

**OVERVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES AND  
BUDGET**

---

---

**HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**  
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

—————  
MARCH 8, 2001  
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

72-227 DTP

WASHINGTON : 2001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana

CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska

GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon

CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming

BILL FRIST, Tennessee

LINCOLN D. CHAFEE, Rhode Island

GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia

SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware

PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin

PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota

BARBARA BOXER, California

ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey

BILL NELSON, Florida

STEPHEN E. BIEGUN, *Staff Director*

EDWIN K. HALL, *Democratic Staff Director*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Feingold, Hon. Russell D., U.S. Senator from Wisconsin, prepared statement ..	30
Powell, Hon. Colin L., Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC .....	3
Prepared statement .....	10
Responses to additional questions submitted for the record by:	
Senator Jesse Helms .....	36
Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr. ....	43
Senator Russell D. Feingold .....	45
Senator Paul Wellstone .....	46
Statement submitted for the record:	
The Fourth Freedom Forum .....	35



## OVERVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES AND BUDGET

---

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2001

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:35 a.m. in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Jesse Helms (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Helms, Lugar, Hagel, Thomas, Frist, Brownback, Biden, Sarbanes, Kerry, Feingold, and Torricelli.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order, and I wish we had a larger hearing room, because there are at least as many people outside as are inside, so you know how to draw a crowd, Mr. Secretary.

Having said that, we welcome you, of course, for this morning's meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and this meeting is your first appearance before the committee as Secretary of State. We are pleased and honored to have you with us.

Now, we hope that you will always feel at home here and that you will visit with us often, not only when we ask you to come, but whenever you have something to say to Congress and the American people. So the door will always be open.

Before we turn to you for your testimony, there is one issue that I hope you will address while you are with us, and that is, reforming foreign aid. First, the Agency for International Development [USAID] must be folded into the State Department directly under the control of your own good self, the Secretary of State.

Second, there must be a significant cut in the size and cost of the foreign aid bureaucracy, and I will leave it to you to decide how much.

Third, we must take every penny we save by cutting bureaucracy and invest it in a new international development foundation charged with delivering block grants to private and faith-based charities that are saving lives all around the world, and finally, we must match those savings dollar for dollar with an increased U.S. investment in the work of these relief organizations, and specifically, Mr. Secretary, I pledge to you this morning that for every dollar we take out of bureaucratic overhead, I personally will support a matching dollar increase in U.S. assistance delivered through these private and faith-based charities.

In other words, every \$1 that is cut from the bureaucracy will translate into \$2 in real relief for the neediest people in this world.

Now, if you reduce the size of the bureaucracy by 5 percent, I personally will help you fight for a 5 percent increase in U.S. assistance. If you reduce the bureaucracy by 10 percent, I will champion a 10-percent increase, and 15 percent, and on down the line. Mr. Secretary, let me put it this way. If you want to see how far I will go in working with you, just test me.

In any case, Mr. Secretary, I hope that I can have your commitment today to work with this committee to reform the way that we have been delivering so wastefully foreign aid in the past.

Senator BIDEN. Excuse me. I'm sorry.

I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I join you in welcoming Secretary Powell. Secretary Powell, I just want you to know that you have knowledgeable people hopefully in front of you, but you also have Mrs. Sarbanes sitting behind you, so she is more knowledgeable than we are, so I just wanted—I just embarrassed her—but I welcome you here.

Last week, the President submitted his budget, Mr. Secretary, his budget outline, I should be more precise, to Congress. A more detailed budget is still to come, and based on what we know so far, I must tell you I am disappointed with the international affairs budget. It provides only a modest increase in real terms over fiscal year 2001, and it is below the levels provided for fiscal year 1999 and 2000.

During your confirmation hearing, Mr. Secretary, you made clear your belief that you did not have enough resources to accomplish your mission. Now, I acknowledge that you are just getting underway, and there is a lot you have to get in place, but I want you to know that you have not only raised my expectations, but I think you raised, in your first meetings with your colleagues at the State Department, their expectations as to how significant an increase may be forthcoming to do some of the very basic things that have to be done at State to modernize it.

As you well know, you have been put in the dubious position by the press and both parties as being the guy who is going to be able to deliver like no other Secretary could for your folks over at State, so I realize you are in a bit of a tough position. I am glad to see the increase, but I am concerned that the funding levels in the budget may be insufficient to strengthen our diplomatic readiness.

I think it is a delusion to believe that we can protect our numerous interests overseas with a diplomatic infrastructure that is second-rate—I am not talking about the people. I am talking about the infrastructure—and assistance programs that are underfunded.

As you continue to develop your priorities, I strongly urge you to seek additional funding for the Department and international programs that you need, notwithstanding the fact that you may not be able to get them. I realize every Cabinet Secretary has that difficulty, but we are counting on you to make the best case possible for the needs of the Department.

I hope you can spend a few minutes this morning reporting on your recent trip, although I know that is not the primary purpose of your visit here today. In particular, I am interested in hearing your ideas about reenergizing sanctions against Iraq.

We also must keep the world focused on the key threat, Saddam's effort to acquire weapons of mass destruction, and that can again and are likely to threaten our neighbors.

I particularly welcome your assurance to our NATO partners. I have had more calls than I can tell you, including a visit from Lord Robertson yesterday, to tell me how pleased everyone was with your comment, that we went in together and we will come out together. I think that goes a long, long way to reassuring our NATO allies of our steadfastness and our commitment.

Finally, let me say a quick word about the current visit of South Korean President Kim, who is the author of the engagement strategy and is slowing opening up North Korea. I must tell you, I was somewhere between puzzled and disappointed by what the reports of the meeting with the President were yesterday, particularly in light of what I read your statements—that you were taking a positive but not naive look at what possibilities there may be.

If President Kim was correctly quoted, or paraphrased, he said he thinks there is a window of opportunity that is open now that will not stay open very long. As I have said in response to inquiries from the press, I am not sure what is on the other side of that window. I am not sure that we want what is on the other side of the window, but I am quite sure that we should look through the window.

So I hope that if you have an opportunity, again, today—there is a lot on your plate here, but I hope you get an opportunity to maybe—clarify is the wrong word, explain to us what President Bush, if you are able to, meant by his statement yesterday that there be no immediate—and I emphasize, I, maybe because I want to convince myself, look to the word immediate as the operative word, but I may be wrong, no immediate interfacing with North Korea.

But if you have time, I would like you to—you may be able to respond to that in the question and answer period.

But again, I welcome you, look forward to working with you. As the Senator said to you, I think you can count on both sides of this panel, Democrats and Republicans to, once you conclude what you need, to help you fight for the resources you believe you need at State to do the job I think we all think we need to do.

Thank you very much, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary.

**STATEMENT OF HON. COLIN L. POWELL, SECRETARY OF STATE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Secretary POWELL. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Senator Biden for your welcome. It is good to be back before the committee, this time as the Secretary of State, and I thank you for the prompt consideration of my nomination just a few short weeks ago.

I have been the Secretary of State for 5½ weeks. I must admit, it is beginning to feel like 5½ months, if not 5½ years, as I have begun to deal with the tasks before me, and I am also pleased that you will be dealing with the other nominees for the Department of State in a prompt manner, as those nominees come up to you. It is still a little lonely down there at the State Department, Mr.

Chairman, but I am looking forward to a great team joining me in the very, very near future.

I, too, look forward to the opportunity on a regular basis to come before the committee and to share my thoughts on the policies of the Bush administration, and to answer any questions you may have and, of course, I am at your disposal at any time, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, and look forward to seeing you individually and in different aggregations and not just in the form of hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I fully take aboard what you said with respect to USAID. I remember vividly our previous conversation on this. Early on, the second week of my tenure as the Secretary of State, I went over to USAID and with the entire staff sat and talked and began the process of understanding how they were operating, making it clear to them that changes would be coming.

I put in place an aggressive transition team, which is still over there working, and I am waiting for their report back on what directions we ought to move into, and I made sure I understood your interest in this particular matter, and said to the whole USAID team that I have been given an offer from Senator Helms as to how we can get more resources for these vital programs of ours if we show movement toward efficiency, toward reducing bureaucracy, and toward making better use of the nongovernmental organizations, especially faith-based sorts of organizations that are available to us.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we have all that underway. As you know, the President has expressed his intention to nominate Mr. Andrew Natsios to be the next Director of the USAID. He brings a great deal of experience and a great deal of leadership ability and skill to this task and, in my conversations with Andy, I made it clear to him that I wanted him to be a change agent in order to make sure that we are doing the best job for the American people, and the people of the world, with the money that Congress is providing us to use through the U.S. Agency for International Development.

So I look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee, and the Congress, on this issue, and I wrote down very, very carefully the deal that we just talked about, one for one. It is going to be a lot more than one for one, and we will look forward to that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Biden, I thank you for your comment on resources. This budget submission is far from the end of the game. It is the beginning. In the short period of time we had to make adjustments to the budget submission, I think that the State Department did rather well, with a 5-percent overall increase in the account and the function, and with about a 15-percent increase in the Commerce, State, Justice piece of the account, which gives us the operational money we need to run the Department, and so I think we are off to a good start.

But I am not fearful at this point that I am going to fail the expectations that you have of me, sir, or that the Department has of me, because I think President Bush also has expectations that we will do better, and that he will help us do better in future budgets.

The outyears are a source of concern, and we will deal with that as we get into the next budget cycle, and I am confident I will be



able to make the case that will generate more resources from within the President's budget, and that I can come up in future hearings and talk about a higher level of resources for the Department.

I think before going into a very short version of my prepared statement, I would like to talk to some of the foreign policy issues that Senator Biden raised, because for the most part I am here to talk about the budget, but of course we can talk about any issues that members wish to talk about.

Let me start with Iraq. Iraq and the situation in Iraq was the principal purpose of my trip throughout the Persian Gulf and Middle East area the week before last. When we took over on the 20th of January, I discovered that we had an Iraq policy that was in disarray, and the sanctions part of that policy was not just in disarray, it was falling apart. We were losing support for the sanctions regime that had served so well over the last 10 years, with all of the ups and downs and all of the difficulties that are associated with that regime. It was falling apart.

It had been successful. Saddam Hussein has not been able to rebuild his army, notwithstanding claims that he has. He has fewer tanks in his inventory today than he had 10 years ago. Even though we know he is working on weapons of mass destruction, we know he has things squirreled away, at the same time, we have not seen the capacity emerge to present a full-fledged threat to us. So I think credit has to be given to the United Nations and to the Perm 5 and to the nations in the region for putting in place a regime that has kept him pretty much in check.

What I found on the 20th of January, however, was that regime was collapsing. More and more nations were saying, let's just get rid of the sanctions, let's not worry about inspectors, just forget it. There was all kinds of leakage from the frontline states, whether it was through Syria, through Jordan, through Turkey, or down through the Persian Gulf with the smuggling of oil, and so what I felt we had to do was to start taking a look at these sanctions, remember what they were oriented on in the first place, and remember that with respect to the sanctions—let's call that basket No. 1. That is what the United Nations does. It has nothing to do with regime change. That is U.S. policy. That U.S. policy, that let us put in basket No. 2, the no-fly zone, or in basket No. 3, Iraqi opposition activities.

My immediate concern was basket No. 1, the U.N. basket and how it was falling apart, and it seemed to me the first thing we had to do was to change the nature of the debate. We were being accused and we were taking on the burden of hurting Iraqi people, hurting Iraqi children, and we needed to turn that around.

The purpose of these sanctions was to go after weapons of mass destruction. That is what they were put in place for in the first instance, back at the end of the gulf war, so let us start talking about how the Iraqi regime is threatening children, their own children and the children of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and Syria and all over the region, how they were a danger, in danger of what Saddam Hussein was doing, and take away the argument he was using against us.

In order to make sure that that carried forward, we then had to take a look at the sanctions themselves. Were they being used to

go after weapons of mass destruction, and was that the way they were connected to our original goals, or increasingly, were those sanctions starting to look as if they were hurting the Iraqi people.

And it seems to me one approach to this was to go to those sanctions and eliminate those items in the sanctions regime that really were of civilian use, and benefited people, and focus them exclusively on weapons of mass destruction and items that could be directed toward the development of weapons of mass destruction.

I carried that message around the region, and I found that our Arab friends in the region, as well as members of the Perm 5 in the United Nations, as well as a number of my colleagues in NATO, found this to be a very attractive approach, and that we should continue down this line. And so we are continuing down this line that says, let's see if there is a better way to use these sanctions to go after weapons of mass destruction and take away the argument we have given him that we are somehow hurting the Iraqi people.

He is hurting the Iraqi people, not us. There is more than enough money available to the regime now to take care of the needs they have. No more money comes in as a result of the change to this new kind of sanctions policy, but there is greater flexibility for the regime if they choose to use that flexibility to take care of the needs of its people.

How do we get out of this regime ultimately? The inspectors have to go back in. If he wants to get out of this, if he wants to regain control of the oil for food escrow accounts, the only way that can happen is for the inspectors to go back in. But rather than us begging him to let the inspectors in, the burden is now on him. We control the money. We will continue to restrict weapons of mass destruction. You no longer have an argument, Mr. Iraqi Regime, that we are hurting your people. You let the inspectors in and we can start to get out of this.

If the inspectors get in, do their job, we are satisfied with their first look at things, maybe we can suspend the sanctions, and then at some point, way in the future, when we are absolutely satisfied there are no such weapons around, then maybe we can consider lifting, but that is a long way in the future.

So this was not an effort to ease the sanctions. This was an effort to rescue the sanctions policy that was collapsing. We discovered that we were in an airplane that was heading to a crash, and what we have done and what we are trying to do is to pull it out of that dive and put it on an altitude that is sustainable, bring the coalition back together.

As part of this approach to the problem, we would also make sure that the Iraqi regime understood that we reserve the right to strike militarily any activity out there, any facility we find that is inconsistent with our obligations to get rid of such weapons of mass destruction.

That takes care of the U.N. piece. On the no-fly zone, we are reviewing our policies to see if we are operating those in the most effective way possible and, with respect to the Iraqi opposition activities, we are supporting those. Our principal avenue of support is with the Iraqi National Congress, and last week I released more money of the money that had been made available to us by the

Congress, released more of that money for their activities, and we are looking at what more we can support and what other opposition activities are available that we might bring into this strategy of regime change.

And so I think it is a comprehensive, full review, to bring the coalition back together, put the burden on the Iraqi regime, keep focused on what is important, weapons of mass destruction, and keep him isolated and make sure that he is contained, and hopefully the day will come when circumstances will allow, permit, or it will happen with Iraq we see a regime change that will be better for the world.

And so I would hope that the members of the committee will examine this approach as we develop it further, and I hope that you will find the basis upon which you can support it.

Senator Biden also mentioned NATO. I am very pleased that we have solid relations with NATO. There were some irritants in the relationship, and I think those have been taken care of.

With respect to the President's meeting with Kim Dae Jung yesterday, I think it was a very good meeting. They had a good exchange of views. The President expressed his support for President Kim Dae Jung's efforts to open North Korea. It is a regime that is despotic. It is broken. We have no illusions about this regime. We have no illusions about the nature of the gentleman who runs North Korea. He is a despot, but he is also sitting on a failed society that has to somehow begin opening if it is not to collapse. Once it is opened, it may well collapse anyway.

And so we support what President Kim Dae Jung is doing. At the same time, we have expressed in the strongest possible terms, and President Bush did it in the strongest possible terms yesterday, our concerns about their efforts toward development of weapons of mass destruction and the proliferation of such weapons and missiles and other materials to other nations, not only in the region, but around the world, a major source of proliferation.

As we look at the elements of the negotiation that the previous administration had left behind, there are some things there that are very promising. What was not there was a monitoring and verification regime of the kind that we would have to have in order to move forward in negotiations with such a regime.

And so what the President was saying yesterday is that we are going to take our time, we are going to put together a comprehensive policy and in due course, at a time and at a place of our choosing, we will decide and determine how best to engage with the North Korean regime, but it was a good meeting, and I think the two Presidents had a very candid exchange of views, and we look forward to more exchanges of views with the South Koreans as we move forward, as well as with the Japanese, so we can move forward together, even though we may be on separate tracks from time to time.

Mr. Chairman, I will stop there on foreign policy issues and just briefly touch on what we are trying to do in this budget. As you know, there are many ways that the President engages in foreign policy, sometimes it is meetings such as he held yesterday with President Kim Dae Jung, or meetings he has held with President Fox and held with Prime Minister Chretien of Canada.

Sometimes it is sending the Secretary of State whizzing around the world, seven countries in 4 days. That gets a lot of news. But the real work of foreign policy is not accomplished just by Presidents or by Secretaries of State. It is done by the thousands and thousands of dedicated Americans who have signed up to serve in the Foreign Service, to serve as civil servants, to serve as Foreign Service nationals, for those who are not Americans, representing us around the world, and it is theirs that is the daily grind of foreign policy, punctuated by the occasional thrill and excitement of a diplomatic success.

And their activities range from the minor to the sublime, from the courteous handling of a visa application, to the inking of a treaty limiting arms control, or limiting conventional arms in Europe, and I am saying to you, Mr. Chairman, something that you and the members of the committee already know. There are no finer groups of Americans anywhere in the world who represent our interests as well, and it is our obligation to give them the resources they need.

I have seen how we try to take care of our military folks. I mentioned this to you at the last hearing, how places like Camp Bondsteel look so great when you go over to the Balkans. We ought to make sure that all of our State Department facilities look as great as those military facilities, and I think the budget that we have presented to you, with the increases that are proposed, start moving us in that direction.

We are making strides in classified information technology. We are making sure that our people have access to the Internet. We are doing all we can to get a handle on energy, on embassy construction. We are especially grateful to a former member of this committee, Senator Grams, for his part in conceiving the 5-year authorization of embassy funds.

I am very pleased that 2½ years after the bombings in Kenya and Tanzania we are well on our way to reestablishing our presence there. We have other embassies that are state-of-the-art that are coming up out of the ground now, so we have a lot going on, but I think we could do a better job of managing our embassy construction program.

It is for that reason that I went out and tried to find one of the best persons I could find, expert in this, to come in and help me in the Department. I have acquired the services of a retired Major General in the United States Army, surprise, surprise, but retired Major General Chuck Williams, Charles E. Williams is from the Corps of Engineers. He built Fort Drum, New York. He built the Dulles Greenway out here, not far from here. He has brought projects to life all over the world, and he knows this business, and he is coming in to serve as the new head of our Foreign Buildings Office.

I am going to move it out from under its current location so that it can have more direct reporting responsibility to me and to the Under Secretary for Management, and General Williams' instructions are, get out there, find out what we need to fix the management of this account, and we want to get rid of the bureaucracy, we want to find private ways of doing things. This is a first step toward perhaps ultimately going in the direction of the Kaden

Commission recommendation, which would move it entirely out of the Department.

I am not there yet. We have got a long way to go, but this, I think, is an aggressive first step in showing the kind of leadership I want the Department to see that we have identified a problem in that operation, went out and got a leader who is skilled, not just a political appointee, but somebody who knows how to get this job done, given him the political mandate to do it, and I am sure that General Williams will do a good job that will make us all proud.

So Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of thing we are doing, the kind of thing we are going to do to get our information infrastructure fixed, to make sure that 30,000 desks throughout the State Department are wired for unclassified access to the Internet. This budget will do that, and then we will start working on classified access to the Internet.

We are going to make sure that our people are state-of-the-art. We are going to make sure that if an ambassador somewhere out there needs to get something from the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, he is not going to wait for something to be faxed or mailed to him, he is going to be able to bring it out of the ether online instantaneously, as he needs it.

We are going to get into the state-of-the-art with the State Department. Mr. Chairman, I want our people to be supported as well as all of our soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines, and we are going to make sure that happens in the years ahead.

The President's budget also provides money to hire a number of new Foreign Service officers. We are below the number we need to get the job done. One of the things we are going to do with this new budget is to create a float. We do not have a float in the Department. We always are robbing Peter to pay Paul when a new mission comes along.

I need a float, just as we had in the military, so people can go to training, so that there is always a little reserve capacity where people can go off to school and get the additional skills they need without us vacating a position somewhere in an embassy or an important office here in Washington, and so we are going to increase the number of Foreign Service officers. We are going to create a float so that they can get the training that they need.

And you are going to see, Mr. Chairman, that the budget also provides for the kinds of things that really advance our foreign policy, programs aimed at restoring peace, building democracy, and civil societies, safeguarding human rights, tackling nonproliferation and counterterrorism challenges, addressing global health and environmental issues, responding to disasters, and promoting economic reform.

The budget expands counterdrug alternative development and government reform programs in the Andean region. It helps provide military assistance to Israel to meet cash-flow needs. It will fund all of the scheduled payments that are due in 2002 to the multilateral development banks, and the United States commitment to the heavily indebted poor countries. It increases funding for migration and refugee assistance, for HIV/AIDS, one of the biggest problems facing the world today, trafficking in women, basic education for children.

And with respect to trafficking in women and children, let me take this opportunity to thank Senator Brownback for his work in this effort and for the amendment that you offered last year, Senator, that was successful and added \$10 million in economic support funds for efforts in Sudan to protect civilians from attacks and from slave trades.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget for 2002 also provides money to support peacekeeping operations, supports political and economic transitions in Africa, with emphasis on countries such as Nigeria and South Africa.

As I go into these sorts of programs, I am going to be trying to invest in those countries that have made the necessary changes that put them on the path of democracy and the free enterprise system, and not keep propping up despots who will not move in the right direction. The cold war is over. We do not need to prop up those kinds of institutions in countries any longer.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a budget that moves in the direction of freedom and democracy and supporting those efforts. It will help to reduce the risks presented by international terrorism. It will help halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction by providing stronger international safeguards on civilian nuclear activity. We are also going to increase funding for the Peace Corps, and I know Senator Dodd has a particular interest in that.

And as I noted earlier, we are also going to provide additional money, not for Plan Colombia, per se, but to regionalize our activities so that Plan Colombia just does not become a snapshot, but it is part of a broader strategy for the region.

Mr. Chairman, I can also say to you that I am going to work hard to carve out needless layers within the State Department. I know that the committee has intense interest in organizational activities and streamlining activities in the Department, and I am going to be on top of that, but I think that all begins with leadership. It begins with putting a team together. It begins with communicating throughout the Department that we are a team. We are going to be linked together on the basis of trust.

When you have got that all going, Mr. Chairman, then you can start to make the organizational changes that I think will be needed and are needed to make sure that the Department is relevant to the needs of the Nation and the needs of the world in the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, let me stop there. I will provide the whole statement for the record, with your permission, and now I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Powell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. COLIN L. POWELL, SECRETARY OF STATE

"FUNCTION 150 OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002"

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am pleased to be back before you so soon after our last hearing in January—and this time in support of President Bush's budget request for FY 2002.

I know that it is the custom to use this particular hearing not only to discuss the President's budget but also to have the Secretary of State present, as Chairman Helms described it last year, "the annual around-the-world state of our nation's foreign affairs."

But since we did a great deal of that in our January hearing, and since I warned you in that hearing that as soon as I got the details together to support budget testimony, you would see me again, I want to use my opening statement to focus on the budget.

I know that you will want to ask questions of me with respect to President Bush's foreign policy and I will be pleased to answer them for you when I can and get for you any answers when I cannot. But for my opening statement I would like to concentrate on a matter very dear to me and, I know, very dear to you—the dollars for State Department operations particularly, and for Function 150 in general.

Mr. Chairman, in January I not only told you to expect my return with respect to budget matters. I also told you that President Bush would be a leader who faithfully represents to the world the ideas of freedom and justice and open markets.

The President has many ways he can do this, many different methods through which he can show the world the values of America and the prosperity and peace those values can generate. His recent personal visit to Mexico to talk with President Fox is one of those methods.

Working out the means of cooperation and trade with a neighbor such as Mexico, however complex and difficult some of the underlying issues may be, is an undertaking full of promise for the future. President Bush knows how important such foreign policy efforts are and that is why we went to see President Fox.

And, as you know, I returned just last week from visits to Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the West Bank, as well as to Brussels on my way home to participate in a meeting of the North Atlantic Council and to talk with some of my counterparts in Europe.

As you also may know, I was able to have a talk with Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov as well, while I was in Cairo.

Such trips by his Secretary of State are another of the methods the President has at his disposal to represent American values and interests in the councils of state around the world.

But the most important method by which the President presents America to the world, the most important method by far, is through the thousands of people who labor away at such representation every day of the week in almost every country in the world.

I am of course speaking of our front line troops in the State Department, as well as those here in America who support them.

I am talking about the Foreign Service officers, the Civil Service employees, and the Foreign Service nationals who make up the Department of State.

Theirs is the daily drudgery of foreign policy, punctuated by the thrill and excitement of diplomatic success ranging from the minor to the sublime, from the courteous handling of a visa application to the inking of a treaty limiting conventional arms in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, there are no finer people chipping away at tyranny, loosening the bonds of poverty, pushing the cause of freedom and peace, on the U.S. Government payroll.

And it is a mystery to me how they have continued to do it over the years with so little resources.

In my confirmation hearing with this committee I mentioned Camp Bondsteel in Kosovo where our GIs are stationed. As you know, it is a superb, first-class facility put in overnight to make sure that our troops are taken care of. But as many of you also know—Senator Biden for example—if you visited some of our dilapidated embassies and other facilities in the region, you would wonder whether the same government was taking care of them. The same bald eagle is clutching the arrows and the olive branch, but in many of State's buildings that American eagle is very ill-housed.

Also at Camp Bondsteel there are excellent capabilities with respect to information technology, including the capability to send unclassified e-mails. In many of State's facilities there were no such capabilities.

Now since the time that construction was begun on Camp Bondsteel, with the help of this committee and of the Congress as a whole, and with the good work of former Secretary Albright and her dedicated people, we have made great strides in our unclassified information technology at State.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and all the members on this committee, for what you have done to get this process started.

Many of you were active in helping to steer the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Act—our authorizing legislation and an important counterpart to the later appropriations bill—through the committee process and ultimately to floor passage.

That legislation was an important start to what needs to be done with respect to the State Department's budget.

My hope is that, in the first year of the Bush administration, you will work with us to continue this good progress we have made, and to see that our operations and our foreign affairs are put back in balance with everything else we do in the world.

For example, now that we have made such strides in our *unclassified* information technology, we have to continue that progress by gaining broad-based Internet access. At the same time, we have to begin work to create *classified* Local Area Network capabilities, to include e-mail and word-processing.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know some of our embassies in addition to lacking up-to-date information technology, are not as secure as they should be—and so we have *people* who are not as secure as they should be.

But again thanks to the House and Senate's attention to this matter, we are beginning to get a handle on it.

We are especially grateful to a former member of this committee, Senator Grams, for his part in conceiving the five-year authorization of funds for embassy construction and to all the members of this committee for your hard work to begin to correct the years of neglect of our embassy infrastructure.

I understand that when the FY 99 emergency supplemental was being put together, we did not have the sort of robust buildings program that was needed to meet security needs. We had to prove that we could ramp up to such a program and then manage it.

Let me just say that in the two and a half years since the bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, we are well on the way to doing just that.

We provided an immediate stand-up of facilities in Dar Es Salaam and Nairobi and within 12 months replaced each with more secure interim facilities that will be in place until the new replacement facilities are finished.

We broke ground on those permanent facilities in August.

Likewise, we just completed construction in Kampala, Uganda and our people have moved in just 15 months after construction began.

We will also move into a new embassy in Doha, Qatar in early June of this year.

Other new construction projects where we have broken ground include Zagreb, Istanbul, and Tunis.

Ground-breaking for Abu Dhabi will occur this spring.

In addition, we've funded over 1,200 individual perimeter security upgrades with over 50 percent now completed.

But we are still not moving quickly enough nor efficiently enough.

And I want to work with you and the other Members of Congress to gain your confidence so that we can move faster and eliminate some of the barriers that cost money to overcome.

In that regard, we are carefully studying construction costs.

I know that we can do better in adapting the best practices of industry and smart engineering techniques and technologies to embassy construction.

The hundred-foot set-back, for example, can sometimes be overcome by better and smarter construction.

Blast protection remains the same but the dollar costs are significantly lower because acquisition of land is exorbitantly expensive. If we can provide the same degree of security through a better built wall that has only, say, a fifty-foot set-back, then that's what we are going to do.

And we believe better overall management is also achievable so that construction delays don't eat up precious more dollars.

Better overall management includes bringing on board an experienced operations executive to manage the Overseas Facilities Program, as recommended by the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel. It also includes realigning the Foreign Buildings Office from within the Bureau of Administration to a stand-alone organization reporting directly to the Undersecretary for Management—requiring of course consultation with the Congress. And I hope I'll have your support on that.

The combination of strong leadership, realignment of the function, and an industry panel to assist with identifying best practices from the private sector, along with implementation of other OPAP recommendations, will greatly improve the management of the overseas buildings program.

I have asked one of the Army's finest engineers, retired Major General Charles Williams, to head this effort. He is an expert at reducing costs while delivering high quality and I've no doubt he will offer us new ways to execute and to manage our embassy construction.

As a result, we may be able to reduce that hundred-million-dollar price tag on new embassy construction. I am committed to working with you and the appropriators on this issue.



Mr. Chairman, in the past we have not in all cases done the best we could to see that our overseas personnel were as secure as they should be—but together, you and I can change that. Together, we can continue this very positive effort we have begun to pull the State Department into the 21st century.

And that is what we are after in the President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2002—to continue this very positive forward momentum.

The President's request of about \$23.9 billion—a five-percent increase over this year—will do just that.

We are providing increased funding, for example, toward our steadfast commitment to the safety of our men and women serving overseas.

These dollars will allow us to continue to address our infrastructure needs including the construction of new, secure facilities and the continuing refurbishment of existing ones.

These dollars also provide the means to improve security operations—including the hiring of additional security officers who are essential to the prevention and deterrence of terrorist attacks against our embassies, such as those that occurred in Nairobi and in Dar Es Salaam.

We will not be deterred by such attacks from doing our job in the world—but we will take measures to protect our people.

The President's budget also provides funds for modernizing—and in some cases acquiring for the first time—the required information technology for the conduct of foreign affairs.

These dollars will allow us to modernize our secure Local Area Network capability, including e-mail and word-processing. Likewise, they will allow us to provide open access channels to the Internet so that our people can take full advantage of this enormously important new means of communication and research. This access will also increase communications and information sharing within the foreign affairs community.

Mr. Chairman, this development alone has the potential to revolutionize the way we do business.

Take for example the great products turned out by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, or "FBIS" as we call it.

No longer will an ambassador or political or economic officer in one of our embassies have to wait for the bound copies to arrive by courier or mail at his desk or office, often delaying the hottest, most recent news.

Switching on the computer, accessing the Internet, and clicking on the FBIS account puts the latest news from in-country and regional newspapers and periodicals at your fingertips almost instantly.

Similarly, clicking onto your e-mail account allows you to query any subject matter expert in the system as swiftly and securely as modern technology permits.

When I arrived in the Transition Office at State in December of last year, the first thing I put on the table behind my desk was my computer with access to my e-mail account.

I didn't want to be out of touch for an instant.

We are talking of course about unclassified communications. But unclassified communications are a considerable part of our everyday routine.

As you know, we need secure methods of communications also. And with the President's budget we will continue installing these secure methods everywhere we need them.

The Department of State intends to exploit fully the ongoing technology and information revolutions.

Our long-term investment strategy and ongoing acquisition of new technology will continue to address the many information needs of our foreign policy professionals.

I have personally committed to this transformation and the President's budget for 2002 is the next step toward fulfilling that commitment.

I have also personally committed to reinvigorating the Foreign Service—an arm of our professional public service apparatus every bit as important as the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard.

To do this, we need to hire more of America's brightest and most talented young people who are committed to service.

And we will only be successful if we change how we recruit, assess, and hire Foreign Service officers. And we are doing that. We also need to be smarter about how we market the State Department if we are to win the fight for talent.

Funding alone will not solve our human resource challenges. We must create a place of work that can compete with our higher paying private sector competitors for the very best young people America has to offer.

And I assure you we will, by providing a career that rewards innovation, recognizes achievement, and demands accountability and excellence. With your help we

will win the fight for talent and that victory will be reflected every day in America's foreign policy.

The President's budget provides the dollars to hire a significant number of new Foreign Service officers so we can establish a training float—a group of FSOs that will begin to relieve some of the terrible pressures put on the conduct of America's foreign policy by the considerable shortage of FSOs we are currently experiencing.

Mr. Chairman, there are other areas of the President's budget that I want to highlight in addition to embassy security, construction and refurbishment; information technology; and hiring of new people for the Foreign Service.

These are the program areas that must be funded to advance America's foreign policy interests overseas—the backbone of our foreign affairs.

These are programs aimed at restoring peace, building democracy and civil societies, safeguarding human rights, tackling non-proliferation and counter-terrorism challenges, addressing global health and environment issues, responding to disasters, and promoting economic reform.

For example, the budget expands counterdrug, alternative development, and government reform programs in the Andean region.

The budget provides for military assistance to Israel to help meet cash flow needs for procurement of U.S. defense systems, and to demonstrate our solid commitment to Israel's security.

The budget fully funds all 2002 scheduled payments to the Multilateral Development Banks and the U.S. commitment to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries debt reduction initiative.

The budget increases funding for Migration and Refugee Assistance—to give crucial and life-sustaining support to refugees and victims of conflict throughout the world.

The budget reflects the Bush administration's leadership in promoting the protection of human rights, for example, in combating impunity for crimes against humanity in Sierra Leone.

The budget increases resources for combating global HIV/AIDS and trafficking in women and children, and for basic education for children.

With respect to trafficking in women and children, let me take this opportunity to thank you, Senator Brownback, for the amendment you offered in Senate debate last year, an amendment that was successful and that added ten million dollars in Economic Support Funds for efforts in the Sudan to protect civilians from attacks and from slave raids.

And I would also like to note that today, March 8, is International Women's Day, a day set aside to honor women for their extraordinary achievements and important contributions to family, society, country, and the world.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget for 2002 also provides money to support peacekeeping operations around the world, such as those in Bosnia and in Kosovo.

The budget also supports political and economic transitions in Africa, with emphasis on those countries, such as Nigeria and South Africa, that have a direct bearing on our national security and on those countries that have demonstrated progress in economic reform and in building democracy.

Building democracy and civil societies remains a top priority of this administration, so our budget also supports short- and long-term programs to support democratic elements in countries where alternative voices are silenced. Toward this end, the budget increases funding for U.S. international broadcasting to support the free flow of information by providing accurate information on world and local events to audiences abroad.

It also sustains our efforts to remove landmines in former war-ravaged countries—landmines that kill and maim children and innocent civilians.

The budget supports our efforts to reduce risks posed by international terrorism, and to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction by supporting stronger international safeguards on civilian nuclear activity and by helping other countries to improve their controls on exports of potentially dangerous technology.

The budget also provides increased funding for the Peace Corps. And I want to thank Senator Dodd, not only for your past service in the Corps, sir, but for your help last year in pushing through the amendment that secured an increase in funding for the Peace Corps—an increase that was important enough so that, in conference, the amount was increased even further.

The Peace Corps is another group of bright and talented individuals committed to public service. There are more than 7,000 volunteers around the world, addressing a variety of challenges in agriculture, education, small business, the environment, and health matters.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my prepared statement, let me call your attention to several areas upon which I want to place a special emphasis.

In addition to what I have already highlighted with respect to the money for the Andean region, you know that much of that money is directed at Plan Colombia.

We are asking for money to continue and expand programs begun with the 1.3 billion dollar emergency supplemental in FY 2000.

Colombia is the source or transit point of 90 percent of the cocaine and over 50 percent of the heroin that arrives in America. Those percentages are increasing, by the way.

Neighboring countries, such as Bolivia and Peru, have conducted effective coca eradication programs, but maintaining their successes will require vigilance and U.S. support.

The Bush administration believes strongly that any successful counterdrug strategy in the region must include funding to bring greater economic and political stability to the region and a peaceful resolution to Colombia's internal conflict.

We must capitalize on the ground work of programs funded thus far, including the expansion of Andean eradication and interdiction programs, sustained alternative development programs, and continued attention to justice and government reform initiatives.

In addition, the President's budget requests funding for Ecuador, Brazil, Venezuela, and Panama, to strengthen their efforts to control drug production and the drug trade. Our efforts must be regional in scope and this money keeps them so.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to emphasize our efforts to de-layer the bureaucracy at State to promote a more effective and efficient organization for the conduct of our foreign policy.

We have begun an initiative to empower line officers—the true experts in most areas—and use their expertise to streamline decision-making and to increase accountability.

The current organization sometimes complicate lines of authority within the Department and hinders the development and presentation of a coherent foreign policy, and thus mars its effectiveness.

I ask your help on this serious matter. When I want to carve out needless and even hurtful pieces of the current organization, I will need your support. I won't do it unless I am certain it is necessary, but when I do it I will look for your assistance and backing.

I feel very strongly about this effort. Throughout the last 4 years I have seen up close and personal how American business has streamlined itself. This streamlining is sometimes ruthless; it is sometimes hard; it is almost always necessary. We need to do the same thing at the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, consistent with the effort to reduce subsidies that primarily benefit corporations rather than individuals, our budget for international affairs will include savings in credit subsidy funding for the Export-Import Bank.

As you know, the Export-Import Bank provides export credits, in the forms of direct loans or loan guarantees, to U.S. exporters who meet basic eligibility requirements and who request the Bank's help.

The President's budget proposes savings of about 25 percent in the Bank's credit subsidy requirements through policy changes that focus the Bank on U.S. exporters who truly cannot access private financing, as well as through lower estimates of international risk in 2002.

These changes could include a combination of increased risk-sharing with the private sector, higher user fees, and more stringent value-added tests.

These efforts at redirection anticipate that the role of the Export-Import Bank will become more focused on correcting market imperfections as the private sector's ability to bear emerging market risks becomes larger, more sophisticated, and more efficient.

Mr. Chairman, there is one more issue I want to highlight here.

I want to thank the Senate for enacting legislation to release \$582 million in arrears payments to the United Nations. This was an important step that I hope will soon be incorporated into legislation for the President's signature.

But I also want to stress the urgency of simultaneous movement to lift the cap on peacekeeping payments so we do not accumulate new arrears.

If we do not deliver on our end of this commitment, we will halt the momentum for UN reform and run up new arrears.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I believe we have an historic opportunity with this budget to continue—and even to speed up a little—the refurbishment of our foreign policy organization and, ultimately, of our foreign policy itself.

I believe that is as it should be for what we are doing, finally, is redressing the imbalance that resulted from the long duration—and necessary diversion of funds—of the Cold War.

For over half a century we found it absolutely imperative that we look to our participation in that titanic struggle for ideological leadership in the world as the first and foremost requirement of our foreign policy and our national security.

Now, the Cold War is over. Now, as all of you have recognized, we are involved in spreading the fruits of our ideological triumph in that war. Now, we have need of a more sophisticated, a more efficient, a more effective foreign policy. Indeed too, a more traditional foreign policy—with the exception that there is nothing traditional about the information and technology revolutions nor about the speed with which they are bringing the potential for a wider and more prosperous freedom to the entire world.

Now is the time to provide to the principal practitioners of that foreign policy the resources they need to conduct it.

Thank you, and I welcome your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, an excellent statement. Your entire statement as written will be printed in the record as if read.

I was sitting here thinking about Saddam Hussein. There may have been somewhere in history a more brutal guy to his own people than Saddam Hussein. I could never forget what he did to the Kurds, hundreds of thousands of them. There are many other instances, and I am a little disappointed in my and your friends among the other Arab states. They seem to be a little bit less than eager to get involved, and in the name of God and everything else that is holy, whatever their God is, they had better take stock of what Saddam Hussein is.

By the way, you started the clock on me, and we will have 5 minutes on the first round, and when the red light comes on, please be conclusive in what you are saying.

In 1982, the Reagan administration made the six assurances to Congress on Taiwan, and every administration since then has declared them to be U.S. policy, and I am particularly interested about assurance number three, which is that the United States would not engage in advance consultations with the People's Republic of China, that is, Communist China, on defense sales to Taiwan, and I would like for you to comment, if you will, sir, that all of the six assurances will remain U.S. policy, and that there will be no advance consultations with mainland China, Beijing, on defense sales to Taiwan.

Secretary POWELL. They do remain U.S. policy, and we are now reviewing the arms sales proposal. We have a list, and have been going over the list from the Republic of China. I can assure you, I have no plans to consult with anybody in the People's Republic of China on what the relationship is we have with Taiwan or what their needs should or should not be.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you confident that nobody else in the administration will consult with Beijing?

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir, I am reasonably confident. It is an administration where I cannot think of any of my colleagues who would be so inclined.

The CHAIRMAN. They had better not, or we will both jump on them at the same time.

During your recent trip—you mentioned this in your remarks—your trip to the Middle East, you talked about smart sanctions on Iraq, and I guess we all are in favor of smart sanctions as opposed to dumb sanctions, but I have got to tell you, I am a little bit confused about smart and dumb.

I assume that the United States will continue to object to any exports to Iraq that will contribute to Saddam's weapons program.

Secretary POWELL. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. I am told that there is already \$4 billion in cash available to the United Nations escrow account for Iraq to buy pretty much anything Iraq needs. Is that your understanding, too?

Secretary POWELL. As long as the items they wish to purchase are not proscribed because they are weapons, or they might lead to the development of a weapon, or they may be dual use, of a nature that causes us concern. If that is the case, then those contracts will not be honored no matter how much money there is in that escrow account.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, are you going to monitor that situation personally?

Secretary POWELL. Very carefully, and one of the advantages of the new system is that we can sort of sweep out the underbrush of other things that people want to argue about and make sure we are focusing on the important things that really could add to his capability.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one further question on this. What might Saddam be able to buy, under smart sanctions, that he is not able to buy right now?

Secretary POWELL. There are probably some dual use items that we might be holding up. Let me just pull an example out of the air, which may or may not be correct, but I think it is illustrative, and you have seen it in the paper from time to time, water pumps.

Water pumps can be used to bring water up out of a well, and that would benefit people. But a sophisticated kind of a water pump, a water pump that is of a uniquely high tolerance and pressure settings or what-not, that could be used in an industrial way, and perhaps used in the kind of plant that might develop weapons of mass destruction, I think what we would say is let water pump number one go. Let us not waste time arguing about that, and let us make sure we take a good look at water pump number two.

The United States right now holds up about 1,500 contracts, and at the same time we are holding up those 1,500, the United Kingdom only finds 250 of those troublesome, and all of our other friends find only 10 or 20 troublesome. So we would take another look at the ones we are holding up to make sure we are holding them up for the real reasons of weapons of mass destruction and not just for another reason which is, we are holding them up to hold them up because there are some things in there that we are really going to make a point of, that all of our other allies do not make, or is worth making a point of.

That has been the problem, and that is why we are getting such pressure, look, if we cannot do this in a smart way, as some call it, then let us get rid of the whole thing.

One other point, if I may, sir. I understand your disappointment with respect to the Arab states, but I came back from my trip with all of them saying to me, and I left one of my Assistant Secretaries behind to visit the rest of them, we understand the threat presented by Saddam Hussein, and we are willing to work with you on the weapons of mass destruction, but we are getting killed in

the Arab street. We are getting killed in the Arab population, who think we are responsible for hurting the Iraqi people with the sanctions regime. So this is a way of clearing out that argument and giving them something to stand for with us.

The CHAIRMAN. I will be back.

Senator Biden.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am one of those who is sympathetic to what you are attempting to do with regard to Iraq, Mr. Secretary, in large part because I believe if something is not done, we will be unilaterally imposing sanctions.

I am not going to take the time now, but at another time I will go back and drop you a note. I am very anxious to know what the French reaction is to your initiative, and whether or not what they consider to be—I am not sure they consider anything to be smart sanctions right now.

Secretary POWELL. I had positive discussions with my French colleague, and I am waiting for a further response.

Senator BIDEN. I would like to move very quickly to the issue of the budget, your budget. We are at a slight disadvantage here this morning, we the committee, because as you well know, we have the 150 function number, but we do not have the account-level numbers. We inquired of your folks, and they indicated, and possibly with good reason, that they were not authorized to release any of those numbers until Monday, and so when you talk to us about the increase, State-Commerce-Justice budget, that is really where those account functions are, and we do not know how they break out.

Could you in the brief time I have here list for me what the priorities are in this sense, that you have sought roughly a \$700 million increase in your budget which in real terms is about 3 percent, as I read it, Mr. Secretary, but I do not want to quibble over whether it is 3 or 5.

You obviously made judgments about what are the most important areas you need immediately to get increases, an infusion of dollars. Can you tell us, not necessarily the numbers, but what the priorities are in your first crack at an attempt to put this Department in shape?

Secretary POWELL. Information technology investment, consular affairs, embassy security. There is a—let's see, those are the three that immediately come to mind. I would like to give you a more—

Senator BIDEN. Well, no, I am sure by Monday—we have been assured by Monday your Department will provide those to us. We had your old boss here, Frank Carlucci, last week, and he made a very, very strong case for additional resources as well as reform, and he emphasized very strongly embassy security technology and increased investment in personnel, bringing the Department up to—now, it is one thing to cut the fat that exists in the bureaucracy, and there is some there, in my view, but it is another thing to have this shortfall in Foreign Service officers.

And there seems to be an attitude, at least in the campuses I have been, there is not nearly the enthusiasm for getting into this line of work that I think there need be—not only should be, need be, and so I hope as you develop and lay out these priorities you will be willing to discuss them with us, and I am anxious to see

what the actual account levels are, so we could more intelligently followup with questions.

Secretary POWELL. Recruiting is a part of it, and sometimes it does not take money, it just takes common sense. It has taken us 27 months—I may have mentioned this before—to recruit somebody from the day they say they want to join the Foreign Service until we get them in. Well, for young people today, they cannot hang around for 2½ years, so we got that down now to 22 months, and I want to find ways to change the whole recruiting system so that we can get people in a lot faster and get them moving into meaningful jobs.

Senator BIDEN. Let me just say one thing on Korea. You indicated that there was a time and place of the administration's choosing, that what was missing was mention of monitoring or verification. Well, I do not think that was missing in my discussions with the last administration. They had not reached any agreement on that, but that was the next stage, when they were deciding whether or not to go in January, and they made, I think, a wise decision not to put your administration in the position in January of having moved to finalize the agreement.

Let me just state what worries me, and if you want to respond, fine. What worries me is, in my experience, which is not that expansive, but I have been here a long time—it has been 28 years—the Chinese, North Koreans, even our Japanese allies sometimes have difficulty discerning the nuanced approaches that we occasionally take, or the blunt approaches we take.

What I am very worried about is that this opportunity to find out whether or not there is any real possibility here is slipping away, can slip away, and the rhetoric makes a difference. Rhetoric, words matter, I think, particularly in this engagement. I compliment you on the rhetoric you have used, the words you have used. I just strongly urge you to move along as quickly as you can to decide what your policy is, and move on, because this could easily escape us.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Powell, this is a moment for bullet comments, to take full advantage of 5 minutes. Let me say first of all that I appreciate very much the rallies that you have held at the State Department, and inviting the President to come over, and he responded. I think this is tremendously important, and I applaud everything you are doing with regard to improving the morale and the substance of those relationships.

I share Senator Biden's anxiety that the budget submission may not support all of the thoughts that you have expressed today as well as publicly, and I just want to say that there is strong support on the Republican side and the Democratic side to do a whole lot more, to have an ambitious budget submission, and I mean that sincerely. I think this is a crucial point, at the beginning of this administration, President Bush and your administration, the Secretary of State, and if the moment is not seized now, it is likely to be downhill from there on.

Senator BIDEN. That may be the only thing there is absolute, total agreement on.

Senator LUGAR. We are hopeful.

Now, having said that, specifically we have had success, created by our chairman and Senator Biden, with regard to payment of some of our U.N. dues and arrears. There is still an item of the 25-percent cap on peacekeeping that I believe must be addressed.

I hope that you will work with the chairman and ranking member, with members of the committee, to fulfill what I believe were obligations undertaken by former Ambassador Holbrooke at the United Nations, and understood by many of our allies, who are, in fact, providing the peacekeeping, and to whom we owe back funds. I think this is a very important point to follow through.

Second, last year, we adopted the African Growth and Opportunity Act. The principal work was done by distinguished Members of the House of Representatives. I introduced on the Senate side equivalent legislation, joined by many of my colleagues at this table. A very modest act was passed, inhibited largely by protectionist forces in our country, but nevertheless, it was a beginning, a minimal beginning to some addressing of the economic side of the African equation.

I am hopeful, because I know your intense interest in that continent, and in an unfilled agenda, that there will be a full-blown program, a comprehensive approach to Africa, which I look forward to supporting, and I think many others would around this table.

On sanctions reform, I have offered, along with many others in two Congresses, and am prepared to offer a third comprehensive sanction reform that does not eliminate sanctions, but gives some criteria as to how and why we ought to do them, some way of removing them, and some way of evaluating whether they are effective.

I know that you are studying the bill that we offered last year that was supported by 600 firms in the USAEngage coalition, the American Farm Bureau, and others. I would like to work with you as we introduce that legislation, and hope for greater success on this occasion.

I have worked with Senator Biden, and Representative Portman over on the House side, once again, on a renewal of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act for another 5 years. I think for a variety of reasons this makes sense in foreign policy as well as in the ecology. It is worth your study, I believe, or those of your subordinates who are involved in this, to make certain we do it right.

And finally I would ask that the State Department position in the past administration with regard to carbon sinks, to rid the world of carbon dioxide, that you study that carefully. This is something of great consequence to American agriculture, for obvious reasons.

I was sad that the negotiations on carbon sink went downhill after an aggressive posture by State but affected by a European barrage who simply want American industry to suffer. But nevertheless, the carbon sink idea is a good one in fulfilling a lot of obligations. We ought to do it in any event, whether we have international obligations or not. Insofar as we have a negotiating posture I think it is an important bridge, and I would say this is one area where American farmers come into very sharp coincidence with the State Department, and as supporters of American diplo-



macy. I am looking for those bridges, for obvious reasons, so I mention it today.

Having said all that, there are only a few seconds for you to respond, but I know that you have jotted down a few of these things, and I am grateful to you.

Secretary POWELL. Well, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished former chairman raised a number of good points, and I wish you would comment.

Secretary POWELL. Can I have just a few seconds to respond? On resources, thank you very much, Senator Lugar, and I hope you will keep pushing me, kicking me, nudging me in the direction of more resources. It of course helps my case as I make the argument within the administration as well.

On lifting the cap on peacekeeping, I have been in contact both with the chairman and with Senator Biden on how best to do that, and I think it is a matter of how best to do that, as opposed to doing it.

African Growth and Opportunity Act, a wonderful piece of work. Now we have got to implement it and make sure it happens.

Sanctions reform, I look forward to working with you, and we are examining your proposals. I found some of the sanctions to be even more constraining, now that I have been in the job for 5½ weeks, than I did when I first mentioned it at the end of my transition period.

Carbon sinks, if I could touch on that one, I understand that the administration is just now coming to grips with what our policy is going to be on global warming and climate, and we are getting ourselves ready for the next conference at the end of July, which we hope will not be as big a disaster as the last one was.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Good work, Senator. Senator Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, welcome. We are pleased to have you back before the committee.

First of all, I am just kind of curious, what is it like driving this gray Mercedes S-500 with the 12 cylinder engine?

Secretary POWELL. It was cool. It was very cool.

Senator SARBANES. I hope the King realized he was really getting a high-paid chauffeur there.

Secretary POWELL. Well, I felt a little awkward the next day, when I realized that it made the New York Times. That was not our intention. So I called His Majesty a day later and said I hoped I had not caused him any embarrassment, and he assured me, not at all, and come back any time, and so I look forward to that.

Then, as another aside, I called another leader in the region who I did not have the chance to visit, and we were chatting about Iraq and the Middle East peace process, and at the end of the conversation, in order to needle me for not having visited that particular country, he said, you know, we have wonderful cars in this country, too.

So I have to get there very soon.

Senator SARBANES. I want to first commend you for the effort you are making within the Department itself to draw the career people

into the process. It has obviously been very well received. There are an awful lot of very able and talented people whose skills and capacities ought to be drawn upon, and I am delighted to see what you are doing, and I just encourage you in that regard.

I think having these desk officers brief the President on his Mexico visit was a terrific idea, and I understand from various reports that it just gave a terrific boost to morale within the—well, certainly a boost to the morale of the desk officers and the more junior people. I am not altogether sure exactly how the senior people are taking it, but in any event—

I want to echo my colleagues on your budget. It is kind of strange to come up here and have Members of the Congress telling you, you know, you ought to be seeking more resources rather than trying to chop you down. When George Shultz came in as Secretary of State he met with a number of us, and one of the pitches he made was the necessity of having adequate resources.

Of course, we had a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress, but he got a good reception on the Democratic side to that pitch, not unanimous, but a good reception, and of course he had the support of Republican Members of the Congress because I mean, it was the Reagan administration, and he was able to get a good increase in the resources to carry out our international affairs function.

In fact, the average over those years in current dollars is \$27½ billion, just to put this in perspective. This was when you were at the National Security Council, and the point I am trying to make is, you know, you had more resources then to work with in relative terms than you have today, significantly more.

I mean, you would have to have about a 12 percent increase in this budget you have come forward with to just reach that average figure, let alone some of the better years, and I dare say if at any point our military budget had ever reached the point where our diplomatic budget is—it would never have reached it. The outcry would have started much sooner, and the response would have been much more intense. It never would have gotten down to that point.

But you do not have the resources, in my judgment, with which to do the job, and I just encourage you to push very hard for that.

Now, let me make one final point and leave you with this question. At the end of January, there was an article in the Washington Post. I am going to quote from it.

“Two dozen leading conservatives yesterday sent a letter calling on President Bush to make human rights, religious freedom, and democracy priorities for American foreign policy, and urging him not to adopt a narrow view of U.S. national interests.

“American leadership must never remain indifferent to tyranny, must never be agnostic about the virtues of political and economic freedom, must always be concerned with the fortunes of fragile democracies,” the letter said, and the same letter apparently was sent to you and to the National Security Advisor and to the Vice President.

The letter also recommended support for groups promoting democracy and said, ‘U.S. nonhumanitarian aid, including assistance given through international lending institutions, should be used to

promote freedom and stop tyranny. When given to governments, the aid should be tied to countries' performance on human rights," the group said.

I just want to make the point for the record that that is the sentiment and an emphasis on priority that extends well beyond the conservative part of our political spectrum, and I think is fairly widely held here in the Congress, and across the country, and I guess my question is, have you all made any response to this letter, or what is your view on this emphasis with respect to our foreign policy priorities?

Secretary POWELL. I agree, I believe that our foreign policy should rest on the bedrock of human rights, respect for the individual, democracy, and nations that are moving in that direction. We should invest in those nations, and not invest in those nations that are despotic or are moving in the wrong direction.

We may sometimes have to do some things with those nations for humanitarian concerns because there are people under those despots, but for the most part we should invest in those that are moving in the right direction, and so I agree entirely with the sentiment. I cannot say whether or not the letter has been answered.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hagel.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Secretary, welcome. Good morning. I believe you are on the right track regarding sanctions in Iraq, and I would encourage you to continue to think broadly and deeply, as you are.

And on that general point, Senator Lugar made some observations regarding trade and sanctions, and something that he has been very actively engaged in for many years. It is my understanding that you are in some stage of review at the State Department on all sanctions, on all certifications, on onerous reporting requirements. You, I believe, have significant support up here to help you clear out the underbrush. I wonder if you could give us some status report on how you are doing with all of those reviews.

Secretary POWELL. We are working on that, Senator. I do not have a date I can give you where it will be ready. We want to make sure that sanctions and certifications and similar constraints are serving their originally intended purpose, and they are not just burdens for us, and no longer serving the foreign policy interest. And this is not to say that I do not believe in sanctions, I believe in sanctions that are serving the purpose and I will always support those.

But where they become a hindrance, and some of the drug certification procedures right now I think have become a problem, then I think we should aggressively go after them. In many instances there are strong constituencies for some of these sanctions, and it is difficult to remove the sanctions language, but as soon as that review is completed, you can be sure I will be bringing it up before this committee.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

Senator Lugar also touched on carbon sinks. I have a general question regarding climate change. You said that the administration was now just coming to grips with all the dynamics and we understand that, but let me ask this: is it your intention, is it the

President's intention to continue to keep the climate change responsibility portfolio within the State Department?

Secretary POWELL. Yes, although the interagency working groups that come together to determine our position might well be chaired by the NSC, because of the disparate Cabinet responsibilities. It really is such a complex issue that it goes well beyond the State Department. EPA, Treasury, Commerce, and a lot of others in the administration want to play a role in establishing a new policy, but you can be sure that State will continue to play a lead role.

Senator HAGEL. One of the frustrations that some of us had, if not many of us, in a subcommittee that I chair on this committee and have chaired the last 4 years, was that we could never get a concentrated answer to some of these, as you suggest, complicated questions to complicated issues. We would get witnesses before us who would say, well, I do not know, that is another department, or that is the White House, or that is somewhere else. I would hope that this administration, as you develop your process and your policy, is going to be able to concentrate the responsibility for this issue in the hands of someone. I noted the EPA Administrator saying some things last week, and then having to say other things in Rome, which probably did not reflect great credit on the administration. But I understand how those things work. I would hope that that is done fairly quickly, that you get control of that.

Secretary POWELL. We are trying. We pulled together an interagency briefing team that is going around to each one of the Cabinet officers and presenting them the same briefing, so we can all start off with a common understanding of the challenge and the dynamics and what global warming is all about, and now we are starting to get together to come forward with individual agency positions, and how do we move forward and come up with an administration position.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you. Let me ask a broader question with my last few seconds about the South American situation in a specific area, the Andean countries. A number of my colleagues and I have just recently visited Colombia and Ecuador. These are complicated problems, issues, dynamics. Regarding Plan Colombia, I support Plan Colombia. Could you reflect on that a bit as to where you are, the position of the President on that part of the world, what we can look for from you in further support, and further action regarding South America?

Secretary POWELL. We of course support Plan Colombia, and I think there has been some degree of success in the destruction of some of the crops in the Putumayo Valley, so we will continue to support Plan Colombia.

But we feel just as strongly that you cannot deal with a problem in one place without it spreading to other parts of the region, so in subsequent years we will be talking about an Andean strategy, and there is money in the budget for that Andean strategy.

We will be talking about how the Free Trade Association of The Americas plays into this, how Andean trade preference extension plays into all of this, so we will try to come up with a comprehensive strategy that deals with the whole region, and not just singularly focusing on Plan Colombia.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Kerry. Before you begin, John, there is a rollcall vote scheduled on the floor at 11:50 a.m. I just wanted Senators to be aware of that.

Senator KERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, welcome. Good to see you.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, Senator.

Senator KERRY. Mr. Secretary, I must confess to you that I was puzzled and somewhat troubled by the decision made yesterday to announce that the administration did not intend to immediately sort of, quote, "pick up where the Clinton administration left off," which really means negotiating. I mean, that was what was going on, it was a negotiating process.

On Tuesday of this week you were quoted as saying the administration, the Bush administration did intend to pick up. By the end of the meeting with President Kim it was stated that there was some question about whether or not agreements had been lived up with. There is only one agreement, and it seems to me the only way to proceed is to negotiate.

What changed in those 2 days, and why is it that you would not send a signal to North Korea that the direction they have been moving in is, in fact, welcomed, and that you welcome the concept of a dialog?

Secretary POWELL. I think there is less difference there than meets the eye. Obviously, when you come in from replacing a previous administration, things are left on the table. What was left on the table from North Korea was a set of ideas with respect to reducing their missile production, their proliferation of this kind of system, and Dr. Rice and I were briefed extensively by the outgoing administration in the transition period.

What was missing in what had been done was how one would put in place any kind of monitoring or verification regime, and the North Koreans had not engaged on that in any serious way in the period of the Clinton administration. So where we are is that those elements are still there. They have not been dismissed, they have not been rejected, but the President said, and we all agree, that we want to take some time in reviewing what was accomplished in the previous administration, in determining what we think we are going to need with respect to monitoring and verification, and seeing whether there are other things that ought to be part of such a discussion.

For example, there is a huge army poised on the demilitarized zone pointing south that is probably as great a threat to South Korea and Seoul and regional stability as are weapons of mass destruction. Should that be included in a negotiation with the North Koreans, and President Bush made that point to President Kim yesterday.

So what came out of yesterday is that President Bush will continue our policy review. We will do it in a measured way, with clear-eyed realism with respect to the nature of the regime and the single individual who has all authority within that regime, and at a time when we are ready, and a time when we are prepared to engage, we will then engage at that time, but there was a suggestion that we were getting ready to do it imminently, and it was that suggestion that we were trying to beat down.

Senator KERRY. At this point, can you state whether or not you support, whether or not the Bush administration continues to support the 1994 agreed framework?

Secretary POWELL. We are monitoring the agreed framework, and we have continued to support the 1994 agreed framework.

Senator KERRY. So the administration will support the continuation of the shipments of fuel oil, and construction of the light water reactors?

Secretary POWELL. We will do so, as we also at the same time review some concerns that exist with respect to how the light water reactors might be used, and what kind of supervision it will be under, and is that supervision adequate to the kinds of monitoring and verification regime we are interested in.

There are others who have also suggested perhaps one might want to substitute different kinds of energy-generating capacity. So for the moment we are in accord with the 1994 agreement, but that does not prevent us from looking at aspects of it that we might wish to revisit or change.

Senator KERRY. Well, obviously the administration can and obviously will make up its own mind as to when it feels ready. I think, given the tensions with respect to China and the questions on the entire peninsula, the messages we send are awfully important in terms of whether we are sort of open to engagement.

If we start to—I think you are free to raise anything you want at any time you want in the course of that, but I just have a sense that we may be sending messages that are also subject to misinterpretation. In that vein, I would ask you how you react to the military expenditure increase in China, and likewise the issue of—my time is up, but the issue of whether or not you are satisfied with their answer with respect to fiber optic transfer to Iraq, how that fits in the picture.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will allow time for you to answer this.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, sir. On Korea, I think the important message that came out of yesterday's meeting is that President Bush appreciated what President Kim Dae Jung has done with respect to opening that door, opening that window, as it is often referred to, and supports him, and supports the additional things he is going to be doing this year with respect to that second summit, while at the same time we review what it is we plan to do with respect to our engagement with North Korea, and when we decide that it is the appropriate time to reengage.

With respect to China, a 70-percent increase is probably leading to a 50-percent increase in total over the next several years. We want to discuss with the Chinese the nature of this buildup. We are going to encourage them to have more transparency in what they do with their defense programs, as we have transparency in ours.

I do not view it as a break-out investment, where suddenly China is on the march as an enemy, but it is, of course, something we have to look at carefully, make sure we keep our forces in the region up to the best possible standard, and we invest in them, because we really are the balance wheel of stability in that part of the world.

With respect to the fiber optics case, China has now said that they have told the companies that were in the area doing fiber optics work to cease and desist. We are still examining whether or not it was a specific violation of the sanctions policy, and if it was, we will call that to the attention of the sanctions committee so that they can take appropriate action with respect to China.

Senator KERRY. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Thomas.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Mr. Secretary.

Let me say that I think it is very appropriate for you and the new administration to take a little pause in these issues, take a look at where we are. Times change, and I think we need to take a little shot at some of these things.

For instance, I am very encouraged that we have some openings in North Korea, but I think we have to move fairly carefully, and require some more confirmation that we are having something on the other side that occurs as we move, certainly to stay with our friends in South Korea and in Japan as we move forward.

I am also one that will not quite join in the chorus for more and more money. I think 5.5, 5.3 percent increase is going to be more than most agencies have in this budget, and I would hope that, as is generally the case, you take a look at how it is managed now. We can look for different ways. Times have changed, and efficiencies and so on. How many total full-time employees are there?

Secretary POWELL. If you add it all up, with overseas and here in the United States, Foreign Service nationals approach 40,000, roughly.

Senator THOMAS. A total of 40,000. What was the dollars in Colombia? There were some commitments last year to billions of dollars. Where are we on that?

Secretary POWELL. A total of \$1.3 billion was the U.S. contribution to Plan Colombia, a roughly \$7 billion program, the rest of the money being made up by European contributors, as well as Colombia's own contribution of a little—close to \$3 billion to the effort. Ours was principally for the helicopters, and the training for the helicopters.

Senator THOMAS. So there was a \$7 billion effort?

Secretary POWELL. The overall program was intended to be 7 or 7½, as I recall.

Senator THOMAS. Have the participants contributed all that money?

Secretary POWELL. No. There has been a shortfall, so far, with the European contribution, and the Colombians are still striving to make the contribution they promised to the program.

Senator THOMAS. What is the status of appointments, in terms of Under Secretaries?

Secretary POWELL. You are looking at him, sir.

Senator THOMAS. That is what I was afraid of.

Secretary POWELL. We talked about this earlier. It is really the ethics, and the conflict of interest clearance that is taking the time, properly to make sure we put in place a team that is great, and there are no problems, and the chairman has given me his guar-

antee that as soon as I get them up here, he will get them confirmed.

Senator THOMAS. Have you had an opportunity to look at the Indonesia situation?

Secretary POWELL. Just recently I have started to turn my attention there. It is a very troubling situation, and I think it is an area that is not that well-known in the United States, and the consequences of failure in Indonesia are very great, not only for the region, but for the world.

Senator THOMAS. I think they are. ASEAN, much depends on it. I think you are right, it has been sort of out of the vision, but it is very important too, obviously.

Have you had a chance with respect to the People's Republic of China and Taiwan to have a position on the agreements that have been made, the communications that have been made with respect to Taiwan, Taiwan agreements?

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir, I have. The 1972—any specific agreements you have in mind, sir?

Senator THOMAS. The communiqués, just the communiqués.

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir. I am familiar with them. I think we will continue the policy that has existed for a number of years, the one China principle, and that the ultimate resolution of how one China evolves is up to the parties in power, and must not be imposed by force. They will have to deal with that amongst themselves over time, and we maintain our commitment to Taiwan to ensure that it has defensive means, so that this democracy can feel secure behind its Armed Forces, also in the knowledge that it has a friend in the United States.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Feingold.

Senator FEINGOLD. Mr. Secretary, it is good to have you here, and let me first compliment you on your comments on Iraq and the Iraq sanctions. My constituents will be very pleased to hear such a thoughtful series of ideas and comments about that policy.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, sir.

Senator FEINGOLD. Let me ask you about West Africa. There has been consistent bipartisan support in Congress for ending the cycle of impunity in West Africa, and for holding those responsible for grave human rights abuses accountable for their actions. But when I was in Sierra Leone last month, I did hear a number of people say, Mr. Secretary, or voice concerns about the State Department's willingness to identify funds for the first year's commitment to the court, and I do see that in your written remarks you make reference to it, so if you could just assure me that this administration will commit to supporting the special court for Sierra Leone, and also its Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Secretary POWELL. I think I can give you that commitment, Senator, but let me go back and find out what reticence may exist within the Department.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, and then, with regard to the Democratic Republic of Congo, Joseph Kabila's strange rise to power at least appears to have opened up new possibilities for peace in the DROC, but some observers have suggested that the



United States may not actually want to see the Lusaka Accords implemented, because we are unprepared to support a peacekeeping mission in this difficult region. Can you assure me that that cynical view is inaccurate, and what steps is the United States willing to take to support peace in Central Africa?

Secretary POWELL. We support the Lusaka Accords. I met with President Kabila a few weeks ago, and also with President Kegami, and encouraged them to respect human rights, start to disengage their forces and get back to the process of peace to stop the suffering of the people in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

I am pleased to see that in recent weeks there has been some movement, some disengagement of forces, and some hope for the process to begin, and I notice that Secretary General Annan is now prepared to send in some peacekeepers, so we are prepared to back that, but we at the moment do not have a commitment, nor have we made a commitment to provide U.S. peacekeepers to such forces.

Senator FEINGOLD. Fair enough, and I was not asking about actually providing U.S. peacekeepers, but our support for what the U.N. is attempting to do.

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir.

Senator FEINGOLD. Let me switch to Indonesia and East Timor, which Senator Thomas mentioned. More than a year after the 1999 violence in East Timor, the Indonesian Government has not indicted a single person in connection with that violence, despite the fact that many of the suspected organizers are in fact living in Indonesia, many of them in West Timor.

Kofi Annan said in January 2000 that the Indonesian courts would be given a chance to handle the cases first, but he did not rule out an international tribunal if the Indonesian judicial process proved not to be credible.

As a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, will the United States push for an international tribunal on East Timor now that Jakarta's unwillingness or inability to prosecute anyone is really quite manifest?

Secretary POWELL. That is certainly an option. I think what I have to do on that one, Senator, is let me go back and study the ramifications, and study the current state of play, and then give you a more definitive answer for the record.

Senator FEINGOLD. I would appreciate it.

[The following response was subsequently received:]

INDONESIA: INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR EAST TIMOR

*Question.* More than a year after the 1999 violence in East Timor, the Indonesian Government has not indicted a single person in connection with that violence, despite the fact that all the suspected organizers are in fact living in Indonesia, most of them in West Timor and Jakarta. Kofi Annan said in January 2000 that the Indonesian Accords would be given a chance to handle the cases first, but he did not rule out an international tribunal if the Indonesian judicial process proved not to be credible. As a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, will the United States push for an international tribunal on East Timor now that Jakarta's unwillingness or inability to prosecute anyone is really quite manifest?

*Answer.* As I indicated at the committee hearing, establishing an international tribunal for East Timor remains an option. We are very concerned about the continued lack of accountability for human rights abuses committed by the Indonesian military and pro-Indonesia militias in East Timor in 1999. We will continue to urge

the Indonesian Government to fulfill its commitment to pursue its internal investigation in a vigorous, expeditious and credible fashion.

The Indonesian Attorney General's office and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) are conducting concurrent but separate investigations into these abuses. The United States has provided technical assistance to both. We are convinced that the best way forward at this time lies in supporting and encouraging a credible Indonesian investigation and a strong and complementary UNTAET investigation.

We believe that these two processes could form the foundation for respect for and growth of the rule of law in what should soon be two, neighboring countries. If these processes fail, we will consider other options to ensure that credible justice and accountability are achieved.

We will continue to monitor closely the progress of the Indonesian government's and UNTAET's investigations, and will continue to support efforts to pursue and to hold accountable those responsible for human rights abuses. I welcome your interest in this issue and would welcome your support for our efforts.

Senator FEINGOLD. Do you believe it is possible, with regard to China, for the United States to mobilize sufficient support at the commission in Geneva this year to overcome a Chinese-sponsored no-action motion to prevent a debate on their human rights record, and what other methods will the United States take to press the Chinese on human rights issues in the year ahead?

Secretary POWELL. I press my Chinese interlocutor at every occasion. I met with the new ambassador and made sure he understood that human rights will remain in a place of honor within U.S. foreign policy goals, and we are looking forward to the visit of the Vice Premier in a few weeks time.

We will be aggressively pushing the resolution in Geneva. It will be tough. It will be very difficult. The situation is more difficult this year than it was last year, but we will be giving it our every effort.

We just selected a delegation to represent us there, of people who have strong views on human rights, and I will be spending a good part of my time from the middle of March until the middle of April to press the case.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

[The prepared statement of Senator Feingold follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

Secretary Powell, I want to welcome you again and to thank you for being here today. The administration's "budget blueprint" does not, of course, contain a great deal of detail at this point. But this is still a very valuable opportunity to discuss foreign policy priorities, which will eventually be reflected in our international affairs budget.

I have been heartened by many of your recent statements and by your obvious commitment to reinvigorating the State Department and the foreign service, two critically important and long-neglected institutions. But the budget numbers that we do have suggest that there are some difficult choices ahead. Compared to the fiscal year 2001 appropriated level of \$22.7 billion, the administration's budget blueprint represents a 3% increase in real terms, but is a 3.8% and 2.9% decrease compared to fiscal years 1999 and 2000 respectively. The priorities that you have identified—embassy security, information technology, and human resources are clearly important, and I commend you for pursuing them.

But the United States confronts vast challenges and great opportunities abroad in this new century, and we cannot afford to ignore regional needs and transnational issues that also deserve attention from the administration and within the 150 account. As the sole remaining superpower, and as a country committed to the integrity of our national values, the United States must strive each day to balance the imperatives of order and justice around the world. We must work to protect human rights, to stop environmental degradation, to fight infectious disease, and to combat international crime and corruption.

I recently returned from a trip to Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and Senegal, and I can say unequivocally that the United States has a tremendously important role to play in the region, and that we neglect it only at our peril. Likewise, as new prospects for stability emerge in central Africa, the United States must remain engaged. And in China, Indonesia, Colombia and the Middle East, policy-makers face extraordinarily difficult situations, and the critical importance of getting it right, maintaining a highly principled approach, and putting the appropriate resources behind our policy.

I look forward to discussing these crucial policy priorities with you today.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Frist.

Senator FRIST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, thanks for your leadership, your energy, your commitment to Foreign Service officers within the State Department. You just travel throughout Washington, you are running into people who reflect and respect your commitment to them as Foreign Service officers, and their expertise and their skills.

I want to turn our attention briefly to what I regard as one of the most dangerous humanitarian, economic, and development crises of our time, and that is the global epidemic of AIDS, AIDS/HIV. The facts, you know them well, they are sobering. AIDS killed ten times the number of people in Africa than all of the armed conflicts combined. In eight countries at least one-third of all 15-year-olds today, eight countries, that will die of AIDS.

I have a 15-year-old, and every time I look into his eyes and I think about this, I think about the 85 percent chance that he would die from that if he were in one country, Botswana. Some 13 million orphans already, 40 million orphans over the next 10 years, all of this dramatically undermining the social structures and reversing economic development, wiping out a whole era of people in the most productive years of their lives.

You look at Russia, you see the largest percent increase in AIDS cases. You look at India, that has the largest number of HIV/AIDS cases in the world as a country today. The statistics go on and on.

David Gergan wrote recently, the struggle against AIDS and related diseases in Africa represents one of the greatest moral tests of our time.

You put all that together, and we have no choice but to respond. It is the appropriate, it is the right thing to do. How we do it, where we do it in our Government, what entity, is it under your Department amidst the 40,000 people somewhere? It is clear we have got to have a focus because the medical profession, the public health infrastructure, the pharmaceutical companies, our Government, the NIH. Nobody can do it alone.

You have reached out from your very first briefings at State, in that first meeting in Africa, and starting long before that have and are rapidly becoming, and are, I guess, already are an in-house expert on this overall challenge. I am delighted to see in the budget, which is the focus of our topic today, that the President's budget does provide increases to the Agency for International Development for activities to combat global HIV/AIDS, a welcome development, and I look forward to working with you and the administration on the details.

The Chairman and Senator Kerry and I and others on this committee put forth the Global AIDS and Tuberculosis Relief Act of 2000. Last year past, Congress doubled our foreign assistance ap-

propriations for AIDS, all of which is real progress. More needs to be done in terms of funding. We need to redouble those efforts.

But funding itself, as you well know, is only part of the solution, and it is going to take United States leadership of the President, other senior officials, if we are going to really adequately deal, and appropriately deal with this crisis.

The foreign policy, the international economic implications of the AIDS epidemic demands high-level engagement, and you are at that highest level. It is going to have to be by the Department of State, elsewhere in the administration possibly.

A specific Secretary-supported function might well serve to focus all of these U.S. foreign policy developments, and would help coordinate the interagency efforts that are being made on behalf of Labor, on behalf of Health and Human Services, DOD, USAID, as well as State, all of which have mandates and budgets, and that really leads me to my question. How do you see the administration, and I guess more specifically the Department of State, dealing with what has to be a coordinated and focused approach in response to this international HIV/AIDS crisis?

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, doctor, and I agree with everything you said with respect to the nature of this crisis that is before the world. It is an economic crisis, a health crisis, a security crisis, the destruction of families, cultures, tribes, nations, all of that is there, and the more time I spend on this, the worse it gets, and one country that I know just slipped your mind, or one area where it is going to get even very, very much more difficult is close to home, and that is in the Caribbean, where it is really starting to pick up, and so all of that is true.

I am looking at how we are organized. I have taken one person, a trusted agent of mine, and said, this is your job. Find out how we are organized for battle against this within the Department. Come forward, show me what we are doing, because it is everywhere. It is all over the place. Show me where it is, how do I pull it together, how do I give it focus so I can see it all the time, and then from that launching point I can then figure out how the rest of the administration should also join this in a very, very direct and coordinated way.

I see the problem in the same terms you do, Senator.

Senator FRIST. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I have loved working with you, and looking forward, I think we can make real inroads by pulling the partnerships together.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Torricelli, last but not lest.

Senator TORRICELLI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much.

Mr. Secretary, welcome. I would like, if I could, to present you with three issues, and with no thread through them, and if you would then respond to each of the three.

The first to raise with you, ironically, given that you are America's most famous soldier, and I have never had the honor of wearing its uniform, we all feel very saddened by what happened with the U.S.S. *Greenville*. It was a terrible tragedy, with a needless loss of life. The President of the United States has apologized, the Secretary of Defense has apologized, I know you have apologized. I think all Americans are very saddened.

I was surprised that added to the board of inquiry was a Japanese admiral. If there was fault by American servicemen, I know they will be held accountable. Every American would expect no less. I believe the record of the United States for being responsible for our misdeeds has historically been very good, is particularly good in comparison with some other nations that have not ever accounted for their histories.

I believe this is a troubling precedent, and as much as I want to see justice done, I do not believe that American servicemen and women should ever be cannon fodder for dealing with a diplomatic problem. I do not know if there is precedent for such actions, but I believe it is a troubling situation, and casts some questions of credibility on the outcome of these proceedings, given that there was a foreign national who was participating, even if on a non-voting basis. I leave that with you, and would invite your response.

On two other issues, Senator Hagel noted that we are clearing the underbrush in dealing with American sanctions. I think we all recognize the Congress' intentions that there be no American financing of exports to Cuba, this, of course, not being the underbrush, but a virtual giant redwood, I assume we have nothing to fear from the administration revisiting that issue. The Congress has been clear that, while there would be food exports, we would not use American taxpayers' dollars to help underwrite the Castro Government.

And finally, while otherwise pleased with the beginning weeks of the foreign policy of the Bush administration, I would like some clarification of the joint press conference with Tony Blair in which the President said, and I quote, "I am going to wait and be asked by the Prime Minister with reference to American involvement in the peace process in Northern Ireland."

I would hope the administration would be considering having a mediator to succeed Senator Mitchell, and have the United States fully engaged in that process, because I believe that we have been so helpful.

And while I promised that was my last point, I simply want to identify myself with Senator Kerry's comments with regard to the North Korean arrangements from 1994. I think the promise is so great, with that rather peculiar regime, for a breakthrough, at least there is a potential, that our credibility must remain paramount. While any issue can be revisited on a mutual basis, I hope there will be every effort to make sure that we keep to the letter of the agreement on the 1994 understanding with the North Koreans, so they can provide a framework for going forward to other and even more important arrangements.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, Senator. On your first point, the *Greenville*, from my own experience, and knowing nothing about how they formed their court of inquiry, I am absolutely sure that any accountability or any judicial action or any nonjudicial administrative action that would come from this would be solely in the hands of American officers, and not the Japanese admiral.

His exact status there, I really think I need to provide an answer for the record from the Secretary of Defense, and not me speculate on.

Senator TORRICELLI. Mr. Secretary, could we be assured, however, that this judgment was reached by the military alone, without State Department or other U.S. Government involvement by the United States, to invite the Japanese admiral?

Secretary POWELL. I will ask the Secretary of Defense how that judgment was reached. I was never involved in it, and I do not think any of my staff were involved in it, or if they were, they did not tell me about it. We would not have pressed the case in that way. But we will give you a complete answer for the record.

[The following response was subsequently received:]

JAPANESE PARTICIPATION IN USS GREENVILLE COURT OF INQUIRY

*Question.* Why did the membership of the USS *Greenville* Court of Inquiry include a Japanese Admiral? Was the State Department or any other U.S. Government agency involved in the decision to invite Japanese participation on the court?

*Answer.* U.S. Navy and Department of Defense regulations governing the conduct of Courts of Inquiry permit inclusion of non-U.S. advisors to the court. The Commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, following consultation with the Department of State, invited the Government of Japan (GOJ) to appoint a senior Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Forces officer to serve in this non-voting capacity during the *Greenville* inquiry. The invitation was extended in an effort to enhance the court's transparency, to address GOJ questions about the incident, and to mitigate subsequent criticism of the court's findings.

Secretary POWELL. We are not reviewing our policies with respect to exports to Cuba, and the third point, Northern Ireland envoy, we are following the developments very closely and identifying somebody in my Department who will take this on as a primary additional duty, and be ready to serve in a communication role and keep us in touch with what is going on.

I am not clear yet whether we think there will be a need for somebody like a George Mitchell, but that certainly is something we can keep under advisement if the situation moves in the way that suggests it takes that kind of high-level special envoy involvement.

Senator TORRICELLI. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, you have done well. It is always good to see you.

Senator BIDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I have 30 seconds before you close, not even that?

The CHAIRMAN. Sure.

Senator BIDEN. Is it appropriate that we can submit some questions in writing?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, absolutely. I think you expected that.

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a lot of committee meetings working on crucial things, otherwise there would have been a 100 percent attendance this morning, and I am sure that there is going to be a lot of questions filed for you in writing, and I know you will respond to them forthwith.

Let me say that I appreciate the administration's strong comments opposing the International Criminal Court, and I will have a further comment with you about that. But in general it has been good to have you with us this morning, and if there be no further business to come before the committee, we stand in recess.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.  
 [Whereupon, at 12:06 p.m., the committee adjourned.]

---

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE FOURTH FREEDOM FORUM

NEW STUDY DETAILS "SMART SANCTIONS" PROPOSALS TO DISARM IRAQ

*Secretary of State Powell testifies on Iraqi sanctions today before Senate committee*

WASHINGTON, DC.—A new study that examines options for restructuring U.N. sanctions in Iraq<sup>1</sup> may preview coming Bush administration policy initiatives intended to minimize hardships for innocent civilians and strengthen controls over Iraqi weapons programs. An advance release of the study comes just as Secretary of State Colin Powell is due to testify today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The new report by the Fourth Freedom Forum and the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame, and originally set for release Monday, proposes a narrowly defined and tightly implemented set of "smart sanctions" focusing on weapons and military-related goods, as an alternative to the current faltering comprehensive sanctions regime.

The study's authors, who have met extensively during the past four months with government officials and international experts from the UN, U.S. and allied nations, write that a modernized sanctions regime would need to be sustainable over the long term through the support of key United Nations Security Council members and frontline states. It would remain in effect until such time as Iraq complies fully with the relevant Security Council resolutions and fulfills its disarmament obligations, the study says.

High among the expectations for Powell's testimony is the new administration's position on weapons inspections in Iraq. Last week, during a trip to the Middle East, Powell suggested changes in U.S. sanctions policy toward Iraq. Meanwhile, Vice President Richard Cheney and National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice said in separate interviews published in the past few days that the return of U.N. arms inspectors in Iraq was not a critical part of continued U.S. pressure on Iraq and that the U.S. has no choice but to push for a new sanctions policy.

Fourth Freedom Forum and the Joan Kroc Institute, two leading research centers that focus on economic sanctions and weapons control as a means of preventing international conflict, sponsored the study, written largely before Powell's trip. The full report will be available shortly at [www.fourthfreedom.org](http://www.fourthfreedom.org). Among the conclusions the study reaches are:

*Embargo Arms, Not Trade*

- Revamp current embargo in favor of a sharpened sanctions system aimed at two key targets—the control of financial resources generated by the export of Iraqi oil, and the prohibition against imports of weapons and dual-use goods;
- Maintain strict controls on Iraqi oil revenues and military-related imports, but permit trade in civilian consumer goods to flow freely;
- Contract out to commercial companies the responsibility of certifying and providing notification of civilian imports into Iraq;
- Permit the ordering and contracting of civilian goods on an as-required basis rather than in 180-day phases.

*Maintain UN Financial Controls*

- Continue to channel all Iraqi oil revenues through the UN escrow account;
- Contract with an independent multinational oil brokering firm, through which all records and payments for permitted oil purchases would pass, to manage the sales of Iraqi oil and monitor any illegal payments or surcharges;
- Establish a new compensation mechanism to provide economic assistance to neighboring states and begin paying Iraq's external debt;
- Freeze the personal financial assets of Saddam Hussein and his family, of senior Iraqi political and military officials, and of those associated with weapons production programs.

---

<sup>1</sup>This study is available via Internet at: [www.fourthfreedom.org](http://www.fourthfreedom.org)

*Strengthen Verification and Monitoring*

- Tighten land-based monitoring by establishing at major border crossings into Iraq fully-resourced Sanctions Assistance Missions, modeled on the UN sanctions experience in Yugoslavia;
- Establish a system of electronic tagging of approved dual-use imports;
- Create a special investigative commission to track down and expose sanctions violators;
- Assist member states in establishing effective penalties for companies and individuals that violate the ban on exporting weapons and dual-use items to Iraq;
- Require Iraqi-bound cargo flights to submit to UN inspection.

“No single element of this smart sanctions package stands alone in wielding sufficient coercive clout,” the study says. “But linked together such controls provide a tightened sanctions regime.”

To discuss the findings of the study or for comment on “smart sanctions” proposals, please call:

David Cortright, Fourth Freedom Forum President and Joan B. Kroc Institute faculty fellow, at (800) 233-6786 [please contact his assistant Ruth Miller at extension 10];

George Lopez director of policy studies and senior fellow at the Joan B. Kroc Institute, at (219) 631-6972; (219) 315-7118-cell

Alistair Millar, Fourth Freedom Forum Vice President, at (202) 393-5201—work, (202) 716-4716—cell.

*The Fourth Freedom Forum’s goal is a more civilized world based on the force of law rather than the law of force. Through scholarly research, public education, dialogue with policy experts, and media communications, the Fourth Freedom Forum explores options for the nonviolent resolution of international conflict and brings these concepts to the forefront of mainstream debate.*

*The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame conducts educational, research, and outreach programs on international peace. The Institute’s programs emphasize international norms and institutions; religious, philosophical, and cultural dimensions of peace; conflict transformation; and social, economic, and environmental justice.*

---

## ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

### RESPONSES OF SECRETARY OF STATE COLIN POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JESSE HELMS

#### TRADE AND BUSINESS ISSUES

*Question 1.* When does the Bush Administration plan to seek fast track negotiating authority?

Answer. The Administration has been consulting with Congress, business, NGOs and others regarding trade promotion authority. Although timing has not yet been decided, President Bush has stated that he would like to show progress towards gaining trade promotion authority in time for the Quebec Summit of the Americas meetings in April.

*Question 2.* Will the United States support inclusion of a “democracy clause” setting representative democracy and respect for human rights and the rule of law as a condition of participating in the FTAA process?

Answer. The Summit of the Americas has been a process for promoting democratically elected governments from the beginning. Leaders reiterated that at the Santiago Summit. We support a more explicit affirmation of that commitment at the Quebec meeting for the entire Summit process, which includes the FTAA.

*Question 3.* What steps will you take, in conjunction with other agencies, to make sure that the interests of U.S. companies, in particular their patent rights, will be protected?

What will you do in cases where there is a clear TRIPS violation, as in Argentina and the Dominican Republic?

Answer. In international fora and through our embassies, the Department of State works to ensure that foreign governments provide adequate and effective protection for intellectual property. We view compliance with TRIPS obligations as a benchmark in this effort. However, in multilateral and bilateral negotiations, such



as the ongoing Free Trade Area of the Americas negotiations, we encourage the adoption and enforcement of intellectual property protections that go beyond the minimum protection requirements afforded by TRIPS.

With regard to Argentina, WTO dispute settlement consultations have been initiated to address the government's inadequate protection of patents and test data. We also are reviewing Argentina's protection of intellectual property rights through the annual Special 301 process.

With regard to the Dominican Republic, we are encouraging the Dominican Government to revise patent legislation to conform to its TRIPS obligations. We are also reviewing the Dominican Government's protection of intellectual property in the Special 301 process.

#### HAITI

*Question.* What will you do to press the de facto Aristide government to comply with the eight conditions set by the outgoing Clinton Administration? What specific steps will you take to bolster the opposition and other democratic elements in Haitian civil society?

*Answer.* Our policy on the eight points was articulated in President Bush's February 13 letter to President Aristide. This correspondence called the eight points a "starting point," conveying our expectation that President Aristide would exceed them if necessary to address our concerns. We have also made clear that the U.S. will not fully normalize relations, nor support restoration of assistance to the Haitian Government by the United States and international financial institutions, until the eight conditions are met.

Through our programs we actively back the activities of Haitian journalists, labor unions and NGO's and diplomatically support the mediation effort of civil society. Through capacity-building measures that would be made available to all Haitian political parties, we intend to assist the opposition once a meaningful negotiation process has begun.

#### ANDEAN REGION: PLANS FOR ASSISTANCE

*Question.* How will the Bush Administration assist all of our allies in the Andean region—not just Colombia—to prevent a return of illegal drug cultivation and to bolster their weak democratic governments?

*Answer.* We are developing a coordinated assistance plan for the entire region, including Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela, to prevent traffickers from simply shifting operations in reaction to Plan Colombia and to help these countries deal with varied threats. This initiative recognizes that the problems confronting the Andean region—threats to democracy, weak economies and narcotics trafficking—are linked and must be addressed in a coordinated manner. Sluggish economies produce political unrest that threatens democracy and provides ready manpower for traffickers and illegal armed groups. Weak institutions, corruption and political instability discourage investment, contribute to slow growth and provide fertile ground for traffickers and outlaw groups. The drug trade has a corrupting influence that undermines democratic institutions, fuels illegal armed groups, and distorts the economy, discouraging legitimate investment. None of the region's problems can be addressed in isolation. All need to be addressed comprehensively, and be accompanied by appropriate public diplomacy initiatives, to advance our goals in the region.

#### ANDEAN AND DRUG ISSUES

*Question 1.* What are your views on President Pastrana's current strategy of engaging Colombia's narco-terrorists by granting them large tracts of land in exchange for peace? Should the United States support an unpopular, unsustainable policy that grants safe-havens to the narco-terrorists, allowing them to expand their drug production and other illicit activities with virtual impunity?

*Answer.* We have fully supported President Pastrana's efforts to negotiate a solution to the Colombian conflict. We share President Pastrana's assessment that Colombia's problems cannot be effectively resolved while illegal armed combatants continue to wreak havoc upon Colombians and that Colombia's civil strife cannot be won by military means.

With respect to the advisability of the FARC demilitarized zone ("despeje") or of the proposed ELN demilitarized zone ("encounter zone"), we have deferred to the Colombian Government on the utility of these specific mechanisms to advance peace discussions. Fundamentally, the management of the Colombian peace process is

something to be negotiated between the Government of Colombia and the illegal armed groups.

Nevertheless, we will not support any Colombian peace agreement that would impede our ability to conduct counternarcotics operations in Colombia. We have told the Government of Colombia that our support for the Colombian peace process is contingent on whether it satisfactorily addresses our counternarcotics concerns. To date, the existence of the FARC “despeje” has not interfered with our counternarcotics efforts in Colombia, including our support of the ambitious Plan Colombia strategy in southern Colombia.

*Question 2.* As you know, the mycoherbicide technology is a promising new tool designed to reduce the cultivation and supply of illicit narcotic crops. Do you support the immediate testing, and possible deployment, of the mycoherbicide technology in Colombia?

Answer. The United States government has supported research towards controlling the cultivation of illicit narcotic crops for many years. Using funds appropriated by Congress in 1990, USDA developed a proof of concept on the use of biological control agents to control illicit crops, particularly coca. The Department, after consulting with USDA, concluded that this would require conducting limited field tests in the “target”, i.e. foreign, environment where the illicit drug crops are actually grown. The Colombian Government and the U.N. International Drug Control Program (UNDCP) are discussing potential cooperation to conduct these field tests, which are essential to developing definitive data on the safety and efficacy of these mycoherbicides in their intended environment. Testing in Colombia will proceed only with the full cooperation and approval of the Colombian Government. This approval has not yet been granted, pending the completion of an acceptable research protocol.

#### CUBA POLICY—LIBERTAD ACT

*Question.* Officers in the State Department’s Bureau for Western Hemisphere Affairs (WHA) responsible for investigations under the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 have concluded that the Spanish firm Grupo Sol Mehiá (GSM) is trafficking in property owned by a U.S. claimant. Under the law, this conclusion triggers an immediate decision by the Secretary of State to sanction GSM. Negotiations between GSM and the claimant have been terminated. When will the State Department provide the Committee a copy of its sanction determination letter to GSM? The Clinton Administration has routinely waived provisions of Title III of the LIBERTAD Act citing promises by Europe to promote human rights in Cuba. Will you review the current waiver of Title III and comply with the legal requirement that such waiver genuinely hastens the democratic transition in Cuba?

Answer. The Department of State has a long-standing practice of not commenting publicly on Libertad Act cases which may or may not be under review. I would be happy to have Under Secretary of Economic Affairs Larson meet with you to discuss matters related to these issues.

Regarding Title III of the Libertad Act, I understand that the Department is scheduled to review relevant factors this action is appropriate. Certainly we share your commitment to realize a democratic transition in Cuba. Our goal is to apply the law in a way that builds international consensus on encouraging democratic and economic change, and respect for human rights.

#### ECUADOR: EMELEC

*Question.* The Government of Ecuador has failed to show the good faith necessary to find a mutually beneficial resolution of a dispute regarding ownership and operation of Empresa Electrica del Ecuador, Inc. (ENELEC). Will you instruct the U.S. Embassy in Quito to assist the American trustees in resolving this case and to notify the Ecuadorian government that its normal relations with the United States depend on its equitable treatment of these and all U.S. investors and property claimants?

Answer. I share your view that the Government of Ecuador should work with the interested parties to resolve the EMELEC dispute. The U.S. Embassy in Quito is in fact maintaining close and frequent contact with the Government of Ecuador and the American trustees to encourage a rapid and fair resolution of this dispute. U.S. Government officials have met regularly over the last year with high-level Ecuadorian government officials, including President Noboa, to keep the Government of Ecuador engaged on this issue. In these contacts, we have conveyed the importance the U.S. Government attaches to the prompt and full repayment of the Export-Import Bank debt.

The U.S. Government is concerned with any case in which the property of a U.S. national has been or may be expropriated by a foreign government. However, while EMELEC is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maine, it has been wholly foreign-owned since it was sold to Ecuadorian citizens in 1992. The American trustees have not provided us with any indication that the company conducts business, owns property or employs anyone in the United States.

Nevertheless, while the U.S. Government has taken no position on the merits of this dispute, we regularly raise this issue with the Government of Ecuador in order to ensure payment of the Ex-Im Bank loan and to avoid this dispute possibly becoming a larger problem between our two countries. We understand that the Government of Ecuador and the American trustees recently accelerated the pace of their negotiations, meeting twice weekly in an attempt to conclude a settlement.

#### VENEZUELA: U.S. POLICY

*Question.* Recently, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez has made efforts to consolidate a great deal of political power under his authority, express solidarity with radical groups in neighboring countries, and seek close ties to the People's Republic of China, Iraq and Cuba. In light of these efforts, will you review U.S. policy toward Venezuela?

*Answer.* Since his election in late 1998, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez has begun a process of radical change in his country's political and socioeconomic policies. The changes sought by Chavez could endanger Venezuela's democratic tradition and market-driven economy.

President Chavez has used extreme rhetoric as a political tool to intimidate his opponents. We are concerned by his effort to concentrate power in the hands of the executive branch and by his association with some of the world's most notorious dictators—Castro, Saddam Hussein, Khadafi.

That said, Venezuela's democratic institutions have thus far proven sufficiently strong to withstand any attempt to weaken democratic rule. It must be remembered that Chavez won two elections with large majorities. Virtually all of the actions he has taken to date have fallen within the bounds of the Venezuelan constitution, and are largely supported by the majority of the Venezuelan populace.

We will continue to monitor the situation closely and to look for opportunities to support Venezuelan civil society organizations dedicated to protecting democracy.

We continue to urge Venezuela and its neighbors to work through disagreements peacefully. Expressions of solidarity with radical groups undermine stability.

Despite our disagreement with President Chavez' foreign policy, we are determined to protect our vital interests in Venezuela. To this end, we will remain engaged on areas of greatest importance to the USG: maintenance of democratic institutions; protection of economic and commercial ties, including energy; counter-narcotics cooperation; and regional stability.

#### CUBA: SUPPORT FOR DISSIDENTS

*Question.* Mr. Secretary, President Bush has declared his intention to keep the embargo on Cuba in place until there are free elections. We agree on that. I hope you agree also with me that the embargo alone is NOT an adequate policy—we need to do more. We need a policy of increased, pro-active support for dissidents on the island—a policy modeled after President Reagan's decisive support for the Polish Solidarity movement. Do you agree with that approach? And will you make full use of your current authorities to increase pro-democracy programs right now—including additional funding?

*Answer.* We agree that the embargo alone is not an adequate policy and that we need to do more. We must also maintain and enhance our people-to-people program, maintain support for dissidents, disseminate information and the exchange of ideas and work to increase pressure on Cuba by other countries and international organizations.

We plan to continue our policy of active support for dissidents in Cuba. Our funding for pro-democracy programs increased this year from \$3.5 to \$5 million. This is a significant increase. As you well know, the basic problem is that Cuba is a police state. That is why we want to see change in Cuba, but that situation hampers the international community's ability to meet and talk with Cubans, discuss transition and have access to universities and think tanks. We are open to new and different proposals that can help the Cuban people to create the sort of civil society that Cuba will need to make a peaceful transition to a democratic society with a market economy.

## TAIWAN: U.S. POLICY REGARDING TAIWAN'S STATUS

*Question.* Did you mean to imply a change in U.S. policy when you said, "Taiwan is part of China" during your confirmation hearing?

*Answer.* Our policy has not changed. It has been consistent since first established in the 1972 Shanghai Communiqué and then reiterated in the 1979 Normalization Communiqué.

It was that policy to which I was referring before the Committee when I said: "The United States has long acknowledged the view that there is only one China. In that respect, Taiwan is a part of China."

## CHINA—ASSISTANCE TO IRAQ

*Question.* Do we intend to take any action against Communist China for its efforts to assist Saddam Hussein in building up his air defense network?

*Answer.* We have made our views and concerns clear to the Chinese government, which understands that failure to completely resolve this issue through ongoing efforts will damage Sino-U.S. relations.

The Chinese government has reiterated its understanding of China's responsibilities to uphold UN Security Council resolutions and has told us that it has taken steps to ensure that PRC companies abide by these resolutions. We will continue to monitor the situation closely and will work with the Chinese government to properly resolve this issue.

## INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

*Question.* How does the Bush Administration intend to deal with the ICC when it comes into existence?

Will you pledge to work with the Committee to ensure that American citizens are protected from the jurisdiction of this Court?

*Answer.* The Bush Administration has taken note of the possibility that the International Criminal Court may be up and running in just a few years, irrespective of USG concerns. Now is the time to develop and begin to implement a strategic plan to pursue effectively our objectives, including the protection of U.S. citizens from the Court's jurisdiction.

I welcome an open and frank dialog with the Committee on this complex issue. I look forward to working with the Congress to achieve our common goal of protecting U.S. personnel.

## RUSSIA: CHECHNYA

*Question.* Will you meet with the foreign minister of Chechnya when he next visits the United States? And what will you do to promote a peaceful resolution to this conflict?

*Answer.* Department officials have met with members of the Chechen separatist government before and will do so in the future. We recognize Chechnya as part of Russia, however, and meet with them as individuals, not in their official capacity. We met March 26 with Mr. Akhmadov at the Assistant Secretary level in Washington. That meeting was an important opportunity for us to discuss his views on the conflict and urge dialogue, respect for human rights, and an end to terrorist violence. The Department official who met Mr. Akhmadov has shared with select congressional staff his impressions from that meeting.

We are working with our allies in a coordinated, sustained international effort to stop the fighting and move toward a political settlement; to ensure humanitarian assistance reaches those in need; and to have those responsible for human rights violations held accountable.

## BELARUS: PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

*Question.* How confident are you that the regime in Minsk will allow presidential elections to take place?

If they do, how confident are you that the elections will be free and fair?

*Answer.* We think the elections will take place, but it is an open question as to whether they will be free and fair. Lukashenko may try to control presidential elections as he did the October 2000 parliamentary elections. This would be a serious mistake. We have communicated forcefully and clearly that an improvement in relations with the U.S. requires a return to democracy and an end to the climate of fear. Half measures or a continuation of current repressive policies will only prolong and deepen Belarus' isolation from the international community.

## PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

*Question.* Like President Reagan, I think that, frankly, explaining American policy and values abroad is important—and remains so today. A public diplomacy officer in a major European capital told a member of my staff that she strongly favored consolidation, but that decisions that took 3 clearances before consolidation now take 23. And someone working on public diplomacy at the State Department told my staff that at decision meetings, public diplomacy officers are frequently told: “We’ll formulate the policy and then you figure out how to sell it.” What do you anticipate doing in the coming months to increase the say of public diplomacy folks in the regional bureaus, to give them a role in decisions from the ground floor, and to cut red tape—as the congressionally-mandated consolidation intended?

*Answer.* Public diplomacy and the work of the Department’s Public Diplomacy Officers in promoting America’s national interests are vital to the success of U.S. foreign policy. From what I can see so far, the 1999 reorganization is well on its way to achieving the goals you set out by proposing it, but we can do even better. We not only need public diplomacy people involved in formulating policy, but we need all our people involved in winning support for it.

## CHILD ABDUCTION

*Question.* An American delegation will travel to the Netherlands later this month to attend a periodic conference of parties to the Hague Convention on Child Abduction. I consider this issue to be a top national priority, and have serious concerns about the level of cooperation received from a number of European allies on this matter. What will the U.S. delegation say and do in the Netherlands to underline the need for better cooperation on child abduction?

*Answer.* From March 22-28, the U.S. participated in the Fourth Special Session on the Practical Operation of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. As head of delegation, Assistant Secretary of State Mary A. Ryan made specific remarks that focused on the importance of improving enforcement of Hague return orders and ensuring left behind parents have meaningful access to their children.

Included in the U.S. delegation were Representatives Nick Lampson (D-Texas) and Steve Chabot (R-Ohio), a staff representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, members of the judiciary, and experts from the private sector, as well as State and Justice officials. Assistant Secretary Ryan also met with her counterparts from Mexico, Germany, Sweden, and Austria and raised the specific concerns we have with those countries’ compliance with the Convention.

## STATE DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS

*Question 1.* There are several models for State Department reform now available, including the Carlucci Report, the Kaden Report and others.

- (a) Which of these, if any, is the preferred model?
- (b) Among the recommendations in these many reports, which are the Department’s highest priority?

*Answer.* All of the available reports share many common themes about what State needs to do to reform itself, with the Carlucci report offering the best and most recent synthesis. I take seriously the need to improve designation of the Deputy Secretary as Chief Operating Officer. The focus will be on improving our overseas infrastructure (many posts need to be rebuilt; others need improved security); bringing State’s information technology up-to-date; and obtaining the personnel and resources necessary to support the expanded duties that State carries in today’s world.

*Question 2.* When can we expect the State Department’s authorizations request? Congress has not received the workforce planning report mandated in Section 326 of Public Law 106-113. According to the cited statute, the report was to have been presented to Congress on March 1, 2001. Please give the intended date of delivery.

*Answer.* The Department looks forward to working closely with the Committee in order to obtain passage of our authorization bill, and we appreciate that you are requesting our input. We hope to provide you with a fully cleared administration proposal in the very near future. The Department workforce planning report has been completed and was transmitted to Congress on March 16, 2001.

*Question 3.* In Section 2303 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, Congress mandated that “[the officer of the Department of State with primary responsibility for . . . personnel in the Department of State, or that officer’s principal deputy, shall have substantial professional qualifications in the field of

human resource policy and management. Will you ensure that the eventual nominee for Director General and/or the person chosen to serve as the Director General's principal deputy meets this statutory requirement?

Answer. We agree that the position of Director General of the Foreign Service and Director of Human Resources is a critical State Department leadership position. We can assure you that the person the President nominates for that position will have the highest level of qualification in the field of human resource policy and management.

#### BALKANS: MARCH 31 CERTIFICATION

*Question.* Should the President recommend certification?

Answer. I evaluated all of the FRY's actions relevant to the criteria laid out in Section 594 of House Resolution 5526, and judged that the FRY's actions in relation to those criteria justified certification.

However, I believe more can and must be done by the FRY and Serbian governments to implement many of the steps necessary to ensure full cooperation with the ICTY. We have notified Belgrade authorities that we expect them to follow through on their stated commitment to full cooperation. If these promises are not fulfilled, the Administration is prepared to withhold support for a donor's conference.

#### CHINA: ARMS PURCHASES FROM RUSSIA

*Question.* What steps will the Bush administration take to dissuade the Russians from selling advanced weaponry and engaging in nuclear cooperation with the PRC?

Answer. This is an issue of serious concern to us. We have asked the Russians to look into this issue and plan to follow up.

We will continue to closely monitor sales of Russian military equipment to China, developments in the Taiwan Strait and the modernization of the Chinese military.

We will continue to raise with Russia our concerns about the effect of its arms sales on regional stability.

#### CHINA—FINANCING MILITARY BUILDUP

*Question.* Does the Bush administration believe it is necessary to take any steps to slow down the flow of funds to the government of China—IFI loans, Export-Import Bank loans and guarantees, capital market offerings—in order to inhibit its ongoing military buildup?

Answer. A number of legal restrictions already limit trade promotion and development assistance activities the USG may undertake in China. Regarding the three specific areas raised above, the U.S. opposes International Financial Institution (IFI) lending to China except for projects that meet basic human needs. The Export-Import Bank is an independent agency established by Congress to promote U.S. exports and continues to operate in China. As for capital market offerings, it is USG policy not to intervene in capital markets.

#### THAILAND: THAKSIN'S ECONOMIC PROMISES

*Question.* New Thai Prime Minister Thaksin's populist economic promises, if implemented, will almost certainly put renewed pressure on the baht and may derail the nascent reform process in that country. Has the administration given any thought to possibly hinting to the Thaksin government that another bailout may not be forthcoming if Thailand pursues reckless economic policies?

Answer. Prime Minister Thaksin's government is currently in the process of formulating its economic and other policies. The cost of its policies and programs and the possible impact on economic performance are yet to be determined. As it stands, Thailand's debt is less than 60 percent of GDP, which is better than many developing and some developed countries. We will continue to engage with the Thaksin administration as these economic policies take shape.

#### CHINA—SINOPEC

*Question.* Does the Administration believe that Sinopec's recent agreement to invest in Iran's petroleum sector merits sanctions under the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act?

Answer. This is a question we are now reviewing. Our Embassy in Beijing has expressed our concerns about this matter to both the Chinese government and Sinopec, and we raised the issue here with the recently-departed Chinese Ambassador. We are continuing to seek relevant information from all available sources.

When procedures are completed, we will be in a position to determine whether sanctionable activity has occurred, and if it has, what action, under the law, to take.

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM: APPOINTMENT OF AN AMBASSADOR-AT-LARGE

*Question.* Will you ensure that the position of Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom is not merged with another existing post at the State Department?

Will you ensure that the Office of International Religious Freedom is properly funded and adequately staffed?

*Answer.* The question about double-hatting came up in my testimony to the House International Relations Committee on March 7. With respect to the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom, I said the position is "vacant at the moment, and I'm looking for somebody to fill that position." The position of Ambassador-at-Large will not be merged with an existing State Department position, so that the Ambassador can focus full attention on the issue of religious freedom. The Office of International Religious Freedom will be adequately staffed and funded.

RESPONSES OF SECRETARY OF STATE COLIN POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS TEST MONITORING

*Question.* One small, but very important, element in your budget is our contribution to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO). This \$20 million (which is matched by \$60 million in contributions from other countries) goes primarily to build an International Monitoring System (IMS) to detect possible nuclear tests. The IMS will provide information that can readily be used with other countries or in public diplomacy, in contrast to data gathered by National Technical Means.

(a) What is the status of the U.S. contribution to the CTBTO Preparatory Commission in the President's proposed budget for FY 2002? Will you work to maintain full funding for this important program?

(b) What is the status of the FY 2001 funds for our CTBTO Preparatory Commission contribution? Have they been expended?

(c) In January, General John Shalikashvili wrote that: "Higher funding and intelligence collection priorities should be assigned to monitoring nuclear test activities." What are you doing to ensure that the U.S. Intelligence Community also gets the tasking and support that it needs in this area?

*Answer (a).* For FY 2002, we are requesting the funds needed to pay fully the estimated U.S. share of costs for the ongoing work development and implementation of the International Monitoring System to detect nuclear explosions.

*Answer (b).* The U.S. contribution to the CTBTO Preparatory Commission for 2001, \$17,598,257, was paid in full.

*Answer (c).* The Department:

- tasks the Intelligence Community through membership in the Nuclear Test Intelligence, Joint Atomic Energy Intelligence, and Measurement and Signature Intelligence Committees;
- stresses key issues such as foreign nuclear testing in its participation in interagency bodies overseeing collection strategies, requirements, and resources for all disciplines (imagery, HUMINT, SIGINT, MASINT, OSINT);
- is participating in the just-begun review of the Nuclear Detection System aimed at revalidating system requirements and consolidating funding and support;
- chairs the interagency Treaty Monitoring Working Group, through which it addresses IC budget issues;
- informs the Congress, as required by law, when the verifiability of a treaty is in doubt due to the impending loss of critical monitoring assets; and
- will allocate Key Verification Assets Fund monies (as available) to help preserve nuclear test detection capabilities.

INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

*Question 1.* What are the Administration's plans for signature and ratification of the recently negotiated treaty on persistent organic pollutants?

*Answer.* The persistent organic pollutants (POPs) treaty will be open for signature at a diplomatic conference in Stockholm in May. The Administration is currently reviewing the treaty to determine whether or not to sign.

*Question 2.* The President has said that he is convinced climate change is occurring. With climate change negotiations due to resume this summer, would you tell us the process by which the Administration is developing policy on this issue? Has the President given any direction to that process? What sort of policy proposals are being considered for those negotiations? Who will lead the Administration's negotiations?

Answer. The Administration is undertaking a Cabinet-level review of U.S. climate change policy. This review will consider what policies this Administration should pursue domestically and internationally. It will fully examine global climate change issues—including the science, technologies, market-based systems and innovative approaches to global climate change. The Administration has not determined who will lead upcoming climate change negotiations.

#### INDIA/PAKISTAN

*Question.* (a) What actions are you considering which would help make South Asia a safer place?

(b) How will the failure of the United States to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) affect your ability to get India and Pakistan to sign that treaty or to take other steps away from the nuclear brink?

Answer. The most important thing we can do is to develop our relations with India and Pakistan so that we can exercise leadership across a broad range of political, economic and security issues. We'll be looking at ways to do this as we review our policy toward the region over the coming months.

At the same time, you can expect that the Administration will continue to urge both countries to exercise restraint in nuclear and missile matters. We remain firm in our belief that nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles create serious risks for regional security and also for global efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. We will certainly encourage both India and Pakistan to continue to observe their voluntary moratoriums on further nuclear testing. We will also encourage and assist them to adopt effective controls on the export of sensitive materials and technology.

We will urge India and Pakistan to create the conditions that will lead to a resumption of the dialogue suspended as a result of the Kargil crisis. They have much on the agenda, including Kashmir. We will be prepared at all times to be helpful but we will not seek a mediation role.

Regarding the CTBT, every country will make its decision on the Treaty according to its perception of its own national interests. India and Pakistan are well aware that the U.S. has long abstained from nuclear testing. India has stated that it will continue its voluntary moratorium until the CTBT comes into effect, unless its supreme national interests are jeopardized. Pakistan has said it would continue its moratorium as long as India does. Both governments have stated their intentions to develop a national consensus in favor of signing the CTBT, although domestic and national security concerns have, thus far, prevented them from doing so.

#### AFRICA: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN KEY COUNTRIES

*Question.* What emphasis will be placed on working with democratic elements within countries that have not made significant steps towards democracy, or have actually taken steps in the opposite direction, such as Ivory Coast or Zimbabwe?

Should we expect this administration to focus more on trade as a means of development assistance in Africa? How is this reflected in the President's FY 02 Budget?

What special programs or initiatives will this administration undertake to help African governments deal with the impact that HIV/AIDS has on their countries, and how is this reflected in the budget?

Answer. We emphasize, particularly in transitional countries, activities to promote the development of democratic principles, the advancement of human rights and increased access to both the judicial system and political processes for women and ethnic groups. Experience over the past decade has demonstrated the value of sustained support of democratic elements even within countries that *prima facie* have limited opportunities for positive political change. South Africa and Nigeria are examples of countries where the USG commitment to non-governmental actors contributed significantly to emerging democratic cultures. Accordingly, we can help countries such as the Ivory Coast and Zimbabwe, once models of stability in crisis-torn regions, return to the path of good governance, by strengthening these critical building blocks of democracy and empowering human rights advocates, women, and marginalized groups.

This administration certainly favors expanding trade in general and enhancing our trade and investment relations with Africa. The President indicated his support



for expanding trade with Africa during his January 31 meeting with the Congressional Black Caucus. The African Growth and Opportunity Act is an important legislative tool to achieve this goal.

Trade will be a major component of our policy toward Africa since it is such an important aspect of economic growth and development. In addition to benefits under the AGOA, we and other donors in the WTO have been working with African and other developing countries to reinvigorate the Integrated Framework for coordinated trade-related assistance. To help them take fuller advantage of trade benefits like AGOA, we are trying to improve developing countries' ability to understand sanitary and phyto-sanitary requirements; we are also working to ensure trade policies are integrated into country assistance and poverty reduction strategies with multilateral development banks.

I consider the international spread of HIV/AIDS as a critical issue of concern—USAID remains the lead USG agency in international HIV/AIDS programs. In FY 01, Congress allocated \$340 million for HIV/AIDS to USAID; a more than three-fold increase from 1999 levels. The current administration's FY 02 budget includes an increase of 10 percent.

USAID has identified Uganda, Zambia and Kenya as "Rapid-Scale Up" countries in sub-Saharan Africa. They will receive increased support to achieve measurable impact against the epidemic within one or two years. Additionally, USAID is working to involve local communities through faith-based initiatives. Finally, USAID's Africa Bureau provides assistance to various countries to assess the impact of HIV/AIDS; this will produce long term plans to cope with this decimation.

#### CENTRAL ASIA: IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

*Question.* Central Asia presents the United States with a fundamental dilemma. It is a resource-rich area in a strategically important part of the world. Yet it is ruled by corrupt dictators who use the specter of insurgency to justify their repression, and this brutality generates popular support for the very forces it seeks to stamp out. In Kazakhstan, for example, President Nazarbayev has virtually eliminated any semblance of an independent judiciary and freedom of the press is essentially non-existent. There is little accountability for the government's actions.

(a) How would you propose to maintain U.S. influence in Central Asia without sacrificing our basic values?

(b) Using your gift for forthright speech rather than diplomatic jargon, what message on the fundamental importance of human rights would you send to the leaders of Central Asia?

*Answer.* I agree fully with your description of the problem we face in Central Asia. An "Arc of Instability," including such neighbors as Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, China and Russia, surrounds the Central Asian countries. The governments of the region face serious transnational threats such as terrorism, narcotics smuggling, and trafficking in arms, including weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, we see these same governments turning increasingly to autocracy and repression as tools of statecraft.

Only by remaining engaged on both fronts can we reconcile our support for enhanced regional security with our effort to promote democratization and free market economic reform. As we encourage the Central Asian states to participate actively in the NATO, the Partnership for Peace and the OSCE, we are also exposing them to the democratic values those institutions represent. In discussions of regional and international security, we reserve time to raise general, and sometimes specific, issues of democracy and human rights. We also use the OSCE Permanent Council in Vienna as a forum for both bilateral engagement on these issues, and when necessary, public criticism of abuses by the Central Asian governments.

The message we should send to these leaders is very simple: Democracy and respect for human rights are basic values for the United States government and its people. We will continue to press you on these issues at every opportunity. We think it is in your own self interest to empower your citizens both politically and economically, because in the end they will not support you if they do not have a stake in your country's future.

---

#### RESPONSE OF SECRETARY OF STATE COLIN POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTION FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

##### ANGOLA: PUBLICATION OF OIL REVENUE PAYMENTS

*Question.* Earlier this year, British Petroleum made a commitment to publicly publish their annual payments to Sonangol and the Angolan government, including

signature bonus payments, so that the Angolan people can begin to have a sense of how much revenue their government takes in, and thus begin to hold officials accountable for their management of the budget. Would you support efforts underway to encourage major American oil firms to do the same?

Answer. The United States strongly supports continuing Government of Angola efforts to improve transparency. In recent meetings with us, senior Angolan officials reiterated their pledge to pursue transparency. We are encouraged by the Government of Angola's recognition that it bears primary responsibility in this matter. We are working with the Government of Angola and the International Monetary Fund to support the progress of the ongoing "diagnostic" review of oil sector revenues. The goal of the review is to clearly trace revenues from oil production as an important step in improving transparency and accountability in these accounts. We strongly encourage all U.S. firms active in the Angolan oil sector to work with the Government of Angola and the IMF to provide all relevant data in support of the ongoing diagnostic review.

---

RESPONSES OF SECRETARY OF STATE COLIN POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PAUL WELLSTONE

CHINA: RESOLUTION AT UN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

*Question.* While strongly supporting the administration's decision to sponsor a resolution on China at the UN Commission on Human Rights, I am concerned about the U.S. being the only sponsor again, making it far easier for the Chinese government to defeat the measure. To exert serious pressure on China through this process, we will need other co-sponsors. What efforts are you personally, and the President, making to ask other governments to co-sponsor? For example, has Mexico, a key member of the Commission this year, yet been approached? Or Canada? Or Costa Rica? Or the Czech Republic?

Answer. We are seeking co-sponsors for our China resolution and active support for our effort to defeat China's anticipated no-action motion. We are serious in our pursuit of the resolution in Geneva. I am personally involved in these efforts, and have already underscored U.S. priorities with other concerned countries. For example, I have urged EU ministers to support the resolution. It would be best not to discuss further U.S. interactions with specific governments regarding the resolution in deference to the confidentiality of government-to-government discussions and to ensure the best possible atmosphere for our diplomatic efforts to succeed.

CHINA: RAISING HUMAN RIGHTS WITH VICE PREMIER QIAN

*Question.* The State Department should be commended for a strong, detailed and hard hitting report on human rights deterioration in China. What specific human rights concerns will you raise directly with Vice Premier Qian when he visits Washington, March 18-24?

Answer. We made clear to Vice Premier Qian our strong commitment to securing progress on human rights in China. We did not shrink from candidly discussing differences. We urged the Chinese government to improve the situation on the ground in China and conform with internationally accepted standards.

CHINA: GENEVA RESOLUTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS DIALOGUE

*Question.* If Vice Premier Qian insists the U.S. drop any effort to censure China in Geneva in exchange for resuming the formal dialogue on human rights (suspended by China in May 1999), how will you respond?

Answer. We have already announced that we are going forward with a China resolution at the UN Commission on Human Rights. We are committed to that course. We have also made clear to the Chinese that we are ready to resume our human rights dialogue without preconditions.

