is out.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you.

Some recent speculation about the possibility of a rapprochement between Hamas and the Palestinian Authority. A lot of young demonstrators both in the West Bank and in Gaza are encouraging just that, a time to come together and have one unified Palestinian

voice and government. Does the United States welcome such a rapprochement and are there preconditions from our point of view that would have to be met before we would recognize such a unified government?

Secretary CLINTON. Absolutely there are preconditions. It goes in part to Congressman Kelly's prior question.

We have made it very clear that if Hamas does not renounce violence, does not recognize Israel's right to exist, does not agree to support previous agreements that have been entered into, we could not in any way support any government it was a part of or any rapprochement that took place.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you.

You talked about the 150 Function, and earlier, many hours ago, you talked about something like a 10:1 ratio of advantage for every dollar we invest. I think you said for every $4, we get $45 back, roughly a 10 or more, 11 to 1 ratio. Of course, I completely agree.

Our friend Mr. Kelly unfortunately has left, but he talked about the cuts being real and he talked about investments as a businessman, correctly so. But surely the foreign assistance we provide relative to our defense budget or lots of other expenditures is an investment that over time has proved itself. And I was really struck by something you said. You don't want to be empty-handed in the exercise of diplomacy when we really need it. And we can't envision that in Congress, and surely that argues for protecting that investment and giving you some flexibility with respect to it.

Would you care to elaborate?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, first, it would be my fervent hope that USAID and State Department would be viewed as national security. Having served in Congress, I know how often it occurs that we say, Well, we are going to cut discretionary spending except for defense, or except for national security, which is defined as being only defense. And in today's world that is just no longer the case.

What we do side by side with the military, coming in after the military, staying after they go, trying to prevent conflicts and everything else that is on our plate, with far fewer resources, if I might add, than the military, requires us to begin to think more broadly about what we mean by national security; and certainly from our perspective we do think that we can justify what we spend.

We have undertaken an effort to cut back on areas that we don't think are important to America's national security anymore, and we are going to keep doing that, and we are going to keep trying to get smarter.

At the very beginning of the hearing, Ranking Member Berman referred to contractors. We do so much better than being charged so much by contractors to deliver services that then we have to keep reinvesting every time there is a crisis by bringing a lot of that in house and paying for it, which is something I have tried to do over the last 2 years, which will save us money.

So in many different ways of looking at how we are cost-effective, I think we are on the right track. I am well aware and I am one who believes that we have to be strong economically at home. But I also believe that part of being strong economically at home is giv-

ing us the tools we need to project our leadership abroad. Because it has a kind of boomerang effect. If we are not looking strong abroad, that undermines how we look and how we are treated at home. So I think we have to look at this from a broader perspective.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank you, and I yield back my time.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much.

Mr. Marino of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Secretary, it is a pleasure to meet you. I thank you for your patience and your service. I also thank you for your passion. I understand that. By the way, one of the counties in my district is Lackawanna.

I have listened very intently with what you had to say, and I understand the conviction and the passion. I really do. I understand the geopolitics that are involved here. But I want to bring this home a little bit and bring it back to our side of the ocean, if I may.

My constituents of the Tenth Pennsylvania Congressional District have lost their jobs or will be losing their jobs. Many are worried about whether they will keep their jobs, with unemployment at still over 9 percent and a debt of $14.2 trillion. These same constituents not only are losing their jobs but they are losing their homes and their businesses. I have had grown men tear up in front of me because they cannot support their families, send their children to college, or even buy them new clothes.

I have known that you as a senator prided yourself on meeting the needs of your constituents. How can we expect our constituents—that the United States must send their tax dollars overseas, that it is in the best interest of these countries, and the U.S. in the long run, to continue to send our money to other countries, even those who hate us, while my constituents are hurting and yet we cannot use these funds and others to create jobs by putting their tax dollars back into their pockets and eliminate the debt. What say you to this as a compassionate person?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I know your district. I thank you for raising in such moving terms what the people of the Tenth District are going through. I have been visiting your district my entire life, so I know that these are good people, these are hard-working people, and they deserve better. And I do believe that we need an economic policy here at home that does generate new jobs, new investment, new economic opportunity for people who, like your constituents, are willing to work hard for the dollars that they bring home.

I also know that you have a very patriotic district and you have a high percentage of people who have served in our military and who have answered the call of service time and time again and that what my job first and foremost to do is to do everything I can to provide security for the American people.

It is not an easy choice. And I wish that we could say, Well, let's just put the world on hold for 5 years while we rebuild our economy. The world has never been able to be put on hold, but especially today. Things are moving much too quickly. And the threats we face, the challenges we confront are not going to go away. And they pose direct threats to markets where goods that we can make

in the Tenth District in Pennsylvania can be sold. They pose direct threats to the security of our people because of the launching of terrorist attacks from ungoverned territories that, unfortunately, can become havens for terrorist groups with the instigation and support of al-Qaeda and others. They pose health threats as diseases move further north and pose real concerns to us.

So the list is long about costs that, unfortunately, will come back to bite us if we are not trying to exercise preventive diplomacy. And so I do know that there have to be tradeoffs and difficult decisions. My only plea today is that many people when they are asked around the country—this was true with my own constituents who I served for 8 years in New York—when you ask them, how much money do we give in foreign aid, they think it is like 15 or 20 percent of the budget.

And so to try to help Americans understand, it is a small part of a budget that has to be reined in. We cannot overlook the hurt the people are experiencing today. So what we have to be is smart about how we do this, especially now, when, frankly, we face an unpredictable future that could undermine the security and well-being of our people across America.

Mr. MARINO. I understand it, and thank you. But you have been faced with a constituent standing before you saying, my grandmother used to say, Let's take care of our own—and now.

Again, that is not a question. I thank you. Get some rest.

I yield my time.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you.

Ms. Buerkle of New York.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you, Madam Chairman; and thank you, Secretary Clinton, for your perseverance here this morning and willingness to answer all of our questions.

I am going to take my issue back across the seas as well and to my district. It is an intensely personal issue for the constituents. I represent New York's 25th Congressional District. We are the home to Syracuse University. I know you are familiar with that area of the State.

On December 21, 1988, 259 people onboard a Pan Am flight bound to New York died in a fiery blast. The product of that bomb was planted by a Libyan terrorist. The Pan Am flight crashed into a small town in Scotland, Lockerbie, and took, along with those on the plane, 11 folks who were on the ground.

On that plane were 38 students from Syracuse University returning home for their Christmas break. Their families will never forget that day and the dramatic change that it made in their life. For many of those families, they will not be able to move forward. They will not get closure until the people responsible for that flight and that bomb are held accountable.

In light of the information that we have gotten over the past several weeks, it has now become more apparent—we knew, but it is become more apparent to us—what happened on that plane and who caused that crash. So I am asking you this morning, what is the administration doing to gather evidence to build a case against Qadhafi? And when they do, will they prosecute him?

Lastly, what must we do to encourage this? Because for my district, for many of the families affected, they cannot go on until he is held accountable for his actions.

Thank you.

Secretary CLINTON. Congresswoman, thank you.

As you know, I know your district well and had many experiences with the families of the flight that was clearly the subject of a terrorist bombing. I was given a letter before coming out here, thanks to the chairwoman, that asked very specific questions about how we could gather evidence and put together a case against Qadhafi and all those with whom he might have conspired in setting in motion the chain of events that led to the explosion over Lockerbie. We will follow up on that.

Much of the activity that is asked for in the letter would have to be done by our law enforcement agencies, but I will certainly contact after this hearing FBI Director Mueller and Attorney General Holder and others to see how we can move on that. Because there have been statements made in the last days by what are now former members of the Libyan Government fingering Qadhafi, making it clear that the order came from the very top, I think we do need to move expeditiously.

In the Security Council resolution we have a referral to the International Criminal Court. That would certainly be one of the many counts that would be put against him if he ever is captured alive and turned over for justice proceedings.

So we are going to continue to pursue this. This is a matter of great personal importance to me, because I did have the privilege of representing Syracuse, and I know that the pain and the feeling that he never was held accountable is so palpable and it is why so many of us were outraged by the release of Megrahi and protested vociferously to the British and Scottish Governments. To this British Government's credit, a report has been put forth giving us more information about what went on behind the scenes. But there is a lot that we still need to do, and this letter is a good list of beginning efforts that need to be undertaken.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you. And I speak, I am sure, on behalf of the families of those victims that we really need to act expeditiously and to bring this man to justice. Thank you very much.

I yield back.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much.

Madam Secretary, you are a wonder woman. Thank you so very much for the generosity of your time and your kindness in allowing all of our members to ask a question.

The committee is now adjourned.

We welcome you back soon. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

[Whereupon, at 1:37 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Material Submitted for the Hearing Record

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515-0128

Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), Chairman

February 25, 2011

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be held in **Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live, via the WEBCAST link on the Committee website at http://www.hcfa.house.gov):**

DATE: Tuesday, March 1, 2011

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

SUBJECT: Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges

WITNESS: The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton
Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State

By Direction of the Chairman

The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202/225-5021 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

Day *Tuesday* Date *March 1, 2011* Room *2172 Rayburn*

Starting Time *10:05 a.m.* Ending Time *1:37pm*

Recesses [ ] (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____)

Presiding Member(s)

Chairman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session [✓]
Executive (closed) Session [ ]
Televised [✓]

Electronically Recorded (taped) [✓]
Stenographic Record [✓]

TITLE OF HEARING:

Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges in the Middle East

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Attendence Attached

NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes [✓] No [ ]
(If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*

Bass, Berman, Bilirakis, Burton, Carnahan, Cicilline, Connolly, Duncan, Ellmers, Griffin, Kelly, McCaul, Meeks, Rivera, Ros-Lehtinen, and Royce QFRs

Connolly Statement for the Record
Berman Addedum (including letter)

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____
or
TIME ADJOURNED *1:37 p.m.*

Mark Gage, Deputy Staff Director

Hearing/Briefing Title: Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges in the Middle East

Date: March 1, 2011

Present	Member
X	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, FL
X	Christopher Smith, NJ
X	Dan Burton, IN
	Elton Gallegly, CA
X	Dana Rohrabacher, CA
X	Donald Manzullo, IL
X	Edward R. Royce, CA
X	Steve Chabot, OH
X	Ron Paul, TX
X	Mike Pence, IN
X	Joe Wilson, SC
X	Connie Mack, FL
X	Jeff Fortenberry, NE
X	Michael McCaul, TX
X	Ted Poe, TX
X	Gus M. Bilirakis, FL
X	Jean Schmidt, OH
X	Bill Johnson, OH
X	David Rivera, FL
X	Mike Kelly, PA
X	Tim Griffin, AK
X	Tom Marino, PA
X	Jeff Duncan, SC
X	Ann Marie Buerkle, NY
X	Renee Ellmers, NC

Present	Member
X	Howard L. Berman, CA
X	Gary L. Ackerman, NY
X	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, AS
X	Donald M. Payne, NJ
X	Brad Sherman, CA
X	Eliot Engel, NY
X	Gregory Meeks, NY
X	Russ Carnahan, MO
X	Albio Sires, NJ
X	Gerry Connolly, VA
X	Ted Deutch, FL
X	Dennis Cardoza, CA
X	Ben Chandler, KY
X	Brian Higgins, NY
X	Allyson Schwartz, PA
X	Chris Murphy, CT
X	Frederica Wilson, FL
X	Karen Bass, CA
X	William Keating, MA
X	David Cicilline, RI

The Honorable Gerald E. Connolly (VA-11)

HCFA Full Committee Hearing
Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges
Tuesday March 1st, 2011 @ 10am

Even with the modest increases in recent years, supported by both Democratic and Republican administrations and Congresses, the FY2012 international affairs budget totals less than 1.5 percent of the federal budget and less than 1 percent—.38 percent to be exact—of the Gross Domestic Product. This infinitesimal piece of the federal budget is a worthwhile investment.

The Continuing Resolution (CR) that the House passed two weeks ago proposed devastating cuts to the international affairs budget—the major vehicle used to advance U.S. development interests in democracy, health, human rights, and security. Specifically, the CR proposed a 19% cut to the FY2011 requested levels (and a 16% cut from FY2010 outlays). Compared to the FY2010 enacted base, the CR proposes a 30% cut from development assistance, an 11% cut from global health, a 42% cut from humanitarian aid, and a 40% cut from multilateral assistance. The consequences for national security are troublesome.

But today's hearing is about the FY2012 budget request for the Function 150 and International Programs. When evaluating this budget request, I urge my colleagues to fully consider the national security implications of cutting such key funding. After reviewing the request, it is apparent that the Secretary requested the absolute minimal funding necessary to invest in America's security interests through the Function 150.

A notable difference in the FY2012 budget request is its division into two parts: the core budget and the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account. The OCO outlines the funding for the Frontline States of Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. Thanks to the deployment of civilian development professionals to those states, total OCO funding for FY2012 will fall by 25% or $41 billion from FY2010 levels. In other words, the Department of Defense's reduction in OCO funding offsets the growth in the civilian OCO budget. This is what development professionals have been saying for years—that schools and roads are an inexpensive yet worthy investment.

The FY2012 budget includes funding for essential programs that develop civil society in Afghanistan and Iraq. Such programs are designed to stabilize these countries so the United States can withdraw its combat troops. For example, the State Department and USAID are tasked with training police officers in Iraq beginning in FY2012. Similarly, the State Department is increasing its civilian capacity in Afghanistan to ensure stability through development work. Such work is essential if U.S. forces are to withdraw without leaving a power vacuum.

The work of our diplomats, development professionals, and their support staff is vital. It is no mistake that national security experts repeatedly extol the virtues of a strong international affairs budget. The United States' civilian-led foreign policy tools play an essential role in preventing conflicts and stabilizing volatile areas around the world. Defense Secretary Robert Gates knows the importance of diplomacy and development in U.S. foreign policymaking. He stated, "Without development, we will not be successful in either Iraq or Afghanistan." He acknowledged the value of investing in development and said, "Economic development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers." Madam Secretary, thank you for testifying once again before this Committee.

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD L. BERMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ADDENDUM TO HEARING RECORD OF MARCH 1, 2011

MR. BERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the following articles and letter be placed in the hearing record:

POLITICO
http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0211/49708.html

Invest in nation's 'smart power'
By: Rep. Gerald Connolly and Rep. Leonard Lance
February 17, 2011 04:33 AM EST

Making decisions for the first time about foreign policy and national security is a daunting responsibility — but an important one that freshmen members of Congress face. Fortunately, the advancement of our national security is one issue with bipartisan support.

In the current economic climate, national security decisions are especially difficult. Strategic investment and efficacy are crucial to our nation's future security.

We must work together to ensure that our national security focuses on the three pillars — defense, diplomacy and development. Neglecting the second two pillars can be costly — in terms of unnecessary spending and, more important, American lives.

National security experts repeatedly extol the virtues and importance of a strong international affairs budget to keep our nation safe and build our economy. Defense Secretary Robert Gates has highlighted the importance of diplomacy and development in U.S. foreign policy. "Without development," Gates said, "we will not be successful in either Iraq or Afghanistan." He asserted, "Economic development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers."

Gates is not alone in his assessment of international development as a key foreign policy tool. Numerous bipartisan commissions, among them the 2006 National Security Strategy, the Pentagon's Quadrennial Defense Review, the 9/11 commission and the Baker-Hamilton Iraq Study Group, all concluded that a strong and effective international affairs budget is essential to ensuring U.S. security in the 21st century.

This is why military leaders, fresh from the battlefield, advocate for programs funded by the international affairs budget. In a recent poll of military officers, nearly 90 percent of active duty and retired military officers agreed that the tools of diplomacy and development are critical to achieving U.S. national security objectives and a strong military alone is not enough to protect America.

That doesn't mean diplomacy always works — but it should always be tried. President John F. Kennedy understood this. "Let us never negotiate out of fear," Kennedy said. "But let us never fear to negotiate."

The international affairs budget does more than just keep our nation safe—it bolsters our economy by creating jobs here and developing markets for U.S. goods and services overseas. It makes sense: effective development brings stability, economic development and a demand for goods and services.

In fact, one out of five U.S. jobs depends on international trade, and roughly half of total U.S. exports each year go to developing countries. That's more than $500 billion annually.

Among the myths about the federal budget, perhaps none is greater than the widespread belief that more than 10 percent is spent on foreign assistance. The reality, of course, is far different. Even with the modest increases in recent years, supported by both Democratic and Republican administrations and Congresses, the international affairs budget totals less than 1.5 percent of the federal budget.

This small investment yields a significant return. In this tough economic climate our constituents are demanding – and we are committed to delivering – efficient programs with tangible results.

As freshmen, you are likely to face a dizzying array of difficult decisions. But foreign assistance shouldn't be one of

them. A strong and effective international affairs budget is critical to our national and economic security.

Standing up for smart power is the right approach to our foreign policy — no matter what your political affiliation.

When you are faced with a vote on the international affairs budget, just remember the adage: An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Reps. Gerald Connolly (D-Va.) and Leonard Lance (R-N.J.) are both beginning their second terms. Their offices are side-by-side in the Cannon Office Building.

DAILY CALLER
http://dailycaller.com/2011/02/23/keeping-america-safe-in-the-21st-century/#ixzz1FYBTQHlt

Keeping America safe in the 21st century
By Frank Carlucci
Published: 10:03 AM 02/23/2011 | Updated: 3:19 PM 02/23/2011

The recent celebrations of President Reagan's legacy of service on what would have been his 100th birthday have brought back memories. It was one of the greatest honors of my life to serve under this remarkable man as both secretary of defense and national security advisor, working to keep America safe and secure and to liberate millions from the tyranny of communism.

Since the fall of the Iron Curtain and particularly since 9/11, the world has changed dramatically. The global challenges we face today require a balanced foreign policy approach where we utilize our development and diplomatic efforts along with our military in keeping our nation safe. Just as President Reagan invested in defense to end the Cold War, today we must make an investment in a strong and effective international affairs budget.

As a former foreign service officer, I have seen the pivotal role civilian operations play in protecting our national security. Today, our development and diplomatic operations are more critical than ever, especially as we seek to ensure peace and stability in places like Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. New threats from global pandemics to terrorism have no respect for borders and could be upon our shores at any moment. We need a smart power approach to our foreign policy that uses all of the tools in our arsenal — development, diplomacy, and defense — to keep America safe.

Better coordination, cooperation, and resources among our civilian and military operations are a must in 2011. Trying to reorganize government and make it more efficient is never easy. In 1986, I was not in favor of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act, which brought the various branches of the military under a unified joint command structure. Today, however, I not only see its benefits, but believe we should extend this coordinated approach to the other critical pillars of our foreign policy — diplomacy and development. A strategic approach is what we need to improve efficiency and help keep us safe.

Right now, the administration is taking a lead in such an approach by bringing together all of our international programs in a cohesive manner to better coordinate our foreign policy. In a similar vein, as the Pentagon's Quadrennial Defense Review, Secretary Clinton's Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review is a tool that can lead to better efficiencies and effectiveness in our work around the globe. To accomplish this goal, however, we must allocate the resources to do so. It's a wise investment, and one we must make for the sake of our national security.

As President Reagan said, "Security assistance programs, an essential complement to our defense effort, directly enhance the security of the United States. Development assistance also contributes to this effort by supplementing the indigenous efforts of recipients to achieve economic growth and meet the basic needs of their peoples. Progress in both of these areas will contribute to regional stability and to a more peaceful world, both of which are central

U.S. policy objectives." Let's also remember that with strong bipartisan support, the National Endowment for Democracy was created under President Reagan's watch to help spread U.S. values around the world.

Today, military leaders from General David Petreaus to Admiral Mike Mullen, and civilians such as my colleague, current Secretary of Defense Bob Gates, have made it abundantly clear that development and diplomacy are essential elements of our national security. Even with a large national deficit and a challenging budget environment, we must keep Americans safe by promoting stability in the most dangerous corners of the world. To do that, we need a strong and effective international affairs budget.

Frank Carlucci served as the Secretary of Defense to President Ronald Reagan from 1987 to 1989 and National Security Advisor from 1986 to 1987. He is a member of the Advisory Council for the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition.

DEFENSE NEWS
http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=5819256&c=FEA&s=COM

Don't Cut International Affairs Spending
Development, Diplomacy Can Ease Threats
Published: 28 February 2011

When I entered the military years ago, the world was a very different place. Our enemies were more defined and consisted of states that wished to do us harm.

Today we face different foes, and our complex and interconnected world requires us to use every foreign policy tool available in our arsenal to keep our nation safe.

That is why it is critical for us to invest in development and diplomacy alongside defense.

I know times are tough, and legislators must make difficult choices to balance our nation's budget, but we cannot cut critical national security funding, and that is what the entire International Affairs Budget represents.

Administrations of both political parties, starting with President George W. Bush and continuing with President Barack Obama, have correctly classified this as part of our national security spending. While some in Congress may differ, I strongly believe the International Affairs Budget must remain under the banner of national security. Significant cuts will jeopardize our investments in places like Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq, and put American lives at risk.

Development and diplomacy programs funded by the International Affairs Budget keep us more secure by addressing complex threats in the most dangerous corners of the world, from global pandemics and infectious disease to instability caused by food shortages and natural disasters. A strong civilian capacity prevents conflicts before they occur.

Addressing the challenges of today with civilian tools costs far less in dollars than sending in the military, but more important, in terms of our most precious resource - the lives of our men and women in uniform. At just over 1 percent of federal spending, the International Affairs Budget is an incredible return on our investment.

As we look at the changes unfolding before our eyes in the Middle East, we must be cognizant of how critical it is for us to have a strong diplomatic and civilian presence around the globe. Instead of allowing countries to become breeding grounds for those who wish to do us harm, we need to do what we can to assist them in building a better way of life.

Many of the most troublesome areas of the world, like Yemen and Somalia, have the potential to become the next Afghanistan. This may be prevented, however, by working through our diplomats and development experts to encourage economic growth, ensure clean water, prevent diseases and encourage the rule of law.

It may seem unusual for a military man to speak out for more resources for the State Department or the U. S. Agency for International Development, but I'm not alone. A recent poll showed that more than 90 percent of active duty and retired military officers agreed the tools of diplomacy and development are critical to achieving U.S. national security objectives.

Testifying before Congress Feb. 17, Adm. Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "I reiterate my unequivocal support ... to fully resource an expansion of … diplomacy and development capabilities, particularly in Iraq to support the transition from a military to a civilian-led mission."

The transition in Iraq Mullen mentioned is a critical one. Our military has fought for every inch of ground we have gained there. Now that our troops are coming home and our civilians step in, we cannot afford to let those gains slip away.

Defense Secretary Robert Gates has said, "Without development, we will not be successful in either Iraq or Afghanistan."

This year's International Affairs Budget requests $4 billion for Iraq operations, which pales in comparison to the $45 billion that will be saved in our military drawdown. As Secretary of State Hillary Clinton says, every business owner she knows would gladly invest $4 to save $41.

As a nation, we find ourselves in a critical moment. We have the mightiest military in the world, but we need strong civilian partners to help us meet the global challenges we face today. As a military man who has dedicated his life to keeping this country safe, I know this to be true from my own experience. A strong and effective International Affairs Budget is essential to our national security, and this must continue to be a priority for our nation moving forward.

By retired Adm. James Loy, commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard from 1998 to 2002 and deputy secretary of Homeland Security from 2003 to 2005. He is a co-chair of the National Security Advisory Council of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition.

--

The Honorable John Boehner
Speaker of the House of Representatives

The Honorable Eric Cantor
Majority Leader, House of Representatives

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi
Minority Leader, House of Representatives

February 22, 2011

Dear Speaker Boehner, Majority Leader Cantor, and Minority Leader Pelosi:

It is shocking to imagine that in the next major global humanitarian crisis – the next Haiti, Tsunami, or Darfur – the United States might simply fail to show up. Yet that is the very real risk posed by H.R. 1. The bill cuts global disaster aid by 67%, global refugee assistance by 45%, and global food relief by 41% relative to FY10 enacted levels. Addressing the drivers of the national debt is wise. Abruptly reducing US humanitarian commitments in order to save less than one quarter of one percent of total discretionary spending is not. These cuts would imperil the longstanding US commitment to provide lifesaving humanitarian assistance for those threatened by disaster and conflict.

The United States has – with strong bipartisan support – long been the backbone of worldwide humanitarian response. This US leadership saves hundreds of thousands of lives each year. With the fiscal year nearly half over, the move to halve US humanitarian budgets would leave the US without even a minimal level of humanitarian operating resources for the rest of the fiscal year. This could potentially cost many lives:

- Without additional funding, the US will be unable to respond to major new emergencies. If a natural disaster strikes, a drought turns into a famine, or a new civil war breaks out somewhere in the world, America will be forced to stay home while the rest of the world struggles to cover for our sudden absence.
- The reduced funding for US food assistance in H.R. 1 would decimate America's capacity to respond to a worsening drought in the Horn of Africa. Following several weak rain cycles, this region stands on the verge of a famine that could push more than seven million people towards starvation. This would badly undermine a region whose stability is a significant strategic priority for the United States.
- The humanitarian accounts support life-saving programs in Afghanistan and Pakistan for people displaced by conflict and natural disasters, for 1.7 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan, and for refugees who have returned home to Afghanistan to

rebuild their country. A failure to help meet the needs of these populations would undermine US goals in the region at a critical moment.

- Funds from the humanitarian accounts provide the vast majority of America's support to Darfur as well as substantial support to the future state of South Sudan. The cuts in H.R. 1 would put hundreds of thousand of Sudanese lives at risk, just as the country embarks on the fragile process of North-South separation.
- HR1 would slash USAID's disaster risk reduction (DRR) funding, which saves lives and money by reducing the humanitarian impact of disasters. Without this kind of smart investment, the US will ultimately have to spend far more money responding to crises after the fact – as we recently saw in Haiti.

Such outcomes would be devastating – for the world's refugees and conflict victims, for US interests, and for the United States' standing and reputation as a global leader.

Effective humanitarian response requires up-front funds in order to support life-saving activities during the onset of an emergency. For this reason it is urgent that the humanitarian accounts receive full funding now rather than be patched up with supplemental appropriations later in the fiscal year. We would also stress that robust humanitarian funding should not come at the expense of other international poverty reduction and development accounts. We strongly urge that House leadership work to increase the International Disaster Assistance, Migration and Refugee Assistance, and Title II Food Aid accounts to FY 2010 enacted levels as the budget process moves forward.

Sincerely,

Rudolf Maier
President
ADRA International

David A. Weiss
President and CEO
CHF International

Ruth Messinger
President
American Jewish World Service

Anne Lynam Goddard
President and CEO
ChildFund International

Daniel Wordsworth
President and CEO
American Refugee Committee

Rev. John McCullough
CEO
Church World Service

Dr. Helene D. Gayle
President and CEO
CARE

David Evans
President
Food for the Hungry

Ken Hackett
President
Catholic Relief Services

Gideon Aronoff
President and CEO
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society

Nancy A. Aossey
President and CEO
International Medical Corps

Dr. Arthur B. Keys
President and CEO
International Relief and Development

A. Barry La Forgia
Executive Director
International Relief Teams

George Rupp
President and CEO
International Rescue Committee

Fr. Michael A. Evans, S.J.
National Director
Jesuit Refugee Service/USA

Dr. Mujahid Al-Fayadh
President and CEO
Life for Relief & Development

John A. Nunes
President and CEO
Lutheran World Relief

Neal Keny-Guyer
CEO
Mercy Corps

Raymond C. Offenheiser
President
Oxfam America

Michel Gabaudan
President
Refugees International

Farshad Rastegar
CEO
Relief International

Michael Poffenberger
Executive Director
Resolve

Charles MacCormack
President and CEO
Save the Children

William F. Schulz
President and CEO
Unitarian Universalist Service Committee

Lavinia Limon
President and CEO
US Committee for Refugees and Immigrants

Sarah Costa
Executive Director
Women's Refugee Commission

Richard Leach
President and CEO
World Food Program - USA

Dr. Karl Eastlack
President and CEO
World Hope International

Richard Stearns
President
World Vision

Cc:

The Honorable Harold Rogers
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations

The Honorable Norm Dicks
Ranking Member, House Committee on Appropriations

The Honorable Kay Granger
Chairwoman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations

The Honorable Nita Lowey
Ranking Member, House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations

The Honorable Jack Kingston
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture

The Honorable Sam Farr
Ranking Member, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture

The Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
Chairwoman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs

The Honorable Howard Berman
Ranking Member, House Committee on Foreign Affairs

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA, AND CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Questions for the record from Chairman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton

A November 2010 inspection of Embassy Bangkok and Consulate General Chiang Mai, Thailand by the Department of State's Office of the Inspector General found that: (1) while the State Department and other U.S. government agencies have located regional operations in Bangkok, regionalization may have reached its limit; (2) that the information management staff needs to place more emphasis on information systems security and information technology emergency preparedness; and (3) that the Embassy improperly spent program funds to maintain and improve the residence of the Chief of Mission.

1. What is the State Department's position on decentralizing the U.S. Government's regional presence?
2. What steps are being taken on site to place more emphasis on information systems security and information technology emergency preparedness?
3. What is the status of the program funds used to maintain and improve the residence of the Chief of Mission?

UN Peacekeeping:

The FY'12 budget request for Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) is $1.92 billion, reflecting a reduction of $205 million from the FY'11 request. The total needs for FY'12, including a $30 million increase for the mission in Cote d'Ivoire, is $2.15 billion. The difference between the actual needs and the request, roughly $230 million, reportedly will be made-up through the application of "credits."

1. Madam Secretary, please provide a detailed accounting of how the $225.5 million in credits will be applied. Given that the budgets for each mission are distinct and funds cannot be comingled, did you simply reduce the request level for individual missions where there were overpayments from prior years?

2. Have credits for closed peacekeeping missions also been factored in? If so, how and under what authority?

3. How much is the UN currently holding in the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund and/or pursuant to the authority granted to the Secretary-General in 2003 to maintain cash surpluses from closed missions?

Pursuant to the UN Financial Regulations, credits from closed missions must been remitted to Members States within 12 months, with a possible extension of an additional four years. In 2003, the General Assembly approved a resolution granting authority to the Secretary-General to retain cash surpluses in order to cover shortfalls in ongoing operations. However, that authority must be renewed annually in order to have force.

1. Given that the General Assembly has deferred action to extend the authority to retain cash surpluses from closed UN peacekeeping operations since June 2004, when will the $87.4 million due to the United States be remitted to the U.S. Treasury?

The United Nations never created a separate account that would isolate "arrears" accumulated prior to 2001, which the United States and the UN jointly agreed would not be paid pursuant to the historic Helms-Biden Agreement. As a result, the UN continues to report that the United States is in "arrears" for UN peacekeeping, most recently to the tune of $442.6 million.

1. Madam Secretary, is the United States in arrears to the UN for peacekeeping? Is so, how? Didn't Congress provide supplemental funding to clear all prior cap-related arrears and budget shortfalls for UN peacekeeping in Fiscal Year 2009? Didn't we also meet the full funding request for supplemental appropriations for the Haiti mission last year?
2. How do you define "arrears recognized by the United States"? Do you include pre-Helms-Biden arrears in that definition?
3. Is the United States being penalized in any way, including through the withholding of credits due, as a result of the UN's failure to isolate the pre-2001 arrears that we agreed would never be paid?

HIV/AIDS:

The Fiscal Year 2012 budget request includes $7.15 billion for the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), including $1.3 billion for the U.S. contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis (Global Fund). The total request for PEPFAR has increased by $31 million since Fiscal Year 2010 and by $1.146 billion since Fiscal Year 2008.

1. Madam Secretary, notwithstanding the strong commitment of the American people to help stem the tide of the AIDS pandemic, are the proposed funding levels sustainable? Can the beneficiary countries absorb such extraordinarily high levels of assistance in an effective and transparent manner?
2. Should nations with growing economies, including Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, assume greater responsibility for financing their own health needs? When will these nations be "graduated" from U.S. health assistance?
3. What specifically are you doing to encourage other potential donors, including from the Gulf, the Middle East and beyond, to step up to the plate?

China currently is the fourth largest recipient of Global Fund assistance ($941.3 million) and has received an additional $30 million through PEPFAR. The FY'12 request includes an additional $3 million for China under the Global Health and Child Survival account.

4. Madam Secretary, with over $2.65 trillion in foreign cash reserves, how could it be possible that China cannot afford to finance its own HIV/AIDS response? Why would the United States, in effect, borrow from China only to turn around and provide China with hundreds of millions of dollars in assistance? How can you justify the continuation of $3 million in assistance to China in these difficult economic times?

India is the second largest recipient of Global Fund assistance ($1.2 billion) and has received an additional $165 million in assistance though PEPFAR. The FY'12 request for India includes $105 million under the Global Health and Child Survival account, amounting to an increase of nearly $18 million from Fiscal Year 2010 and over $29 million from Fiscal Year 2009.

5. How can you continue to justify such high levels of Global Fund and PEPFAR assistance to India while India boasts the 11th largest economy in the world, has emerged as a donor nation, and has announced its "graduation" from assistance from the United Kingdom?

Despite the fact that the U.N. Development Program acts as the Principal Recipient for more than half of the funds granted through the Global Fund –and the fact that the Global Fund's inspector general has uncovered massive corruption schemes in its programs affecting hundreds of millions of dollars – UNDP consistently refuses to submit to the jurisdiction of the Global Fund IG. In fact, UNDP even refuses to share the findings of its own internal investigations of UNDP-administered Global Fund grants with the Global Fund.

1. Madam Secretary, if UNDP is going to act as an implementer of Global Fund programs, should it not submit to the jurisdiction of the Global Fund's Inspector General?
2. As a Member of the Global Fund Board, what specifically are you doing to ensure that UNDP complies with repeated requests for greater cooperation? Will there be consequences for UNDP's continued intransigence and lack of transparency?

Sudan

1. Please provide details on the Administration's full request for Sudan, through all spigots, and how this reflects our greatest priorities in the country. Now that the South has voted to secede, how will United States assistance programs change?
2. Has any assistance been included in the request for northern Sudan, outside of Darfur? If so, for what purpose?
3. How far along is the Administration's review of Sudan as a State Sponsor of Terrorism? When might we expect to see a report of your conclusions?
4. What steps has the Government of South Sudan taken to ensure transparency and accountability in its budgeting process? Has the GOSS taken steps to address allegations of corruption?
5. Have any measurable results been achieved with the $203 million dedicated thus far to security sector transformation in South Sudan? Have there been allegations of serious human rights abuses by the SPLA or the Southern Sudan Police Service since the start of the Interim Period? Have any of those allegations been linked to units supported by United States assistance and training? How have the allegations been remedied?

Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership

The FY'12 Budget request cuts key counterterrorism initiatives in Africa, while significantly increasing funding for global health programs and climate change. The Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership has been cut by $6.5 million across three accounts, and

complementary bilateral assistance under the Economic Support Funds (ESF) and Development Assistance (DA) accounts to partner countries has been zeroed-out, with the exception of DA for Mali and Morocco. Other than the flat-lined level of $10 million under the Peacekeeping Operations account, the request for Partnership for Regional East Africa Counterterrorism, formerly known as the East African Regional Strategic Initiative, has not been defined.

1. Where does counterterrorism rank in terms of the Administration's top priorities for foreign assistance, particularly in Africa?
2. Notwithstanding the prevailing state of insecurity across North Africa and the Sahel, is the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership no longer a priority of the Administration?
3. Please provide a detailed account, from all spigots, of the funds requested for the Partnership for Regional East Africa Counterterrorism. How is this initiative different from its predecessor?
4. Are you relying upon funding provided by the Department of Defense, through Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), to address our national security concerns in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel?

Lord's Resistance Army

1. Madam Secretary, please provide a detailed description of all USG resources being employed to advance the Administration's Congressionally-mandated strategy to counter the Lord's Resistance Army. How is this reflected in the FY'12 request?

The United States has relied heavily on the Ugandan People's Defense Forces to execute this strategy, yet the FY'12 request for Uganda includes $600,000 in International Military Education and Training (IMET), $300,000 in Foreign Military Financing (FMF), $0 in Peacekeeping Operations (PKO), and $0 in Economic Support Funds (ESF).

2. Is the LRA still a priority of the Administration? Are you relying upon assistance from the Department of Defense, through Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act, to mount an effective campaign against the LRA, or have you determined that the UPDF is no longer our principal partner in this fight?

3. Have you established benchmarks to measure the success of the UPDF? Has the money we've put in since the initiation of the strategy paid off in any measurable way?

4. What portion on the $7.2 million in PKO identified for the "Africa Conflict Stabilization and Border Security" program will be reserved for countering the LRA?

5. Of the funds identified for counter-LRA activities, how much, if any, will be used to support operations by the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of Congo (FARDC), and the Armed Forces of Central African Republic (FACA)?

Western Hemisphere

Last November, it was revealed that Nicaraguan forces had invaded Costa Rican territory to carry out a dredging project that clearly violates Costa Rica's territorial integrity and sovereignty. In the months since, Nicaragua has continued its efforts unabated, causing irreparable environmental damage to Costa Rica's wetlands. While Costa Rica has employed nearly every multilateral tool it has at its disposal, including bringing its case to the Organization of American States and the International Court of Justice next week, the United States has remained virtually silent on the matter. In fact, in a recent Miami Herald editorial, Costa Rican President Laura Chinchilla stated –

> "Despite such serious implications, the international community has shown a minor interest in the case. May the message be that if no weapons are fired and no casualties are counted, there is no reason for concern? This would be a terrible message for disarmed countries such as Costa Rica, and for convincing others to invest in development and institutional building instead than spending on weapons."

1. **Madam Secretary, with this in mind, I would like to make it clear for the record - does the United States agree that Nicaragua has invaded Costa Rican territory?**

Madam Secretary, following your trip to Mexico last month you were asked in an interview if you considered the violence in Mexico as something that threatens U.S. national security. You stated-

> "No, I consider it more of a problem that we have some responsibility for that's affecting our neighbor."

2. As we continue to see the violence from Mexico increasingly spill over the border, as well as harm, and sadly kill, U.S. personnel and other citizens within Mexico, I am seriously concerned that you would not consider this to be an issue of U.S. national security. **How can we formulate an effective foreign assistance package to Mexico that serves U.S. interests if the underlying premise of this assistance is so flawed?**

3. In the FY2012 budget request, funding for the Central America Security Initiative is nearly doubled under ESF, while INCLE remains relatively stagnant and FMF is zeroed out. This appears to contradict the strategy we took in Mexico and Colombia in which the initial focus was on security assistance with the understanding that a strong security foundation is instrumental to sustainable success in the area of development assistance. **Can you please explain what the strategy is then for Central America and why it differs from that in Mexico and Colombia?**

4. The FY2012 budget request includes a significant decrease in INCLE funding to Colombia (from $243m to $160m). I understand that the Government of Colombia is taking significant steps to nationalize many of the programs that the United States currently supports; however, this appears to be quite a drastic cut. **Does Colombia have**

the capacity to effectively assume ownership of these programs at such a drastic pace?

EASTERN EUROPE AND EURASIA QUESTIONS

1. With regard to Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia for FY2012, the President's Budget Request states that "for Russia, the request focuses on programs to promote democracy and rule of law, and also to promote cooperation with the Government of Russia in areas of mutual interest, such as health, environment, and trade."
    a. With regard to funding environment and health programs in Russia, why should the U.S. taxpayer pay for these programs given that Russia reaps large revenues from its oil and gas exports?

2. Since Viktor Yanukovych assumed office last year as Ukraine's President, there have been reports of backtracking on the democratic and media freedom improvements made since 2004. I raised concerns about these negative trends in a letter I sent you on February 10th, in which I requested that during your meeting with the Ukrainian Foreign Minister Gryshchenko, that you express to him that the U.S. will condemn "any steps taken to weaken Ukraine's hard-won democratic reform of government and respect for human rights, freedom of the media and the proper rule of law."
    a. Did you raise these concerns with Foreign Minister Gryshchenko? What was his reaction?

3. The FY2012 Budget Request for Ukraine is $79.1 million, which has been reduced from the $88 million request for FY2011.
    a. How, if at all, will the U.S. assistance strategy for Ukraine change in light of the negative trends in that country with regard to democracy and media freedoms?

4. The flawed presidential elections last December in Belarus were followed by beatings, arrests and harassment of political opposition and civil society activists and journalists by the Belarusian authorities. In response to this repression, the U.S. pledged to increase last year's assistance of $11 million by nearly 30% to help support civil society, political competition and more interaction between the citizens of Belarus and the outside world.
    a. Given the restrictions imposed by the Lukashenko regime on pro-democracy and civil society programs and activities in Belarus, what is the strategy in effectively utilizing U.S. assistance to help the people of Belarus?
    b. Please comment on the coordination efforts between the United States and the EU on bolstering civil society and political competition in Belarus?

5. Are there plans for the United States to provide defensive weapons to Georgia to help that country deter a future attack by Russia? If not, why not?

6. The United States is currently working with Central Asian countries to diversify our supply routes to Afghanistan.

a. How vulnerable are these routes to attacks carried out by Islamic extremists?
b. What steps are being taken to ensure that our engagement with the governments in Central Asia does not, in fact or perception, support or contribute to repression and corruption in those countries or come at the expense of our agenda to promote freedom and democracy in the region?

7. Last June, tensions between ethnic Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbeks in southern Kyrgyzstan erupted in violence which resulted in hundreds being killed and thousands injured. The President's FY2012 Budget Request for the Kyrgyz Republic is $37.0 million. How much of that amount is going to be utilized to help address the tensions between ethnic Kyrgyz and Uzbeks in that country?

QUESTIONS ON ASSISTANCE POLICY:

1. The QDDR states that the Agency for International Development will take the lead on Presidential development initiatives, such as the "Feed the Future Initiative," but what else has the QDDR suggested to improve the coordination between AID and the Department of State? How will the lines of accountability and authority established between the State Department and AID with regard to assistance program initiatives be better clarified?

2. Madam Secretary, as you know, the so-called "F" process, created under a Director of Foreign Assistance at the State Department, was established to improve coordination between the Department and AID by standardizing and better tracking information on our foreign assistance programs. The F process also essentially replaced AID's Policy and Program Coordination Bureau by absorbing much of its staff. However, under the current reforms by AID Administrator Shah, two new offices have now been established at AID: the Bureau of Policy, Planning and Learning (PPL) and the Office of Budget and Resource Management (BRM).

   - What is the future of the "F" process? While it has been criticized for lacking coverage of United States Government-funded agencies outside of the State Department and AID, isn't the so-called "F" process still integral to our aid coordination going forward? Does the "F" process now have the kind of high-level, hands-on leadership it needs to succeed?

3. Madam Secretary, as you know, the late-Richard Holbrooke made major changes in the way our foreign assistance programs are implemented in Pakistan in his role as Special Envoy, moving to provide our assistance more directly to local Pakistani organizations. However, there has been criticism that such Pakistani organizations lack the capacity to manage such funds appropriately.

   - Do you agree with this shift in U.S. foreign assistance from U.S. and foreign non-governmental organizations to local Pakistani organizations and government

entities? What oversight mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that funds are spent in an accountable and transparent manner?

QUESTIONS ON ASSISTANCE BUDGETS AND PROGRAMS:

1. Madam Secretary, over the past decade, the total funding appropriated to the Department of State strictly for the assistance programs for which it has responsibility has almost tripled --- growing from $9.06 Billion in Fiscal Year 2001 to $25.49 Billion in Fiscal Year 2010. However, very large portions of some of the accounts that have grown over the past decade are actually transferred to AID for implementation in specific programs – accounts such as the Economic Support Fund account (approximately 93% transferred to AID for implementation in recent years) and the State Department's portion of the Global Health and Child Survival account (approximately 60% transferred to AID for implementation in recent years).

    - Why should these funds be appropriated to the State Department if it does not have the capacity to implement the programs involved?

2. In Fiscal Year 2010, approximately $702 Million was provided for the State Department's International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INCLE) account for, among other things, the Department's preparations to take over the training of Iraqi police forces from the Defense Department. The Fiscal Year 2011 budget request had sought $315 Million for that program and an additional $1 Billion would be provided under the Fiscal Year 2012 budget request.

    - How much is the Iraqi government contributing to this police training program?
    - How much is the European Union—or any other donor—contributing to this program?
    - How familiar will the U.S. trainers be with Iraqi cultural and political practices, as they relate to policing in Iraq? Will the trainers consist of retired U.S. police officers, as in many other such U.S. police training programs?

3. Madam Secretary, this past January the *Wall Street Journal* published an article titled "Setbacks Plaque U.S. Aid to Pakistan," suggesting that our civilian-development and humanitarian aid programs there – totaling $6 Billion over the last decade -- are doing little to overcome anti-American sentiment in that country. What do you see as the cause of this disconnect between our notable levels of civilian aid and an apparent lack of impact on the view of the United States held by many Pakistanis?

Middle East Questions

Madam Secretary, speaking at the Human Rights Council in Geneva, you called on the UN General Assembly to suspend Libya from the Council. You said that [QUOTE] "Governments that turn their guns on their own people have no place in this chamber." [END QUOTE] You're absolutely right, though I wish that the Administration would have acted on this principle last

May, when the Qaddafi regime was elected to the Council and we failed to protest. And speaking of governments that have turned their guns on their own people, Cuba and China, among many other dictatorships, continue to be members of the Human Rights Council. Recently, the Iranian regime joined the UN Commission on the Status of Women.

1. Will the Administration act now, before more lives are lost, to call for these other gross human rights violators to be thrown off the UN Human Rights Council and the Commission on the Status of Women?

Madam Secretary, when the Administration sought to join the UN Human Rights Council two years ago and critics said that your decision would legitimize that illegitimate body, your Department said that the U.S. would seek to change it from within. Well, you've had some small and largely symbolic victories, usually by criticizing countries that were already severely isolated, but let's look at the big picture. The Council is in the nearing the end of its five-year review process, and the results are dismal. The U.S. delegation's statement called this process "a race to the bottom," and that "delegates repeated fixed positions and blocked any opportunity for genuine debate." The Council's working group on this five-year review adopted an outcome document that does not adopt any meaningful membership standards, and that preserves the injustice of having a permanent agenda item that singles out the democratic, Jewish State of Israel for criticism, with no such permanent focus on the world's worst human rights abusers, including Libya.

2. Why, Madam Secretary, did the U.S. join consensus on this indefensible outcome document? Why didn't the U.S. call for a vote and vote "No"?

3. Now that the review process has reinforced the fact that the Council will continue to be an anti-Israel rogues' gallery, will the U.S. finally do the right thing, withdraw from the Council until it is meaningfully reform, and explore alternative international forums to defend and advance human rights?

NOTE: Not all responses were received prior to printing. The responses received follow this page.

WRITTEN RESPONSES FROM THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA, AND CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#17)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

The Fiscal Year 2012 budget request includes $7.15 billion for the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), including $1.3 billion for the U.S. contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis (Global Fund). The total request for PEPFAR has increased by $31 million since Fiscal Year 2010 and by $1.146 billion since Fiscal Year 2008.

Madam Secretary, notwithstanding the strong commitment of the American people to help stem the tide of the AIDS pandemic, are the proposed funding levels sustainable?

Answer:

Improving the health of people in the developing world drives economic growth, fights poverty, and strengthens families, communities and countries. Fighting global disease protects our national security by reducing the instability that causes war and conflict. And fighting global disease directly protects our health in the United States because infectious diseases know no borders.

We are grateful for the Committee's leadership in the reauthorization of PEPFAR. The Lantos-Hyde Act authorized a total of $48 billion over 5

years for AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, reflecting the central role of global health in our foreign policy.

In terms of finding the right levels of appropriations for PEPFAR, that's something that we will of course work with Congress on. But I want to note several important areas on which PEPFAR is focusing. First, PEPFAR is redoubling efforts to make smart investments, making each dollar go as far as it can in saving lives. Second, PEPFAR has entered into Partnership Frameworks to build greater ownership on the part of our partner countries. These Frameworks support countries in taking on greater responsibility, including financial responsibility to the extent they have resources. Finally, we recognize that we are just one country and AIDS is a shared, global responsibility. So we're working to strengthen the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, to ensure there is an effective vehicle that other donors can use to do more. The greater our success on all these fronts, the better position we'll be in to make an appropriate contribution to the global effort.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#18)
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
March 10, 2011

Question:

Can the beneficiary countries absorb such extraordinarily high levels of assistance in an effective and transparent manner?

Answer:

This is certainly a valid concern. To simply put more resources into weak health systems that can't use them would be a disservice. However, I believe the strong results achieved to date by the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) reflect the fact that our AIDS investments have been building capacity in our partner countries, allowing the money to be used in an effective and efficient manner. Moving forward, we will continue to strengthen systems as we implement programs, and we will also work to gain additional efficiencies. By aligning PEPFAR investments with Governments and other donors to ensure that all work together to build the systems of care that are needed, we are working to ensure our resources are used with the greatest possible efficiency to meet substantial unmet needs.

Regarding our partnership with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria (Global Fund), the United States is also working to ensure that

Global Fund resources are used in an effective and transparent manner. Reflecting our desire to ensure that Global Fund grants have maximum impact at the country level, the U.S. has been a leader in reform of the Fund. Since October 2010, we have worked with the Global Fund Board to develop an action agenda that includes clear timelines and measures progress so all parties can be held accountable for the strong action steps that must be taken to improve the impact of grants and ensure the effective, efficient, and accountable use of Global Fund resources. The Global Fund Board embraced this call to action and will consider and endorse a comprehensive reform agenda in May 2011.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#19)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Should nations with growing economies, including Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, assume greater responsibility for financing their own health needs?

Answer:

Yes, and we are working to make this a reality. The overwhelming majority of U.S. global health resources are invested in countries that are among the world's poorest. However, we do have modest programs in these larger, middle income countries such as Brazil, China, India and Russia. These programs are very different from those we support in poorer countries: rather than large-scale program implementation, we provide targeted technical assistance so that these countries can lead their own responses – for which they do provide the vast majority of resources. And many of these large countries are then able to provide resources for other countries in their regions -- or in the case of Brazil, other countries that share their language -- which in turn helps those other countries to do more for themselves.

Unlike the other four countries named, we do have a significant role in program implementation in South Africa through PEPFAR. In South Africa and its neighboring middle-income African countries, PEPFAR has used Partnership Framework negotiations to encourage governments to assume greater responsibility for financing the health needs of their countries. These frameworks have promoted increasing country management and oversight of programs, because strong government leadership of the health system is integral to long-term success, and health systems are strongest where governments have leadership and technical skills to address health system weaknesses.

As part of the Partnership Framework on HIV/AIDS between South Africa and the United States, South Africa is committed to being the leader and steward of their country's efforts to fight against HIV/AIDS. The Government of South Africa has committed to greater domestic investments in 2011 and beyond, and expressed an intention to approach full financial responsibility for its program by 2016. U.S. support through PEPFAR remains essential during this critical transition phase.

Through the Global Fund, the United States is also working to encourage emerging economies to assume greater responsibility for financing the health

needs of their countries. The United States strongly believes that the eligibility, prioritization, and cost-sharing criteria of the Global Fund must ensure that resources are targeted strategically towards countries and regions with the greatest need and least ability to pay. We believe the Global Fund can play an important role in providing limited, catalytic support for high-impact interventions targeted at vulnerable populations in middle income countries with high disease burdens; but at the same time robust cost-sharing requirements are necessary to ensure sustainability of programs in middle-income countries.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#20)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

When will these nations be "graduated" from U.S. health assistance?

Answer:

Under the Global Health Initiative, the focus of our programs is to save the greatest possible number of lives, both by increasing our existing health programs and by building upon them to help countries develop their own capacity to improve the health of their own people. We are laying the groundwork in working with our partner countries to uproot the most deep-seated obstacles that impede their own people's health, and we are engaged with them to bring their full commitment to this effort.

To galvanize country leadership, we are bringing to bear the full weight of American diplomacy. Our diplomats are working closely with their counterparts worldwide to embed a deep commitment to health—not only in the office of the health minister, but the foreign minister, the defense minister, the finance minister, and especially at the top, in the offices of prime ministers and presidents. Too often, we've seen health relegated to the

sidelines and treated as a lesser priority in terms of how much money is allocated and how much attention is devoted. The United States is willing to invest our money, our time, and our expertise to improve health in countries. Through the Global Health Initiative, we are now asking their governments to demonstrate a similar commitment, in terms of human resources, serious pledges to build capacity, and where feasible, financial support. We expect these countries to step up, and we're in this with the mindset that we're going to work ourselves out of a job because the countries will be taking up these responsibilities, on behalf of their people.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#21)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

What specifically are you doing to encourage other potential donors, including from the Gulf, the Middle East and beyond, to step up to the plate?

Answer:

The United States is using all opportunities, in both public and private fora, to encourage other donors to assume a greater responsibility in global health -- it is a shared global responsibility that requires a shared global response. As part of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, the global community committed to tackling some of the world's most pressing challenges —extreme poverty, disease, inequality, hunger, and illiteracy—in the poorest countries. In addition to our public statements in fora such as U.N. High-Level Meetings, we are working behind the scenes to highlight the success U.S. investments have been able to achieve, and to encourage others to step up.

We also continue to engage the private sector through Public-Private Partnerships as foundations, corporations and other private partners play an essential role in our efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

In addition, through our partnership with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization, PEPFAR is directly leveraging contributions from other donor governments, the private sector and foundations. Our work to reform and strengthen the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, described above, is essential to convincing other donors that there is an effective vehicle they can use to do more.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#22)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Madam Secretary, with over $2.65 trillion in foreign cash reserves, how could it be possible that China cannot afford to finance its own HIV/AIDS response?

Answer:

Fighting HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria is a shared global responsibility, and we have to ask all countries, including China, to meet that responsibility. We have urged China to take greater responsibility as a recipient and an emerging donor, we are pushing for China to take more financial responsibility for its national response to the three diseases, and we are cooperating with the Chinese to better address health issues in other countries. It is important to note that infectious diseases know no borders, and China has a significant TB burden which is highly associated with HIV.

The USG has and will continue to work through our seat on the Global Fund Board to ensure Global Fund resources get to people most in need. With strong USG support and engagement, the Global Fund Board is developing new eligibility and prioritization criteria and cost-sharing requirements designed to ensure resources are allocated most strategically,

with a focus on reaching countries and populations in greatest need and on enhancing the sustainability, including through increased domestic investment, of Global Fund grants in middle-income countries.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#23)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Why would the United States, in effect, borrow from China only to turn around and provide China with hundreds of millions of dollars in assistance?

Answer:

We have urged China to take greater financial and political responsibility for its own national response to the three diseases, and share your interest in seeing China take more responsibility as an emerging donor. Public health challenges beyond our borders cannot be ignored because infectious diseases know no borders.

The scale of Global Fund investment in China is of growing concern to the United States and should be better calibrated to their ability to pay for their own response to the three diseases. At the same time, the Global Fund model supports civil society engagement and support for vulnerable populations, principles that are vital to establishing an effective and sustainable response in countries such as China. For example, the Global Fund requires that Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs) include nongovernmental members. As a result, the Global Fund grants to China

have allowed Chinese civil society a stronger, albeit still limited, voice in the national response to the three diseases, and in particular HIV/AIDS, through their membership on the Chinese CCM. That said, we are pushing for China to move from being a Global Fund recipient to donor as quickly as possible.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#24)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

How can you justify the continuation of $3 million in assistance to China in these difficult economic times?

Answer:

It is important to note that infectious diseases know no borders, and China has a significant TB burden which is highly associated with HIV. The United States continues to provide HIV assistance to China in order to provide technical assistance and capacity building to the Government of China (GoC), strengthening its ability to provide oversight and manage its national HIV response in a sustainable manner. The GoC provides strong leadership and funding for the national HIV program, but requires assistance in assuring the quality of HIV interventions and building technical capacity, especially at the provincial and local levels. The United States Center for Disease Control's technical assistance relationship with China's CDC at the national and provincial levels focuses on best-practice guidelines and technical approaches, while USAID's technical assistance relationships with

provincial and local CDC and other implementing partners focuses on developing implementation models for most-at-risk populations (MARPs).

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#25)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

How can you continue to justify such high levels of Global Fund and PEPFAR assistance to India while India boasts the 11th largest economy in the world, has emerged as a donor nation, and has announced its "graduation" from assistance from the United Kingdom?

Answer:

India is another country with a significant TB burden which is highly associated with HIV. It also has the third largest HIV/AIDS epidemic in the world, with an estimated 2.4 million people living with HIV in the country. Given the huge population size, even small increases in HIV/AIDS rates in India could have global ramifications.

The United States bilateral HIV assistance in India is limited and focused, and demonstrates a targeted approach that is appropriate to both the HIV epidemic in India and the GOI's level of capacity and ownership of the response to HIV. The United States provides targeted technical assistance and capacity building, strengthening the GOI's ability to provide oversight and manage its national HIV response in a sustainable manner. PEPFAR investments in India have increased country ownership and increased sustainability.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#26)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Despite the fact that the U.N. Development Program acts as the Principal Recipient for more than half of the funds granted through the Global Fund – and the fact that the Global Fund's inspector general has uncovered massive corruption schemes in its programs affecting hundreds of millions of dollars – UNDP consistently refuses to submit to the jurisdiction of the Global Fund IG. In fact, UNDP even refuses to share the findings of its own internal investigations of UNDP-administered Global Fund grants with the Global Fund.

Madam Secretary, if UNDP is going to act as an implementer of Global Fund programs, should it not submit to the jurisdiction of the Global Fund's Inspector General?

Answer:

The United States is committed to ensuring Global Fund resources reach people in need and are used as effectively and efficiently as possible to save lives. We strongly support the Global Fund's Office of the Inspector General (OIG), and its ongoing efforts to strengthen the Global Fund's oversight systems. We have consistently advocated for increased transparency, accountability, and oversight over U.S. contributions to the Global Fund, including Global Fund resources managed by UNDP.

The United States supports the Global Fund in being granted the same access to UNDP audits as other member states, including the United States. The Global Fund is a financing mechanism for HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis (TB) and malaria, with no in-country presence. Global Fund grants are implemented through Principal Recipients (PR) in each country, typically government entities and NGOs. While the Global Fund seeks to promote country ownership by funding local entities where possible, UNDP has played an important role as a Global Fund Principal Recipient in countries facing complex emergencies and/or exceptional development challenges, including very limited or no local capacity to carry out complex health programs. UNDP is currently the Global Fund PR in 27 countries, managing a total of 63 active grants amounting to $1.1 billion, which is about 10% of the Global Fund's active portfolio.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#27)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

As a Member of the Global Fund Board, what specifically are you doing to ensure that UNDP complies with repeated requests for greater cooperation?

Answer:

The United States has had high-level discussions with UNDP management on the importance of sharing relevant audit information with the Global Fund's OIG and cooperating with the OIG in instances of suspected fraud. While UNDP does not currently share its internal audit reports with the Global Fund, UNDP has taken several interim steps to coordinate with the Global Fund's OIG, including 1) consulting with the OIG on development of UNDP's annual audit plan, 2) sharing summaries of UNDP's Global Fund-related audits, and 3) bringing potential irregularities involving Global Fund projects to the attention of the OIG whenever and wherever they are found. These steps are helpful but not sufficient, and the United States is continuing to push for full Global Fund access to relevant UNDP audit reports.

With strong U.S. encouragement, UNDP management has agreed to present options for allowing increased access to its audit reports to the UNDP Executive Board for consideration and approval in September 2011. The United States is working to build support among UNDP Board members for amendments to UNDP's audit disclosure policies that would allow increased transparency, accountability, and oversight over resources under UNDP management. We will also continue to have conversations with UNDP staff at the highest levels to emphasize the importance of increased transparency, accountability, and oversight over Global Fund resources managed by UNDP.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ros-Lehtinen (#28)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Will there be consequences for UNDP's continued intransigence and lack of transparency?

Answer:

The United States is confident that progress towards greater transparency around Global Fund resources managed by UNDP will be achieved this year when UNDP management presents options for allowing increased access to its audit reports to the UNDP Executive Board. If the new policies on transparency around Global Fund resources managed by UNDP do not meet the minimum standards of the United States and the Global Fund Board, the Global Fund may be required to identify another Principal Recipients that can serve, as UNDP has, in countries facing complex emergencies and/or exceptional development challenges.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#29)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Please provide details on the Administration's full request for Sudan, through all spigots, and how this reflects our greatest priorities in the country.

Answer:

The budget charts and information below, along with additional details, can be found in the Regional Perspectives Annex of the FY 2012 Foreign Operations Congressional Budget Justification.

Request by Account and Fiscal Year

($ in thousands)	FY 2010 Enacted	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 CR	FY 2012 Request
ADJUSTED TOTAL (Enduring + War Supp)	427,780	705,021	*	518,257
Development Assistance	0	1,300	*	0
Economic Support Fund	296,034	296,034	*	335,650
Food for Peace Title II	30,000	305,948	*	30,000
Global Health and Child Survival - State	7,036	7,036	*	12,397
Global Health and Child Survival - USAID	30,010	30,010	*	38,510
International Military Education and Training	800	793	*	800
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement	16,000	16,000	*	37,000
Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining and Related Programs	3,900	3,900	*	3,900
Peacekeeping Operations	44,000	44,000	*	60,000
Non-War Supplemental	0	0	*	0
TOTAL	427,780	705,021	*	518,257

Request by Objective by Account, Program Area and Fiscal Year

($ in thousands)	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 CR	FY 2012 Request
Sudan	705,021	*	518,257
1 Peace and Security	98,339	*	159,669
Economic Support Fund	34,646	*	67,169
1.6 Conflict Mitigation and Reconciliation	34,646	*	67,169
International Military Education and Training	793	*	800
1.3 Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform	793	*	800
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement	15,000	*	27,800
1.3 Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform	15,000	*	27,800
Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining and Related Programs	3,900	*	3,900
1.3 Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform	3,900	*	3,900
Peacekeeping Operations	44,000	*	60,000
1.3 Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform	44,000	*	60,000
2 Governing Justly and Democratically	83,945	*	102,692
Economic Support Fund	82,945	*	93,492
2.2 Good Governance	32,350	*	42,800
2.3 Political Competition and Consensus-Building	36,439	*	26,692
2.4 Civil Society	14,156	*	24,000
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement	1,000	*	9,200
2.1 Rule of Law and Human Rights	1,000	*	9,200
3 Investing in People	110,189	*	114,907
Development Assistance	1,300	*	0
3.2 Education	1,300	*	0
Economic Support Fund	41,550	*	49,000
3.1 Health	16,000	*	11,000
3.2 Education	25,550	*	38,000
Food for Peace Title II	30,293	*	15,000
3.1 Health	30,293	*	15,000
Global Health and Child Survival - State	7,036	*	12,397
3.1 Health	7,036	*	12,397
Global Health and Child Survival - USAID	30,010	*	38,510
3.1 Health	30,010	*	38,510
4 Economic Growth	136,893	*	140,989
Economic Support Fund	136,893	*	125,989
4.1 Macroeconomic Foundation for Growth	10,490	*	20,000
4.2 Trade and Investment	0	*	5,000
4.4 Infrastructure	81,308	*	46,355
4.5 Agriculture	25,499	*	19,855
4.6 Private Sector Competitiveness	7,551	*	7,274
4.7 Economic Opportunity	7,045	*	19,505
4.8 Environment	5,000	*	8,000

Food for Peace Title II	0	*	15,000
4.5 Agriculture	0	*	7,500
4.6 Private Sector Competitiveness	0	*	4,500
4.8 Environment	0	*	3,000
5 Humanitarian Assistance	275,655	*	0
Food for Peace Title II	275,655	*	0
5.1 Protection, Assistance and Solutions	275,655	*	0

Request by Program Area and Fiscal Year

($ in thousands)	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 CR	FY 2012 Request
Sudan	705,021	*	518,257
1 Peace and Security	98,339	*	159,669
1.3 Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform	63,693	*	92,500
1.6 Conflict Mitigation and Reconciliation	34,646	*	67,169
2 Governing Justly and Democratically	83,945	*	102,692
2.1 Rule of Law and Human Rights	1,000	*	9,200
2.2 Good Governance	32,350	*	42,800
2.3 Political Competition and Consensus-Building	36,439	*	26,692
2.4 Civil Society	14,156	*	24,000
3 Investing in People	110,189	*	114,907
3.1 Health	83,339	*	76,907
3.2 Education	26,850	*	38,000
4 Economic Growth	136,893	*	140,989
4.1 Macroeconomic Foundation for Growth	10,490	*	20,000
4.2 Trade and Investment	0	*	5,000
4.3 Financial Sector	0	*	0
4.4 Infrastructure	81,308	*	46,355
4.5 Agriculture	25,499	*	27,355
4.6 Private Sector Competitiveness	7,551	*	11,774
4.7 Economic Opportunity	7,045	*	19,505
4.8 Environment	5,000	*	11,000
5 Humanitarian Assistance	275,655	*	0
5.1 Protection, Assistance and Solutions	275,655	*	0
of which: Objective 6	31,532	*	25,874
6.1 Program Design and Learning	7,793	*	7,051
6.2 Administration and Oversight	23,739	*	18,823

Peace and Security. The United States will continue to support peace and security initiatives in Sudan during FY 2012. Urgent support will be needed

to build consensus around the new geographic reality that will affect the power sharing, security arrangements, economic situation, and political balances in the national, regional, and state governments. U.S. assistance will be geared toward addressing the threat of new or renewed conflict in potential flashpoint areas along the north-south border, particularly the Three Areas, minimizing the potential for increased tension between north and the South while supporting peace initiatives for Darfuris. To achieve these goals, it is necessary to bolster and expand programs in conflict prevention and mitigation. Peacekeeping operations are an essential part of these prevention and mitigation efforts. Ending the conflict in Darfur and ensuring security and justice for Darfuris will remain a priority for the United States. The United States will continue to support the ongoing Doha peace process and promote justice, accountability, and reconciliation.

Governing Justly and Democratically. The newly independent Southern Sudan will require focused support of emerging institutions and processes of democratic governance. Interventions in the immediate post-independence period will determine the long-term viability and outlook of the new state. U.S. assistance will build on efforts made since the signing of the CPA to strengthen core government institutional capacity at the central, state, and local levels; facilitate consensus building; strengthen legislative process and

the Southern Sudan Legislative Assembly and southern state legislative assemblies; and strengthen civic participation. Potential engagement in post-CPA northern Sudan may also be an important strategic opportunity as conditions permit, assuming the Government of Sudan fulfills its commitments, including under the CPA. USAID-managed development assistance will be effective in addressing unresolved CPA issues in the Three Areas and across contentious border regions, and will also promote stability and reform in northern Sudan by promoting citizen participation and equitable regional development.

Investing in People. U.S. Government investments in education and health in Sudan share a common challenge and agenda, improving upon some of the lowest human development statistics in the world for literacy, educational facilities, maternal and neonatal mortality, child survival, nutrition, and access to safe water and the most basic sanitation. Despite exceptionally low educational and health indicators, Southern Sudan is entering into a new and promising era with increasing political stability and strong government commitment to strengthening the education and health sectors and improving delivery of essential services. Many of the weaknesses in Southern Sudan's health and educational institutions are consequence of emergency efforts made during the decades-long civil war.

With the hoped-for peace and stability that will follow the recent successful referendum, U.S. interventions will make significant progress in strengthening government capacity and improving performance of the public health and educational sectors.

The education portfolio focuses on investments in primary education (through both traditional and non-traditional channels) while continuing to strengthen diverse facets of educational systems at all levels of government. The U.S. program will launch a major flagship program on teacher professional development this year. The need for trained teachers is acknowledged by the Ministry of Education as its single greatest priority, and the program will seek to address these needs through a comprehensive approach that covers policies, pre- and in-service training, curriculum, and infrastructure. U.S. assistance will improve people's ability to gain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they need to improve their lives and contribute to a peaceful and productive society by increasing access to quality education. Support will continue to focus on the southern states, the fragile Three Areas, and other vulnerable areas of Sudan, if conditions permit. The U.S. program also seeks to strengthen the government's capacity to manage the education system and deliver high quality services by

providing technical assistance to education ministries at both state and central levels.

USAID's investment in health responds to the compelling need to address maternal, infant, and child mortality rates that are among the highest in the world. Accordingly, the FY 2012 Budget will provide increased funding to programs that strengthen maternal and child health services in target geographical areas, and will expand access to high-quality, voluntary family planning and reproductive health care services, counseling, and information. In the South, U.S. assistance will support interventions that target priority health threats, improve access to potable water and hygiene and appropriate sanitation, and reduce the burden of infectious diseases, particularly HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, vaccine-preventable diseases, and neglected tropical diseases. The FY 2012 Budget will support improvements in six health system components: health governance and administration, human resources, health management information systems, financial management, health commodities logistics, and service delivery. In doing so, U.S. assistance will raise the capacity of central, state, and county governments to plan, manage, and monitor health programs. It will also strengthen coordination between USAID's programs in HIV/AIDS,

malaria, and tuberculosis and those supported by the Global Fund and other donors.

Economic Growth. The Economic Growth portfolio features a recalibration of the U.S. Government's strategic approach better to reflect post-CPA opportunities and aid effectiveness principles. Specifically, the United States will begin to decrease its historic emphasis on direct, large-scale infrastructure investments, substituting in its place interventions to diversify the economy by taking advantage of the agricultural base in addition to supporting policy reforms that will encourage private investment and enable the effective capture and use of public revenues. This approach has proven in Africa's more stable countries to increase private sector activity and job creation effectively and sustainably, while reducing poverty and food insecurity. The improved business environment and market orientation will particularly benefit the agriculture sector and support the President's Feed the Future Initiative, with the realization that rural economic development is directly correlated with the stabilization of conflict-prone areas.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#30)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Now that the South has voted to secede, how will United States assistance programs change?

Answer:

Since the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed in 2005, U.S. assistance has focused on helping the CPA parties to implement the agreement. USAID is finalizing a new transition strategy for South Sudan as it approaches statehood, with the overall goal of helping to make South Sudan increasingly stable. Our transition strategy is based on the premise that increasing stability in South Sudan depends on three things:

1. Strengthening of core governance institutions and increasing inclusiveness of governance processes.
2. Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS) capacity to respond to expectations of citizens for essential services and improved livelihoods.
3. Ability of the GoSS to contain conflicts that may erupt, and addressing the grievances that drives them.

The transition strategy addresses critical local drivers of conflict through flexible and quick-impact conflict mitigation interventions in flashpoint areas that will be implemented in partnership with local officials and traditional authorities. USAID will support broad initiatives to strengthen effective, accountable, and inclusive governance, the lack of which underpins and deepens grievances that can be mobilized for conflict in South Sudan. At the same time, citizens' grievances against the state will be addressed by targeting specific institutions, processes, and actors focusing on building effective and transparent institutions at the executive level, reducing corruption, and fostering a stable macroeconomic and legal framework that encourages investment. USAID will strengthen the capacity of citizens, civil society, media, and other nongovernmental actors to hold the GoSS accountable and ensure that it is responsive to its citizens. GoSS and private efforts to address citizens' high expectations for delivery of essential services will be strengthened at the state and local levels, in coordination with ongoing humanitarian programming and with an aim to transition from aid dependency to GoSS self-sustainability. USAID will support, with other donors, the oil sector and oil revenue management since South Sudan will remain primarily an oil-based economy for some time to come. USAID will support sustained and inclusive agriculture sector-led

growth to enhance resiliency and reinforce stability. Economic interdependence will be reinforced through increasing household productivity and linking communities to markets, providing access to credit for agribusinesses and small-scale farmers, and building strategic partnerships to better enable south Sudanese to capture market opportunities and enhance stability in targeted areas where lack of economic opportunity is part of the conflict dynamic.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#31)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Has any assistance been included in the request for northern Sudan, outside of Darfur?

Answer:

The FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification contains one budget for all of Sudan. Any funding split between Southern Sudan, the Three Areas, Darfur, and other parts of Sudan for FY 2012 is notional at this time, but generally consistent with prior years. While the amount of assistance to the north is not yet determined, some level of assistance is envisioned for vulnerable areas in northern Sudan outside of Darfur, including for the Three Areas of Abyei, Southern Kordofan State and Blue Nile State. U.S. assistance in the North will be consistent with U.S. expectations that the Government of Sudan fulfill its commitments to the international community.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#32)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

If so, for what purpose?

Answer:

Activities focused on the "Three Areas" (the Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan States, and Abyei) will remain a priority for U.S. assistance. These areas pose particular risks and opportunities with respect to achieving sustainable peace in Sudan. The question of Abyei's status (whether it joins the South or remains part of the north) must be resolved, whether through the agreed-upon referendum or through negotiation. Historical grievances stemming from colonial boundary decisions make this especially sensitive and important. In Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan, the successful conduct and conclusion of the popular consultations process is critical to continued stability and future development. If effective, these processes could lead to greater autonomy for these States, which could serve as a positive model for peace in Darfur and political reform in northern Sudan. If popular consultations fail, conflict and instability would likely escalate and serve as

a catalyst for instability throughout the north. Recognizing this risk, the United States plans to continue humanitarian, recovery, and development programs in the Three Areas to help ensure peace for these key regions following the end of the CPA process, and to increase the chances of a sustainable peace for both north and South Sudan. USAID will support local governance reform, as and where appropriate, especially in conflict-prone areas, and promote political reform and citizen participation through political party development, civil society strengthening and media freedom.

Support for post-referenda and post-popular consultations stability will be required to counter the threat of new or renewed conflict following the creation of a new country in southern Sudan. The United States will promote programs directed at mediating and preventing conflict around post-2011 issues, including cross-border development, security and movement, inter-ethnic relationships, and oil security.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#33)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

How far along is the Administration's review of Sudan as a State Sponsor of Terrorism?

Answer:

To date, the review is ongoing and the results are not yet known.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#34)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

When might we expect to see a report of your conclusions?

Answer:

The review is on-going and we do not have a target date for completing the evaluative process. The President must submit to Congress, at least 45 days before the proposed rescission would take effect, a report justifying the rescission and certifying that:

- The Government of Sudan has not provided any support for international terrorism during the preceding six month period; and

- The Government of Sudan has provided assurances that it will not support acts of international terrorism in the future.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#35)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

What steps has the Government of South Sudan taken to ensure transparency and accountability in its budgeting process?

Answer:

The GOSS has implemented a comprehensive budget process to improve transparency and launched several initiatives targeted at improving accountability and reducing corruption.

Transparency

- Resource ceilings for agencies are approved by the GoSS Cabinet, and a Budget Document based on these resources is presented to the Legislative Assembly each year by the Executive. The Assembly then has the opportunity to scrutinize and make changes to the appropriations, before approving them through an Appropriation Act.

- The Appropriation Act provides penalties for misuse of funds, and sets reporting requirements (quarterly reports to Cabinet, bi-annual reports to the Assembly).

- The Budget Document itself provides detailed and comprehensive information both on the appropriations given to each Agency, and on their programs.

Accountability

- The GoSS Ministry of Finance & Economic Planning has, with US project assistance, implemented a financial management information system (FMIS) to enable it to have complete and accurate information on expenditure so that it can meet the reporting requirements in the Appropriation Act.

- The Ministry is also rolling out this FMIS to each of the ten States of South Sudan. Over a quarter of the GoSS budget is sent to the States as transfers, and States are required to use the FMIS to ensure they generate accurate expenditure reports which are then submitted to the Ministry of Finance.

- In 2010, aggregate outturns were within 2% of the Approved Budget; however, there was some significant under and over spending by some Agencies.

- To address this challenge, the Ministry of Finance is currently designing a program of reforms to improve sub-aggregate financial discipline and cash management.

- The Ministry of Finance, with USAID project support has also developed a Public Financial Management and Accountability Act containing more comprehensive financial rules which is awaiting legislative review by Government Legal Advisors before proceeding to the Assembly.

- A Procurement Law is also being developed by the Ministry with USAID assistance.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#36)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Has the GOSS taken steps to address allegations of corruption?

Answer:

GoSS's steps to address allegations of corruption have been limited to the investigatory side of allegations. The Southern Sudan Anti-Corruption Commission (SSACC) and Presidential Office have conducted investigations into the grain scandal and several other complaints, however nothing has progressed beyond that level into prosecutorial action or other proactive tactics. The SSACC's investigations referred over to the Government of Southern Sudan Ministry of Legal Affairs and Constitutional Development (MOLACD) for prosecution have not gone anywhere. The SSACC argues that the Ministry is not fulfilling their duty. The Ministry and Courts claim that the SSACC investigations have not been of sufficient quality and evidence for them to pursue further.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#37)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Have any measurable results be achieved with the $203 million dedicated thus far to security sector transformation in South Sudan?

Answer:

Thus far, U.S. government assistance to security sector transformation in South Sudan has supported the enhancement of SPLA command and control by building infrastructure, including constructing two division headquarters and the SPLA general headquarters, providing communications training and equipment to allow for the SPLA general headquarters to communicate with all the SPLA divisions, brigades, and battalions in sensitive areas, conducting leadership and human rights training for the SPLA to better discipline and lead its forces, and establishing command operation centers. U.S. assistance also provided advisors and training that assisted the SPLA to develop a defense strategy, the SPLA force structure, a procurement process, a cadre of military police instructors, a riverine unit to patrol and secure the Nile River, a logistics training center, and security plans to prepare for the 2010 elections and the 2011 referendum.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#38)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Have there been allegations of serious human rights abuses by the SPLA or the Southern Sudan Police Service since the start of the Interim Period?

Answer:

There have been allegations of human rights abuses by the SPLA and the SSPS. Allegations since the start of the interim period include extrajudicial killings, physical abuse of persons, rape, abuses involving disarmament activities, arbitrary detention, use of child soldiers, and voter intimidation and presence at polling stations during the elections. There were also instances in which Southern security forces detained and beat journalists, and restricted media freedom. In 2010, there were allegations of rape and forced prostitution of female cadets, beatings, and sale of food that should have gone to cadets at the John Garang Unified Police Academy at Rajaf. The Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices documents reported abuses by Southern security forces. These reports can be found at http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/index.htm.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#39)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Have any of those allegations been linked to units supported by United States assistance and training?

Answer:

The State Department vets in accordance with the Leahy amendment to prevent any unit of Southern Sudan's security forces from receiving assistance if the Department has credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights.

The United States had provided assistance to the John Garang Unified Police Academy, where grave human rights abuses against cadets are alleged to have taken place. All U.S. support for the site is currently on hold pending a full, transparent, and credible investigation of these allegations.

The Department has also denied training to members of the SPLA military police unit in Juba due to a 2008 incident in which SPLA military police detained eight third-country nationals in SPLA Headquarters, transferring four of them to a facility known as the customs market and

abusing them. The SPLA reported that the commander and the deputy commander were reassigned for failure to properly supervise and train soldiers, and that a sergeant was permanently dismissed due to wrongfully treating persons in custody.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#40)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

How have the allegations been remedied?

Answer:

The United States strongly support the development of a professional Southern Sudanese security force that respects human rights. We regularly raise our concerns regarding abuses committed by Southern Sudanese security forces at the highest levels with the Government of Southern Sudan. Security force impunity continues to be a problem, but the GoSS is making progress.

The SPLA has notably taken steps to address the issue of child soldiers. UN personnel believe that SPLA is not actively recruiting child soldiers. The SPLA inaugurated a Child Protection Unit in August 2010. UNICEF continues to demobilize children from the SPLA.

U.S. assistance to the security sector includes a focus on promoting the rule of law and respect for human rights and international humanitarian law. Since 2007, we have focused International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) programming to support the establishment and

development of the primary criminal justice training and education institutions. In addition, we have supported immediate needs of the criminal justice sector and transformation of the current system before and after the referendum. It has included support for the development of relevant legislation, training for Judges, and attention to vulnerable populations within the criminal justice system, especially juveniles.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#53)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Last November, it was revealed that Nicaraguan forces had invaded Costa Rican territory to carry out a dredging project that clearly violates Costa Rica's territorial integrity and sovereignty. In the months since, Nicaragua has continued its efforts unabated, causing irreparable environmental damage to Costa Rica's wetlands. While Costa Rica has employed nearly every multilateral tool it has at its disposal, including bringing its case to the Organization of American States and the International Court of Justice next week, the United States has remained virtually silent on the matter. In fact, in a recent Miami Herald editorial, Costa Rican President Laura Chinchilla stated –

"Despite such serious implications, the international community has shown a minor interest in the case. May the message be that if no weapons are fired and no casualties are counted, there is no reason for concern? This would be a terrible message for disarmed countries such as Costa Rica, and for convincing others to invest in development and institutional building instead than spending on weapons."

Madam Secretary, with this in mind, I would like to make it clear for the record - Does the United States agree that Nicaragua has invaded Costa Rican territory?

Answer:

Costa Rica and Nicaragua have long disputed issues related to their boundary. In response to last fall's escalation of tension and Nicaraguan placement of military personnel in territory that Costa Rica has identified as

its own, the United States publicly supported OAS resolutions calling on both parties to distance armed personnel from the disputed territory and pursue a peaceful resolution. On March 8, the International Court of Justice ruled on the request for "provisional measures" in a decision that has been lauded by both Costa Rica and Nicaragua. The United States will continue to monitor the dispute and encourage Costa Rica and Nicaragua to resolve it peacefully.

Question for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#56)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

The FY2012 budget request includes a significant decrease in INCLE funding to Colombia (from $243m to $160m). I understand that the Government of Colombia is taking significant steps to nationalize many of the programs that the United States currently supports; however, this appears to be quite a drastic cut. Does Colombia have the capacity to effectively assume ownership of these programs at such a drastic pace?

Answer:

U.S. counternarcotics and rule of law assistance to Colombia remains a priority of our regional efforts to stem the flow of drugs to the United States and enhance citizen security. The reduction to the FY 2012 Colombia INCLE request is in line with the process of nationalization that we have negotiated with the Colombian government. With Colombian concurrence, we are gradually transferring operational and financial responsibility for several counternarcotics programs to the Government of Colombia.

The Department has been working closely with Colombia on this nationalization. The program's sustainability is evidenced by Colombia's ability to successfully assume responsibility for activities like the Air Bridge Denial program, purchasing all aviation fuel and providing the helicopter security escorts for aerial eradication.

The nationalization process is continuing; the Administration's FY 2012 Colombia INCLE request reflects the ongoing nationalization of several U.S.-supported Colombian military programs. By the end of 2012, we have agreed with the Colombian government to transfer full responsibility for the Colombian Army Aviation and Army Counterdrug Brigade programs. Over the next two years, the titles to the remaining 24 helicopters that are part of the Colombian Army Aviation program will be gradually turned over to Colombia.

Nationalization has, however, not only been limited to Colombian military programs. Significant savings have also been realized through nationalizing components of the aerial eradication program. In addition to the helicopter security support already mentioned, the Department expects Colombia to begin purchasing the glyphosate used in aerial eradication later this year.

As I have made clear, the U.S. government has a "shared responsibility" on the drug problem with countries like Colombia. As we continue to increase Colombian institutional capacity, the savings will be reflected in our Colombia INCLE requests. The Department will continue to work with you and your committee to ensure sufficient funding to this important Andean nation.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#58)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Since Viktor Yanukovych assumed office last year as Ukraine's President, there have been reports of backtracking on the democratic and media freedom improvements made since 2004. I raised concerns about these negative trends in a letter I sent you on February 10th, in which I requested that during your meeting with the Ukrainian Foreign Minister Gryshchenko, that you express to him that the U.S. will condemn "any steps taken to weaken Ukraine's hard-won democratic reform of government and respect for human rights, freedom of the media and the proper rule of law."

Did you raise these concerns with Foreign Minister Gryshchenko? What was his reaction?

Answer:

The President has raised democracy-related problems with President Yanukovych, and Vice President Biden echoed our concerns during his March 2 telephone conversation with President Yanukovych. The Vice President underscored that our strategic partnership with Ukraine is based on shared democratic values. He emphasized the importance of improving election procedures through a transparent, inclusive reform process in advance of the 2012 parliamentary elections.

Democracy and human rights concerns were a major focus of my meeting with Foreign Minister Gryshchenko during the February 15 session of the U.S.-Ukraine Strategic Partnership Commission in Washington. I emphasized these concerns and underlined the need to protect Ukraine's democratic gains. Specifically, I underlined the importance of avoiding the appearance of politically-motivated prosecution of opposition leaders. I raised problems going back to Ukraine's flawed local elections last October, and stressed the importance of improving election procedures in advance of the 2012 parliamentary elections.

To ensure regular U.S.-Ukraine discussions of Ukraine's democratic record, the United States and Ukraine established a Political Dialogue and Rule of Law Working Group as part of our Strategic Partnership Commission, which convened most recently on February 14-15. In addition, a parallel U.S.-Ukraine civil society event took place alongside the Commission meetings. In both of these fora, democracy and human rights issues were the focus of the agenda.

Democracy and rule of law issues will remain at the top of our agenda with Ukraine.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#65)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

What steps are being taken to ensure that our engagement with the governments in Central Asia does not, in fact or perception, support or contribute to repression and corruption in those countries or come at the expense of our agenda to promote freedom and democracy in the region?

Answer:

The United States has an important interest in promoting a stable, secure, and prosperous Central Asia that is integrated into the global economy and whose governments respect universal human rights. Success in the region depends on the ability to bolster the civilian institutions that can prevent extremism and conflict. The United States works to encourage democracy and responsive government, increase access to better quality education and health care, create more economic opportunities, and empower women. Governance programs help build government capacity to operate in a more accountable and transparent manner and to effectively deliver basic services. The United States is working to strengthen rule of law, increase respect for human rights, support independent media and access to objective news and information, create civil societies that advocate

for citizens' rights and participation, promote fair and open political processes, and empower women as agents of change.

As part of the effort to engage in a dialogue on human rights, Assistant Secretary Blake started in December 2009 Annual Bilateral Consultations (ABCs) with every Central Asian country. The ABCs have facilitated candid discussions on every bilateral issue, including human rights. A senior representative from the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor has participated in the ABCs. As part of the March 24-25 ABCs with Kazakhstan, Assistant Secretary Blake and Kazakhstan Deputy Foreign Minister Kayrat Umarov hosted a civil society roundtable that provided a forum for more than 30 representatives to engage with the U.S. and Kazakhstan governments. On every trip to the region, Assistant Secretary Blake and other senior U.S. officials, including Secretary Clinton during her December 2010 visit to Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan, make a point of engaging with civil society and non-governmental organizations.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#66)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Last June, tensions between ethnic Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbeks in southern Kyrgyzstan erupted in violence which resulted in hundreds being killed and thousands injured. The President's FY2012 Budget Request for the Kyrgyz Republic is $37.0 million. How much of that amount is going to be utilized to help address the tensions between ethnic Kyrgyz and Uzbeks in that country?

Answer:

The United States has worked with the people and government of the Kyrgyz Republic through a broad spectrum of engagement and assistance programming to build democracy and promote peace and reconciliation in the Kyrgyz Republic. Following the June 2010 violence, the United States directed significant emergency resources to address humanitarian needs and begin the process of reconciliation. Shortly after the conflict, USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives began a $20 million community-level stabilization project that seeks to relieve tension between ethnic communities through local-level economic development. In addition, $15.88 million of Section 1207 FY2010 funding is being used to address

underlying causes of instability, bolster local sources of resilience, and develop the capabilities of Kyrgyz security and governance institutions in southern Kyrgyzstan to respond accountably and effectively to conflict. The Department of State's Office of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor provided $2 million in FY09 and FY10 funding to facilitate discussion of human rights issues and increase access to independent sources of information.

Many portions of the funding requested for FY 2012 will assist in the reconciliation process, including approximately $2 million for a USAID Youth Empowerment Program aimed at reducing the potential for conflict and addressing reconciliation and a significant portion of the expected $750,000 budget for Embassy-sponsored small grants. In addition, $3.8 million will be used to facilitate reform of security forces including the goals of improving police respect for human rights, and greater representation of ethnic minorities in police forces. The USG will also use $2.2 million to support reform and training for prosecutors and judges to improve professionalism and reduce the occurrence of ethnically motivated prosecutions. Programs focused on the educational sector will use $2.3 million to ensure universal access to primary and secondary education for children in conflict affected areas of southern Kyrgyzstan. In addition, the

$10.6 million food security and agricultural improvement project will include activities focused on conflict affected areas to ensure equitable access to water for irrigation and agribusiness partnerships between Uzbeks and Kyrgyz to increase farmer incomes in all communities.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#70)
House Foreign Affairs Committee
March 1, 2011

Question:

Do you agree with this shift in U.S. foreign assistance from U.S. and foreign non-governmental organizations to local Pakistani organizations and government entities?

Answer:

Yes, I absolutely agree with the shift toward implementing a substantial portion of U.S. civilian assistance through local Pakistani organizations and government entities. The U.S. Government has changed its model for development assistance to Pakistan to improve the provision and effectiveness of our aid, strengthen our partnership with the Pakistani government at both the federal and provincial levels, and to empower these governments to have responsibility for, and capacity to impact their country's development.

In channelling more assistance through Pakistani organizations, we are better positioned to uphold our commitment to building a long-term partnership with the Government of Pakistan and the Pakistani people. We will implement this assistance responsibly via a variety of

mechanisms to include: direct-sector budget support; federal and provincial government projects and programs; Pakistani non-governmental organizations (NGOs); Pakistani contractors; multi-donor trust funds; and public-private partnerships.

At the same time, while we are fully committed to channel funds directly to Pakistani institutions, we require that transparent mechanisms, financial management, and other relevant processes are put in place to ensure the proper use of our funds.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#71)
House Foreign Affairs Committee
March 2, 2011

Question:

What oversight mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that funds are spent in an accountable and transparent manner?

Answer:

The United States has put in place robust oversight mechanisms to ensure U.S. assistance to Pakistan is used as it is intended.

For security assistance to Pakistan, the U.S. provides training and equipment to Pakistani security institutions, rather than providing funding directly. The United States is fully committed to meeting our obligations under the Arms Export Control Act to ensure that our military assistance is used for its intended purpose and to preserve the technological advantages enjoyed by the U.S. military. To do this, we ensure recipient nations' compliance with these measures with rigorous end-use monitoring through the Department of Defense Golden Sentry program. Specifically, it monitors government-to-government transfers to ensure that the defense articles and services provided by the United States Government are utilized and safeguarded in accordance with the

terms and conditions for the transfers. The Department also takes the necessary steps to ensure that we are in full compliance with the Leahy Amendment in Pakistan. There is a strong process in place to vet security force units and individuals before they receive U.S. assistance to ensure that they are not implicated in any gross human rights violations.

Similarly, when the U.S. provides law enforcement training, equipment, and infrastructure support to Pakistan, International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INL) conducts on-site inspections, requires regular reporting, participates in project bidding review processes, and conducts rigorous end-use monitoring of all assistance.

USAID vets all potential implementers of U.S. assistance for technical capacity, risks of financial misconduct, and terrorist financing before awarding funding. USAID also conducts pre-award assessments of all Pakistani organizations that may receive funding to determine if financial management and overall management systems and policies are in place that will ensure the transparent and accountable use of USG funds. The assessments examine organizational and management structure, accounting, financial management systems, internal controls, technical capabilities and quality assurance capabilities. If significant

weaknesses are identified, USAID will either not provide funding or will institute capacity building and other risk mitigation measures to ensure appropriate use of U.S. funds.

In addition, the Inspector General community plays an invaluable role to ensure the appropriate use of funds and has a Memorandum of Understanding with the Supreme Audit Institution of the Government of Pakistan (GOP) to allow access to financial and audit records for GOP entities.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#77)
House Foreign Affairs Committee
March 2, 2011

Question:

Madam Secretary, this past January the *Wall Street Journal* published an article titled "Setbacks Plague U.S. Aid to Pakistan," suggesting that our civilian-development and humanitarian aid programs there – totaling $6 Billion over the last decade -- are doing little to overcome anti-American sentiment in that country.

What do you see as the cause of this disconnect between our notable levels of civilian aid and an apparent lack of impact on the view of the United States held by many Pakistanis?

Answer:

The United States is committed to pursuing a long and lasting partnership with Pakistan. Fundamentally, U.S. assistance to Pakistan is about building a long-term partnership and moving away from a transactional relationship, not about affecting polling numbers.

In any case, we know that inherent suspicion – in Pakistan against Americans and in America against Pakistanis – will not go away overnight. U.S. assistance is not appreciated in all parts of Pakistan, but that isn't going to stop us from coming to the aid of the next flood victim who has lost her home or deter us from our commitment to our

partnership with the people of Pakistan. We have a lot of work to do to combat this distrust and to better convey to the people of Pakistan what our intentions are, to prove to them through our consistent engagement that we are not fair-weather friends, but long-term partners. We need to do a better job of communicating with the Pakistani people and we will continue to do so – whether in town halls in Islamabad and Karachi or in exchange visits for young Pakistanis to America.

The Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 legislation and our public commitment to seek civilian assistance for Pakistan is a critical indicator of our staying power as we launch projects in key sectors like energy and the economy that will benefit Pakistan for years to come. These projects are developed in close cooperation with Pakistanis so that we are funding programs that we know Pakistan wants and needs and that will reach the Pakistani people. Roughly 50% of these funds will be managed through Pakistani institutions, giving Pakistani institutions the opportunity to set funding priorities and be directly involved in supporting their people.

The United States has also built America's largest educational and cultural exchange program in the world in Pakistan. Through the largest English language micro-scholarship program, Fulbright academic exchange,

and professional and youth exchange program, as well as many other initiatives, we are building bridges of understanding, respect, and continuing cooperation between Pakistanis and Americans across a variety of fields.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#78)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Madam Secretary, speaking at the Human Rights Council in Geneva, you called on the UN General Assembly to suspend Libya from the Council. You said that [QUOTE] "Governments that turn their guns on their own people have no place in this chamber." [END QUOTE] You're absolutely right, though I wish that the Administration would have acted on this principle last May, when the Qaddafi regime was elected to the Council and we failed to protest. And speaking of governments that have turned their guns on their own people, Cuba and China, among many other dictatorships, continue to be members of the Human Rights Council. Recently, the Iranian regime joined the UN Commission on the Status of Women.

Will the Administration act now, before more lives are lost, to call for these other gross human rights violators to be thrown off the UN Human Rights Council and the Commission on the Status of Women?

Answer:

The United Nations is a product of its member states. The United Nations 192 members serve on any number of UN bodies, including the UN Human Rights Council and the Commission on the Status of Women. Over the past several years, U.S. advocacy helped to keep Iran and Belarus off the Council, a result that not only sent a message to those regimes, but to others like them. The United States was also proud to play an instrumental role in

the Council's special session condemning Qaddafi's actions against the people of Libya, working with the EU and Mexico to put forward a strong resolution that was adopted by the entire Council. The United States also played a key role in the UN General Assembly's follow-on action to suspend Libya's membership rights in the HRC. While the Council has considerable flaws, most notably its biased treatment of Israel, strong and principled U.S. engagement has made a difference on several counts. The U.S. has helped the Council achieve important new gains –new Rapporteurs on the situation in Iran and on Freedom of Association, a Working Group to monitor discrimination against women, Commissions of Inquiry on Cote d'Ivoire and Libya, focused attention on Guinea, Kyrgyzstan, Tunisia, and Somalia. We will continue our work with like-minded states to hold human rights abusers accountable, including those that sit on the Council.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#79)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Madam Secretary, when the Administration sought to join the UN Human Rights Council two years ago and critics said that your decision would legitimize that illegitimate body, your Department said that the U.S. would seek to change it from within. Well, you've had some small and largely symbolic victories, usually by criticizing countries that were already severely isolated, but let's look at the big picture. The Council is nearing the end of its five-year review process, and the results are dismal. The U.S. delegation's statement called this process "a race to the bottom," and that "delegates repeated fixed positions and blocked any opportunity for genuine debate." The Council's working group on this five-year review adopted an outcome document that does not adopt any meaningful membership standards, and that preserves the injustice of having a permanent agenda item that singles out the democratic, Jewish State of Israel for criticism, with no such permanent focus on the world's worst human rights abusers, including Libya.

Why, Madam Secretary, did the U.S. join consensus on this indefensible outcome document (2011 Review Outcome)? Why didn't the U.S. call for a vote and vote "No"?

Answer:

The statement and meeting to which you refer was a meeting of a working group, not an official session of the Human Rights Council. The Outcome Document of this working group came before the Council during

its 16th session for adoption by the Council and transmittal to the UN General Assembly. The United States disassociated from consensus. The U.S. did not vote "no" because the review is two-staged and the process is not yet over. We intend to continue this discussion in New York in the coming months.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (#80)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Madam Secretary, when the Administration sought to join the UN Human Rights Council two years ago and critics said that your decision would legitimize that illegitimate body, your Department said that the U.S. would seek to change it from within. Well, you've had some small and largely symbolic victories, usually by criticizing countries that were already severely isolated, but let's look at the big picture. The Council is in the nearing the end of its five-year review process, and the results are dismal. The U.S. delegation's statement called this process "a race to the bottom," and that "delegates repeated fixed positions and blocked any opportunity for genuine debate." The Council's working group on this five-year review adopted an outcome document that does not adopt any meaningful membership standards, and that preserves the injustice of having a permanent agenda item that singles out the democratic, Jewish State of Israel for criticism, with no such permanent focus on the world's worst human rights abusers, including Libya.

Now that the (Human Rights Council 2011) review process has reinforced the fact that the Council will continue to be an anti-Israel rogues' gallery, will the U.S. finally do the right thing, withdraw from the Council until it is meaningfully reformed, and explore alternative international forums to defend and advance human rights?

Answer:

The review process has not concluded, nor is it the only means to improve the Council's functioning. The United States believes that the best

way to improve the HRC is through our strong and principled leadership in achieving real results, session by session, resolution by resolution, and by exercising effective leadership and advancing accountability for human rights performance.

Through our active participation we are working to improve the Council's work on the basis of three principles. First, the Council must have the capacity to respond to emergencies in real time. And it must demonstrate clearly that it possesses the will to address gross abuses, hold violators accountable, and work with governments, citizens, and civil society organizations genuinely committed to reform. Second, the Council must apply a single standard to all countries based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It cannot continue to single out and devote disproportionate attention to any one country. And third, the Council needs to abandon tired rhetorical debates and focus instead on making tangible improvements in people's lives.

The results of the most recent Human Rights Council session show some progress towards this goal. The session included ground-breaking action in support of the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. It charted a new course for global efforts to combat discrimination against people on the basis of religion and to protect and

promote freedom of expression. It established a Commission of Inquiry to examine serious abuses and violations of human rights in Cote d'Ivoire. And it took bold, assertive action to highlight the deteriorating human rights situation in Iran by establishing a Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights Situation in that country.

Despite these achievements, much work remains to be done to ensure that the Council realizes fully its intended purpose. In particular, the United States remains determined to end the Council's biased and disproportionate focus on Israel. The U.S. maintains a vocal, principled stand against this bias, and will continue its robust efforts to end it.

WRITTEN RESPONSES FROM THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD L. BERMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Howard L. Berman (#1)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Machine Readable Visa Fees: Section 140 of Title I of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (8 U.S.C. 1351 note) as supplemented by 8 U.S.C. 1713, authorizes the Department to charge a fee for processing machine readable non-immigrant visas and to deposit such fees as offsetting collections to any Department appropriation to recover the costs of providing consular services. The fees finance much of the Department's Border Security Program.

How much of the Machine Readable Visa (MRV) fees go to recovering the costs for specifically the processing of nonimmigrant visas?

Answer:

For nonimmigrant visas (NIVs), the MRV fee is sufficient to cover all costs related to the processing of a nonimmigrant visa application, regardless of whether the visa is issued. The costs associated with the MRV fee range from: (a) direct costs, such as equipment, supplies, and personnel (including U.S. Direct Hire and Locally Employed Staff), to (b) indirect costs, including building and maintenance expenses, and to (c) costs involved in actually printing and issuing a visa. The Department's Cost of Service Model (CoSM) provides a detailed cost analysis of those direct and indirect

costs of the full range of consular services with the aim of ensuring that the fees on the Schedule of Fees for Consular Services are set appropriately to recover the cost of the services delivered. For Fiscal Year 2010, the amount of MRV fees that were used to recover the NIV costs were approximately $884.4 million.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Howard L. Berman (#2)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Border Security Staff: The FY12 budget requests $398,928,000 for salaries of Border Security Staff and notes that the Department plans to increase staff by an additional 20 overseas positions to support consular workload overseas.

Please describe the type of new overseas personnel the Department plans to hire. Will these 20 new hires be Foreign Service Officers? Where do you plan to post them? How much of the $398 million will be used to hire the 20 new overseas positions?

Answer:

The 20 new overseas personnel will be Foreign Service Officers. Each year the Bureau of Consular Affairs conducts a review of consular workload demand and staffing at our overseas posts. The final determination on placement of positions is made at the conclusion of this review, and ensures that posts with the greatest demand and/or most complex workload issues gain the new Foreign Service positions.

Preliminary projections indicate that CA will likely increase staffing at posts in China, Brazil, India, and Argentina. U.S. Missions China and Brazil will receive multiple positions. This is not an exhaustive list. $2.9

million of the $398 million will be used to hire the 20 new overseas positions.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Howard L. Berman (#3)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Temporary Commissioned Consular Officers: The Department hired temporary commissioned consular officers in Mexico in anticipation of a surge in visa demand.

Given that there have been significant increases in visa demands in China, Brazil and India, will the Department hire temporary commissioned consular officers in FY 2012 or beyond to meet these demands? If not, how do you propose to address these increased visa demands?

Answer:

To address the growing demand for visa services in high-volume missions, we are developing a plan to hire temporary visa adjudicators in Limited Non-Career Appointments for a maximum of five years. During the FY 2011 pilot phase, we hope to hire 20 language-qualified adjudicators to work in China and Brazil. If the program is successful, we will expand it as needed.

At the present time, the Foreign Service Officer staffing is sufficient to meet consular workload demand in India. We continually monitor consular workload demand and will look to add either Foreign Service

Officer positions or Limited Non-Career appointed visa adjudicators once warranted.

We proposed a similar program in Mexico in 2008, but never actually hired temporary commissioned consular officers because of security concerns. We met increased consular demand in Mexico by increasing the number of Foreign Service Officers assigned to our posts there.

WRITTEN RESPONSES FROM THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE DAVID RIVERA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative David Rivera (#1)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

February 24 marked the 15th anniversary of the Brothers to the Rescue shoot down in which four Americans were murdered over international air space. Did the State Department, the White House or anyone in the Obama Administration issue any statement marking that day and condemning that heinous act against American citizens?

Answer:

On February 24, Assistant Secretary of State Arturo A. Valenzuela sent individual letters to each of the victims' families extending our deep sympathies once again and letting them know that the Department of State has not forgotten their loved ones nor the brutal act that caused their deaths. The Department of State has met with the victims' families on numerous occasions in the past and acknowledges that the victims serve as an inspiration to others who are working to advance democracy, peaceful dissent, and respect for human rights in Cuba.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative David Rivera (#2)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Regarding the 1996 Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (Helms-Burton). As you know, the President may suspend, and has in fact repeatedly suspended, Title III of Helms-Burton every six months if the President reports in writing to the appropriate congressional committees at least fifteen days before such suspension, that it is necessary to the national interests of the United States and will expedite transition to democracy in Cuba (emphasis added). Can you give examples of the second part of that requirement, "expediting a transition to democracy"? Exactly how has suspension of Title III, which has occurred for the last 15 years continuously, "expedited a transition to democracy in Cuba"? Does not the fact that such suspensions have occurred for 15 years, and that no transition to democracy has occurred, prove in and of itself that the suspensions have been unjustified and without foundation? On what basis will the Administration substantiate an "expedited transition to democracy" in the next suspension of Title III?

Answer:

The right to bring an action under Title III has been suspended since its enactment for successive six-month periods by Presidents Clinton, Bush, and Obama, who found that suspension is necessary to the national interests of the United States and will help expedite a transition to democracy in Cuba. As you know, the United States considers the promotion of democracy in Cuba to be a fundamental objective of our foreign policy in the Hemisphere. However, the Administration believes that failure to extend the suspension of Title III would jeopardize cooperation with our international partners on critical national security

goals, such as counterterrorism cooperation and nonproliferation, and would undermine other countries' willingness to cooperate with the United States and advocate for human rights and democracy in Cuba.

WRITTEN RESPONSE FROM THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTION SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE GREGORY W. MEEKS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Gregory Meeks
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

During your June 2010 trip to Ecuador you commented favorably on the region's political and economic growth. Much of this growth is attributable to the ATPDEA. Do you support the immediate extension of ATPDEA as a means to increase stability and attractiveness to U.S. entrepreneurs of the trade and investment climate in the Andean region and to strengthen relations between Andean nations and our own? If so, do you agree that a long-term extension of ATPDEA would better support U.S. foreign policy priorities?

Answer:

We urge Congress to reauthorize the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA), as well as the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), at the earliest opportunity and for the longest period possible. These programs support U.S. jobs, promote economic development overseas, and provide greater certainty for American businesses and investors. The lapse in GSP and ATPA authorization has already cost U.S. businesses millions of dollars in additional import duties, increased costs to American manufacturers and consumers, and undercut efforts by developing countries to grow their economies and fight poverty. Long-term reauthorization of GSP and ATPA would give industry greater confidence that the programs' benefits will be available for the duration of their investment, thus maximizing the

development benefits of the programs. If the programs are not reauthorized soon, many U.S. importers may be forced to find other sources for their GSP and ATPA imports, raising costs for all and undermining the development objectives of the programs.

WRITTEN RESPONSE FROM THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTION SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE JEFF DUNCAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Jeff Duncan (#1)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Madame Secretary: Following your trip to Mexico last month, you were asked in an interview if you considered the violence in Mexico, specifically along the U.S.-Mexican border, as something that threatens U.S. national security. You stated: "No, I consider it more of a problem that we have some responsibility for, that's affecting our neighbor." This violence from Mexico increasingly spills over the border, harming and sadly, killing U.S. personnel and other citizens. I am seriously concerned that you would not consider this to be an issue of U.S. national security – especially now that more evidence leads us to believe that the terrorist organization, Hezbollah, is in bed with the cartels and possibly using our porous border and cartel smuggling routes to bring God knows what into the country.

So – what justification could you possibly have for not considering the border violence and situation as a whole a threat to our national security? How can we formulate an effective foreign assistance package to Mexico that serves U.S. interests if the underlying premise of this assistance is so flawed?

Answer:

The United States is committing significant resources to help the governments of Mexico and Central America reduce the levels of crime and violence that their citizens face and break the power and influence of the transnational criminal organizations that operate in the region. The President and the Secretary of State have recognized that we share responsibility for meeting these challenges. Both the United States government and the Mexican government

seek to disrupt and dismantle the criminal networks that traffic drugs into the United States and illegal weapons and illicit revenues into Mexico in order to ensure the security and well-being of Mexicans and Americans alike.

While the State Department is responsible for leading our efforts to support the Mexican effort against transnational crime, the Obama Administration has also dramatically increased efforts here at home to fight criminal organizations that cross our border and operate in the United States. In August 2010, the President signed into law the Southwest Border Security Bill which included $600 million in supplemental funds for enhanced border protection and law enforcement activities. The President also authorized the deployment of up to an additional 1, 200 National Guard troops to the border. Enhanced cooperation and coordination between the U.S. and Mexican governments has also paid off in operations in the United States, such as Xcellerator, Coronado, and Deliverance.

We are working towards fighting transnational crime through the Merida Initiative, an unprecedented partnership between the United States and Mexico to fight organized criminal groups and associated violence while respecting human rights and the rule of law. It is laying the groundwork for a sustained partnership, and has built confidence that is transforming our bilateral relationship. The four strategic goals of the Merida Initiative are: disrupt the capacity of organized crime

to operate; institutionalize the capacity to sustain the rule of law; create a 21st century border structure; and build strong and resilient communities.

The Merida Initiative has enabled greater cooperation between U.S. and Mexican law enforcement agencies, prosecutors and judges as they share best practices and expand bilateral cooperation in tracking criminals, drugs, arms and money. U.S., Mexican, and other law enforcement agencies in the region leverage opportunities to work together to investigate multinational law enforcement cases and share information.

The Merida Initiative has also funded a variety of programs that strengthen Mexican justice sector institutions. These programs support efforts to develop professional law enforcement, justice and corrections personnel, investigate, penalize, and prevent corruption within law enforcement agencies; facilitate the transfer of critical law enforcement information; and provide infrastructure support, equipment and technical assistance.

Through the Merida Initiative, the United States has funded purchases of specialized equipment to support the disruption of organized criminal groups and augment equipment investments by the Mexican government. We are also

providing aviation equipment to facilitate air mobility for the Mexican federal police and military and important non-intrusive inspection equipment to assist with inspections at borders and inland checkpoints.

To build strong and resilient communities, USAID programming has already yielded a comprehensive baseline evaluation on the existing demographic, health, economic and social conditions in Ciudad Juarez that has been shared with the Mexican government and posted online for the general public. USAID youth programming also provides safe spaces for disadvantaged young people, strengthening and expanding after school and summer programs, and preparing Mexican youth for viable futures through self or salaried employment.

WRITTEN RESPONSES FROM THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE RUSS CARNAHAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Russ Carnahan (#1a)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Could you please give an update on the transition process and the steps State has taken to improve its capacity to efficiently manage and oversee contracts, especially given the need for increases in contracted personnel to fulfill transition needs?

Answer:

We are on track to be mission capable at all sites by October 2011. In order to take over responsibility from the Department of Defense (DoD), the State Department is engaged in build-out, equipment procurement and contracting for services essential to a successful transition, to include preliminary construction at each site to make security and facility improvements necessary to ensure our civilians can safely perform their vital work in this challenging environment. We are also in close coordination with the Government of Iraq on final land use agreements and site negotiations.

The Department has facilities management teams on the ground at each of our diplomatic sites, and State's Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations (OBO) is continuously reviewing the build-out schedule to ensure that we will be mission capable by October 1. OBO facility managers are coordinating with USF-I

colleagues so that as they complete their draw down they can simultaneously assist in our efforts to prepare for our build-outs. USF-I has assisted us in moving protective barriers, clearing ground, and emplacing stay-behind DoD equipment. The contract for build out of unclassified facilities in Basrah was awarded on March 14, 2011 and the notice to proceed was issued on March 22.

We are ensuring sound contract management and will provide strong contract, administrative, and operational oversight. Our primary Contracting Officer (COs) are located in Washington where they can draw on the headquarters expertise. The Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs) are in Iraq and are supported by multiple levels of technical oversight depending upon the complexity of each contract. Additionally, we have asked the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) to provide day-to-day contract administration at the Embassy and each of the sites.

For Diplomatic Security (DS) private security contractors (PSCs), DS is establishing 25 new special agent positions and up to 77 DS authorized security protective specialist (SPS) positions. These positions will manage security programs at all non-OSC-I locations, and provide operational oversight of personal security details (PSDs). This includes CORs, Government Technical Monitors (GTMs), DS agents serving as CORs, and SPS personnel. DS currently employs this robust oversight everywhere they operate in Iraq to ensure that DS PSCs

perform their duties in a professional, responsible, culturally sensitive, and cost effective manner.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative Russ Carnahan (#1b)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

What is your assessment of agency coordination in the planning and implementation of the transition?

Answer:

The magnitude of this transition is unprecedented, and the security environment is very challenging. In anticipation of the planned U.S. military drawdown, we have sustained an intensive, two-year effort both within the State Department and with our partners across the U.S. government. This process has included daily involvement of both Deputy Secretaries of State and close coordination with USF-I and the Department of Defense (DoD). In addition, DoD and State have created Iraq Transition Coordinator positions, in order to lead our respective departments in the final planning and implementation of the transition. We continue to work daily with DoD and other agencies to implement and, as necessary, adjust our planning, and resolve any issues that may arise. We are on track to complete the transition successfully.

We can point to a number of successes in the ongoing DoD-State partnership on Iraq transition. Beginning in 2009, the Embassy and USF-I together identified 1,127 U.S. military programmatic responsibilities in Iraq, including rule of law,

governance, economic development and security. During the past year, they have reviewed these tasks and determined which will be handed off to the embassy, to an increasingly capable Iraqi government, to NGOs, international organizations, and which will cease.

The agreement by DoD to allow State to use the U.S. Army's critically important life support contract, Logistics Civil Augmentation Program (LOGCAP), and agreement to loan 60 Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles (MRAPs) are just two examples of cooperation. State will benefit greatly from the Defense Department's assistance in continuing to provide contract oversight and administration experts from the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) and the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) for LOGCAP, maintenance of tactical vehicles and security equipment and other contracts.

State and DoD have also worked hand-in-hand to prepare State's facilities for operations after the military withdrawal. State's Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations (OBO) has worked alongside USF-I for months to maximize use of USF-I assets and excess property during the initial phase of preparations. This phase includes constructing perimeter walls, identifying and marshalling items of excess military property, and scope development and design.

Interagency coordination more broadly on transition has also been strong. The White House and the Vice President have led this whole-of-government effort,

with regular meetings of both Principals and Deputies to track progress and make key decisions. A robust set of interagency working groups in Washington and in Baghdad support this process and delve into the details of every facet of transition.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Russ Carnahan (#1c)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Could you comment on the wisdom of the significant cuts included in the recently passed CR to reduce funding for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative?

Answer:

The President's FY11 request for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative (CSI) was $184 million. The cuts passed by the House under H.R. 1 would reduce CSI funding by 75% to only $47 million; or $137 million below the President's request. CSI supports the critical conflict prevention, mitigation and response work of the interagency Civilian Response Corps and the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization in Afghanistan, Sudan, Kyrgyzstan and many other fragile and conflict areas around the world. For example, in Southern Sudan, CRC members used their technical and stabilization expertise to support institutional capacity building, conflict monitoring and response, and for local dispute resolution that ultimately aided the Government of Southern Sudan in achieving an effective and peaceful referendum that resulted in a vote for independence. They bolstered the small US Consulate in Juba not only with about two dozen professional Civilian Response Corps members, but also supported

themselves with classified and unclassified satellite communications, armored and unarmored vehicles, office and living containers and charter aircraft. Without adequate funding, the ability of the United States to respond rapidly to prevent and mitigate conflict and to stabilize fragile areas will be severely hampered, which undermines U.S. national security interests, and may, in the long run, cost more in terms of foreign assistance for post-conflict reconstruction.

Experience has shown that preventing conflict is less costly than military intervention, and results in a safer America by helping to stabilize countries under stress, preventing terrorist organizations from gaining a foothold, and reducing transnational and trans-border crime such as drug and human trafficking. Failure to fully fund CSI will impact national security. I strongly urge the House to reconsider and fund CSI in FY11 as the President has requested.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Russ Carnahan (#1d)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

What mechanisms are in place to ensure that lessons learned from transition in Iraq are applied for future planning, especially given the impending transition in Afghanistan?

Answer:

The Department's of State and Defense are working to systematically identify and share the lessons learned from the transition in Iraq to Afghanistan. This process is ongoing in Washington and with Embassies Kabul and Baghdad. The Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs/Iraq (NEA/I) is working with the Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs (SCA) and the Office of the Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan (SRAP) to inform the Afghanistan transition planning process. The process includes meetings between officers from each bureau to transmit lessons learned in the Iraq transition process along with the exchange of formal papers and products that SCA and SRAP will be able to use in the development of Afghanistan transition planning.

There is also an integrated, interagency civilian-military effort underway to capture and institutionalize Lessons Learned and Best Practices from Afghanistan and Iraq Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) led by the Center for Complex

Operations. Although transition encompasses aspects of the entire range of civil-military engagement in Iraq, this project will look at elements of our provincial presence in both countries to identify lessons that have immediate operational and tactical relevance, as well as those which can inform key aspects of reconstruction and stabilization operations in the future.

The project uses interview questions and surveys to collect lessons learned from personnel serving in both Afghanistan and Iraq PRTs. An interagency analysis team reviews these interviews and develops best practices that are shared with the rest of the community for implementation in both countries. We have begun incorporating these lessons into our Iraq transition planning through a series of interagency workshops begun in January 2011. Our best practices will help determine how the Embassy, Consulates, and Embassy Branch Offices (EBOs) conduct diplomatic engagements throughout the provinces after the transition. The Bureau for Near Eastern Affairs' Iraq Office and State's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization will also incorporate our lessons learned into the training curriculum for staff members assigned to Iraq and other similar posts to ensure that we continue to build on the knowledge we have developed to date. The same process will be used during the Iraq transition to collect information from interagency participants both in Washington DC and in Iraq so that those lessons can be applied to the future military-to-civilian transition in Afghanistan.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Russ Carnahan (#2)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

Secretary Clinton, when you testified before the Committee last year, I asked you about US efforts to support Bosnian reconciliation. You spoke of the Department's efforts to advance constitutional reform, and the need to engage with the Europeans to achieve real progress. First of all, I want to thank you for your efforts over the past few years, and couldn't agree more with the need for active US engagement with the EU. In the months since the elections in Bosnia, there has been [no] government formed, and obviously, no real progress on reform and reconciliation.

What efforts are being undertaken to engage with the Europeans to help the Bosnian's form a new government?
Looking further ahead, what prospects do you see for long term, sustainable political reconciliation in Bosnia, including the much needed constitutional reforms?

Answer:

We are concerned about the slow pace of government formation in Bosnia and Herzegovina following last October's elections. The United States and European Union strongly backed High Representative Inzko's recent efforts to mediate an agreement on the formation of a Federation government. We regret that that effort did not lead to an agreement which would have allowed for a broad-based coalition with the participation of the Bosnian Croat HDZ parties. We continue to coordinate closely with the Europeans and the Office of the High

Representative to encourage the formation of a government at the state level that can make decisions to address urgent domestic issues as well as reforms required for European and Euro-Atlantic integration.

Constitutional reforms to address human rights deficiencies and improve government functionality remain essential for Bosnia and Herzegovina to advance towards EU and NATO membership. These issues should be among the top agenda items for a new state government. We believe progress can be achieved if the parties are prepared to proceed incrementally and focus on areas related to EU and NATO integration requirements. Success on constitutional reform, and political reconciliation more broadly, will require the parties to demonstrate greater flexibility, appreciation and accommodation of other parties' perspectives than under the previous government.

WRITTEN RESPONSES FROM THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE RUSS CARNAHAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative David Cicilline (#1)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

The waiver authority Congress granted the President under Section 907 stipulates that the "President may waive section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act if he determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that to do so . . . will not undermine or hamper ongoing efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan or be used for offensive purposes against Armenia." Is the President confident that he will be able to meet this certification requirement? And, do you believe the Government of Azerbaijan is taking demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, as required by Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act?

Answer:

Since 2002, successive Presidential Administrations, including the Obama Administration, have waived the full application of Section 907 pursuant to authorities provided by Congress.

Azerbaijan is an important security partner for the United States, and our assistance to Azerbaijan is provided in this context, achieving important U.S. national security objectives on counter-terrorism, border control, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, maritime security, and critical energy infrastructure protection. Azerbaijan has over 90 troops stationed in Afghanistan and provides valuable overflight, refueling, and landing rights

for U.S. aircraft bound for Afghanistan. Azerbaijan is also a key node on the Northern Distribution Network, allowing non-lethal goods to transit its territory to resupply our forces in Afghanistan. U.S. assistance to Azerbaijan has enhanced Azerbaijan's interoperability with NATO and U.S. forces and furthers U.S. peacekeeping and security objectives.

Such cooperative programs cannot be used for offensive purposes against Armenia and can be undertaken without undermining ongoing efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan remains an active participant in OSCE Minsk Group process toward a peaceful settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative David Cicilline (#2)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 1, 2011

Question:

In FY 2009 and FY 2010, Congress appropriated up to $8 million in aid to Nagorno Karabakh, but the State Department has disbursed less than $2 million for each year. In addition, in FY 2007 and FY 2006, Congress appropriated "at least" $3 million, but the State Department only disbursed around $2 million for each year. Could the State Department provide an explanation as to why funding has not been disbursed according to congressional intent and if the Department plans to expend the outstanding funds?

Answer:

Since 1998, the United States has provided over $35 million in humanitarian assistance to victims of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, including food, shelter, emergency and medical supplies, access to quality healthcare and water, and demining projects. In addition to continuing the ongoing demining project which has thus far cleared 85% of anti-personnel and anti-tank mines and 73% of the battle area, a new potable water project that began in fall 2010 is helping to meet the basic water needs of approximately 25,000 people in Stepanakert, roughly half of the city's population. The level and focus of the Administration's annual assistance to Nagorno-Karabakh balances several factors, including the results of needs

assessments conducted by USAID personnel and evaluations of the absorptive capacity within Nagorno-Karabakh.

Programs in Nagorno-Karabakh are funded through a Eurasia Regional budget line within the overall Assistance to Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia (AEECA) account; this budget line funds a number of other regional priorities, including the U.S. contribution to the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Since 2001, the level of U.S. support to Nagorno-Karabakh has remained constant, despite a number of competing priorities, a sharp decline in the Eurasia regional budget, and a more than 60% decline in the overall AEECA account during that period.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by
Representative David Cicilline (#3)
House Committee on Foreign Relations
March 1, 2011

Question:

The Administration has said, since early last year, that it wants Turkey and Armenia to establish ties "without preconditions and within a reasonable time-frame." The Bush Administration also supported ending Turkey's blockade of Armenia without any preconditions. Can you define for us what the Administration means by "preconditions," and also what the Administration believes constitutes a "reasonable time-frame?" At his confirmation hearing in March 2009, Assistant Secretary of State Gordon indicated that he hoped that the Armenia-Turkey border would be re-opening by October 2009. In addition, in July, 2010, the Turkish Foreign Ministry stated that they insist on a resolution of the Karabakh conflict before ending Ankara's blockade of Armenia. Can you describe any steps Turkey has taken to ratify the protocols? Also, what steps do you intend to take to address Turkey's delay in honoring its commitments in the protocols?

Answer:

The Administration supports the work done by both Armenia and Turkey to normalize relations. We continue to urge both sides to keep the door open to reconciliation and normalization, and we believe that the normalization process carries important benefits for Turkey and Armenia as well as for the wider Caucasus region. Ultimately, this is a decision for Armenia and Turkey.

While the Turkish government has submitted the protocols to the Turkish Parliament for ratification, I understand such ratification is stalled. We have said that the ball is in Turkey's court, and I have encouraged Turkey to take meaningful steps to move forward.

The border between Turkey and Armenia has been closed for 17 years; the current normalization process has been going on for only a fraction of that time.

The Minsk Group remains the international community's preferred mechanism to address the Nagorno Karabakh conflict.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE DAN BURTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA

HCFA FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

TO: CONGRESSMAN DAN BURTON

FROM: LEGISLATIVE STAFF

DATE: MARCH 1, 2011

TOPIC: QUESTIONS for SECRETARY CLINTON

Iran/Sanctions Enforcement. The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 mandates (among other provisions) that the President initiate investigations of potentially-sanctionable activity under the Iran Sanctions Act—and that the President must notify this Committee, among others, of the results of an investigation, or provide certification that such an investigation need not be conducted.

- Can you explain why, seven months after enactment of that law, Congress has not received the names of any companies currently under investigation?
- Will you commit to briefing Congress, either in an open or classified setting, on the specific companies that are under investigation?
- Do you intend to brief or consult with Congress at all on the specific investigations prior to the end-of-March deadline for completing such investigations?
- Can you confirm that there are Russian and Chinese firms under investigation for Iran Sanctions Act violations?

Iran/Warships & Hezbollah Support. Can you comment on Administration efforts to block the two Iranian warships that have sailed from the Suez Canal into the Mediterranean? Can you comment on reports that they are carrying advanced missiles, arms and ammunition, and night-vision goggles to Hezbollah in Lebanon? Do we know what is on the ships?

ENERGY and THE MIDDLE EAST

- Regular gasoline averaged $3.19 a gallon last week, the highest since October 2008
- Gasoline has been edging up since last fall and passed the $3 mark even before the beginning of the year.
- The Energy Department predicted the price would be $3.24 a gallon by July and $3.42 next summer.
- The recent spike is due to the unrest in the Middle East.
- BUT demand from China and India will continue to drive these prices up regardless of peace or unrest throughout the world.
- Oil and natural gas supplying more than sixty percent of our National energy needs
- Ninety-nine percent of the fuel used by Americans in their cars and trucks comes from oil and gas

- The Administration needs to back away from its domestic drilling moratorium and, instead, pursue safe and responsible drilling of oil and natural gas.

- **What is the Administration's overarching plan to protect our necessary supply of oil flowing from the Middle East? What measures are you currently taking and what measures do you plan to take?**

MEXICO and THE BORDER Given the high level officials who have been murdered in northern Mexico, including 11 Mayors and a police chief, it seems the cartels simply eliminate anyone in a place of power who stands in their way. The Mexican government seems very sensitive to some of the rhetoric being used to describe the severity of the situation, such as words like insurgency and any mention of the possibility of becoming a failed state.

You used the word "insurgency" in September and then President Obama downplayed your comment.

Do you think that the situation in Mexico is indeed both indicative of an insurgency and on the verge of becoming a failed state?

What are the implications of a failed state on our southern border?

Does the rule of law exist in northern Mexico anymore? Is Calderon still effective? Has cartel rule grown to a size and scope that can be contained AT ALL?

President Calderon has criticized American diplomats for being "ignorant to Mexico's security situation".

I'd like to know your reaction this comment, as well as what are we doing to fix this perception and work with Mexico to achieve a satisfactory partnership and joint strategy for dealing with cartels?

Europe:
Belarus is the only country in Europe that is considered by many reputable organizations as not free. **The Belarus Democracy Act and its subsequent reauthorization were significant steps, but what is the current administration's strategy in helping the people of Belarus?** The repression is horrific and this dictator runs over any opposition that mobilizes against him.

Central Asia has opportunity but is also a concern. Economic opportunities are there, specifically in energy and other extractives, and it's a region that is strategic to broader U.S. security interests, but I'm concerned about the stability of democracy, lack of rule of law, and oppressive behavior. I think the U.S. can do more to promote freedom while maintaining national security interests without the region looking Northward or Eastward. **With that in mind, what is being done to strengthen our relationships with the region?**

The West Bank and Gaza. Madam Secretary, the U.S. has provided about $2.5 billion to the Palestinians in the last five years alone. But what is that money paying for? While the Israeli government continues to take extraordinary steps in pursuit of peace and offers to negotiate anytime and anywhere, the Palestinian leadership continues to refuse to negotiate directly with Israel. Instead, it undermines opportunities for peace. It seeks unilateral recognition of a non-existent Palestinian "state" by various foreign governments, and has stepped up its long-standing efforts to demonize Israel in the UN. Less than two weeks ago, the Palestinian leadership forced a vote on yet another anti-Israel resolution at the UN Security Council, despite pressure from the Administration not to do so. After your Administration vetoed the latest anti-Israel resolution at the UN Security Council last week, the Palestinian leadership has reportedly whipped up anti-American incitement in the West Bank, including mass protests condemning President Obama and the U.S., with loyalists of Abu Mazen describing President Obama as "despicable" and a "Zionist agent." Palestinian officials are even calling for a "day of rage" against America. Once again, Palestinian leaders appear to be implicitly threatening violence in order to extract concessions. So, Madam Secretary:

- Why does your budget request include yet another bailout for Ramallah, over $400 million in further assistance to the Palestinians, the exact same amount you requested last year? Does this also include the direct transfer of cash to the Palestinian Authority?
- Why should U.S. taxpayers pay for the Palestinian leadership's efforts to condemn America and demonize Israel?
  - Why shouldn't the U.S. reduce or cut off assistance and demonstrate that there are real-world consequences for the Palestinian leadership's actions?

China Funding Justification. China currently is the fourth largest recipient of Global Fund assistance ($941.3 million) and has received an additional $30 million through PEPFAR. The FY'12 request includes an additional $3 million for China under the Global Health and Child Survival account. Madam Secretary, with over $2.65 trillion in foreign cash reserves, how could it be possible that China cannot afford to finance its own HIV/AIDS response? Why would the United States, in effect, borrow from China only to turn around and provide China with hundreds of millions of dollars in assistance? How can you justify the continuation of $3 million in assistance to China in these difficult economic times?

EUROPE AND EURASIA

Russia/WTO Entry. Russian officials say they are planning to enter the World Trade Organization this year. But Russia has one of the worst records on intellectual property piracy of any country. There may have been some recent improvements, but there is no positive track record to speak of. Why are we in a rush to help Russia get into the WTO before it has proven – proven, not just promised – that it will keep its commitments?

Poland/Assistance. The Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia account has been decreased by over $114 million in the President's Fiscal Year 2012 budget request,

yet $3 million of these funds have been allocated for Poland. While Poland is an important ally to the United States, can you please explain why Poland needs these support funds, when it is a full member-state of the European Union and is slated to receive approximately €10.2 billion ($14 billion) in EU Cohesion Fund financing this year alone?

"Feed the Future" diversion of Europe/Eurasia assistance. On page 73 of the State Department's Executive Summary of the President's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request, it states that the Feed the Future program *"while funded predominantly through the DA [Development Assistance] account, will also be funded through the Economic Support Fund and the Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia account."* Can you explain why funds are being diverted from the AEECA account for the Feed the Future initiative, when none of the 20 program countries identified by USAID for the Feed the Future program are located in Europe, Eurasia or Central Asia? Couldn't those AEECA funds be used to support key U.S. national security interests in the reason, such as for counter-terrorism, counter-narcotics, or transnational crimes programs in the countries of the Balkan region?

Balkans/Crime & Trafficking. The Balkan region has become one of the world's key transit routes for drug and human trafficking. The UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has stated that the so-called "Balkan Route" has *"become a major hub for drug traffickers from Afghanistan, and this, along with an increase in human trafficking, money laundering and corruption cases, threatens the stability of the whole region that includes Central Asia and the Caucasus"*. However, since 2003 none of the countries in the Balkan region have received US Department of State funding for counter-narcotics programs. In fact, these countries are not included in the State Department's current budget for any International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement program funding either. What is the State Department doing to address this problem?

Balkans/U.S. Assistance Strategy. The Congressional Budget Justification for FY2011 states that U.S. assistance to the countries of the Balkans is *"to consolidate the gains made since the end of the conflicts of the 1990s through a strategy that emphasizes Euro-Atlantic integration"*. Given that NATO and EU membership is not something that the U.S. can guarantee, and also given that public support for membership in these organizations has been decreasing for some time in certain Balkan countries, is this a reasonable premise upon which to base the U.S. strategy for assistance to the region? Has the Department been considering any alternative strategy for stabilizing the Balkan region?

U.S. & EU/Assistance Coordination. The U.S. and the EU are operating similar development and stabilization programs in many countries throughout Europe, Eurasia and the Caucasus regions. How does the State Department coordinate with our European allies to prevent duplication of effort? How is the Department encouraging the EU to take the lead in development and stabilization efforts in those countries that it has identified as being part of its European Neighborhood Policy?

Russia/U.S. Assistance. Madam Secretary, with regard to Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia for FY2012, the President's Budget Request states that "for Russia, the request focuses on programs to promote democracy and rule of law, and also to promote cooperation with the Government of Russia in areas of mutual interest, such as health, environment, and trade." With regard to funding, why should U.S. taxpayers pay for environment and health programs in Russia, given that Russia reaps large revenues from its oil and gas exports?

Ukraine/Democratic Backtracking. Madam Secretary, as you know, since Viktor Yanukovych [YAH-NOOH-KOH-VICH] assumed office last year as Ukraine's President, there have been reports of backtracking on the democratic and media freedom improvements made since 2004. Key Members of Congress have raised concerns about these negative trends and requested that, during your meeting with the Ukrainian Foreign Minister Gryshchenko (GREESH-CHEN-KOH), you express to him that the U.S. will condemn any steps taken to weaken Ukraine's hard-won democratic reform of government and respect for human rights, freedom of the media and the proper rule of law. Did you raise these concerns with Foreign Minister Gryshchenko [GREESH-CHEN-KOH]? What was his reaction?

Ukraine/U.S. Assistance. Madam Secretary, the FY2012 Budget Request for Ukraine is $79.1 million, which has been reduced from the $88 million request for FY2011. How, if at all, will the U.S. assistance strategy for Ukraine change in light of the negative trends in that country with regard to democracy and media freedoms?

Belarus/U.S. Assistance. Madam Secretary, the flawed presidential elections last December in Belarus were followed by beatings, arrests and harassment of political opposition and civil society activists and journalists by the Belarusian authorities. In response to this repression, the U.S. pledged to increase last year's assistance of $11 million by nearly 30% to help support civil society, political competition and more interaction between the citizens of Belarus and the outside world. Given the restrictions imposed by the Lukashenko [LOOH-KAH-SHEN-KOH] regime on pro-democracy and civil society programs and activities in Belarus, what is our strategy to ensure that U.S. assistance is effective in helping the people of Belarus? Can you comment on the coordination efforts between the United States and the EU to bolster civil society and political competition in Belarus?

Georgia/Defense Needs. Madam Secretary, are there plans for the United States to provide defensive weapons to Georgia to help that country deter a future attack by Russia? If not, why not?

Central Asia. Madam Secretary, the United States is currently working with Central Asian countries to diversify our supply routes to Afghanistan. How vulnerable are these routes to attacks carried out by Islamic extremists? What steps are being taken to ensure that our engagement with the governments in Central Asia does not -- in fact or perception -- support or contribute to repression and corruption in those countries, or impair our agenda to promote freedom and democracy in the region?

Kyrgyzstan/U.S. Assistance. Madam Secretary, as you know, last June, tensions between ethnic Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbeks in southern Kyrgyzstan erupted in violence which resulted in hundreds being killed and thousands injured. The President's FY2012 Budget Request for the Kyrgyz Republic is $37.0 million. How much of that amount is going to be utilized to help address the tensions between ethnic Kyrgyz and Uzbeks in that country?

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE GERALD E. CONNOLLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

The Honorable Gerald E. Connolly (VA-11)

HCFA Full Committee Hearing
Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges
Tuesday March 1st, 2011 @ 10am
Questions for the Record

1. Please describe the implementation program for NSPD-12. (NSPD-12 establishes, as national policy, the need to provide civilian U.S. Government personnel serving overseas with survival training if they are in a hostage situation). Are there plans to ensure that those deployed overseas are subject to NSPD-12?

2. Currently, Peace Corps volunteers overseas are not subject to NSPD-12. Should they be? And does the State Department have a plan to phase in such training?

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. ROYCE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Questions for the Record
Submitted by Rep. Ed Royce (CA-40)
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Secretary of State Clinton
March 1, 2011

Countering Violent Extremism. This year's budget request includes a new item, requesting $5 million for the "Countering Violent Extremism" program. This is to support "targeted counter-radicalization interventions in high priority countries by promoting positive alternatives to violence." Please explain this program in some detail. Are these to be run by the United States, or are they to be a contribution to other countries "counter-radicalization" programs? Where have we had success with such programs?

Counterterrorism Bureau? The State Department's recently released "Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review" set the goal of "working with Congress to establish a *Bureau* for Counterterrorism." Currently, the State Department has an *Office* of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, which reports directly to the Secretary of State. What is the rationale for the new Bureau? Who would this new Assistant Secretary report to? How would be the mission of this new Bureau differ from the current Office? Would this new Bureau require more resources than that of the coordinator for counterterrorism?

Lord's Resistance Army. Joseph Kony, the head of the Lord's Resistance Army, continues to wreck havoc across central Africa – killing, capturing and resupplying for their next pillage. As you know, last year Congress mandated that the Administration devise a strategy to remove Joseph Kony from the battlefield. This strategy was presented to Congress last November. Please explain in detail how your budget request would implement this strategy?

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE KAREN BASS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1

Representative Karen Bass

Secretary Clinton Hearing Remarks

March 1, 2011

Thank you Madame Chair.

Secretary Clinton, thank you for your important testimony.

My district in South LA is home to one of the largest and most diverse population of immigrants in the US and the work that you do every single day to lift families and workers abroad out of poverty is greatly appreciated by my constituents.

In the midst of some of the most challenging international circumstances this country has ever faced, your leadership has ushered in a new era of engagement including with our friends across the Muslim world. As our nation's top diplomat, you have truly strengthened international partnerships and restored the US image abroad. To your credit, in only 18 months the State Department has accomplished:

1) Ratifying the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with Russia making us safer;
2) Launching a global initiative to fight hunger and promote sustainable agricultural development;
3) Responding to over 60 life-threatening disasters in over 50 countries; and
4) Supporting HIV counseling and testing for nearly 29 million people around the world.

Secretary Clinton, as I reflect on your recent successes reached with bipartisan support, I am concerned that much of this progress is in jeopardy. Deep cuts proposed and passed by my Republicans colleagues in the 2011 Continuing Resolution would slash the State Department budget by **16 percent** and eliminate at least **2,170** State Department jobs – absolutely crippling US diplomacy.

Madam Secretary, without doubt the CR cuts would be detrimental to national security, and I will work with you and the President to block any attempts to gut the foreign aid budget. That is my pledge to you.

Secretary Clinton Hearing Questions

Global Health Initiative

Secretary Clinton, the Obama Administration's Global Health Initiative (GHI), along with the highly successful President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief have set the standard for global health prevention and treatment programs. The Continuing Resolution proposes cutting the Global health Initiative by 18 percent from the 2011 request and PEPFAR nearly half a billion dollars below the actual FY2010 levels.

Question 1: Can you quantify what these cuts will mean in terms of the number of people who won't receive life-saving HIV/AIDS treatment? With these funding levels, will we be able to reach the goal of preventing more than 12 million new HIV infections?

International Food Aid Cuts & Food Insecurity
Secretary Clinton, on passage of the Republican Continuing Resolution, Ellen Levinson, the Executive Director of the Alliance for Global Food Security, recently stated, "The House of Representatives has put America's international food aid programs on the chopping block ... These cuts would deny aid to roughly 18 million people and would curtail efforts to reduce the burden of destabilizing food shortages on poor and vulnerable populations. The timing of these cuts could hardly be worse."

Question 2: What are the short and long term implications of the Republican sponsored cuts to the international food aid program on political stability in developing countries and the global economy?

Foreign Aid and US Jobs
Secretary Clinton, although hundreds of thousands of US jobs are created and sustained through foreign aid programs, the Republicans have in particular targeted foreign aid for spending cuts.

Question 3: Secretary Clinton, can you explain how agricultural and transportation industries and workers here at home who play an essential role in the food aid supply chain would be affected by the cuts proposed in the Republican spending plan? Do you have any estimates of the numbers of American jobs lost if these cuts are carried out?

Internet Freedom
Secretary Clinton, days after you gave your address on internet freedom, I toured Facebook and Twitter. Like you, I agree that internet freedom expression is "a vital agent of change" and should not be censored by foreign governments.

Question 4: Can you please discuss the Administration's plans to make Internet freedom a diplomatic priority. What actions are the State Department taking to promote internet freedom worldwide?

Reform & Lean Budget
Republicans frequently attack the State Department budget. Meanwhile, the State Department and USAID have made tremendous cost-saving reforms. The wide-ranging and first-ever Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review makes a series of recommendations that intend to make the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development more efficient and make better use of taxpayer dollars.

Question 5: How will these changes improve the operations of the State Department and USAID? What is your timeline for carrying out these changes, including the restructuring of several bureaus at State? What have the returns on the investment been thus far? How will these reforms save Americans money?

Humanitarian Assistance & Disaster Relief
State and USAID work to help countries and communities become more stable, democratic, and prosperous. When conflicts do arise, State and USAID work to transition countries from violence to stability to long-term development and to prevent struggling states from becoming failed states. Doing so reduces the burden on our military and enhances our diplomacy. Yet the CR makes devastating cuts to humanitarian assistance accounts by gutting over 40% of funds to these programs. It would make a 50 percent reduction to the International Disaster Assistance.
Question 6: How will this significant reduction limit our ability to respond to natural disasters? We will simply be unable to respond to earthquakes and other disasters the way we did in Haiti? How will these cuts impact our ability to assist the 1.6 million International Displaced Persons in Darfur? What will occur if USAID is unable to meet prevailing emergency and recovery needs in southern Pakistan where an estimated 4 million people remain in some form of displacement and will require critical support in the coming 6-8 month?
Democracy
Since the Reagan years, Congress has provided strong, bipartisan support for assistance to grassroots democracy organizations worldwide, both through State Department and outside groups. The House passed Continuing Resolution, however, drastically cuts 30 percent from the Development Assistance account, which supports democracy efforts, despite democratic progress in Tunisia and Egypt.

Question 7: What is your assessment of these cuts on promoting democracy? In the midst of great political instability in the Middle East and natural disasters worldwide, how will these cuts impact the current international volatility?

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Congressman Michael T. McCaul

Madam Secretary,

Thank you for your time and effort in appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday to testify and answer questions about the State Department's program and budget.

To follow-up on our interaction yesterday, I have submitted these questions for the record, and I look forward to your responses:

Mérida Initiative

1) In response to my question about why funds appropriated for the Mérida Initiative have been bottled up at the State Department, you responded:

"The complexities of negotiating technical requirements with Mexico - what we expect to get for our money; what we expect from them when we give them our money – and the need to ramp up staffing to support a program of this magnitude has taken time. But we have also decided what works best is providing professional training which is what we are doing....we will give you chapter and verse about what we are doing."

To follow up on your response and willingness to share specifics on the State Department's efforts in the Mérida Initiative, I would like to know the following:

a) What are the specific and set expectations/objectives/outcomes that you agreed upon with Mexico as part of the negotiating process? What were the roadblocks in the negotiating process? Are we accomplishing what Mérida was proposed to accomplish for the US after "negotiations" with Mexico?
b) How many State Department staff members did you have to hire or transfer to support Mérida full time? How long did it take to hire or transfer them? How much of the equipment acquisition and training for Mérida is contracted out by the State Department and USAID to outside companies?

c) You mentioned that professional training works best. As crime statistics support, continued and escalated violence in Mexico tells me that money provided for training efforts in Mexico via Mérida have, thus far, yielded little results. Has training that is provided by the State Dept, USAID, or contracted companies really done anything substantial to secure our borders and diminish the strength of the cartels – or, to that point, benefit the people of Mexico?
    1. If so, what objective metrics are you using to measure this benefit? Are you monitoring the training provided by contracted companies on-site for quality assurance?

d) I was informed by one company who produced detection equipment for Mérida as a subcontractor with FY 2008 SUPP funds that they have already fulfilled the delivery of

their order to the prime contractor. However, their equipment is still listed as "not delivered" by NAS Mexico City data.

1. Where is the equipment secured with FY 2008 funds?
2. Why has it taken nearly three years to deliver equipment that is already made and packaged and doesn't require a research and development spin-up?
3. What are your plans to expedite delivery of such equipment?

e) May I please be provided a copy of the report that should have been submitted to the House Appropriations Committee, pursuant to Sec. 1010, Public Law 111-212, regarding the Mérida Initiative and its progress? Has this report been amended since 2010?

2) I also asked questions during the hearing that, unfortunately, you did not have the opportunity to address during the hearing due to time, and I would like to revisit them:

a) Will the administration vigorously press Mexico to get the killers of our ICE agent extradited to the United States?

b) There is a 1990 agreement which does not allow our agents to carry weapons in Mexico. I would like the administration to revisit this agreement. Are you going to revisit this agreement? When will our agents operating in Mexico be able to be armed?

Sudan

3) We have been watching the Administration's stepped up diplomacy on Sudan, and we know there still is a lot to do before South Sudan becomes a new State in July. The success of the referendum in Sudan was a relief to many international monitors and spectators who feared that the time and events leading up to the referendum could have become marred by bloody conflict.

a) How many State Department S/CRS team members did you have on the ground in preparation for the referendum, and what actions did that take to prevent conflict during the Sudan Referendum?
b) Did budgetary or manpower shortfalls affect your ability to accomplish the mission?
c) How will these teams be utilized in the post-referendum efforts in South Sudan leading up to the planned, official independence declaration in July?

While the South has great potential, they will need assistance in the short term for state building.

d) Can you describe what else you think the US needs to do now, and how long it will be before South Sudan will be able to stand up on its own?

Iran and Sanctions

4) Governments around the world regularly delegate the inspection of sea-bearing vessels to non-governmental organizations known as Classification Societies.

In the United States, the US Coast Guard has designated several such Classification Societies to serve as Agents of the US Government, or Recognized Organizations, on many matters of maritime safety. Several foreign-based, Recognized Organizations of the United States also serve as Recognized Organizations for the government of Iran — meaning the Classification Societies act as Agents of both the United States and Iran.

In January a ruling was requested from your department on the legality of such relationships in light of the current sanctions on the government of Iran. Could you please update me on any actions the Department has taken to look into this matter?

Thank you for your time and attention to these important matters. I look forward to your responses.

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE GUS BILIRAKIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Full Committee Hearing
Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges
Congressman Gus M. Bilirakis
Questions
March 1, 2011

1. Since 1993, Congress has appropriated Economic Support Funds to Cyprus for reunification, further restricting the funds "to be used only for scholarships, administrative support of the scholarship program, bicommunal projects, and measures aimed at reunification of the island and designed to reduce tensions and promote peace and cooperation between the two communities on Cyprus."

   The on-going division of Cyprus presents a unique situation that warrants a level of scrutiny concerning the provision of United States assistance that goes beyond that which is required for other countries. In recent years, there have been concerns in Congress regarding the lack of transparency related to the uses of this funding on the island.

   If ESF funding continues for Cyprus programs in FY 2012 and beyond, what will you do to ensure the funds are used in a manner consistent with these congressional restrictions and allocated
   transparently after engaging in consultation with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus?

2. With the drama of events in Egypt and the wider Middle East, I am concerned that the world's attention will be diverted from the dangers of Iran's nuclear program.

   The Administration has yet to sanction non-Iranian banks, despite reports that several Turkish, South Korean, Ukrainian and Chinese banks continue to deal with Iranian financial institutions in violation of the Iran Sanctions Act. When do you plan to sanction one of these banks?

3. Events of recent weeks have highlighted the unique role Israel plays in the Middle East as a reliable, stable and democratic ally that shares our values and interests. Likewise, there is no question that the tumult throughout the region and especially in Egypt raises strategic questions for the Israelis and their ability to maintain a qualitative military edge.

   Is the Administration in close contact with the government of Israel about the impact of recent events on Israel's QME and possible new threats it faces?

   In light of the current uncertainty, is the Administration reconsidering the massive sales of advanced weaponry to the region, some of which were already notified?

4. The Muslim Brotherhood has been very careful over the past few weeks to appear moderate and supportive of a move toward elections. As you know, it is the world's oldest, largest and best-organized Islamist movement and it remains committed to the establishment of a Caliphate ruled by one individual governing by Islamic law.

According to the Brotherhood's worldview, the existence of a sovereign non-Muslim entity is unacceptable.

What is the Administration's policy towards the Muslim Brotherhood?

5. We have provided substantial assistance to the Lebanese government and the Lebanese Armed Forces in the past and the President requested $100 million in economic assistance, $100 million in military assistance and $25 million in security assistance for Lebanon for FY 2012. Given that the new Prime Minister of Lebanon is backed by Hizballah and Hizballah continues to take on a greater role in the Lebanese government, I am very worried about how this assistance might be used in the future and about the fact that no one – especially not the UN… has done anything to prevent Hizballah from rearming.

   I understand that the Administration is currently reviewing our assistance to Lebanon. What is the status of this review and how is it being carried out?

   How will our aid to Lebanon be affected in light of Hizballah's growing role in the government?

6. Russia announced Feb. 26 that it was going to continue to supply Syria with cruise missiles despite the current events in the Middle East. This sale is believed to be worth at least $300 million and will ultimately put 72 cruise missiles in Syria's arsenal. The President's Budget Request states that "for Russia, the request focuses on programs to promote democracy and rule of law, and also to promote cooperation with the Government of Russia in areas of mutual interest, such as health, environment, and trade." Why should U.S. taxpayers pay for aid to Russia when it is reaping hundreds of millions of dollars of arm sales to state sponsors of terror like Syria??

7. This year's budget request includes a new item, requesting $5 million for the "Countering Violent Extremism" program. This is to support "targeted counter-radicalization interventions in high priority countries by promoting positive alternatives to violence." Please explain this program in some detail. Are these to be run by the United States, or are they to be a contribution to other countries "counter-radicalization" programs? Where have we had success with such programs?

8. While the unrest spreading throughout the Arab world, we should not forget about Iran, which has recently become the site of increasing protests and yet another brutal crackdown. It's believed that, since January, the Iranian regime has executed one person every 9 hours. The Administration has been remarkably silent, especially back in the summer of '09 when addressing Iranian human rights abuses? What are we doing to help the Iranian people in the streets who are protesting for nothing more than basic human rights and democratic freedoms?

9. It is widely known that upon entering office, the Obama Administration cut aid to pro-democracy Egyptian civil society programs. Additionally, it reverted back to a system

ended during the Bush Administration under which each NGO which was to receive U.S. aid had to be cleared first with the Egyptian government which would, of course, exclude any real pro-democracy organizations that could threaten their stranglehold on power. Will you now admit that this was a mistake? What lessons has the Administration learned from this? What concrete steps is State taking to assist the Egyptians in this time of transition?

10. The Balkan region has become one of the world's key transit routes for drug and human trafficking. The UN Office on Drugs and Crime has stated that the so-called "Balkan Route" has *"become a major hub for drug and human. traffickers which threatens the stability of the whole region."* What is the State Department doing to address this problem?

11. Madam Secretary, governments around the world regularly delegate the inspection of vessels to non-governmental organizations known as Classification Societies. In the United States, the US Coast Guard has designated several such Classification Societies to serve as Agents of the US Government, or Recognized Organizations, on many matters of maritime safety. Several foreign-based Recognized Organization of the United States also serve as Recognized Organizations for the government of Iran—meaning the Classification Societies act as Agents of both the United States and Iran. In January a ruling was requested from your department on the legality of such relationships in light of the current sanctions on the government of Iran. Could you please update the Committee on any actions the Department has taken to look into this matter?

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE MIKE KELLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Mike Kelly
House Committee on Foreign Affairs

Hearing on
Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities
and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges

March 1, 2011

Question #1:

Secretary Clinton, the State Department's international affairs budget request for FY 2012 includes $400.4 million in funding to the Palestinian Authority:

> West Bank and Gaza ($400.4 million): The FY 2012 request will strength the Palestinian Authority (PA) as a credible partner in Middle East peace and security efforts, and continue to respond to humanitarian needs in Gaza. Assistance will provide significant resources to support PA reform efforts; support economic, democratic, and social development of the West Bank and Gaz [sic]; increase the capacity of the PA to meet the needs of its people; and help build the institutions necessary for a future Palestinian state that can live side-by-side with Israel in peace and security. Funding will be used to ensure progress is made towards peace, create a more stable Middle East and support U.S. national security.

Executive Budget Summary, Function 150 & Other International Programs, Fiscal Year 2012, 82.

- Please describe the State Department's goals, objectives, and targets for determining whether the programs and activities funded by the above request are successes or failures.
- Please describe the State Department's methodology for monitoring and evaluating the performance and the results of programs and activities funded

by the above request, specifically as they pertain to effectiveness, transparency, and accountability.

Question #2:

Secretary Clinton, the United States has provided about $2.5 billion to the Palestinians in the last five years alone. As discussed above, the international affairs budget request for FY 2012 includes another $400.4 million in assistance to the Palestinians – the same amount requested last year.

- Please describe the State Department's goals, objectives, and targets for determining whether the programs and activities funded by the abovementioned $2.5 billion in foreign aid were successes or failures. Did these programs and activities succeed or fail?
- Please describe the State Department's methodology for monitoring and evaluating the performance and the results of programs and activities funded by the abovementioned aid, specifically as they pertain to issues of effectiveness, transparency, and accountability. Were these programs and activities effective, transparent, and accountable?
- What lessons were learned by the State Department from the last five years of providing the abovementioned aid with respect to the evaluation of the success, effectiveness, transparency, and accountability of programs and activities?
- In light of the lessons learned above, what changes will be made to the design, implementation, and monitoring of programs and activities funded by the portion of the FY 2012 international affairs budget request that is designated for assisting the Palestinians?

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE TIM GRIFFIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Rep. Tim Griffin (AR02)

Questions for the Record to Sec. of State Clinton

Hearing: 01 March 2011 "US Foreign Policy Priorities"

Question 1: Since 2001, nearly $52 billion has been appropriated in aid for Afghanistan, 56 percent of which has gone to training and equipping Afghan forces; the remainder has gone to development and humanitarian-related activities, including: infrastructure development, private sector support, governance and democratization strengthening, counter-narcotics programming. Also, since 2003, the U.S. has spent over $4 billion in Iraq through the Economic Support Fund (ESF), $323 million in a Democracy Fund, and $470 million in USAID funding. What end-game is the State Department seeking to achieve through this funding, and what metrics does the State Department have in place to assess when this has been achieved?

Question 2: The FY2012 budget includes $1.2 billion in ESF funding for Afghanistan. This includes cash-for-work, alternative livelihoods, and large-scale infrastructure programs. What measures of effectiveness does the State Department have in place for the programs funded as part ESF funding?

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BY THE HONORABLE RENEE ELLMERS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Congresswoman Renee Ellmers (NC-2)

Submitted by Brian Wilber, North Carolina constituent Q approved by committee: I would like to know what Sec Clinton is doing to free Mr. Davis from Pakistan. Being that he has diplomatic immunity, why is he still being held? What is her plan to fix this issue?

Submitted by Robert Ray North Carolina constituent Q approved by the committee: Why the difference in the response to the Iranian elections (2009) (which was a timid and restrained response) compared to the response to Hosni Mubarak not wanting to step down immediately, compared to Gaddafi in Libya? The foreign policy reaction of the administration seems inconsistent.

Parenthesis indicates words were added by Congresswoman Ellmers.

NOTE: Responses to these questions were not received prior to printing.