

**PROMOTING SECURITY THROUGH DIPLOMACY
AND DEVELOPMENT: THE FISCAL YEAR 2011
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

—————
FEBRUARY 25, 2010
—————

Serial No. 111-88
—————

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

55-126PDF

WASHINGTON : 2010

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

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California, *Chairman*

GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York	ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa	CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey	DAN BURTON, Indiana
BRAD SHERMAN, California	ELTON GALLEGLY, California
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York	DANA ROHRABACHER, California
BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts	DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York	EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
DIANE E. WATSON, California	RON PAUL, Texas
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri	JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey	MIKE PENCE, Indiana
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
MICHAEL E. McMAHON, New York	JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
JOHN S. TANNER, Tennessee	J. GRESHAM BARRETT, South Carolina
GENE GREEN, Texas	CONNIE MACK, Florida
LYNN WOOLSEY, California	JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas	MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas
BARBARA LEE, California	TED POE, Texas
SHELLEY BERKLEY, Nevada	BOB INGLIS, South Carolina
JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York	GUS BILIRAKIS, Florida
MIKE ROSS, Arkansas	
BRAD MILLER, North Carolina	
DAVID SCOTT, Georgia	
JIM COSTA, California	
KEITH ELLISON, Minnesota	
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	
RON KLEIN, Florida	
VACANT	

RICHARD J. KESSLER, *Staff Director*

YLEEM POLETE, *Republican Staff Director*

DIANA OHLBAUM, *Senior Professional Staff Member*

GENELL BROWN, *Senior Staff Associate/Hearing Coordinator*

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESSES	
The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State	4
LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING	
The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton: Prepared statement	8
APPENDIX	
Hearing notice	52
Hearing minutes	53
The Honorable Howard L. Berman, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, and Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs: Prepared statement	55
The Honorable Christopher H. Smith, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey: Prepared statement	57
The Honorable Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, a Representative in Congress from American Samoa: Prepared statement	61
The Honorable Diane E. Watson, a Representative in Congress from the State of California: Prepared statement	69
The Honorable Russ Carnahan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri: Prepared statement	70
The Honorable Gerald E. Connolly, a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia: Prepared statement	71
The Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas: Prepared statement	73
Questions for the record submitted to the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton by:	
The Honorable Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	78
The Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida	80
The Honorable Eliot L. Engel, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	90
The Honorable Dan Burton, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana	91
The Honorable Barbara Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of California	101
The Honorable Joe Wilson, a Representative in Congress from the State of South Carolina	113
The Honorable Shelley Berkley, a Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada	115
The Honorable Michael T. McCaul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas	117

PROMOTING SECURITY THROUGH DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT: THE FISCAL YEAR 2011 INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2010

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Howard L. Berman (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman BERMAN. The committee will come to order. Welcome, Madam Secretary.

In order to maximize the time for member questions, I will limit openings statements to myself and the ranking member. I intend to keep my statements short, well shorter than usual. And all other members are welcome to submit written statements for the record.

Madam Secretary, we appreciate this opportunity to explore with you the President's international affairs budget request for Fiscal Year 2011, the supplemental appropriations request for the current fiscal year, and the various policy initiatives you have championed as Secretary of State.

This is the second budget request submitted by this administration, but the first one prepared from start to finish under President Obama's and your leadership. So this is the first opportunity for Congress and the Nation to see a clear and comprehensive picture of your vision and the priorities you have set.

We applaud the President's decision to define "national security" to include not only the Defense budget, but also the international affairs budget. As you have said on many occasions, America's national security depends not only on our men and women in uniform, but also on the civil servants who risk their lives on a daily basis to support America's interests abroad.

Regrettably, this point was brought home by the recent deaths of a dedicated Foreign Service officer in the Haitian earthquake and seven CIA officers at the hands of a suicide bomber in Afghanistan. These courageous civilians gave their lives in service to our country.

Our diplomats and development specialists work day and night to head off international crises before they erupt, and to prevent the onset of failed states where terrorists who threaten our security find safe haven. Over the long run, these civilian efforts are much more cost effective than putting our brave soldiers in harm's ways.

Investing in the international affairs budget is the proverbial ounce of prevention. For example, if we are to resolve the Iranian nuclear crisis, whether by diplomacy or sanctions, it will be thanks mainly to the creativity and hard work of our diplomats and civil servants.

Madam Secretary, you have set out very clear priorities in this budget: Working with the local partners to defeat al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan; ensuring that children around the world have enough food to eat and don't die of easily preventable diseases; helping nations reduce emissions and adapt to climate change; putting women front and center in our humanitarian and development efforts; and rebuilding our civilian workforce by hiring a new generation of Foreign Service Officers and giving them the training and resources they need to make a real difference.

There may be differences of opinion about the relative priority of these initiatives and the optimal amount of funding for specific countries and programs, but I, and I hope my colleagues on this committee, will do everything we can to maintain the overall funding level because we recognize—as you do—that diplomacy and development are integral to our national security.

In fact, a full 18 percent of the international affairs budget request—\$10.8 billion—is for the frontline states of Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq. That includes \$1.6 billion for programs that were previously carried out by the Pentagon, including Iraqi police training, the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund, and Section 1207 reconstruction and stabilization assistance. By having the State Department assume responsibility for these programs, we place them in civilian hands where they belong and now allow the military to focus on its core mission.

There are many ways to look at the budget figures. I would argue that in order to compare apples to apples, the Fiscal Year 2010 total should include supplemental funding—both the new request and “forward funding” provided in the 2009 supplemental. Looking at it that way, the Fiscal Year 2011 request represents a very modest increase, about 2.8 percent.

In these difficult economic times, it is particularly important to remind ourselves and the American people that the international affairs budget is little more than 1 percent of the entire Federal budget, and only a small fraction of the amount we spend on defense.

Madam Secretary, we look forward to hearing your testimony on the budget request and the administration's foreign policy priorities. And now I am very pleased to turn to my ranking member, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, for any opening remarks that she might want to make.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, welcome back to our Foreign Affairs Committee. For the sake of time I am going to incorporate my questions into the opening statement to allow time for more members to raise their concerns during the question period.

Our existing public debt is already more than \$12 trillion. Under the President's overall budget for Fiscal Year 2011 our national debt would grow at an estimated rate of almost \$4 billion per day. Our foreign aid funding is not a major part of the overall budget we know, and we want to accomplish many things overseas, but in

light of our fiscal situation the international affairs budget should also be subject to selective freezes or slower rates of spending in order to assist in the battle for our Nation's economic future.

The \$9.5 billion requested for the State Department's basic salaries and operations when combined with last year's increases amounts to a 33 percent jump from Fiscal Year 2009 levels. These increases do not include, of course, funds sought in the anticipated supplemental for Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. There are reports that we are spending \$1 billion, \$1 billion for a new U.S. Embassy in London described as a crystal form that is light-filled and light-emitting. We all want to provide for the security of our overseas personnel, but we should be able to meet those needs without seeking to build a crystal palace.

There is a 22 percent increase for the International Atomic Energy Agency, which according to GAO has provided millions in assistance to the nuclear program of Iran and Syria. The international affairs account has grown significantly over the past decade. It was \$23.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2000. By 2010 it was at \$50.6 billion. That is a 116 percent increase.

I would like our foreign aid budget to move to a greater reliance on development credit assistance, which should help us achieve considerable savings. As the State Department's own documents note, the development credit account has historically leveraged significant amounts of private funds for development projects.

Turning to policy questions, Madam Secretary, on Iran the recent IAEA report stated concerns "about the possible existence in Iran of undisclosed activities related to development of a nuclear payload for a missile."

Then today's news report have Russian officials refuting claims that Iran could be pursuing nuclear weapons while emphasizing Russia's commitment to delivering advanced air defense missiles to Iran. Some European officials are also quoted suggesting that sanctions should come later and investments in Iran continue.

Madam Secretary, successive U.S. administrations, under the guise of seeking multilateral concessions, have taken no action under the Iran Sanctions Act, and the Iranian threat keeps growing. When are companies like Royal Dutch Shell, France's Total, Russia's Gazprom, and Spain's Repsol going to be held accountable for their actions? When will we take action to address the almost \$3 billion in investments by China's Sinopec? When will we be leveraging the Iran Sanctions Act for concrete cooperation from our allies and cutting off the regime in Iran?

Turning to Cuba, I am also deeply concerned about reports that the administration might bend to the Cuban regime's blackmail and agree to end anti-censorship and pro-democracy programs in exchange for the release of U.S. citizen Alan Gross. As you know, Orlando Zapata Tamayo, a Cuban dissident in jail, died this very week from a hunger strike and we must do all that we can to help with the dissident movement and help with the opposition in Cuba.

I would like to hand to you a copy of a February 3rd letter addressed to you from former U.S. Ambassadors to the Western Hemisphere countries urging you "to not make any concessions to any dictatorial regime and particularly not to Cuba."

And lastly, turning to PA funding and UNRWA, a former Palestinian anti-corruption official has reportedly revealed that Palestinian officials have stolen hundreds of millions in foreign aid, yet the administration is requesting another \$0.5 billion, including \$150 million in direct cash transfers for the Palestinian Authority.

Similarly with respect to the United Nations' Relief and Works Agency, the homicide bomber who killed 7 Americans at a base in Afghanistan previously worked at UNRWA, in an UNRWA camp and had significant radical Islamic ties. UNRWA also continues to agitate against Israel while refusing to vet radical Islamic extremists in its very ranks. Yet the administration just announced another \$40 million to UNRWA.

What is it going to take for the U.S. to stop the no strings attached pipeline of funds to the PA and to UNRWA?

And Madam Secretary, Mr. Chairman, 1½ minutes to go. I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you and welcome. Glad to hear that the President is doing much better.

Chairman BERMAN. Well, thank you very much.

Madam Secretary, I yield myself 5 minutes to begin the questioning—oh, yes. Do you want to testify? We can really save a lot of time.

Secretary CLINTON. Mr. Chairman, I will do it in a New York minute.

Chairman BERMAN. No, no, no, you take all the time that you want. This is important.

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

Secretary CLINTON. Well, first let me say to you and to the ranking member and to all of the members of the committee that it is a pleasure to be back with you today.

When I was last here discussing our budget, I emphasized my commitment to elevate diplomacy and development as core pillars of American power, and since then I have been heartened by the bipartisan support of this committee and the rest of Congress, and I want to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of the men and women who work every day for the State Department, for USAID here at home and around the world putting our foreign policy into action, advancing America's interests and values. And that is what this budget we are presenting today intends to do.

Our Fiscal Year 2011 requests for the State Department and USAID totals \$52.8 billion. That is a \$4.9 billion increase over 2010. Of that increase, \$3.6 billion will go to supporting efforts in the front line states, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq. Other funding will grow by \$1.3 billion, which is a 2.7 percent increase that will help us address global challenges, strengthen partnerships, and ensure that the State Department and USAID are equipped with the right people and resources.

Over the past 6 weeks in Haiti we have been reminded yet again of the importance of American leadership. I am very proud of what our country has done. Our military and civilian personnel have performed extraordinarily, and we are continuing our work with our Haitian and international partners to address the ongoing suffering and transition from relief to recovery.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that this is a time of great economic strain for our fellow Americans, and as a former Member of Congress I know what this means for the people you each represent. For every dollar we spend we have to show results. That is why this budget must support programs vital to our national security, our national interests, and our leadership in the world while guarding against waste, duplication and irrelevancy, and I believe it achieves those objectives.

The figures in the budget are more than numbers on a page. They tell the story of the challenges we face and the resources we need to overcome them. We are fighting two wars that call for the skill and sacrifice of our civilians as well as our troops.

We have pursued a dual track approach to Iran that has exposed for the world to see its refusal to live up to its responsibility, and it has helped us achieve a new unity with our international partners. Iran has left the international community little choice, but to impose greater costs for its provocative steps, and we are now working actively with other countries to prepare and implement new measures to pressure Iran to change course.

We also achieved this past year unprecedented unity in response to North Korea's provocative action, even as we leave the door open for a restart of six party talks. We are moving closer to a fresh nuclear agreement with Russia, one that advances our security while furthering President Obama's long-term vision of a world without nuclear weapons.

With China we are seeking areas of common purpose while standing firm where we differ. We are making concrete our new beginning with the Muslim world, and we are strengthening partnerships with allies in Europe and Asia, with friends in our own hemisphere, and with countries around the world from India to Indonesia to South Africa, Brazil and Turkey. And yes, we are working every day to end the impasse and the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians.

At the same time we are developing a new architecture of co-operation to meet global challenges that cross national boundaries like climate change and the use of our planet's oceans. In so many instances our national interests and the common interests converge, and so from the Western Hemisphere to Africa, Asia and the Middle East we are promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy and Internet freedom. We are fighting poverty, hunger and disease, and we are working to ensure that economic growth is broadly shared.

Our agenda is ambitious because the times demand it. America is called to lead, and we need the tools and resources to exercise that leadership wisely and effectively. We can bury our heads in the sand and pay the consequences later or we can make hard-nosed, targeted investments now, addressing the security challenges of today while building a stronger foundation for security and prosperity in the future.

Let me quickly highlight the three areas where we are making significant new investments, first in the security of the front line states. In Afghanistan we have tripled the number of civilians on the ground and this presence will grow by hundreds more with the \$5 billion in this budget. Our diplomats and development experts

are imbedded with our military. They have moved into Marja along with our forces, they are now helping to set up institutions, expand economic opportunities, and provide meaningful alternatives for insurgents ready to renounce violence in al-Qaeda and join Afghan society in a peaceful way.

In Pakistan our request includes \$3.2 billion to combat extremism, promote economic development, strengthen democratic institutions, and build a long-term relationship with the Pakistani people. This includes funding of the Kerry-Lugar-Berman initiative, and I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your visionary leadership on this legislation.

Our request also includes a 59 percent increase in funding for Yemen to help counter the extremist threats and build institutions and economic opportunity.

In Iraq we are winding down our military presence and establishing a more normal civilian mission. Our civilian efforts will not and cannot mirror the scale of our military presence, but rather provide assistance consistent with the priorities of the Iraqi Government. So our request includes \$2.6 billion for Iraq to enable us to support the democratic process and ensure a smooth transition to civilian led security training and operational support. As these funds allow civilians to take responsibility for these programs, the Defense Department's budget for Iraq will decrease by about \$16 billion. That is a powerful illustration of the return on civilian investment.

We are blessed, as we all know, with the best troops in the world as we have seen time and time again, but we have got to give our civilian experts the resources that we ask them to exercise as they go about doing what they are expected to do, and the budget takes a step in that direction. It includes \$100 million for a State Department Complex Crisis Fund, replacing the 1207 fund through which the Defense Department directed money toward crisis response. It includes support for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund, which previously also fell under the Defense Department.

The second major area is investing in development. This budget makes targeted investments in fragile societies which in our interconnected world bear heavily on our own security and prosperity. These investments are a key part of our efforts to get ahead of crisis rather than just responding to them, positioning us to deal with the threats and challenges that lie before us.

The first of these is in health. Building on our progress, treating HIV, Malaria, and tuberculosis, our global health initiative will invest \$63 billion over 6 years, starting with \$8.5 billion in Fiscal Year 2011, to help partners address specific diseases but also to build strong sustainable health systems for themselves.

The administration has also pledged at least \$3½ billion a year in food security over 3 years, and this year's request includes \$1.6 billion, of which \$1.2 billion will be funded through the State Department. This funding will focus on countries that have developed effective, comprehensive strategies where agriculture is central to prosperity and hunger remains widespread.

On climate change our request of \$646 million seeks to promote the United States as a leader in green technology and to leverage other countries cooperation, including through the Copenhagen Ac-

cord, which for the first time brought developed and developing countries together on this challenge. This is part of the administration's total request of \$1.4 billion to support core climate change activities in developing nations.

Our request also includes \$4.2 billion for humanitarian assistance programs. Our efforts in Haiti have made clear that State and USAID must be able to respond quickly and effectively to human tragedies.

These initiatives are designed to enhance American security, help people in need, and give the American people a strong return on their investment. Our aim is not to create dependency, but to help people develop solutions that they can sustain for themselves over the long term. And essential to this is a focus on advancing equality and opportunity for women and girls, who are the key drivers of economic and social progress in the developing world.

And that brings me to the third and final area of investment. None of this can happen if we do not recruit, train and empower the right people for the job. The State Department and USAID are full of talented and committed public servants, but too often we have neglected to give them the tools they need to carry out their missions on the ground. Rather than building their expertise, we have often relied on contractors, sometimes with little oversight and often with increased costs.

This budget will allow us to expand the Foreign Service by over 600 positions, including an additional 410 for the State Department and 200 for USAID. It will also allow us to staff the standby element of the civilian reserve corps, which a crucial tool we are developing to respond to crisis.

Now while deploying these personnel does generate new expenses in some accounts, it will reduce expenses in others by changing the way we do business. We are ending an overreliance on contractors and finding opportunities to save money by bringing essential functions into government and improving oversight.

One thing that I hope is clear from this budget is that the State Department and USAID are taking a lead in carrying out the United States foreign policy and national security agenda. As we finish the first ever Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, we have a unique opportunity to define the capabilities we need and then match resources with priorities.

This budget aligns our investments with the strategic imperatives of our time. We are putting a lot of effort into the management of the State Department and USAID. We are asking a lot of hard questions, and we come to you with a commitment to be responsive as we have done so this past year.

At a time of change and challenge at home and abroad we believe these investments will enhance the security of Americans, assure the future of American leadership and help build the foundations of peace, stability, and prosperity for the years ahead.

I look forward to continuing to work with you and I would be pleased to take your questions, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Clinton follows:]

**SECRETARY OF STATE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY
HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 25, 2010**

Chairman Berman, Representative Ros-Lehtinen, and Members of the Committee, it is a pleasure to be with you today. When I was last here to discuss our budget, I emphasized my commitment to elevating diplomacy and development as core pillars of American power. Since then, I have been heartened by the bipartisan support of this committee and the rest of Congress. Let me take this opportunity to thank you, on behalf of the men and women who work every day around the world to put our foreign policy into action.

The budget we are presenting today is designed to protect America and Americans and to advance our interests. Our fiscal year 2011 request for the State Department and USAID totals \$52.8 billion – a \$4.9 billion increase over 2010. Of that increase, \$3.6 billion will go to supporting efforts in “frontline states” – Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq. Other funding will grow by \$1.3 billion, a 2.7 percent increase that will help address global challenges, strengthen partnerships, and ensure that the State Department and USAID are equipped with the right people and resources.

Over the past six weeks in Haiti, we have been reminded yet again of the importance of American leadership. I’m proud of what our country has done, and we continue to work with our Haitian and international partners to address ongoing suffering and transition from relief to recovery.

This is a time of great economic strain for many Americans. As a former member of Congress, I know what this means for the people you represent. For every dollar we spend, we have to show results. That is why this budget must support programs vital to our national security, our national interests, and our leadership in the world, while guarding against waste. I believe it achieves those objectives.

OUR PRIORITIES

These figures are more than numbers on a page. They tell the story of challenges we face and the resources we need to overcome them.

We are fighting two wars that call on the skill and sacrifice of our civilians as well as our troops. We have pursued a dual-track approach to Iran that has exposed its refusal to live up to its responsibilities and helped us achieve a new unity with our international partners. Iran has left the international community little choice but to impose greater costs for its provocative steps. We are now working actively with our partners to prepare and implement new measures to pressure Iran to change its course.

We have also achieved unprecedented unity in our response to North Korea's provocative actions, even as we leave the door open for a restart of Six-Party Talks. And we are moving closer to a fresh nuclear agreement with Russia – one that advances our security while furthering President Obama's long-term vision of a world without nuclear weapons.

With China, we are seeking areas of common purpose while standing firm where we differ. We are making concrete our new beginning with the Muslim world. We are strengthening partnerships with allies in Europe and Asia, with friends in our hemisphere, and with countries around the world, from India to Indonesia to South Africa, Brazil, and Turkey. And we are working to end the impasse between Israelis and Palestinians.

At the same time, we are developing a new architecture of cooperation to meet global challenges like climate change and the use of our planet's oceans. In so many instances, our national interest and the common interest converge, and so from our own hemisphere to Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, we are promoting human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and Internet freedom; we are fighting poverty, hunger, and disease; and we are working to ensure that economic growth is broadly shared.

Our agenda is ambitious because our times demand it. America is called to lead – and we need the tools and resources to exercise our leadership wisely and effectively. We can bury our heads in the sand and pay the consequences later, or we can make hard-nosed, targeted investments now – addressing the security challenges of today while building a foundation for security and prosperity in the future.

Let me now highlight the three areas where we are making significant new investments.

INVESTING IN SECURITY

First, the security of frontline states.

In Afghanistan, we have tripled the number of civilians on the ground, and this presence will grow by hundreds more with the \$5 billion in this budget. Our diplomats and development experts are helping build institutions, expand economic opportunities, and provide meaningful alternatives for insurgents ready to renounce violence and join their fellow Afghans in the pursuit of peace.

In Pakistan, our request includes \$3.2 billion to combat extremism, promote economic development, strengthen democratic institutions, and build a long-term relationship with the Pakistani people. This includes funding of the Kerry-Lugar-Berman initiative, and I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on this legislation. Our request also includes a 59 percent increase in funding for Yemen, to help counter the extremist threat and build institutions and economic opportunity.

In Iraq, we are winding down our military presence and establishing a more normal civilian mission. Our civilian efforts will not and cannot mirror the scale of our military

presence, but rather provide assistance consistent with the priorities of the Iraqi government. Our request includes \$2.6 billion for Iraq – resources that will allow us to support the democratic process and ensure a smooth transition to civilian-led security training and operational support. As these funds allow civilians to take full responsibility for programs, the Defense budget for Iraq will be decreasing by about \$16 billion – a powerful illustration of the return on civilian investment.

We are blessed with the best troops in the world, as we have seen time and again in today's wars. But we also need to give our civilian experts the resources to do civilian jobs. This budget takes a step in that direction. It includes \$100 million for a State Department complex crises fund – replacing the 1207 fund through which the Defense Department directed money toward crisis response. And it includes support for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund, which previously fell under the Defense Department as well.

INVESTING IN DEVELOPMENT

The second major area is investing in development. This budget makes targeted investments in fragile societies – which, in our interconnected world, bear heavily on our own security and prosperity. These investments are a key part of our effort to get ahead of crises rather than just responding to them, positioning us to deal effectively with the threats and challenges that lie ahead.

The first of these investments is in health. Building on our progress treating HIV, malaria, and tuberculosis, our Global Health Initiative will invest \$63 billion over six years, starting with \$8.5 billion in FY11, to help our partners address specific diseases and build strong, sustainable health systems as they do so.

The Administration has also pledged to invest at least \$3.5 billion in food security over three years, and this year's request includes \$1.6 billion, of which \$1.2 billion is funded through the State Department. This funding will focus on countries that have developed effective, comprehensive strategies, where agriculture is central to prosperity and hunger remains widespread.

On climate change, our request of \$646 million seeks to promote the United States as a leader in green technology and to leverage other countries' cooperation – including through the Copenhagen Accord, which for the first time brings developed and developing countries together on this challenge. This is part of the Administration's total request of \$1.4 billion to support core climate-change activities in developing nations.

Our request also includes \$4.2 billion for humanitarian assistance programs. Our efforts in Haiti have made clear that State and USAID must be able to respond quickly and effectively to human tragedies.

These initiatives are designed to enhance American security, help people in need, and give the American people a strong return on their investment. Our aim is not to create

dependency, but to help our partners devise solutions they can sustain over the long term. Essential to this is a focus on advancing equality and opportunity for women and girls, who are the key drivers of economic and social progress in the developing world.

INVESTING IN THE RIGHT PEOPLE AND TOOLS

That brings me to our third area of investment. None of this can happen if we do not recruit, train, and empower the right people for the job.

The State Department and USAID are full of talented and committed public servants, but we have too often neglected to give them the tools they need to carry out their missions on the ground. Rather than building their expertise, we have too often relied on contractors, sometimes with little oversight.

This budget will allow us to expand the Foreign Service by over 600 positions, including an additional 410 positions for the State Department and 200 for USAID. It will also allow us to staff the standby element of the Civilian Reserve Corps, a crucial tool for responding to crises.

While deploying these personnel generates new expenses in some accounts, it will reduce expenses in others by changing the way we do business. We are ending an over-reliance on contractors and finding opportunities to save money by bringing functions into government and improving oversight.

A YEAR OF RESULTS

One thing should be very clear from this budget: the State Department and USAID are taking a lead in carrying out the United States' foreign policy and national-security agenda. As we finish the first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, we have a unique opportunity to define the capabilities we need and to match resources with priorities. This budget aligns our investments with the strategic imperatives of our time.

The QDDR will also help ensure that we are more effective and accountable. Jack Lew, the first Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources, has put his skill to work in developing this budget and in reviewing it over and over to make sure that every item is economical and effective.

At a time of change and challenge at home and abroad, these investments will enhance the security of Americans, assure the future American leadership, and help build the foundations of peace, stability, and prosperity in the years ahead. I look forward to working with all of you as we move forward, and I would be pleased to take your questions.

Chairman BERMAN. Thank you very much, and now I yield myself 5 minutes to begin the questioning.

I want to start out by truly commending the administration for its sincere and full effort to engage Iran in the goal of stopping the Iranian nuclear program. It is regrettable that the Iranians have not accepted the President's outstretched hand. The world has seen the President's efforts at engagement have been met by an Iranian clenched fist. If there are any doubts about the nature of the Iranian regime, they have been erased by fraudulent elections and brutal repression of dissent. If there was any doubt about Iran's intention of having a nuclear weapons capability, the revelations of the last 3 or 4 months surely have removed those doubts by any objective standard. We have tried engagement, and I believe we should remain open to a diplomatic solution, but I think it is time to shift our focus to implementing effective sanctions, sanctions that maximize the chance that Iran will change its decision, change its course, and end its effort to seek that nuclear weapons capability.

The question is what kinds of sanctions work. I think it is a mistake for us to try and draw you out fully as you are engaged in an important diplomatic process at the Security Council and with other countries bilaterally to develop that strategy. But I do want to raise a more general issue. There are people around who say the words "targeted" and "smart sanctions" get thrown around all the time. The test is whether the sanctions maximize the chances of achieving the goal of changed behavior on these issues. And some say our targeting of sanctions should be limited to individuals, we don't want to cause any economic deprivation to the Iranian people beyond that which the regime's own policies have foisted on their people. I don't understand how we can have the level of sanctions that can change behavior without it unfortunately having consequences on the Iranian people. But we are talking about in the context of Iran, hundreds of thousands of Iranians have put their lives on the line to protest their regime. They are suffering in some cases executions, mass arrests, show trials, beatings and all kinds of brutality. The notion that because of the regime's behavior their economic deprivation, which is already serious, may grow. The notion that that causes them to rally behind the very regime that has caused them to go in the streets to me makes no sense.

And I guess I would like to get your thoughts on this issue of sanctions that are called smart because they have no impact on the Iranian people versus sanctions that could change behavior.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, first let me underscore what you said about the importance of the President's strategy this past year. We believe strongly that the President's leadership and willingness to reach out for engagement with the Iranians was exactly the right approach for two reasons. First, as he said in his Inaugural Address, he was willing to stretch out his hand but people had to unclench their fist. Offering the Iranian leadership the opportunity to engage in a serious way was a necessary and important step which the President has been willing to take against some political criticism, as you know.

But secondly, the fact that the Iranian regime has failed to respond and indeed in the course of this past year has shown its bru-

tality toward its own people and the revelations that have come to light about the undisclosed facility at Qom, their failure to accept the Russian, United States and French offers through the IAEA on helping to provide the uranium they were needing for the Tehran research reactor, their decision to try to enrich to a higher percentage. All of the litany that we know of the actions they have taken and the IAEA's much more robust conclusions about that have demonstrated to the rest of the world what the facts are about Iran's ambitions and about its refusal to engage in a serious manner.

Therefore, we in the pursuit of a very aggressive diplomatic campaign believe that the broader the approach on sanctions against Iran, the more isolation and pressure Iran will feel. It is therefore important that we speak with one voice, one voice within our Government and one voice internationally against Iran's failure to live up to its responsibilities. And so we have done an intensive consultation process around what we see as the most effective approaches to sanctions. And I personally have engaged in numerous discussions with many countries, when I was in London just recently, in the Gulf next week, in Latin America, pointing out how the evidence all adds up. And I think because we were willing to engage we have a much more receptive audience than we might have had otherwise. And I think that our efforts to move forward in the Security Council should not be viewed as our exclusive efforts because we have also stated clearly we will look at additional bilateral and preferably multilateral sanctions with willing nations on top of whatever we get out of the Security Council.

So in sum, we believe in a broad approach, we believe that we have to be as focused on what could change attitudes and behavior within the leadership of Iran. As you might have noticed, I was very clear in my remarks when I was in Doha and Jeddah last week about the increasing role that the Revolutionary Guard is playing in the politics and economy of Iran.

So our goal is your goal. If we are going to go to the international community through the U.N., through other multilateral efforts, we want sanctions that will be effective and we think the broader, the more likely that is to be.

Chairman BERMAN. Thank you very much. I do note that in consultation with the ranking member we did something which should not be considered oppressive with respect to time, but I thought this was important enough issue to fully develop. I now am pleased to recognize the ranking member for 5 minutes.

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

Why is the administration doing nothing to pass the free trade agreements with Colombia, South Korea, Panama? Solid U.S. allies, wonderful friends, very pro-American. Will you and President Obama become engaged in trying to pass these FTAs?

Secondly, why did we join the U.N. Human Rights Council if we were going to do nothing by being on the Council? We were supposed to change it from within, yet in the time we have been there the United States has not called for a special session or even sponsored a resolution to try to promote it on the human rights viola-

tion in Iran, and North Korea, and Syria, Sudan, Cuba, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Russia, you name it, nada.

And lastly, Madam Secretary, if you could please comment on the death of Orlando Zapata Tamayo, the Cuban dissident who I referred to in my opening statement.

Thank you.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you very much. Let me start where you ended. The United States Government deeply regrets the death of Orlando Zapata Tamayo and we send our condolences to his family, and we also reiterate our strong objection to the actions of the Cuban Government. This is a prisoner of conscience who was imprisoned for years for speaking his mind, for seeking democracy, for standing on the side of values that are universal, who engaged in a hunger strike. The United States Government consistently requested that he be given medical assistance. And unfortunately, he paid for his courage and his commitment with his life. He is one of more than 200 prisoners of conscience held by the Cuban Government, and we continue to reiterate and in the strongest possible terms put forth a strong objection to the existing behavior and a hope that through the consistent pressure that we can place on the Cuban Government over matters like this that these prisoners of conscience will eventually be released.

Secondly, with respect to the Human Rights Council, actually, Congresswoman, there was a Human Rights Council session on Iran and the deplorable human rights record of Iran. Just last week the United States was there and made a very strong and forceful presentation; Assistant Secretary Posner from Democracy Human Rights Bureau in the State Department led our efforts, and I think we again made a historic record in front of Iran.

Now they don't care about their people so they are not going to care about the world exposing these constant human rights abuses, but I think it is far better for us to be exercising our freedom of expression and our strong beliefs inside that Council and forcing others to look at the evidence that is presented. So for the past year that is exactly what we have been doing and we will continue to do so.

And finally on the free trade agreements, as President Obama said in his State of the Union Address last month, we are committed to these free trade agreements and we hope that we can begin a process of consultation and consensus building within the Congress. I will be going to Latin America next week. I share your characterization of Colombia and Panama, two of our strongest allies and two countries that have worked very hard to make changes and create a conducive atmosphere to these free trade agreements being confirmed here in our Congress.

So we are going to be working on this, and I appreciate your raising it because I personally believe it is a very important issue.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Madam Secretary. Yes, I do realize that we did have that periodic review on Iran, but it was not U.S. sponsored, it was not a special session, and that is why I raise it. I want us to be more involved now that we are part of that rogue's gallery. Fortunately we are not a rogue regime, but unfortunately then we become part of the problem. I would like for the U.S. to be the sponsor and call for special sessions.

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman BERMAN. Thank you very much. And now the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Middle East and South Asia Subcommittee, Mr. Ackerman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good to see you, Madam Secretary. Difficult to let this historic moment go by without noting that so many of us are feeling buyer's regret that in a previous incarnation we allowed your health plan proposal to go by the boards. What a different place we would be at right now. But this is a different committee.

I want to spend a moment, if I might, talking about the Goldstone report and its implications. This report is a deeply flawed and grossly biased political diatribe, a club used to beat Israel over the head and attempt to delegitimize its very existence; a country that has attempted to defend itself, as have we, against terrorists and terrorist attacks and suicide bombers and murderers who would destroy so many human beings and civilization. But it is not Israel that I raise the concern about; it is the implication that this has for the United States.

If this report, which addresses the new kind of warfare that we are in, warfare that isn't traditional battlefield warfare which has general rules and regulations that the whole world has operated under, but going after terrorists who have no conscience, who would hide and morph themselves and meld into civilian populations, hiding their arms and weapons and shedding their uniforms the way they have in the Middle East, and the way we have faced them as well. The implications for the United States are more than serious. I won't quantify it, but the number of civilians that have unfortunately and regrettably perished as we, the United States, have pursued terrorists whether they be in Iraq, or Afghanistan, or elsewhere are certainly a number multiplied by some huge multiple compared to the number of civilians that were killed as Israel pursued terrorists in Gaza throughout that entire incursion.

It is not difficult to envision the short path, if that report is accepted as the international standard, to see what happens to our country and envision just the limitations that it would place on your travel ability, Madam Secretary, or the indictment of some American President or future Secretary, or even past, for international war crimes because civilians were killed in the pursuit of terrorism, would put a chilling pall on our ability to fight the war on terror. How do we address this?

I do want to commend the administration for jumping out ahead of this as quickly as it did and doing all the things, and I know a lot of things got derailed because of things that were not in our control, without going into them, but how do we deal with this at this moment in time as this report moves forward?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, you have highlighted one of the serious deficiencies in the report that we have also noted. The whole concept of self-defense and the right to self-defense is one that was not adequately addressed or even taken into consideration. There are a number of other deficiencies within the report, but you have as usual put your finger on one of the potential ramifications that go beyond the findings relating to what happened in one place at one time in history, and we believe strongly

that the issues raised in the Goldstone report should be subjected to strong domestic review processes. We believe Israel has the capacity and the institutions to do so, and in fact Israel, as you know, has undertaken such review, as has, I might add, the Palestinian Authority. The group that hasn't is Hamas and those who support and fund Hamas. And we believe strongly, too, that other countries have a stake in supporting our perspective on this, because it is not only the United States if this international standard, as you say, were to morph out of this report, but nearly every other country that would similarly be held to account.

So I share your concerns, and we have stood very staunchly on the side of those who reject the underlying premises of this report.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Madam Secretary. It is always great to see you.

Today, Mr. Chairman, ultrasound imaging has given us a window to the womb and the child within, and micro surgery and a myriad of fetal health interventions are commonplace. Today as never before unborn children ought to be viewed as humanity's youngest patients in need of proper prenatal care, nurturing, and, when sick, diagnosis and treatment.

The prevention of mother to child HIV transmission got a major boost from PEPFAR, and I am happy to say that commitment continues and is expanded in the Global Health Initiative. The Global Health Initiative must, however, ensure that even the unplanned and unintended unborn child is welcomed, cared for, and included in the initiative.

I was disappointed to read on page 14 of the consultation document that unintended pregnancy seems to be relegated to the status of a disease, juxtaposed between HIV and tropical diseases. Pregnancy isn't a disease. The child in the womb is neither a tumor nor a parasite to be destroyed.

I am, Mr. Chairman, deeply concerned that with the elimination of the Mexico City policy by Executive Order last year, NGO implementing partners may actively seek to integrate abortion with the many necessary and noble undertakings funded by the Global Health Initiative. Therefore, I respectfully ask that the administration consider that for many of us, all abortion, legal or illegal, is violence against children, poses significant, often under appreciated risks to women, and especially, and this is largely unfocused upon, to children later born to post-abortive women.

The term "safe abortion" in my opinion is the ultimate oxymoron, child dismemberment, forced premature expulsion from the womb by chemicals like Misoprostol, and deliberate starvation by RU-486 can never ever be construed to be benign, compassionate or safe.

Millennium Development Goal Number 4 seeks the reduction in child mortality; abortion is child mortality.

Safe abortion? At least 102 studies show significant psychological harm, major depression, and elevated suicide risk to women who abort. Recently the Times of London reported, and I quote in pertinent part that "Senior . . . psychiatrists say that new evidence has uncovered a clear link between abortion and mental illness in women with no previous history of psychological problems." They

found “that women who have had abortions have twice the level of psychological problems and three times the level of depression as women who have given birth or who have never been pregnant . . .”.

In 2006, a comprehensive New Zealand study found that almost 80 percent, 78.6 percent to be exact, of the 15- to 18-years-olds who had abortions displayed symptoms of major depression as compared to 31 percent of their peers, and that study also found that 27 percent of the 21- to 25-year-old women who had abortions had suicidal idealizations compared to 8 percent of those who did not.

Safe abortion? Not for subsequent children born to women who have had an abortion. At least 113 studies show a significant association between abortion and subsequent premature birth. For example, a study by researchers Shah and Zoe showed a 36 percent increased risk for preterm birth after one abortion and a staggering 93 percent increased risk after two. Similarly, the risk of subsequent children being born with low birth weight increases by 35 percent after one and 72 percent after two or more abortions.

Another study showed the risk increased nine times after a woman had three abortions. Clearly this terrible consequence has been overlooked and under focused upon for far too long.

What does this mean for her children? Preterm birth is the leading cause of infant mortality in the industrialized world after congenital anomalies. Preterm infants have a greater risk of suffering from chronic lung disease, sensory deficit, cerebral palsy, cognitive impairments, and behavioral problems; low birth weight is similarly associated with neonatal mortality and morbidity.

Finally, I would respectfully submit that if we are truly serious about reducing maternal mortality, women especially in the developing world need access to proper maternal health care, skilled birth attendants, and safe blood. I had a hearing that I chaired years ago on safe blood, and a WHO representative said 44 percent of maternal mortality goes away in Africa if there is the availability of safe blood.

So I would ask respectfully that these things be considered.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Payne, chairman of the Africa Subcommittee, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much, and let me commend you, Madam Secretary, on your recent trip to Haiti as you flew back from a previously planned trip to be there on the ground. Also, I want to commend you for the grueling six-country tour you took to Africa last year. They are still talking about it. The only negative is the countries you didn't go to. Of course there are 54, so you have got 48 more to do.

Let me just bring up a few quick questions. Number one, I have some concern about Somalia. As you know, the transitional Federal Government of Sheikh Sharif continues to struggle. There was not any increase for development aid for Somalia. I think if we get the governance program going we will stop the piracy because I do know Sheikh Sharif and his people can take that under control.

Secondly, we do see in Sudan an agreement with JEM and the Government of Sudan. Of course the Government of Sudan has signed a lot of agreements and has broken every one, so I am not

that optimistic. However, there was a 10 percent reduction in ESF funds for South Sudan which is coming up with a big referendum next year. I don't think that is the way to go since this very important referendum is coming up.

Thirdly, Liberia has a problem with about 3,500 Liberians who are here under DED. On the 30th of March, DED will expire. They came here under the reign of Charles Taylor. It is Homeland Security/State Department, but if you could look into this I would really appreciate being able to call you about that.

[A written response to the inquiry follows:]



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

MAR 16 2010

Dear Congressman Payne:

During Secretary Clinton's testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 25, 2010, you asked the Secretary about the status of Liberian nationals currently in the United States under Deferred Enforced Departure (DED).

Since 1991, the United States has provided safe haven for Liberians who were forced to flee their country as a result of armed conflict and widespread civil strife. Approximately 3,600 Liberians have been provided either Temporary Protected Status (TPS) or DED since that time. Conditions improved such that TPS ended effective October 1, 2007, but President Bush, pursuant to his constitutional authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States, authorized DED for the Liberians originally granted TPS. On March 20, 2009, President Obama extended DED for this same group of Liberians for an additional 12 months.

Although Liberia has made significant political and economic strides forward, the extension provided additional transition time for the Liberian DED beneficiaries, their families, and the government of Liberia. The current DED authorization expires on March 31, 2010. The Department of State closely monitors the situation in Liberia to assess the impact of the return of the Liberians covered under DED. We anticipate that the President will be making a decision on this issue in the near future.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance to you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard R. Verma
Assistant Secretary
Legislative Affairs

The Honorable
Donald Payne,
House of Representatives.

Mr. PAYNE. Finally, Nigeria's problem of course with the President Yar'Adua being very ill. The Vice President has taken over. Yar'Adua has gone back to Nigeria, so we need to take a look at that to make sure that we don't have a conflict of two Presidents. There are enough problems in Nigeria right now.

Finally, I am concerned about Morocco's occupation in Western Sahara, and I do think that the Saharan people should have an opportunity to have the referendum there in Western Sahara. The

United Nations said it should be done, and the Baker plan said it should be done. I think we should go ahead and do that.

Finally, on another issue, on March 9th there will be a vote in Northern Ireland. As you know, the Hillsborough Castle Agreement for the UPD and Sinn Fein said the evolution process will go on. However, we can anticipate there may be violence coming up, because we had the car bombing last week. So I would wonder if you could look at that and just urge them for the March 9th vote to vote yes so that we can get the evolution behind us.

I will wait to hear your answer on those that you can answer. Thank you.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, thank you so much, and I will try to speak very quickly, Congressman, and as always, thank you for your personal and very welcome attention to Africa.

With respect to Somalia, there are decreases in the funding from the State Department, but we are working very hard in other accounts as well as with other donors. We share your commitment to Sheikh Sharif on the TFG.

With respect to Sudan, however, we are actually increasing the request. It is about 3 percent over the Fiscal Year 2010 total estimate, and we again share your concern which is why we are putting both more funding and more diplomatic attention to what is going on in Southern Sudan.

The Sudan-JEM agreement is welcome. We share your concern about whether it is real, but we are working hard on that and I met when I was in Doha with the Prime Minister of Qatar who has been a facilitator of that effort.

With Liberia we are making a decision to extend that deferred status.

With Nigeria, Assistant Secretary Johnny Carson was in Nigeria and very much involved in the peaceful transition. With the return of the President we are going to maintain vigilance over what is happening inside Nigeria.

We support the U.N. process concerning Morocco and the Western Sahara.

Finally, on Northern Ireland, as you may know, I went to Northern Ireland. I spoke in Stormont. I have been deeply involved with, and telephoning with all of the major players, just met with Shaun Woodward, the Secretary for Northern Ireland. I share your hope that the March 9th vote is affirmative.

Chairman BERMAN. Amazing. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Burton.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two brief comments. I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Ackerman regarding the Goldstone report. I just signed a letter to the Secretary along with you, Mr. Chairman, and others regarding that.

The second thing I wanted to say is that the Sanctions Act that you graciously got through the House and has been passed in the Senate still has to go to conference committee, and I would hope we would get that passed and to the President as quickly as possible.

Third, I want to thank the Secretary of State for her hard work. She has been working very hard. It is pretty apparent. She has been all over the place and we appreciate your work.

I have two questions for you, first of all regarding Iran. Iran—and we have been talking about this now for several years—they have not moved one inch from their development program. In fact, IAEA said they are planning 10 more sites and several thousand more centrifuges. They are also talking about building a bombproof facility in the side of a mountain. And so while we are talking about negotiating all kinds of measures to put pressure on them, I think that we ought to also be talking about an attack on those sites and let them know that the United States and Israel, working together, will do whatever it takes to stop a development program that will threaten the Middle East, our energy supplies and the State of Israel. And while we are talking about this, you know, working with our allies to put pressure on them through sanctions, I really think the message should be sent publicly or through you privately that we are prepared to give Israel whatever they need to be able to go way below the ground, maybe 100, 200, 300 feet, whatever it is, to knock out those development sites if necessary, because we don't want them to have as a terrorist state nuclear weapons that can just destabilize the entire region and maybe destroy Israel.

And so I hope you will maybe comment on that. The other thing I would like you to comment on, Madam Secretary, is I was informed that the Justice Department has somewhere up to nine or maybe even more people working there who did pro bono work for some of the terrorists or detainees that are being held at Guantanamo. And if that is the case, I am very concerned about the decision that is being made by the Justice Department to bring those people to the United States for civil trial. People may have a biased attitude over there, and I hope that those people aren't involved in the decision-making process.

I personally feel that the terrorists or the detainees should be tried at Guantanamo. There is water all the way around them, they can't get away, and they should be tried by a military tribunal. And the vast majority of the American people feel exactly the same way.

So I would like for you to address those two things. If you can't address the first part because of classified information, that is fine, but I wish you would take to the President the message that many of us in Congress want Tehran and Mr. Ahmadinejad to know that we are not going to let them develop a nuclear weapons capability and a delivery system. As I understand it now, they are working on a missile with a delivery system for possibly a nuclear weapon. At least that is what the IAEA says and that is very troubling.

So I hope you will deliver that message and if you could comment on those two things, I would appreciate it.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I will convey the message. Our policy is to rally the international community for the broadest and most effective sanctions that can be brought to bear on the Iranian regime and thereby influence the decision making.

One of the benefits of having the IAEA and supporting it, as we propose doing in this budget, is because they are viewed as an

independent source of information. And I agree with you that their recent study under the new Director General, Ambassador Amano, has been given an enormous amount of credibility, which helps to make the case that we are making.

With respect to your question about the Justice Department, obviously I would ask you to refer that to the Attorney General. I have no information on the points you are making concerning working there, but I would say this: I think that the President's commitment to close Guantanamo has been a very valuable asset to us as we have made our case around the world. Fairly or not, Guantanamo came to be seen as not reflective of American values, of the strength of our Constitution and our institutions, and I think there are ways to accommodate the concerns that are rightly held about the detainees and the terrorists. But I still very strongly support the closing of Guantanamo.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Sherman, the chairman of the Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade Subcommittee, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is good to see you, Madam Secretary.

The Iran Sanctions Act requires to name and shame those companies that invest over the triggering amount, I believe it is \$40 million, in the Iran oil sector, and to either impose sanctions or waive them. Your budget contains tens of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions to work in the world for democracy and for the rule of law. But for 10 years, three administrations have made a mockery of democracy and the rule of law here in the United States, as three administrations have deliberately failed to follow the minimum, nonwaivable portions of the Iran Sanctions Act. In fact, the prior administration told me flat out in foreign policy we don't follow those statutes that we think are bad policy. This can only be called the Dick Cheney approach to the rule of law.

Last October, a number of us, led by Congressman Ron Klein, sent a letter outlining 21 firms that had invested a triggering amount in the Iran oil sector. This was prepared not by the CIA but the CRS, the Congressional Research Service. We were promised by the relevant Assistant Secretary a response, a report in 45 days. That was October. This is February. We have received a response that says he is still working on it, but that he has identified some transactions that are "potentially problematic."

Madam Secretary, will you be providing Congress with a report, perhaps classified, detailing the findings of this initial review? Will you provide us with an explanation in each instance of why certain transactions have been determined to be not problematic? And, most importantly, will you break with 10 years of State Department practice and actually follow the law by reviewing each transaction that seems to trigger the act and by naming, shaming, and either sanctioning or waiving with regard to the offending transactions?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, thank you very much for both your concern and your thoughtful approach. Deputy Secretary Jim Steinberg has led an internal State Department team on this issue. As you have well stated, there were no determinations made under the act in the prior administration.

We have completed that preliminary review. We responded at the beginning of February to the inquiries you mentioned, and we indicated that some of the cases we reviewed deserved more thorough consideration, which is what we have undertaken. We have aggressively moved on three fronts to ensure that the review is serious and thorough, and we have a rigorous process in place for implementation.

First, we continue to raise in our bilateral engagements with countries the need to strengthen their own reaction and present a united front in restricting investment in Iran's energy sector.

Second, we have worked with our embassies overseas to collect information on potentially sanctionable activity. There wasn't a big, thick file when we got there, Mr. Sherman. We were very much starting pretty well from scratch, and we have already engaged with all of the companies and the governments that were included in the House letter, as well as some additional companies that we believe could be engaged in similar activities.

Finally, we are undertaking a review with the intelligence community with respect to certain activities of some companies that are warranting further scrutiny and have requested an all-source intelligence community assessment so that we can make whole of government assessments.

I understand that the State Department is working to arrange a briefing, a classified briefing, with Members on the outcome of this preliminary review.

Mr. SHERMAN. I look forward to that. I would like to squeeze in three more questions to which I would like response for the record.

First is as to Armenia. I am glad that you are providing more aid, but I think Congress should be against that. Thank you for having parity on military financing, but you do not have parity between Armenia and Azerbaijan as to international military training, and there should be a specific aid request for Nagorno-Karabagh.

As to Sri Lanka, I would like you to respond for the record how the administration is working with the government to ensure the rights of the Tamil minority are protected, particularly of the over 300,000 refugees.

As to Sudan, given the likelihood that Southern Sudan will choose independence, what is the United States doing to support a successful, independent south, and more broadly a peaceful Sudan, and I await your responses in writing.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Manzullo, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary, a fellow Illinoisan. Welcome here.

The state of America's economy continues to struggle with unemployment still unacceptably high, and I am sure you have heard the jobless claims for February jumped to a record 496,000 for the week ending on February 20. At the same time the Institute for Supply Management shows for the 7th month in a row, I believe, it is above 50 and continues to climb to show that orders are coming in to our manufacturers. However, despite this promising sign, there are two chokepoints that remain. Yesterday we brought the

first one up with Chairman Bernanke, and it is the inability of manufacturers and small business people to access credit; and obviously without credit they can't meet the payroll, replace inventory, or buy new equipment, and these are the real job creators because the orders are out there waiting because we have to manufacture our way out of this recession, not try to buy our way out of it.

The second chokepoint is the outdated and inefficient export control system that unnecessarily prohibits export of items that do not pose a national security threat. The House addressed these inefficiencies by giving the State Department new tools to process export licenses in the House version of the State authorization bill. Unfortunately, the Senate has not acted on this.

Because of your Midwest roots giving rise to a love and appreciation for manufacturing and the fact that you have always been an outstanding proponent of exporting our manufactured goods, we are asking you to use your leadership and influence to help move this process forward.

I am just wondering, first of all, I know that you agree with everything that I have said, and my question to you is what more can be done? What can you do individually and as Secretary of State to break through on these export controls so we can ship more things overseas? Last year we had an outstanding bipartisan working group that modified section 17(C) of the Export Administration Act making it easier to ship aircraft parts overseas. That has resulted in \$1 billion more in exports. That is 20,000 jobs that were added in manufacturing, or saved just because of that shipment.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I do agree with everything you have said, and I thank you for strongly advocating for American manufacturing. You are right, there is an uptick. We are seeing some positive signs. The President has directed that the State Department and the Commerce Department and the Defense Department and other elements of the government work together to come up with a strong proposal to modify the entire export regime because there are so many outdated and inefficient aspects to it.

But as you rightly point out, we have to get congressional buy-in across the board on this. So we are working at the governmental level. We are reaching out to Members of Congress. Your bipartisan working group could be a great partner to us in doing this. And you know what the debate comes down to. There are some people who say if we lift the export restrictions on certain nuts, bolts, and screws we are going to be undermining American security. I don't buy that. But there is a very strong resistance within the Congress to making the changes that I think are not at all dangerous to our security but would help our manufacturing.

I will have someone follow up with you specifically, but we need the help of the bipartisan, on both sides of the Hill, members who will support what we are trying to do.

Mr. MANZULLO. The other question is we are working—I have the world's only fish processor of gefilte fish. Thank you, thank you. Believe it or not, it is Asian carp that is being caught in the Lower Mississippi and—this is true—and in the Great Lakes. Israel has imposed a 120 percent duty. There are nine containers of this that are locked up. We are in contact with the ambassador from Israel.

Passover is coming quickly to Israel. We are working with the rabbis there who inspect this facility in Thompson, Illinois, and I just want to make this public and see if there is anything that you can do to get the gefilte fish to Israel by Passover.

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, I will take that mission on.

Mr. MANZULLO. Thank you. Thank you.

Secretary CLINTON. I don't know if I can promise that we can get it done, but I will give you my best efforts. And if not, we will have to figure out what to do with nine containers.

Mr. MANZULLO. It is 55 percent of their product. They could lose a couple hundred jobs if we don't get the gefilte fish there.

Secretary CLINTON. We should consult with the chairman and Congressman Ackerman. This sounds to me like one of those issues that is something that should rise to the highest level of our Government.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Chairman BERMAN. The menu of the next State dinner. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Engel, the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Manzullo, I would like to place an order for two jars of the gefilte fish. Passover is coming very soon.

Madam Secretary, thank you very much for the wonderful, extraordinary job that you are doing as our Secretary of State. I know Mr. Manzullo talked about your Illinois roots. You mentioned a New York minute before, and New York is very, very, very proud of you. I would like to just throw out a couple of things and then ask you to comment.

I have just come back from a trip to Israel. I met with top leaders. All anyone wanted to talk about was Iran, and we have had a lot of discussion here about Iran. Obviously, it is a very serious situation and we all agree that Iran must not be allowed to have a nuclear weapon and I really believe ultimately nothing should be taken off the table because they really must not be allowed to have a nuclear weapon.

Syria. I was the author of the Syria Accountability Act, which slapped sanctions on Syria for aiding and abetting terrorism. I know that as of last week we have opened diplomatic relations with them and exchanged ambassadors with them for the first time in many, many years. I know the rationale for it is to get them to engage and help; but, frankly, I haven't seen any change. This is the game that Syria has been playing for years and years. I haven't seen any change in that regime's behavior. Perhaps something is going on behind the scenes that I am not privy to, but I am wondering if you can comment on that.

We talk about Iran and the dissidents in Iran. I know that the feeling in some quarters is that we don't want to publicly identify with them too much because it will just help the regime to identify the dissidents or agents of the United States. But I really think we need to have more public support for the brave people of Iran who are standing up under extraordinary conditions against their regime.

Kosovo. It just turned 2 years old last week, and we are trying very hard to get other countries to recognize them. I know the administration has been doing that as well. The officials of Kosovo are very interested in getting into the EBRD, which is the European Bank for Reconstruction Development. They need some countries to vote them in, and I would hope that behind the scenes we are helping to convince countries to support them in that.

I want to quickly talk about, since I chair the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, a couple of those issues. First of all, thank you for the extraordinary effort of you personally and the administration with Haiti. This has been something of course that has all gripped us, and I think it is very, very important.

I am delighted to hear of your upcoming travel to Latin America. I think we are reengaging the hemisphere after years of neglect, and I think it is very, very important. I want to talk about drug policy. I believe we need a more holistic approach to our counter-narcotics strategy in the Western Hemisphere. I support strongly the Andean Drug Initiative, the Merida Initiative, and the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative, but I think we need to do a better job in weaving all of these things together. I would like to hear you are thoughts on that and what efforts you are taking to better integrate these efforts so our successes in certain countries don't contribute to problems in other countries.

I personally have suggested designating a coordinator at the State Department to oversee all of our Western Hemisphere security initiatives, and would you consider doing this? Would you think about this?

Lastly, two comments. Number one, Venezuela. Yesterday the OAs' human rights agencies criticized Venezuela for its deteriorating human rights situation, and this follows their recent condemnation of Chavez's closure of RCTV and several other cable television stations. How are we working with our partners in the OAS to call attention to this?

Finally, as was mentioned before, I am extremely concerned about the Cuban imprisonment of USAID contractor Alan Gross. I met with his wife yesterday at the Capitol, and needless to say, everyone is concerned.

Can you comment on any or all of those things?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, I will certainly give you responses to these important issues in writing.

Let me just briefly say on Syria, the President decided to return an ambassador because it is in our national interest to do so. This is not any way a reward because there is no basis for such a reward for Syria, but it is because we think having an ambassador on the ground in Damascus helps to ensure our national interests are taken care of, and also to avoid strategic miscalculations on the parts of the Syrians.

So we are very committed to making clear to the Syrians what we expect. There is a lot that we do expect. But we think having an ambassador back on the ground actually gives us more leverage and more opportunity to pursue those expectations.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Royce, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Thank you, Madam Secretary. I appreciated very much your comments last week on Iran, but we should be doing more, I think, to target those who are hanging, who are raping, who are maiming Iranians. The ranking member and I have legislation that would target Iran's human rights abusers with travel sanctions, with financial sanctions, and I think a concerted effort here would do much to discredit the regime both inside and outside Iran.

Second, I wanted to point out that there are some 200,000 political prisoners. We discussed a little bit the problem in Iran. We have the same problem in North Korea. People are being tortured and worked to death, starved to death in the gulags in North Korea, and I think pressing human rights should be part of our strategic policy toward North Korea.

Lastly, and I think most importantly for me, is an issue that came to light that we are all conversant with now, but a Nigerian banker going to the U.S. Embassy stating that his son is under the influence of religious extremists in Yemen, as he shared with us. And then we find that we have months of communication that come through our U.S. intelligence intercepts about al-Qaeda having a plan to attack us using a Nigerian. And then the response comes from one of the administration's spokesmen, and these are his words, "hunches are not enough to constitute reasonable suspicion." Really. Why is that?

Well, if you look at the language adopted from a legal case, and here we get into the worry that we are becoming too legalistic on this, there is *Terry v. Ohio*, it is a Supreme Court case back in 1968 that determined when fourth amendment protections against unreasonable searches allow the police to frisk American civilians. Somehow the administration went forward, and I can't understand how we have foreign terrorists somehow being granted fourth amendment reasonable rights that the courts intended to protect Americans from being searched by local police. Those are two different issues.

Americans enjoy special rights and protections because we carry out the responsibility of being Americans. Those outside our border have no part in that compact, especially enemy combatants. But increasingly we have this issue. Are intelligence officers allowed now to make these hunches? That hunch should have been that the visa should be reviewed and searched and he should be searched before being allowed to get on that plane. So we have to allow our intelligence agents to make those determinations.

I would ask, with the Obama administration leaning toward treating terrorism as a matter for domestic law enforcement, such as trying terrorists in civilian courts instead of military tribunals and making decisions like this that hunches are not enough to constitute a reasonable suspicion, are we allowing a legalistic culture here to get in the way of allowing our intelligence agents to do their job?

Secretary CLINTON. I think the answer, Congressman, is no. Obviously there were some deficiencies in how the visa of the Christmas Day bomber was treated. And certainly speaking for the State Department, we have moved to plug any slight gap that we needed to.

But, you know, since 2001, the State Department has revoked 51,000 visas for a variety of reasons, including more than 1,700 for suspected links to terrorism. In addition to revocation, in just Fiscal Year 2009, consular officers refused nearly 2 million visas; 1,885,000, to be exact. So we have people acting on their gut on evidence, on hunches, on the feel of their fingertips when they sit across from an applicant in a consular interview, and I don't think that story gets out. So, yes, there is—

Mr. ROYCE. I think that is a good point. But if we have someone in the administration who believe that hunches are not enough to constitute reasonable suspicion, it only takes one terrorist getting through, and that is why I bring the point up.

Secretary CLINTON. I appreciate that, and I take it very seriously, Congressman. It is on the top of my mind every single day since I was privileged to serve as a Senator from New York on 9/11.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The chairman of the Europe Subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Delahunt.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Welcome, Madam Secretary. I am not going to talk about Europe, but I would note that yesterday the committee had an excellent interparliamentary exchange with the state members of the Russian Duma, and it would appear that significant progress is being made on the START treaty. Let me congratulate you. If we can get that done, that is a significant achievement in terms of you and the President's ambition to deal with this issue of nuclear proliferation.

But I want to talk about Iraq. I am very concerned about these upcoming elections in Iraq. Chairman Berman and Chairman Ackerman and several of us on this side of the aisle sent a letter to the President last month. We hear a lot about the deficits, and my understanding is that we are quickly approaching \$1 trillion in terms of not the human but the financial cost of the war in Iraq. So that is obviously a significant component of the deficit challenge that we have to address.

And there is a lot of talk about Iran. There was an interesting op-ed piece this morning in the Post by David Ignatius where he reports the observation by General Odierno that the administration is clearly concerned about the possible manipulation of the Iraqi elections by Iran. I found it interesting that according to that op-ed piece, the primary agent in this effort is none other than Ahmed Chalabi, whom we all remember was a key player in terms of providing intelligence that led the previous Congresses under the previous administration to authorize the war in Iraq.

But just to quote one section and then to ask for your response to the question, what are we doing about this apparent manipulation by the Iranians in terms of the Iraqi elections that are going to mean so much in terms of what post-occupation Iraq looks like and whether we have an ally in Iraq or whether there is a state in Iraq that is more aligned with Iran, as some of us said 6, 7 years ago was a possibility?

This is just an observation by General Odierno: Iran interferes in Iraq's political process, urging alliances that not all Iraqi politicians favor. In an effort to consolidate power among parties sup-

ported by Iran, for example, Ahmed Chalabi met with the Commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and the Iranian Foreign Minister to discuss the merger of two slates of Shiite candidates backed by Iran.

Your comment, please.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, we are very focused on these elections. I will make three quick observations.

First, there is no doubt that not only Iran but other neighbors are doing what they can to support or influence the outcome of the election. We are most concerned and focused on Iran because of their ties with many Iraqis who had previously sought exile or refuge in Iran who were supportive of the efforts against Saddam Hussein. You know very well the story.

Yet at the same time we see on balance the Iraqis are much more nationalistic and much more willing to stand up for themselves vis-à-vis Iran with the exception of some Iraqis who have a different agenda, who are carrying water, if you will, for the Iranians.

So I cannot sit here and predict what the outcome of the election will be, but we are trying to ensure as big a participation as possible, which we think mitigates against the Iranian influence. We are trying to ensure that Iraqi refugees in Syria, Jordan and elsewhere are empowered to vote. We are trying to ensure insofar as possible that there are significant electoral observers, both of the voting and of the 2-week counting process. And then we are going to be very active in supporting the government formation process.

Mr. ACKERMAN [presiding]. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Paul from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Welcome, Madam Secretary. I have a question about the cost of our foreign operations. We are now in the midst of a financial crisis. We have a heavy burden of debt. We know what debt can do. Greece is experiencing that type of problem. We could reach that problem, I believe, if we continue to do what we are doing. The international affairs budget 10 years ago was \$23 billion and now it is \$54 billion. That is a tremendous increase and that is not all from this administration, obviously. But during that same period of time the real wages of most American workers has gone down, and the unemployment right now, according to the Department of Labor, the under employment, is 20 percent. So this is nothing to ignore and it is related to all of our spending.

A lot of Americans can't justify the amount of money we are spending, both in the war effort and in our affairs around the world. Quite frankly, there are some who don't feel a lot safer for it, but there is a human price that we are paying. We have lost over 5,000 Americans in fighting these wars, over 1,000 now in Afghanistan alone. There are hundreds of thousands of casualties of veterans coming back with both physical and mental problems. They are going to be needing care for many, many years. The cost of all of this is probably, in the last 10 years, could easily be \$1.5 trillion.

Also there is the refugee problem. We have hundreds of thousands of refugees still, you know, experiencing difficulty both in Iraq and Afghanistan. Just this very last month 24,000 refugees

were added in the invasion into Afghanistan. Yesterday we had a report from the United Nations that there were 346 children killed in Afghanistan. So the violence affects everybody and that truly is a cost.

But the more specific question I have for you is one of priorities. Obviously what is going on here in the Congress is everybody justifies all of their spending. People here justify the domestic spending, and people justify the overseas spending and the war spending, and they worry about not having enough bipartisanship. I worry about too much because they get together and they enjoy spending both places and nobody cares about the deficit.

I want to specifically ask you about the Embassy in London because people can see that and they can feel it. We built an Embassy in Baghdad and it cost close to \$1 billion. We built one in Kabul which cost close to \$1 billion, and then there are always cost overruns and the maintenance. It is very, very expensive. I think the American people have a hard time understanding what we are doing in London.

Assume for a minute that you could come to my district and talk to some of my unemployed people and explain to them why it is in their interest to spend, for the American people to spend \$1 billion building a fortress in London when they are falling through the cracks and their wages have gone down, the ones that have work. See if you can relate to them and explain to them the importance, and you have to say that that \$1 billion will have to be more debt because where are you going to save it. Can you explain that to these unemployed people?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, with respect to the Embassy, we are selling 11 sites that we currently rent at very high cost in London to consolidate in one building. Therefore, the money that we gain from the sale of these buildings will be used to fund the Embassy. So we are not asking for additional or new money. The reason we need a platform like that Embassy in London is because we do so much work in every department of our Government through London. It is not just our diplomats, but obviously every other part of the American Government is represented there.

So I believe I can make the case that we are not asking for new money on that. But I take very seriously your larger point, Congressman. It breaks my heart that 10 years ago we had a balanced budget, that we were on the way to paying down the debt of the budget of the United States of America. I served on the Budget Committee in the Senate, and I remember as vividly as if it were yesterday when we had a hearing in which Alan Greenspan came and justified increasing spending and cutting taxes, saying that we didn't really need to pay down the debt. Outrageous, in my view.

Mr. PAUL. Is there any place in your budget where you could cut anything significant?

Secretary CLINTON. We are cutting. Part of our problem is that we are now assuming so many of the post-conflict responsibilities, and that is the bulk of our increase, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Carnahan from Missouri for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Welcome, Secretary Clinton.

Yesterday our Oversight Subcommittee had Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, Stuart Bowen, testifying about reports they had done a year ago and recently talking about hard lessons learned in terms of vast amounts of money that was thrown into Iraq without having adequate structures in place, as well as overlap, money—literally billions of dollars—not being able to be accounted for. And I guess as we ramp up the military and civilian presence, tripling the civilians on the ground under this budget, what measures are in place to be sure that we are doing this in a targeted way that we can account for?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I take the lessons from the mistakes in the last years in Iraq and Afghanistan very seriously. We are trying to apply those lessons with much greater accountability, with much greater oversight of contractors. It is one of my highest priorities because I do believe strongly that I or someone should have to be able to justify not just to you but to your constituents why we are doing what we are doing and to do the very best job we can in order to eliminate the outrageous overruns and fraud, waste and abuse. I cannot justify the past. We are going to work as hard as we know how to make the present and the future better.

We are looking at every single contract. There is so much waste in these contracts and so much that was literally just allowed to continue in the rush of everything that accompanied military action. So we are looking very hard at that and trying to make these adjustments. We will be reporting to you as we go forward.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you. I wanted to ask additionally about the Global Engagement Fund. I understand that it is a follow-up to the President's speech in Cairo and will focus on expanding opportunity, science and technology partnerships and human development issues. Could you provide us some details on what you hope that can accomplish?

Secretary CLINTON. Yes. We can give you certainly more specifics than the time permits. But this did arise out of the President's Cairo speech and his vision for a new beginning with Muslims around the world. We are enhancing our public diplomacy outreach. We are using more of the tools that America has, like our science and technology and education strengths. We have science envoys, distinguished Nobel Prize winners, and other very well known leading scientists going to Muslim majority countries. We have a lot of English language programs for young people that we are expanding. So we have a full range of such issues that bring a different message.

And we don't want to forget that we have a very diverse Muslim population in the world. People get focused on just one part of the world, often to the exclusion of the entire spread of Islam from North Africa to Indonesia. So what works in one place or what we are trying doesn't necessarily mean that it will be the same somewhere else.

Mr. CARNAHAN. One other point I want to make: I want to voice my support for your request to increase funding to Bosnia, particularly with the political challenges they face—Presidential and parliamentary elections in October. How do you see us, strategy-wise, moving forward to help them once they get through the election

process and to be sure that they are on track with constitutional reforms and momentum to be able to join the EU and NATO?

Secretary CLINTON. I appreciate your raising Bosnia, and I know that is a particular concern of yours because there does have to be constitutional reform, and we are pushing that as an important part of our outreach.

I wanted to just specifically respond to you that as we look at Bosnia, this has been a priority for me this past year. We have to do it with the Europeans. We cannot do it alone. The EU and the neighbors have to take more responsibility. We have worked with the European Union, and I made this one of my highest agenda items with the new High Representative, Baroness Catherine Ashton. The EU and Europe has to make a stronger case to Bosnia as to why constitutional reforms are in their interest and will assist in their integration with the rest of the Europe.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentleman from California, Mr. Rohrabacher, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

Madam Secretary, I am sorry I have had to come in and out. We have a space program hearing that needed some attention. Just a few questions, Madam Secretary.

I understand in your foreign aid budget that we provide nearly \$10 million for programs in China. Now how does that make any sense at a time we are borrowing money from China, we actually are giving foreign aid to China?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, we are not giving any foreign aid to China. Let me just flip here to give you the best answer that I can.

What we do is try to foster civil society inside China. We try to support Chinese activists who are working on issues that are important to our entire engagement with China, issues that have to do with human rights, with the rule of law, and environmental protections. The kinds of actions that we think are important.

Our programs provide pilots and models that the Chinese people can subsequently adapt using their own resources. And we also provide assistance programs working with Tibetan communities to promote their interests as well.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I notice that \$5 million of it is economic support.

Secretary CLINTON. That is right. Economic support is provided to U.S. higher educational institutions and U.S. nongovernmental organizations working in China in line with earmarks.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. In line with earmarks?

Secretary CLINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. This was forced upon you by Congress?

Secretary CLINTON. Those were your words.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. I am happy to see that we agree on something that should not be in the budget then. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, the President when he first came into office and over his first year has done his best to basically use a conciliatory tone toward Iran in hopes of trying to create a situation where we could actually have some progress, and I have been one of the ones criticizing him for that. Has this worked out? We have had

1 year now. Has this conciliatory process or tone with Iran, has it worked to make the mullahs more open and interact with us in a better way? Or has it been looked at as a sign of weakness by this oppressive mullah regime?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, I think the President's policy of engagement has been very beneficial and welcomed by the rest of the world.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. What about the mullahs?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, clearly the President came with a two-track approach. One was an offer of engagement if the Iranians would engage seriously on matters that were critical to us; namely, their nuclear program, and there has not been a response. But the fact that the President reached out has brought us an enormous amount of credibility and goodwill in the rest of the world. But at the same time the President always said we have a dual track approach, and the approach of sanctions and pressure, it wasn't an afterthought, it went simultaneously with his offer of engagement.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I want to suggest, Madam Secretary, that playing to our liberal, willy-nilly friends in Europe is less important for us than to be tough with a repressive regime, a murderous regime that has engaged in murdering people on their streets. Don't you think that this conciliatory tone, which as you just admitted certainly has not been accepted by the mullahs, has in some way depressed or at least hurt the spirit on the streets of Iran of those young people who are trying to struggle to end this mullah regime?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, no, we do not see evidence of that. We actually believe that if you take everything that we are doing together, including working to make sure that information continues to flow into Iran over the efforts by the government to block the Internet and satellite television and the like, if you look at the information coming out by those who have been detained, and I have talked to several people who have imprisoned by the Iranian regime, they actually think that President Obama has struck exactly the right tone and approach to give heart to the people who are putting their lives on the line, who know that we stand with them, know that we support their efforts, but also recognize that they have a long hard road ahead, and what we are trying to do is get international opinion that will force the Iranian regime to change its calculation.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee, 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Secretary, thank you again. I think it is important to acknowledge the seismic change of the policies of the Obama administration with your leadership and policy knowledge, that we have really changed the story of America around the world. I think that is an important point that we should affirm.

We should also make note that in actuality our budget is very fiscally responsible. It is a budget that includes some of the hotspots of the world, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iraq. And so in my comments I would like you to make mention and might I pub-

licly say I am delighted to note that President Clinton is mending and we thank him for his work in Haiti.

Let me also acknowledge the loss of a civil foreign officer in Haiti. Many of us have had our eyes on Haiti and I was down just about 2 weeks ago. What do you think going forward would be a potential supplemental on Haiti? What is the going forward approach for reconstruction and rebuild? Many Americans want to be engaged. Thank you for your work on the evangelists and others who had missteps and were arrested. We talked about that, too, and I asked for them to be given mercy, released, and they are gone. But I do think it is important to have some standard for faith organizations. All of them are trying to come down. Their intentions are good and I would like to see us have that.

I would like to get your assessment of the progress and the work of Pakistan. As you well know, I have advocated for Pakistan in the bad days. But I have seen, just as I had expected and hoped, a major commitment by the government and of course their work on the border.

Two last points. I would like you to assess any focus that the State Department is having on the children of Afghanistan. My colleague talked about the loss of life. I would like to get a sense of whether you have a focus.

My last point is a comment for your staff, if they could take this down. I have a constituent whose daughter was killed in America by a Peruvian student. The name is Lindsey Brasier in Austin, Texas. The perpetrator was Evelyn Denise Mezzich. That person is in Peru, and we have not been able to have that person brought back for justice. They have a felony of skipping bail and Interpol has this matter. This has been a tragedy which occurred in 1998. You know how tragic that is. I would appreciate being able to work with you on this extradition issue as relates internationally. Brief comments on those questions. I thank you again for your service and the President's policies.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you, Congresswoman, and thank you for your attention to Haiti. We are working on a supplemental that we hope will come to the Congress in the next few weeks. It will include both replenishment of funds in the State Department and USAID principally, but also funding for the recovery and reconstruction efforts going forward.

I think that the leadership role that the United States has played has redounded so greatly to our benefit, not only in the hemisphere but around the world. We will be having a conference March 31 co-hosted by the U.S. and the U.N., along with other major donor countries, that will look very specifically about the way forward. So we will hopefully continue to have strong bipartisan support in the Congress.

Thank you for your continuing attention to Pakistan. I agree with you. I think this last year has demonstrated significant changes in approach and commitment from the Pakistani Government, the democratically elected government, as well as the military and intelligence services. Their cooperation with us in the recent arrests and apprehension of leading Taliban figures is I think very strong evidence of that.

I share your concern about children in Afghanistan or anywhere in the world, really, and we are focused on doing what we can in cooperation with our partners who are sharing the donor responsibility in Afghanistan, and we can give you more information on that.

Finally, my staff will work very closely with you on this request on behalf of your constituent and see what, if any, action we can take.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you. I look forward to working with you on the children issue. And thank you for the help with the mother who has been grieving for so long.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Flake for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Since Dana took the only earmark question, I am left with just Cuba.

Cuba has been mentioned a couple of times. You mentioned the dissident Tamayo who recently died, a tragic situation in that regard. Also we have the situation of Alan Gross, an American who is being held by the Cuban Government, was a USAID contractor there.

The gentlelady from Florida mentioned in light of recent events there, that it is her hope that the Obama administration not offer any concessions to the Cuban Government. I would go a bit further. I would hope that this administration would stop offering concessions to the Cuban Government. These concessions have been offered not just by this administration but by many administrations in the past. I would argue that the policy we have where we deny Americans the freedom to travel to Cuba is a concession to the Cuban Government. Whether they admit it or not, whether they quietly lobby or publicly lobby for that change, I don't think they want it. And every time we seem to get close, they provoke us somehow and so we change our policy. I think we ought to do it because that is simply what is right.

I was excited to hear that the Obama administration would recast our Cuban policy, and they took a good first step by allowing Cuban Americans the ability to visit their family members without restrictions and to remit money to their family members. That does a good deal to help the dissidents who are there and the families of those who are held prisoner.

That is a good thing. But beyond that it seems our policy is on autopilot. The contractor who is being held by the Cuban Government, he was on a contract that was awarded by the Bush administration. We still have policies going forward that don't serve us well, I would argue. It goes from \$400,000 in scholarships that brought two Cubans to America. Hundreds of thousands of dollars in Europe to try to persuade European governments to change their Cuba policy. Bumper stickers, "Made in Miami," that Cuban dissidents and others were supposed to put on their cars, for crying out loud. We have some of the craziest things going, and I see your smile so I think you probably agree, when we simply could say, and I am assuming we have put some of these USAID contracts on ice, given that we have one contractor in jail. Why don't we simply allow Americans to travel to Cuba unabated?

I have no doubt that the Cuban Government will try to impose its own restrictions. They want the revenue that would come with travel but not the influence. But if somebody is going to limit my travel and the travel of my constituents, it should be a Communist, not this government. We should not be in that business. We should be able to say Americans should be able to travel.

We talked about this the last time you were here. I know you are open. We have legislation moving. There are more than 180 cosponsors to lift the travel ban, but there are things that the Obama administration can do prior to the passage of that legislation. We could lift some of the restrictions or dial back some of the restrictions imposed by the Bush administration on people-to-people travel and allow more of that.

Can I have your thoughts on that?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, the reason I am smiling is because I think that we all share the same goal. The goal is to create changes for the better in the lives of the people of Cuba, promote democracy and freedom and hopefully see the time soon when the Cuban people have the same rights as we do. That is our goal, and that is what we are pursuing.

The President's April announcement last year changed United States policy toward Cuba in a number of ways based on the evidence that we should try some different approaches, and we should really look at what it is we are doing that is actually helping the Cuban people because there is evidence that every time we try to encourage more free flow of people and information, the Castro regime shuts down. That is the last thing that they want. They do not want Americans traveling freely, remittances coming in, more communications systems, back and forth. We are working very hard to break through the control of the media but in a smart way.

I am looking at every single program because frankly I want things that work. If we have been doing something over and over and over again and it is not working to help the people in Cuba, then we need to take a look at it.

Mr. FLAKE. Let me just offer, TV and Radio Marti, we can move. Thank you.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from North Carolina for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Madam Secretary, I very much understand the need to support development, but I worry about the next set of conflicts that may involve us, and even if they don't involve us, will be catastrophic for the people who live in the societies in conflict. General Anthony Zinni said that ungoverned areas and extreme poverty were a Petri dish for extremism and radicalism. And certainly there is an unholy mix of weak states, ungoverned areas, extreme poverty with a lack of any real economic development and conflict. And a quarter to a third of the states that are in conflict will fall into conflict again within 5 years, whether it is the same conflict or another conflict. And conflict leads to poverty and poverty leads to conflict, and all of it leads to very weak states, states that cannot survive the pressures on them.

The budget increases development assistance by 18.3 percent, the proposed budget; 23.1 percent for economic support funds, but there are other areas that seem to be important for avoiding con-

flict, for conflict-prone societies; a 13 percent decrease for the Transition Initiatives Account. How much of the increases for the Development Assistance and Economic Support Fund goes to those frontline states? Is the budget sufficient to meet the needs in the other parts of the world where there is extreme poverty and either conflict now or potential for conflict, and what are the pressures on the budget, on that part of the budget?

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, it is a balancing act. I mean, that is what we do every single day. We have incurred responsibilities in the frontline states in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan because of policies that were there when we came into office, but which we have responsibility to fulfill. So as you rightly point out, a significant percentage of what we are doing in development and assistance is going to those three countries.

At the same time we have tried to identify countries that are in that Petri dish that you describe, that are really on the brink of collapse or becoming a failed state, from which extremism is being exported. Yemen is obviously the key example. And we are bolstering our involvement and assistance in ways that we hope will stabilize those countries, but there are so many places now and particularly in Africa that are vulnerable, and it concerns me greatly what I see happening across that continent. And I think we have to do a better job coordinating other investments from non-governmental donors, from the private sector, so that we know what is happening, where it is, and what the consequences are. And we also need to do a better job of making sure what we are doing actually has good results, we are not just putting money in for the sake of saying we have done it. So it is a very difficult calculation.

Mr. MILLER. You mentioned Yemen and obviously Yemen has gotten a fair amount of attention. It is an ungoverned or lightly governed area with severe economic problems, but it also looks like in a decade the people of Yemen will look back on the way things are now as the good old days. They are running out of oil. Oil is the great bulk of their government revenue. They are running out of water. I don't know what you do with a country that runs out of water. What are we doing in Yemen and, as you put it, how are we making sure that the assistance we are providing is being effective, it is meeting needs and it is actually anticipating the problems that are coming at them?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, this is a country that there is increasing interest from many others as well. I represented the United States at a conference about Yemen in London about a couple of weeks ago, and we are trying to do a better job coordinating. Some of the Gulf countries are much larger contributors than we are. What is hard is the Government of Yemen came to that meeting with a plan for development that they had adopted, which was sensible, and a recognition of a lot of their shortcomings. They have to change their agricultural product production if they are going to save their water, and that is a huge undertaking. But we are working in concert with others to try to help the government fulfill its own objectives.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Boozman, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And again I want to send you warm greetings from your many, many friends in Arkansas, and we appreciate having you here today.

I would like to ask you real quickly about the fact that the committee seems to indicate that they are going to propose the Armenian genocide resolution. And right now—currently the Turks and the Armenians are in the process of having protocol, normalization, talks and things. What I would like to know is your opinion of how that would affect that. And also the impact on the Turkish United States. Several years ago when I was in Incirlik visiting with the commanders there, they were really concerned about force protection, really far reaching problems if that were allowed to go forward.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, on Turkey-Armenia relations it is our position that the normalization process that Turkey and Armenia have undertaken carries important benefits for both sides and it should take place without preconditions and within a reasonable time frame. Last year in his Armenia Remembrance Day statement, President Obama made clear that our interest remains a full, frank and just acknowledgement of the facts related to the historical events. But the best way to do that with all respect is for the Armenian and Turkish people themselves to address the facts of their past as part of their efforts to move forward, and in that spirit we are working very hard to assist Armenia and Turkey in their efforts. We would like to continue to support that effort and not be diverted in any way at all.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Very good.

While testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee last October Assistant Secretary Jeff Feltman said that the State Department was in the process of reviewing 20 countries—20 companies, rather, that could be sanctioned under the Iranian Sanctions Act. He indicated this review would last about 45 days and an answer on those companies would be released at that time. Recently a few of my colleagues received a single page response in that regard.

Can you enlighten us a little bit in that regard.

Secretary CLINTON. Yes, Congressman. In response to Congressman Sherman, I laid out the process we have followed. The preliminary report was delivered in February and it made clear that we are doing in-depth investigation into a number of companies. We have already reached out to other countries on this. We have asked our embassies around the world to acquire additional information and we are offering in the near future a classified briefing for Members who wish to get into depth. There is a lot of information that would be better conveyed in a classified setting.

But we are taking this very seriously. There wasn't any action taken in the prior 8 years. The only time there has been action on the Iran Sanctions Act was by former Secretary Madeleine Albright and then that was waived because of national security interests. So this is an incredibly complex arena, but we are moving in a deliberative and thorough way and we look forward to briefing you in a classified setting.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Good. Thank you. One other thing real quick, I know that the economic support funds for 2011 has been cut nearly

\$26 million. Can you comment on—you know, that is a pretty significant cut at a time when Sudan is due for its first democratic elections in decades, and the future of the comprehensive peace agreement for Sudan really does hang in the balance. Can you comment a little bit about that and if that is going to be a problem?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, our information is that we actually have an increase in assistance for Southern Sudan. So we will get to you a written response because that is the second time I have been asked that question. So either we haven't presented it in a clear enough way or there may be some interpretation we are not aware of. But I take the point, the larger point very seriously. We have to do more to help prepare Southern Sudan for a future dependent upon the choice it makes. If it is going to choose independence, then it needs a lot of work to have the institutions of statehood. And we are putting more diplomatic and development assets in order to try to help the Southern Sudanese as they work through these decisions.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Scott, 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Welcome again, Madam Secretary. It is always a pleasure to see you, and let me compliment you on the extraordinary job that you continue to do as our Secretary of State.

I would like to focus on Yemen again, having been there last year. I think we need to go a little deeper into this because this is a very dangerous place and it appears to me we are on the front lines there now, our State Department personnel, our embassies and our special operations people, particularly our Navy Seals. And at a recent questioning I asked about any effort from a military standpoint of getting in there and of course the question is no. So that leaves it that you are on the front lines there in trying to combat this and in trying to deal with it.

Yemen is seriously I think approaching and utilizing and training with al-Qaeda, al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, their relationship with Somalia and training camps there. When I was there with Special Ops we visually saw these things happening. Now in your referral to your comment to my colleague, Mr. Miller, you mentioned of our aid that is going in there, but the problem is President Saleh has two reluctances. First of all, he has the reluctance to go after al-Qaeda and he has the reluctance of wanting more of our aid. So it is sort of like we are in a Catch-22 here.

So I would like your assessment of how do we effectively use our resources in this kind of an environment where the people of Yemen themselves and the President's reluctance to be seen taking our aid, taking more of it and at the same time is his reluctance to even go after al-Qaeda.

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, that is an astute description of the challenges that we face. In addition to what you have stated, there are also continuing problems in the north and the south in addition to AQAP. In the international conference about Yemen in London it became clear that other countries, particularly in the Gulf, provide much more funding for Yemen than we do or that we will. Therefore, they have to be united with us in the messages

that we convey to President Saleh. And I agree that we have to work very hard to have a united front with all the international donors. Some of the European countries have long-standing connections with Yemen, certainly Saudi Arabia, Qatar and others in the region do. And I am focused on how we send as clear and unequivocal a message as possible as to what is expected in return for this aid. We do have to be sensitive to some of the local concerns about American involvement, but at the same time Yemen sits 25 miles across the Gulf from Somalia, and we know that there is that constant continuing connection.

We will have more to report to you as we follow through on our policy here, but it is a mixed policy, it is an international policy. It is all aimed at influencing Presidential decisions, because as you saw, that is where they all come from and we have to support the President in making the right decisions. But this is going to be challenging.

Mr. SCOTT. What do you suggest that we should do specifically about the evidence of the growing al-Qaeda training camps in both Yemen and Somalia?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, I think the Government of Yemen has in the last few months been very active in going after training camps and identified members of al-Qaeda. So they are beginning to do what we would hope they would do, which is to protect their own country against the threat of growing extremism. But I think we and others in this international effort have to continue to support them, provide intelligence assets, provide surveillance assets, provide military equipment and training, all of which we are doing and all of which is very necessary if they are going to be successful in going after this threat.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Fortenberry.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Madam Secretary. Welcome. Thank you so much for coming today. I would like to ask you two questions centered on Iran and bioterrorism. But before I do, given our previous dialogue, my conscience demands that I raise the issue with you again of including abortion as reproductive health care and including it as an integral component of our foreign affairs considerations. I believe this actually undermines our good diplomatic initiatives. Abortion is not health care; abortion is so often the result of abandonment. Women deserve better and certain taxpayers should not be put in the position of paying for it either here in the United States or underwriting it in our international programs. So I respectfully request that you reconsider your position.

With that, let me return to Iran. I fear that we will all awake to the headline one day soon that Iran has the bomb. This would be a geopolitical game changer. I am very appreciative of your intensified efforts of late in this regard. I would like to hear your outlook though for the next 6 months. There is just so little time left.

Secondly, I would like to hear what the State Department is doing to lead international diplomatic efforts to prevent bioterrorism, especially within the context of the G-8 Global Health Security Initiative for medical countermeasures, including stockpiling and delivery. As you are aware, the Weapons of Mass Destruction

Commission unanimously concluded that bioterrorism is the most likely WMD threat that the world faces.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you very much, Congressman. And let me respond to your point and to some of the points made by Congressman Smith. First of all, the United States Government does not fund abortions. We don't. We are increasing our funding to organizations that provide family planning services and maternal health. In fact, the budget provides \$700 million to combat maternal mortality, with expanded coverage of prevention and lifesaving interventions such as the prevention and management of postpartum hemorrhaging and other terrible consequences of uncared for pregnancy that I take very seriously.

I think that in many ways you and Congressman Smith and I have actually some of the shared views and concerns, but we do believe it is important to provide money, which we do in this budget, \$590 million, for family planning and reproductive health, because so much of what happens in the health of women in developing countries is because they cannot control their reproductive health, and it is a matter of great concern to me because many of these women are very young, they are not prepared for pregnancy, they often suffer grievous injuries during labor and birth because they do not have adequate treatment, and that is one of the reasons why in our Global Health Initiative we are expanding America's commitment to maternal and child health.

So we share some of the very same goals, and I hope to be able to work with you. Where we differ is on the question of a woman's right to choose, but we would like to avoid the choice that could lead to abortion by providing better resources and support for women around the world.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Before we pivot to the other two questions, though, you have redefined abortion as a part of reproductive health care for the first time and overturned the Mexico City policy which would again underwrite organizations who would participate in the act of abortion.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, you know, this is a debate that goes back many, many years and, you know, we do not believe in the gag rule, we do not believe that women should be deprived of information that might be important to their health and to plan for their own families. And as we exchanged views the last time I was here, I have seen the consequences of just terrible medical treatment that women have been subjected to because they didn't have the right to pursue what was in their own interest, but we will not agree on that, but we will agree that we need to do more to help with maternal and child health I hope.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you.

Secretary CLINTON. With respect to the outlook for Iran, obviously we believe that we have made progress in changing the attitudes of a number of nations toward Iran. We are going to continue to do so. We share your concern about Iran's ambitions and its program and we are making the case very vigorously around the world about what the consequences would be for other countries.

I think when I started 1 year ago many countries were not convinced that this is a problem that had anything to do with them, and we have every day made the case that a nuclear armed Iran

will create an arms race in the Gulf that will destabilize the region that so much of the rest of the world depends upon for oil and gas. It could even lead to conflict, which would be an economic catastrophe for many countries that are so reliant, and therefore countries should join with us in doing everything we can to demonstrate international unity in pressuring Iran to change direction, and that is what we are engaged in vigorously right now.

Finally, Congressman, the United States leads the world in terms of overall biopreparedness but there is a lot more we need to do. We are trying to work with the international community to pay more attention to the bioterrorist threat, to implement new policies, to stockpile vaccines. We are assisting with that through a wide range of activities. For example, we have foreign assistance programs that are specifically aimed at biological threats across South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and expanding into Africa, and we take it very seriously and will work to that end.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you.

Chairman BERMAN [presiding]. The time of the gentleman is expired. The gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Ellison, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Good morning, Madam Secretary. Let me join some of my colleagues in applauding you. I like the budget and I intend to support it.

My first question has to do with the administration's commitment to try to support UNRWA and people who are trying to make it in Gaza, not the people who are engaged in terrorist activities but the regular folks who are trying to survive, but some of the assistance that we have given already has not really made it to the people and I would just be curious as to your thoughts as to how we might be able to actually get some of this humanitarian assistance into the hands of folks who we intended in to help.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, we happen to believe that UNRWA is a vital humanitarian actor that does provide critical services and assistance that would otherwise be provided by extremist groups. We can't have it both ways. If we are not in there supporting UNRWA and actually providing services, I believe that the situation would become even more threatening to us and to Israel. So UNRWA is an indispensable counterweight to radicalism, to terrorism, particularly in Gaza and Lebanon. And in fact UNRWA's efforts are supported by the Governments of Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan and the Palestinian authority. So that is a pretty broad cross-section of the region. And we do closely monitor what UNRWA does. We make sure it meets all of the conditions for funding under our law and the Foreign Assistance Act provision. And we have worked to make sure that UNRWA implements measures designed to ensure the neutrality of its staff, including preemployment checks, sharing the list of staff member names with host governments on an annual basis, and so much else.

And I share your concern that we are not getting enough help into Gaza. I have raised this consistently with the Israeli Government. They have made certain moves which have increased the flow of food and clean water and medicine, but I think more could be done that would not provide any threat to Israeli security and we raise that with the Israelis on a regular basis.

But I think you are right that what we want to do is support the regular folks, not do anything that empowers Hamas. And much of the material that gets into Gaza, which still comes through the tunnels, through smuggling actually, is taxed by Hamas, which then provides Hamas with the money that they use to buy arms and other material that is used against Israel.

So I look at things from a real logical perspective. What can we do to undermine Hamas, to support the security of Israel, and to help the “regular folks” so that they don’t turn to extremism.

Mr. ELLISON. I couldn’t have said it better myself.

About 60 percent of the 2.5 million internally displaced people in Pakistan are women. What is the USAID package or programs doing specifically to address the need of female refugees in Pakistan?

Secretary CLINTON. Well, Congressman, we are working very hard. We have a range of programs that assist refugees. We also have tried to target aid to women refugees. One example, which was a great public/private partnership, is last summer we reached out to Pakistani-American doctors and nurses and asked them to go to the refugee camps because women were not getting adequate medical services. And we had several dozen Pakistani doctors, mostly women, who took time off from their practices, took 6 weeks, went to Swat, worked with refugee women.

So we are always looking for ways that we can get the aid to women and children because they are often the ones that are most severely dislocated and damaged by any kind of conflict.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Madam Secretary, I just want to say that I appreciate that, because as you and the President reach out to the Muslim world, and I certainly commend that, you should just bear in mind that the United States is part of that world, and to draw upon American talent, medical talent or otherwise is just a very good idea.

I will just end with an editorial comment, and that is the people who stood up against the position to condemn the Goldstone report never claimed that the Goldstone report was completely accurate. The point was that most of us hadn’t read it and we would hope that Israel would participate in that report to make its points, which it certainly had evidence to make, and so that is—my time is out.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. McCaul. And I just mentioned to the committee members that the Secretary has to leave at 12:15.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield 15 seconds to the gentlelady from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. So thankful to you. Madam Secretary, I will be handing you a letter that I have written regarding the protection of the Iranians who are in Camp Ashraf in Iraq. We are very worried about their plight. We have made commitments to them to make sure that certain action would not be taken against them, and I fear that as we keep moving those protections are going to be taken away and certain guarantees.

Thank you, Mr. McCaul, and I have that letter for you in writing. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you. And thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here today. I introduced a resolution today, and I thank the ranking member for cosponsoring it, condemning the human rights violations in Iran and supporting voices of freedom and democracy. I hope you will take a look at that. I think it is something that we need to be doing. I am also concerned about Iran's influence in the region, both in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan, and I wanted to see if you could touch on that point.

And my second question from a budgetary standpoint has to do with—I think we are making some great military success in Afghanistan now. I think the Pakistan military, ISI are really starting to step up to the plate really for the first time in years, and I commend you and the administration for that.

We honored Charlie Wilson at his funeral the other day, and of course after we defeated the Soviets his big point was we left a vacuum, and I think he was right. Joanne Herring, who was a constituent mine was sort of the driving force behind Charlie. You probably know Joanne. She is very flamboyant, a very passionate voice for the Afghan people and Pakistan. She has this idea of a Marshal plan sort of for the region.

I know that State through USAID has outlined in the budget an Afghan-Pakistan regional stabilization strategy to achieve some of this. I wanted to see if you could comment on what State is doing in that respect because I think we have to win militarily, but we also have to provide economic stability and win the hearts and minds.

Secretary CLINTON. Congressman, I agree with that, and I hope every Member has gotten a copy of the Afghanistan and Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy. If not, we will be sure that you do, because it is very specific about what we are trying to do, what we are doing in agriculture, education, women's rights and so much else.

In order to do that we have to have the civilians on the ground. We have 920. That is more than triple what we had when we started last year. They are doing extraordinary work. I mentioned earlier that we had civilians embedded with our forces going into Marja, and they are now literally moving in to help stand up the presence of Afghanistan governmental authority.

It is a very challenging task, but we have people that are dedicated to doing that and to make sure that what Charlie Wilson said doesn't happen again. You know, I am glad he was so honored at Arlington and so many people who really understood his contributions. And yet this is going to be hard work. Part of it is that there are no quick answers to begin to rebuild Afghanistan culture, and to move people away from poppies to pomegranates is a long-term investment. We are seeing results already, but we have a long way to go. Building up local governance when we cleared Marja by the courage of our military forces, you know, we have to have the presence of an Afghanistan Government at the subnational level that can begin to build the confidence of the people, a police force that will keep law and order.

We are working hard on all of these, which are laid out in the stabilization strategy, but I appreciate your reminder of what

might happen if we did walk away again. So we are going to keep working on it.

Chairman BERMAN. 3 minutes, but the only reset policy we have is with Russia, not with the clock.

Mr. McCAUL. Okay.

Chairman BERMAN. It got reset for some reason that I don't know about.

Mr. McCAUL. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from American Samoa, the chairman of the Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment Subcommittee, Mr. Faleomavaega.

Mr. Faleomavaega. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Madam Secretary. Let me begin by stating my firm conviction that under your leadership and that of President Obama the United States is well on its way to restoring the credibility of the United States in the eyes of the world. I also want to especially thank you and President Obama for all the support that you showed the Samoan people in the aftermath of the earthquake and the tsunami that struck the islands of Tonga and Samoa in September of last year. Your help was critical in cutting the red tape and allowing critical emergency donations from our Samoan and Tongan communities in the United States to be airlifted. For your leadership and quick response I, on the behalf of all Samoans, will always be grateful.

I also want to congratulate you, Madam Secretary, for the special emphasis you and the President have placed on reengaging and upgrading our relationships with the countries of the Asia Pacific region, the world's most dynamic, in my humble opinion. The time and thought you have put into our policies toward the region have demonstrably improved the United States position in this important part of the world.

I also want to say that I had an excellent meeting a couple of days ago with Assistant Secretary Kurt Campbell, and I want to thank you personally for your decision recently to reestablish the presence of USAID in the Pacific region. As you know, Madam Secretary, I have been screaming about this for years and years and I sincerely hope this is not just a token presence, but a substantive one to help some 17 to 18 Pacific Island nations that I feel are so important for us as part of our foreign policy in this region.

Madam Secretary, it was announced this month that the President is going to visit Guam, Indonesia, and also Australia. May I also suggest, if at all possible, that on the President's return from Australia, he stop by in American Samoa just to say thank you to the thousands and thousands of our men and women who are in the military. I don't know if you are aware of the fact that on a per capita basis, our little territory sustains more casualties and deaths as a result of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. And I just think that our veterans and our people would deeply appreciate it if the President would just stop by there and say hello on his way back from Australia.

The last Presidential visit that my little territory had was in 1967. That was 43 years ago. Now I realize the President wants to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the treaty of friendship with Australia. But I would just like to say that this year in April, we

will be celebrating the 110 anniversary of when the American flag was raised in American Samoa. We have a unique political relationship between American Samoa and this great Nation of ours.

So I just wanted to convey my humble request, that, if at all possible, the President would do this.

A couple other issues I want to share with you, Madam Secretary. I know there is not enough time. I visited Laos. We have got a serious problem with unexploded ordnance and cluster bombs that we created. This country never attacked us. We need to make improvements on that.

Debt forgiveness in Cambodia, the problems of Agent Orange in Vietnam that we have never really addressed properly, and also the current negotiations going on with the Federated States of Micronesia and Palau. I think we need a little better attention in terms of the needs of these important countries.

It was my privilege recently, Madam Secretary, to travel with Senator Cardin and Congressman Alcee Hastings to attend the OSCE meeting of some 56 nations in Europe. And I want to implore you on your good grace to make sure that Kazakhstan is well understood in terms of the importance that the country plays, not only as part of the Central Asian region, but the important role that it plays especially when it comes to nonproliferation, and you are well aware of that.

Madam Secretary, I know my time is about up, but I just want to say thank you again for all your help.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you for that, Representative. I so appreciate your kind words. I will convey them, along with your invitation to President Obama. And I have enjoyed working with the heads of state from the Pacific Island nations, both at a meeting that I chaired at the United Nations General Assembly and again in Copenhagen.

Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA. Thank you.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. And the gentleman from Texas, who is not here. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Mack, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And it is good to see you again, Madam Secretary, and I thank you for your time and your hard work.

I have a bunch of questions and ideas and I am going to try to go through them quickly and give you time to speak, but I am going to make a formal request to you to spend some time on the Western Hemisphere and Latin America and so we might be able to have the time to talk about some of these issues more then.

First of all, on the free trade agreements, both the President and you have talked about the support for the free trade agreements in Colombia, Panama and South Korea. I have a resolution that I will be dropping today to try to push the Congress into moving on these issues and I know we need to get them from the President. I would like you, if you could, to talk to us about what is holding that up. I was excited to hear in the State of the Union that this is something we can work on in a bipartisan fashion. So I would like to get your thoughts on that.

I am also very concerned about the relationship with Iran and Venezuela and now that you, Madam Secretary, seem to be taking

a much harder stance when it comes to Iran, that we can get some policies that really send a message to Venezuela, Hugo Chavez, that we are not going to continue to stand for his complete destruction of democracy in Venezuela and that we are going to support the Venezuela people and the people of Latin America.

As you know, I have sponsored legislation that would put Venezuela on the state sponsor of terrorism list, and I would like to get your thoughts on that.

Also in Haiti I want to commend the State Department and our Government on its swift actions in Haiti. There are a lot of people who are suffering and continue to suffer and who will be suffering for a long time, and one of the requests that I would make, instead of sending a lot of this money to the U.N. to then be used to help and aid in Haiti, that we just go directly and buy things like water and tents so there is no skimming off the top, we can get the best bang for the buck in Haiti, and that we really look at restroom facilities because it has become a big problem.

I am also concerned or I just need to make a statement about Cuba if I can. We heard earlier, to me there never can be a time when the U.S. Government policies can support a dictator like Fidel Castro, who is willing to murder his own people, as well as imprison people from the United States, U.S. citizens for political purposes. So I would like to get your thoughts on that.

And the last thought is on the budget. I have concerns that we are continuing to spend, to give aid to countries like Bolivia and Nicaragua. I think it sends the wrong message when we are going to show support for someone like Evo Morales in Latin America but we don't move on these free trade agreements.

Secretary CLINTON. Well, I will try to go quickly, Congressman. We are working on the free trade agreements. I mean, as the President said, we support them, we would like to move them, we have to get the votes for them. So we are reaching out and anything that Members can do on their own we welcome to make the case why this is good for America. It is not just good for the countries. This is a plus, plus for the American economy by our analysis, but we have to be able to make that case.

Secondly, Venezuela is already certified as not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts. We renewed that certification in May and so there is a prohibition against the sale or licensing of certain items. We agree with you completely about the need to stand up to what we see happening with Chavez's attack on democracy. I was pleased to see the OAS come out finally and criticize Venezuela on what it is doing in that area, and we are going to continue to try to put greater pressure.

With respect to Haiti, we do buy directly most of what we are using and we also try to better coordinate with other donors, the Red Cross, the Clinton-Bush fund, a lot of others who are trying also to target effective aid. You are absolutely right, one of the biggest needs, I had a meeting about this earlier this week, are restroom facilities, sanitation facilities.

And finally, on Cuba, Congressman, we share the same goal. We do not want to do anything that supports the regime, but we do want to create more movement toward democracy, and it is a ques-

tion of what will work and what won't, and that is what we are trying to figure out.

Chairman BERMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from New York, Mr. McMahon.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, Madam Secretary. It is a thrill and a pleasure to see you again. And as you know, the people from where I think is the most dynamic place in the world, Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York, send their regards and love to you and look to see you come back for a visit.

I want to just echo the comments of some of my colleagues, to thank you for putting forth the budget that is a continued reflection of your work of resetting, if you will, America's foreign policy and really bringing forward a true American foreign policy which first and foremost protects and promotes the national security and concerns of interests of our country, stands by strongly our allies, our democratic allies and those with whom we have good partnerships, and also continues to engage those parts of the world that we hope some day will be our allies, strong security but also enlightened development and aid, and I think that certainly you were writing a great new chapter on American foreign policy and we thank you for that.

Also, if you would, express for myself and my constituents our good wishes for President Clinton's speedy and healthy recovery. And also thank him for his work in a bipartisan fashion with President Bush again to help those who need help in Haiti. Many who have relatives, in Brooklyn in particular, and also some in Staten Island, but also again appealing to the better angels of us in America to help those who need help.

Madam Secretary, I would also like to just go on record by reiterating many of my colleagues' concerns in regards to Iran. It is certainly time to move on the sanctions effort and I know you have spoken to that. But in particular human rights abusers should be sanctioned as well as the petroleum manufacturers and smugglers. I just want to call to your attention a bill, a bicameral bill, that I have introduced in the House, H.R. 4647, which follows the Lieberman bill in the Senate, which will bring sanctions to those individuals from the Revolutionary Guard who bring about human rights violations.

I would also just like to ask one or two questions. One is last year you were leading very strongly and continue the initiative which looks at the protocols between Armenia and Turkey. I was just wondering if you would think it would be appropriate in that regard to appoint maybe someone from the State Department who would focus on bringing about the adoption of the protocols in the two parliaments of those two countries, if that is something you would consider.

And then also in that regard, being that our relationship with Turkey is so important, we need to maintain our leverage, our strong relationship, which is very much that leverage, and I was just a little concerned to see when America's Ambassador to Turkey, James Jeffrey, recently said in a newspaper interview that Turkey has "security concerns on Cypress." Certainly he can't be

supporting this rationale for keeping Turkish troops on Cypress, and I would just ask you if he misspoke on that point.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you very much, and thank you for the kind wishes for my husband and say hello to everybody in Staten Island and Brooklyn.

First, on the protocols, we are very committed to working with both Armenia and Turkey, and I have personally been involved in this. I was deeply involved in the negotiations in Zurich some months ago that led to the signing of the protocols. I am on the phone probably more with the leadership in Turkey, Armenia, and Azerbaijan than in any other part of the world on a regular basis, and we are very committed to doing everything we can both in furthering the protocols for normalization between Armenia and Turkey and working for a durable diplomatic solution of the conflict over in Nagorno-Karabagh. That is not a precondition for the normalization process between Turkey and Armenia, but it is essential for the long-term regional stability in the Caucasus. So we have a whole team committed to that, Congressman, and we are working it as hard as we can.

With respect to what the Ambassador said, it is my understanding that he was reflecting the Turkish belief, not that we endorsed it, ascribed to it, supported it, but that is what the Turkish position is, that they, agree with it or not, they view a continuing security interest.

We are working to support the U.N. process of mediation to try to get to a resolution in Cypress between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Some progress has been made. There have been intensive negotiations own over the last 6 weeks, but a lot more needs to be done.

Chairman BERMAN. Well, Madam Secretary, as we notified our staff members, the committee members and announced earlier, it is 12:15, a deal is a deal. And so without objection, members have 2 legislative days to submit questions for the record. We thank you very much for coming and wish we had time for almost everybody, but we almost did. Thank you.

Secretary CLINTON. Thank you.

Chairman BERMAN. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X



MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
Committee on Foreign Affairs
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515-0128

Howard L. Berman (D-CA), Chairman

February 18, 2010

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

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**:

DATE: Thursday, February 25, 2010
TIME: 9:30 a.m.
SUBJECT: Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development: The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget
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.

Attendance - HCFA Full Committee Hearing
Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development: The Fiscal Year 2011
International Affairs Budget
Thursday, February 25, 2010 @ 9:30 a.m. , 2172 RHOB

Howard L. Berman (CA)	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, (FL)
Gary Ackerman (NY)	Christopher H. Smith (NJ)
Eni F.H. Faleomavaega (AS)	Dan Burton (IN)
Donald Payne (NJ)	Dana Rohrabacher (CA)
Brad Sherman (CA)	Donald Manzullo (IL)
Eliot L. Engel (NY)	Edward R. Royce (CA)
William D. Delahunt (MA)	Ron Paul (TX)
Gregory W. Meeks (NY)	Jeff Flake (AZ)
Diane E. Watson (CA)	John Boozman (AR)
Russ Carnahan (MO)	Connie Mack (FL)
Albio Sires (NJ)	Jeff Fortenberry (NE)
Gerald E. Connolly (VA)	Michael T. McCaul (TX)
Michael E. McMahon (NY)	Ted Poe (TX)
John S. Tanner (TN)	Bob Inglis (SC)
Gene Green (TX)	Gus Bilirakis (FL)
Lynn C. Woolsey (CA)	
Sheila Jackson-Lee (TX)	
Barbara Lee (CA)	
Shelley Berkley (NV)	
Joseph Crowley (NY)	
Brad Miller (NC)	
David Scott (GA)	
Jim Costa (CA)	
Keith Ellison (MN)	
Ron Klein (FL)	

February 25, 2010

Verbatim, as delivered

Chairman Berman's opening remarks at hearing, "Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development: The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget"

Witness: Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton

Madam Secretary, we appreciate this opportunity to explore with you the President's International Affairs budget request for fiscal year 2011, the supplemental appropriations request for the current fiscal year, and the various policy initiatives you have championed as Secretary of State.

This is the second budget request submitted by this Administration, but the first one prepared from start to finish under President Obama's and your leadership. So this is the first opportunity for Congress and the nation to see a clear and comprehensive picture of your vision and the priorities you have set.

We applaud the President's decision to define "national security" to include not only the Defense budget, but also the International Affairs budget.

As you have said on many occasions, America's national security depends not only on our men and women in uniform, but also on the civil servants who risk their lives on a daily basis to support America's interests abroad.

Regrettably, this point was brought home by the recent deaths of a dedicated Foreign Service Officer in the Haitian earthquake and seven CIA officers at the hands of a suicide bomber in Afghanistan. These courageous civilians gave their lives in service to our country.

Our diplomats and development specialists work day and night to head off international crises before they erupt, and to prevent the onset of failed states where terrorists who threaten our security find safe haven.

Over the long run, these civilian efforts are much more cost-effective than putting our brave soldiers in harm's way. Investing in the international affairs budget is the proverbial ounce of prevention. For example, if we are to resolve the Iranian nuclear crisis, whether by diplomacy or sanctions, it will be thanks mainly to the creativity and hard work of our diplomats and civil servants.

Madam Secretary, you have set out very clear priorities in this budget: Working with local partners to defeat al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Ensuring that children around the world have enough food to eat and don't die of easily preventable diseases. Helping nations reduce emissions and adapt to climate change. Putting women front and center in our humanitarian and development efforts. And rebuilding our civilian workforce by hiring a new generation of Foreign Service Officers and giving them the training and resources they need to make a real difference.

There may be differences of opinion about the relative priority of these initiatives and the optimal amount of funding for specific countries and programs. But I, and I hope my colleagues on this committee, will do everything we can to maintain the overall funding level because we recognize – as you do – that diplomacy and development are integral to our national security.

In fact, a full 18 percent of the International Affairs budget request – or \$10.8 billion -- is for the frontline states of Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq. That includes \$1.6 billion for programs that were previously carried out by the Pentagon, including Iraqi police training, the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund and Section 1207 reconstruction and stabilization assistance.

By having the State Department assume responsibility for these programs, we place them in civilian hands where they belong and allow the military to focus on its core mission.

There are many different ways to look at the budget figures. I would argue that in order to compare apples to apples, the fiscal year 2010 total should include supplemental funding -- both the new request, and "forward funding" provided in the 2009 supplemental. Looking at it that way, the fiscal year 2011 request represents a very modest increase, about 2.8 percent.

In these difficult economic times, it is particularly important to remind ourselves and the American people that the International Affairs Budget is little more than one percent of the entire federal budget, and only a small fraction of the amount we spend on defense.

Madam Secretary, we look forward to hearing your testimony on the budget request and the Administration's foreign policy priorities.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH
4TH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

CONSTITUENT SERVICE CENTERS:
1540 Kuser Road, Suite A9
Hamilton, NJ 08619-3828
(609) 585-1976
TTY (609) 585-3650

108 Lacey Road, Suite 38A
Whiting, NJ 08759-1331
(732) 350-2300

2379 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-3004
(202) 225-3765

<http://chrissmith.house.gov>



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEES:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH
SUBCOMMITTEE
RANKING MEMBER

WESTERN HEMISPHERE
SUBCOMMITTEE

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND
COOPERATION IN EUROPE
RANKING MEMBER

CONGRESSIONAL EXECUTIVE
COMMISSION ON CHINA
RANKING MEMBER

DEAN, NEW JERSEY DELEGATION

Duty to Protect the Inalienable Right to Life

by Rep. Chris Smith
House Foreign Affairs Committee
February 25, 2010

Madame Secretary, the most persecuted and at risk minority in the world today are unborn children.

Today ultrasound imaging has given us a window into the womb and to the child within. Microsurgery and a myriad of fetal health interventions are commonplace, yet some have chosen this time in history to dehumanize and exclude unborn babies.

Unborn children ought to be viewed as humanity's youngest patients, in need of proper prenatal care, nurturing, and when sick, diagnosis and treatment. The prevention of mother to child HIV transmission got a major boost from PEPFAR and I'm happy to say that commitment continues in the Global Health Initiative (GHI).

The Global Health Initiative must, however, ensure that even the unplanned and unintended child is welcomed, cared for and included in the initiative.

I was disappointed to read on page 14 of the GHI Consultation Document that unintended pregnancy seems to be relegated to the status of a disease—juxtaposed between HIV and tropical disease.

Pregnancy is not a disease. The child in the womb is neither a tumor nor a parasite to be destroyed.

I am deeply concerned that with the elimination of the Mexico City Policy by executive order last year, NGO implementing partners may actively seek to integrate abortion with the many necessary and noble undertakings funded by the Global Health Initiative.

I respectfully ask that the administration consider that for many of us, all abortion—legal or illegal—is violence against children and poses significant, often underappreciated risks to women and even to children later born to post-abortive women.

Madame Secretary, the term “safe abortion” is the ultimate oxymoron. Child dismemberment, forced premature explosion from the womb by chemicals like misoprostol, deliberate child starvation by RU486, can never, ever be construed to be benign, compassionate or safe. UN Millennium Development Goal #4 seeks to reduce child mortality. Abortion is child mortality.

At least 102 studies show significant psychological harm, major depression and elevated suicide risk in women who abort.

Recently, the Times of London reported that, “[S]enior...psychiatrists say that new evidence has uncovered a clear link between abortion and mental illness in women with no previous history of psychological problems.” They found, “that women who have had abortions have twice the level of psychological problems and three times the level of depression as women who have given birth or who have never been pregnant...”

In 2006, a comprehensive New Zealand study found that almost 78.6% of the 15-18 year olds who had abortions displayed symptoms of major depression as compared to 31% of their peers. The study also found that 27% of the 21-25 year old women who had abortions had suicidal idealizations compared to 8% of those who did not.

At least 28 studies—including three in 2009—show that abortion increases the risk of breast cancer by some 30-40% or more. Yet the abortion industry has largely succeeded in suppressing these facts.

So-called safe abortion inflicts other deleterious consequences on women as well including hemorrhage, infection, perforation of the uterus, sterility and death. Just last month, a woman from my home state of New Jersey died from a legal abortion, leaving behind four children.

Safe abortion? Not for subsequent children born to women who have had an abortion. At least 113 studies show a significant association between abortion and subsequent premature births. For example, a study by researchers Shah and Zoe showed a 36% increased risk for preterm birth after one abortion and a staggering 93% increased risk after two.

Similarly, the risk of subsequent children being born with low birth weight increases by 35% after one and 72% after two or more abortions. Another study shows the risk increases 9 times after a woman has had three abortions.

What does this mean for her children? Preterm birth is the leading cause of infant mortality in the industrialized world after congenital anomalies. Preterm infants have a greater risk of suffering from chronic lung disease, sensory deficits, cerebral palsy, cognitive impairments, and behavioral problems. Low birth weight is similarly associated with neonatal mortality and morbidity.

Today, some governments including ours, UN treaty implementation bodies including and especially CEDAW, some UN organizations including and especially UNFPA, and many non-government organizations (NGOs) are pushing—pressuring—sovereign nations to legalize, facilitate, and expand access to abortion.

For the record, the first serious sign of all-out aggressive pro-abortion lobbying took place in Cairo and the Prepcoms that preceded the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development. We had our fights in Mexico City in 1984. But not like Cairo. I know I was there.

After a rough year and an even rougher week, the Cairo outcome document and plan of action absolutely precluded any international right to abortion and dozens of countries filed an explanation of position (EOP) to ensure that their strong opposition to abortion was fully understood by all—all facts the pro-abortion NGOs want you to forget today.

Despite repeated attempts by the pro-abortion side to manipulate plainly worded text, the pro-life side emerged from Cairo with this clear admonition: “Governments should take appropriate steps to help women avoid abortion, which in no case should be promoted as a method of family planning...” Cairo also reiterated the primacy of national sovereignty on this issue, stating: “Any measures or changes related to abortion within the health system can only be determined at the national or local level according to the national legislative process.”

A year later, I was in Beijing as co-chair of the congressional delegation for the UN women’s conference. Again, attempts were made to push abortion and again a diverse consensus from the four corners of the globe rejected it.

Today, as never before, the largely preventable tragedy of maternal mortality is being exploited to promote unfettered access to abortion on demand.

I would respectfully submit that if we are truly serious about reducing maternal mortality, women, especially in the developing world, need access to proper maternal health care, skilled birth attendants, safe blood and clinics where obstructed deliveries can be turned into safe passages. Abortion, on the other hand, solves nothing, kills children, harms women and should in no way be integrated into any global action plan or country specific strategy otherwise designed to mitigate maternal mortality.

Finally, since 1979, brothers and sisters have been illegal in much of China. If a woman is caught pregnant without explicit government authorization to give birth, she is forced to abort. Unwed mothers are all compelled to abort. Handicapped unborn children, if discovered, are killed by the state. Ruinous fines—up to ten times the combined salary of both parents—jail, torture, property confiscation, loss of employment, education opportunities, housing and health care are all weapons aggressively used by the family planning cadres to ensure compliance.

No wonder over 500 Chinese women commit suicide each day in China.

And making matters even worse, the ever worsening gender disparity is frightening. Where are China's missing girls? By the tens of millions, they are gone victims of the earliest form of discrimination against the girl child—sex selective abortion.

Surely China's forced abortion policy and as a direct consequence—missing girls—constitutes a massive crime against women and the girl child. Why has the UNFPA supported, funded and defended China's forced abortion policy for thirty years? Where is a strong clear voice from CEDAW protesting sex selective abortion as discrimination against the youngest of women? Where are the voices of the Human Rights Council and the UN General Assembly against this genocide of baby girls—targeted for destruction in the womb simply because they are female?

Last November at a hearing of the Lantos Human Rights Commission, Wuijan, a Chinese student attending a US university testified about how her child was forcibly murdered by the government. She said, "[T]he room was full of moms who had just gone through a forced abortion. Some moms were crying. Some moms were mourning. Some moms were screaming. And one mom was rolling on the floor with unbearable pain." Then Wuijan said it was her turn, and through her tears she described what she called her "journey in hell."

Silence in the face of massive crimes against women in China—women like Wuijan—shouldn't be an option.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA
CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ASIA, THE PACIFIC AND THE
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

before the
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**“PROMOTING SECURITY THROUGH DIPLOMACY
AND DEVELOPMENT: THE FISCAL YEAR 2011
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET”**

FEBRUARY 25, 2010

Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for convening today's hearing, and Madam Secretary, thank you for joining us today. Let me begin by stating my firm conviction that under your leadership and that of President Barack Obama, the United States is well on its way to restoring the credibility of the United States in the eyes of the world.

Thank you again for all the support you showed the people of Samoa in the aftermath of the earthquake and the tsunami that struck American Samoa, Samoa and the Tongan Islands on September 29, 2009. Your help was critical in cutting the red tape and allowing critical emergency donations from our Samoan and Tongan communities in the United States to be airlifted to Samoa. For your leadership and quick response I – and all Samoans – will always be grateful.

I also want to congratulate you for the special emphasis you and the President have placed on reengaging and upgrading our relationships with the countries of the Asia Pacific, the world's most dynamic region. The time and thought you have put into our policies towards the region have demonstrably improved the U.S. position in that part of the world.

The fact that you made your first overseas trip to the region and have made three additional trips to the region since you have been in office – and would have made a fourth trip if not for the tragic earthquake in Haiti – sent precisely the right signal that under this Administration the United States is going to fully engage with the region. Our friends in the region also

appreciated the fact that the first foreign leader to visit President Obama after he took office was Japan's Prime Minister. The President's participation in the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Summit in Singapore last November, along with his visits to China, Japan and South Korea were also important signals of his intention to reenergize our commitment to the region. The fact that the President attended the first-ever U.S.-ASEAN summit and United States signed the ASEAN Treaty of Amity and Cooperation further reinforced that commitment, as will his coming trip to Guam, Indonesia and Australia.

As you may know, I wrote to President Obama on February 2, 2010 and asked if he could also stop in American Samoa, if his schedule permits, if only to refuel. I think it would be the best way for the Commander-in-Chief to say thank you to the thousands of Samoan men and women who currently serve in the U.S. Armed Forces, especially since the Iraq war death rate per 1 million population is higher for American Samoa than any other State or Territory, and USA Today has commended American Samoa for its outsized sacrifice.

No President has visited American Samoa since Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1967 and a visit by President Obama would give special meaning to this year's Flag Day Celebration as this April will mark the 110th year anniversary of the raising of the U.S. flag in American Samoa. A Presidential visit would also come in the midst of rebuilding after American Samoa was hit by the most powerful earthquake of 2009 on September 29 which set off a tsunami with waves that towered over 20 feet high and which resulted in deeply personal tragedies for numerous families and villages. In

response to this disaster which left American Samoa in ruins, President Obama was the first to promise full, swift and aggressive action to help American Samoa rebuild and recover. A stopover in American Samoa by the President at this time in the recovery process would go a long ways to show that under the Obama Administration's watch, residents of America will never suffer again like victims of Katrina did. Given what a Presidential visit would mean to the people of American Samoa at this time, I am hopeful that you will also do all you can to encourage the President to refuel in the Territory.

Two days ago, I had a conversation with your Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific and he mentioned that you are rescheduling your trip to Australia, New Zealand and Papua News Guinea and that you may be considering a stopover in American Samoa. I can assure you that our people will extend to you the same warm welcome that they would extend to President Obama, and we would be honored by your visit. Your presence in the Territory would be historic and, on behalf of our people, I would like to personally extend an invitation to you to make a brief visit as American Samoa is well-positioned to be a regional leader and strengthen U.S.-Pacific Island relations.

Meanwhile, I am looking forward to next year's APEC Leaders Summit, which President Obama will host in Honolulu. And I want to applaud the important speech you gave at the East West Center in January on the Administration's views on a new "regional architecture" for the Asia Pacific. As you noted in that speech, the Administration is "working to deepen our historic ties, build new partnerships, work with existing

multilateral organizations to pursue shared interests, and reach beyond governments to engage directly with people in every corner of this vast region. We start from a simple premise: America's future is linked to the future of the Asia-Pacific region; and the future of this region depends on America."

As Assistant Secretary Campbell mentioned to me earlier this week, you were going to deliver a similar speech focused exclusively on U.S. policy toward the Pacific Islands while in Papua New Guinea had you been able to visit if not for the tragedy in Haiti. In any case, I look forward to that hearing that speech and hope that it lays out the "a more comprehensive approach, American approach," that you suggested when you testified before this committee in April last year.

I also thank you for meeting leaders of the Pacific Island nations during the 2009 U.N. General Assembly. I understand you met with representatives from all the Pacific Islands except Fiji – and the Fijian Permanent Representative was invited, but did not attend. I further understand that the President of Nauru chaired the meeting, and some of the Island nations were represented by their leaders and others by their foreign ministers. In any case, the meeting provided an opportunity for you to discuss issues critical to the Pacific Islands, express the U.S. commitment to the Pacific, and discuss plans for the reintroduction of USAID to the Pacific, the Pacific Partnership and other ship visits. Assistant Secretary Campbell mentioned that you plan to hold annual summits with Pacific Island leaders, and the President plans to hold a summit with them on the sidelines of APEC next year. These

commitments will do much to correct our unfortunate neglect of these important countries in recent years.

I also welcome your moving forward on an initiative I have pursued for well more than a decade – returning USAID to the Pacific. In fact, in the 110th Congress, my bill, H.R. 3062, which would have authorized appropriations for USAID in the Pacific passed the House, but unfortunately was not taken up by the Senate. I understand that you have requested \$13 million for USAID programs for Pacific Island nations in FY 2011, including \$9.5 million for global climate change adaptation, \$2.5 million for HIV/AIDS programming in Papua New Guinea, and \$1 million for disaster management and mitigation in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

These two steps will have an important, positive effect on our relations with the Pacific Island nations and ensure that the “Pacific” part of our Asia Pacific policy gains the appropriate attention.

Regarding USAID’s renewed presence, I want to urge you once again to consider changing our current policy toward Fiji. I have outlined my thoughts on this for you previously so simply want to emphasize one point: Fiji serves as a lifeline to several other island nations, and a renewed USAID program in the Pacific Islands cannot be fully effective unless are able to work cooperatively with Fiji. I stand ready to assist in any way that would help our relations with Fiji and the other Pacific Island nations.

Finally, regarding Kazakhstan, over the last eighteen years, Kazakhstan and the United States have developed an enduring friendship and formed a strategic partnership as allies in Central Asia and worldwide. President Nursultan Nazarbayev has been a leader in nuclear disarmament, including his success at securing the Soviet nuclear arsenal in his country at the end of the Cold War. President Nazarbayev will be in Washington for the nuclear security summit in April and it is my hope that you would support a bilateral meeting between President Obama and President Nazarbayev to discuss our mutual interests in this important area, as well as our mutual objectives in Central Asia, including a successful outcome in Afghanistan.

Kazakhstan also assumed leadership this month of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), an organization of 56 member states with vast potential for strengthening regional and global cooperation, security, peace, and prosperity. This is a remarkable historic achievement for a nation that only 19 years ago gained its independence from the former Soviet Union. It is also a recognition of the vision and leadership of Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev who has charted a course to establish not only a modern state but an emerging democracy.

It has been 10 years since the OSCE held a security summit (in Istanbul). The security context that was defined in Istanbul was drastically altered after September 11, 2001. New security threats and challenges have emerged (post 9/11) that endanger not only Europe but the United States as well. From my perspective, an OSCE meeting, bringing together all member states, to discuss and come to solutions regarding the security of all nations will be beneficial to the United States and this is why on January 27,

2010, eighteen Members of Congress, including myself, signed a letter urging President Obama to support this summit. We also copied our letter to you and remain hopeful that you will also support this historic initiative.

Madam Secretary, I again want to thank you for your leadership in Asia, the Pacific and all around the world, and I look forward to our continued association as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and its subcommittees work closely with you in restoring America's stature's once more.

Statement
Congresswoman Diane E. Watson
Full Committee: Foreign Affairs
Thursday, February 25, 2010
9:30 a.m.

*"Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development:
The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs"*

Thank you, Mr. Chairman for holding this timely hearing on the State Department's fiscal year 2011 budget. I want to thank my friend, Secretary Clinton for being here.

I have been an ardent supporter of the international aid efforts by the U.S. Our country has the unique ability to help struggling peoples of other nations and we should play our part as best we can. Through our civilian efforts, we help stabilize and improve the quality of life in other nations, making the world a safer place for our citizens.

Though much of the budget is focused on the frontline nations of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, the President's budget does make important investments in food security, health, and the environment. I am interested to hear how the requested dollars will be mobilized effectively on the ground.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I yield back the remainder of my time.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE RUSS CARNAHAN (MO-03)
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Hearing on
*Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development:
The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget*
Thursday, February 25, 2010, 9:30 a.m.
2172 Rayburn House Office Building**

Chairman Berman and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, thank you for holding this hearing regarding the fiscal year 2011 international affairs budget. Madam Secretary, thank you for coming to testify today.

As we are recovering from the economic crisis, it is important that we are fiscally responsible. At the same time, we must support a robust international affairs budget, so that we can use all of the tools of “smart power” to prevent crises before they occur.

That is why I am pleased overall with this budget, which represents only a 2.8 percent increase when compared to the full amount in FY10 (which includes “forward funding” from the FY09 supplemental, as well as the FY10 supplemental request).

Madam Secretary, you state in your request that our civilian mission in Afghanistan is also growing. As Chair of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight, I hosted a hearing yesterday on the hard lessons learned in Iraq. As we prepare to triple the number of civilians on the ground in Afghanistan, I want to help ensure that taxpayer resources are not wasted or lost to duplication, mismanagement, or corruption during this massive scale-up.

Last month, I also launched, along with Representative Joseph Cao of Louisiana, a new bipartisan American Engagement Caucus in order to help restore America’s relations in the world and bring greater economic and security benefits to our country. Therefore, I take great interest in the announcement of the Global Engagement Fund. I understand that it is a follow-up to the President’s speech in Cairo, and will focus on expanding opportunity, science and technology partnerships, and human development issues. I look forward to coordinating with you to making this fund targeted and effective.

Finally, I’d like to support the request for increase in funding to Bosnia and Herzegovina (approximately \$9 million increase). We should continue to address Bosnia’s political challenges as it prepares for its presidential and parliamentary elections in October.

Thank you again for your testimony today, and we look forward to working with you to support a strong diplomacy and development agenda.

Congressman Gerald E. Connolly (VA-11)

**HCFA Full Committee Hearing: Promoting Security through Diplomacy & Development: The FY2011
International Affairs Budget
Thursday, February 25, 2010
9:30am**

For years, there has been a bipartisan consensus among national security leaders that a strong International Affairs Budget is essential to ensuring U.S. security in the 21st century. Former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice called international development “a vital investment in the free, prosperous, and peaceful international order that fundamentally serves our national interest.” Similarly, Defense Secretary Robert Gates said that “the challenges confronting our nation cannot be dealt with by military means alone,” and that these challenges require a “whole-of-government” strategy. National security leaders recognize that we live in an increasingly interconnected world where infectious diseases, failed states, economic despair and terrorism don’t observe international borders. The role of foreign aid and development as a part of our national security strategy ought to determine the nature of the discussion about the 150 Function.

There are many misconceptions about foreign aid. Perhaps the most common myth is that the International Affairs Budget represents a sizeable fraction of the annual budget. The reality could not be farther from the truth. In fact, the FY2011 International Affairs budget request represents only 1.4% of the total FY2011 Budget.

Today, we may hear that this year’s International Affairs budget request represents an increase of 15.7% since FY2010. This number is utterly inaccurate, as it does not account for actual or likely FY2010 supplemental funding. Therefore, when compared to the true tally of spending in FY2010, which includes forward funding from the FY2009 supplemental and FY2010 supplemental request, the true budget increase is only 2.8%. Let me repeat that—the true Function 150 budget increase is only 2.8%. And the total FY2011 Function 150 request represents only 1.4% of the total FY2011 Budget.

In the FY2011 Budget, three programs that were previously funded through the Department of Defense will now be funded through the Department of State. These three programs, which amount to almost \$1.6 billion, will “begin to rebalance roles between DOD and State,” according to the International Affairs Budget request.¹ This is a welcome change, though its effect on DOD’s “Section 1206” authority remains to be seen.²

The budget request to continue funding for USAID’s Development Leadership Initiative (DLI) is also positive. The DLI is a key part of addressing USAID’s shortage of development professionals. The FY2011 budget request will support an increase of 200 Foreign Service Officers within AID. This is in addition to the commitment to add 720 FSOs within AID between 2008 and 2010. Effective development professionals are the most qualified to distribute aid and manage projects on the ground.

As a member of this Committee and the Budget Committee, I look forward to the upcoming discussions about a robust International Affairs Budget.

¹ The three programs are: the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund or PCCF at \$1.2 billion, Iraq Police Training Fund at \$295 million, and USAID Complex Crises Fund at \$100 million.

² In 2006, DOD received Section 1206 authority from Congress. This allows DOD to spend up to \$350 million annually to train and equip foreign military forces for counterterrorism and stabilization operations, despite the fact that the FAA of 1961 states that this authority falls with the Secretary of State (such as in the FMF account).

CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
STATEMENT BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
“PROMOTING SECURITY THROUGH DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT: THE FY2011
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET”

FEBRUARY 25, 2010

Let me first thank Chairman Berman his leadership in bringing forth this important hearing. I want to also thank our renowned witness and my friend, Secretary of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Along with many of my colleagues, I called for a robust international affairs budget, and I am happy to see that this budget delivers on our request. The FY2011 budget request marks an important step in America’s transition to a more well-rounded distribution of our funding for foreign engagement. It reflects the wishes of Secretary Gates to shift key reconstruction and stabilization capabilities from the Department of Defense to the State Department. The budget also reemphasizes the importance of the two “Ds”—diplomacy and development—which, along with defense, forms the core of our national security and foreign policy.

I want to highlight some of the important issues facing our foreign policy, and I hope that you, Madam Secretary, will have an opportunity to address how we plan to fund them.

First and foremost, I would like to address the issue of Haiti. As you well know, American and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. This effort spearheaded by the US Agency for State Department, was unprecedented and extraordinary.

The State Department, the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard— all worked overnight to ensure critical resources were positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

Yet, challenges remain—especially in regards to children. Before the earthquake, UNICEF estimated that 46 per cent of Haiti’s nearly 10 million people are under 18 years of age. Although it will take some time to count the true number of children affected by the earthquake, it is clear that the orphan situation in Haiti demands our immediate attention. In January I, along with Congressman Driehaus and Congressman Manzullo, wrote you a letter expressing our concern for the welfare of Haiti’s children. As co-chairs of the Congressional Children’s Caucus we urged you to develop and implement an interagency response to protect the Haitian orphans affected by this disaster.

Orphans in Haiti fall into one of three categories, each with its own unique challenges. First there are those orphans for whom the adoption process had already started when the earthquake struck. These orphans range from those who had made preliminary contact with their adoptive parents to those who were on the verge of leaving Haiti to join their new families. Through facilitating humanitarian parole, the Department of State has done an outstanding job in accelerating the application process for adopting parents who had already started the adoption process. The Department of State estimates that of the approximately 900 such cases, between 600 and 700 cases have been accelerated through humanitarian parole, and we urge you to address the remaining cases as quickly as possible.

Madame Secretary, I would like to thank you for your leadership in responding to the humanitarian crisis in Haiti—specifically in regards to the children affected. Although they are

extremely vulnerable, Haiti's children are vital to their country's reconstruction and future success. The American government must do everything in its power to protect these children and safeguard Haiti's future.

Although Haiti became our paramount foreign policy issue on the eve of the earthquake, it is not the only issue. That is why we must ensure that our response does not negatively affect other crucial programs throughout the world.

WOMEN'S GLOBAL ISSUES

Women's rights around the world are an important indicator of understanding global well-being. Many may think that women's rights are only an issue in countries where religion is law, such as many Muslim countries. Or even worse, some may think this is no longer an issue at all.

As women in this country, we may still face a glass ceiling or have to fight like Lily Ledbetter for equal pay, but we have a process by which we can petition our government and our courts for redress. And often like Lily Ledbetter, we can eventually succeed in these efforts. Yet many of our sisters around the globe are suffering. These tumultuous times are not only slowing women's progress but in some countries, reversing it altogether.

In the Middle East, women and children face much daily prejudice due to their gender. Recently, we learned of deadly attacks and destruction of girls schools by the Taliban in Pakistan near the Afghanistan border along with the brokering of Sharia laws. We read that women in Somalia's third-largest city, Baidoa, have been ordered to wear Islamic dress starting this week or face jail time, according to a resident and Somali media reports.

There are concerns that Islamic law, which has numerous interpretations and variations, could lead to government-sanctioned human rights abuses in Somalia. As you know, the strict interpretation of Sharia forbids girls from attending school, requires veils for women and beards for men, and bans music and television.

In Iran, we have the cases of Roxana Saberi and Esha Momeni, Iranian-American citizens who were detained, as well as the many women in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan that are seeking freedom from oppression. They seek not simply women's rights but human rights.

In Mexico, where the drug wars are heating up particularly along border states such as California, Arizona, and the great state of Texas, we see women and children caught in the cross-fires. Not to mention, the massive rapes and sexual exploitation of women and girls in the Sudan, and the Congo.

Women and children also suffer disproportionately from poverty. Research and experience have also shown that women in poor countries are more likely to use their income for food, healthcare and education for their children, helping to lift entire communities out of poverty. However, women face unequal social and economic barriers that prevent them from earning a living and supporting their families.

These reasons are why I have consistently pushed for going beyond military force and strategies, to include and expansion of democratization, expanding USAID and other Foreign Assistance Programs that are necessary steps toward enhanced national security, international economic stability, combating poverty, and reducing the spread of devastating diseases. Humanitarianism and foreign assistance programs create a diplomatic framework for improving relationships with other countries and will revitalize America's Global Leadership.

IRAQ AND CAMP ASHRAF

Political and religious freedom in Iraq is a vital concern with regards to the nation and region. When we envision the long-term peace and security of Iraq, we envision a country with a strong, functioning democracy that respects the rights of all citizens. That vision is not a product of the imperialism of Western ideas; the tradition of religious plurality has roots in the history and religious beliefs of the Iraqi people. But, although Iraq has a strong history of multiculturalism, it must not rest on this reputation. The rights of minorities in Iraq are not fully protected, and the Iraqi government can and must do more to protect the rights of its minorities.

The degree to which Iraq protects those rights is a reflection on our country. Because of the United States' unfortunate detour from our struggle against terrorism into Iraq, the actions of the new government of Iraq directly reflect upon us. So far, I believe that the actions of the government of Iraq with respect to political and religious freedoms are problematic.

In no case is the Iraqi government's treatment of minorities more troubling than their treatment of the residents of Camp Ashraf. Although Camp Ashraf is halfway around the world, the conditions there affect Americans, including in my own district and throughout the state of Texas where some of my constituents have family members in Camp Ashraf. For example, my constituent, Mitra Sohrabi, has a brother who is currently detained in Camp Ashraf, and worries about his health on a daily basis. I also know many people in Houston and throughout the state of Texas who were affected directly by the July 2009 raid on Camp Ashraf.

Late last year, three months after U.S. forces turned over control of Camp Ashraf, Iraqi Security Forces violated the human rights of the People's Mujahideen of Iran (PMOI). Camp Ashraf detains over 3,400 exiled Iranian political dissidents, who are members of the PMOI, including over 1,000 women. The PMOI opposes the current Iranian regime, and for their political beliefs they have been exiled from Iran and sequestered in Camp Ashraf. Several women detained at Camp Ashraf have reported acts of intimidation and threats of physical and sexual violence by members of the Iraqi security forces.

On July 28, 2009, Iraqi Security Forces conducted a raid on the detainees at Camp Ashraf. The raid occurred fewer than three months after the U.S. passed control of Camp Ashraf to the government of Iraq. The raid began on Tuesday, July 28th when Iraqi armored vehicles began attacks against the Iranian prisoners. The attacks continued for two full days and resulted in the death of 11 exiles and the injury of over 400 more. As a result of the raid on Camp Ashraf, 36 men were arrested under allegations of violent behavior. The 36 arrested Camp Ashraf residents have since been freed, but the United States has a continuing interest in ensuring that the events of July 28th never occur again.

The Iraqi government's treatment of the camp's residents sets a dangerous precedent for future treatment of minority groups. In recent years, there have been alarming numbers of religiously motivated killings, abductions, beatings, rapes, threats, intimidation, forced conversions, marriages, and displacement from homes and businesses, and attacks on religious leaders, pilgrims, and holy sites, in Iraq, with the smallest religious minorities in Iraq having been among the most vulnerable, although Iraqis from many religious communities, Muslim and non-Muslim alike, have suffered in this violence. In summary, members of small religious minority communities in Iraq do not have militia or tribal structures to defend them, do not receive adequate official protection, and are legally, politically, and economically marginalized.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Foreign assistance allows the United States to export democracy globally. Through humanitarian assistance, we can reach out to the women and girls in particular providing,

Providing, a peaceful framework for stabilizing fragile states and ensuring sustainable development and is critical to prevent instability, violence, and genocide by integrating civilian and military tools to create sustainable and peaceful democracies worldwide.

As we have seen with our prior administration, terrorism and violence cannot simply be deterred and contained through purely military means. Rather, by educating women and girls, fostering international cooperation, and building partnerships with developing nations, we can not only ensure security of millions of people overseas, but we can ensure stability within our own borders.

For instance, medical missions in Sub-Saharan Africa and Central and South Asia are starting points for military relations that prevent the rise of conflicts due to diplomatic tensions. Our foreign assistance to Pakistan, South Africa, The Horn of Africa, among other places has stabilized tenuous regions and bridged cultural gaps.

Additionally, humanitarian foreign assistance is the crucial lynchpin to fight global poverty and the spread of infectious diseases. More people die from poverty and diseases in developing nations every year than in every war of the 20th century. Providing access to life-saving anti-retroviral drugs and medication to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, Malaria, and a litany of other public-health threats will save millions of lives and prevent young children from becoming orphans, a crisis that is occurring at an alarming rate.

Disease surveillance networks can monitor the further spread of diseases and prevent catastrophic outbreaks of epidemics such as avian flu and SARS, and foreign assistance can create sustainable hospitals and health-facilities that create jobs, save the lives of millions, and improve the foundation of impoverished societies.

Foreign assistance is a fundamental tool for globalization that creates economic opportunities and foster growth that not only pull people out of poverty, but open new markets for trade and economic relations.

I believe that foreign humanitarian assistance is also a path to further environmental protection. Aid programs in Central and South America, as well as in Sub-Saharan Africa allows the transfer of farming technology and methods that prevent deforestation and loss of biodiversity in environmental rich regions.

By combating, disease, violence, and terrorism, and encouraging environmental responsibility and education, we can begin to take steps towards creating better environments for nations, particularly women and children. Humanitarian assistance is also a first step in reaching out to women and girls who are subject to the Shariah law or other oppressive laws or regimes.

It results in not just monetary assistance, but also education and training assistance that ensures effective and efficient programs. Working not simply through USAID, but rather broadening our initiatives internationally can ensure a cooperative and diverse aid system that can save lives and foster international stability and cooperation.

CONCLUSION

I would like to once again thank Secretary Clinton for coming here today. Although America's economy is still in the recovery phase, I agree with Secretary Clinton that it is important to retain our robust international affairs budget. Yet, it is also crucial that our programs are effective, transparent, and free of waste and fraud. As you know, Stuart Bowen Jr., the Inspector General for Iraq, testified yesterday before the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight. During his testimony he argued that all agencies, including the Department of State, could do a better job preventing waste and increasing

efficiency. I hope that you will with his office, as well as our other oversight mechanisms, to ensure that every dollar counts.

I am looking forward to your testimony Madam Secretary and seeing where you believe the Administration stands on the plight of women and girls, the increase in foreign assistance and democratization funding, and the path forward for the this Administration as it builds or rebuilds our relationship with the rest of the world, I yield back the balance of my time.

Questions for the Record
Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development:
The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget
February 25, 2010

Rep. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega

Questions for Secretary Clinton

Responses were not available at the time of printing for the following questions:

1. I had a conversation with your Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific two days ago. He mentioned that you are rescheduling your trip to Australia, New Zealand and Papua News Guinea and that you are considering a stopover in American Samoa. I can assure you that the people of American Samoa would be honored to welcome you and extend our personal thanks for all the support you gave in the aftermath of the earthquake and tsunami that hit American Samoa and Samoa in September of last year. Your help was critical in cutting the red tape and allowing critical emergency donations from our Samoan and Tongan communities in the United States to be airlifted to Samoa. For your leadership and quick response I – and all Samoans – will always be grateful.
2. I have encouraged President Obama to make a similar stopover in American Samoa on his upcoming trip to Indonesia, Guam and Australia. As you know, on a per capita basis, American Samoa has a higher Iraq war death rate than any other State or Territory, and the thousands of Samoans serving in the U.S. Armed Forces and our veterans would greatly appreciate a visit by their Commander-in-Chief. Can I count on your support to encourage President Obama to refuel in American Samoa?
3. Madam Secretary, over the last eighteen years, Kazakhstan and the United States have developed an enduring friendship and formed a strategic partnership as allies in Central Asia and worldwide. President Nursultan Nazarbayev has been a leader in nuclear disarmament, including his success at securing the Soviet nuclear arsenal in his country at the end of the Cold War. President Nazarbayev will be in Washington for the nuclear security summit in April. Would you support a bilateral meeting between President Obama and President Nazarbayev to discuss our mutual interests in this important area, as well as our mutual objectives in Central Asia, including a successful outcome in Afghanistan?
4. Madam Secretary, it has been 10 years since the OSCE held a security summit (in Istanbul). The security context that was defined in Istanbul was drastically altered after September 11, 2001. New security threats and challenges have

emerged (post 9/11) that endanger not only Europe but the United States as well. From my perspective, an OSCE meeting, bringing together all member states, to discuss and come to solutions regarding the security of all nations will be beneficial to the United States. Can you and the President support this summit?

5. I also want to applaud you for moving forward on an initiative I have pursued for well more than a decade – returning USAID to the Pacific. In fact, in the 110th Congress, my bill, H.R. 3062, which would have authorized appropriations for USAID in the Pacific passed the House, but unfortunately was never acted upon by the Senate. I understand that you have requested \$13 million for USAID programs for Pacific Island nations in FY 2011 including \$9.5 million for global climate change adaptation, \$2.5 million for HIV/AIDS programming in Papua New Guinea, and \$1 million for disaster management and mitigation in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Can you give us some more detail on how the funds will be allocated by country?
 6. Assistant Secretary Campbell mentioned that had you been able to travel to Papua New Guinea, you were scheduled to deliver a follow up speech to the one Asia Pacific Architecture speech that you gave at the East West Center, and the topic would specifically address U.S. policy toward the Pacific Islands. He also mentioned that the plan is to deliver the speech when you reschedule the trip, but I would appreciate it if you could give us a preview of the major themes of the new policy.
 7. I understand that last September at the U.N. General Assembly, you met with representatives from all the Pacific Islands except Fiji – and the Fijian Permanent Representative was invited, but did not attend. I further understand that the President of Nauru chaired the meeting, and some of the Island nations were represented by their leaders but some by their foreign ministers. In any case, the meeting provided an opportunity for you to discuss issues critical to the Pacific Islands and express the U.S. commitment to the Pacific. Assistant Secretary Campbell mentioned that you plan to hold annual summits with Pacific Island leaders, and the President plans to hold a summit with them on the sidelines of APEC next year in Hawaii. Can you give me some details on your plans regarding annual meeting with Pacific leaders and the President's plans for a Hawaii summit?
-

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
Hearing On: "Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development:
The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs"

Responses were not available at the time of printing for the following questions:

Africa

1. Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership and the Global Engagement Initiative: Islamist extremists continue to expand their operations in Africa and the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership (TSCTP) is a critical program on the African continent. The budget documents show significant cuts in funding of this key program, thus suggesting counterterrorism programs in Africa are not of main concern.

- How high of a priority is the TSCTP and other counterterrorism programs in Africa?
- Do the proposed cuts to the TSCTP stand at odds with the Administration's stated intent to "assume a primary role in the USG strategy for countering terrorism through attacking terrorist networks and countering violent extremism?"
- Will these cuts be offset by funds requested under the new, ill-defined "Global Engagement Initiative"?
- How is the Global Engagement Initiative different from the Middle East Partnership Initiative, which itself is seeing a significant increase in the budget request?

2. Zimbabwe: The budget request includes a \$10 million increase in Economic Support Funds for Zimbabwe.

- For what purpose will these funds be used and how will they be monitored?
- How do you intend to continue to isolate the negative forces of the transitional government, particularly Robert Mugabe and his thugs, while strengthening reform-minded elements?

Global Health

3. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief and the Global Health Initiative:

- Where does PEPFAR fit into the Global Health Initiative?
- If PEPFAR will be at least partially (if not fully) absorbed by the Global Health Initiative, how do you intend to track spending on abstinence and fidelity programs in order to meet the statutory obligations under the Leadership Act?
- Given the Administration's stated intent to press for full "integration of services" and expand access to family planning and reproductive health, please describe how you intend to preserve the Conscience Clause under the integration strategy.
- Please describe precisely how the GHI "Strategic Reserve" will be used, including detailed information about the ten "Partner-Plus" countries to receive assistance.

4. Maternal/Child Health versus Family Planning/Reproductive Health: Funding for Maternal/Child Health programs appears to be separated from Family Planning/Reproductive Health in the budget explanation. However, the descriptive paragraph of FP/RH then identifies integration of FP/MCH and FP/HIV as if they are one-in-the-same. (See budget explanation page 57).

- Please provide the complete breakdown of funding for FP/RH across all accounts and agencies, including our contribution to UNFPA.
- In terms of implementation of the GHI, are maternal health and family planning to be regarded as the same thing? By extension, are maternal health and reproductive health the same thing?

Asia

5. The Committee has been informed over the last several years of allegations from State Department employees regarding serious, ongoing abuses of the personnel system by senior managers in the Bureau of Human Resources (HR). Some of these matters have now been raised in public, including at a Town Hall meeting you, Secretary Clinton, recently held, in a decision last summer by the Foreign Service Grievance Board upholding the complaints of a class of Foreign Service Officers regarding the HR Bureau's administration of Senior Foreign Service bonus pay awards and in the media. In addition, these same employees have expressed frustration with the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), which they allege has either refused to investigate their complaints, or done cursory investigations unlikely to produce credible results.

- Please provide a description of the steps the Department has taken to investigate allegations regarding abuse of the personnel system (including tampering with the Foreign Service promotion process and not implementing competition for Civil Service jobs) by senior HR managers.
- Please provide the results of any such investigations.
- Please provide a detailed description of the measures the Department has taken or plans to take to correct systemic defects in the personnel system to prevent such alleged abuses in the future.
- Where does the appointment of a permanent Inspector General stand?

6. There is also an allegation that in a recent grievance State's attorneys asserted that the grievant -- who had gone to Congress with allegations of malfeasance by senior HR managers -- had to relinquish all his/her communications regarding these allegations with Congress to State.

- Please provide the legal basis for the contention that State Department whistleblowers may not engage in private communications with Congress.
- Please provide the number of times and under what circumstances the Department has told employees that their whistleblower activities with Congress are subject to State Department scrutiny.

7. On the issue of Nyi Nyi Aung, the U.S. citizen imprisoned and tortured in Burma, I request the following information: has the State Department formally raised this case with officials from the Burmese junta? On what specific dates, at what specific locations and at what diplomatic level have these demarches been made?

8. Madam Secretary, the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act is a key legacy issue of our former Chairman and dear colleague Tom Lantos. The State Department has informed us in writing (on February 5th) of some of the impediments to implementation of a Kimberley-like process to restrict the international trade in Burmese rubies and jadeite as was done with conflict diamonds. However, the State Department has nonetheless pledged to “continue to explore this issue with other governments” including Thailand, China, India and the EU.

- What concrete measures will the Department undertake to ensure international support for implementation of the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act?

9. For each category below, please provide us with the total amounts that you intend to spend in FY10 and (based on the budget request) in FY11 on the following activities prioritized in the North Korean Human Rights Act (P.L. 108-333), which was recently reauthorized and strengthened by Public Law 110-346:

- Support for human rights and democracy programs aimed at North Koreans (Sec. 102 of P.L. 108-333); Radio broadcasting for North Korea (Sec. 103); Actions to promote freedom of information inside North Korea (Sec. 104); and Humanitarian assistance to North Koreans outside of North Korea, including refugees and trafficking victims (Sec. 203).

Eastern Europe:

10. Madam Secretary, earlier this month U.S. Ambassador to Russia, John Beyrle, reportedly stated that the U.S. and Russia have agreed that a new arms control treaty (START) will mention a link between offensive nuclear arms and defenses against them.

- Please comment on what exactly was agreed to on this issue and whether the language will explicitly or implicitly limit U.S. efforts to deploy missile defense systems for itself or its allies.

11. Madam Secretary, France and Russia are currently negotiating a deal whereby France would sell Russia one or more of its amphibious assault ships. As you know, Russia continues to occupy Georgian territory following the August 2008 war and Georgia has raised concerns about this sale, as have our allies, the Baltic states, which are also concerned about their own security and political sovereignty. If this agreement is finalized, it would be the first time that a NATO member has sold such advanced military technology to Russia.

- What is the U.S. policy on this matter and what steps are being taken to implement that policy before France approves this dangerous arms sale?

12. Madam Secretary, please tell us whether the United States will provide defensive weapons to the military forces of Georgia to help deter a future attack by Russia. If not, why not?

13. Georgia currently has 170 troops in Afghanistan and will soon be deploying another 800 troops there, making that country the largest per capita contributor to the mission in Afghanistan. When Russia invaded Georgia in 2008, we witnessed how Georgia was unable to immediately utilize in its own defense those of its troops that it had deployed in Iraq in support of our mission there.

- What impact will Georgia's contribution to Afghanistan have on their own security capabilities needed to defend against the type of Russian aggression it experienced in August 2008—and, more importantly, what assurances does Georgia have from us that its defense will be respected by Russia as it deploys troops to Afghanistan?

14. Madam Secretary, last week it was reported that Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister, Sergei Riabkov, stated that Russia will honor a contract to deliver S-300 missiles to Iran and that Russia is against "crippling sanctions" on Iran.

- If not crippling sanctions, are we to assume Russia will only support weak and ineffective sanctions? Can these comments be interpreted as anything other than that Russia will not cooperate with us on issues relating to Iran?

15. Madam Secretary, the U.S. is currently working with Central Asian countries to diversify our supply routes to Afghanistan.

- How do we balance between the need to cooperate with Central Asian states in the important resupply of our forces fighting terrorists in Afghanistan and the fact that some of the Central Asian governments with whom we may cooperate may in turn be feeding Islamic insurgencies by their corruption and repression?

16. Madam Secretary, in light of the stated intention by newly-elected President Yanukovich in Ukraine to seek closer relations with Russia, how will such a reorientation of Ukrainian foreign policy impact the U.S.-Ukraine Charter on Strategic Partnership that was signed by our two countries in 2008 and which focuses on enhanced cooperation in the areas of defense, economics, trade, energy, democracy and emphasizes enhanced engagement between NATO and Ukraine?

Western Europe and the Balkans

17. Madam Secretary, the Balkan region has become one of the world's key transit routes for drug and human trafficking. In 2006, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), stated that

the Balkans had “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”. In 2008, the UNODC stated that the majority of opiates continued to be transported along the “Balkan route” into Western Europe.

However, it appears that none of the countries in the Balkan region have received much if any International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) assistance for intensive counter-narcotics or narcotics control programs, with aid funds from the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) account instead going to general judicial aid programs, some training at the International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA) and a general, regional program that may or may not be effective in addressing the reported huge flows of narcotics. After all these years, there is apparently no funding request for the INCLE account in Fiscal Year 2011 to address this major challenge.

- What will the State Department do to directly provide bilateral assistance through INCLE to the individual police forces in the Balkan states for improved operations, capacity and training to fight narcotics trafficking in the Balkans that may be providing financial support to extremists seeking to use that region as a staging ground for terrorist operations?

18. Several leading intelligence and diplomatic officials have expressed concern that the Balkan region may become a safe haven for extremists, as was stated recently by Israeli Foreign Minister Lieberman when he said, “*the Balkan region is the next destination for al-Qaeda and other Islamic extremist groups to set up operations.*” In fact, on February 2nd, Bosnian authorities arrested seven “Wahhabi” extremists in a remote northern town, confiscating a large cache of weapons, ammunition, explosives, Arabic language propaganda CD’s and DVD’s and military uniforms. Such reports and evidence of the expansion of extremist movements in countries across the Balkans have increased over the past decade or more.

- How is the Department of State working to address this growing threat?
- Why does the FY2011 budget proposal for Non-Proliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs (NADR) funding for the Balkans reduce total NAD funding to the Balkans by 7% from last year, with a 41% cut for funds to Bosnia? However, NADR funding to Bulgaria would increase by 38% and to Montenegro by 100%. Can you explain why these two countries would receive such a large increase when the rest of the region’s funding was reduced?
- Will the State Department make the Balkans a focus of assistance through the International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INCLE) account in order to ramp up the total resources available for concrete law enforcement assistance that can contribute greatly to the fight against extremism?

19. On April 3, 2009, President Obama stated in France that, “I’ve come to Europe this week to renew our partnership...where our friends and allies bear their share of the burden.” Recently, however, we have seen: The European Parliament vote to reject the vital counter-terrorism

financing information exchange agreement, utilizing the SWIFT banking consortium; France, a NATO ally, decide to sell to Russia advanced force projection military equipment in the form of a Mistral class assault ship -- despite Russia's 2008 invasion of Georgia and continued occupation of that country's territory;

Commentary that Germany is more interested in "strategic partnership" with the Russian regimes than in joining others in NATO in standing up to Russian aggression in Georgia;

Spain's persistent efforts to fully normalize relations with the Cuban regime without regard for repeated human rights violations by that regime; The speculation, apparently well-grounded, that the EU is considering lifting its arms embargo on China; The refusal of some European nations to increase their military engagement in the mission in Afghanistan or eliminate their "caveats" on engagement in combat by their troops deployed in Afghanistan; and The continuing, significant dependence of the EU states on US and NATO military airlift assets (transport helicopters, strategic airlifters) for the transport and support of EU-led peacekeeping and security missions, placing increased strain on both US and United Kingdom strategic airlift.

- With all this in mind, how useful are a number of our NATO allies in standing up to terrorism, deterring aggression and bearing their share of the burden of military operations, and what concretely is the Department of State doing to support the President's call for our allies to do so and to persuade them to end unwise arms sales to Russia, refuse to sell arms to China and so on?

The Middle East

Iraq

20. The Function 150 Budget request stated that "This budget request includes a total of \$2.6 billion to support U.S. government programs and a staff of over 570 employees in Iraq. Our diplomats are working closely with the Iraqi government to strengthen democratic institutions and ensure that the upcoming elections proceed smoothly and safely."

- Could you please describe the Administration's transition strategy for Iraq, more broadly, and the role of the State Department within that strategy, in particular? Has the State Department developed a written strategy for Iraq transition? If so, would you please provide it to the Committee? If not, would you please provide the Committee at the very least, a written outline.

21. Of particular note is the State Department INL Iraq program.

- When will INL assume responsibility for the police training program in Iraq? What is the strategy and timeline for this process?

Afghanistan

22. The State Department's budget justification states that "in Afghanistan, our civilian mission is also growing. As we prepare to send 30,000 new troops, we are also tripling the number of civilians on the ground." In your testimony before the Committee in December, you mentioned that there will be a total of 974 by the end of the year. Now your request mentions "1500 staff in Kabul and the provinces and public diplomacy programs.

- Is this still the final number that you envision?
- What is the breakdown of the civilian request, both in terms of attaches, foreign service officers, and 3161 contract employees?
- What is the sustainment strategy?
- Could you also provide us a breakdown and progress report of Embassy and consulate construction in Afghanistan?

Yemen

23. As it pertains to United States security assistance to Yemen, could you comment on whether the Administration is considering developing a mechanism similar to the PCCF?

- Can you comment on the level of cooperation between the State Department and Defense Department as it pertains to the implementation of US security assistance programs to Yemen? How are our nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs (NADR) (NAY-DUHR) and our anti-terrorism assistance programs coordinated with our FMF, 1206 and other activities to ensure that our programs are well-synchronized?
- Is the Administration looking at other models, such as the Pakistan Counter-insurgency Capabilities Fund, to provide security assistance to Yemen?

24. The recently released FY 2011 budget increases assistance to Yemen \$106 million-- more than 6 times the \$17 million that was spent in FY 2008. Economic Support Funds are increasing almost sevenfold in just one year, from \$5 million in FY 2010 to \$34 million for FY 2011.

- Where is our absorptive capacity on the ground to accommodate this type of increase in funding?
- Does the Embassy have the ability to project its presence on the ground to implement this funding and programming effectively?
- How does the Yemeni Government itself have the absorptive capacity to accommodate this kind of increase?
- What are our performance metrics for this funding and programming?
- What conditions are we placing on US assistance to Government of Yemen, particularly regarding the implementation of its financial sector/economic reform program?

25. Given the gravity of the situation in Yemen, would the Administration commit to provide to Congress a multi-year, comprehensive interagency strategy and implementation plan for long-term security and stability in Yemen, to include: A financial plan and description of the resources, programming, and management of United States foreign assistance to Yemen,

including the criteria used to determine their prioritization; and a complete description of both the evaluation process for reviewing and adjusting the strategy and implementation as necessary, and measures of effectiveness for the implementation of the strategy?

26. *West Bank and Gaza*

Regarding the \$400 million in ESF for the West Bank and Gaza, what is our plan for phasing out this assistance to the Palestinians, particularly the use of cash transfer? Please elaborate.

27. *Egypt*

- Could you elaborate on the FY 2011 request for \$250 million in ESF for Egypt?
- What performance metrics and evaluation mechanisms does the Administration have in place to ensure that these funds are spent effectively?
- Given Egypt's continued failure in meeting economic and political reform benchmarks, is the Administration planning to phase out ESF to Egypt?

The United Nations

UNRWA

28. Madam Secretary, in FY 2010, the Administration contributed over \$267 million to UNRWA, even as we ran up trillion-dollar deficits. Last year, when Deputy Secretary Lew testified before our Committee on your FY 2010 budget request, he stated that UNRWA receives "the highest level of scrutiny" by the State Department. But UNRWA does not even vet its staff and aid recipients through U.S. watch lists for ties to violent extremist groups, in contravention of U.S. law – and State still has not required them to do so. The homicide bomber who killed 7 Americans at a base in Afghanistan previously worked in an UNRWA camp and had significant radical Islamist ties. UNRWA also continues to agitate against Israel and in favor of groups like Hamas. But the Administration just announced another \$40 million for UNRWA.

- Madam Secretary, what's it going to take for the Administration to cut off UNRWA?

UN General Assembly

29. Madam Secretary, on February 26, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution that again endorses, if this time implicitly, the biased "Goldstone Report," which accused Israel of deliberately targeting Palestinian civilians for attack during Operation Cast Lead. While the U.S. has opposed multiple UN measures to endorse the Goldstone Report, Administration officials have also repeatedly legitimized the Report, claiming that it raises "serious" issues and needs to be considered "seriously."

- Will the Administration commit, consistent with House Resolution 867, to opposing any consideration of the Goldstone Report in international forums?

UNDP

30. Madam Secretary, the budget request includes over \$75 million for the UN Development Program. UNDP's board is chaired by Iran. UNDP has been accused of mismanagement and misuse of funds from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe. Further, UNDP is now reopening in North Korea, which it left after allegations that it allowed assistance to benefit Kim Jong Il's regime. And UNDP admits that it will select North Korean personnel from a list handpicked by the regime.

- So why, Madam Secretary, are we continuing to send money to UNDP?
- Why should U.S. taxpayers be indirectly supporting the regime in Pyongyang?
- Why are U.S. officials continuing to attend UNDP board meetings, in violation of a Congressional prohibition on attending meetings of international organizations run by state sponsors of terrorism like Iran?

UN Reform

31. Madam Secretary, our Ambassador to the UN, Susan Rice, has spoken of a "new approach" at the UN consistent with a "new era of engagement." But the key element of this "new approach" is that the U.S. has unconditionally surrendered our strongest leverage to produce real change at the UN: our funding. Instead of conditioning our contributions on real reform, the U.S. has paid billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars to the UN – no questions asked, no matter what outrages the UN commits. And what did we get in return? The AP reported last month that "The United Nations has cut back sharply on investigations into corruption and fraud within its ranks, shelving cases involving the possible theft or misuse of millions of dollars."

- So what's it going to take, Madam Secretary, for the U.S. to finally condition our contributions to the UN on real reform?

UNHRC

32. Madam Secretary, last year the U.S. joined the misnamed UN "Human Rights Council," seeking to change it from within. Many of us criticized that decision at the time, believing the Council was deeply structurally flawed and that U.S. participation would only legitimize the Council's biased behavior. Several months later, the Council remains a swamp of anti-Israel, anti-freedom bias. It mandated and endorsed the anti-Israel Goldstone Report. And UN Watch, which monitors the Council, recently reported that the Council remains unchanged, and that the U.S. has taken few real steps at the Council to advance our interests or combat human rights abuses.

- Madam Secretary, where's the beef?

- If the U.S. joined the Council to change it from within, why has the U.S. not called for a special session of the Council on Iran, even as Iran has repeatedly and brutally repressed its own people?
- Why has the U.S. not introduced and pushed for a resolution condemning the Iranian regime's human rights violations?
- Why the U.S. not called for a special session of the Council on North Korea, or Syria, or Sudan?
- Why has the U.S. not introduced and pushed for a resolution condemning human rights violations by Cuba, or Syria, or Sudan? Or by Saudi Arabia, or Venezuela, or Russia?

**Questions for the Record – Rep. Eliot Engel
February 25th hearing with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton**

Responses were not available at the time of printing for the following questions:

- **Drug Policy:** We need a more holistic approach to our counternarcotics strategy in the Western Hemisphere.

I strongly support the Andean Counterdrug Initiative (ACT), the Merida Initiative and the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative (CBSI). **But**, we need to do a better job weaving these efforts together.

What efforts are you taking to better integrate these efforts, so that our successes in certain countries do not contribute to problems in other countries?

I have suggested designating a coordinator at the State Department to oversee all of our Western Hemisphere security initiatives. Would you consider doing this?

- **Venezuela:** Yesterday, the OAS's human rights agencies criticized Venezuela for its deteriorating human rights situation. This follows their recent condemnation of President Chavez's closure of RCTV and several other cable TV stations.

How are you working with our partners in the OAS to call attention to the closing of democratic space in Venezuela?

- **Cuba:** I am extremely concerned about the imprisonment of USAID contractor Alan Gross in Cuba. I understand his health is deteriorating, and I hope he will be released as soon as possible.

Can you please update me on the State Department's efforts on this situation?

Questions for Madam Secretary Clinton

To be submitted in the record
Congressman Dan Burton
House Committee on Foreign Affairs Hearing
Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development:
The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget
February 25, 2010

Response from the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State

1) On October 10th, the governments of Turkey and Armenia signed historic protocols to normalize relations between the two countries. In addition to opening borders and taking several other important steps to improve relations, the parties agreed to set up a Commission to “implement a dialogue on the historical dimension with the aim to restore mutual confidence between the two nations, including an impartial scientific examination of the historical records and archives”

This Commission would be made up of scholars and experts not just from Turkey and Armenia, but also from third party countries. Now we hear that this committee – without inviting a single scholar or conducting a single hearing – may again take up the Armenian Genocide Resolution scheduling a markup for next Thursday. Are we really more qualified than an international panel of experts to make these determinations?

Secretary Clinton, do you agree that this would be a mistake by the committee, and that it would be better for the United States to continue to encourage the two countries to normalize relations and address this problem jointly rather than having the Congress act in a way that will drive the countries further apart?

Answer:

It is our position that the normalization process that Turkey and Armenia have undertaken carries great benefits for both sides. Last year, in his Armenian Remembrance Day statement of April 24, 2009, President Obama made clear that our interest remains a fair, frank, and just acknowledgment of the facts related to the historical events. The best way to do that is for Armenia and Turkey to address the facts of their past as part of their efforts to move forward. I have stated that the Administration believes further Congressional action on House Resolution 252 could impede the progress made thus far on normalization of relations.

2) Problems continue with VOA Persian Service in Iran and have existed for some time. As Subcommittee on the Middle East and Southeast Asia Witness Scott Carpenter testified at the beginning of this month, “Critical in the medium term is to do something dramatic to improve what should be America’s preeminent vehicle for communicating with the Iranian people: the Voice of America’s

Persian News Network (PNN). Poorly managed by people who do not know Iran or its politics, PNN's journalistic professionalism currently meets only minimal standards...and its lack of a proper editorial board makes for poor priority setting, robbing PNN of impact."

Carpenter further insisted that, "The Obama administration should work urgently with the Broadcasting Board of Governors to appoint a director who knows broadcasting, speaks Farsi, knows both American and Iranian politics, and who can re-tool the organization to meet its Congressional mandate. This is not as hard as it sounds."

As the VOA's Broadcasting Board of Governors submits a \$768.8 million fiscal year 2011 budget request to Congress that asks for additional funds for Persian language TV broadcasts into Iran, what is the State Department doing to ensure that our taxpayer dollars are being used for its original mandate and not wasted echoing the rogue regime's sentiments?

Answer:

The State Department holds one of nine seats on the Broadcasting Board of Governors and we are working with our fellow board members to ensure effective use of resources for Persian language programming.

Because of the nature of the U.S. relationship with Iran, VOA Persian is among our few avenues for getting official U.S. views directly to the Iranian people. The State Department's Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs engages regularly with journalists from VOA Persian seeking official USG commentary for stories on U.S. policy and developments inside Iran. This takes the form of short interviews from USG spokespersons, and longer interviews with U.S. policy makers on topics ranging from human rights, to sanctions, to efforts to work with our international partners to address concerns about Iran's nuclear program. The State Department is aware of criticism directed at VOA Persian, including accusations of biased reporting. We believe that official U.S. views as presented by our spokespersons are reported accurately and fully on VOA Persian.

In 2009, the State Department Office of Inspector General concluded that PNN "is performing a vital function," and is "the only platform from which the U.S. Government can reach an Iranian audience with unbiased news and information about U.S. foreign policy and American life." The report made 16 recommendations; nine of which have been closed and the remaining seven await the IG's assessment of whether VOA's actions satisfactorily address concerns.

3) (a):

In a related sense;

- Could you discuss how the State Department will be funding reform efforts in Iran? Will the State Department continue to provide funds to help suppress the blockage of internet access in Iran?

Answer:

Since 2004, the State Department has supported projects to help Iranian civil society make its voice heard in calling for greater freedoms, accountability, transparency, and rule of law from its government. Because of the sensitivity of these programs, I cannot discuss specifics in this context. We can offer you a more detailed in-person briefing.

Since FY 2008, Congress has appropriated \$50 million specifically to support Internet freedom around the globe. \$15 million in the FY 2008 Democracy Fund account (DF), \$5 million FY 2009 DF, and \$30 million in FY 2010 Economic Support Funds (ESF) and DF. While these funds are global in scope, they support activities that benefit the Iranian people.

3) (b):

- How much funding will be going into these programs?

Answer:

Funding to support Iran-related Internet freedom activities will come from the \$30 million FY2010 earmark, including the Near East Regional Democracy Fund. We can offer you a more detailed in-person briefing.

3) (c):

- What is your assessment of the internal situation in Iran and the impact the protests are having on the current regime?

Answer:

The domestic political situation in Iran remains unsettled. There are factions within the ruling elite, as well as a continued divide between the government and the governed, manifested in ongoing demonstrations and other forms of non-violent protests. Students and other opposition activists who engage in protests continue to be met with swift and harsh action by the Iranian government, as evidenced in the recent intimidation and detention of pro-reformists prior to the anniversary of the Islamic revolution on February 11. While the opposition continues to be a source of frustration to the government, Supreme Leader Khamenei has not made any substantial concessions to the opposition, focusing instead on using the state's substantial security organizations to suppress dissent and organize large-scale pro-government demonstrations.

While we have seen a recent dramatic increase in the persecution of Iranians for their political beliefs, human rights abuses are a persistent, long-standing problem in Iran. The subjects of political repression in Iran include religious minorities, women's rights advocates, ethnic minorities, labor union organizers, student activists, and internet bloggers.

As President Obama stated, "What's taking place within Iran is not about the United States or any other country – it's about the Iranian people and their aspirations for justice and a better life for themselves."

4) In December, you acknowledged that efforts to engage Iran in negotiations on its nuclear program had not had the desired results, saying, "I don't think anyone can doubt that our outreach has produced very little in terms of any kind of positive response from the Iranians."

Iran continues to enrich uranium, test missiles and work on its heavy water reactor. The most recent IAEA report indicated that Iran has already begun its effort to enrich uranium to a 20 percent level, while its stockpile of low-enriched uranium is well over 4,500 pounds. The global community cannot sit idly by as Iran continues to build a nuclear weapons capability.

- Does it remain U.S. policy to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon?
- What is the U.S. sanctions strategy? You have spoken about "crippling" economic sanctions while others are talking about "smart and targeted" sanctions. What specific sanctions are we preparing to impose?
- I fear that U.S. policy on Iran has become too focused on maintaining international unity and not on the ultimate goal of preventing a nuclear weapons-capable Iran. Is the U.S. willing to impose sanctions to persuade Iran to stop its nuclear program even if it means losing international unity?
- When do you expect to see action by the Security Council on a new Iran resolution? For how long will the U.S. seek a Security Council resolution on Iran before moving to other sanctions options?

Answer:

The Administration's goal remains unchanged: We continue to seek the prevention of an Iranian nuclear weapons capability, verification that Iran suspends its nuclear enrichment activities and affirm that the nature of Iran's nuclear program is exclusively peaceful. This goal is inscribed in five UN Security Council resolutions and is at the center of P5+1 efforts. The United States will continue to work towards achieving not only this goal, but also for Iran's full compliance with all its international obligations to the UN Security Council, International Atomic Energy Agency and Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

There is growing understanding in the international community that Iran should face consequences for its defiance of international obligations regarding its nuclear program. We are having very serious and high level conversations with our P5+1 partners and others about the importance of holding Iran accountable, including what we think that means in concrete terms.

UN sanctions resolutions are detailed and complex; developing and negotiating them often takes time.

The most effective sanctions are those that have the broadest international support. These can most effectively underscore to the Iranian government the cost of defying the international community. They are also the most difficult to evade.

Sequencing is important. Imposing strong unilateral measures that cost us an emerging consensus on the Security Council would be far from optimal. Moreover, securing a Security Council resolution first will allow us and our allies to subsequently impose additional pressure on Iran as appropriate or necessary.

The international community is more unified than in the past on the necessity for Iran to fully and verifiably suspend its proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities and reestablish international confidence in the peaceful nature of its nuclear program. This was demonstrated by the overwhelming vote at the IAEA Board of Governors meeting in November 2009 condemning Iran's illicit nuclear activities, particularly its construction of the recently disclosed uranium enrichment facility at Qom.

We will continue to work with Congress to ensure any action we take will be effective to implement the President's policy.

5) In 2008, the U.S. government imposed new sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC). The IRGC continues to be a major player in Iran's illicit nuclear activities, as well as the violent crackdown on protestors. Unfortunately, these sanctions have never been enforced. Not a single foreign entity has been sanctioned for continuing to do business with Guard.

- Why isn't the administration enforcing the sanctions we already have on the books for the IRGC?
- What would new sanctions on the IRGC look like?

Answer:

On February 10, 2010, the Treasury Department designated IRGC General Rostam Qasemi, who is the commander of Khatam al-Anbiya Construction Headquarters, the engineering arm of the IRGC that serves to help the IRGC generate income and fund its operations. The Treasury Department also designated four companies that are subordinate to Khatam al-Anbiya and directly support various mining and engineering projects. These actions were taken precisely to target the entities that support the IRGC.

The U.S. government previously designated nine IRGC-affiliated entities, including Khatam al-Anbiya, for being owned or controlled by the IRGC and its leaders, and designated five IRGC-affiliated individuals for their relationship to the IRGC, at the time of the IRGC's designation in October 2007. Concurrently, the Treasury Department designated the IRGC Qods Force, the IRGC's foreign operations arm, for providing support to terrorist groups.

In coordination with the Treasury Department, the State Department has encouraged all governments to take similar steps to isolate these and all other sanctioned entities and individuals from the international financial system to prevent further facilitation of activities that could support Iran's nuclear and missile programs, or its support for terrorism. It is worth noting that the European Union and Australia have also designated IRGC-affiliated companies.

With regard to new actions, we are seeking support for new measures that will be broadly supported by the international community and which can effectively sharpen the choice for the Iranian government with regard to its nuclear program. We are having very serious and high level conversations with our P5+1 partners and others about the importance of holding Iran accountable for its defiance of the international community, including what we think that means in concrete terms. We will certainly be looking at those Iranian entities that support the nuclear program during that process.

6) (a):

- What will the administration do to limit the damage done by the Goldstone report as it is considered in the future?

Answer:

As we have consistently stated, we have serious concerns with the deeply flawed Goldstone Report, even as we strongly support accountability for human rights and humanitarian law violations in relation to the Gaza conflict. We firmly believe that thorough and credible domestic investigations and follow-up are the appropriate measures for addressing the allegations contained in the report. Israel has the capacity and democratic institutions to ensure domestic accountability. We have urged Israel to continue using its domestic processes to fully investigate these allegations. Israel is currently investigating and reviewing all of the allegations in the Goldstone report, as well as all other allegations arising out of the fighting in Gaza last winter. We also welcome steps taken by the Palestinian Authority to establish an Independent Investigation Commission to follow up on implementation of the recommendations made in the Goldstone Report with respect to the Palestinian side. The parties' domestic processes should be given an opportunity to play out. Further UN action at this time would be inappropriate and counterproductive. The United States, of course, voted against a counterproductive resolution on Goldstone follow-up on February 26 in the UN General Assembly. If there is nevertheless to be further discussion of the Goldstone Report in the United Nations, it should be limited to the Human Rights Council, since it was the body that commissioned the Report in the first place. Ultimately, the best way to address the situation in Gaza lies in the vigorous and ongoing efforts that the United States and others are making to bring about a comprehensive peace in the region, including two states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace and security.

6) (b):

- The Goldstone Report is only one example of a broader campaign to delegitimize the State of Israel, much of it encouraged by the Palestinian Authority. How will you and the State Department counter these efforts?

Answer:

We have long urged the Palestinian Authority to refrain from using international organizations, particularly the UN and its organs, to single out Israel for criticism. We have stressed that avoiding highly-charged rhetoric in these bodies will help to promote a new climate in the region. All sides have a responsibility to help foster an atmosphere conducive to advancing a comprehensive regional peace. Palestinian Authority President Abbas and Prime Minister Fayyad have made clear their support for

peace and a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We will continue to ask the Palestinian Authority, the Arab states, Israel, and others to take serious, concrete steps that will help lay the foundation for the resumption of negotiations that will resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and reconcile the Palestinian goal of an independent and viable state based on the 1967 lines, with agreed swaps, and the Israeli goal of a Jewish state with secure and recognized borders that reflect subsequent developments and meet Israeli security requirements.

7) (a)

A year ago, the U.S. signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Israelis to help stop the flow of rockets and other weapons to Hamas in Gaza. Unfortunately, the Iranians continue to support the smuggling of weapons to Gaza. A few months ago, this was evident with the capture of the Francop freighter, which contained over 500 tons of Iranian-made weapons meant for Hamas and Hizballah.

- Can you update us on the implementation of this MOU? Has the MOU had an impact in stopping the flow of weapons into Gaza?

Answer:

The Memorandum of Understanding Between the United States and Israel Regarding the Prevention of the Supply of Arms and Related Material to Terrorist Groups is a vital component to our effort to help protect Israel and ensure regional stability. This MOU specifically addresses our efforts to prevent arms smuggling to Gaza-based terrorist groups. While the terms of the MOU do not cover smuggling destined to groups located outside Gaza, such as Hizballah, arms smuggling to Hizballah would be a violation of UN Security Council resolution 1701 and presents a clear threat to regional stability and security. As such, we continue to urge all parties to abide by the arms embargo outlined in resolution 1701 and to fully implement the resolution's provisions. The recent announcement of the creation of Lebanon's border security committee is a positive step in this direction.

Israel's seizure of over 500 tons of illegal arms aboard the M/V FRANCOP, which was reportedly bound for Hizballah, was indeed a very disturbing incident and highlights the need for international cooperation to stem the flow of these weapons that threaten to destabilize the region.

Turning to Gaza, long-term success in combating smuggling depends in part on alleviating conditions in Gaza and removing the economic incentives currently driving smuggling on both sides of the border. In this regard, we are encouraging Israel to allow increased amounts of humanitarian and consumer goods into Gaza. We also want to support efforts to provide economic development assistance in the Sinai to give the Bedouin population alternative means to earn their livelihood without relying on smuggling.

As part of our MOU commitment, we are working with regional and international partners to prevent arms smuggling. We are also working closely with the Department of the Treasury to identify and designate individuals or groups involved in Gaza arms smuggling – cutting off the financial means for terrorist groups in Gaza to operate. Egypt, which views smuggling through its territory as a threat to its own national security and to regional stability, is working on several fronts to improve its ability to detect and prevent illicit arms shipments to Gaza.

While the MOU is a bilateral agreement between the United States and Israel, we are also working with other international partners who are committed to stopping arms smuggling to Gaza. In March 2009, the United States and eight other nations (Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and the UK) formed the Gaza Counter Arms Smuggling Initiative (GCASI). GCASI-participating states agreed to employ a broad range of tools, to include diplomatic, military, intelligence, and law enforcement components to prevent and interdict the illicit trafficking of arms, ammunition, and weapons components into Gaza. The last GCASI meeting was held in Washington in December, and the next will be chaired by the Netherlands and held in The Hague in mid-to-late May. We believe that our efforts to live up to our MOU obligations, as well as the efforts of our regional and international partners, are helping to stem the flow of arms smuggling to Gaza.

7) (b)

- As Iran continues to send shipments of weapons to its terrorist allies in the region, what steps can the U.S. take to diminish Iran's ability to smuggle these weapons?

Answer:

We cooperate closely with our partners in the region and beyond to prevent transfers of arms and related materiel to terrorist groups in the region, as well as to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 1747, which prohibits Iran from exporting arms and related materiel. Much of this cooperation is extremely sensitive. We would be happy to provide additional details at the classified level.

8) I have been working on a resolution that emphasizes the need to protect religious freedom in the Middle East in the face of growing radicalism. Through this emphasis on smart power, what efforts, if any are being made to promote greater religious freedom and tolerance in the Middle East when radicalism is on the rise?

Answer:

The U.S. promotes religious freedom as a core objective of our foreign policy. Freedom of thought, conscience, and religion is the birthright of all people and a universal value. Religious freedom empowers members of communities of faith to advance the common good. Promoting religious freedom is one important way to decrease the threat of radicalism, because it allows more moderate voices to compete in the market place of ideas with extremist ones; it is an imperative for national security, and critical to international security.

At the Department of State, the Office of International Religious Freedom's mission is the promotion of international religious freedom worldwide. This office compiles the annual *Report on International Religious Freedom*, based on reporting from embassies and other sources. The International Religious Freedom Office works with the Bureau of Near East Affairs to promote religious freedom in the Middle East region.

We promote religious freedom in the Near East by using a range of tools that include outreach, advocacy and programs. We use diplomacy to engage bilaterally and multilaterally, and our diplomats are encouraging inter-faith dialogue at embassies around the world. We speak out publicly when concerns arise. For example, when Assistant Secretary Posner recently visited Egypt he called for the Egyptian government to uphold the rule of law in bringing the perpetrators of the Naga Hamadi killings to justice. At the UN Human Rights Council, we included concerns relating to religious freedom in our statements when Egypt, Qatar, Iraq and Iran presented their human rights records as a part of the Universal Periodic Review process. Also at the UN Human Rights Council, we are working with delegations, including delegations from the Middle East, on an action-oriented way forward on the issue of religious intolerance throughout the world; we have proposed an action plan that would, among other things, commit states to fight religious discrimination and violent hate crimes based on religion, promote inter-faith dialogue and activity, promote governmental outreach to members of religious minorities, and promote tolerance through education. We will continue to work with others at the UN on this important issue.

We fund programs in the Middle East to train civil society, lawmakers, and government officials to develop legal and policy protections for religious freedom, to increase public awareness of religious freedom through media and opinion makers, and to strengthen the capacity of religious leaders to promote faith-based cooperation across religious and sectarian lines. We have an International Visitor Leadership Program that brought approximately 140 religious leaders from the Middle East and North Africa to the U.S. between 2008 and 2009 on programs that promote interfaith dialogue, pluralism, and religious freedom. Hundreds of civil society leaders, teachers, journalists, legal professionals, and other key opinion makers from this region visit the U.S. each year and observe our pluralism firsthand.

Hannah Rosenthal is our Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, and is committed to promoting tolerance and building inter-faith bridges.

Your resolution specifically mentions concern for the Baha'is. We partner with Congress, the NGO community, and others to call attention to the plight of Baha'is living in Iran. The Government of Iran should be held responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranians, including members of the Baha'i Faith. We have made numerous public statements calling for their protection and have joined other members of the international community in condemning the actions of the regime in Tehran. Assistant Secretary Posner raised the situation of the Baha'i in Iran on February 15 during Iran's Universal Periodic Review stating, "more than 200 Baha'i leaders have been executed since 1979. We are concerned about the welfare and legal rights of seven Baha'i leaders imprisoned for more than a year and now on trial on unsubstantiated charges."

We stand for the vigorous defense of freedom of religion in the Middle East.

9) Corruption is rife in Pakistan and there are widespread concerns that the country has neither the capacity to absorb, nor the monitoring mechanisms to oversee, the kinds of large economic growth and development assistance funds being planned for it. To what extent is this a problem and a potential obstacle to effective use of U.S. aid to Pakistan? How does the State Department intend to address such potential issues?

Answer:

The State Department and USAID take seriously concerns about accountability and absorptive capacity when we develop our assistance programs. We have made great progress in the past year in developing mechanisms to ensure the accountable and effective use of U.S. assistance in Pakistan, including expansion of local auditing capacity, vetting implementing partners prior to disbursing funding, and tracking outcomes to ensure that aid results in tangible progress on the ground.

To this end, I appointed an Assistance Coordinator in Pakistan, Ambassador Robin Raphel. She oversees the development, implementation, and monitoring of all civilian assistance programs in Pakistan as we commit additional funds to help the Pakistani people combat the threat posed by violent extremism and create the foundation for a stable and prosperous future.

Plans are underway to strengthen audit and investigatory capabilities for U.S. funding by:

- Establishing field offices in Pakistan for the inspectors general of the Department of State and the USAID;
 - Expanding the use of independent Pakistani public accounting firms to conduct financial audits of funds provided to Pakistani non-governmental organizations (NGOs);
 - Providing training to Pakistani public accounting firms and to the Auditor General on conducting audits of U.S. government funds;
 - Helping the Pakistan Auditor General to conduct financial audits of funds provided to Pakistani government entities;
 - Expanding investigatory coverage—along with providing fraud awareness briefings and building the capacity of the Pakistan government to carry out / assist with investigations;
 - Coordinating audits and investigations among the U.S. inspectors general and the Government Accountability Office (GAO).
-

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton by
Representative Barbara Lee
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
February 25, 2010**

Question 1:

Despite allegations of corruption, this week President Karzai took control of the Electoral Complaints Commission, the same independent body from which members uncovered massive and widespread fraud during President Karzai's victory in the recent election.

What does this action say about President Karzai's commitment to reform, and what tangible steps has he taken to demonstrate his resolve on this issue?

Answer:

We have some serious concerns about the recent electoral decree issued by President Karzai. There is the potential to harm the independence and credibility of Afghanistan's electoral institutions, and undermine women's representation in the legislature. This is an issue we are discussing seriously with the Government and our international partners.

The international community applauded Karzai's inaugural address, broadly endorsed his ambitious agenda at the London Conference, and committed significant resources to Afghanistan's success. However, progress to date by way of visible action has been uneven.

Our ability to continue providing assistance throughout the elections cycle depends on demonstrable progress in establishing more effective and honest governance - independent electoral institutions are a crucial component.

Question 2:

What metrics are we using to assess his progress in combating corruption within the central government, as well as our own efforts in support of that goal?

Answer:

President Obama and I, as well as many leaders from the international community, have consistently voiced our concerns to President Karzai and the Afghan government over corruption and the absence of rule of law. President Karzai's inaugural address was particularly strong on the steps he intends to take on corruption. He reinforced this stance on December 15th on the occasion of an anticorruption conference in Kabul. But the Afghan government must now take measurable actions to combat corruption; they have the responsibility to demonstrate to the Afghan people - and the wider international community - that they are making progress.

Tackling corruption is a cross cutting issue, which focuses not only on prevention but also law enforcement. On the occasion of the London Conference in January 2010, the Afghan Government and the international community made several commitments

among other key reform/anti-corruption initiatives, we will measure progress against the following specific measures taken:

- Empowerment of an independent High Office of Oversight to investigate and sanction corrupt officials and lead the fight against corruption.
- Enhancing the effectiveness of civil service appointments and vetting process and revising the civil service code. In particular, appointment of competent, reform-minded individuals to remaining unfilled cabinet positions and also to key provincial and district positions in the South and East.
- Concrete action by the Afghan government against corrupt officials and known criminals (e.g., increased investigations by the Major Crimes Task Force resulting in criminal charges; public prosecutions of corrupt officials).
- Enhanced oversight of ministries, especially police (e.g., creation and strengthening of inspector general functions in core ministries as well as provincial line ministries at the sub-national governance level; increased audits of major programs).
- Decreased evidence of political interference with Afghanistan's Chief Prosecutor and other Afghan law enforcement bodies, and more generally in anticorruption enforcement.
- Registration of asset declarations by Senior Government Officials.
- Establishment of an Ad Hoc Monitoring and Evaluation Mission, comprising Afghan and other eminent experts, tasked with developing clear and objective benchmarks for progress and providing periodic reports on national and international activity to the Afghan President, Parliament and people as well as international community.
- Institutionalization of systems and processes taken within central and provincial governing bodies that incorporate anti-corruption related training, internal self-assessments, financial controls and HR oversight mechanisms.

Fighting corruption is not easy and we should not expect results overnight. A key factor of our governance and anti-corruption strategies and programs are to address the issue of corruption through strengthening the capacity and capability of Afghan institutions, thus developing greater accountability and transparency. Our programs will incorporate indicators that will allow us to track the progress of both the effectiveness of our programs and the GIROA's ability to reform. President Karzai has announced some important measures to reduce corruption including: the simplification of administrative systems through the anticorruption commission, thus reducing the opportunity for corruption and improving basic services for the population; and working closely with the international community to streamline donor coordination through the Afghan Government. Afghanistan has recently set up a Major Crimes Task Force and has plans to create a commission against corruption. Several US agencies work with a range of Afghan counterparts on training and building such capacity. There is also a crucial role to be played by the Afghan people themselves – through civil society organizations,

Parliament and other institutions and through media debate – to set out what they need from their government and what they will be able to give in return.

USG, and the wider international community, also has a responsibility to ensure that the considerable amount of foreign assistance we provide does not add to the problem and is utilized appropriately and effectively. We have a system for certifying ministries to receive U.S. funds directly and will expand that. USAID is reviewing the financial, management, procurement and expenditure systems of key ministries regarding their capacity to accept U.S. direct assistance. As of February 2010, USAID has assessed and certified that the Ministries of Public Health, Communications and Information Technology, and Finance can directly accept US government funds. Assessments of other key ministries are planned. Assistance will not go directly to ministries until they are “certified” as having in place the required controls to combat corruption. In the future we will be using fewer foreign contractors and channeling more assistance directly to GIROA thus ensuring a larger percentage of funds actually reach the target beneficiaries. We are dramatically increasing the numbers of USAID field officers to monitor our support to provincial government. Due to security, USAID implementing partners however will still be required to provide oversight on behalf of the USG.

Question 4:

Workforce Diversity

It is my understanding that since taking your position as head of the State Department you have released a new “Statement on Diversity and Equal Opportunity.”

Can you outline this policy as well as any positive outcomes the Department has yielded over the last year in its efforts to maximize diversity in the workplace and improve the employment and advancement opportunities for women, minorities, and individuals with disabilities?

Answer:

Shortly after taking office, I signed a Statement on Diversity and Equal Employment Opportunity in order to emphasize that, “[i]n representing the United States to the world we need a workforce that reflects and respects the rich composition of our nation.” This policy emphasizes the role of “equity, fairness, and inclusion in our work environments.” Our 2007-2012 Strategic Plan lists diversity as a core value. Additionally, we have longstanding internal policy guidance on Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) published on the Department’s intranet, readily available to managers and employees alike, in the Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM). Per the FAM, EEO applies without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, political affiliation, marital status, or sexual orientation.

Over the last year, I proactively worked with Department leaders and employees to achieve a variety of positive outcomes to maximize diversity, including, but not limited to, the following:

Efforts with Employees

- Within the first month of taking office, I met with the leaders of Employee Affinity Groups (EAG), groups that work to enhance diversity initiatives and provide a support network for traditionally underrepresented groups. The meeting

provided the EAGs with the opportunity to voice their concerns about Department policies and present their priorities for the upcoming year.

- In 2009, the Department sponsored two new EAGs, the South Asian American Employee Association (SAAEA) and the Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (RPCV).
- I worked with the EAG Gays and Lesbians in Foreign Affairs Agencies (GLIFAA) to successfully advocate for the Department to expand the “members of household status” benefits to same-sex partners, and the Department became the first federal agency to do so. GLIFAA received the “2009 Out and Equal Workplace Advocate Award” for its efforts, the first federal entity to receive this award.
- Our EAG Executive Women at State (EW@S) expanded its membership to include women at all levels rather than only at the executive level. EW@S created an Associates level for mid-level employees and an Entry and Juniors level for entry-level employees.
- We furthered our Leadership Liaison (LL) program by assigning an Assistant Secretary-level leader to each EAG, thereby granting each EAG access to senior leadership so that they may voice their concerns to an individual with power and influence on Department policies. (Example: GLIFAA utilized their LL in order to advocate for same-sex partner benefits.)
- Our commemorative events, co-sponsored by the Office of Civil Rights and an EAG, celebrate outstanding individual’s contributions to American society and to recognize the importance of diversity. As Secretary I feel it is critical to personally participate in as many of these events as possible and to date I have participated in three commemorative events.

Efforts with Leaders

As I said in my Statement on Diversity and Equal Employment Opportunity, “[t]he key to promoting diversity at the Department is leadership.” To this end, I have embarked on various efforts described below.

- We created a Disability Leadership Committee, a group of Assistant Secretary-level leaders focused on addressing barriers to individuals with disabilities and implementing policy changes to create a more inclusive environment at the Department.
- Our Diversity Governance Council, a group of Assistant Secretary-level leaders focused on addressing barriers to diversity and implementing policy changes to improve representation among traditionally underrepresented groups at the Department, was reenergized in 2009.
- Department Bureaus leaders began independent diversity initiatives to emphasize the importance of diversity. For example, the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs (EUR) released a statement supporting diversity initiatives to embassies abroad and domestic offices. Additionally, EUR hosted a Town Hall Meeting to discuss diversity issues specific to the Bureau.
- Department Bureau leaders are briefed by the Chief Diversity Officer/Director Office of Civil Rights on their individual workforce diversity statistics. Internal barriers and strategies to increase diversity are also discussed.

Leading by Example

Finally, we have to demonstrate, by word and deed, our commitment to the full diversity of America, because that is one of our strengths. The diversity of our workforce

represents our values and traditions as well as any policy or proclamation ever could. And it enriches the pool of ideas that help shape our agenda at home and overseas. I am proud of the rich diversity of my senior level appointments.

Question 5:

Have any specific diversity targets been set at the State Department and how successful has the Department been in achieving these goals?

Answer:

We are limited in our ability to set specific diversity targets for traditionally underrepresented groups due to the legal prohibition on quotas in affirmative action programs. Nonetheless, our Chief Diversity Officer/ Director of the Office of Civil Rights, and our Diversity Management and Outreach (DMO) staff analyzes statistics on the Department's workforce diversity and then highlights underrepresented groups as compared to the Civilian Labor Force and other cabinet level agencies. DMO prepares briefings to present the data to Department leadership and provides advice on implementing initiatives to increase diversity. Department leaders utilize the data and advice to establish diversity-related goals in their respective bureaus.

Question 6:

Can you outline the Administration's request for the West Bank and Gaza? Does the Administration's request specifically target any proportion of this funding for reconstruction and humanitarian assistance in Gaza?

Answer:

Assistance to the Palestinians is captured through three U.S. Government efforts: bilateral economic support; security sector assistance; and assistance to Palestinian refugees through United Nations agencies.

The Department's \$400.4 million request in FY2011 for the West Bank and Gaza ESF program supports the Palestinian Authority's development and institution-building priorities through the following bilateral economic support:

- \$200 million in direct budget support to the PA.
- \$72.5 million for the delivery of basic education, health, and water services.
- \$81.4 million in programs to help develop the environment for growth in the Palestinian private sector.
- \$15.5 million in food, medical, and other humanitarian assistance for Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza.
- \$31 million to enhance democratic reform, respect for human rights and the rule of law, and increase civic engagement.

The Department also seeks \$150 million through the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INL) to train, equip and garrison Palestinian Authority security forces. INL will direct a portion of this funding to provide training, equipment,

infrastructure, and technical assistance to prosecutors, investigative police, and prison officials in the Justice and Corrections Sectors.

The Department's FY 2011 request also includes support through the Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA) account for UNRWA. The Department contributes annually to UNRWA, which provides basic humanitarian services, education and health care to over 1 million Palestinian refugees in Gaza and 770,000 in the West Bank. In 2009, the U.S. government provided more than \$267 million to UNRWA. The Department continues to support the work of UNRWA in Gaza as a valuable counterweight to extremism in the region.

Question 7:

What is the current state of the humanitarian situation in the Gaza Strip, and how has this been impacted by the blockade of much-needed supplies and resources?

Is it the Administration's goal to work toward the easing of this blockade consistent with Israel's security requirements?

Answer:

International organizations report that basic humanitarian foodstuffs supplied by donors are in adequate supply. Humanitarian items in supply include salt, sugar, rice, beans, chickpeas, lentils, frozen meats, and milk. Locally grown produce is also available. Other food items are either unavailable, too expensive for most Palestinian families, or smuggled from Egypt through the tunnel network. The Coordinator for Government Activities in the Territories (COGAT) has recently increased the volume and variety of commercial goods and the categories of non-edible items permitted to enter Gaza, to include glass, equipment and materials for greenhouse construction. Israel has allowed into Gaza all of the material necessary to complete phase A of the World Bank's North Gaza Emergency Sanitation Treatment (NGEST) project, including cement. According to multiple sources, there has been a noticeable increase in the imports of non-edible consumables in the last quarter of 2009 and early 2010.

More needs to be done – the President and the Secretary of State have said that expanding support for the people of Gaza is a priority. With constant attention to Israel's security concerns, we continue to press Israel at the highest levels for expanded access in Gaza.

Hamas is an increasing obstacle to international efforts to provide assistance to Gaza. Hamas' stranglehold on life in Gaza, rocket attacks into Israel, and the continued captivity of Corporal Gilad Shalit only heighten Israel's security concerns. Even if there were improved access through the official crossings, Hamas attempts to interfere with assistance shipments and our NGO implementing partners, including through the temporary confiscation of commodities, complicates efforts to get more support moving forward.

Question 8:

What steps can the United States take to remove obstacles to aid delivery and to improve access to basic necessities including food, fuel, water, and reconstruction materials?

Answer:

We continue to engage the Israeli government bilaterally, also in coordination with the Quartet Representative, Tony Blair, and leading donors, to increase both the quantity and scope of goods entering and exiting Gaza. The Secretary addressed Gaza in her meeting with Defense Minister Barak, February 26, making it clear that the people of Gaza deserve hope for a better future, and that providing that hope is in the security interests of both Palestinians and Israelis.

Question 9:**Climate Change**

Can you outline the Administration's FY11 request for climate change programs in the context of short and long-term financial commitments made by the United States at the COP15 Conference in Copenhagen in December of last year?

Answer:

The FY 2011 Budget request, which reflects a planning process that began well in advance of the Copenhagen talks, describes the Administration's proposed climate change-related assistance agenda for the next fiscal year. It is a critical component of overall USG policy relating to international efforts to address climate change, and is consistent with our commitments in operationalizing the Copenhagen Accord.

The Copenhagen Accord represents a vital step forward by the global community. As of today, over 100 countries representing more than 80% of the world's greenhouse gas emissions have associated themselves with the Accord.

U.S. and other donor commitments to provide a range of climate change-related assistance were critical to securing this deal, which included commitments on reductions and transparency from China, India, and other emerging economies. Donors pledged to mobilize "approaching \$30B" over 2010-2012. As a subset of this pledge, the U.S. and five other developed countries collectively pledged \$3.5 billion over the 2010-2012 periods for REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) activities, with the U.S. pledging \$1 billion as its share of that total.

The Administration's FY 2011 request of \$1.4 billion in State, USAID, and Treasury funding for "core" climate change assistance (i.e. assistance that is part of the initiative and specifically focused on climate change outcomes) -- a 38% increase over FY 2010 and over four times that of FY 2009 -- contributes to the U.S. share of the 2010-2012 commitment.

Within that larger total, the \$347 million for Sustainable Landscapes builds on the \$233 million in core Sustainable Landscapes funding in the FY 2010 Appropriations bill to advance the Administration's commitment mentioned above to provide \$1 billion over the 2010-2012 periods for REDD+ activities.

In addition to our "core" funding, other State, USAID, and Treasury development programs offer climate-related benefits estimated at about \$400 million in FY 2011, and other agencies complement this support with an estimated \$100 million for programs that directly address climate change internationally.

At Copenhagen donors also committed to a goal of helping to mobilize \$100 billion dollars per year from combined public and private sources by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries (in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency). Private sector financial flows are expected to account for the majority of mitigation-related financing flows, and the carbon market will be a key instrument for catalyzing these investment flows. Building developing country capacity to assess greenhouse gas (GHG) baselines, craft long-term GHG abatement strategies, verify their reductions, and access the global carbon market are major goals of our assistance program in FY 2011.

The Administration is fully committed to working with our partners around the world to make the Copenhagen Accord operational, and we have actively urged other countries to associate themselves with it and begin to implement its provisions.

Question 10:

Although not legally binding, under the Copenhagen Accord developed at the December Conference, major world emitters of greenhouse gas emissions were expected to “inscribe” their reduction targets by January 31, 2010.

How many countries have submitted voluntary reduction targets under this Accord to-date?

Answer:

As of March 23, 75 Parties—including all major greenhouse gas emitters—had inscribed their commitments to limit greenhouse gas emissions, and a total of 115 had indicated to the UN their support for the Accord and agreement to its provisions.

Question 11:

Does the Administration continue to seek a binding international legal treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and how critical is domestic legislation to garnering the full participation of major and emerging economies around the globe?

Answer:

The United States supports a legally binding agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions provided that it would apply in a symmetrical manner to all major economies.

The Administration continues to support the passage of comprehensive clean energy and climate legislation to bolster the American economy, enhance our national security, and set the United States on a path to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and be a leader in clean energy technology. The United States’ inscription in the Copenhagen accord references “anticipated U.S. energy and climate legislation,” and that legislation will underpin the United States’ efforts going forward. Failure to pass legislation would negatively impact the leadership position of the United States in the climate negotiations and would similarly impair the full participation of the global community in making and sustaining necessary greenhouse gas reductions in the context of the Copenhagen Accord.

Question 12:

The United States has rightfully led one of the largest international emergency relief efforts in history in Haiti.

What steps is the Administration taking to manage the enormous demands of this emergency relief effort without causing any detriment or reduction in resources for other critical humanitarian priorities, such as in Darfur?

Answer:

The International Disaster Assistance (IDA) account is a contingency resource used to respond to natural and complex disasters worldwide. Its flexibility allows OFDA to allocate program funds as necessary to meet emergency needs.

Notwithstanding the significant IDA resources being allocated to the emergency response requirements in Haiti, OFDA is confident that it can continue to support ongoing programs and critical new programs with the IDA resources made available in the FY 2010 appropriation.

OFDA intends to work with its partner organizations to identify critical funding needs and ensure that, at a minimum, partial funding is made available to allow ongoing activities to continue and new activities to begin in Darfur and other critical humanitarian priority areas.

Question 13:

Even as we continue to provide emergency aid to the people of Haiti, the donor community and the Government of Haiti (GOH) are beginning to plan for longer-term reconstruction and development.

Moving forward, echoing the President of Haiti, this is the opportunity to rebuild differently. In order to rebuild differently and in a more sustainable manner, I believe we must adopt a "rights-based approach" to assistance.

Such an approach would be "Haitian-led" and include democratic participation of civil society, would adopt concrete transparency and accountability mechanisms, and would focus on building the capacity of the GOH to provide basic services such as education and public health, while ensuring the social, civil, and political rights of its people.

The statements made by yourself and the Administration regarding transparency and partnering with Haiti are very encouraging.

Can you please describe the policy framework that is beginning to emerge for U.S. reconstruction and development assistance to Haiti?

Will this framework be reflected in the Administration's supplemental request and will it be presented at the Haiti Donors Conference in March?

Answer:

Prior to the January 12 earthquake, Haiti experienced a period of relative calm and political stability during which time Haitians had begun to take action to bolster a course of economic development. The United States government was very near the release of a new development and assistance strategy in Haiti when the earthquake struck. That strategy sought to develop a sustainable path of economic growth directed by the Haitian government, using a whole of government approach, focusing our long-term assistance efforts on infrastructure improvements, job creation, and food security. Within that framework, Haiti's agriculture, energy, security, and health sectors were emphasized.

The earthquake has not changed the U.S. Government's commitment to Haiti. As the President and Secretary have said, we stand as a partner to the people and Government of Haiti and look forward to working with them as they build a more prosperous future. Our policy framework moving forward will maintain a whole of government approach, in which we support Haiti's development and security needs by means of a sustained, long-term, effort that is fully aligned with the Haitian government's goals and developed in coordination with the international community.

This framework will be reflected in the supplemental request and the March 31 Donor Conference where the goal will be to mobilize international support for Haiti's recovery and redevelopment needs and to begin to lay the foundation for the country's long-term economic growth and development. By means of several pre-conferences that will focus on Haitian citizens, members of the Haitian Diaspora, the private sector, state and local government, and the NGO community, the conference will also incorporate a variety of civil society and non-government views.

Question 14:

What specific measures will State and USAID take to ensure that projects are transparent and participatory, both to international observers and to local Haitians?

Answer:

The Department of State has consulted closely with the Haitian Government, the U.S. Agency for International Development, other government agencies, and the international community on our policy efforts in Haiti since before the January 12 earthquake. Numerous interagency assessment teams were sent to Haiti last summer to determine appropriate sectors on which to focus our policy strategy and a similar interagency strategy is informing the post-earthquake policy review.

In the immediate aftermath of the earthquake, the Department worked with more than 40 international partners, the United Nations, and numerous NGOs, in a swift, coordinated fashion to save and sustain life in Haiti. This gave rise to the most successful search and rescue effort in history as countries from around the world came together in the spirit of common humanity. State and USAID are also working closely with an international shelter cluster that is organized on the ground in Haiti to address the pressing, urgent need to provide shelter to those who lost their homes or for whom the structural integrity of their homes has been compromised.

We have also been working to ensure that the Haitian people, NGO's, members of the Haitian Diaspora, private sector, and state and local governments have a prominent voice in the March 31 International Donors' Conference Towards a New Future for Haiti.

In consultation with the UN's Office of the Special Envoy for Haiti, NGOs, and local community groups the Department helped organize more than 125 focus groups that are expected to reach over 1000 Haitians living in rural and urban areas of Haiti's 10 departments. These groups are soliciting input on reconstruction plans from the local community and will present their findings to the assembled ministers through civil society representatives at the donors conference.

As we move forward, we will continue to work in close coordination with the Haitian Government, USAID, and the international community to develop our long-term strategy in Haiti.

Question 15:

Cuba

Yesterday, February 23, 2010, Rep. Collin Peterson of Minnesota introduced H.R. 4565, the "Travel Restriction Reform and Export Enhancement Act," which would end many of the travel restrictions on Americans who wish to do business, see their families or simply engage in tourism in Cuba and it also expands agricultural exports so that American farmers can someday be the number one exporter of goods to Cuba. I am an original co-sponsor of that legislation.

The American Chamber of Commerce issued a statement in support of the bill and added that the Chamber supports efforts to broaden economic engagement with Cuba in the belief that additional commercial and people-to-people contacts will help advance democracy and the rule of law.

Why does the United States maintain stringent restrictions on travel to Cuba when it does not restrict travel to other countries ruled by communist or authoritarian regimes?

Answer:

The Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act (the "TSRA"), passed by Congress in 2000, restricts the President's authority to authorize certain travel-related transactions to, from, or within Cuba by U.S. persons to twelve specific travel categories. The Executive Branch has some discretion to define the scope of travel-related transactions that fit within those categories and can be licensed. Any activity falling outside of these twelve categories, however, is defined in TSRA as "tourism" and may not be the basis for issuing a license.

Question 16:

Can you tell the committee if the American policy on Cuba helps or hurts the diplomatic efforts of the State Department in Latin America and beyond?

Answer:

In early 2009, the United States indicated its desire to reach out to the Cuban people and its readiness to engage the Cuban government on matters of mutual interest. The White House announced policy changes in April 2009 that lifted restrictions on family visits and remittance, expanded the list of humanitarian items that can be exported to Cuba, and created new opportunities for telecommunications between the U.S. and Cuba. We joined other governments at the OAS General Assembly in San Pedro Sula, June 2009, in approving a resolution that opened a path for Cuba to rejoin the OAS, consistent with the principles, purposes, and practices of the organization and key Inter American instruments such as the Inter American Democratic Charter. We resumed Migration Talks with Cuba in June and initiated talks in September to establish direct mail service between our countries. These measures have been recognized by our partners in the international community as clear signals of our interest in establishing a more constructive relationship with Cuba. We have also held firm to our support for improved human rights conditions and increased respect for fundamental freedoms in Cuba, most recently with regard to the death of prisoner of conscience Orlando Zapata Tamayo. This is consistent with our principled, yet pragmatic approach to our relations with Cuba, which we believe is viewed positively by governments in Latin America and elsewhere.

Response was not available at the time of printing for the following question:

Question 3:**Non-Military Foreign Assistance Budget**

Is it your assessment that the State Department's ongoing Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) will provide a clear picture of the current and future needs to achieve our diplomacy and development goals including the United Nations Millennium Development Goals?

Representative Joe Wilson
Questions for the Record
Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development:
The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget
February 25, 2010

Response from the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State

Question:

Could you please describe the Administration's transition strategy for Iraq, more broadly, and the role of the State Department within that strategy, in particular? Has the State Department developed a written strategy for Iraq transition? If so, would you please provide it to the Committee? If not, would you please provide the Committee at the very least, a written outline.

Answer:

The Administration's strategy is to responsibly end the war through a transition to full Iraqi responsibility; build a lasting partnership with the Iraqi people and government, and support Iraq's productive reintegration into the region.

The broad contours of the U.S. transition strategy have been largely set by the President's Camp Lejeune speech, the U.S. – Iraq Security Agreement, and the U.S. – Iraq Strategic Framework Agreement. The Administration has adopted a "whole of government" approach to the transition. Led by Vice President Biden, the Department of State, Department of Defense, USAID and the rest of the interagency are working together in lock-step to assure a smooth transition. Through a robust interagency committee structure – both here in Washington and in Baghdad – the State Department plays a lead role in determining which tasks currently performed by the U.S. military will transition to the Iraqis, which will transition to State or other civilian agencies, and which tasks will sunset. A separate but closely related committee structure within the Department is actively planning for the future of those tasks that will transition to State.

In addition, starting in May of 2009 and ending in November, the interagency undertook a long-term transition planning process, and determined the programs and capabilities vital for a smooth transition from DoD to the Iraqis, and from DoD to State. The results of this review process are carefully reflected in our FY10 Supplemental and FY11 request.

An interagency team from State, DOD and USAID jointly briefed House and Senate oversight committee staffs and provided a detailed outline on transition planning in early March 2010. We welcome the opportunity to provide this or a more detailed brief to you or your staff, upon request.

Question:

When will INL assume responsibility for the police training program in Iraq? What is the strategy and timeline for this process?

Answer:

The State Department, in partnership with the Government of Iraq (GOI), will assume full responsibility for police training in Iraq on October 1, 2011.

Sustaining the progress that the Iraqi Security Forces have made over the past several years is vital to Iraq's stability and future as a society governed by rule of law and is crucial to achieving a stable, secure, and self-reliant Iraq. The police development program, as it transitions to Department of State management, will shift from a counterinsurgency mission to a civilian police model focusing on community policing. The State-led program will provide senior levels of the Iraqi Police Services and Ministry of Interior with the management, leadership and technical skills to maintain Iraq's internal security and support the rule of law. It will differ considerably from the current police training program, both in size and scope by emphasizing advanced professional, management, and leadership skills over basic training. The GOI has indicated to us that it wants the next phase of training to focus on such higher-order skills. The State-led program is designed to facilitate the transfer of responsibility for the police development mission to the GOI during the next several years.

The State Department is working closely with the Department of Defense to insure a smooth transition of responsibility for the police development program in Iraq. Some of the major milestones in the planning process are:

March 2009 to Present	Ongoing planning for INL program development in conjunction with GOI.
August 2009	Police Development concept approved by Deputies Committee.
November 2009	Established police transition team.
Summer 2010	Obtain GOI commitment for use of property/facilities.
Sum/ Fall 2010	Upon receipt of funding begin aircraft and vehicle procurement and facilities upgrades.
January to July 2011	Senior police program management staff deploy.
August 2011	Facilities upgrades complete.
September 2011	All remaining advisors and police program staff deploy.
October 1, 2011	State assumes responsibility for Iraq police program.

Rep. Shelley Berkley
 Questions for the Record
 Promoting Security through Diplomacy and Development:
 The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget
 February 25, 2010

Responses were not available at the time of printing for the following questions:

Iran – Human Rights

I am deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Iran and efforts to promote democracy there.

- I believe our efforts will need to be extended over the long term, but I understand State Department media grants currently last for two years, after which recipients need to be self-sufficient. Is that a realistic expectation?
- Will the State Department continue to provide funds to help suppress the blockage of Internet access in Iran? How much funding will be going into these programs?

Iran – Nuclear Weapons and Sanctions

The most recent International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) report indicated that Iran has already begun efforts to enrich uranium to a 20 percent level, while its stockpile of low-enriched uranium is well over 4,500 pounds.

- When do you expect to see action by the Security Council on a new Iran resolution?
- Once that vote takes place, when would you expect the sanctions to actually come into place? Once sanctions are actually in place, how long before they actually have an impact?
- If other Security Council members do not support sanctions, what is our alternative strategy?
- What are our next steps if sanctions fail
- Can the U.S. impose sanctions unilaterally to persuade Iran to stop its nuclear program?

In light of Iran's non-responsiveness to our offers of engagement, the Administration has indicated it will pursue sanctions targeted at Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC).

- How optimistic are you that such sanctions can be effective in time to avert Iranian success in achieving nuclear-threshold status and when do you think Iran will achieve that status? How can we be certain that the IRGC will not be able to circumvent such sanctions?

Goldstone Report

I appreciate the Obama Administration's repeated condemnation of the UN Goldstone Report on last year's conflict in Gaza. This report is greatly disturbing and wrongly accuses Israel of deliberately launching attacks on civilians for political purposes. It also fails to recognize that Israel's actions were part of a legitimate response to ongoing rocket and terrorist attacks by Hamas.

- The Goldstone Report is only one example of a broader campaign to delegitimize the State of Israel at the U.N. What are you and the State Department doing to counter these efforts?
- What are you doing to limit the damage done by the Goldstone Report as it is considered in the future?

National Intelligence Estimate on Iran

The U.S. National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) in 2007 claimed Iran stopped its covert nuclear weapons program in 2003. However, the IAEA stated in its most recent report that it had concerns about Iran's nuclear activities, which it believes continued well beyond 2004.

- Does the State Department believe Iran halted its nuclear weapons program in 2003?
- Will there be a new NIE to address these questions?

Iran Sanctions Act

- What actions has the State Department taken to implement the Iran Sanctions Act?
- Specifically, what companies are investing in Iran's petroleum sector, and what sanctions will be applied to them?

Israel-PA

Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas continues to refuse to negotiate with Israel, unless certain preconditions are met.

- What steps are you and Senator Mitchell taking to urge President Abbas to resume negotiations *without preconditions*?
- Do you believe President Abbas has the political will and strength to make the compromises necessary for any peace agreement with Israel?
- We have not heard much about steps the Arab States are taking to promote peace and bolster President Abbas. What should the Arab states be doing and how does that compare with what they are actually doing?
- Some in the Palestinian leadership have called for a strategy of unilaterally declaring a Palestinian state; some in the EU are talking about recognizing such a state. What would the U.S. response be to such an effort?

Turkey

I am concerned about the direction Turkey is heading in. Of late, they have made several disparaging comments about Israel and they excluded Israel from joint naval exercises.

- What is your assessment of Turkey's direction? Are they hoping to integrate more with the Arab world, or are they leaning more toward the western world and the EU in particular?

The U.S. Ambassador to Turkey, James Jeffrey, recently stated in an interview that, Turkey is "a peaceful country. It doesn't invade its neighbors. It has security concerns in Cyprus." As you know, there are more than 40,000 Turkish troops occupying Cyprus.

- Is it U.S. policy that Turkey did not invade Cyprus?
 - Does the State Department believe Turkey has legitimate security interests in Cyprus?
-

Representative Michael T. McCaul
February 25, 2010
The Fiscal Year 2011 International Affairs Budget

Responses were not available at the time of printing for the following questions:

1. In recent months, thousands of Iranians peacefully protested the actions of their government; however, retaliatory use of force by the Iranian regime resulted in hundreds of citizens imprisoned and countless others killed. Today, I am introducing a resolution that expresses my concern over the Government of Iran's continued oppression of its people and which calls on the Administration to take measured action. Support of those interested in a positive change in Iran's government is key, especially as elements of that government are currently supporting insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Iraq, how do you propose to counter Iranian influence, especially as US military forces are drawn down? In Afghanistan, how do the civilian efforts by the State Department and USAID outlined in this budget and in the Afghanistan/Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy work to support US military efforts and address Iranian influence in the region?
2. Historically, we have had difficulty coordinating with the ISI in Pakistan. Although recent captures potentially indicate a stronger commitment to defeating the Taliban, incidents such as preventing direct access to AQ Khan and failing to provide timely intelligence information still hamper cooperation. Given the increase in resources allocated to Pakistan, how will you provide oversight for the management of this funding? What incentives does Pakistan have to use the funds for their intended purposes? Given the historic trust deficit between the US and Pakistan, how do you balance the need to effectively manage these funds against Pakistan's wariness over putting additional conditions on aid?
3. In this budget, there is a dramatic increase in the total assistance to Pakistan that will potentially be channeled through the State Department. Specifically, under this proposed legislation, control of the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund, whose purpose is to provide funds for the training and equipping of the Pakistan military, will be transferred from the Department of Defense to the State Department. Does the State Department have the resources to effectively manage this program? Given that most of the expertise on what is required for this initiative resides within the Department of Defense, specifically CENTCOM, how closely will you consult with DoD?
4. The proposed budget includes a dramatic increase in aid to Yemen, from \$67M in FY2010 to \$109M in FY2011, purportedly to assist with nation building efforts. Given the wide-spread corruption within the government and the internal conflicts, how do you propose we effectively manage this funding? What type of additional support should we expect from our allies in the region, such as Saudi Arabia?
5. The Afghanistan/Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy focuses on putting together a true "whole-of-government" approach to the region. How will the proposed new international executive secretariat balance the need to coordinate the US interagency with its roles and responsibilities of coordinating with our partners and allies? How will this body coordinate both with CENTCOM as well as military commanders on the ground?



[Click here for responses received after printing](#)