AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2001 INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

FEBRUARY 16, 2000

Serial No. 106–177

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

71–859 DTP WASHINGTON : 2001

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: (202) 512–1800 Fax: (202) 512–2250
Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York, *Chairman*

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
PETER T. KING, New York
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina
MATT SALMON, Arizona
AMO HOUGHTON, New York
TOM CAMPBELL, California
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
KEVIN BRADY, Texas
RICHARD BURR, North Carolina
PAUL E. GILLMOR, Ohio
GEORGE RADANOVICH, California
JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado

SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
TOM LANTOS, California
HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, Georgia
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida
PAT DANNER, Missouri
EARL F. HILLIARD, Alabama
BRAD SHERMAN, California
ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, New Jersey
JIM DAVIS, Florida
EARL POMEROY, North Dakota
WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
BARBARA LEE, California
JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York
JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL, Pennsylvania
[VACANCY]

RICHARD J. GARON, *Chief of Staff*
KATHLEEN BERTELSEN MOAZED, *Democratic Chief of Staff*
KRISTEN GILLEY, *Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

Page

WITNESS

The Honorable Madeleine K. Albright, Secretary, U.S. Department of State 6

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Response by the Department of State to a question posted by Rep. Burton concerning the firing of Linda Shenwick 19

APPENDIX

Prepared statements:

The Honorable Benjamin A. Gilman, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, and Chairman, Committee on International Relations ... 51
The Honorable George Radanovich, a Representative in Congress from the State of California 54
The Honorable Madeleine K. Albright 55

Responses by the Department of State to additional questions submitted by:

The Honorable Doug Bereuter 88
The Honorable Matt Salmon 89
The Honorable Kevin Brady 90
The Honorable Dan Burton 91
The Honorable Joseph Crowley 109
The Honorable George Radonovich 111
The Honorable Steve Rothman 112

THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2001 INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST

DAY, MONTH 00, 2000

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

Chairman GILMAN. The Committee will come to order. Madam Secretary, we thank you for your appearance before our Committee. We may be called for a general vote, but we will continue right on because we know your time is limited and our Committee's time is limited.

We thank you for your willingness to come and review the budget with us today. We believe it is vitally important for our State Department to engage the Congress, and particularly our International Relations Committee, in a vigorous dialogue on foreign policy challenges that face our nation.

The Administration has been playing an important role in the Arab-Israeli peace process, as well as in discussions in the north of Ireland and we commend your efforts in those two areas, Madam Secretary. And you have been doing an outstanding job trying to keep things together.

I understand you will be traveling to Croatia and Albania at the end of this week. And we wish you godspeed in your mission to that difficult region.

Before turning to the subject of today's hearing, the President's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request, I would like to say a few words about Libya and the trial of the two suspects of the bombing of PanAm Flight 103. We have received your letter of February 8th in which you assure us that there are no external negotiated limits to the authority of the Scottish prosecutors in the trial regarding the lines of inquiry they can pursue. That is welcome news and we hope you will soon be able to share Secretary General Koffi Anon's letter to Momar Ghadafi with the families of the PanAm 103 victims which I had previously suggested to you in my earlier letter.

With regard to the budget, Madam Secretary, I intend to support funding at approximately the level you have requested and I think most of our Members will probably agree to that. However, we do disagree with some of your priorities, for example, we passed and the President signed the Foreign Affairs Authorization Bill that provides for about $200 million more per year for security than you have requested.

I think that is a vote on a resolution on the House Floor on adopting the record. We will continue the hearing and I am asking some of our Members if they would go on over early and then we will come back and continue right through with our testimony.

We will be urging the Budget Committee and the appropriators to make room for a security amount and that they find offsetting cuts in accounts such as peacekeeping.

I would like at this comment on some specific problem areas around the world. With regard to Russia, it is certain that Russia has been violating its commitments to the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, its obligations under its own constitution and in all likelihood, the rules of war. The response to the Russian atrocities by the Administration has not been as strong as we would like.

There are some things we feel we could do ranging from the cutting off of IMF loans to the Russian government and taking this issue up in a decisive, strong manner in an international forum such as the U.N. But, we are not even doing that. We welcome your thoughts with regard to that. I understand you recently have come back from a visit to Russia and we certainly welcome your thinking.

Lastly, with regard to Kosovo, President Clinton referred to the excellent job our airmen and other military personnel did in bringing that conflict in Kosovo to a close. Yet, there are many reports today that our effort to bring lasting peace and stability to Kosovo is not going as well as we would like. We look forward to hearing from you this morning about how our nation and our allies in Europe plan to ensure that our military success will be matched by our efforts to restore an orderly society to Kosovo and bring democracy to Serbia as well.

With regard to the investors in central Europe, Madam Secretary, the admission of the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary into NATO is a proud achievement and those states are now moving toward entry into the EU as well. We hope however, that you will impress upon our new allies the need to assure proper treatment of American investors, a matter of urgent concern to some of our investors in the Czech Republic and in Poland, in particular.

With regard to North Korea, Madam Secretary, Congress remains concerned about our policy toward North Korea. Despite 6 years of engagement, nearly $1 billion in American aid, North Korea still enhances its missile technology to the point where it may be able to strike the continental United States with a nuclear weapon. In addition, North Korea has evolved into the world's leading proliferator of missiles and missile technology. For the sake of future American generations we hope you can explain to our Committee how the Administration's policy will lead to an end to this brinksmanship by North Korea.

With regard to the People's Republic of China, Madam Secretary, we have similar concerns with that nation. Our policy of engagement has produced very questionable results. Despite our efforts, human and religious rights abuses continue, proliferation goes unchecked, Chinese espionage continues against our high tech industries and their military buildup against Taiwan still moves forward. It is shortsighted to assert that increased trade alone will

solve those problems and I hope you have some other options for us regarding our policy toward the People's Republic of China.

And with regard to Latin America, Madam Secretary, many of us are grateful that the Administration has begun to focus on the drug crisis that grips Colombia. But we must not ignore the rest of the region. Funding to support Mexico's elections should be a priority. We are concerned that the wave of democracy in Latin America may be cresting. How our nation directs or withholds resources can make a difference.

Ecuador, for example, is on the brink of chaos. The jury is out on Venezuela. The legitimacy of Peru's upcoming elections is open to question. Paraguay remains fragile. Property issues in Nicaragua continue to fester. And after closing our bases in Panama, the Administration has done very little to try to get them reopened. We must address escalating drug trafficking and drug corruption in Haiti. We are not doing enough to discourage violence and have not provided promised resources to level the playing field for Haiti's upcoming elections, an important election and the hour is late. We need to do some things now before those elections.

With regard to the management issues, 2 weeks ago our Committee heard from Members of the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel. We have examined their report. We believe it provides a sound roadmap for modernizing the State Department into the next century. I trust that you will aggressively pursue these recommendations and put them into action. We know you are concerned about them.

I intend to hold further hearings on your progress on the issued outlined in the Panel's report and I now turn to our Ranking Minority Member. Mr. Lantos, do you have any opening remarks?

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, as I was listening to my good friend, Chairman Gilman, I take it that the brunt of his message is that in your 3½ years as Secretary of State you have not solved all of the problems of all the portions of the world thus far. I hope you will be able to give us your defense that there are still some problems in this world, despite your extraordinary stewardship of this post.

I want to take my minute or 2, because this may be one of the last times you appear before us as Secretary of State, to express my deepest appreciation and I am sure that of the American people as well for the extraordinary leadership you have shown as Secretary of State. You brought to this job a unique background, an extraordinary intellect, and a degree of energy that all of us deeply envy.

Let me just say that while everybody speaks of the remarkable U.S. economy domestically, I admire the remarkable achievements in the international field. It would take hours to cite all of them. But let me just deal with your courageous position with respect to the crisis in Yugoslavia. Your determination to see to it that the NATO Act will go down in history as a pivotal act. It serves as a warning to countless totalitarian countries, that the civilized world will act when human rights are violated on a grand scale. During those difficult days you often felt you stood almost alone, but there were a few of us who stood with you and we have prevailed.

I also would like to take this opportunity to advise you that during my questioning period I will ask you about Austria. While on the surface Austria today is a very prosperous, free and open society, there are early indications that a vote of 27 percent will go to Mr. Haidar, a man of singularly disturbing views and background. I will ask you about the plans you have for dealing with this new crisis. The Haidar episode is not restricted to Austria.

The neofascist and the neo-Nazis in the whole region are delighted that his extremist, xenophobic, racist political party is now part of the Austrian government. In other countries in the region similar parties are looking forward to being included in their respective governments.

I will ask you what your views are of future applicants to NATO if they include ultra-right wing, racist, xenophobic political parties in their government as we now see in Austria.

I also would like to suggest that your determination to maintain U.S.-Russian relations on an even keel despite the tragedy in Chechnya is clearly in the long term interest of the United States. Russia is not just a faltering economy. It is a nuclear power and as such represents a unique case in looking at the globe.

Madam Secretary, I have one sort of general critique of the Administration which I hope you will be able to address during your observations. The debate on the Republican side in the presidential campaign relates to tax cuts versus paying down the debt. And I personally wish that our Administration would have seen it fit to use this time of extraordinary prosperity to make a quantum jump upward in funds devoted to the conduct of international relations. We are devoting about 1 percent of our budget to international relations.

The world is a very dangerous place and I would have hoped that there might have been more courage, perhaps vision, in dramatically upgrading our presence overseas. In recent years, we have been closing embassies. We have been starving our foreign service. We have not provided the kinds of cultural opportunities for people around the global to visit American cultural centers. And in the long run, this is not a far sighted policy with respect to the 21st century. I welcome strongly your views on this subject because I would have been more than willing to support a request by your Department considerably above what you are coming in with. This is the moment for us to make a major step in building the future of the world on a stable and democratic basis and we have the resources to do it. I welcome your presence.

Chairman GILMAN. The Committee will stand in a brief recess until a senior Member returns and we will continue.

[Recess.]

Mr. BEREUTER. [Presiding.] The Committee will come to order. We will resume sitting.

Madam Secretary, those of us who went to vote assumed your opening statement was remarkable.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Not yet.

Mr. BEREUTER. We will take it on trust.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I have not done it yet.

Mr. BEREUTER. You have not done it yet. I have been asked first by the Chairman to recognize the Ranking Member, Mr. Gejdenson for his opening remarks.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you, Madam Secretary. It is great to have you before us again and I for one want to commend you and the Administration. In this post-Soviet area, you have set for us a compass that encompasses all of our values as Americans and have persisted where it may have been easier to avoid responsibility. And even though as we sit here today we all share some frustration in the Middle East, in Ireland and elsewhere, American leadership in the Middle East has kept the progress going and I am frankly still an optimist in the midst of all these difficulties.

In Northern Ireland, we have had setbacks, but we have had tremendous progress and I think it is important in every one of these instances to recognize where we would be without your and the President's leadership.

And even in Kosovo where from day to day we are frustrated by the continued expression of hatred, America's resolve led the Western world to stop what would have been a brutal massacre, not necessarily on the numerical scale of World War II, but clearly one that would have annihilated many of the Kosovar Albanians.

There is still much to be done in Haiti. We made progress, but there is a long way to go. In Africa, we need to make sure that America is not seen as simply leading the effort to stop violence in Europe, but ignoring our responsibilities in Africa and the Administration's efforts to bolster the process to end the violence in the Congo and elsewhere is an important act.

I commend the President for going to India and I hope that you will go there soon as well. I think we have an opportunity to build a new relationship with India as we have ended the Cold War. And I think the President is right to go to India. I know that the Pakistan issue is before us, but I think that as we see the military ruler in Pakistan removing the court system, trying the elected president, it would be the wrong signal to send.

There is one area where I wish this Administration be doing a little more and that is in heating oil. Part of that is your responsibility and that of some of the countries that America went to war for and part is a protected sum. My old friend Secretary Richardson and I have written to him to release the strategic petroleum reserve because what I am fearful of is that we will replace a heating oil crisis for a gasoline crisis this summer and America needs to use its strategic petroleum reserve and your good offices to increase the availability of fuel stocks.

Additionally, I think that our people who work overseas deserve our maximum support in a sense of security to make sure that they work in facilities that are secure and safe from terrorist attacks and to that end we need to work with all democratic nations that want to fight terrorism. Cooperation between countries which are improving in India, the Middle East and elsewhere to fight terrorism is still an important role for the United States to take the lead in.

We need to understand that American consular activities are part of our economic vitality today. I have just completed a trip

with 15 companies to India and I can tell you that without Ambassador Celeste, the Foreign Commercial Service and others, we would not have had the success that we did so I want to commend you there.

We are still short in many places as Americans come to embassies for visas and other assistance. The demand exceeds our ability to provide those services and you are going to have to work with this Committee and other Committees in Congress to make sure there is adequate funding.

International disease prevention; you know oftentime, our efforts are seen as simply humanitarian efforts when we fight AIDS and other diseases overseas, but we have seen in the northeast, the West Nile fever spreading up the coast from New York into Connecticut and the opportunistic diseases that follow AIDS in Africa will be rapidly brought to the United States. So there is both the humanitarian aspect to our engagement of these international diseases, and also a self-preservation effort.

I want to tell you that I think you have done an exceptional job. The Administration has really led us into a new era and we need to take this last year of this President's Administration and not squander it, but to continue even where we face difficulties.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Gejdenson, thank you very much.

Secretary Albright, we are pleased to have you, we are privileged to have you today to make a presentation of the Administration's budget request for FY 2001 and other matters you want to bring to the attention of the House International Relations Committee. You may proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to testify regarding U.S. foreign policy and the President's budget.

And today, I am going to do something that may be without precedent for a Secretary of State in these annual around the world hearings. I will not only promise to be brief, I will keep my promise.

The membership list of this Committee is long and time is always short and I think I have learned my lesson here that you deserve to ask the questions. Moreover, you have my written testimony which I am sure you will study carefully, perhaps at bedtime.

I will take only about 5 minutes to highlight some areas where it is vital that we work together in the year ahead. For example, we must do all we can to see that the tide of democracy around the world remains a rising tide. In recent decades the number of countries with elected governments has more than doubled, but many transitions have stalled due to economic crisis, ethnic division, rising crime or leaders whose commitment to democracy is only skin deep.

This year we are investing significant resources in four key democracies: Colombia, Indonesia, Nigeria and Ukraine. Now each of these countries is unique in its culture and history, but each is also

important in its region and at a pivotal point in its democratic growth.

Second, I ask your support for peace. We need your steady backing as we strive to help the parties move forward in their search for a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. We also need your support for efforts with our partners to help Southeast Europe, including Kosovo and eventually Serbia, integrate itself into the continent's democratic mainstream. And we need your help in working with the U.N. and African leaders to halt the terrible conflicts in Sierra Leone and the Congo.

Third, I ask your support to protect American security, including the President's request for funds to insure the safe handling of nuclear materials and expertise within the former Soviet Union. We need your patience as we work with our allies in Seoul and Tokyo to assure stability on the Korean peninsular where 37,000 American troops stand watch. And we need your help in establishing common ground on how to protect our citizens against ballistic missiles and preserve U.S. leadership on arms control. We need your backing on resources to make our diplomatic missions more secure and to counter international terror and drug traffic.

Fourth, I ask your support for prosperity. No nation has a greater stake than ours in an open and inclusive global economic system within which American genius and productivity receive their due. We need your help to build such a system by supporting our efforts to assist Americans doing business overseas as Congressman Gejdenson has just stated. Help us to promote responsible labor and environmental policies around the globe and we need your help in broadening the participation in the world economy by approving permanent normal trade relations with China, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the Southeast Europe Trade Preference Act.

Fifth, I ask your support for the values that Americans cherish. Let us strive together to increase respect for human rights, bring war criminals to justice, advance the status of women and girls, preserve the environment and increase our contribution to fighting killer diseases, including HIV/AIDS. And let us support the President's plan to provide debt relief for the most heavily indebted poor countries and his request to provide full funding without unrelated restrictions for international family planning which reduces the number of abortions and saves human lives.

And finally, I ask your support for all the people, platforms and programs that enable us to represent America's interest around the globe and I ask your support for American leadership. Today, our rich and powerful nation devotes a smaller percentage of its wealth to assisting overseas development than any other industrialized country. During the past decade, our rate of investment has declined by 50 percent and over the past half century by more than 90. As the new century dawns, we are allocating only one penny out of every Federal dollar we spend for the entire array of international programs.

And I am very grateful to the statements already made in supporting our full budget. But the truth is here if we look at this the one single penny can spell the difference between hard times and good times for our people, war and peace for our country, less and

more freedom for our world. In summary, I ask your help in using America's prestige and power in the right way, for the right reasons in order to achieve the right results for our citizens and for our many friends abroad.

And now I will stop and I look forward to responding to your questions and to hearing your views.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Albright appears in the appendix.]

Mr. BEREUTER. Without objection, the Secretary's written statement will be made a part of the record. I will turn the chair back to the Chairman at this point.

Chairman GILMAN [presiding]. Madam Secretary, we regret the interruptions. In November, the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel submitted their report on a range of issues related to our overseas representation. That report calls upon our President to set up an interagency group to work on issues that will help modernize our overseas presence.

Could you tell us, Madam Secretary, what has been done with regard to those recommendations and within the State Department who is in charge of implementing the Panel's recommendations and have you established any priorities among those 40 recommendations that were included in the report and any prospects for success?

Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you. Well, first of all I was very pleased to have the Panel's recommendations and I welcome their emphasis on the urgency of improving our capital plan, the importance of investing in human resources and the indispensable nature of universal representation.

I strongly agree with the Panel's focus on the need to assure stronger interagency teamwork. And I noted with dismay the way that the Panel Members responded to the substandard condition of our many overseas facilities and their emphasis on improving our employees' quality of life. As they traveled around, they saw what many of you see and what I see, that some of the places where our people are stationed are neither safe nor useful in terms of their work.

We are now reviewing all this at the State Department in terms of trying to figure out how all the recommendations fit together. But let me also make the following point, Mr. Chairman. The recommendations from this Advisory Panel are not simply about the State Department. They affect all agencies operating overseas and I think it is very important that we try to see this as an interagency effort with the support of the White House and Congress. In the Department, the Undersecretary for Management is handling it specifically, but I must tell you that it is a subject with which I am very familiar and I am spending a lot of time because I really do believe that we need to at this particular moment spend a great deal of time and money trying to resolve the problems that they set out.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Your testimony, Madam Secretary, identifies a number of very important priorities for the new year, including a growing global economy. How-

ever, some of us are disappointed and surprised to see that the energy crisis now threatening economic growth around the world and gripping large parts of our own nation, particularly the northeast, is not on the list of the State Department's priorities. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, OPEC, keeping more than 6 percent of the crude oil capacity off the market and energy prices now reaching $30 per barrel, we find that our reserves are at their lowest levels since the late 1970's.

American energy consumers, small businesses and hundreds of independent truckers are demanding prompt solutions. For example, with OPEC, should we be reviewing our current security relationship with all of the OPEC member states and their close allies perhaps suggesting to them they should not assume that we will bail them out the next time their security is threatened as they threaten our own economy? And what actions are we taking to insure that OPEC gets the right message before its forthcoming March meeting to determine new production quotas for the coming year, Madam Secretary?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me say that this is obviously an issue of great importance to Americans and one that as Congressman Gejdenson already mentioned is something with which we all ought to be highly concerned.

State Department and Department of Energy officials testified before this Committee last week and we have consistently made clear in our public statements and in our discussions with individual OPEC producers our opposition to the OPEC cartel's efforts to coordinate and set world oil prices. I can tell you that in discussions that I have already had with a variety of Middle East leaders this has come up and Assistant Secretary Ned Walker is traveling the region as we speak on a number of issues and this is obviously one that is high on his agenda, but we are also working with the Department of Energy on this issue.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Madam Secretary. We are concerned that our policy toward Iraq is in disarray. There have been no international inspections in Iraq for over a year. Virtually, none of the assistance that Congress has made available to the Iraqi opposition has actually been delivered.

Madam Secretary, can you tell us whether the Administration remains committed to removing Hussein from power and can you tell us when significant portions of the $97 million in military assistance and $8 million in political support funds are actually going to be delivered to the Iraqi democratic opposition? And can you estimate for us the date on which U.N. Inspectors will be able to return to resume monitoring Iraq's weapons programs?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me start out by saying that our policy toward Iraq has not changed. We believe that a tight sanctions regime is important for the containment of Iraq so that it does not pose a threat to its neighbors and we work very hard in New York in order to get the new Security Council resolution on this subject to try to get the Inspectors back in on conditions where they can do the job correctly, not just to go in there.

The United Nations has just named a new head of UNMOVIC which is the successor to UNSCOM, Dr. Hans Blix, who has a proven record of understanding how inspections should go on and they

are in the process of organizing themselves. The question is whether Saddam Hussein will accept the Inspectors, but we have other ways of checking what is going on.

On the Iraq Liberation Act, let me just say the second part of our policy states that we are committed to regime change and to assisting the opposition both inside and outside Iraq. We have been working very hard with the opposition and are discussing providing it first with nonlethal material and training. They are making progress, the Iraqi opposition in organizing themselves and we have been working with them. I have met with large numbers of them so our position has not changed. We believe that we should be involved in containment and regime change.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you and Madam Secretary, in conclusion I want to note that General Vung Pow, the leader of the Hmong people who fought alongside our troops during the Vietnam Wars is present with us today and we welcome General Vung Pow.

[Applause.]

Madam Secretary, just this morning we received distressing news alleging that the Vietnamese troops are working closely with the Lao government forces to wipe out Hmung freedom fighters and their supporters. We are very distressed by those reports and we ask you, Madam Secretary, to please look into this matter.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I will, sir.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you. Mr. Gejdenson.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. Madam Secretary, following up on the Chairman's questions on the Iraqi resistance, you know, to listen to some in Washington you would get the sense that there is a large, unified, broadly supported opposition where we would only have to give them weapons they could move in and remove Saddam Hussein. Is it fair to say that at this point we are far from a stage where there is a large unified organized opposition that is viable? And further that the danger may be at this point if you simply handed them weapons that they would very quickly be decimated and those weapons would end up in Saddam Hussein's hands?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, let me say that it is a large disparate group and one of the things that Frank Richardony (whom I have asked to coordinate all of this), one of the things that he has been doing is working with them in order to get themselves more organized. They were able to have a national congress; the Iraqi National Congress held its first executive meeting since 1994 and a first mass assembly since 1992 in 1999 thanks to the work that we had been doing.

I think there are those who believe that one could insert some kind of a group into Iraq and make sure that that is the way you overthrow him. We think that that would require regional support which does not exist now, and more fundamentally it would also require the support and protection of U.S. troops. So while one might well wish to have something like that happen, I think it is not a reality and your statement also, Congressman Gejdenson, is true. That at this stage, we have to give them assistance to the extent that they can well absorb it rather than have it go into the wrong hands.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Let me just take one moment to commend you for raising environmental and labor issues with our allies. I think

what happened at the World Trade Organization in Seattle is an indication that this is something broadly felt in the American public, that just as we deal with intellectual property in international agreements, trade and environmental and labor issues need to be included.

I, frankly, even though this is a great difficulty of the Syrian-Israeli negotiations, I still think it is a key and I hope again the Administration continues its efforts there.

Let me go on to ask you about the situation in Ngarno-Karabach. There had been some progress and then, of course, the tragic assassination that occurred. Can you give me a sense of where we are today in that region?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes. In fact, President Aliev of Azerbejan was in the United States yesterday and met with President Clinton and with me. We have made very clear our interest in having that situation resolved and there have been some talks. It is important that the Minsk Group which is part of the OSCE process really be able to produce with them some additional movement.

I think that, as you pointed out, Congressman, the tragic assassinations in Armenia had created some problems in getting the process going, but we talked about it when we were in Istanbul with the President and we keep a very close eye.

Mr. GEJDENSON. What is your sense of the situation in Pakistan? Obviously, I think many of us in Congress have felt tremendous frustration, one obviously first with the coup; second now with the assault on the judiciary; the connection, at least, with some elements of terrorist operations in the region coming out of Pakistan and obviously the connection with the Taliban. What are the things you are looking for from the Pakistanis in cooperation say in anti-terrorism activities as well as a return to democracy?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, I think that we have to remember the very important relationship that we have had with Pakistan and one that unfortunately has been interrupted by both the nuclear tests as well as by the action of General Mesharaf. We have consistently urged now General Mesharaf to move in terms of some measurable milestones of a return to civilian government and we are watching very carefully how he reforms the electoral commission on the parties and holds local elections.

We want to see some kind of a public show and not just show, but real action in terms of returning to democracy. And we will continue to support grassroots democracy in Pakistan. We have made quite clear to them that we are concerned about some of the activities in terms of terrorism and we have that under continual review.

We have been concerned about the fact that groups like the Harakutl Mujahedin which we believe was involved in the recent hijacking of Indian Airlines 814 operate in Pakistan and that they have been a transit point for terrorists, so we are concerned and we hope that we can see some action both in terms of democracy and dealing with the terrorists' threat.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Gejdenson.

Mr. Leach?

Mr. LEACH. Madam Secretary, I want to ask a nonpolicy question, but an institutional one and that is whether in your view you have adequate resources to run the Department of the State. We have more embassies. We have had more embassies than we have had in our history. We have more countries being created and yet over this Administration State Department funding has been pretty level, not keeping up with inflation.

Do you think that is adequate? Would you recommend that more resources ought to be given to the United States Foreign Service?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Congressman, I have been very concerned about the funding of the State Department and quite appalled by the fact that in 1985 our budget was $22.4 billion and we are coming to you today to request $22.8 billion and given what we know about what has happened to money——

Mr. LEACH. I am sorry. I am not as interested in the totality of the foreign aid. I am more looking at just the State Department itself.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. The operations?

Mr. LEACH. Which is about a tenth of that figure.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Right. And let me say what I have been trying to do, we hit rock bottom at the end of the 1980's and early 1990's in terms of funding for the State Department operations in Foreign Service and I have been systematically trying to raise that amount.

Yes, we could certainly use more and one of the issues that we now have to deal with is the question about security so that a large portion of our operations budget also by rights has to go to security, but it is really robbing Peter to pay Paul. We need secure buildings, but we need people in them and so we certainly—I have never felt that we have adequate resources. It is a problem that we are very grateful that there have been some statements already about full funding of what the President has requested, but I do believe that we have been systematically underfunded, but this has been going on for a long time, as I said the late 1980's and early 1990's, and I have been trying very hard to get us out of that trough.

Mr. LEACH. I appreciate that. I would only stress, if you would look at the President's request it is not [underfunded]. If you take out the security, we are basically about where we were in 1992 or 1993 in terms of funding, without inflationary impacts. And just as an individual—I mean it is my strong view that all Americans can have credible doubts about levels of foreign aid and that is a matter of judgment, but no one should have doubt whether the United States should be supremely well represented abroad. And I am very concerned that the level of funding that you have requested for the American officers is inadequate and as the trite phrase is of an increasingly complicated world, an increasingly sophisticated, an increasingly intertwined world, we ought to be upgrading significantly the capacities of the professional foreign service. And that cannot be done without resources and I am not convinced that the Department has weighed in with its request to Congress as adequately as perhaps it could. And I just want to express——

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Congressman, let me say that the Department has weighed in up to here and we have been working very

hard to get increases. I happen to believe that American diplomats should be treated as well as the American military and I fully approve of the treatment of the American military without whom we could do nothing.

So I think that our American diplomats should have the respect and the needs that they have in order to do their work properly and I thank you very much for your comments.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Leach. Mr. Lantos?

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, let me first ask you about Austria and then Syria. We have a very serious, very threatening, long term trend which is developing in Austria and I think it is important for us to understand the antecedents. Austria portrayed itself very successfully as Hitler's first victim when in point of fact Austria was Hitler's first ally and while the Germans have cleansed themselves to a remarkable degree of their Nazi past, the Austrians have never done that. As a matter of fact, their election of the infamous Waldheim as President after his lies became public knowledge is an indication of how xenophobic and uncleansed that society in fact has been.

Now we have Haidar getting 27 percent of the vote. I think it is important to realize that not all the people who vote for him are neo-Nazis, but I think it is also important to understand that all the people who are neo-Nazis are voting for Haidar and all the people who are profoundly opposed to a new and democratic and integrated Europe are voting for Haidar.

Haidar claims that he is not responsible for his parents which at one level is true, but it is also true that just as John McCain brought to his public persona his family as did some of our other presidential candidates, in Haidar's case his father joined the Nazi party in 1929, his mother in 1930. He grew up in an atmosphere of hate, dripping with hate. He makes statements which are way, way beyond anything acceptable. To me the most sickening statement is his reference to concentration camps as punishment camps as if, in fact, the million and a half children who were killed in these concentration camps had to be punished somehow.

Now it is very important as we deal with this delicate and complex issue that we walk a fine line. The European countries have taken a very strong stand against Haidar. You have recalled temporarily our ambassador and some of us have had an opportunity to have lengthy conversations with her as well as with the Austrian ambassador here.

I would like to ask you on the Austria issue, do you feel that what is happening in Austria with the xenophobic, extremist, racist political party now part of the government has ramifications on some of the neighboring countries? For instance, in Hungary, a similar party is now overjoyed at Haidar's admittance into the government of Austria. There are similar elements throughout the region and I think the way we treat the Haidar phenomenon will have long term ramifications for the development of democracy in the area.

With respect to Syria, I would like to ask you to comment on what appears to be Assad's newest approach, namely since he did not see the meetings in this country between Mr. Barak and his foreign minister bringing immediate fruit, he has now revved up

his surrogates, the Hezbollah in southern Lebanon and has begun the pattern of violence and terrorism. I would be grateful if you would tell us what you plan to do in this respect.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you. Let me say on Austria, Congressman Lantos, that your summary of the situation I would agree with and I will not question any of the aspect of it because I personally agree with what you have said. I have been in touch even before when Chancellor Shussel was Foreign Minister Shussel to tell him how concerned we were and that it was most unfortunate that he had not been able to create his coalition with the Socialist Party. And when I was in Moscow, I actually had a conversation with Shussel on the phone. He then sent me the preamble to their agreement which has a lot of good words in it. What we have said to them, both personally as well as through now Ambassador Hall who has returned to Vienna temporarily and will be coming back again, is that we will be holding them to their actions and that words are not enough.

On a series of issues that have to do with their past, I have asked Stu Eizenstat, who even though he is now Undersecretary of Treasury continues to be my personal representative on the Holocaust issues, to be in touch with officials in Austria in order to deal with compensation funds and all the issues that are of importance.

As far as the rest of Europe is concerned, I have had very good and important discussions with fellow foreign ministers on the general concern that they have for the rise of right extremist right wing parties and the collapse of some legitimate conservative parties, this is an even greater problem. I also recently had a very good conversation with Foreign Minister Guremech of Poland who will be hosting in June a conference on the community of democracies which we had basically thought originally could be on evolving new democracies. But I have asked them to take up the issue of Austria as a problem of existing democracies which might be subjected to these kinds of points. So believe me, this is very much on my agenda. I am going to Zagreb tomorrow in order to be present at the inauguration of the new Croatian President which is a great victory and at that time I will be talking with other foreign ministers who are there on this very subject.

On Syria, let me say that we were very disappointed in the fact that the Blair House talks and then Shepherdstown did not yield immediate results. As you know better than anyone this is a very difficult and complex situation and we have wanted to and will continue to try to work at lower levels to bring about progress on that track as well as on the Palestinian track. At the same time we have been very concerned about the rising activity of the Hezbeollah. I have been in touch with Foreign Minister Shara several times to tell them that they need to control, use their influence to control the Hezbollah.

We had managed to get a monitoring group meeting on subjects such as the understandings between Israel and Lebanon, and on how to deal with that zone. We were all set. They were meeting and then there was another Hezbollah attack. It is impossible to negotiate or have meetings under those circumstances. So I have talked to Shara. We have made our views known to the Syrians

and we will continue to do so while we try to keep these tracks going.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Lantos. Mr. Bereuter.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, thank you for your testimony and for your energetic and dedicated service to our country. As the Chairman of the Asian Pacific Subcommittee I want to associate myself with the questions and concerns of Mr. Gejdenson related to Pakistan. I noted in your comments secondly that you said in September we had reached an understanding with the North Koreans that they will refrain from long range missile flight tests as long as negotiations to improve relationships are underway. I would just say for your information, but also to the North Koreans in effect, if they test Taepo Dong II I think they have chosen path two of confrontation under Secretary Perry's report to the Congress and to the Administration.

I have two questions, Madam Secretary. A senior assessment team was sent to Indonesia to take a look at types of assistance and activities that would be appropriate, and they recommended a half billion dollars, $500 million in the next 3 years. You have been personally involved. You have been to Indonesia. My first question would be do you support the full funding of the assessment team's recommendations over the next 3 years, one half billion dollars?

Secondly, I was interested as I know you were in the recommendations that were forthcoming and now have arrived from the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel. The report is available to us just recently. I think we have to change the whole framework or structure in the way we rehabilitate and construct embassies for security and other reasons. They made some very interesting recommendations there. I would like to work with you on that.

But they also recommended the establishment of an Interagency Overseas Presence Committee. Since you have in the embassies today representatives of so many Federal agencies and they recommend implementing the accountability review board's recommendations on security, I would like to get your response to the Indonesia question and to these items in this Overseas Presence Advisory Panel report.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. On Indonesia, let me first say as I mentioned in my testimony it is one of our target countries because I think that there are huge possibilities for movement and it is important for the region. We have just received this assessment and we are going to be in consultation on this. In anticipation of their report, we have increased economic assistance funding for FY 2000 to $125 million, primarily in USAID development assistance and ESF funds and are requesting $144 million in FY 2001. So we are working actively and I thank you very much for your support on this.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Secretary, I would like to ask for your personal involvement in this Indonesian issue.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I assure you that you have it. I have spent a lot of time on it and will continue to do so which is why I chose it as one of our countries.

On the report, let me say again that I am very pleased we have the report by these really remarkable people who took a lot of personal time, traveled around, saw things.

We are looking at how to implement it. One of the major problems here is how to have an interagency approach to it and I have now written to my fellow cabinet members who are somehow involved in this about the need for us to work together on what we would call the right sizing of our missions and how the State Department serves as a platform, but a number of other agencies are there with us and we are going to be looking at it.

I think the questions that we have, have to do—I am very glad that they supported universality of representation because I think an American presence, no matter what size and countries is very important. But as we, for instance, rebuild the Nairobi embassy we have turned it into a regional hub in order to service in support ways throughout East Africa. So we are looking into rebuilding. We are taking all their recommendations very seriously and I look forward to working with you on this. This is a major opportunity for the Department of State and therefore the United States to be able to rethink how we do business and we have to do business differently. The whole telecommunications revolution makes that imperative.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you. Thank you.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Bereuter.

Since the Secretary's time is limited and since we have so many Members who want to intervene, I am going to ask our Members to please limit themselves to one question and we will have to limit ourselves to 3 minutes each in order to give every Member an opportunity to be heard——

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry?

Chairman GILMAN. Yes?

Mr. BURTON. Many of us got here very early today because we had a number of questions we wanted to put to the Secretary and we have waited here for a long time. I realize she has a very busy schedule, but we do not have many opportunities to talk with her and I hate like the dickens for any Member to have their time cut short when these questions are very important, especially when we are talking about appropriating large sums of money for foreign policy. She should make herself available so that we can ask these questions.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Sir, I am available. I will be happy to answer your questions.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, she said she would be available and I would like to have——

Chairman GILMAN. The Secretary has agreed to stay until 12:30 and we will be calling on the Members in the order in which they were present by seniority at the time the gavel came down and for those who came in after the gavel, we will call on them in order of their appearance.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. Mr. Berman.

Mr. BERMAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one question, two parts. [Laughter.]

Chairman GILMAN. Mr. Berman?

Mr. BERMAN. I am getting ready to go.

Chairman GILMAN. You have already used 1 minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. BERMAN. You and the President have spent an incredible amount of time trying to get the Middle East peace process going again. You have done a superb job and handled yourself very deftly, and a lot of us are very grateful for this investment of time.

Should the present bump in this process be resolved, should agreements be concluded, it is likely that a lot of countries, particularly the United States, as well as obviously the participating countries, will be asked to pick up some substantial expenditures.

Essential to accomplishing this is to approach it on a bipartisan basis, that there be early consultations between the Administration and the Congress. I know you have already started doing that on your own, but most of all the American people have to understand why peace in the Middle East is an American priority, why it is in America's national interest, and why it is worth an investment of the incredible time you and the President are putting into it and of our financial resources. I am wondering if we can just start that process by you speaking to that issue.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. First of all, I think that anybody who has followed events in the Middle East in this century or last century knows the importance of the region to the United States and to Europe.

And I will not repeat that whole history, but it is an area that is strategically important to the United States for a variety of reasons. Plus, the indissoluble link between this country and Israel that has existed since 1948 that has had bipartisan support is something that needs to be continued. It is a democracy with whom we have very close ties. If we can manage to get the Syrian track, the Palestinian track and the Lebanese track done in the near future, I think it would be a tremendous boon to the American people and I hope that we are able to do that.

At the same time we know that in the past when there have been agreements they have required some kind of financial assistance from the United States and even other countries. We know that if we should be able to achieve progress in these tracks we will incur some major security costs for a future peace and while it is premature to really be talking about numbers of any kind, I do think that the American people need to know how important the region is to us for both humane, human values, principled reasons and security reasons. I hope very much, Congressman Berman, to have the opportunity to come here and actually talk about what we need for a comprehensive peace.

Mr. BERMAN. The second part of the question is related to the Middle East as well. Just what is your evaluation of what is going on in Iran? Elections are coming up. You have made some initial moves. You have welcomed a dialogue. You have taken them off the drug list. We see the reformers moving. We see the establishment reacting, but we do not see any fundamental change, it seems to me, on either development of weapons of mass destructive or support for terrorism. Where do you think things are?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, clearly what Iran is, is a country and a society that is in some flux. They will have elections to the majelus on the 18th and we continue to follow and be intrigued by the moves of some of the reformers and President Khatami and how he is dealing with what is clearly an upsurge in support for his kind of approach which is being supported by people of the middle class, younger people, women. So we are watching that.

We are concerned, however, about the fact that they are not supporting the Middle East peace process. They are evidently supporting terrorism in various places and they continue to try to acquire weapons of mass destructive and that is something that we are monitoring and we are working with those countries, in fact, that we are concerned——

Mr. BERMAN. Does Khatami have any control over foreign or military policy in Iran?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, in some way it looks as though there are two parallel governments that are going on, but I hesitate to comment too actively until we see the results of these elections. They could have a large influence on the way things go and we have said that we are prepared to have a dialogue on issues, on all the issues of concern and as you know there have been statements where Khatami has given interviews. We have tried to respond and so we have essentially a policy by interviews at the moment, but we are looking at ways should there be some change that might lead to something different. But we are concerned by the three points that you have raised, support for terrorism, acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and lack of support for the Middle East peace talks.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Berman.

Mr. Burton?

We will continue right through the voting. It is a vote on rule. Please come back as quickly as you can.

Mr. Burton?

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, I appreciate your request for cooperation with the Congress and toward that end a lady named Linda Shenwick who worked at the United Nations was fired because she was a whistle blower. She talked about waste, fraud and abuse, and the State Department under your leadership was instrumental in having her removed. Fifty-three Members of Congress, myself included, along with Chairman Gilman, wrote you a letter on November 5th and we have not received a reply. We would like for you to talk to your secretary and get a reply to us on the reasons why Ms. Shenwick was removed.

In addition to that, in Colombia we have a problem down there that Chairman Gilman and I and others have been talking about for 4 or 5 years and I think in February 1998 you said no additional helicopters were necessary after you talked to the drug czar. And of course, now we are going to send $1.3 billion down there because the drug war is about out of control. We appreciate that and we hope that it will be pressed aggressively because that entire region is at risk.

I had a hearing in California about 3 or 4 weeks ago regarding the Metroken Papers and Mr. Metroken and a GRU Member who are now in the Witness Protection Program in the United States. Mr. Metroken left the KGB, and was a person who left the KGB in our Witness Protection Program. He said that in Europe and in the United States there are many sites where they believe the Soviet Union buried communications equipment, military equipment and possibly, small nuclear devices.

As far as I know, the State Department has not looked into that. Now we know that two sites have been uncovered in Europe, one in Switzerland and one in Belgium, so this is not just baloney. It really occurred in Europe. We believe it may have occurred here in the United States. I would like to ask the State Department to look into that as quickly as possible and press the Russians for an explanation about that and where the sites might be.

Now Khazakstan is out of control right now. We understand that the government over there has repressed people. They are violating human rights, putting people into prison. There is no access to the opposition to state run media and the only printing press in the country that the opposition had has been destroyed. And if your Department could look into that I would appreciate it.

Now regarding Vietnam, this is something we have not talked about in a long time. We still have 2,047 POW/MIAs missing from the Vietnam War. When President Clinton agreed to normalize relations with Vietnam, we were supposed to get a complete accounting as every President prior to him has requested. Two-thousand forty-seven are still unaccounted for. We have 43 that the Vietnamese knew were alive. We do not have an accounting on those. We need to have those as well.

And finally, regarding Iraq, since August 1998 we have not had inspectors on the ground and I believe it may not be intentional, but I believe the American people are being misled into believing that we know what is going on. Iraq has the ability to produce biological, chemical and nuclear weapons and unless we have inspectors on the ground, we cannot find that out. Spy satellites will not get the job done. We need inspectors on the ground. We have not had them there in over a year and a half and I wish you would look into that. I have some other questions I will submit for the record and if you would care to comment on any of those, I would appreciate it.

[The response by the Department of State follows:]

I apologize for the delay in responding to your letter. I am aware of your interest in these issues and wanted to take the time to review them carefully. A response, dated May 3, 2000, has been sent to you.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much.

Let me just say on Ms. Shenwick's case I do not think it is really appropriate for me to comment—to respect her privacy—and we are trying, the State Department is cooperating fully with the process established by Congress for investigating her whatever allegations there are. But let me just say that neither I nor anyone else in the State Department is trying to persecute her and it is my personal policy and the policy of the Department of State to treat all employees fairly. And I will work on the subject.

Mr. BURTON. A response on Ms. Shenwick will be appreciated. Fifty-three Members of Congress wrote you a letter 2 or 3 months ago and we would like to have a response.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Then on the issue of Colombia, let me say that we have looked very carefully now on and have been supportive of Plan Colombia which President Pastrana was able to design which has a comprehensive approach to the problems there: narcotrafficking, the peace process, the economic issues and social structure. We have come to you requesting a supplemental of $1.6 billion over 2 years. I was down in Cartegena about 3 weeks ago and spoke with President Pastrana's team. We have been looking at how the police and the military work with each other, and are going to be supplying equipment and assistance. I think that we have a very good balanced package and I look forward to working with you on that.

On Tajikistan, we will look into what you have been saying. We obviously have some concerns about some of the activities there. On Vietnam, when I was in Vietnam, I have been there a couple of times, I have specifically gone once to the agency that does the POW/MIA tracking and was quite impressed with the way they do their work. When I was there last time I brought back some remains so this is something that is very much on my mind. We raise it every time with your former colleague, now Ambassador Peterson, who has obviously taken a great personal interest in this and I can assure you that we will continue to do so.

On Iraq, let me say that we have worked very hard in order to get inspectors back in. Chairman Blix is now working on putting together an inspection team. I want to make sure that it is a real team. We do not want anything that says they are able to inspect when they are not and we are in the process of monitoring that now. I agree with you. We need to have better access and Saddam Hussein will not have his sanctions removed if there is not a real inspection team able to do its monitoring. Believe me, it is very much something that we work on on an hourly basis.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Burton.

Mr. Faleomavaega.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, I confess I do not have the eloquence and ability as would my good friend from California, Mr. Lantos, in offering his personal commendations to you and the outstanding job that you are doing on behalf of our country. I would like to offer my personal compliment to you and your associates on the tremendous job and the responsibility that you bear in this important position in our government.

I want to thank the Administration also for all the events that have transpired affecting the situation that we are now confronted with on East Timor. I think I would be remiss if I did not offer my personal sense of appreciation to the leaders of the government of Australia for the initiative and the leadership that they have demonstrated in taking the lead and responsibility on this important work of this part of the world to bring about a better sense of stability on East Timor. They are now making preparations for a truly democratic and free country.

I have a question in two and a half parts, Madam Secretary. We have talked about East Timor. It is behind us more or less in terms of building a democratic government in that area of the world, but one area that really troubles me, Madam Secretary, is West Papua New Guinea. As you are well aware, 10 years prior to the military takeover of East Timor, the same military regime conducted not only a tax, but literally conquered West Papua New Guinea by the sword in killing, torturing, and murdering well over 100,000 West Papua New Guineans.

Madam Secretary, if we are planning to offer some kind of economic aid to the Indonesian government to provide stability—realizing the importance of that all—I am really bothered by the fact that here we still have West Papua New Guinea being given the worst treatment, very similar to what was given to East Timor. Yet we seem to be forgetting now, putting it under the rug so to speak, what we should be doing to the West Papua New Guineans and giving them their freedom, their right of self determination. At least, what could the United Nations do to correct the inequities and the things that have transpired and what happened to West Papua New Guinea some 20 years ago? I would like your position on these. What is the Administration's position with West Papua New Guinea?

[Mr. Bereuter presiding.]

Secretary ALBRIGHT. If I might there was one question of Congressman Burton's I did not answer which was about the allegation about Soviet weapons and I just wanted to say that we take that seriously and we will stay in touch. I did not want him to think that I had not answered that.

On your questions, first of all, I do think that the international community should take credit for having moved fairly rapidly on East Timor and there are so many tragedies going on there. Today's paper, I think describes the lack of institutional structure there and we are working very hard to make that happen.

On Papua New Guinea, West Papua New Guinea, let me just say that this is something that is obviously of major concern to us. I, 2 weeks ago, had some Indonesian officials in and we talked about the fact that they need to find a peaceful resolution to that problem as well as Ache and we have encouraged all the parties to focus their efforts on some kind of a political solution. Recently, the State Department co-hosted a conference on justice and reconciliation to try to deal with it and these three Indonesian cabinet members and selected NGOs were part of that. I think that I just would like to assure you that this is something that we talk about a great deal. Ambassador Gelbard in Jakarta has raised this issue and will continue to do so because there is great injustice.

I think the problem though is Indonesia is a huge, multi-ethnic country, spread over a large area of land. They need to figure out how to deal with the multi-ethnicity, which could be a great strength for Indonesia.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. It seems that NATO has proven its capabilities, especially in bringing stability to the region, in Europe. Has there ever been any movement by any of the leaders in Asia or the Pacific Rim countries to organize a regional security organization

similar to NATO? Will there be a possibility of doing a similar situation for the Southeast Asian region?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, when I was in college which was many hundreds of years ago, actually there was an organization called SEATO. We learned all the alphabet soup at that stage and I am very interested that you should be asking this because ASEAN has a regional forum that deals with security issues. I have thought that it would be worth exploring something larger. We need to look at that. What I find very interesting is that recently as a result of the Korean problems which Congressman Bereuter had referred to earlier, Japan, the United States and South Korea are cooperating more in a trilateral approach. I think it is out there, but it is not there yet, but at this what is lovingly known as the ARF, we talk about security problems because I think there is a sense that something could be done.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you very much. Madam Secretary, I would like to send you a written request regarding the Montreal Biotechnology Protocol and appreciate your answer. It is very important to agriculture and food producers.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Madam Secretary, I apologize for running out. I had to testify on MFN before the Ways and Means Committee, so I apologize not hearing your full statement.

Let me just begin by thanking you and the Administration for signing H.R. 3427, the Embassy Security Act which had about 100 disparate measures. I introduced it. It was co-sponsored by many Members of our Committee, 287 pages. And also the Torture Victims Relief Act which will help mitigate some of that misery of people who have been tortured.

I have a number of questions. I would just like to pose them and ask you if you would respond. The first dealing with China. As we know, we are in the midst of a brutal crackdown by the Chinese government. Just last Thursday, 150 Asians converged to arrest an 80-year-old Catholic Archbishop in Fujian Province, Jon Yon Shu Dow. We know that Bishop Shu and many others have suffered, and pastors. The 10-year-old Pnacha Lama and the Fulong Gong are now being smashed, to use the words of the Chinese dictatorship. Five thousand Fulong Gong practitioners have been sent to labor camps and an additional 2,000 have been rounded up in the last week and a half alone. We know that the Administration argues that trade will lead to an improvement. We have had 7 years of significant regression. Amnesty International sits where you sit every year and says just that. It is bad and getting worse. And Wei Ji Chung made a very, very powerful bit of testimony again right where you sit before my Subcommittee and said that when we are strong and when we link trade, there is an improvement. When we make nice for the Chinese dictatorship the torture begins in earnest and people are worse off in the Lau Gai and in the prisons.

Secondly, in Vietnam and Laos, I was just in Vietnam on a human rights mission. There is a decline there as well in religious freedom. As a matter of fact in Laos, there is now a—and I have an actual copy of it, a statement that has to be signed by people

to renounce foreign religion. In other words, anyone who is affiliated with anything outside of the Laotian borders is called upon to sign this and there are threats and there are beatings and imprisonment for those who do not.

And finally, with regards to Chechnya, I have had as Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, held a hearing on Chechnya just a few weeks ago and I would note that based on that and a call that has just been made by Mr. Brezhinski, Haig and Kampelman we know that the Administration has said the right things and we applaud you for that with regards to the brutal crackdown in Chechnya and the indiscriminate killings under the guise of anti-terrorism, but they have called for three specific steps that they are asking the Administration to follow and I would ask you if you would ask you if you would consider responding to those one.

One, oppose the release of World Bank and IMF loans to Russia as long as the war in Chechnya continues. Two, initiate consultations with the G–7 nations regarding suspension of Russia from the annual summit. And three, call upon the United Nations to appoint a special rappateur for Chechnya. I yield to the gentlelady.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you. First of all, on China let me say that I am as appalled as you are by what has been going on in terms of human rights and dealing with the Falan Gong and the religious problems. We have introduced a resolution in the Human Rights Commission and we will be making that case very strongly. What I disagree on is that trade should be linked to it because I believe that trade is one of our very best wedge points in terms of opening up China and I was very interested in a piece yesterday in front of the New York Times where a young woman talked about the opportunities that were opened to her as a result of being able to use computers and internet and I do think that opening it up is, we could spend a lot of time talking about this, but I can assure you that I care as much about it as you do.

Mr. SMITH. I understand. If you just yield for 1 second. Rather than permanent normal trade relation, there is a body of evidence that suggests that they could still accede into the WTO with annual MFN which at least preserves the right of Congress and the Administration to take a look every year and hopefully keep the pressure on that government.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I believe, sir, that we can keep the pressure on them anyway, but that the permanent normal trading relations is important in terms of opening up China to us for a market and I think that it is not only economically sound, but good in terms of national security, but we will have time to talk about that.

On Vietnam and Laos, let me say again I am concerned about what you say and we are working very closely. I now have a religious—advisor on religious affairs, Bob Sipel. We talk and think about how to deal with this particular issue all along.

On Chechnya——

Mr. SMITH. Gentlelady yield on that point? We had the hearing with Bob Sipel. As a matter of fact, that legislation went through our Subcommittee.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. And we worked—thank you for your help in the end on that. But those two countries were not listed. China was, but

those two countries were not listed and my hope is given this deterioration if they would be listed, it would be very helpful.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. We will take a look at that, sir.

On Chechnya, let me say I was just in Russia. I had a reasonably good meeting with Acting President Putin on everything except Chechnya where they basically see this as a major terrorist threat and do not see it in the way that we do which is the horrors that have been visited on the civilian population there.

I think though something I think that earlier Congressman, Chairman Gilman had talked about where were we going with Russia. I think the very important part here with Russia is to realize that we have a large relationship with them which includes a number of facets and that it is to our national security benefit to have them to get them to reform economically. Therefore, whatever steps we take need to be viewed from that regard and I believe that it is a huge mistake to try to recreate a Russian enemy. That is easy enough. What we need to do is manage our relationship with them. I think the U.N. actually is involved. They have just sent an assessment team there. I have talked to Foreign Minister Ivanov yesterday about giving greater access to that U.N. team as well because of your interest in OSCE to make sure that the OSCE mission as they agreed to in Istanbul would be able to go in.

Mr. BEREUTER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentlelady from Georgia, Ms. McKinney is recognized.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, I have two questions. In my hands I have a press release dated February 15th, yesterday, issued by Roberto Geriton, Special U.N. Human Rights Representative to the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Geriton report is on the situation in the Eastern Congo. He is concerned about the situation of Monsignor Archbishop of Pukafu. He says that many human rights organizations are now speaking of the cruel and inhumane treatment occurring to citizens under the territorial control of RCD Goma and RCD ML, factions under the control of our allies, Uganda and Rwanda. He goes further to say that if the allegations against our allies in the Tori District, they constitute crimes against humanity. He demands that the detainers of Monsignor Catalico explain his whereabouts and why he has been arrested. He further states that they must open an investigation into the massacres that have taken place under their control and they must have their troops respect the 1949 Geneva Convention stop conducting the areas under their control as if they have seceded from the country such as the adoption of a new flag other than the Congolese flag which is recognized internationally and to let the Congolese under their control participate in a national dialogue as is stipulated in the Lusaka Peace Agreement.

Madam Secretary, I requested a briefing yesterday from the State Department to know what the U.S. has done to emphasize in more than rhetorical terms to our allies that their invasion of Congo is unacceptable, that the United States stands with the rest of Africa and not with them, that de facto partition of Congo is unacceptable and that their continued presence is creating ethnic hatred heretofore unknown in the Congolese context.

Unfortunately, yesterday I did not get satisfactory answers to my questions. In fact, I learned instead that we still have a military relationship with these countries, that we have not yet voiced our concern about the situation of the Archbishop of Bukavu and that we continue to cover up and make excuses for our successive policy failures with respect to this region.

Madam Secretary, can you tell me how your stewardship of the Great Lakes peace will be any different than the failed policies of the past that seemingly have abetted the current climate of ethnic hatred, genocide, revenge genocide, crimes against humanity and the violation of international law?

My second question is could you tell me what you are doing to help settle outstanding law suits that have been filed by African American employees against the Voice of America?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. On the first question, let me say that I think you were present in New York when I chaired the meeting at the Security Council with the heads of State that were intimately involved with the problem of the Congo and how to really carry out fully the Lasaka Accords. I believe that we have done a great deal in order to try to deal with the horrible situation in the Great Lakes region and are trying to work with the parties which is why we have been requesting a support for a peacekeeping operation in Congo. And the human rights problems that you have raised, we have raised also and will continue to do so.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Madam Secretary, the State Department has not yet issued any statement at all on the situation of the Monsignor. We have had the Vatican to release a request that he be returned to his people. What is the State Department willing to do to secure the release of the Monsignor?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I will raise the issue when I get back to the Assistant Secretary and I appreciate very much your profound interest and knowledge of the region and I thank you.

On the other issue, Congresswoman, I will have to look into it. I do not know the answer. I will get you an answer on that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you, gentlelady. The gentleman from California, Mr. Rohrbacher is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you very much and Madam Secretary on issues like Ms. McKinney just raised on human rights issues and issues that may seem local to some people are of great importance to all of us. We pay close attention to that, especially when a Member like Ms. McKinney has spent considerable time and effort to try to do some good in places, some far away places.

Madam Secretary, a prelude to my question is that last week communist China repeated their threat to consider the use of force against our democratic friends in Taiwan. They also received a warship from Russia capable of firing a nuclear tipped missile at an American aircraft carrier, thus posing a serious threat to the lives of thousands of American military personnel. They continue to arrest and without trial, send to labor camps thousands of people whose only crime is some sort of a meditation exercise program, the Faulun Gong. They have arrested an 80-year-old Catholic bishop and continue in their genocidal policy in Tibet. Yet this Administration has repeatedly come before this Committee and described communist China as America's strategic partner.

On the other hand, the Administration severely reacted to tiny Austria, a democracy where civil liberties are practiced. They attacked Austria because a conservative party with a platform that is based against illegal immigration is a serious concern to those people. In a free election where a conservative party received a majority of votes, unfortunately, the year that party made some statements which were admittedly detestable yet for being concerned about illegal immigration and making statements for which he apologized in the past, and being part of a free election, this Administration has come down really hard on Austria. While the Austrians, as I say, this Austrian leader apologized for those statements that he made in the past, the communists have never apologized for any of their brutality. In fact, they continue to rub our noses in their human rights violations and their transfer of weapons of mass destruction to rogue states. They are apologizing for nothing. Worse, they use the profits from an economic relationship where we have established the rules, they have enormous profits, billions of dollars of a trade surplus, they are using that to buy even more weapons from Russia which will potentially pose a threat to many thousands of American military personnel.

Now to compare the condemnation that we had in Austria, to democratic Austria, because of a concern about illegal immigration and yes, some detestable statements made years before that were apologized for, the comparison shows that there is something totally out of sync, out of proportion with this Administration's foreign policy. And I would like to know how you as the spokesman for the Administration's foreign policy can justify this totally out of proportion situation where we continue to call communist China our strategic partner and then come down hard on the people of Austria.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me say that as far as China is concerned we have said that in the future it might be nice to have them in a strategic relationship with us. We do not believe that they are a strategic partner at this time. And let me just say that our concern with China is very large in terms of human rights. I have already stated that we are moving in the Human Rights Commission to condemn China and I have done that a number of times in public fora as well as to their face and I will continue to do that.

At the same time I believe that we are involved in an appropriate policy to try to engage with China on areas of trade where they have access to our markets and we do not have access to theirs. Therefore it is to America's advantage to move forward on having a trade relationship with them never forgetting what our basic values are. And I can assure you we can all be criticized on many things, but I would not accept criticism on my record on human rights.

The second issue on Austria, let me say there is a difference here. This is a country that has been a functioning democracy that has a leader who not way in the past, but quite recently has made, I think, repugnant statements that he thinks he can apologize for one day and then make a slightly different version of the next. In my response to Congressman Lantos I think I explained what the overall problem here is in terms of our concern with the rise of extremist right wing parties in Europe. I think there is no reason or

way to compare our policy toward China, a country of 1.2 billion people that is a major power in the region that we need to engage with, to our condemnation of some of the actions in Austria, where we have not cut off relations we are just making clear that we believe that the steps they have taken, and including the Freedom Party and the government, does not promote democracy.

[Mr. Gilman presiding.]

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you, Madam Secretary, and I am very happy to hear that we no longer consider China our strategic partner as we have heard before this Committee on numerous occasions.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Rohrbacher.

Mr. Hoeffel.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, thank you for being here. Many of us in Congress are trying to help constituents collect judgments that have been entered in U.S. courts against foreign countries who have been sponsoring terrorism. Joe Siscipio who comes from my district in Pennsylvania and who is here with us today was held for 5 or 6 years in Lebanon by Iranian terrorists. He has a U.S. court judgment against Iran, but he cannot collect. So I have a two-part question under the Berman rule. Number one: What can the State Department or what has the State Department done to help American citizens collect their judgments entered in U.S. courts against terrorist nations? Secondly, I understand that the Treasury Department has a fund that is building that they are holding for Iran related to U.S. diplomatic use of Iranian buildings here in this country and that rent is being paid, I think through the State Department. The fund is being held by Treasury for the day that relations are normalized between this country and Iran. Could that fund be used eventually to pay U.S. citizens for judgments against Iran? Who controls that fund? Does Congress have to act? Does State control it? Fundamentally, what can we do to help our U.S. citizens that have these judgments that cannot presently be paid?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me say that we have been very concerned about those individual cases where American citizens have somehow been victimized by states that support terrorism and we are trying to be of assistance in terms of how to resolve these. We are prepared to work with these families to identify unblocked Iranian assets to help satisfy the judgments they have received, but we have to do it in some way that does not harm our overall foreign policy interests. And let me just say that one of our problems here is that we stand the danger of exposing our own diplomatic facilities abroad to similar actions by other states if we somehow make our diplomatic and consular property available. I know this has been one of the suggestions that what the Iranians have had here could somehow be attached and it then violates some of the obligations that we have under the Vienna Convention on diplomatic and consular relations.

We have been looking at various funds. They somehow are all controlled in—they have various specifications with it, but I can assure you this is a subject that is high on our agenda and we are trying to figure it out in a way that the families can be assisted,

but at the same time we do not undercut some of our international obligations that then expose us to problems with other countries.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Can I continue to work with your office to try to get this judgment paid?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes sir.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Albright, it is always a pleasure to have you with us.

Madam Secretary, I have three questions related to the issue of Cuba, first, regarding the Elian Gonzales; secondly, regarding the POW program known as the Cuba Program where Castro agents were sent to Vietnam in 1967 and 1968 to torture our American POWs; and the third has to do with the Lourdes intelligence facility in Cuba.

Regarding the Elian Gonzales case there has been a lot of contact between the State Department and Castro officials since November of last year regarding the case of Elian Gonzales. I would like to ask if there are any commitments that our government made to the Castro regime or if any assurance has been given to the Castro regime regarding Elian Gonzales and why there has been so much diplomatic contact from our government with the Castro regime since our government says that this is purely an INS matter. Regarding the INS jurisdiction on this, they have, as you know, refused to grant the opportunity of Elian to file for political asylum and we know that that court hearing is pending in just a few days. Does the State Department no longer consider the Castro regime to be a totalitarian regime that violates human rights and if we do label them as such why is Elian Gonzales not being given the opportunity to file for political asylum?

Secondly, about the Cuba program, I wanted to ask whether you will continue to press the Vietnamese on this issue and if you would instruct Ambassador Peterson who is our former colleague to pursue this matter. Will you give us the commitment that you will do the same with the Castro regime to press him on this in order to bring about these tortures to justice?

And thirdly, on the Lourdes intelligence facility with the Russian President, have you mentioned to him or raised the issue of Lourdes with him? This is an intelligence facility that you know is based on Cuba. It continues to pay $200 to $300 million a year to the Castro regime for this Lourdes facility whose mission is to spy on American citizens for military, political, possibly commercial and now we think perhaps technological uses. Have you had the opportunity to mention this to the Russian President and will you continue to press him on this issue?

Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you. First of all, on Elian Gonzales, let me just say that from the very beginning I think that we have all been concerned about his well being and have sought to insure that the process of reaching a decision in this case was undertaken in a very deliberate and considered manner. As far as the Department of State is concerned, our primary role has been to communicate with the government of Cuba and facilitate contact between

the INS and Elian Gonzales' father, that is what we have been doing and it is basically an INS issue. And what we have done is we issued a visa to the two grandmothers to facilitate a visit, but this is a case that is currently before the Federal District Court and we are awaiting the outcome on it. But I think that our main concern here is that the child's well being be considered and that the U.S. Government has determined this to be a case not about custody, but about surviving parents' parental rights. One of the other issues is that were there a similar case to that of Elian involving an American child abroad, the Department of State would expect the foreign government to return the American child to the surviving parent wherever that parent may be. And I would just point out that just like the case here about victims that sometimes are issues about how we protect Americans in a similar problem has international repercussions.

On the Vietnam issue, on October 29th last year, Ambassador Peterson personally asked the Vietnamese government for any information regarding any foreign personnel, military or civilian, who may have participated in the interrogation of American prisoners during 1967, 1968; their duties and who authorized and funded their participation or presence in the prison camps where Americans were held. And the Vietnamese promised to research the matter and we have not yet received a final answer. We will be in touch with Ambassador Peterson again on it.

On the Lourdes issue, I think that here it is a matter, it is an issue of intelligence and not subject to commenting on in public and if you want your staff to be in contact, we will get you a classified briefing on it.

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

Chairman GILMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired. Thank you, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

Ms. Danner.

Ms. DANNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Madam Secretary, we are pleased to have you here with us today. In the supplemental budget for the Year 2000, the President has asked for $624 million for Kosovo. At the same time we know that when the Senate Armed Forces Committee met an issue came to light that the Pentagon had reached into other budgets to the tune of $2 billion and taken it out of those other assigned areas and put it into Kosovo.

On both sides of the aisle, over in the Senate, Democrat and Republican alike, they questioned the fact that our allies are not coming forward with their fair share to—and let us see what they said, the United Nations, the European Union and other international agencies are not living up to their commitments to rebuild the local economy. This has cost us $2 billion that we have spent on deployment of troops.

My question is what are we going to do to recoup that $2 billion or the fair share of it with regard to burden sharing so that those dollars go back into the Pentagon budget where they are very much needed?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think there is some confusion here. The $2 billion was for military operations, as I understand it, and the allies contributed a share of that. What we are concerned about at

this point is to make sure that the civilian operation is fully funded and there have been questions that were raised, I believe, by Senator Warner on this subject and we think that the Europeans need to pay their fair share.

The way that it is set up now, the Europeans' share of all foreign assistance to Kosovo was 66 percent in FY 99 and they have pledged 76 percent of the total for this fiscal year. The United States, because of our military capabilities, I think there is no doubt that we took the lead in the military part of the Kosovo campaign and the Europeans are supposed to take the lion's share of the part in the civilian. I have been in touch with all the foreign ministers of the countries involved and said that they need to come forward with their pledges. It is very important. But I think, Congresswoman, the thing that we have to remember is it is thanks to the United States and NATO that 800,000 or so people in Kosovo did not freeze to death or were not tortured or did not suffer the kinds of horrible things that were happening a year ago at this time. And I think we should be very proud of what we have done in order to try to change the situation in Kosovo. We have a great deal left to do and I for one am very proud of what our military has done and what our civilians are doing there now. I would hope very much that the Europeans, in fact, could do their share which needs to be larger than ours because we did the lion's share in the military part.

Ms. DANNER. Well, to follow through on that the Ranking Member, Democrat Carl Levin of Michigan echoed this same dissatisfaction and said and I quote, "I am mystified why our NATO allies are not providing more police in their own backyard." So this was coming from both sides of the aisle, not just from Senator Warner, but from Senator Levin as well. And once again, I think that in light of the fact that our defense budget has gone down proportionately, I think that it is very important that we be assured that there is proper burden sharing. I certainly agree with you regarding the social inequities that have existed in Kosovo and what our military has been able to do and that is very well and wonderful, but of course, the same thing could apply to Africa where we have not gone into. Thank you.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me just say that you are absolutely right on the civilian police issue. We believe that the Europeans need to come forward with larger amounts of civilian police. The United States has been contributing to that, but the Europeans need to do that. Again, this is a subject that I raise all the time. And I do believe with Senator Levin that something needs to be done here and we are working on it, but I do think that we need to have a sense of great pride.

Ms. DANNER. Thank you.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Ms. Danner. Mr. Chabot.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In light of the Chairman's instructions concerning time constraints here I would like to submit a letter concerning U.S. relationship with Khazakstan. I know Mr. Burton raised Khazakstan as well in his remarks and I would ask for your attention, Madam Secretary, and a response in the near future if you would not mind, please, doing that.

Secondly, last October this Committee held a hearing on the implementation of the Hague Convention on the civil aspects of international child abduction. It was one of the most educational hearings that I have attended in my 5 years in Congress and as a father it was one of the most emotionally disturbing. And as a Member of the Congress, it was one of the most frustrating hearings that I have sat through, certainly as any Member who listened to the incredible, painful stories told by the parents of abducted children, you could not help but walk away from the proceedings with a sense of anger. My comments after the hearing is it really made your blood boil.

I have had the opportunity over the last several months to listen to and talk with some of the parents who have been victimized by international child abduction. I have become quite familiar with the case of one individual, Mr. Tom Sylvester from Cincinnati that I represent whose daughter Carina was abducted by her mother in 1995 and taken to Austria. We have heard Austria come up several times in this hearing today and she remains there today. Since that time, Mr. Sylvester has faced roadblock after roadblock in his efforts to be reunited with his daughter. During this entire ordeal as your Department will readily agree, Tom Sylvester has played by the rules. He has followed the law. As Assistant Secretary Ryan said in her testimony to this Committee and I quote, "He believed in the system." Well, if Mr. Sylvester has lost his faith in the system, it is certainly understandable and he is not to be blamed for that because the system has failed him miserably. It has denied him a happy life with his little girl who is an American citizen. She was born here.

During our hearing last fall, there was considerable discussion as I recall about a recent *Reader's Digest* article entitled, and I quote the name of the article, "America's Stolen Children, Why Has Washington Turned Its Back on Thousands of Abducted Kids?" That article detailed efforts by American parents of abducted children to enlist their government's assistance in their quest to see their children returned home. Many of those parents believe that their government has let them down.

My colleague, Ohio Senior Senator Mike DeWine, makes this point and I quote, "We go after countries that steal our products or violate patent or copyright laws, but not when they are supporting the theft of American children. What does that say about us as a country?"

Now Tom Sylvester noted and I will quote Tom, "Austria forsakes international relationships for the sake of its nationals whereas the United States forsakes its nationals for the sake of international relations." He tells of a conversation that he had with his former wife who abducted the child and now resides with the child in Austria and she said, "Tom, the difference between us is that my government protects me." Those words, Madam Secretary, were very troubling to me and I asked our witnesses in October if they could assure me that diplomatic niceties would not stand in the way of bringing these American children, these American citizens back home and I will ask you the same question. I am very frustrated by our government's inability to resolve these cases and I am wondering if there are not stronger actions that we can take

in the diplomatic arena to return some of these stolen children to their parents. What kind of pressure can we bring to bear on countries like Austria and Germany and others that continue to thumb their noses at American citizens who have had their children stolen? Has the State Department even considered taking action that might deny any benefit these offending nations might receive in the relationship with the United States?

And finally, Madam Secretary, Tom and Carina Sylvester need your help. Their government has let them down, I believe. I know I can speak for my colleague from Cincinnati, Congressman Rob Portman as well when I say that we would be willing to sit down with you and with Mr. Sylvester at any time in any place to work on bringing a happy ending to this terrible case. By personally engaging in this issue, you would help to build a bridge to all the other parents who need our help and you would be sending a strong message to all those governments who consistently stonewall our efforts to bring our children home. And I hope we can count on you for your active help in this matter.

Could you comment, Madam Secretary?

[Mr. Bereuter presiding.]

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Congressman, let me say as a mother and grandmother I am as appalled as you are by these kinds of things and frustrated. I think that the welfare of American children abducted from the U.S. by one of their parents is a high priority item for our Department and Attorney General Reno. I have both of us been frustrated by this and we have a policy, the two Departments, State and Justice, have created a policy group and asked for a detailed action plan to improve the Federal response to the problem of international parental child abduction and our Office of Children's Issues chairs an interagency working group coordinating the implementation of the plan.

Over the past year we have doubled the number of staff in the Department dealing with these cases so that each child's case receives more attention and we can be more responsive to the left behind parents. We have entered into another agreement with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children which increases its assistance to children and parents in cases of children abducted abroad.

We have, in fact, placed new emphasis on outreach and prevention activities. We have sent officers throughout the country to meet with parents and lawyers and judges and we are instituting a tracking system. I raised earlier when I was asked about Elian, this is exactly why we have to be careful in the way that issue is dealt with because it could have even further implications when it is American children that we are trying to deal with. I will be very happy, Congressman, to look at this personally and in my discussions with the Austrian government, such as they are at this moment, I will raise that question.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you. Can we follow up with a meeting with you, Madam Secretary?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you.

Mr. BEREUTER. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Crowley, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Madam Secretary, it is good to see you again. I have one question, three parts. A and B I am going to ask first and then C, if there is time left. [Laughter.]

Madam Secretary, Fiscal Year 2001 budget request, I notice that you requested $50 million in ESF and $400,000 in IMET funding for Indonesia, $135,000 in IMET money for Yemen; $75,000 in IMET for Chad as well as funding a host of other countries that do not have diplomatic relations with Israel. In 1994, Rep. Hamilton had language included in State Department foreign relations Fiscal Year 1994–1995 and authorization bill that stated the Secretary of State should make the issue of Israel's diplomatic relations a priority and urge countries that receive U.S. assistance to establish full diplomatic relations with Israel, Part A. Do you or does anyone on your staff have an update on implementation of this provision?

The second question relates to the funding last year for U.N. family planning. Secretary Albright, as you know, I was disappointed last year that the Administration's decision to allow so-called Mexico City policy to be included in the omnibus legislation. I am not here to criticize the President and I want to make it perfectly clear I understand the issues that were bound last year. But this is a new year and we need to move on. However, I am concerned about the precedent that may have been set by allowing that to happen. Can you inform the Committee why the Mexico City policy that was included in last year's omnibus bill is bad for the U.S. policy and should not be repeated as well as your position on including such a provision again? And then I will get to C.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. On the first question, let me say that one of the issues that I have been working on as we move forward with the Middle East peace process is to try to get countries that do not have normal diplomatic relations or even contact with Israel to change their policies. And when, for instance, the new foreign minister of Indonesia was here he is someone who is particularly concerned about religious and ethnic strife and he himself is looking into this and I will give you an update, get you one. But this is very ch on my mind and is a part of creating a different atmosphere for Israel as it takes the risks for peace in moving through the peace process.

On the whole issue of family planning, we believe that family planning saves lives and protects women's health and promotes healthy families and prevents abortions. I think that is a policy that fits well within our overall foreign policy that would like to see increasing stability and dealing with very serious problems throughout the world. Although family planning services are more widely available than ever, it is estimated that more than 150 million women in developing worlds still want to space or limit child bearing, but have no access at all to contraceptive methods. We believe for a number of reasons that it is suitable for American foreign policy to have those kinds of guidelines. I think we are asking for increased funding for population programs to $541 million that will return us to the FY 1995 levels and I think that that is a very important initiative and I will pursue that actively.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you, Madam Secretary. The political process in Northern Ireland has taken some turns for the worse, most recently, and the British government has suspended the Northern Ireland power sharing executive. Such a drastic measure, I do not believe instills confidence in the Republican and national side of the aisle here. Now I realize there has been much criticism in the press lately and I think unfairly about the IRA and the decommissioning process even though the Good Friday agreement and the Mitchel review do not require actual decommissioning by any date, let alone May of this year. However, this turn of events does have me greatly concerned about the future of the peace process and the democratic institution of Northern Ireland. What is the U.S. government doing, if anything, to help the Northern Ireland assembly be reinstituted and what is your assessment of the peace process at this time?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, let me say that the United States has put a tremendous amount of effort into this. Senator Mitchel, obviously, taking a lead, but President Clinton himself very much involved and talks are actually continuing today to resolve the impasse and try to restore the institutions including in London between the Irish and British prime ministers and with the various political leaders. We support these efforts and want to see the parties build on the offers made.

It is really vital that all the parties exercise their creativity and their flexibility to restore the momentum toward the implementation of all aspects of the Good Friday accords. I think the saddest part about this is that the people have voted for peace and I think that the leaders need to really be flexible and creative and we will continue to work on this. The President is making calls, we all are, on the subject.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Brady is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you. Welcome, Madam Chairman. I have two areas of cooperation I would like to bring up today. For you to do your job well, America's financial commitments have to mean something and those financial investments in peace and democracy are growing as we have seen. In Syria, we are looking at some very serious numbers for security and peace there. We have a number of the Latin American countries with billion dollar requests before us and those commitments will grow. The funding of Wye River last year was an example of how not to do that and how not to fund a very important investment. And so this year I would ask, just encourage the budget negotiators whoever are the big cheeses that squeeze the numbers are, to sit down early with Congress and work out a realistic responsible budget plan to give us the resources that we need to make our commitments good or out in the world.

The second area of cooperation deals with one of your priorities, fighting international crime. The issue is extradition. And you may recall last year this Committee under the leadership of Chairman Gilman began an initiative to close safe havens for criminals who prey on Americans and then flee our country. The world is getting smaller. Crime is getting more sophisticated and in addition to violent crime, drug trafficking, cybercrime, money laundering and

child abduction, we have treaties that our outdated. Half of them predate World War II. The ones before 1970 have extraditable offenses only that are listed and as you would guess in 30 years those crimes have become outdated. They are incomplete in that we do not have agreements with 40 percent of the world, in effect, we have safe havens—nearly half of the world is safe havens for our criminals.

Your Department is going to identify, review the treaties, identify some of the factors that contribute to safe havens and take a close look at recommendations on how to close them. But I need your help in two areas. One, we need to better define the problem. Right now we are a bit poking at the fog and that the numbers are soft on how deep this problem is. The Justice Department estimates that we have 1500 criminals who have fled our country and that if history plays out only 1 out of 4 will ever be returned here to face justice. That leaves a whole lot of families without any justice, survivor's victims who need that justice. One, help identify the resources to better define the problem for us and then if your office will help us this year identify the financial and human resources to aggressively and update our existing treaties and establish those in countries in which we lack treaties, I will conclude with this. I am convinced that while this problem cannot be solved over night, it is complex, but there is some encouraging signs around the world that the rest of the international community understands that we have a common interest in closing these safe havens. For America to lead in this area the State Department, the Justice Department and Congress has to be a very thoughtful, deliberative, determined team to make this happen. Attorney General Reno has given us her commitment to be part of that team and I think there are a lot of families in America who would love to have your commitment to do the same.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Congressman, first of all, on the first point about budgeting, we last year did have some supplementals and they, in fact, have brought our amount up to around $23 billion for last year. That is why this year we asked for a budget that, in fact, would be realistic, would take into account the fact that we had obligations and that is why we have asked for a budget of $22.8 billion. But, and I say this because all of you have each raised some subject of interest. There is no way for us to be able to know where something is going to happen as an emergency at any given time. We need more flexibility within the State Department budget and trying—we are trying to get to a realistic budget number and not try to come in low and then expect supplementals. But I have to tell you there will probably be requests that we cannot foresee. But what we basically need is some more realistic budgeting and I appreciate your asking and making that statement.

On the extradition issue, first of all within a larger context I think that the international community is much more aware of mutual obligations on issues of dealing with criminal activity and I find now in a lot of meetings where I am that there is just much more of a sense of our interdependence. On the extradition issues themselves, you have been really terrific in shining a light on this and we are working very hard as to how to pay close attention to

developments in each country in identifying and resolving systemic problems. We do not want to see the safe havens.

I can tell you that in most of my bilateral discussions where there are problems with extradition treaties I raise them, but we look forward to working with you on this because I think you are right.

Mr. BEREUTER. Several Members have indicated they have additional written questions for you, Madam Secretary. Without objection the record will remain open for 5 days to receive questions and statements for the record and Madam Secretary, I hope that you and your staff could give us some prompt replies.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Delahunt is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman and let me express my admiration, Madam Secretary, for the fine work that you have done.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You will leave a remarkable legacy. In your opening statement, you reference the fact that Colombia was one of your target countries. Let me just ask a series of questions. I know time is limited. I have many more, but hopefully I can submit them in writing or secure some answers from your staff. As you are well aware, there is a large aid package that will be considered shortly by Congress. It is a considerable amount of money. Have there been benchmarks established to measure the efficacy of that assistance and could you give us estimates in terms of a time line and what we could anticipate in terms of a decline in the level of cocaine and heroin that would be coming into this country if this package, as it is presently configured, should pass this institution?

Secondly, I am of the conviction that if we are going to accomplish something that is both significant, substantial and permanent in terms of reducing the flow of drugs from Colombia into the United States that stability is critical. To achieve stability, the peace process must be successful. I think that is the ultimate answer. And recently, as I am sure you are well aware, there have been some glimmers of hope. The major insurgency group, the FARC, along with representatives of the government have spent 10 days in Scandinavia and I am just going to quote some comments by FARC representatives, the government and Mr. Jan Egellan who is the U.N. Special Envoy to Colombia and presumably played a role in making that happen. And again, I am sure you are aware that he played a key role in the Oslo Accords. His statement from just several days ago, is "The whole trip was a breakthrough for building trust. It started with a total lack of confidence between the two sides and ended with growing trust." He said he was "especially impressed with how open they were to address obstacles to peace." A joint communique from both sides, and again I am quoting, stated "We are in need of an economic, political and social model that breaks away from corruption, drug trafficking and violence."

I am a realist. I understand that these are just simply words. But I would suggest there are some hopes. Are we monitoring the peace process? Are you aware of the—are you monitoring or have you been consulting with other governments and the United Na-

tions in this regard? And if so, what are your impressions? And if there is substantial progress in terms of the peace negotiations, what does this signify in terms of the package? Is there flexibility if peace should break out in Colombia, God willing. I thank you.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much. Let me take this series of very important points that you have made and put them into context. When President Pastrana was elected, and even before he was inaugurated, he came to the United States and met with President Clinton. I think we were all quite inspired by his desire to move the process forward and had been working with him as he tried to figure out how to deal with the very important aspects: the peace process, how to deal with the narcotraffickers, his economic situation as well as how to deal with the paramilitary problems that he had. We had worked with him as he developed Plan Colombia and I have been very pleased with the way that the package has been put together because it has the support of the Colombian people and it deals with all these aspects. It is a comprehensive approach. The whole package is $7.5 billion and $4 billion of it is being contributed by Colombia itself and the European countries. There is going to be a donor's table in March that deals with this and the World Bank and the IMF have contributed. So there is really a sense that this is not just a problem for Colombia, not even just a problem for the Western Hemisphere because of the way narcotraffickers are now also moving into Europe.

I went down to Cartegena about 3 weeks or a month ago, and met with President Pastrana and his team. Undersecretary Pickering is there now and we will be working with them very closely in terms of monitoring working with them and being supportive of them.

I have also found quite remarkable the FARC trip around Europe. This is very encouraging because it is kind of a sign, first of all, that there is a way if people can be brought together to talk about this, but for another reason because there had been a sense, at least this is what I learned earlier, that the FARC did not want any kind of international involvement in all of this. I think this shows that the international community can, in fact, help.

On the economic aspects of this package, it has been very carefully looked at to see what the system in Colombia can absorb in terms of assistance on developing new structures, in economic assistance, and the main issue that they have to deal with unfortunately is the narcotrafficking aspect of this. So $95 million of this is going to the police and then, because the police cannot protect itself as it goes into the southern region where the greatest coca growing is going on, they are going to be protected by the army. Again, when I was there I was quite interested in the Army and the police now working together and the Army that is going into that because we all have concern about human rights issues. There are two regiments going in that have been vetted case by case for not having any human rights abuses. We will try to measure what you have asked in what this does for coca production. All we know specifically is that our efforts in Peru and Bolivia were highly successful and that there are programs that can work, and believe me we are all going to put our effort into it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you, Madam Secretary. There are nine Members in attendance who would still like to ask questions. The Secretary has extended her time until 12:30. Under House rules, I cannot unilaterally reduce the question period, so exercise restraint for your colleagues.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Radanovich.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for coming to visit with us, Madam Secretary.

I have three countries, one question, two parts, so if you will beg my indulgence I do need to cover a few areas. First on Croatia, I applaud you for your decision to make the trip to Zagreb here and celebrate the swearing in of Croatia's new democratically elected president. I wish to work with you in supporting Croatia's desire to be a part of the Partnership for Peace Program, and perhaps NATO some day or even the World Trade Organization, so I applaud you for that effort.

The next issue and the next country I would like to discuss is Armenia. During this hearing I especially want to associate myself with the comments made by my colleague, Mr. Lantos from California regarding the new fascist element that is emerging in Austria. Given that this is a current event, it now concerns me because the Administration's lack of willingness to recognize the extermination of 1.5 million Armenians that began in 1915, leads me to believe that your registered concerns with the country of Austria might be muted. Or, that in effect the Administration is soft on genocide policy as I view it and I would like you to comment on that. If I can load you up with my third country and second question concerning the country of Laos. As you know, General Vang Pow is in the audience and has——

[Applause.]

Forgive me, my concerns are regarding two Hmung American citizens, Michael Vang and Wa Lee. Michael Vang is a constituent of mine. I am aware that the Wa Lee family is here in the audience. I think we have most of the Hmung Americans in Washington, probably most of them in this room right now, as you just noticed, but finding out the disposition of the disappearance, and the circumstances related to it, for Michael Vang and Wa Lee raises grave concerns for me. We have gotten more information out of the FBI and CIA than we have the State Department. We have even learned of Codel's going into Laos and Thailand to seek more information on their disappearance, when the State Department has withheld evidence regarding the disposition of these two people.

After meeting with the CIA and FBI I have recognized that it may be a long time before we find out their disposition and the circumstances regarding it. But what I find deplorable is that the State Department has not contacted the families of Michael Vang and Wa Lee and it has not been forthright in giving them any information regarding the details of what it knows, even up to this point. I would request, in fact, plead with you to contact those families and give them the information that you do know.

Also, I am concerned that while this is occurring (and these are American citizens), that the Administration is pursuing normalizing trade relations with Laos. The way the State Department has

handled this leads me to believe that the United States is pursuing the normalization of trade relations with Laos with such intent that you are willing to brush under the rug the disappearance of American citizens, saying that they were perhaps insurgents involved with interior affairs in Laos. My comment is that it should not be because that is one of the bloodiest communist regimes. We have gone Hmong in Laos that are disappearing sometimes hundreds of people by the day.

So I would ask that you please contact those families directly and give them the information that you do know. I also ask that you not pursue normalizing trade relations while the question of their demise is still unknown. Thank you.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you. Let me comment on these, all the points briefly. On Croatia, I think that we have a huge opportunity to support this new government. I went there and I met with them just as the prime minister had come into office and I am very pleased to go to the inauguration. It is not without some difficulty since the Japanese are coming here and I have asked the Japanese foreign minister very kindly to see me on Sunday instead of on Friday and I am very grateful to the Japanese for having agreed. But I do think that Croatia—really not only for Croatia but for the signal it is sending to the other countries in the region—is very important and we will be looking at PFP WT—all the issues that you raised because as they are ready, I think we want to really be of assistance.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Terrific.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. On Armenia, let me say here that as far as our dealing with the issue of what happened there, President Clinton has traditionally commemorated Armenian Remembrance Day (April 24th) by issuing a statement that mourns the loss of innocent Armenian lives and challenges Americans to recommit themselves to making sure that this does not happen again. He will do so this year.

When we were in Istanbul for the OSCE summit we again, to both the Turks and the Armenians made very clear, and to other countries in the caucuses, that we can neither deny history nor forget it and we are confident that both Armenia and Turkey can seek normal relations. We are trying to figure it out in the context of the Ngarno-Karabach issue to deal with this. And we have—this is a subject, I can assure you, that is very much on our minds.

On the issue of Laos, let me say I acknowledge that a number of your Members have made the importance of this issue very clear. We have not tried to hide information. On the contrary, we have extensively shared information with the families and with the Congress regarding our efforts to locate these two. There is a difference though, between sharing what we know and simply passing along unsubstantiated reports. In this case some highly contradictory reporting leads in a number of directions and investigators are unable to confirm any of the information. The State Department is the one that brought in the FBI and CIA so that we could get some help on this.

I understand the importance of this and I will keep an eye on it and make sure that we pursue it. We are going to explore all investigative leads here.

But I would like to generally answer a question because this has come up with a number of countries. I believe that it is essential for us to pursue individual cases whether it has to do with those who are suffering from terrorist acts or extradition or what you are saying, but I think we have to figure out the context in which we do it. So for instance, normalizing trade relations might be. If it is good for the United States, we ought to be doing it and hold various issues hostage. We need to pursue both angles and from our perspective I will do that.

Mr. RADANOVICH. If I may just add, to my knowledge, Madam Secretary, and you may want to double check this, the families were told that they would be contacted by the State Department and have never been heard from since.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. We will check on it.

Mr. BEREUTER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BEREUTER. I would say to Madam Secretary we will honor your commitment to have you out of here by 12:30, but if you can make any kind of informal accommodations to gentlemen and ladies in attendance, but not called upon, they include Mr. Pomeroy and Mr. Wexler and Mr. Menendez, Mr. Rothman, Ms. Lee, Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Payne, Mr. Hilliard, Mr. Tancredo.

And for the last minute or 2, the gentleman from California, Mr. Sherman is recognized.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me just say I will stay.

Mr. BEREUTER. You will stay?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes, sure.

Mr. BEREUTER. That is very kind of you. I am sure the Members appreciate it.

[Applause.]

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Sherman, if you can try to give the Secretary an opportunity to answer on your 5 minutes she would probably appreciate it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Secretary, I want to join with those who have thanked you for your service to our country. I have a few comments followed by one question with one part.

You commented on the importance of trade negotiations; (I think), that the sole or best standard for evaluating our success there is the balance of trade and we do have the largest trade deficit in the history of life on the planet. And I would hope very much that in our trade negotiations we do not focus exclusively on getting countries to change their published rules, but rather focus on real results measured by the balance of trade.

I join with you in advocating higher levels of foreign aid by the United States around the world. I think it is in our interest, but I have to disagree with your argument that Americans are spending less on foreign aid than Europeans, the Japanese or other developed democracies. In fact, the American taxpayer in terms of providing for peace and progress around the world is the most generous taxpayer in the history of the world because we not only provide foreign aid, but we provide the security shield which does more for European security than all the armies of Europe, does more for Japanese security than its own military and does more to

promote the values that we share with Japan and Europe than all of the militaries financed by their taxpayers.

I note with regret that the budget submitted by the Administration cuts aid for Armenia by 27 percent and increases aid for Azerbejan by 77 percent, but I am confident that Congress will exactly reverse those ratios anyway. What concerns me to a greater degree is that when Congress does appropriate funds, I hope that your Department spends those funds effectively and expeditiously. We have appropriated funds for aid to Ngarno-Karabach and I have some concerns that those funds are not being disbursed expeditiously.

I would also point out that those who advocate aid for Azerbejan must explain why the country—one that has so much oil wealth that they tell us that we must get on their good side because they are so politically important—needs economic aid. Only a very badly run government, sitting on so much oil, would need to ask for aid and would be unable to attract investment and to borrow money to deal with its own people.

I would hope that your staff would provide some comments for the record in response to those comments, but I want to focus your attention on the 13 Jews in Iran who are imprisoned in Sharaz on trumped up charges of spying. Those charges are ridiculous because as you know, no Jew in Iran is allowed anywhere near anything of military significance.

I want to thank you, Madam Secretary, for your strong statements about human rights in this regard. Three of these individuals have been released, but the other ten and perhaps even those three will face charges and trials under extreme and unfair conditions which could lead to the execution of some or all of these oppressed individuals.

I note that the Japanese foreign minister is going to join you and I think that is fortuitous. My question for you is whether you believe that Japan and our other allies should continue to do business as usual with Iran to finance hydroelectric facilities in Iran while the Jews of Sharaz are facing these outrageous charges. Also, if it is important for Japan to issue a statement that if justice is not done and certainly if there are any executions that all such business as normal will cease.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me just comment on a couple of things that you said before I get to the Iranian Jewish issue. Let me just say this, I do believe that American taxpayers are very generous, but we are all, as one of them, doing this to protect our national interest and what we do to support our military is in our national interest. But obviously our foreign assistance program—first of all, I think the word foreign aid should be banned—we are talking about aid that helps America and if we talk about the drug issue as we have been on Colombia, we want to make sure that our children are protected. So we could have a long discussion on this. We will provide for your additional comments.

On the issue of the 13 Iranian Jews, I have been very actively speaking to our various allies and others about the importance of making the case to the Iranian government and I believe that they have been doing so. I am hoping that there will be some positive resolution on this. I will obviously discuss this with the Japanese

foreign minister when he gets here. It is a concern to us and I have made this very clear, Congressman. I will continue to do so.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you.

Mr. BEREUTER. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Tancredo.

Mr. TANCREDO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, I have a couple of questions about two countries, really, Sudan and New South Sudan. I recognize that most people do not consider them to be two countries, but I think in fact, culturally, politically, religiously, ethnically, every way you can think of them, they are. There are certainly two countries in my mind.

As you know, Madam Secretary, the Foreign Ops Appropriations Bill for FY 2000 included language in Section 592 which allowed for the President to provide food assistance to groups engaged in the protection of civilian population from attacks by regular government forces, associated militias or other paramilitary groups supported by the government of Sudan. The Appropriations Committee received the required report concerning this language last week from the President and was notified that the Administration at this time was not going to use such authority to provide food aid to opposition forces in the south.

Madam Secretary, the United States has sought to take a policy of isolation and containment toward the terrorist regime in Khartoum. We have provided assistance through such programs as the U.N.-run Operation Lifeline Sudan and USAID's Sudan Transitional Assistance for Rehabilitation Program to people being affected by this conflict in both northern and southern Sudan. While we have sought to help those in need, we have not taken a hard line stance against those who are responsible for the almost 2 million dead, millions more internally displaced—namely the government of Sudan in Khartoum.

Furthermore, the militias which fight beside the government troops are responsible for the slave trade which is currently taking place in Sudan—responsible for turning young girls into concubines. It disturbs me that when we have given the Administration a chance to work to protect these people in the south from such slave traders and government troops and have supported the actions of the SPLM and others within NDA who stand guard against northern aggression, that we choose to stand idly by.

Madam Secretary, could you please comment on the rationale behind this policy stance. Yesterday I participated in a hearing where Secretary Holbrooke (Ambassador Holbrooke) was testifying about the aggressive stance the United States is taking with regard to the Congo and our position in the U.N.—the position on the Security Council in actually bringing forces to bear inside the Congo in order to eventually bring peace to that region and I certainly commend you. I commend the Ambassador. I do not understand, Madam Secretary, I truly do not understand how we can place so much emphasis in certain parts of the world on accomplishing a mutually agreeable goal—peace—in that area, but so completely ignore the problems in Sudan and further ignore the actions of the Congress in trying to address them through the provisions of food aid to the south.

[Mr. Brady presiding.]

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Congressman, I have spent a lot of time on Sudan and just yesterday met with Bishop Cassis who is a Roman Catholic bishop and has set up a whole network of schools in the south and is working on providing assistance to people in the south. I was appalled by things that he told me where the government in Khartoum is now deliberately targeting schools, according to what he said.

Mr. TANCREDO. And hospitals.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. And I agree with you completely about how outrageous this is. What we are doing is supporting something that is known as the EGAD process which would try to bring some kind of a comprehensive peace and we have now been getting to have a process that is more invigorated. I met with some of the SPLA leaders when I was in Nairobi. We are trying to work in terms of supporting civil society and civil governance in opposition controlled areas through something called STAR, the Sudan Transitional Assistance for Rehabilitation program. We are working very hard on what I consider one of the worst tragedies in Africa.

When I was Ambassador to the U.N., I tried very hard to get sanctions against Sudan and could not get them. Multilateral sanctions. So this is an issue much on my mind. On the food aid, I think that we do not require this kind of authorization, frankly, and the President has not yet made a decision on the issue. We need to figure out how best to get assistance in what—one of the hardest problems on the issue of Sudan is kind of cross-cutting desires by various ways of looking at it. Do we provide humanitarian assistance? How much do we deal with the leaders in the south? How do we isolate the government in Khartoum? But believe me, I agree with you that it is one of the modern horrors and I tried to really work on it. I appreciate your interest and support.

[Mr. Gilman presiding.]

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you. Mr. Wexler.

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Secretary, on behalf of all the peons at the end of the row, thank you very much for sticking around. I would like to follow-on some of the remarks Congressman Gejdenson started with. I very much appreciate your acknowledgment of the important relationship, historically, between the United States and Pakistan. But certainly, as you know better than anybody, the linkage between Pakistan's current government and its terrorist activity is all but undeniable. Whether it be in the context of enabling terrorist activity or actually allowing it or encouraging it may be debatable. I was curious if you could share with us what conversations, what deliberations have gone on recently with respect to Pakistan's government involvement with terrorist activity. What assurances or what assertions have they made to you with respect to their involvement? In the context of the President's upcoming visit to India, have you suggested or outlined any benchmarks or criteria that the President will consider regarding whether or not he should include Pakistan in his visit in that region?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Let me just say that we obviously, as I stated earlier, have the most concern about the fact that certain groups operate out of or within Pakistan and have had discussions with the Ushar government as we had had previously with the Sharif

government. This is obviously with our concern about terrorism and the way that it affects the whole region. It is something that has been very important to us and we have been concerned about Pakistan's support for the Taliban who are in turn closely linked to Osama ben Lodin. So we are actively addressing these issues.

We have, as I stated earlier, laid out the importance of the Musharif government moving back toward some kind of civilian democratic system supporting local elections, and grass roots democracy in Pakistan. The President has, as I have said, made no decision. And obviously, these are all aspects of our overall relationship. The President is going to India and Bangladesh and no decision has been made on Pakistan.

Thank you.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you. Mr. Mendendez.

Mr. MENDENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Madam Secretary, let me applaud you for extending your time. I know how busy you are and let me say that in the times that we disagree, I have a great deal of respect for your work in the service to our country.

Having said that, let me say a few things that I disagree with you on. And one of them is your response—I was not going to raise Elian Gonzales, but I think where the Administration misses the point is that it is not about Elian and it is not about U.S.-Cuba relations. It is about what this country is going to do and I think it is setting a dangerous precedent for children who are fleeing oppressive regimes. In that context, that oppression could be political as it is in the context of Cuba. It could be religious. It could be ethnic. It could be racial. And whether it be an Albanian child in Kosovo or a Jewish child in Moscow of 1987 or Tehran of 2000, I think that we have to look at and differentiate what we do with children fleeing oppressive regimes, and yes, parental rights are very important, but that should also be coupled with the nature of the circumstances of the country we are sending that child back to. I think that is where a great deal of this debate has missed the point. And as an aside to that, I would hope that we would be as vigorous in pursuing the Castro regime on American families that he divides by not granting them exit visas when the United States has granted visas to those families for family reunification. He holds himself out to be the great provider, the great defender of family rights and yet he continuously divides families by not granting them an exit visa.

But the major point I wanted to raise with you is with reference to Latin America. For the last 8 years, both your predecessor and yourself when you have come before the Committee I have vigorously urged that the Department consider increases in the development assistance and economic support funds for Latin America. I know the constraints of the budget, however, the Administration's own requests remain far, far below the level that would reflect a genuine interest by the United States government in the region. If we want to stop illegal immigration, if we want to do something about cementing the democratic foundations that we spent billions of dollars in the 1980's to create, if we want to do something about preserving the rain forests and the biodiversity issues that affect us here in the United States in terms of environment, if we want

to do something about, truly do something about the narcotics issue, then we have to begin to seriously look at the hemisphere in which 50 percent of the people live below the poverty level and think about economic support funds.

We now come to the debate on Colombia where we are talking about $1.6 billion and probably working very late in the process. Had we along the way been dealing as we heard from the leaders of the countries that came to Congress last week to the drug summit, what did we hear each of those leaders where the Administration talks about success saying? Assist us in economic development support funds so that we can ultimately create sustainable development outside of the narcotics-producing products. And yet, that has fallen on somewhat deaf ears.

So I would hope that the Administration and the Department would work with us, particularly as the Colombia package moves forward, in creating a Latin America development fund. I mean the Department has often come here and said well, that might create a ceiling for you. We are just trying to maintain the floor underneath our feet in this process because it is the one place that continuously gets drained. And we believe that this is a good time.

And lastly, we hope and we appreciate your commitment and work with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus on the question of diversity issues, but we are alarmed that this budget eliminates the line item for minority recruitment. We do not see how that ultimately promotes the interest of meeting that diversity.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think I have already said on Elian's case, it is a case in court and that I think is the comment that I make on it at this time.

On the question of support for Latin America, let me say that generally I would like to see us have a larger pie. We need to have more money. We have stated that here. I would be very pleased to pursue that. I also am very concerned about the fact that we have been celebrating Latin American democracy, but each of the countries in one way or another has a variety of threats to that because of the economic situations within them. And I would very much like to have more, there is no question. But I think as I listen to all of you, everybody has their part of the world and what this says to me is we need a bigger pie and we operate within the constraints that we have and when people think that 1 percent of the budget is too much, that kind of causes me to pause and hope very much that we could all get our act together to be for a larger budget, generally, on that.

And on the diversity issue, let me just say that I think we are moving in the right direction on this and the authorizing bill did earmark $2 million. We are spending it and we are trying to see some positive results. It is something that I am committed to as Secretary of State.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Menendez, the gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Rothman.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Thank you. Madam Secretary, it is always a great pleasure to be with you and thank you for agreeing to stay. I think history will record your service here as Secretary of State as being

one of the most effective and competent Secretaries of State we have ever had.

I am going to list about ten issues, but I only want to talk about one. Northern Ireland, Armenia, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Colombia, Wei Og, Cyprus, Pakistan, strategic oil reserve to help the Atlantic Coast States bring down the price of home heating oil prices, Cuba. Those are subjects I am interested in.

It is a marvel how you know so much about a hundred times this list, but I suppose that is what it takes to be Secretary of State.

Nonetheless, I want to talk about Syria. And I wanted to take this opportunity to rant a little bit about Syria and then hope that you will pass the message on to Mr. Assad. The message is that I am and I believe the American people are disgusted and outraged at the way he continues to behave as a brutish thug of a dictator and the murderous individual that he is. He is obviously not concerned about the well-being of his own people since he has kept his people under a totalitarian thumb—his—for decades. They are between 30 and 50 years behind the rest of the western societies in their development because of his rule. He has used innocent men, women and children in his own country, in Lebanon and Israel and the surrounding region as pawns willing to sacrifice them, to slaughter them or to see that they are slaughtered to serve some political power objective of his own which serves only himself to keep him as the total supreme dictator, without regard to the well-being of even his own people.

His latest effort to use (to reintroduce) terrorism as a tool in his negotiating kit, to achieve to some end that I know not is abhorrent, is immoral. To use the Lebanese and the Israelis and to sacrifice those men, women and children, soldiers and civilians alike for some unknown purpose. He could have peace today with Israel on terms that any reasonable individual, knowledgeable about the history of the region could accept. He could have had it 10 years ago, 20, 30 years ago. And I would like you to pass a message on to that thug dictator, ruthless individual, Mr. Hafez al Assad, that the United States Congress and the American people will not forget his behavior. I do not care what it is like in his neighborhood where he can use the slaughter of innocents to prop himself up and then hope the next day because of some power relationship or of some monied interests we will all forget about it. The American people and the United States Congress will not forget his immorality and his ruthlessness and his failure to come to terms and make peace in that region. Particularly, his failure to make peace with America's number one ally in the region (not just strategic), the State of Israel who has often been likened to a democratic aircraft carrier in the midst of the Middle East, a strategic friend of the United States. We will not forget and if peace occurs later than sooner that will be just as long as we remember it, however long we will add to our memory and it will inure to not only him, but to his son. We will not forget the way Hafez al Assad is failing to achieve peace in the region and we will hold him accountable and his son accountable and his people accountable and they will suffer.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Could I just comment with one sentence which is that the late Prime Minister Rabin said that you make peace with your enemies and not your friends.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Rothman, the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. I too would like to compliment you, Madam Secretary, for the outstanding work that you have been doing. I think that your team that you led at the United Nations with Ambassador Holbrooke in the month of January and his chairmanship of the Security Council bringing in President Mandela, dealing with the Burundi situation, having the seven heads of state from Central Africa together to talk about the peace process, having Vice President Gore speak at the U.N. on the crisis, the pandemic of HIV/AIDS and of course, your presiding at that meeting of the presidents, I think set a fine tone to the United Nations. It sends a message that the United States is, in fact, now becoming more engaged in Africa and it has high priority. So I would like to commend you for the leadership you have shown and your team, Dr. Rice and all the others who have been doing an outstanding job. Secondly, I would also like to mention the Summit on Africa where you will be participating and I think that Administration support for this very important week meeting is also important as we move into this new millennium talking about the problems of the world.

I do want to say that I am a bit disturbed that the food aid Mr. Tancredo talked about, the possibility of having assistant food aid outside of OLS was rejected by the Administration. We think that the people are entitled to food, and the government of Sudan is still bombing. Sixteen children were killed by the Nuba Mountains just a day or 2 ago by the anti-Nnasada dropping bombs on civilian people, and the government does not seem to want to change. We are also disappointed that gum arabic was allowed again by the corporate people that want to use the product in their products that they produce and that we are not going to hold up the ban on gum arabic. Also disturbing is that I hear there is a possibility of our embassy opening in the Sudan. I would hope that that is not true because I think if moves are made by a country then we should have a carrot and stick approach. Therein you basically give accommodations for some positive signs, but I think it would be a move in the wrong direction because Sudan has actually increased its brutality toward its people with slavery, as we have heard from Congressman Tancredo. So I would like to know what we intend to do there. Just quickly, if you could tell me in a nutshell the status of the Ethiopia-Eritrea crisis around Botomma and where the OAU framework stands relating to either country approving it; the prospect of the peacekeeping in both the DRU and the Sierra Leone and finally, the surprise coup d'etat. I mean it was not a surprise to me, but many countries around the world and in Africa were surprised that there was a military coup d'etat on Christmas Eve in Cote d'Ivoir, that President Bethier was overthrown, and that General Gay is now in charge.

Do you see that country moving toward elections in the near future?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Congressman, I want to thank you very much for the cooperation that we have had, I think, in moving forward on the Africa agenda and I am very pleased with the kinds

of actions that we have taken. We had a session on Africa in the Security Council 2 years ago at the ministerial level. We have continued that up there, and I think this January was a very important continuation in our attention to Africa at the United Nations.

I believe that to move back from the bottom up here on Ethiopia-Eritrea, we obviously have been very concerned about the lack of resolution and the fact that the OAU framework has not been followed up. Tony Lake is on his way back there. I also am very concerned about an imminent food crisis famine in Ethiopia again and we have bene talking to AID about making sure that assistance—food assistance—is prepositioned.

On Sierra Leone, we have asked for an increase in the size of that peacekeeping operation because it needs to be really enlarged to effectively do its job. I think of the various terrible things that I have seen in Sierra Leone: I went to a clinic—to reach out to shake hands with somebody and then not have a hand at the end of it is quite a stunning sign of the horrors there.

On Congo, we are asking for a peacekeeping operation there, as you know, and we believe that it is essential that we support that, because Congo is not only large, but it is surrounded by nine countries. It is essential that we really participate in that as Congressman McKinney made the point.

On Sudan, I find this one of the most troubling situations. As I said, there is no easy answer to this in terms of what process to support, how to make sure that in ordering assistance to one group of people, it is not cut off from somebody else, how the SPLA operates, how we support the EGAD process, how we should deal with the Khartoum government, and if we should even see whether there is something going on in the Turabi Bashir arguments.

So we are looking at all of this with Dr. Rice who is a leader in that, and we will keep you informed on it. And I just want you to know that there is no lack of attention to it, but there is difficulty in dealing with the various aspects of it that are quite confounding to all of us, and we appreciate cooperating with you on it.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Payne.

Madam Secretary, we want to thank you for your patience and your generosity with your time. Let me make one final point, Madam Secretary. One of the hallmarks of your tenure at the helm of the Department of State has been your steadfast protection of the prerogatives of your Agency. It is in that regard that I would like to rise to you my concern about the recently signed declaration of principles for defense equipment and industrial cooperation between the U.S. and the U.K. That agreement which, as you know, is not legally binding, was negotiated between our Department of Defense and the British Ministry of Defense. Neither the State Department nor any other U.S. agencies with equities in that document were involved. That makes me even more nervous when I understand that it is the intent of DOD to engage in similar negotiations with Australia, with France, the Netherlands, Germany and some other countries. That agreement itself is full of verbiage which goes to the heart of your responsibilities, so let me particularly note my concern about the language on export controls. I do not support a blanket munitions exemption for licenses for the U.K.

That declaration is the latest manifestation of the so-called globalization efforts of our good friends over at the Pentagon. I have significant reservations about those efforts and I hope you do too. As the Administration winds down I strongly urge you to stay engaged on that subject and I can assure you that the Pentagon, even with the departure of John Hamry, is proceeding full steam ahead.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, let me say this is an issue that I have been involved in. I think the process needs to be one in which the State Department does not give up any prerogatives and I thank you for raising it.

Chairman GILMAN. And again, we thank you, Madam Secretary, for your being with us.

We will now conclude our hearing, Madam Secretary, Members and we will immediately reconvene into a brief business meeting pursuant to notice, very brief. I will ask our Members to remain in their seats and at this time we will consider our Committee's views of estimates on the President's Fiscal Year 2001. And Madam Secretary, thank you again.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. And I would like to thank you and the Members for all your kindness and your kind words about what I have done.

Let me just say that I have been many things in life, a Senate staffer, a professor and a talking head, and a campaign advisor, and a wannabe, and all kinds of things, and I try very hard in my daily work because I now have the responsibility to subject my views to a reality check. Through it all I believe I have been a consistent supporter of the goodness of American power based not only on our power, but on our principles and values, and I thank you very much for your help.

Chairman GILMAN. We are very proud of your work, Madam Secretary.

[Applause.]

Secretary ALBRIGHT. And I still have 11 months to go.

[Whereupon, at 1:04 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

Statement of Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman,Chairman
International Relations Committee
The President's FY2001 International Affairs Budget Request
16 February 2000

Madam Secretary, thank you for appearing before our Committee today. We believe it is vitally important that the State Department engage the Congress, and particularly the International Relations Committee, in a vigorous dialogue on the foreign policy challenges that face our nation.

The administration has been playing an important role in the Arab-Israeli peace process as well as the discussions in the north of Ireland. We commend your efforts in those two areas, Madam Secretary.

I understand that you are traveling to Croatia and Albania on Friday. We wish you Godspeed in your mission to that difficult region.

Before turning to the subject of today's hearing, the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request, I would like to say a few words about Libya and the trial of the two suspects in the bombing of Pan Am flight 103.

We have received your letter dated February 8, 2000, in which you assure us that "there are no external or negotiated limits to the authority of the Scottish prosecutors in the trial or the lines of inquiry they can pursue."

This is welcome news, and I hope that you will soon be able to share Secretary General Kofi Annan's letter to Moammar Ghaddafi with the families of the Pan Am 103 victims, which I suggested in my letter of December 23, 1999.

Budget

Madam Secretary, regarding the presidential budget request, I intend to support funding at approximately the level you have requested. However, I do disagree with some of your priorities -- for example, we passed and the President signed a foreign affairs authorization bill that provides for about $200 million more per year for security than you have requested. We will urge the Budget Committee and the appropriators to make room for our security amount and that they find offsetting cuts in accounts such as peacekeeping.

I would like, at this point, to comment on some specific problem areas around the world.

Russia

Regarding Russia, it is certain that Russia is violating its commitments to the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, its obligations under its own constitution, and, in all likelihood, the rules of war. The response to these atrocities by the administration has been weak.

There are some things we could do, ranging from cutting off IMF loans to the Russian government to taking this issue up in a decisive, strong manner in an international forum, such as the United Nations. But we are not doing even that, and it is a shame.

Kosovo

President Clinton referred to the excellent job our airmen and other military personnel did in bringing the conflict to Kosovo to a close, yet there are many reports today that the effort to bring lasting peace and stability to Kosovo is not going well.

We look forward to hearing from you this morning about how the U.S. and our allies in Europe plan to ensure that our military success is matched by our efforts to restore an orderly society in Kosovo and bring democracy to Serbia itself.

Central Europe Investors

Madam Secretary, the admission of the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary into NATO is a proud achievement, and those states are now moving toward entry into the EU as well.

I hope, however, that you will impress upon our new allies the need to assure proper treatment of American investors, a matter of urgent concern to some of our investors in the Czech Republic and Poland, in particular.

North Korea

Madam Secretary, we in the Congress remain concerned about our policy toward North Korea. Despite six years of engagement and nearly $1 billion in American aid, North Korea has enhanced its missile technology to the point where it may be able to strike the continental United States with a nuclear weapon. In addition, North Korea has evolved into the world's leading proliferator of missiles and missile technology.

For the sake of future American generations, I hope you can explain to this Committee how the administration's policy will lead to an end to this brinkmanship by North Korea.

China

Madam Secretary, we have similar concerns with the People's Republic of China. Our policy of engagement has produced very questionable results. Despite our efforts, human and religious rights abuses continue, proliferation goes unchecked, Chinese espionage continues against our high-tech industry, and the military buildup against Taiwan moves forward.

It is short-sighted to assert that increased trade alone will solve these problems, and I hope that you have some other options for U.S. policy.

Latin America

Madam Secretary, many of us are grateful that the administration has finally begun to focus on the crisis that grips Colombia. But we must not ignore the rest of the region. Funding to support Mexico's elections should be a priority.

I am concerned that the wave of democracy in Latin American may be cresting. How our nation directs or withholds resources can make a difference. Ecuador is on the brink of chaos. The jury is out on Venezuela. The legitimacy of Peru's upcoming elections is open to question. Paraguay remains fragile. Property issues in Nicaragua continue to fester. And after closing our bases in Panama, the administration has done nothing to get them reopened.

We must address escalating drug trafficking and drug corruption in Haiti. We aren't doing enough to discourage violence and haven't provided promised resources to level the playing field for Haiti's upcoming elections. The hour is late. We need to act now.

Management Issues (OPAP)

Two weeks ago, Madam Secretary, this Committee heard from members of the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel. I have examined their report and believe that it provides a road map for modernizing the State Department for the next century.

I trust that you will aggressively put these recommendations into action. I intend to hold further hearings on your progress on the issues outlined in the panel's report.

I would now like to turn to our Ranking Democrat, Mr. Gejdenson, for any opening statement he may have.

Congressman Radanovich's Statement on Croatia for the House International Relations Committee hearing with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright February 16, 2000

The recent Croatian parliamentary and presidential elections marked a significant change in the consolidation of democracy in that country and also send an important signal throughout the region.

The elections have been characterized by international observer missions as professional and have made significant strides toward meeting OSCE standards, and as such Croatia deserves recognition on its path towards Euro-Atlantic integration and should be strongly supported by the United States.

As I stated during the General Debate of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill last July, Croatia was a loyal and valuable ally of the US during the Kosovo crisis and deserves commendation for its clear desire to stand with the United States and the West in the US/NATO policy in Southeastern Europe, including SFOR and Operation Allied Force. Croatia's decision to close its oil-pipelines to Yugoslavia was later recognized as a key element in Milosevic's decision to surrender.

It is unbelievable to me that despite all the strides it has made to preserve stability in the region, Croatia is still not a member of the Partnership for Peace program. Croatia meets all of the requirements for Partnership for Peace, even more so than some of its current members and therefore should be seriously considered for membership at the earliest possible opportunity.

I think it is necessary to point out that the democratization of Southeastern Europe is one of our most immediate and important interests, and it is of even more importance and interest to our allies in the European Union and NATO. Every year, US taxpayers see millions of their hard earned dollars allocated towards ensuring peace in this region, and without democratization and economic development in the region, our soldiers will continue to remain there for a number of years. By supporting Croatia's membership into PfP we will not only be making a sound investment in the future stability of Southeastern Europe, we will also be sending a clear message to other countries in the region, most notably Bosnia and Herzegovina and Yugoslavia, of the benefits that come from choosing a democratic path.

I firmly believe that we need to seize the momentum and work closely with Croatia to ensure that every opportunity is provided.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

AMERICA AND THE WORLD IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

I. PRIORITIES FOR THE NEW YEAR

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, good morning. I am pleased to be here to testify regarding the President's proposed Fiscal Year 2001 budget request for international affairs, and to review U.S. foreign policy around the world.

In times past, my predecessors have appeared before this Committee seeking support for Americans at war, help in responding to a grave international crisis, or solidarity in the face of threats posed by a totalitarian superpower.

But now, in this first year of the new millennium, our country is at peace. We enjoy record prosperity. Our alliances are united and firm. And the ideals that underlie our own democracy have spread to every continent, so that for the first time in recorded history, more than half the world's people live under elected governments.

Some might see in this good news reason to sit back, put our feet up, and relax, thinking that we are safe now and there is no more great work to be done.

But experience warns us that the course of world events is neither predictable nor smooth. And given the pace of our era, we know that dangerous threats to our security and prosperity could arise with 21st century speed.

These include the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and the missiles that can deliver them; the plague of international terror; the danger of regional tensions erupting into conflicts; the poisonous effects of drug trafficking and crime; the risk of renewed financial crisis; and the global challenges posed by poverty, disease and environmental degradation.

Three years ago, in my first appearance before this Committee as Secretary, I testified that the framework for American leadership must include measures to control the threats posed by nuclear weapons and terror; to seize opportunities for settling regional conflicts; to maintain

America as the hub of an expanding global economy; and to defend cherished principles of liberty and law.

I said further that our key alliances and relationships were at the center of that framework. For these are the bonds that hold together the entire international system. When we are able to act cooperatively with other leading nations, we create a convergence of power and purpose that can solve problems and spur progress around the globe.

This framework will continue to guide us in the year 2000. Our priorities include an even stronger NATO, with ever more robust partnerships, still open to new members, developing new capabilities and preparing for new missions.

We will also strive with our partners to build peace in Kosovo and integrate all of Southeast Europe into the continent's democratic mainstream.

We will work in consultation with this Committee, our allies, and others to respond effectively to the perils of proliferation and the promise of arms control.

We will promote a healthy, open, and growing world economy whose benefits are shared more widely both among and within nations, and where American genius and productivity receive their due.

We will focus attention on our complex relationships with Russia and China, adhering to core principles, while seeking to advance common interests.

We will act resolutely to support peace in key regions such as the Middle East, Central Africa, Northern Ireland and the Aegean.

We will continue our efforts to enhance stability on the Korean Peninsula and to ease tensions in South Asia.

We will strive for even greater cooperation along our borders with Canada and Mexico.

And we will work to strengthen democratic institutions worldwide, including the four key countries of Colombia, Indonesia, Nigeria and Ukraine.

These and other tasks may seem disparate, but each relates to our vision of a secure and prosperous America within an increasingly peaceful and democratic world.

Unfortunately, it remains unclear whether we will have the resources we need to provide the kind of leadership our citizens deserve and our interests demand.

Despite President Clinton's strong backing and bipartisan support from many in Congress, our foreign policy enters the 21st Century living hand to mouth.

Today, we allocate less than one-tenth of the portion of our gross national product that we did half a century ago to support democracy and growth overseas. During the past decade alone, our investment relative to the size of our economy has declined by more than half. Throughout this period, we have been cutting foreign policy positions, closing diplomatic posts, and shutting AID and USIA missions. And we still have far to go in partnership with Congress to provide fully adequate security for our people overseas.

All this has consequences. It reduces our influence for stability and peace in potentially explosive regions. It detracts from our leadership on global economic issues. It makes it harder for us to leverage the help of others. And it often leaves us with a no-win choice between devoting resources to one emergency and using those same resources to deal with another urgent need.

Last week, the President submitted his Fiscal Year 2001 budget, including a request for about $22.8 billion for international affairs programs. I ask you to support that request in its entirety. And I do so with the clear understanding that the vast majority of the funds requested will be spent next year, under a new Administration. The President's request has nothing to do with parties or personalities; it has everything to do with our nation's ability to protect our interests and promote our values.

And I remind you that today, we devote only one penny out of every federal dollar we spend to our international affairs programs. But that single penny can make the difference between a future characterized by peace, rising prosperity and law, and a more uncertain future, in which our economy and security are always at risk, our peace of

mind is always under assault, and American leadership is increasingly in doubt.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it has been a great honor to work with you these past three years, for they have been years of progress and accomplishment for America.

Because this is an election year, some say it will be harder to gain Executive-Legislative cooperation in international affairs. But you and I both know that the world does not stand still even for American elections. We have an obligation--which I am confident we will meet--to work together responsibly on behalf of American interests. And this morning, I would like to review with you our agenda for leadership in the year ahead.

II. AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AROUND THE WORLD

A) Europe and the New Independent States

Since the end of the Cold War, President Clinton and his counterparts in Europe have strived to adapt trans-Atlantic institutions to deal with the realities of a transformed world. Where once we worked with part of Europe to counter a threat that had imprisoned and made dangerous its eastern half, now we work with all of Europe to secure peace, prosperity and freedom throughout and beyond its borders.

As a result, we begin the 21st Century with a NATO that has been strengthened by new members and prepared for new missions. During the Washington Summit last April, Alliance leaders adopted a revised Strategic Concept, vowed to develop the capabilities required to respond to the full spectrum of threats NATO may face, took its partnerships with Europe's other democracies to a new level, and pledged to strengthen the European pillar of the Alliance in a way that bolsters overall effectiveness and unity. The Allies also underscored their commitment to enlargement by adopting a plan to help aspiring countries prepare for possible future membership.

We have also worked to strengthen the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). At the November summit in Istanbul, OSCE members agreed on a new Charter

for European Security, recognizing that security within societies is as important as security between states.

Our partnership with the European Union (EU) is another pillar of trans-Atlantic security and prosperity. As the EU develops its foreign policy capabilities, we are prepared to develop our partnership in tandem with it. That is why we used the U.S.-EU Summits this past year to improve our ability to act together in fast-breaking crises; manage our differences; and improve joint efforts to address global challenges. We also strongly support the EU's plan for enlargement, including its recognition of Turkey as a candidate for membership.

These measures are part of a larger strategy for realizing one of the most elusive dreams of this century, which is an undivided and fully democratic Europe. This goal is also served by our support for the Good Friday peace accords in Northern Ireland; our diplomatic backing for UN-based talks on Cyprus; our efforts with regional leaders to consolidate freedom in central Europe; and our support for Nordic and Baltic nations as they move down the road to integration and cooperation.

Unfortunately, there remains a large piece missing in the puzzle we have been trying to assemble of a Europe whole and free. And that is the continent's southeast corner, where the exploitation of ethnic rivalries sparked World War I, contributed to the mayhem of World War II, and led to four conflicts this decade, including the recent crisis in Kosovo.

In partnership with the EU and others, we have entered into the Southeast European Stability Pact, a multiyear strategy for integrating the nations of that region into the continent's democratic mainstream. The Pact's goals are to foster peaceful, tolerant societies; build viable economies; and transform the region from a source of instability into a full participant and partner in the new Europe.

We are under no illusions about the difficulty of this task. It is literally to transform the patterns of history; to replace whirlpools of violence leading nowhere with a steady upward tide. This won't happen unless the international community follows through on commitments to

help. And unless regional leaders make the hard choices required to create societies based on freedom and law.

Accordingly, we welcome the European Commission's intention to secure 11.2 billion Euros for these goals during the next six years. And we are encouraged by the commitment governments are making to curb corruption and create a good climate for doing business.

We are also heartened by democratic progress in the former Yugoslavia. Since Dayton, elections have been held at all levels in Bosnia. In Macedonia, there was a peaceful transfer of power last year.

In Croatia, the just-concluded election process has been a true breakthrough, representing a triumph for civil society and a major turning point away from ultra-nationalism and towards democratic values. In Montenegro, President Djukanovic is championing democracy. And increasingly in Serbia, the people are asking when they will be given the right to choose their leaders freely and without fear.

Finally, in Kosovo, our challenge is to prepare the way for democracy by bringing the same determination to the task of building peace as we did to ending conflict.

In less than eight months, much progress has been made. Large-scale violence has ended. Almost a million refugees and displaced have returned home. The Kosovo Liberation Army has effectively met its promise to demilitarize. A civilian police is being established and an Interim Administrative Council created.

Nevertheless, the situation remains tense and unpredictable. Backed by Kosovo's leaders, we have urged citizens to refrain from violence, and to cooperate with KFOR, the UN mission, and the international war crimes tribunal. And we are working with them to prepare for municipal elections later this year.

I urge your support for the President's request for funds to help the Kosovars build a democratic society. Combined with the far larger contributions received from our allies and partners, these funds will be used to help create effective civil administration, spur economic

activity, create democratic institutions and train and equip the police.

In Bosnia, we remain deeply committed to full implementation of the Dayton Accords. In cooperation with our many partners, we are constantly evaluating how best to enable and encourage Bosnians to take full responsibility for building a stable, democratic society. The President's budget requests the resources we will need to help Bosnians continue moving in the right direction.

As we proceed with efforts to help Europe's new democracies, we cannot neglect the health of democracy in older ones. In Austria, we are concerned about statements made by Freedom Party head Joerg Haider. Regardless of the government's composition, we have made it clear that we expect Austria to continue to meet the commitments it has made to respect the rights of minorities, foreigners and refugees.

Further to the east, towards the Caucasus and Central Asia, democratic change remains very much a work in progress. In many countries, respect for human rights and the rule of law is unsatisfactory and economic reforms have been slowed by financial turmoil. These problems are aggravated by the lack of a democratic tradition, uncertainty about Russia's future direction, and instability generated by extremist groups.

In the year ahead, we will vigorously pursue diplomatic and programmatic efforts to help countries in the region find the right road. For example, we are pressing ahead as a co-chair of the Minsk process in search of progress on Nagorno-Karabakh. We are renewing our request for repeal of Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. We will seek progress in implementing CFE commitments, and in insulating Georgia from the consequences of the Chechen War. And with Turkey and its partners in the Caucasus and Central Asia, we will take steps to build on the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline agreement.

We attach high importance to our strategic partnership with Ukraine, knowing that an independent, democratic, and prosperous Ukraine is a key to building a secure and undivided Europe. The Ukrainian people showed in last year's elections that they want to get on with essential reforms. And President Kuchma has vowed to make use of

this mandate for decisive change. We will do all we can to assist in strengthening democratic institutions, improving the investment climate, and bolstering the rule of law. We will also deepen our cooperation under the NATO-Ukraine Charter and strengthen our joint nonproliferation efforts.

The past year in Russia has been extraordinarily difficult. Political turmoil, corruption, terrorist bombings, the war in Chechnya and continued economic problems have created hardships for the Russian people, and at times strained relations with the West.

In the months ahead, we hope to re-establish and expand the basis for cooperation between our countries. There is new leadership in the Kremlin and a new Duma that may prove more constructive and forward-looking than the one it replaced. Our nations are working together again in the Balkans, and consulting closely on arms control and nonproliferation issues. We seek to further develop ties between Russia and NATO. And it remains very much in our interests to help Russia prevent the loss of nuclear materials and expertise, and to assist the Russian people in strengthening civil society.

The key short-term test for Russia's leaders remains the war in Chechnya.

Like many others, we have criticized the Russian military for indiscriminate shelling and bombing in that region. We understand the problems posed by terrorism, but deplore the massive violations of human rights. We are concerned about the regional impacts of the conflict, including refugee flows. And we also believe that the harsh tactics being used will not work.

As I said recently in Moscow, "These tactics will not set the stage for peace. Only a political resolution of the conflict will do that. As long as the fighting continues, it will serve as a magnet for extremism that could one day risk the stability of the entire region."

It should not be surprising that the Russian transition is proving difficult. After all, Communism was a seven-decade forced march to a dead end, and no nation went further down that road than Russia. But there is also no question that a peaceful and democratic Russia that is tackling its economic problems and playing a constructive

international role can make an enormous contribution to the 21st Century. We have an enormous stake in Russian success and will continue to work with Russian leaders whenever possible to advance common interests.

B) The Middle East

We begin the new century with new hope in the Middle East, where our primary objective remains a just, lasting and comprehensive peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

Last month, Israeli Prime Minister Barak and Syrian Foreign Minister Shara journeyed to West Virginia, for intensive talks. Chairman Arafat later met with President Clinton in Washington. And in Moscow, I co-chaired with Foreign Minister Ivanov a very successful ministerial meeting of the Multilateral Steering Group.

All this activity reflects that progress is now possible on all tracks of the peace process. But reaching agreement on any of the bilateral tracks remains a formidable task. President Clinton and I will continue working with the parties to help them narrow differences and identify compromises that satisfy core needs.

At this critical moment, it is essential that the United States remain steady in its support for peace. I thank Congress for providing funds late last year to implement the Wye River and Sharm-el-Sheikh interim accords. I hope we will have your continued backing now, as we seek to ensure the security and promote the prosperity of our friends in the region.

As we strive to bring peace closer between Arabs and Israel, we must also explore opportunities for constructive change elsewhere--for example, in Iran.

Over the last two years, there have been unmistakable signs of public support in Iran for a more open approach to the world. We have welcomed President Khatemi's calls for people-to-people dialogue, his verbal condemnation of terrorism, and his regret over the 1979 hostage episode. The upcoming parliamentary elections could provide evidence that the trend towards openness is gathering speed.

At the same time, Iran continues to pursue some policies that we strongly oppose. The United States recognizes that there are conflicting forces at work in Iran, as there are in many nations. Our hope is that the Iranian people will want and be able to choose approaches that lead to better relations.

Elsewhere in the Gulf, we remain focused on containing the threat posed by the Iraqi regime's aggression and WMD capabilities.

Last December, the UN Security Council approved a Resolution establishing the means and mandate for resuming on-site weapons inspections in Iraq, including a clear roadmap for assessing compliance. The United States will work with Dr. Hans Blix, Executive Director of the new Commission, towards fulfilling the Council's resolutions.

We will also continue to make the point that lifting sanctions in the absence of compliance by Baghdad with its WMD obligations is not an option. The Iraqi Government has shown no evidence that it has learned the lessons of the past nine years. That is why we are working for the day when the aspirations of the Iraqi people are realized, and a new government makes it possible for their country to rejoin the family of nations as a responsible and law-abiding member. To this end, we have increased our financial and other assistance to the Iraqi National Congress, and made clear that a change in Baghdad would lead to a change in U.S. policy.

At the same time, we remain committed to alleviating the hardships faced by the Iraqi people. Since 1996, the "oil for food", which we strongly support and helped conceive, has substantially improved nutrition. In Northern Iraq, where assistance is distributed by the UN rather than the Iraqi Government, child mortality rates are lower than they were prior to the Persian Gulf War.

America's interest in a stable and prosperous Middle East also depends on whether the nations there work together to reform their economies, attract investment, move in the direction of democracy and create opportunities for their citizens. During the year 2000, we will be active in promoting these principles in our discussions with the region's leaders and peoples.

C) The Asia Pacific

No part of the world will play a greater role in determining the character of the 21st Century than the Asia Pacific. The region's stability and its continued development and democratization are of profound interest to the United States. This is reflected in my ten visits to the area since becoming Secretary of State.

The United States is deeply committed to meeting our obligations to treaty allies (Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea (ROK), the Philippines, and Thailand), while striving to promote economic and security cooperation with all countries. To this end, we are working with friends and partners to strengthen existing regional institutions, such as APEC, ASEAN and the ASEAN Regional Forum, and to enhance dialogues between and among nations.

Our most important bilateral relationship in the Asia Pacific is with Japan, with whom we work closely on a full range of security, economic and global issues. In recent years, we have modernized our defense cooperation, negotiated steps to liberalize trade, and developed a common agenda for action on matters such as global climate change, international crime, and development in Africa.

Another ally, the Republic of Korea, has become a source of regional stability under the able leadership of President Kim Dae-jung. Over the past two years, the ROK implemented painful economic reforms that have enabled it to emerge from the Asian financial crisis. Even as it struggled with these difficult domestic issues, it demonstrated regional leadership by contributing to the peace operation in East Timor.

We fully support President Kim's policy of engagement with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). This policy seeks to reduce the DPRK's isolation, address humanitarian needs and prevent destabilizing military incidents.

Over the past year, former Defense Secretary William Perry and the State Department's Counselor, Ambassador Wendy Sherman led a comprehensive review of our own policy toward the DPRK, in close coordination with the ROK and Japan. As a result, we have expressed our willingness to

improve relations with the DPRK as it addresses our concerns about its missile and nuclear weapons programs.

Last September, we reached an understanding with the North that it will refrain from any long-range missile flight tests as long as negotiations to improve relations are underway. We will continue such discussions at the end of this month, and anticipate additional talks at a higher level about one month later.

The DPRK's nuclear weapons-associated activities are another area of deep concern. By freezing the North's nuclear facilities at Yongbyon and Taechon, which pose a serious proliferation risk, the Agreed Framework is making a vital contribution to stability. We need Congressional support for meeting our obligations under the Framework, just as we expect the DPRK to meet its own.

Our policy towards the DPRK reflects our desire for permanent reconciliation on the Korean Peninsula. The question of ultimate reunification is one for Koreans to decide through peaceful means, and we strongly encourage North-South dialogue. We also support the Four Party Talks, which include China, the United States and both Koreas. We and our allies want to engage the DPRK in a comprehensive manner so that all sides may address issues of concern. But we are under no illusions. Further progress depends on the DPRK's further willingness to engage seriously with us.

We believe the new century can generate new momentum and mutual benefits in our relations with China. As the President said in his State of the Union Address, "Congress should support the agreement we negotiated to bring China into the WTO, by passing Permanent Normal Trade Relations (NTR)." If we do not grant permanent NTR, we will risk losing the market access benefits of the agreement, and the right to enforce them through the WTO. The result is that our competitors in Asia and Europe would reap those benefits while American farmers and businesses would be left behind.

The economic benefits we will gain by approving Permanent NTR for China do not conflict with our other interests. Once in the WTO, China will be required to follow international trading rules, open its regulations to public scrutiny and reduce the role of state-owned

enterprises. This will encourage growth in the rule of law, and hasten the development of a more open society.

During the year 2000, we will be consulting closely with China on global and regional security issues, including nonproliferation, South Asian security, and Korean stability. We will seek to prevent tensions from increasing across the Taiwan Strait, and promote cooperation in the South China Sea. We support the protection of Tibet's heritage and will continue to urge Beijing to open a dialogue with the Dalai Lama. And as we purse engagement with the PRC, we will continue our commitment to faithful implementation of the Taiwan Relations Act.

Although the Chinese people enjoy greater freedom of choice in economic and many personal matters than in the past, progress in the area of political and other civil rights is lacking. Examples in 1999 include the harsh prison sentences received by leaders of the China Democracy Party, an intensified reeducation campaign to control Tibetan monasteries, continued pressure on underground churches, and efforts to repress the Falun Gong spiritual movement. As a result, we will work for a Resolution expressing concern about human rights in China at the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva next month.

Last year was a time of historic change in Indonesia, Southeast Asia's largest nation. The Indonesian people deserve great credit for conducting free, fair and peaceful elections. The new government, led by President Abdurrahman Wahid, merits broad support as it strives to stabilize the economy, curb corruption, establish the rule of law, cope with regional crises, and address past abuses of human rights.

These goals are simple to identify, but difficult to achieve. The new President is widely respected for his humanity and wisdom. But to succeed, he must make tough decisions and explain them in terms his people will understand and accept. President Clinton is requesting $144 million this year to aid Indonesia's quest for a stronger, stabler democracy.

Elsewhere in the region, we will continue to work with the UN, the Philippines, Australia, Thailand, and others to bring lasting peace and democratic rule to East Timor. And

we will press for a meaningful dialogue in Burma between the government and the democratic opposition, led by the National League for Democracy (NLD). Burmese authorities must understand that the path to acceptance and progress lies in movement towards a popularly supported government in Rangoon. In Cambodia, we continue to work with the government and UN to bring senior Khmer Rouge leaders before a tribunal that meets international standards.

D) South Asia

Last week, the White House announced that President Clinton will visit South Asia. His itinerary will include India, the world's largest democracy, with whom we seek deeper cooperation on issues that include nonproliferation, economic reform, science and the environment. The President will also visit Bangladesh, a nation of more than 100 million people, and a friend and partner on matters of both bilateral and regional concern.

In nearby Pakistan, we are encouraging the military authorities to make good on their pledge to return the country to elected rule in a timely manner.

As for relations between India and Pakistan, longstanding tensions have heightened as a result of the recent Indian Airlines hijacking and the aftermath of last year's Kargil crisis. Our policy is to encourage dialogue aimed at narrowing differences and preventing violence, and we intend to remain actively engaged with both countries toward this end.

In Afghanistan, we have joined with neighboring countries in seeking an end to the civil conflict, the closing of terrorist camps, and increased respect for human rights, which include women's rights.

E) The Western Hemisphere

The nations of Latin America and the Caribbean have made historic strides in building democracy over the past two decades, but serious problems remain in many countries, including political instability, economic inequality, corruption and crime. Fortunately, there is a general consensus across the region about how to deal with these challenges, and a willingness to work cooperatively on them.

At the heart of this consensus is a commitment to free trade and economic integration. In recent years, every major economy in the region has liberalized its system for investment and trade; and we are making progress toward achieving a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) by 2005.

But the fruits of recent economic growth have not been evenly distributed. While much of the region's population enjoys improved living standards, many others have not seen any appreciable benefit. About a third of Latin America's people live on $2 a day or less, and income inequality is greater here than in any other region.

There is a real risk that support for democracy and free markets will erode if these economic disparities are not addressed. Last month's events in Ecuador serve as a warning of what can happen when significant portions of a population feel left behind.

That is why the 1998 Santiago Summit of the Americas put special emphasis on improving the quality and accessibility of education, especially to the urban and rural poor, and to indigenous populations. We are also working through the Summit process to promote judicial reform, good governance and other steps to broaden access to the benefits of economic growth.

I believe that history will regard this period as a turning point in our relations with Mexico. Issues such as migration, counter-narcotics and cross-border law enforcement will never be easy. But in recent years, we have developed effective mechanisms, such as the Binational Commission and the High Level Contact Group, to address such challenges, while also exploring ways to spur mutual economic growth.

One of our most important priorities this year will be to support Colombian President Andres Pastrana's comprehensive plan to fight drug-trafficking, restore fiscal responsibility, and secure peace in his country. As you know, President Clinton has asked that Congress provide an additional $1.27 billion over the next two years for this purpose. We are asking others in the international community to join in this effort. The IMF has already approved a new $2.7 billion program, and we are endorsing

Bogota's request for nearly $3 billion in loans from the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

As I made clear to President Pastrana when I visited Cartagena last month, our support for Plan Colombia rests on the Colombian government's commitment to continue to take appropriate action against human rights violators - whether those violators are military, paramilitary, guerrilla or just plain criminals. Under President Pastrana's leadership, there has already been solid progress on this issue, but more remains to be done.

Neither criminals nor conflict respect national borders. Accordingly, we must also step up our support for counternarcotics and alternative development programs for Colombia's neighbors. It is not enough to drive drug criminals out of Colombia. Our goal must be to drive them out of business--once and for all.

In Haiti, we are helping authorities and civil society prepare for legislative and local elections to be held this spring. And we will be doing our share to assist the new UN Mission in Support of Haiti, which will be providing technical assistance on law enforcement and human rights.

In Cuba, Fidel Castro continues to justify his pariah status by jailing dissidents and refusing to hold free and fair elections. Last year, the international outcry against his dictatorship grew even stronger. In April, the UN Commission on Human Rights adopted a Czech-Polish resolution expressing concern "at the continued violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Cuba." And in November, at the Ibero-American Summit in Havana, many world leaders met for the first time with Cuban dissidents and called on the Cuban government to show greater respect for human rights and democracy.

Over the past two years, President Clinton has taken a series of steps to reach out to the Cuban people and help prepare for a peaceful transition to democracy. Our goal is to strengthen people-to-people ties and encourage the development in Cuba of peaceful activities independent of the government.

F) Africa

In Africa, our challenge is to address pressing security and humanitarian concerns, while helping to realize the continent's great human and economic potential.

An increasing number of Africa's leaders understand that the continent's future prosperity depends on trade and foreign investment. They are working to create a better environment for doing business, by privatizing state-run enterprises, revamping commercial codes, and adopting sound fiscal policies. As a result, annual economic growth has averaged nearly 4 percent over the past five years.

The United States has a direct stake in seeing Africa's economic progress continue. It means better opportunities for our workers and companies. And it means that African nations could be stronger partners and less dependent on outside aid. So I urge Congress to complete its good work to date and grant final approval to the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This measure would provide essential support for economic reform, and expand our trade with one of the world's largest under-developed markets.

In Africa, as elsewhere, we can have the most impact where we have strong regional allies. And in Africa, the two most influential nations are Nigeria and South Africa.

Nine months ago, President Obasanjo became Nigeria's first elected leader since 1983. Since then, he has waged a vigorous campaign to stamp out corruption and revive his country's economy. But he faces daunting obstacles.

After years of military rule, Nigeria must rebuild its democratic institutions, reinvigorate its Parliament, reform its legal system, and reinvent its military under civilian control. It must also cope with complex regional issues, including ethnic strife. Around the world, few democratic transitions are as fragile or as important. Depending on its course, Nigeria can be a powerful factor for instability or stability within the region. I ask your support in providing the resources required to help Nigeria's democracy put down roots and grow.

The United States greatly values its friendship with South Africa. Under Presidents Mandela and Mbeki, South Africa has moved well along the democratic path, but still faces urgent challenges. President Mbeki has been working

energetically to sell off state-run enterprises, attract private sector investment, improve education and reduce crime. In the year ahead, we will do all we can to assist and broaden our partnership with South Africa's leaders and people.

South Africa and Nigeria are the two anchor nations of Africa. Increasingly, epidemic disease is the continent's albatross. Statistics are not adequate to describe the human destruction being caused especially by HIV/AIDS. Over the next decade, tens of millions of children in sub-Saharan Africa will be orphaned by the disease, infant and child mortality may double and, in many countries, average life expectancy will decline sharply.

In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton proposed a new tax credit to speed the development of vaccines for diseases like malaria, TB, and AIDS that disproportionately afflict developing nations. And he is requesting an increase of $150 million in our worldwide fight against AIDS and other killer diseases. I urge your support for these requests.

This past month at the United Nations Security Council in New York, we made Africa our special focus. In addition to discussing the AIDS crisis, we also led sessions on the conflicts in Angola, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Because of its location and size, and because of the number of countries involved, the conflict in Congo could be described as Africa's first world war. The continent cannot hope to meet the aspirations of its people until this war is history.

The Lusaka agreement, signed last summer, offers a solid framework for ending the Congo war. And the international community--including the United States--has a responsibility to support this process. The Lusaka signatories have agreed to provide access, security and cooperation to international peacekeepers. So I am asking Congress to support a United Nations peace mission for Congo, consisting of 500 observers and roughly 5,000 troops for logistics and protection, with most of the soldiers coming from African countries.

We have learned much over the past decade about the "do's and don'ts" of UN missions. We must apply these lessons firmly and realistically in this case. But we must also be resolute in our determination to help Congo move from war to peace.

In addition, I hope you will support the United Nations peacekeeping force for Sierra Leone. I visited that nation last fall and met with victims of its terrible civil war. The parties have agreed on a plan for healing wounds and building peace. We should help them do so.

Finally, I hope the Senate will ratify the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, which would enable the United States to be a better partner with Africa in preserving agricultural land and making more efficient use of natural resources.

III. GLOBAL OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS

America is a global power with worldwide interests. Many of the actions and initiatives we undertake are directed, as I have discussed, at particular countries or parts of the world. Other policies are more encompassing and can best be considered in global terms.

A) Protecting American Security

The first of these is our strategy for ensuring the fundamental security of our citizens and territory. Fortunately, Cold War dangers belong to an earlier millennium. But today, we face a variety of other threats, some fueled by technology's advance; some by regional rivalry; some by ambition or hate.

Accordingly, our armed forces must remain the finest in the world. But we also need first-class diplomacy. Because on many occasions, we will rely on diplomacy as our first line of defense--to cement alliances, build coalitions, and find ways to protect our interests without putting our fighting men and women at risk.

At the same time, our diplomacy is stronger because we have the threat of force behind it. It is by combining force and diplomacy, for example, that we protect Americans from the threat posed by nuclear weapons.

Here, the military deterrent provided by our armed forces and the technological edge they enjoy are indispensable. But we will all sleep better if our deterrent never has to be used. The diplomatic challenge is to create a political environment in which serious military threats to our country are less likely to arise.

To this end, the United States has led in establishing an international legal framework, centered on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, IAEA safeguards, and the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions, designed to prevent WMD from spreading or falling into the wrong hands.

Moreover, our Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI) (building on the 1992 Nunn-Lugar legislation) has done much to protect the American people, destroying almost 5000 nuclear warheads in the former Soviet Union; eliminating nuclear weapons from three former Soviet Republics; and engaging 30,000 former Soviet weapons scientists in peaceful ventures. The President is requesting $974 million for ETRI in Fiscal Year 2001, including $141 million for programs administered by the Department of State.

We are also taking steps to protect ourselves from the new threats posed by ballistic missiles.

Our policy includes diplomatic efforts to restrain missile development, an option that a number of countries have voluntarily foregone. Thirty-two nations are cooperating to limit technology transfers through the Missile Technology Control Regime. And we are doing all we can to prevent known proliferators from gaining access to advanced missile technology.

We understand, however, that nonproliferation efforts may not be enough. To protect our forces and allies abroad, we are working to develop Theater Missile Defense Systems.

To protect ourselves at home, we are developing and testing a limited National Missile Defense system, with a decision on deployment possible as early as this summer. This decision will take into account threat, technological feasibility, affordability, and the overall strategic environment including our arms control objectives.

But for NMD deployment to occur under the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, certain changes in that agreement would be necessary. We have been discussing these with other nations, including Russia.

As I told Acting Prime Minister Putin in Moscow during my recent visit, the United States believes that the ABM Treaty contributes much to strategic stability. It reassures leaders in both capitals about one another's capabilities and intentions. And it has given us the confidence needed to pursue mutual reductions in nuclear arsenals.

On the other hand, the strategic environment has changed greatly in the 28 years since the Treaty was signed. The Gulf War showed the dangers of theater-range missiles in hostile hands. And tests of longer-range missiles by other nations raise concerns that must be addressed.

To date, Russian leaders have opposed any modifications in the ABM Treaty, and questioned severely the potential impact of such changes on the entire system of international arms control.

We have made clear that the limited changes we are contemplating would not undermine Russian security. In fact, because Russia and the United States are vulnerable to the same threats, we are prepared to cooperate with Moscow on missile defense. It is in our mutual interests to consider arrangements that would preserve the essential aims of the ABM Treaty, while protecting us from the new dangers we both face.

Unfortunately, our consideration of NMD has aroused concerns not only in Russia, but also in Western Europe and elsewhere. I have had to address fears expressed by my counterparts that America is intent on going it alone, disregarding the interests of former adversaries and current allies alike.

These fears were highlighted by the Senate's vote last fall on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The Administration made no secret of its disappointment with that vote. We believe that the CTBT is very much in America's national security interests. It would outlaw

nuclear tests by others, while locking in a technological status quo that is highly favorable to the United States.

In considering the arguments for and against a nuclear test ban, Americans must resist the temptation to think that the strength of our armed forces means we no longer need help from others. It is simply impossible to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction unless countries work together.

International cooperation is also essential to safeguard our citizens from other threats. As we saw several times during the past decade, when America's military is called upon to act, we will often do so as part of a coalition. Accordingly, I ask your support for our security assistance programs, which contribute to the health of America's defense industrial base, take advantage of opportunities to promote democratic practices, and help friends and allies to develop armed forces that are more capable and better able to operate with our own.

Another area where international cooperation is required to protect our interests is in responding to the threat posed by international terror. Because of our military strength, potential enemies may try to attack us by unconventional means, including terrorist strikes and the possible use of chemical or biological weapons. In recent years, the number of terrorist strikes has declined, but their severity has risen.

In countering these threats, we must be prepared at home and overseas. That is why we are taking strong security measures and--at President Clinton's direction--improving our planning for emergency response.

Through our diplomacy and training programs, we help friendly governments to improve border security and share information about those suspected of being affiliated with terrorist networks. We offer rewards for terrorist suspects, and gather information to advise and warn Americans. We strive to forge international agreements and cooperation that will leave terrorists with no place to run, hide, operate or stash their assets. We do all we can to bring suspected terrorists to the bar of justice, as we have in several major cases, including the sabotage of Pan Am 103, and the tragic 1998 bombing of two U.S. embassies in Africa.

And this year, we are proposing in the President's budget the creation of a dedicated Center for Antiterrorism and Security Training. This Center will help us to improve the skills of foreign security personnel who are the front line of defense at airports, diplomatic missions and other facilities frequented by our citizens while overseas.

B) Sustaining American Prosperity

A second overarching goal of our foreign policy is to support American prosperity by promoting a healthy world economy and by ensuring fair treatment for American businesses, farmers, ranchers and workers.

The State Department values highly its partnerships with America's private sector. We consult regularly with business, agriculture and labor leaders. We work hard, both in Washington and in our diplomatic missions, to help our citizens take advantage of business opportunities, to enforce the protection of contractual and property rights, to promote responsible labor and environmental standards, and to combat corruption which harms foreign societies while discriminating against U.S. firms.

In addition, since President Clinton took office, the Administration has negotiated more than 300 trade agreements, including the Uruguay Round and agreements on information technology, financial services and basic telecommunications. These agreements have helped us to find new markets, raise living standards and fight inflation. Today, more than eleven million U.S. jobs are supported by exports, and these are good jobs, paying--on the average--significantly more than non-trade related positions.

This morning, I urge your support for the Administration's initiatives to restore the momentum for liberalizing global trade. As President Clinton made clear in his recent speech to the World Economic Forum, "open markets and rule-based trade are the best engine we know of to lift living standards, reduce environmental destruction and build shared prosperity."

The inability of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to agree on the terms of a new trade round during its December meeting in Seattle reflects the complexity of the issues

involved. Our priorities include broadening market-access liberalization, strengthening and extending WTO rules, and addressing the concerns of both developing countries and civil society.

The WTO must also proceed with internal reforms so that it is more open in its methods and meetings, and therefore seen clearly to be a public interest, not a special interest, organization.

There is no question that changes to the global economy have created new challenges for the trading system. We want to work with our partners to enhance market access for the least developed countries through our respective preferential programs. We want to engage the WTO and the International Labor Organization (ILO) in a constructive dialogue, including consideration of the relationship between core labor standards, trade policy and social development. And we will continue to work to ensure that trade rules support, not undermine, the ability of governments to protect the environment.

In addition, I urge members of this Committee to help us support American prosperity by backing agencies such as the Export-Import Bank, the Trade and Development Agency, and Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which help our businesspeople take advantage of new markets abroad.

In this era, American prosperity depends on the prosperity of others. So I ask your support for the full range of our efforts to promote development around the world.

Last year, the Earth's population surpassed six billion human beings. More than one billion of them live on less than a dollar a day. More than half have never made a telephone call. The new millennium has dawned on a world divided as much as ever before between those who have much, and those who have not.

It is in America's interest to help those who most need help to pull themselves up. For we have learned from experience that desperation can breed conflict, generate uncontrolled refugee flows, provide fertile ground for criminals and terrorists, and contribute to global problems such as environmental degradation and epidemic disease.

We also know that sustained efforts to promote development can produce sustained progress. Between 1960 and 1990, the average life expectancy in the developing world rose by 17 years, infant mortality was cut in half, the rate of child immunization more than doubled, and the percentage of children in school increased from less than half to more than three quarters.

Obviously, the challenge of development today is different than in the past. The world is multi-polar, technology-driven, energized by more open markets and awash in enterprise, ideas and information.

Those who are succeeding are first adapting. To be effective, external assistance must be matched by internal energy and reform. Democracy must be practiced, markets must be opened, investment encouraged and corruption stopped. Marginalized sectors of the population must be given access to the knowledge and skills they will need to compete in the 21st Century. And governments must lead in educating their populations about wise environmental and health practices, including awareness about HIV/AIDS.

Neither the United States, nor any other country or institution, can bring sustainable development to a nation whose government is incompetent or corrupt. But we can, and should, do all we can to help those trying to help themselves gain the capacity to do so successfully.

Accordingly, I ask your vote for legislation to promote investment and trade, including the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the Southeast Europe Trade Preferences Act, and further extension of the Generalized System of Preferences.

I ask your support for President Clinton's initiative, in partnership with the G-8, to provide debt relief for the most heavily indebted poor countries, and to use a portion of that relief to address social problems and conserve the environment.

I ask your approval of our request for funds to support all of the varied and vital work of USAID, the world's finest and most versatile development organization.

And I seek your backing for other vital economic, technical and humanitarian assistance programs such as

those administered by the Multilateral Development Banks, the Inter-American and African Development Foundations, our Peace Corps volunteers, UNICEF, the UN Development Program, and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

C) Safeguarding the Environment

The United States also has a major foreign policy stake in protecting the global environment and in working to prevent transboundary environmental problems that could harm our interests, lead to conflicts or contribute to humanitarian disasters.

As societies grow and industrialize, the absorptive capacities of the Earth will be severely tested. Misuse of resources can produce shortages that breed conflict, famine, refugee flows and further acts of environmental destruction.

That is why we have incorporated environmental goals into the mainstream of our foreign policy, and why we are pursuing specific objectives in areas such as forestry management, coral reef protection and the conservation of marine resources in every part of the world.

Priorities for the year 2000 include 1) helping to shape an effective global response to the challenge of climate change; 2) working to promote and gain world acceptance for a science-based standard for biosafety; 3) gaining international agreement to phaseout the production of twelve persistent chemical toxins; 4) developing multinational strategies for responding to the costly problem of invasive species, protecting coral reefs, and managing transboundary water resources; and 5) defeating efforts to weaken protections for whales.

D) International Family Planning.

Last year, with this Committee's leadership, Congress approved legislation enabling the United States to begin paying down the arrears we owe to the United Nations. Unfortunately, that law included unwise restrictions on our support for international family planning. I ask your help in seeing that these restrictions are not attached to legislation this year.

Contrary to what some believe, the United States does not provide any funds to perform or promote abortions overseas. Instead, our assistance is used for family planning services that reduce abortions, promote maternal and child health, and save lives.

Pregnancy-related complications kill an estimated 600,000 women every year. They are the leading cause of mortality among women of reproductive age in developing countries. And experts believe that perhaps one in every four of these deaths could be prevented through access to family planning.

Family planning also saves the lives of children. Eleven million boys and girls die each year before reaching the age of five. Many could be saved if births were spaced further apart, and mothers bore a higher proportion of their children during their healthiest reproductive years.

Accordingly, President Clinton is asking Congress this year to return U.S. support for international family planning to 1995 levels. Moreover, we believe that private groups overseas should be able to exercise their right of free speech and publicize their views for or against reproductive rights without fearing loss of U.S. funding. The restrictions imposed upon such groups this year should not be carried over into next.

E) Fighting International Crime and Narcotics

A third global objective of our foreign policy is to fight and win the struggle against the hydra-headed evil of international crime.

Drug cartels and crime syndicates have expanded their operations since the end of the Cold War, in part by capitalizing on the same technological advances that have aided legitimate international commerce.

Recognizing the seriousness of this threat, President Clinton has launched a comprehensive effort to integrate all facets of the federal response to international crime. The State Department is a key partner in this initiative.

We are working with other nations around the globe to strengthen legal codes; fight corruption; train police, prosecutors and judges; close criminal front companies;

halt illegal smuggling and money laundering; negotiate extradition treaties; and bring criminals to justice.

In regard to illegal narcotics, we have pursued a comprehensive strategy that includes support for eradication, interdiction, alternative development, the seizure of drug assets and the extradition to the United States of drug kingpins.

These efforts are paying good dividends in our own hemisphere. Peru has cut coca cultivation by more than 66% over the past four years, and Bolivia by 55% since 1997. And as I have discussed earlier, we have greatly stepped up our efforts to assist authorities in Colombia in their battle against drugs and crime.

In the New Independent States, we continue to focus our efforts on law enforcement training and helping legislators to draft anti-crime and corruption laws. We are also negotiating agreements that will allow our own law enforcement officers to cooperate more effectively with their counterparts in these countries.

In Africa, Nigeria is the key. A significant portion of the heroin interdicted in the U.S. is traceable to Nigerian smuggling organizations. Because of the new government in that country, the prospects for improvement are encouraging. It is essential, however, that we have the flexibility in administering our programs to devote sufficient resources to this continent.

F) Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law

A core element in American foreign policy is our support for democracy, the rule of law, religious tolerance and human rights. We view these not solely as American or Western values, but as universal norms applicable to all people.

In 1900, no country in the world had a government elected on the principle of universal suffrage in multiparty, competitive elections. Today, according to Freedom House, 120 nations representing 58% of the world's population, fit this definition. Our goal, in partnership with others, is to preserve and strengthen democracy where it exists and to lend appropriate support to democratic aspirations where it does not.

Earlier in this statement, I mentioned some of the specific programs we use to aid democratic transitions, support free and fair elections and help democratic forces build civil society.

These programs reflect our ideals and serve our interests.

We know from experience that democratic governments tend to be more successful at preventing conflicts, maintaining stability, spurring social progress, and building prosperous economies than regimes that fear their own people.

I personally look forward to attending in Warsaw in June a conference convened by democracies from Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa. Its purpose will be to affirm the value of democratic principles and draw attention to the many facets of true democracy. These go far beyond holding elections to include a free press, independent political parties and labor organizations, and a legal system that protects the civil, political and economic rights of the people.

We also support democratic principles by striving to elevate global standards of human rights and respect for the rule of law. Our goal is to make the 21st Century an era of steady progress in each of these areas, not a time of consolidation or settling for the status quo.

Accordingly, the United States will continue to support democratic ideals and institutions however and wherever we can effectively do so.

We will continue to advocate increased respect for human rights, vigorously promote religious freedom, urge accountability for crimes against humanity wherever they occur, and firmly back the international criminal tribunals for Rwanda and the Former Yugoslavia.

We will support efforts to help women gain fair access to the levers of economic and political power, work with others to end the pernicious trafficking in women and girls, and renew our request for Senate approval of the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

We will push for global ratification of a Convention to ban the worst forms of child labor, and expand partnerships with the private sector to eliminate abusive working conditions in factories abroad, especially those producing for the U.S. market.

And we will remain leaders in the international effort to prevent harm to civilians from anti-personnel landmines. Through the President's "Demining 2010" Initiative, we are working with official and nongovernmental organizations everywhere to detect, map, mark and destroy mines; increase mine awareness; improve mine detection technology; and care for the victims of mines.

IV. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Last October 1, the State Department and United States Information Agency (USIA) merged. This was a key step in the reorganization of our foreign policy institutions called for by the Administration and Congress.

The merger enabled us to make public diplomacy a core element in our approach to foreign affairs by bringing new expertise and perspectives into our policymaking team.

Public diplomacy advances U.S. interests by helping others to understand our society, culture and values, and builds long-term mutual ties through the Fulbright scholar and student programs. It can also be a very practical tool for influencing events. During the conflict in Kosovo, for example, our Internet Assistance Initiative helped us to manage data generated by the massive humanitarian effort, while also aiding refugees in locating loved ones who had become separated. More recently, we used public diplomacy to warn against a breakdown of the constitutional order in Ecuador.

In addition, the State Department's International Visitors Program has been remarkably successful at identifying world leaders early in their careers. Past participants include no less than three dozen current Presidents and Prime Ministers.

I congratulate Members of the Committee for your support during the reorganization process, and urge your

backing for the full range of public diplomacy programs in the year to come.

V. MANAGING FOR SECURITY AND SUCCESS

Mr. Chairman, one of my key goals has been to ensure that I leave behind a State Department that is more modern, better-managed, more diverse, and more effectively organized than when I took office. With bipartisan Congressional backing, we have made significant progress.

The Department's integration with ACDA and USIA has been successful. We have greatly improved passport and consular services. We have modernized communications, gone on-line, and upgraded training. Guided by the Report of the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel, we are striving to "rightsize" our diplomatic posts, and achieve better inter-agency teamwork under our chiefs of mission abroad and the President and Secretary of State here at home.

Above all, we are concentrating on improved security for our personnel, our posts and the information we handle.

Since August 1998, the Africa Embassy bombings have served as a searing reminder that the protection of our diplomatic missions demands unrelenting vigilance and a fresh influx of resources.

Since that tragedy, with help from Congress, we have made a significant downpayment towards our unmet construction needs, while increasing training and hiring additional security personnel. The President's budget request includes $500 million in FY 2001 funds for facility replacement, $200 million for enhanced perimeter security, $16 million for new security professionals, and $328 million for recurring costs associated with security upgrades. It also seeks advance appropriations of more than $3 billion between FY 2002 and FY 2005 to continue replacing our highest-risk embassies and consulates.

Within the Department, David Carpenter, the first law enforcement professional to serve as Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security, has taken a number of steps to tighten security. These include enhanced perimeter protection, a tougher escort policy, and a new surveillance detection program now operational at most of our posts.

I have personally placed a strong emphasis on ensuring the protection of classified information and the security of our facilities. My message is clear that security is everybody's business, every day.

In the days immediately prior to Millennium Eve, I was in almost constant contact with Assistant Secretary Carpenter and our Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Michael Sheehan, as we worked with other U.S. and foreign agencies--amidst a plethora of threats--to deter, detect and prevent terrorist acts.

During the year ahead, I will have no higher priority than to see that security in every aspect of Department operations, both internally and in responding to external threats, is first rate both in effort expended and results achieved.

VI. CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the dawn of the millennium has only intensified our awareness of the passage of time. We conduct much of our daily communications and business through technologies that didn't exist or were in their infancy only a decade ago. The patterns of international relations we lived with for so long have been scrambled beyond recognition; the new patterns shift like a kaleidoscope with every turn of the calendar's page.

We live in a world transformed that will not stop changing. No country is more comfortable in such an environment than America, but we would be lost except for what has not changed, and that is America's purpose.

Some decades ago, when Cold War tensions were at their highest, Walter Lippman wrote about the realities of his time in words that serve as a warning to ours:

With all the danger and worry it causes...the Soviet challenge may yet prove...a blessing. For...if our influence...were undisputed, we would, I feel sure, slowly deteriorate. Having lost our great energies [and] daring because everything was...so comfortable. We would...enter into the decline which has marked...so many societies...when they have come to think there is no great work to be done...and that the purpose of life is to hold on and stay put. For then the night has come and they doze off and they begin to die.

Our challenge is to prove Lippman wrong; to employ our energy, retain our daring, and understand that our responsibilities are similar in magnitude, if not so obviously in drama, as those fulfilled by our predecessors.

It is true we face no Hitler or Stalin. But it is as great a mission to create the conditions under which such evil does not again threaten us, as it would be to oppose such evil if and when it did.

There are no final frontiers for America. We are not and have never been a status quo country. We have always believed that the future can be made better than the past. We are doers.

In the year ahead, we have the chance to add another proud chapter in the history of American leadership, in search of peace, in defense of freedom, on behalf of prosperity, and in service to our collective boss--the American people. I have no doubt that if we are united in that quest, we will succeed.

Thank you very much.

RESPONSES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE DOUG BEREUTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

BIOSAFETY PROTOCOL

Question:

Included in the Biosafety Protocol is a "precaution" provision which gives foreign nations the right to bar imports of any biotechnology product they say might be a threat to the environment or safety. Does that mean that no sound scientific reason is needed to bar the import of American biotech commodities? Already, we find the European Union and others prohibiting the import of American commodities that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has asserted are as safe as conventional crops. Given the very broad latitude of this provision, what assurances do we have that this provision will not be used as a new protectionist barrier against U.S. agricultural products?

Answer:

The Biosafety Protocol's language on precaution does not, in any way, condone a departure from science-based decision making nor does it authorize decisions contrary to a country's WTO obligations. The precaution language must be understood in the context of the Protocol's science-based risk assessment provisions. Moreover, the Protocol's precaution language is conditioned by a provision which clearly states the Protocol does not alter a country's obligations under other existing international agreements, such as the WTO agreement.

The precaution language in the Protocol basically states the truism that countries' regulatory systems often have to act on the frontiers of knowledge and in the absence of full scientific certainty, yet this language is part of a science-based approach to regulation, not a substitute for it, and it sets no new legal standard.

Question:

The EU has not approved any U.S. agricultural biotech products since the Spring of 1998 despite the fact that many products have already cleared EU scientific reviews. As a result, U.S. corn farmers have already lost over $200 million for each of the last two years in sales. More recently, the EU has threatened to limit up to $800 million in U.S. corn based products because they may contain GMO varieties still unapproved in Europe. Does the Administration have a short-term game plan to resolve this issue?

Answer:

The Administration is actively engaging the EU in order to gain reasonable market access for U.S. agricultural exporters. We are trying to encourage responsible regulatory approaches worldwide that address concerns effectively without unduly disrupting global food trade. Achieving this careful approach was also our goal in negotiating the Biosafety Protocol.

In addition to engaging the EU government directly, the Administration's strategy also includes three other aspects. First, we have a public diplomacy effort to educate the EU public regarding the potential environmental and health benefits associated with biotechnology. Second, we are actively resisting EU efforts in multilateral fora to establish as a principle of international law and practice their so-called "precautionary principle," including on food safety issues in the OECD and Codex Alimentarius. Third, we are participating in science dialogues between the EU and US. These efforts include working with the EU on biotechnology issues through the U.S.-EU Senior Level Group (SLG) dialogue and consultative forum of eminent stakeholders. We hope both the forum and the SLG will raise confidence in biotechnology, leading to greater acceptance of our agricultural products.

Opening agricultural markets in the EU remains an important issue for this Administration as we understand farmers and exporters require and deserve predictability and fair treatment in trade systems. We will continue to press for an expeditious resolution, yet we are aware that the EU public continues to have significant concerns regarding the risks of biotech products.

Question:

Given the new "precaution" provision in the Biosafety Protocol, how do we intend to successfully address our legitimate GMO trade concerns if the EU simply invokes this new "precaution" clause citing its self-determined safety concern—a concern which, in accordance with the protocol, does not have to be based on sound science?

Answer:

The precaution language in the Biosafety Protocol does not authorize or encourage capricious action. Further, the Protocol includes a clause that states the Protocol is not meant to affect a country's other existing international rights and obligations, such as those relating to the WTO. Moreover, the precaution language must be understood in the context of the Protocol's science-based risk assessment provisions.

That said, no agreement can prevent countries from trying to justify regulatory decisions that are not science-based. However, the Protocol's language on precaution does not, in any way, replace science-based decision making nor does it authorize decisions contrary to a country's WTO obligations.

RESPONSES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE MATT SALMON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Question:

At the heart of the Oslo process lies the basic, irrevocable commitment made by Arafat that, in his words, "all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations." A declaration of statehood outside of Oslo would, and again I quote from the House and Senate-passed resolution, constitute a fundamental violation of Oslo and would introduce a dramatically destabilizing element into the Middle East, risking Israeli countermeasures, a quick descent into violence, and an end to the entire peace process."

Answer:

During their recent visits to Washington Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat reiterated their commitment to conclude a Framework Agreement on all permanent status issues as soon as possible, and a comprehensive agreement by September 13, 2000. Both sides are working seriously and intensively, and President Clinton came away from his meetings with Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat with a sense that both were committed to moving forward rapidly to reach agreement. After two serious, productive, and intensive rounds at Bolling Air Force Base in Washington, the negotiations will resume in Eilat.

We have told both sides that all permanent status issues should be resolved through negotiations and that we oppose any unilateral action, including a unilateral declaration of statehood, that prejudges the outcome of those negotiations.

Question:

Will the Administration abide by H.Con. Res. 24 and refuse to recognize a unilaterally declared Palestinian state? What action is the Administration prepared to take regarding the renewed effort by the Palestinian authority to declare a state outside of negotiations with Israel?

Answer:

We have told both sides that all permanent status issues should be resolved through negotiations and that we oppose any unilateral action, including a unilateral declaration of statehood, that prejudges the outcome of those negotiations.

PALESTINIAN TERRORISTS WHO HAVE MURDERED AMERICANS

Question:

Why has the Administration failed to post even a single reward in the cases of the Americans murdered by Palestinian terrorists in Israel?

Answer:

We take very seriously the need to bring to justice the individuals responsible for the death and injury of American citizens in terrorist incidents in Israel, the West Bank and Gaza. And we understand the concerns of the victims' families and their supporters who suggested that the Department of State offer rewards and publicize them on the Department's REWARDS FOR JUSTICE webpage.

We are working actively to determine the best strategy, including the possible use of rewards, which would advance the ongoing investigations of these cases and protect other interests of the United States.

Question:

What is your reaction to the rash of anti-Semitic statements issued by the Syrian press and top Syrian officials? Do you believe any real peace talks can take

place while the Syrian press and Syrian officials continue to slander and libel Israel?

Answer:

I have categorically condemned Syrian anti-Semitic statements and stressed their unacceptable nature. We have repeatedly noted to our Syrian interlocutors that these kind of defamatory statements are offensive, and have an extremely negative impact in the U.S. More important is the deleterious effect on public opinion in Israel, which in turn complicates an already difficult search for peace between those two countries.

COSTS OF A PEACE TREATY BETWEEN ISRAEL AND SYRIA

Question:

Although there is a current pause in negotiations, could you share with us your estimates regarding the costs that were discussed with the Israeli team of an Israeli-Syrian peace treaty and what would be the US role in it? Also, did Syria have similar talks regarding an aid package and what would be your reaction to a Syrian request for an aid package, either civilian or military, taking into consideration the fact that Syria appears since 1979 regularly on a list of countries which the State Department identifies as supportive of international terrorism and its part in the latest escalation in Lebanon? Given the difficulties surrounding the Wye River Package last year, what do you think will happen if a peace agreement is reached this year?

Answer:

- The U.S. strongly supports a negotiated peace between Israel and Syria. Although negotiations are currently at a pause, we are doing everything we can to encourage the parties to advance the process.
- Under the present circumstances, it is premature to discuss possible assistance to Syria in the context of a negotiated peace agreement. It is simply too early to enter into a speculative discussion on this issue.
- It's true that Syria remains on the U.S. terrorism list, and it is therefore precluded from receiving direct U.S. government assistance. We have made it clear what Syria needs to do to be taken off the list.
- With respect to Israel, while there will undoubtedly be major security costs in any future peace agreement with Syria, it is too early to assign a price tag to such an agreement or to speculate about the contribution of the U.S.
- We recognize that Congress needs to be involved at an early stage and will consult closely with you before any commitments are made.

RESPONSES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE KEVIN BRADY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

EX-IM BANK TYUMEN OIL TRANSACTIONS

Question:

Madame Secretary, I was pleased to learn in your testimony that the State Department is fully supportive of the work of our trade promotion aqencies including the Export-Import Bank. Controversy has arisen in the past regarding possible Ex-Im loans in Russia, particularly regarding a $500 million loan package for that country's troubled oil industry. I understand that the Department expressed some "rule of law" concerns in regard to this project and I would like to hear the current status of your review of the project. I understand that there are some Texas-based companies who are getting worried that further delays on this project could lead to the export of American jobs to foreign contractors.

Answer:

On March 31, I revoked a Chafee determination that had put a hold on two Ex-Im loan guarantees benefiting a Russian company, Tyumen Oil (TNK). On April 6, Ex-Im approved the loan guarantees. Last December, I had asked Ex-Im to delay approval of the guarantees until we could investigate some serious allegations concerning abuse of investor rights by TNK in a bankruptcy case. My decision reflected the high priority we attach to the rule of law in Russia. I later determined that it was appropriate to allow the loan guarantees to proceed when the parties to the bankruptcy case took substantial steps towards a satisfactory resolution, and the

Russian Government undertook to address the underlying broader problems. The Administration was in close touch with U.S. companies affected during the period the guarantees were on hold.

RESPONSES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE DAN BURTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA

COLOMBIA

Question:

A. Recent press reports indicate President Pastrana will refuse to extradite a FARC leader who gave the order to murder three American NGO human rights workers a year ago. Has our Administration protested this arrogant declaration, or is there even any concern on your part?

B. How can President Pastrana expect to get an aid package from the U.S. when he has said he will protect a known murderer from extradition to America?

C. Is the Administration considering withholding the aid package until President Pastrana guarantees he will extradite this murderer when captured?

Answer:

The Department of State is very concerned about all aspects of the murders that occurred last year. Our understanding from the Government of Colombia is that President Pastrana did not/not say (as the Associated Press article claimed) that he would not extradite the FARC leader who allegedly gave the order for the March 4, 1999 murder of Ingrid Washinawatok, Terence Freitas, and Lahe'ena'e Gay, the three U.S. citizen NGO workers. We understand that President Pastrana did say that the FARC leader would be tried and punished in Colombia. The FARC leader has not been detained and remains at large, presumably with his unit in Colombia.

The USG is very satisfied with the cooperation we have received from the Government of Colombia, and President Pastrana in particular, on the matter of extraditions, especially for narcotics related crimes. The GOC in November 1999 extradited two Colombian nationals to the U.S. on international narcotics trafficking charges. There are about 50 more cases pending. We expect continued cooperation on these cases that will lead to additional extraditions.

Question:

Has there been any progress on the status of the three New Tribes Missionaries kidnapped by the FARC over seven years ago?

Answer:

In October 1999, acting on a tip from a FARC defector, Colombian military and forensic experts excavated a site in northwestern Colombia where it was alleged that the men's remains were buried. The search turned up no evidence of any remains, but Colombian authorities are continuing to investigate. The GOC has been very responsive to our requests for assistance on the case of the three New Tribes Mission members, Dave Mankins, Mark Rich, and Rick Tenenoff, who were kidnapped by the FARC on January 31, 1993. We understand the Government of Colombia will conduct similar searches when presented with other possible sites.

Question:

How much of the 1997, 1998 & 1999, 506(a) drawdown equipment has been delivered to the Colombian National Police?

Answer:

All of the equipment from the 1997 drawdown has been delivered with the exception of 125 flight-crew survival vests, which are expected to be shipped in April, 2000. Deliveries to the CNP from the 1998 drawdown are complete with four exceptions. None of the binoculars from the 1998 drawdown have yet been shipped. Partial deliveries of UH1H spare parts, Meals-Ready-to-Eat and field/flight equipment from the drawdown have been made. The remaining portions of gear and MREs are expected to be shipped on February 28, 2000. The equipment from the 1999 drawdown has not been shipped.

Question:

When will the remaining 506 items be delivered?

Answer:

The Administration is working to get the items down to Colombia as quickly as possible. Deliveries for three items remaining from the 1997 and 1998 drawdowns should be completed in March and April, 2000. Deliveries of items from the 1999 drawdown will begin shortly.

Question:

Has the .50 caliber ammunition shipment, initially delivered to the State Department, reached the CNP yet, or is it still sitting somewhere in the U.S. awaiting shipment to Colombia?

Answer:

The 50,000 rounds of .50 caliber ammunition that State obtained for use in training the Colombian National Police on the GAU–10 system was not delivered to the State Department. The truck transporting the ammunition was misdirected to the Department by the shipping company. When it arrived, it was redirected to its proper destination and the ammunition arrived at the CNP hangar on January 13. 10,500 rounds were used in training and there are approximately 37,000 rounds left.

Question:

Is the floor armor standard for a UH–60 Black Hawk helicopter?

Answer:

There is no DOD standard floor armor for the UH–60. The floor armor in the CNP Blackhawks has been fabricated to provide maximum coverage and to meet the Army's 25 "G" crashworthiness specification for all internal aircraft elements.

Question:

Why did the State Department order the wrong size floor armoring when they knew what kind of helicopter it was to be put on?

Answer:

The State Department did not order the floor armor. The floor armor was one of the "mission kits" that Sikorsky was required to provide under its State Department-financed contract with the U.S. Army for the CNP Blackhawks. Sikorsky subcontracted the requirement to Protective Materials, Inc. Problems with the armor are being worked out between those two firms in coordination with the U.S. Army and the State Department.

Question:

Why did it take an extra 100 days to get weapons and floor armoring delivered to go on the CNP Blackhawks when the money was available at the same time funds for the helicopters was available?

Answer:

The delivery schedule for the armored floor "mission kit" resulted from Army/Sikorsky negotiations of the contract for modification of the Blackhawks. The dimensions of the armor could not be determined until all configuration issues were resolved. The Department was advised on July 9, 1999 of the July 2 Colombian National Police decision to purchase GAU–19 miniguns for the Blackhawks. Engineering analysis to determine the exact location of ammunition cans, gun mounts, etc. had to be conducted before a template for the armor could be developed.

Acquisition of weapons could not commence until the CNP reached a decision on how many of which types of miniguns to buy. As these weapons are not "off the shelf" items, manufacturers' production schedules dictated the delivery schedule.

Question:

Why would the State Department let the CNP Black Hawks fly on missions (after leaving them grounded for 100 days initially) without floor armor, thus endangering the lives of the CNP officers on board and risking the aircraft being shot down?

Answer:

While the Department has provided the Blackhawks to the CNP, it is the CNP who decides when and for what purpose the aircraft will be used. The aircraft were not "grounded" and were available for a wide variety of operations as soon as they arrived. The State Department neither suggested nor concurred in the CNP operational employment of the Blackhawks.

Question:

How much experience handling FMS cases and equipment procurement does the current NAS officer in charge of ordering equipment for the CNP have?

Answer:

The NAS logistics advisor has over 15 years of experience with FMS cases and equipment purchases.

Question:

Did you call Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson in 1999 and ask him to create a job for Linda Shenwick?

Answer:

No.

Question:

If you did not call Secretary Richardson, who did?

Answer:

In the spring of 1999, the Department engaged in settlement negotiations with Ms. Shenwick's attorneys, mediated by the Office of Special Counsel. It was the Department's understanding in these negotiations that it was important to Ms. Shenwick that she remain in New York City. Accordingly, the Department concentrated its efforts on developing settlement offers involving New York City jobs. Department officials and representatives of the Office of Personnel Management contacted federal agencies that had a presence in New York City to ascertain whether or not they had vacant SES positions or a need for an additional SES position in their agencies. The Department also explored detailing Ms. Shenwick to another federal agency or to a non-governmental organization in New York City, and offered to negotiate terms by which it would support Ms. Shenwick for a mutually-agreeable position in the United Nations.

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel Alex De La Garza called his counterparts in the Department of Energy, requesting them to consider whether they would be interested in creating an SES position in that agency in New York City for Ms. Shenwick. The Director General of the Foreign Service and the Director of Personnel, Edward W. Gnehm, Jr., made a follow-up call to Secretary Richardson to make him aware that the Department had approached his staff with this request. The Department of Energy created an SES position as senior Program Advisor to the Director of the Environmental Measurements Laboratory, Department of Energy, in New York City. The Departments of State and Energy solicited the views of the Office of Personnel Management regarding the newly-created position. OPM reviewed the position description and concurred in writing with the Energy Department's determination that the position met the criteria for placement in the SES. OPM also observed in that letter that placement of Ms. Shenwick in this position fostered executive mobility, a key goal in OPM's strategic plan:

> [e]xecutive mobility is a good way to promote executive learning. Executives who are mobile have a broad perspective on Government-wide issues. Their fresh insights can contribute to better management of agency programs and ultimately enhance our Government's ability to successfully deal with the challenges of the 21st century. Fostering executive mobility is a key goal in OPM's strategic plan, and we appreciate the Department's [Department of Energy] support of this initiative.

Ms. Shenwick, however, rejected this offer and terminated the settlement negotiations.

Question:

Did the State Department offer to transfer a SES slot to the Department of Energy to cover the Shenwick transfer?

Answer:

Yes. Although a transfer of an SES slot is done by OPM, and not directly between the Departments of State and Energy, the Department of State was willing to give up one of its SES positions (a net loss to the Department) in order to achieve a settlement agreement with Ms. Shenwick.

Question:

Did the State Department offer to fund that slot for five years?

Answer:

No. The Department agreed only to provide one of its SES slots to facilitate the offer. The Departments of State and Energy sent a letter to the Office of Special Counsel in which we underscored the unconditionality of this offer:

> The Department of Energy has unconditionally offered an SES position to the Department of State employee, Linda Shenwick. The Department of State will release one of its SES allocations to the Office of Personnel Management who will allocate it to the Department of Energy for the purpose of facilitating this offer.
>
> No conditions between the two Departments attach to the unconditional offer to Ms. Shenwick. Specifically, the Department of State has not promised the Department of Energy that it will provide the Department of Energy with funding, including any **[missing copy ????]**

Question:

> *What was the total amount of funding the State Department offered to the Department of Energy for Linda Shenwick's SES slot?*

Answer:

None. The Department agreed only to provide one of its SES slots to facilitate the offer. The Departments of State and Energy sent a letter to the Office of Special Counsel in which we underscored the unconditionality of this offer:

> The Department of Energy has unconditionally offered an SES position to the Department of State employee, Linda Shenwick. The Department of State will release one of its SES allocations to the Office of Personnel Management who will allocate it to the Department of Energy for the purpose of facilitating this offer.
>
> No conditions between the two Departments attach to the unconditional offer to Ms. Shenwick. Specifically, the Department of State has not promised the Department of Energy that it will provide the arrangement under the Economy Act, in return for its offer of a senior position to Ms. Shenwick.

RUSSIA

Question:

> *In early 1998 President Clinton stated "Today, there is not a single Russian missile pointed at America's children." Is this statement accurate? Are you aware of any Russian strategic exercise being conducted to simulate nuclear attacks on the United States?*

Answer:

The President's statement was and remains accurate. He and President Yeltsin agreed to de-target their respective missiles in 1994, and there has been no change in that arrangement. De-targeting is not a panacea; the missiles in question can be re-targeted. Exactly how quickly is classified, but I believe it would be a matter of minutes, not hours. Nonetheless, we are pleased that other nations have now adopted this practice; for example, the United States and China agreed not to target each other in June of 1998. Such moves can only make the world a safer place.

As for strategic exercises, Russia has greatly reduced its strategic forces over the last few years, and continues to reduce further. Nonetheless, the forces that they plan to retain are maintained, kept secure, and occasionally exercised, albeit with less frequency than in the past. We have seen nothing in terms of Russian exercises lately is inconsistent with their de-targeting commitment or their strong and active commitment to continuing the process of reductions under the START treaties.

Question:

> *Why do Russians oppose our proposal to develop tactical, theater and strategic ballistic missile defenses? Do they genuinely feel threatened by them, or is their opposition merely a tactic to keep us from seeing to our own defense?*

Answer:

The Russians do not oppose U.S. programs for tactical or theater ballistic missile defenses (TMD). The Russians acknowledge the increased threat from theater ballistic missiles, and are developing TMD systems themselves. In September 1997, the U.S., Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia, and Ukraine signed agreements that help clarify the distinction between ABM systems limited by the Treaty and TMD systems that are not constrained by the ABM Treaty, per se.

The Russians oppose U.S. deployment of a National Missile Defense (NMD). An NMD system would be prohibited by the ABM Treaty, which includes an explicit agreement "not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of the territory of the country". The U.S. and Russia agree that a modification of the Treaty would be required to allow NMD deployment. Russia currently opposes such a modification to the Treaty.

Russia's concern about our NMD proposals can be summarized in four main arguments:

(1) The current ABM Treaty limits are critical to progress in strategic arms reductions. A deployed U.S. NMD system, they argue, prevents Russia from further strategic arms reductions, and might require them to increase the numbers or quality of their weapons.

(2) Removing the ABM Treaty limits on territorial defense calls into question the quantitative basis of strategic stability in all other strategic arms control agreements (START, INF, etc.), and may require that Russia reconsider all of them.

(3) Because the proposed U.S. NMD system could be, in the Russian view, rapidly expanded to pose a greater threat to Russian deterrent forces, even a limited system is unacceptable today. In their view, the development of a broad sensor suite that covers all trajectories from Russia to U.S. provides a significant base for a system that could threaten their deterrent forces.

(4) The risk of ballistic missile attack to the United States from the "states of concern" does not warrant deployment of a national missile defenses. Rather, they argue that a combination of deterrence and non-proliferation efforts could limit the risk from these nascent long-range missile capabilities.

Question:

To what degree should we be concerned about Russian-Chinese initiatives to forge their own "strategic partnership" in opposition to what the Russians call a unipolar world and the Chinese call "hegemonism," but which in either case means a deliberate program of reducing US power and influence?

Answer:

In general, we welcome the development of peaceful, constructive relations between Russia and China. Their improving relationship has led, for example, to resolution of long-standing border issues and the reduction of military forces within close proximity of each-other, which we believe is in their interest and ours.

At the same time, we are well aware of some of the challenges posed by this relationship. In particular, we closely monitor military cooperation (including arms sales) between the two countries. And, of course, we are alert to instances where China and Russia share—and may coordinate—positions in opposition to those of the US. We believe, however, that both Russian and China take essentially pragmatic stands and, indeed, that they continue to have important differences in their perceived national interests. Thus, we do not see their contacts as necessarily posing any fundamental challenge to U.S. interests in the region or globally.

Finally, we seek better relations with both Russia and China through engagement on a wide range of issues. our policy is aimed at encouraging the integration of both Russia and China into the international economic system, while attempting to promote their adoption of market-based economies and democratic values. We believe that continued engagement with both countries will have a constructive and direct impact on how they approach the U.S. and the world.

CUBA: FERNANDO GARCIA BIELSA

Question:

Madame Secretary I am disturbed by reports that as the White House was preparing to grant clemency to 16 imprisoned terrorists, it pressured the State Department to grant a visa to a notorious Cuban intelligence operative, named Fernando Garcia Bielsa in 1999. This visa would allow Mr. Garcia Bielsa to work under diplomatic cover at the Cuban Interests Section just blocks from the White House. Ironically, Mr. Garcia Bielsa is a high-ranking Cuban Communist Party official in charge of supporting the very terrorist groups to which the prisoners belonged.

Reports allege that President Clinton asked the State Department to issue a visa to him in spite of the evidence in intelligence reports linking him with the FALN, and other groups. I was particularly impressed by reports that the FBI strongly objected to granting a visa to Mr. Garcia Bielsa. Yet, apparently when the State Department pressured the FBI, the bureau dropped its objections.

It has been reported that Fernando Garcia Bielsa serves as the Chief of the American Department of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee. The American Department, known by its initials DA, has a long tradition of being Castro's main instrument for coordinating terrorism in the Western Hemisphere, including agent-of-influence activity and support for Puerto Rican terrorism against the U.S.

Madame Secretary, although I did receive a response to a letter that I and four other members of Congress sent you on September 30, 1999 noting our sincere concern about these reports, can you please give me an update on the status of Mr. Garcia Bielsa?

Answer:

A visa was issued to Mr. Garcia Bielsa on February 7. We have been informed that Mr. Garcia arrived in the United States on March 6.

The decision to issue Mr. Garcia Bielsa a visa was reached in accordance with applicable laws which provide for consultation with and concurrence from appropriate law enforcement agencies. We did not disregard the information the FBI provided us concerning Garcia Bielsa. However, the FBI withdrew its initial objection to Garcia Bielsa's posting to the Cuban Interests Section in Washington. Mr. Garcia Bielsa was found to be eligible and admissible, and thus the visa was issued.

CUBA: SPY RING

Question:

As you are aware, recently a couple from the 1998 Cuban spy ring were sentenced to more than three years in prison for attempting to infiltrate U.S. military installations for the Cuban government. Mr. Joseph Santos and his wife Amarylis Silverio Santos were given a four year and 3½-year sentence respectively. According to reports, authorities said the couple attempted to infiltrate the U.S. Southern Command. In all, 14 people were accused of trying to penetrate U.S. military bases, infiltrate anti-Castro exile groups and manipulate U.S. media and political organizations. Authorities describe the spy ring as the largest Cuban espionage operation uncovered in the United States in decades.

Madame Secretary, has the Department of State expelled from the United States all of the Cuban personnel whom the FBI specified as having had contact with the captured spies? Are any such persons in the United States today?

Answer:

Those diplomats at the Cuban Mission to the United Nations in New York who the FBI was able to identify as having direct links to the captured spies either departed voluntarily from the United States before we could expel them or were expelled by the State Department. No one whom the FBI could document as having direct contacts to these spies is in the United States.

CUBA: CUBAN SOLDIERS AND AMERICAN POWS IN VIETNAM

Question:

Madame Secretary, last year this Committee held a hearing whose subject matter disturbed me greatly. From recently declassified Defense Department documents and press reports this Committee learned that credible evidence existed that Castro sent Cuban agents to torture and interrogate up to 19 United States military officers while imprisoned in Hanoi from 1967–1969. We heard firsthand accounts of Castro's brutality from Captain Raymond Voliden and Colonel Jack Bomar of what life was like in the "Zoo."

There are no statute of limitations on crimes against humanity during time of war. And, I am hopeful that the evidence this Committee now has, not to mention what the Administration has known for some time, will warrant indictments to be handed down against Castro and his thugs. I call on the Administration to release not only information regarding this POW issue before more barriers are dropped with Cuba, but ALL information regarding American POW's in Vietnam to the public.

Madame Secretary, has the State Department ever confronted the Cuban government about these reports? Now that there is credible evidence available from the Department of Defense, does the State Department plan a review of this issue? If so, will it ever confront the Cuban government about it?

Answer:

These are very serious charges and the United States Government has extensively investigated these allegations through the appropriate intelligence and investigative

agencies to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Defense Intelligence Agency. Additionally, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee conducted its own investigation into this issue from July 1973 to September 1974. Despite these efforts, the returned POWs were unable to positively identify their torturers, and no one has been able to produce hard evidence that the torturers in question were, in fact, Cuban. In an effort to shed additional light on the issue, and in concert with the Department of Defense lead on POW investigations, the State Department has instructed our Embassy in Vietnam to raise the issue with the Vietnamese Government. We are awaiting their reply. We will not hesitate to approach the Cuban Government if we can obtain specific, reliable information that Cubans were involved in the torture of American POWs in Vietnam.

NICARAGUA

Question:

Madame Secretary, as you know, currently, there are about 1,000 U.S. citizens with property claims registered with the Nicaraguan government based on property seized by the former Sandinista government.

Recently, I and some of my colleagues sent members of our staff to Nicaragua to participate in a fact-finding mission. In addressing the question of U.S. property claims, Ambassador Oliver P. Garza stated that about 40 property claims are settled every month. However, our staff learned that due to the long and involved process of settling claims, many of the claimants are willing to accept settlements worth significantly less than the market value of their confiscated property. Furthermore, I am concerned that the Nicaraguan government is not complying with their own Supreme Court's ruling in favor of U.S. claimants.

Though it is my understanding that the State Department has increased its efforts on American claimants, more must be done to ensure that U.S. citizens receive just compensation for what is rightfully theirs. I have been engaged for many years on this important issue, and the Nicaraguan government should not be allowed to continue unfairly settling claims made by U.S. citizens.

Madame Secretary, what is the State Department's long-term plan to settle this issue once and for all?

Answer:

Seeking resolution of U.S. citizens' claims for confiscated property in Nicaragua remains the most important bilateral issue between our government and the Government of Nicaragua (GON). Our overall strategy for doing so is twofold. First, we will continue to work directly with all U.S. citizens in their efforts to obtain a satisfactory claims resolution from the GON. As your staff members learned, Embassy Managua is the only U.S. Embassy worldwide in which we have established a Property Affairs Office, dedicated specifically to assisting U.S. citizens in their efforts to gain an acceptable resolution of their claims. To date, 813 American Citizens have registered claims with the Embassy's Property Office and are receiving its active support.

Second, we continue to push the GON to explore alternate means of resolving claims, including land swaps and awarding claimants shares in newly privatized state enterprises. The GON has settled to U.S. citizens' satisfaction a small number of claims through land swaps. It has also introduced legislation that will permit other alternate means of resolution and has drafted a bill that would allow the GON to transfer shares in state-owned companies to qualified property claimants. The Embassy is actively encouraging faster progress in all these areas.

EL SALVADOR

Question:

In late 1996, officials at LAFISE's El Salvador office uncovered evidence that forged company checks had been paid at two local banks. Shortly thereafter, the head of LAFISE's El Salvador office, Mr. Sigfried Guth Zapata, was murdered in what appeared to be a contract killing. Since then, LAFISE has pursued a civil case against the two banks which paid the forged checks, and the Salvadoran National Civilian Police (PNC) have been investigating the murder of Mr. Guth Zapata. LAFISE has also filed a criminal case against the two banks for failure to cooperate in the civil suit. Recently, the judge presiding the case ruled against LAFISE. This action taken by the judge has caused tremendous consternation in El Salvador. The President of the Supreme Court of El Salvador, Mr. Jorge Eduardo Tenorio, has called for an investigation of the proceedings as well as of the judge.

Consistent with the State Department's obligation to protect U.S. companies and citizens abroad, I would like to know your opinion regarding this case. Do you believe that the U.S. interests in this case have been treated fairly and in a transparent fashion?

Answer:

We take very seriously our obligation to assist U.S. business overseas, and officials at Embassy San-Salvador and in the State Department have met with LAFISE representatives to discuss their concerns. The U.S. Ambassador has met with both the Salvadoran Vice President and the President of the Salvadoran Supreme Court (the head of the judicial branch in that country) to tell them we expect this case to be handled transparently. There are apparently two inquiries underway into the matter: one being conducted by the Salvadoran Legislative Assembly and another by the judicial branch. We have not yet seen the results of either inquiry. We understand LAFISE has appealed the adverse ruling from the lower court; obviously the U.S. Government cannot take a position on the specifics of pending litigation, but we will do all that we can to ensure LAFISE receives the benefit of transparent and impartial justice.

CHINA

Question:

Madame Secretary, I am also deeply concerned about recent reports of strategic writings by China's military and party leaders that show China is making plans for war, according to a new Pentagon study. I have learned that some 600 translations of internal Chinese writings by 200 authors reveal China's strategy to defeat a superior foe, using both military and nonmilitary means, such as propaganda, deception and covert action. That foe is clearly intended to be the United States.

The translations also reveal the extreme distrust of the United States by China's military and party leaders. Chinese generals state that the United States intentionally bombed the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, last May as part of a long-term strategy to prompt an arms race that will cause China's collapse. The Chinese statements from the mid-1990s through last year discuss issues normally couched in secrecy inside China. They appear in the book "China Debates the Future Security Environment," published in January, 2000 by a gentleman who is affiliated with the Pentagon's Office of Net Assessment for the National Defense University (NDU) in Washington.

It is very clear that the Chinese strategists plan to use a combination of Marxist-Leninist doctrine and ancient Chinese tactics against the U.S., and, for now, China seeks to avoid head-on confrontation until around 2030, when the Chinese expect U.S. power to decline significantly.

Madame Secretary, in light of China's ambitious military plans and obvious gross violations of human rights, do you truly believe it is wise that the Administration ask Congress to consider granting China permanent Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) trading status?

Answer:

We cannot predict China's future, but we can help give them the opportunity to move in the right direction. Deciding in advance that China will inevitably be a foe is a prescription for a self-fulfilling prophecy. Alternatively, China's integration into institutions of the international community, such as the WTO, make it more likely that China will become a responsible member of the rules-based international community and play a constructive international role in the future.

While we clearly have differing views of one another and of our intentions toward one another, we believe that our relationship with—specifically our engagement of—China has a direct impact on China's approach to the U.S. and the world.

We appreciate the concern that many Members of Congress have with regard to China's intentions toward Taiwan as outlined in the PRC's White Paper on Taiwan. Senior Administration officials, in Washington and Beijing, have reinforced our abiding interest in the peaceful resolution of cross-strait differences. We have said that we reject the use of force or the threat of the use of force to resolve the Taiwan Question. We have stated again our policy in the Taiwan Relations Act that we "consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means . . . at threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States."

We have urged China and Taiwan to take steps that foster dialogue, reduce tensions and promote mutual understanding.

We have also restored direct dialogue between our two militaries to promote better understanding of our intentions. In December, the deputy chief of China's People's Liberation Army general staff was in Washington for defense consultative talks. In early March, CINCPAC commander Admiral Blair visited China.

We want to use the military-to-military dialogue to ensure that there are no misperceptions of our intentions or our capabilities. In fact, these talks are a way of ensuring that we deter through engagement, not through other means.

As for China's human rights policy, this year we made an early decision to introduce a China resolution at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. That decision was based on the fact that China's human rights record deteriorated during the past year and that its actions were contrary to internationally-recognized human rights standards. We are making demarches in capital cities, forcefully making the case for the resolution and to gain widespread support for it.

In addition, we released a hard-hitting report on China in our annual human rights country reports. We pulled no punches. We hold the Chinese to the standards to which they, themselves, have committed. In addition, we designated China a "country of particular concern" in our report for International Religious Freedoms Act.

However, we believe that we must engage with China on both human rights and economic rights.

Specifically, with regard to PNTR, the President submitted a bill to Congress on March 8 to extend normal trade relations to China on a permanent basis. The President will certify that when China becomes a WTO contracting party, "the terms and conditions of China's accession to the WTO are at least equivalent to those agreed between the United States and China on November 15, 1999."

We are confident that when the bill is considered on its merits, Congress and the American people will realize that it is in the interest of the United States to pass PNTR. only in this way will we be able to enjoy the full benefits of China's accession to the WTO.

Our broad agenda in China is designed to pursue American interests and to effect positive change there. Trade and the WTO will help reinforce trends toward a more open economy and contribute to a more open society in China.

TAIWAN

Question:

Madame Secretary, in the wake of China's determined military modernization and Taiwan's threatened security, how will you advise the President when this long-overdue legislation reaches his desk?

Answer:

- The Administration strongly opposes the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act (TSEA) (H.R. 1838) because it would seriously diminish Taiwan's security and undermine the overall U.S. objective of stability in Asia.
- Should this bill be passed and sent to the President in its current form, I and his other senior advisors would recommend that it be vetoed.
- This bill would mandate a number of new security and military arrangements with Taiwan that could create dangerous, false, and inaccurate expectations on both sides of the Taiwan Strait. Movement toward a more formal U.S. military relationship with Taiwan could have serious unintended negative consequences, such as diminishing prospects for cross-Strait dialogue and the peaceful resolution of differences. Diminishing the prospects of the cross-Strait dialogue would be fundamentally detrimental to Taiwan's security interests.
- Several of the bill's provisions also raise constitutional concerns related to the President's broad authority to control the disclosure of information about foreign negotiations and other sensitive national security and foreign relations information, his authority as Commander in Chief, and his ability to carry out his responsibilities for the conduct of the nation's foreign relations.
- The Administration remains firmly committed to fulfilling the security and arms transfer provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). At the same time, we continue to press the PRC to exercise restraint on military deployments, make progress in cross-Strait dialogue, and initiate confidence-building measures with Taiwan.

NORTH KOREA

Question:

As part of any future talks with North Korea, do you plan to pursue this issue on behalf of the many U.S. claimants? If in fact the North Koreans do not com-

ply, can you please explore the use of its frozen U.S. assets as partial settlement of the claims filed by U.S. companies?

Answer:

The United States is keenly aware of the problems faced by companies with claims against the DPRK. The existence of these claims is indeed an important element that must be taken into account as we move forward in our dialogue with North Korea. As part of the solution to this problem, we recognize the potential usefulness of conducting a claims settlement negotiation as we move down the road to improved bilateral relations.

We intend to continue to pursue in our talks with the DPRK full payment of debts owed to, U.S. companies. We have not, however, reached the point in the dialogue where we believe a claims settlement negotiation would lead to a successful resolution of those claims. While, in the past, we have successfully negotiated the settlement of U.S. nationals' claims in connection with frozen assets, issues surrounding disposition of assets frozen under the North Korean sanctions program and resolution of U.S. nationals' claims against North Korea are extremely complex. We welcome your suggestions in this regard, and we will continue to consider the extent to which it would be possible to use the frozen assets in our efforts to resolve issues with the DPRK.

INDIA—CIVILIAN CONTROL OVER NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Question:

Madame Secretary, at present, relations between civilian and military control of nuclear weapons in India is still nascent. India has a long history of civilian control of the military, and nuclear weapons are said to be still in civilian hands. Release of the weapons is strictly limited to orders between the Prime Minister and the head of India's Atomic Energy Commission. If the nuclear program spreads and becomes operational, the military will have to become more involved. But the nuclear doctrine is unclear. India does not have a deputy Prime Minister (equivalent to a vice president). And in an era of coalition politics, (21 parties now form the government), authority for action is still to be decided. Finally, I understand that one of the chief nuclear subjects in the recent London talks between U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh was supposed to be "command and control" in a nuclear crisis.

Madame, Secretary, can you tell this Committee at what length this issue was discussed in London? Does India have a plan for weapon control? For example, will the Army, Navy, and Air Force each control their own weapons? Or will orders be given by a separate strategic command? Will this be discussed during President Clinton's trip to India in March?

Answer:

One of the most important themes in our discussions with India and Pakistan has been to urge them to take steps to avoid a destabilizing and expensive nuclear and missile arms race. In this connection, we have urged both countries not to deploy nuclear weapons or missiles. We have stressed that.the best way for them to ensure against accidental (or other) use of nuclear weapons is not to deploy them. Deputy Secretary Talbott has pressed his Indian interlocutors to explain how they propose to constrain their nuclear and missile programs to avoid an arms race.

We don't believe either India or Pakistan has actually deployed (as the U.S. would use that term either nuclear weapons or missiles for delivering them. Last August, the Indian Government released an unofficial draft "Nuclear Doctrine," prepared by a civilian advisory board. The draft specified that India would build only a "minimum credible deterrent" under firm civilian control; it also contained worrisome language about a triad of delivery systems and rapid response. In response to U.S. expressions of concern, Indian officials assured us that the draft does not represent government policy.

Indian political leaders and senior officials have told us that India's nuclear weapons are, as a matter of both policy and law, kept under strict civilian control. We have no reason to doubt that this is the case.

We anticipate that nonproliferation will be one of the major subjects addressed during the President's visit.

If you desire further information at a classified level, let us know and we'd be happy to provide it.

PAKISTAN

Question:

Madame Secretary, I hope that President Clinton considers including Pakistan in his trip to South Asia this March. Now, more than ever, Pakistan needs our engagement. Madame Secretary, Pakistan is a country confronted with a multitude of challenges. It has.been reported that the general has promised to restore a "true" democracy to Pakistan. I have also learned that General Musharraf's goal is to create a representative government whose power base is located at the grass-roots level. Decentralization of power, he says, will not only help him eliminate fraud and corruption, but it will empower the local districts to make their own decisions. In fact, he has, so far, kept his pledge to bring democracy to the grass-roots level with a call for impartial local elections by this fall.

Numerous reports indicate that General Musharraf envisions Pakistan as a "moderate Islamic state" that is eager to orient itself to the West with a plan to stabilize the country's fragile economy by means of structural reforms, privatization and measures to attract domestic and foreign investments. Finally, regarding its relations to India, I understand that one of the general's first orders was to withdraw Pakistani troops from areas in and around Kashmir.

However, I am interested in the recent comments regarding the December hijacking of an Indian plane made by a senior U.S. official (name unknown). "The HUM (Harkat ul-Mujahideen) is, in our view, a terrorist group and we urge the government of Pakistan to shut down it activities and to sever any links with that organization and to ban it." In response, on January 27, 2000, your spokesman noted that the State Department believed Pakistan had no previous knowledge of this hijacking, nor did Pakistan support it. Furthermore, the response said that the State Department has "reason to believe that the hijackers were affiliated with the HUM" and "'that agencies of the Pakistani government have provided general support to a number of groups operating in Kashmir, including HUM."

Can you please explain these conflicting remarks and provide me with the current position of the State Department with regards to Pakistan and the December hijacking of an India plane by a militant Islamic group? Also, can you please further define the terms, as used, in the context of your spokesman's January 27th response: "'affiliated," and "general support?" I would appreciate any information you may be able to provide that would explain the Department's position on the "relationship" between Pakistan and HUM.

Answer:

- The President and I and other Administration officials have gone to Pakistan in order to keep open our lines of communication with the Pakistani leadership. Such visits have allowed us to make clear to Pakistan our views on key issues like democracy, non-proliferation, terrorism, and regional peace and security. Only by maintaining such contact can we hope to have influence on these issues with the Government of Pakistan.
- We have no evidence that the Government of Pakistan had foreknowledge of, or was involved in carrying out, the hijacking of the Indian Airlines flight in late December 1999.
- We believe there is evidence suggesting the HUM was involved in the hijacking or had ties to the hijackers. The fact that the hijackers demanded and obtained the release of Maulana Masood Azhar, a former high-ranking official of the HUM, suggests some link between the hijackers and the organization. However, the identity of the hijackers has not yet been confirmed.
- The Pakistan Government has allowed members of groups that the United States has designated as terrorist organizations, including members of the HUM, to live and move in and through its territory and provides material and financial support to militants who train in Afghanistan and fight in Kashmir.
- In order for a state to be designated a state sponsor of terrorism, I must determine that its government has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism.
- I have not made such a determination with respect to Pakistan. However, the list of state sponsors is under continuous review.

"SILK ROAD"

Question:

Madame Secretary, last year the House passed the Silk Road Strategy Act of 1999 which seeks to promote free market policies in the new republics of Central Asia and the Caucasus and to encourage foreign investment, increased trade and other forms of commercial ties between the countries of these regions and the rest of the world. These are praiseworthy objectives, and legislation expressing U.S. support for the fledgling democracies of the Silk Road region deserves priority attention. Consequently, I supported the goals of the Silk Road Act.

At the same time, however, many companies from OECD countries, including the United States, have substantial direct investments in several of the Silk Road countries and are not being accorded fair treatment. Investment contracts are not being honored, export permits are not being issued and de facto nationalizations of foreign investment have occurred. In several instances, formal complaints have been lodged by investors through U.S. and other embassies in the region.

In an effort to discourage this kind of mistreatment, Congress amended the bill to include language conditioning U.S. assistance on the fair treatment of foreign investors. Specifically, the amendment required the State Department to produce an annual report that includes "a* description of the progress being made by the United States to resolve trade disputes registered with and raised by the United States Embassies in each country, and to negotiate a bilateral agreement relating to the protection of United States direct investment in, and other business interests with, each country." In *fact, my amendment has already gotten the attention of the government of Kazakhstan, which on August 26 initiated their own review of outstanding disputes in an effort to resolve them.*

I was pleased to sponsor this amendment, however more needs to be done to protect investors. I believe the Silk Road countries must show significant progress *in resolving trade disputes registered with and raised by the U.S. Embassy. U.S. investors are being mistreated in many of the Silk Road countries, and if U.S. aid is not conditioned on fair treatment of U.S. investors, Silk Road countries will continue to mistreat and renege on commitments to U.S. investors.*

This is a good start, but without conditions, beneficiary governments will likely conclude that they have a green light to renege on commitments to foreign investors, jeopardizing hundreds of millions of dollars of investments. In this regard, a number of pension plans have investments in companies doing business in countries such as Kazakhstan. The average American worker participating in a pension is adversely affected as well, and this must stop.

Madame Secretary, what is the State Department's plan for addressing this important issue, beyond the annual report it is now required to produce? Can you please provide my office with a complete list of U.S. companies that have approached the department with a request to assist in the resolution of an investment or trade dispute in each Silk Road country? I would appreciate it if you could include the reason for the dispute as well as the name of the company. Finally, I understand that the report was due on January 31 and has still not arrived. Can you give me a timetable on when Congress might expect the first annual report?

Answer:

The Department of State and the U.S. Embassies in the field are vigorously supporting U.S. investors in the Silk Road region. In addition to providing critical and time sensitive information about the investment climates in the Silk Road countries to potential investors, we have been actively assisting U.S. investors involved in investment and trade disputes in the region.

Our long-run strategy is to assist the Silk Road countries to implement reforms designed to create more open and transparent market-oriented economies, which will offer not only stronger protections for investors, but more investment opportunities as well. We are encouraging these reforms through our assistance programs, as well as by negotiating Bilateral Investment Treaties (BIT) with individual countries. These instruments are particularly important means of establishing U.S. investor rights and defining mutually accepted means for dispute resolution.

Of the Silk Road countries, the USG has BITs in force with Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. The USG has also signed BITs with Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan, to which we hope the U.S. Senate will provide its advice and consent to ratification. The U.S. Government is not currently in BIT negotiations with Tajikistan or Turkmenistan.

The State Department sent a preliminary version of the *FY 1999 Annual Report on NIS Assistance* to the SACFO, HACFO, SFRC and HIRC on February 1. The

final bound version of the report was received from the printers on March 7 and immediately forwarded to the same committees. The FY 1999 report contains a brief overview of progress made in resolving investment and trade disputes and negotiating bilateral investment treaties with the Silk Road countries. The first full report addressing the requirements of the *Silk Road Strategy Act* will be included in the *FY 2000 Annual Report on NIS Assistance.*

For more information about investment-related disputes in Silk Road countries, I refer you to the *1999 Report of U.S. Citizen Expropriation Claims and Certain Other Commercial and Investment Disputes*. The Department of State submitted this report, which is required by Section 527 ("Helms Amendment") of the FRAA, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (P.L. 103–236), to both the SFRC and HIRC in November 1999.

This report contains detailed descriptions of ongoing and resolved investment-related disputes that have been brought to our attention. While the Section 527 report provides descriptions of the disputes, the names of U.S. citizens have not been provided due to Privacy Act concerns. This will also be an issue we will have to consider when preparing the *FY 2000 Annual Report on NIS Assistance*. Of course, the Department can provide this information to you on a confidential basis, in accordance with the Privacy Act's exception for disclosure to Congress.

Question:

> *Things are going from bad to worse in Kazakhstan, a major recipient of U.S. foreign aid. Corruption has increased, foreign investors are mistreated, critics of the regime are jailed by kangaroo courts, and the Administration has accepted the lamest of excuses about last year's shipment of 40 MiG aircraft to North Korea.*

Answer:

We share your desire to help Kazakhstan build the foundations of a democratic state and market-oriented economy. In our view, long-term stability depends on action to strengthen democracy and promote the growth of civil society, including respect for fundamental human rights. A prospering economy is, an equally important pillar of stability. Although Kazakhstan has made progress on economic reform and is back on its IMF program, we believe additional steps are needed. During the meeting in December of our binational Joint Commission President Nazarbayev made a number of important commitments in these areas that were recorded in the commission's final report. The visit I hope to take to Kazakhstan in April will provide an opportunity to discuss implementation of the broad bilateral agenda agreed upon in the framework of the Commission, in the interest of a stronger and more productive relationship between the United States and Kazakhstan.

Regarding the 1999 transfers of Kazakhstani MiG–21 fighter aircraft to North Korea, as part of an intensive dialogue in the wake of the transfers, the GOK provided extensive, concrete nonproliferation commitments and agreed to take specific steps to ensure that no such transfers occur in the future. In large part as a result of these commitments and cooperation, we decided to impose a combination of statutory and administrative sanctions against the Kazakhstani and Czech entities and individuals directly involved in the transfer, but waived sanctions against the Kazakhstani government as a whole. We continue to monitor Kazakhstani arms transfers closely and are working with the GOK to ensure that it fully adheres to its nonproliferation commitments.

With respect to the recent outcome of the trial of two suspects charged with the transfer, we have formally expressed to the GOK our surprise and disappointment at the verdicts and at former Minister of Defense Altynbayev's reinstatement and have urged that the GOK continue to pursue charges against those responsible.

Question:

> *Last November, former Prime Minister Kazhegeldin, now in exile, called for a "national dialogue" to advance democracy and economic reform in Kazakhstan. While the Administration claims to have pressed President Nazarbayev on human rights during his visit last December, a Nazarbayev spokesman told the Kazakhstani press that the subject of human rights never came up. Why doesn't the Administration come out clearly in support of a national dialogue along the lines of the one proposed by Mr. Kazhegeldin? It would be helpful if the Administration pushed Nazarbayev to provide an hour a week on state-run TV for the opposition, and offered to replace at least one of the many opposition printing presses that Nazarbayev's goons have destroyed. Madam Secretary, when will this Administration stand up for democracy and stop coddling dictators like Nazarbayev?*

Answer:

Certainly we support political dialogue, although we don't intend to tie ourselves down to one politician's view of how it should be carried out.

Promotion of democracy and human rights is fundamental to our policy toward Kazakhstan. We're doing all we can to support the development of non-governmental institutions there, but like helping anything take root and grow, it requires time and some patience. We also support prompt implementation of the many excellent recommendations contained in the OSCE election report.

In that regard, we're following with particular interest the OSCE's proposal to initiate, a roundtable process in May of this year. The OSCE is trying to bring together the Kazakhstani Government and the opposition (including parties not in the parliament), plus media and NGOs, to address the recommendations of the final OSCE report on the elections.

WESTERN SAHARA

Question:

There have been reports that the United Nations, at the encouragement of the United States, may decide not to hold the referendum for self-determination for the people of Western Sahara. As you know, the U.N. brokered a cease-fire between Morocco and the POLISARIO in 1991, and a settlement plan was agreed to by both sides. As a result, the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) was established to undertake a number of tasks, including monitoring a cease-fire, verifying the reduction of Moroccan troops in Western Sahara, and ensuring the confinement of Moroccan and POLISARIO troops to designated locations. MINURSO was also responsible for identifying and qualifying voters for the referendum to be held in the territory. In 1995, the identification process stalled. To resuscitate the process, Secretary General, Kofi Annan, appointed former Secretary of State James Baker as his Personal Envoy to the region to resolve the question of identification. Secretary Baker was successful in getting both sides to agree on the mechanics of returning refugees, demining, the release of prisoners, and procedures for the identification and registration of voters (the Houston Agreement). To date, approximately $500 million has been spent on peacekeeping and the Settle Plan.

I would like to know if the United States continues to stand firmly behind the U.N. Settlement Plan and the Houston Agreement which call for a free, fair, and a transparent referendum in Western Sahara?

Answer:

Since the UN Mission to the Western Sahara (MINURSO) was established in 1991, the Department of State has supported the implementation of the Settlement Plan that was negotiated between the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberacion de Saguia el-Hamra y del Rio de Oro (POLISARIO Front) under the auspices of the United Nations. This plan laid out the mechanisms for resolving whether the territory would become independent or a province of Morocco based on a vote of the native population. In essence, it required the identification of eligible voters, the return of refugees to the territory, and a vote under the auspices of the United Nations.

We have supported the Settlement Plan in the belief that a free and fair referendum offered the best solution to the problem of the Western Sahara. Since the parties' agreement to the plan nine years ago, we have consistently urged them to end the delaying tactics both sides have employed. In 1997, we strongly supported the efforts of the Secretary General's Personal Envoy James Baker to reinvigorate the then-stalled process through his mediation of the Houston Accords, which resolved some of the parties' differences over voter identification. In 1998, we again supported his proposal that the parties agree to another package of measures designed to move the Settlement Plan forward. We have repeatedly, at the highest levels, made known our impatience with the unwillingness of the parties to fulfill their commitments, both with regards to voter identification and return of refugees. All the while, the United States has continued to vote in favor of extending MINURSO's mandate because its successful maintenance of the peace is an important contribution to regional stability.

Question:

As Secretary of State, do you believe that the referendum process, as agreed to by Morocco and the POLISARIO, can be implemented in a reasonable period? If not, please explain what obstacles exist that are hindering the referendum process.

Answer:

There is little likelihood that the referendum can be held within the next year. The UN Secretary-General has expressed doubts it could be held before 2002, at the earliest. As he stated in his February 16 report to the Security Council, there are two main obstacles hindering the referendum process: the appeals process and refugee repatriation. MINURSO faces the prospect of receiving as many as 140,000 appeals filed by those excluded from the list of eligible voters, which could take a long time to process. Moreover, the parties disagree on the issue of the admissibility of the appeals. Furthermore, the parties have not agreed to a protocol for the repatriation of refugees.

Question:

Is there any other settlement plan for the Western Sahara, other than the existing referendum arrangement, that the U.S. has been asked to endorse? If so, what does it entail and how does it differ from the current referendum process?

Answer:

We have not been asked to endorse any other Settlement Plan. Secretary-General Annan intends to ask his Personal Envoy, James A. Baker, to consult with the parties to explore ways and means to achieve an early, durable and agreed resolution to the dispute over the Western Sahara. We support Baker's efforts and we urge the parties to cooperate fully with his mission.

Question:

Have there been discussions within the State Department regarding the United States adopting a higher profile in the Western Sahara dispute?

Answer:

No. The Secretary General's Personal Envoy, former Secretary of State James Baker, the current SRSG, William Eagleton, and his predecessor, Charles Dunbar, are American. We also have provided 15 U.S. military observers as part of the MINURSO cease-fire monitoring contingent. But there are no plans to increase U.S. involvement.

Question:

Section 803 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act, which was signed into law as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000, mandates that the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress two reports one—by January 1, 2000 and one by June 1, 2000—"describing specific steps taken by the Government of Morocco and the POLISARIO to ensure that a free, fair and a transparent referendum in which the people of the Western Sahara will choose between independence and integration with Morocco to be held by July 2000."

As of February 9, 2000, your office had not submitted the required report on the Western Sahara to Congress. How do you explain the delay in submitting the report to Congress?

Answer:

The Report was delivered to Congress on February 11. I have attached another copy of the report.

REPORT TO CONGRESS ON WESTERN SAHARA

Pursuant to Section 803 of P.L. 106–113, the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 2000 and 2001, below is a report regarding Morocco, the POLISARIO, and U.S. Government efforts to prepare for a referendum on the Western Sahara.

Since the UN Mission to the Western Sahara (MINURSO) was established in 1991, the Department of State has supported the implementation of the Settlement Plan that was negotiated between the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberacion de Saguia el-Hamra y del Rio de Oro (POLISARIO Front) under the auspices of the United Nations. This plan laid out the mechanisms for resolving whether the territory would become independent or a province of Morocco based on a vote of the native population. In essence, it required the identification of eligible voters, the return of refugees to the territory, and a vote under the auspices of the United Nations.

We have supported the Settlement Plan in the belief that a free and fair referendum offered the best solution to the problem of the Western Sahara. Since the parties' agreement to the plan nine years ago, we have consistently and repeatedly urged them to end the delaying tactics both sides have employed. In 1997, we strongly supported the efforts of the Secretary General's Personal Envoy James

Baker to reinvigorate the then-stalled process through his mediation of the Houston Accords, which resolved some of the parties' differences over voter identification. In 1998, we again supported his proposal that the parties agree to another package of measures designed to move the Settlement Plan forward. We have repeatedly, at the highest levels, made known our impatience with the unwillingness of the parties to fulfill their commitments, both with regards to voter identification and return of refugees. All the while, the United States has continued to vote in favor of extending MINURSO's mandate because its successful maintenance of the peace is an important contribution to regional stability.

At present, the Moroccan Government and the POLISARIO Front disagree over two key issues that bear directly on the implementation of the Settlement Plan: the appeals process and refugee repatriation. Unless the parties reach agreement on these issues, the referendum could be delayed well beyond July 2000.

Despite these disagreements, MINURSO recently achieved a notable success by completing the voter identification process, an issue of dispute since the beginning of the Settlement Plan in 1991. The parties had agreed that eligibility to vote in the referendum would be based primarily on the Spanish Census of 1974 of the Sahrawi population in the then Spanish Sahara. This resulted in a lengthy dispute over the eligibility of the tribal groups who are ethnically Sahrawi but resided in the Moroccan provinces bordering the territory, which were conferred by Spain to Morocco prior to 1974. These tribes are referred to as the '"contested" tribes. By the end of December, MINURSO had succeeded in identifying a total of more than 190,000 eligible voters from both the "contested' tribes and the tribal groups resident in that portion of the territory that did not convey until 1975, referred to as "non-contested".

Subsequent to the disagreement over voter identification, a new dispute has arisen over interpretation of.the protocols to the UN agreements regarding what constitutes valid grounds for appeals. According to a December 6 report by the UN Secretary General, logistical problems posed by the large number of appeals and the divergent views of the parties on the admissibility of such appeals "seem to allow little possibility of holding the referendum before the year 2002 or even beyond."

The Secretary General made this assessment as a result of the filing of nearly 80,000 appeals following the publication on July 15, 1999 of the first part of the provisional voter list. This list contains the names of eligible applicants interviewed by MINURSO during the identification of the "non-contested" tribesmen carried out in 1994–95 and 1997–98. Most of those who were determined ineligible to vote in the referendum have filed appeals. The majority of the appeals assert that new witnesses will provide new evidence of eligibility as required by the provisions of the protocol both parties agreed to in May 1999.

MINURSO anticipates a similar wave of appeals based on the second provisional list of voters, which was published January 17, 2000. This list is made up of eligible applicants from the approximately 65,000 members of the '"contested tribal groups" whose identification MINURSO completed in December. Since only a small percentage of the applicants from these tribal groups were determined to be eligible, MINURSO could face a doubling of the total number of appeals should all those excluded choose to file. Were MINURSO to accept the bulk of the appeals, their processing would be, in effect, a new round of voter identification.

The parties disagree on the admissibility of the appeals. The POLISARIO Front maintains that a large number of the appeals could be eliminated if MINURSO adhered strictly to the procedures that were "agreed-upon," according to their interpretation. Morocco, for its part, argues that all applicants have the right to an appeal and that the appeals must fulfill the requirements of admissibility. In response to this situation, the Secretary General recommended the extension of MINURSO's mandate until February 29, 2000 to allow time to complete the voter identification process, publish the second provisional list of eligible voters, and assess the situation regarding appeals.

There has been little progress during the past year on the issue of refugee repatriation. The parties have not agreed to the draft refugee repatriation protocol presented to them by the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in early 1999. Similarly, they have not begun implementation of the draft plan of action for confidence-building measures the UNHCR submitted to them in August 1999, despite agreement in principle to do SO.

In 1998, UNHCR initiated a pre-registration process to determine how many refugees would be willing to repatriate. It completed the exercise in December 1999, after pre-registering more than 87,000 refugees. According to the UNHCR, the vast majority of the refugees said they feared for their safety should they return to the Moroccan-controlled area of the Territory west of the berm (a Moroccan-constructed defensive fortification that divides the Territory), and were willing to be repatriated

only to areas east of the berm. Although interested in participating in some of the confidence-building activities—such as visits to Laayoune—they were uncertain it was safe to do so. As for the Moroccan Government, it has only recently granted UNHCR permission to establish a presence in areas outside Laayoune and eased restrictions on UNHCR's freedom of movement within the Territory.

Given the unresolved issues surrounding the appeals and refugee repatriation processes, there is therefore little likelihood that the referendum to determine the future of the Western Sahara will take place in July 2000 as currently scheduled. When and if MINURSO is able to proceed with preparations for the referendum, the Settlement Plan stipulates that MINURSO will be responsible for ensuring that the referendum is free and fair and that free access to the territory for independent international observers and media is guaranteed.

MOROCCO

Question:

Since assuming the throne, King Mohammed of Morocco has faced many challenges at home and from abroad. Like his father, he should be commended for keeping Morocco's contacts with Israel open. This was witnessed most recently by Morocco's hosting of a visit of Israel's Foreign Minister. To his credit, King Mohammed also fired Driss Basri, the Interior Minister, who was viewed as a real obstacle to political and administrative reforms.

In your opinion, what are the greatest challenges facing King Mohammed at home and from abroad, and will those challenges affect U.S. policy in the region? (NEA)

Answer:

In his short time in office, King Mohammed has indeed demonstrated that he is one of the most progressive leaders in the Arab world. He is deeply popular and is making the most of his father's legacy to achieve significant progress on democracy. With record foreign investment, declining debt, and a stable currency, by most financial measures Morocco's economic fundamentals are solid. Indeed, on these criteria Morocco would meet the strict numbers set within the EU for currency union. However, significant economic and social challenges remain, and these present the greatest challenge to the new king. Unemployment, particularly among young university graduates, remains high. Infant mortality and illiteracy remain significantly worse than they should be for a nation at Morocco's stage of development. With the majority of the national budget slated for debt service and the bloated public payroll, the government needs to budget carefully to address these serious problems.

The United States is focused on these issues. We maintain a bilateral USAID mission in Morocco that has four strategic objectives: health, water, education, and economic development, all with a cross-cutting focus on women and girls, and on public-private partnerships. In addition, under the US-North Africa Economic Partnership (USNAEP) program, we are working with Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria to increase business with the United States as well as regional trade and investment.

Although the King's primary challenges are domestic, he does face several important foreign policy challenges. Preeminent among these is Morocco's relationship with neighboring Algeria. The borders between these two key Maghreb states remain closed, and, despite new leadership in both Rabat and Algiers, there has been only slight movement towards political rapprochement. Many observers also see the Western Sahara, the principal nationalist issue in Morocco, as an issue strongly influenced by Moroccan-Algerian relations. The United States is working to convince both Morocco and Algeria that their long-term economic and political interests would be best served by enhanced bilateral relations between them.

EGYPT

Question:

As the Middle East moves closer toward peace, I believe it is important that we keep all of the parties actively engaged in securing a just and lasting peace. During your December 1999 visit to Egypt, you commented about their pioneering role in the Middle East peace process and the importance of our strategic partnership with them.

What issues or concerns, if any, about current U.S. Egyptian policy has the Government of Egypt raised with your office, and what has been our response?

Answer:

Last year marked the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty, which remains the cornerstone of all subsequent regional peace efforts.

Egypt, whose late president Sadat boldly initiated the first Arab-Israeli talks, is still a leader in the peace process. President Mubarak is actively engaged in supporting the peace process, and is a crucial figure in rallying Arab opinion. Mubarak has continued Sadat's determined commitment to peace, even when others are at their most pessimistic. The recent visits by Israeli, Palestinian and Syrian leaders to Egypt and Egypt's co-sponsorship of the Sharm el-Sheikh Accord show that all parties involved seek—and need—Egypt's vital support.

The Camp David Accords also marked the beginning of the strategic bilateral partnership between the United States and Egypt, a partnership which is vital to achieving our strategic goals of peace and stability in the Middle East. Egypt is our essential Arab partner in the pursuit of both. Egypt has the demographic, cultural, economic, and political weight and potential to lead, as it did in Camp David and after the invasion of Kuwait. No other Arab state can provide this "multiplier effect" to our policy goals of peace and security, and Egypt's influence touches not only on Arab-Israeli peace and Gulf security, but also to Sudan, Somalia, Ethiopia, Libya, the Arab League, the OAU, the OIC, and the Islamic world generally. Egyptian support is necessary to promote U.S. strategic interests across the entire region.

Egypt contributed more troops to the Gulf War coalition than any other Arab nation, and, while sensitive to the needs of the Iraqi people, Egypt continues to serve a vital role in supporting our efforts to prevent Saddam Hussein's re-integration into the international community; like ourselves, Egypt stresses Saddam's need to comply with the relevant UNSC resolutions. Egypt's current efforts with Qadhafi were critical in Qadhafi's decision to turn over. the Pan Am 103 suspects.

As to the second part of the question, without going into the substance of our diplomatic exchanges, I would note that we and Egypt occasionally and naturally have our different perspectives and emphases; however, when disagreements arise, we work them out. Both countries are firmly committed in the peace process and the irreplaceability of each other as allies. When the U.S. is facing challenges in restraining the parties who reject the peace process, combating international terrorism, rallying African and Arab support in international fora, or allowing unhindered passage for our naval and air forces, Egypt continues to be a solid partner for the U.S.

Question:

Why is it that the United States supports Greek Cypriot inclusion into the European Union, even though the status of the Island remains unresolved, but yet we do not support and actively pursue European Union Membership for our strong reliable NATO ally, Turkey? Is that not a violation of international law?

Answer:

- The United States' policies with respect to the EU accession bids of Cyprus and Turkey are fully consistent with international law.
- The United States has supported the start of EU accession talks with the Republic of Cyprus, the State entity recognized under international law to comprise the entire island.
- At the same time, the United States continues to try to facilitate a comprehensive settlement on the island.
- We are pleased the parties will resume UN-led talks in New York on May 23.
- With respect to Turkey, the United States strongly supported its European Union candidacy bid and welcomed the EU decision at the December 1999 Helsinki Summit to make Turkey an EU candidate.
- We continue to support closer relations between Turkey and the European Union.

CHECHNYA

Question:

In the mid-1990's, President Clinton equated the war in Chechnya to the American Civil War. In December 1999, NATO commander General Wesley Clark compared Moscow's brutal war in Chechnya to Belgrade's war in Kosovo. Which comparison is more apt and why?

Answer:

During Serb military operations in Kosovo, it was clear that a political decision was taken by senior Serb leader to target civilians on the basis of their ethnicity.

Russia's military operation in Chechnya, however brutal, is not analogous. Last August, Chechen field commanders launched an armed incursion into the neighboring Russian Republic of Dagestan in August. Their stated aim was to establish an independent Islamic state.

In September, the Russian Government initiated air strikes on Chechnya followed by a ground operation in October. The Russian Government?claimed that it acted because of the threat from radical Chechen elements. It also linked the action to apartment bombings in Moscow and other Russian cities (although Chechen involvement in those bombings has never been proven). While the U.S. supports Russia's territorial integrity and right to protect its citizens from terrorism, we have strongly criticized the conduct of its military campaign in Chechnya.

Innocent civilians, both ethnic Russians and ethnic Chechens, have suffered greatly during the conflict in Chechnya. Russia's use of force has caused many civilian deaths and more than 200,000 have fled the fighting.

Russia, like the United States, must live up to its commitment to distinguish between civilian and military targets during conflicts.

CHINA-LIBYA COOPERATION

Question:

The Pentagon last month discovered a new customer for Chinese military technology. Sensitive intelligence revealed China plans to build a hypersonic wind tunnel in Libya as part of Tripoli's program to build missiles. The wind tunnel would be used to design rockets and simulate missile flight. In addition, Chinese officials also arranged for Libyan technicians to travel to China for missile-related training and education. (INSIDE THE RING, he Washington Times, Bill Gertz and Rowan Scarborough, 1/27/00.) China continues to proliferate sensitive technology to help the missile programs of rogue nations. In 1993 the administration raised sanctions against China after they promised to stop proliferating missile technology. This is just the latest example of China's disregard of their promise. This technology would tremendously boost the Libyan missile program and endanger North African and European security. If the Chinese do go through with the sale of wind tunnel will the administration pose sanctions on China for violating U.S. missile sanctions law?

Answer:

- It would be inappropriate to comment publicly on alleged intelligence matters.
- China committed in 1994 to ban sales of ground-to-ground MTCR (Missile Technology Control Regime)-class missiles. We have no evidence to indicate that it has violated this pledge. We are, however, concerned about Chinese entities' sales of missile related equipment and technology.
- Whether any particular transfer was sanctionable under U.S. law would depend entirely on the information available to us about that transfer. Should we acquire information that sanctionable activity had occurred, we would fully implement U.S. law.

RESPONSES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH CROWLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

AID PACKAGE FOR SYRIA AND LEBANON

Question:

As you know, I have been a strong proponent for a negotiated peace in the Middle East and a long-time friend of Israel. I have been watching the developments in the Middle East very closely, and although I am concerned, I am still hopeful that an agreement can be reached between Syria and Israel. That being said, my constituents have raised many issues with me regarding such an agreement. In particular, they have concerns with what such an agreement would entail in terms of U.S. assistance to Syria and Lebanon. At this time, what sort of aid package might the Congress need to consider for Syria and Lebanon? And, would any military assistance be put forward in such a package?

Answer:

- The U.S. strongly supports a negotiated peace between Israel and Syria and Israel and Lebanon. Although negotiations are currently at a pause, we are doing everything we can to encourage the parties to advance the process.
- Under the present circumstances, it is premature to discuss possible assistance to Syria or Lebanon in the context of a negotiated peace agreement. It is simply too early to enter into a speculative discussion on this issue.

Question:

Last year, I traveled to Colombia to examine the damage caused by the earthquake that caused so much destruction and ripped apart so many lives. While in Colombia, I had the opportunity to meet with many Colombian officials and discuss current and pressing issues, such as counter narcotics assistance and judicial reform.

In looking at the President's proposal for assistance to Colombia, I see that a great emphasis has been placed on counter narcotics assistance, and some emphasis has been placed on social and economic reforms. While I support this aid package, in principle, I do have some concerns.

Why has such an emphasis been placed on counter narcotics? While a key issue, social and economic reforms should play an equally important role. Does the Administration really consider its requested funds sufficient to help resolve some of the pressing social and economic issues in Colombia?

Answer:

The Administration concurs wholeheartedly that the narcotics industry is one of a handful of issues plaguing Colombia. In fact, Plan Colombia is predicated on the linked nature of that nation's key problems. The needs for social reform, economic reform, effective counternarcotics efforts and an end to the decades-long insurgency all affect each other and must be addressed together. That is why Plan Colombia cannot be understood simply in terms of the U.S. contribution alone. Public discussions on Plan Colombia, unfortunately, have focused on the content of the USG's proposed assistance and have equated the two. We need to recognize, however, that the proposed USG package represents only 21 percent of Plan Colombia's estimated price tag of $7.5 billion. While a significant share of our package will go towards counternarcotics efforts, these United States funded programs are meant to complement the remaining $6 billion of Plan Colombia programs funded by the Government of Colombia and other donors. Those programs are overwhelmingly directed at social and economic reform.

Our assistance for Plan Colombia is intended to meet the needs that these other sources can not. It is based on the shared hope of achieving peace and prosperity in Colombia through the overall reduction of illicit drug production and trafficking, thereby allowing the Colombian government to establish democratic control and provide services and infrastructure throughout its national territory. Clearly, it is also intended to reduce the supply of drugs coming into the United States by assisting the Government of Colombia in its efforts to confront the cocaine and heroin industries. This focus on the so-called "stick" of enforcement will allow other sponsors to provide support for the "carrot," economic and social projects.

Question:

Additionally, I could find no reference in the President's package to the safety of Colombian citizens. I am greatly concerned that as the Colombia government strengthens its efforts in counter-narcotics, the FARC, fearing revenue losses, will increase kidnapping and terror activities against Colombian civilians. Has the Administration given any consideration to this possibility? If so, does it have any plans for dealing with it?

Answer:

The internal armed conflict and the social disruption caused by drug trafficking remain the greatest obstacles to democracy, human rights and the rule of law in Colombia. Therefore, our policy in Colombia is to support President Pastrana's efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the country's longstanding civil conflict and to work with the Colombians—along with our regional partners—on fighting illicit drugs.

The United States Government strongly supports President Pastrana's efforts to broker a negotiated settlement to end Colombia's internal conflict. We remain convinced that the peace process is integral to long-run prospects for fighting drug trafficking, reducing kidnappings, and restoring respect for human rights.

In order to address this, our assistance package will provide support to help train Government of Colombia negotiators and advisors on managing conflict negotiations. The training will also examine the techniques for reintegrating ex-combatants into civil society and seek their support for all aspects of Plan Colombia.

Our assistance package will also send a strong message to Colombia's guerrillas that meaningful negotiations offer the best hope for peace and social justice. They can hope to win neither military victory nor political advantage through violence.

Finally, we believe that to the extent that Plan Colombia reinvigorates the Colombian economy, enhances GOC governing capability, encourages respect for and pro-

tection of human rights, strengthens democratic institutions, and reduces the money available to guerrillas and paramilitaries from involvement in the drug trafficking, it will encourage the peace process.

We have and will continue to call on all combatants to move immediately to humanize the conflict by stopping all kidnapping and murders of civilians, ending the practice of recruiting child soldiers, and by abandoning attacks in situations where the lives of innocent civilians are put at risk.

Question:

I am pleased to see that the Administration requested a significant increase for bilateral international family planning programs. How will this increase be accommodated without affecting funding for other equally important sustainable development programs?

Answer:

The request for a $169 million increase over current funding levels for our international population assistance is simply a restoration of funding to FY 1995 levels $541.6 million. No cuts in other sustainable development programs have been made to accommodate this increase for FY2001.

Our international population assistance program and other important sustainable development programs have suffered in recent years by overall limits on development assistance, as well as restrictions on international family planning. The U.S. is the most prosperous nation on earth, yet ranks eighth in population assistance taken as a ratio of GNP. Restoration of the funding we are currently seeking for international population assistance brings us closer toward meeting the commitments that we and the international community have made to ensuring adequate levels of health and development for the world's population.

RESPONSES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE RADANOVICH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CROATIA

Question:

Madame Secretary, on your recent visit to Croatia you expressed U.S. support to the new government of Croatia and pledged to cooperate in advancing Croatia's inclusion into Euro-Atlantic integration processes, including the Partnership for Peace program. Could you please specify what this U.S. support would consist of? Do you believe that this is the right moment to evaluate and adequately reward Croatia's contributions to USNATO operations in Southeastern Europe?

Answer:

We have been very proactive in our support for the new Government of Croatia. We have increased FY 00 SEED funding from $12 to $20 million and have asked for an additional $35.7 million in the supplemental. Several teams of Treasury and AID advisors have already been to Zagreb to assess the fiscal and economic situation and we expect to have 4–7 short and long-term advisors in place in the next weeks and months. Supplemental funds will be used to bolster the long overdue reforms. Almost half of the amount will be used to support refugee returns, an essential component of the Dayton agreement that had been stalled by the HDZ regime. The economic problems in Croatia are serious but not insurmountable and we are confident that if the new government can stay the course, with our help, it will become an important force for stability and prosperity in the region.

Membership in PfP is a consensus decision made by all 19 members of NATO. We, the United States, are optimistic that Croatia will be able to make significant progress on Dayton related issues. This will signal a real change of political direction and thus facilitate the membership process for PfP.

ARMENIA

Question:

Last February 25th, during your appearance before this panel, I asked you a very specific question regarding the State Department's position on U.S. recognition and Turkish acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide. Unfortunately, I did not receive a response from you on this very important point.

Now that you have had a year to consider my question, I will ask you again to please explain what steps you have taken 1) to ensure that the U.S. Government appropriately commemorates the Armenian genocide, and 2) to urge the Turkish government to come to terms with this tragic chapter in its history?

In asking this question a second time in as many years I would like to note that continued silence on the part of the Department of State will only reinforce the mistaken and highly troubling impression that you seem to be fostering that the American people support a policy of official U.S. complicity in Turkey's shameful campaign to deny the genocide committed against the Armenian nation.

Answer:

As I noted to you in my written reply last April, President Clinton traditionally has commemorated Armenian Remembrance Day, April 24, by issuing a solemn statement that both mourns the loss of innocent Armenian lives and challenges all Americans to recommit themselves to ensuring that such events never occur again.

He will do so again this year.

We have emphasized to both Turkey and Armenia, as well as to all other countries in the Caucasus region, that we can neither deny history nor forget it.

However, we believe that focusing at this time on the tragic events that transpired during the final years of the Ottoman Empire could undercut our efforts to promote peace and stability today in the Caucasus.

This administration gives priority to assisting the states and peoples of the Caucasus to achieve just and peaceful resolutions to their disputes. We are particularly engaged with Armenia and Azerbaijan to attain a mutually acceptable and durable settlement to their conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh.

We are confident that both Armenia and Turkey seek normal relations, and this administration is committed to helping them make real progress toward that goal.

In this regard, the President and I met with Turkish and Armenian leaders in Istanbul last November and in Davos in January, and promoted the process of building peace and stability in the Caucasus that in fact will secure improved relations.

RESPONSES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Question:

Madame Secretary, what is the status of the State Department's efforts to gain Israel's admittance to the Western European and Others Group at the UN?

Answer:

Israel's exclusion from the UN's regional group structure is unfair and inconsistent with the principle of sovereign equality of member states enshrined in the UN Charter. Correcting this injustice remains a priority for the Administration. Participation in the regional group structure is a critical element in any member's effective participation in United Nations activities. Administration officials, including the President and Vice President, have repeatedly engaged the other members of WEOG to bring this issue to closure, as have I.

Enormous progress has been made and was reported in detail to the Congress earlier this year in the annual report on this issue. We have secured EU agreement on Israeli participation in the WEOG at the expert and political director levels. Dick Holbrooke is now engaged in discussions in New York with the other WEOG members to finalize the implementing details that will allow Israel to assume its rightful place as a participant in the regional group structure. Throughout these efforts, we have coordinated closely with appropriate Israeli authorities and will continue to do so.

We hope to bring this matter to a successful conclusion within the next several months and will keep the Congress informed of our progress.

Question:

Madame Secretary, like many Americans and members of Congress, I am deeply concerned about the situation in Colombia. Do you believe the supplemental funding sought by the Administration for Colombia is going to help advance the economic and social reforms that President Pastrana is attempting to institute through Plan Colombia?

Answer:

Yes. Our assistance package for Plan Colombia includes $240 million over two years for alternative development, enhancing good governance, anti-corruption, human rights and humanitarian assistance. Specific initiatives include increasing protection of human rights NGOs, supporting human rights information and education programs, creating and training special units of prosecutors and judicial police to investigate human rights cases involving Government of Colombia officials, and training public defenders and judges.

This is in addition to the some $4 billion that the Government of Colombia is committing to Plan Colombia from its own resources and from loans?. This will be used for the implementation of Plan Colombia, which includes programs such as economic development and humanitarian assistance.

Other donors, including the International Financial Institutions, are providing additional hundreds of millions of dollars aimed primarily at social, humanitarian and infrastructure development as well as economic revitalization.

Question:

The status of our negotiations with North Korea appears uncertain. What is your assessment of relations between North and South Korea?

Answer:

Our discussions with North Korea are ongoing. After a round of talks in New York in March, the DPRK agreed to further talks on Agreed Framework implementation and on missile matters. It also agreed to further discussions on a high-level visit. We are currently working through the New York channel to arrange those talks.

After constantly pressing the DPRK to engage in North-South dialogue, we were pleased with the announcement of a June summit in Pyongyang between the leaders of the two Koreas. We have also been pleased that the preliminary talks between the ROK and DPRK appear to be taking place in a businesslike manner.

It appears that the DPRK is responding positively to ROK President Kim Daejung's policy of engagement with the North. We are hopeful that continued dialogue between the two Koreas will enhance stability and reduce tension on the Peninsula.

Question:

Madame Secretary, the negotiations to reunite Cyprus seem to be stuck on the insistence of Mr. Denktash that the international community recognize the sovereignty of his self-declared "state." How can we move beyond Mr. Denktash and deal with more pragmatic leaders in northern Cyprus who share your goal of reuniting the island of Cyprus?

Answer:

The United States continues to try to facilitate a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem, and we do not believe Mr. Denktash's insistence on recognition should be a precondition to making progress in the talks. We are working hard to intensify the talks when they recommence May 23 in New York.

Mr. Rauf Denktash recently won re-election as the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, and he will continue to head the Turkish Cypriot delegation at the UN-led Cyprus talks. In addition to working with Mr. Denktash, we also meet with a wide range of Turkish Cypriot leaders to encourage progress on the Cyprus issue.

Question:

Madame Secretary, given the mountain of evidence, including that in our own archives, which points to a determined effort by Turkish Ottoman authorities to decimate the Armenian population from their historic homeland in 1915, why haven't you properly characterized this crime against humanity as a genocide? Has your refusal to do so been based on a historical determination or have other calculations influenced your decision?

Answer:

- President Clinton traditionally has commemorated Armenian Remembrance Day, April 24, by issuing a solemn statement that both mourns the loss of innocent Armenian lives and challenges all Americans to recommit themselves to ensuring that such events never occur again.
- He did so again this year.
- We also believe that it is important to focus our efforts on promoting peace and stability in the region today.

- We are confident that both Armenia and Turkey seek normal relations, and this Administration is committed to helping them make real progress toward that goal.
- In this regard, the President and I met with Turkish and Armenian leaders in Istanbul last November, and in Davos in January, to promote the process of building peace and stability in the Caucasus that will secure improved relations between Turkey and Armenia. That delicate process continues.

PAKISTAN

Question:

Madame Secretary, like you, I have witnessed the decline in our relations with Pakistan. In your opinion, what steps does Pakistan need to take to reestablish our confidence that democracy will be restored in Pakistan—in what is now an undemocratic nuclear state?

Answer:

The President and I went to Pakistan in March of this year in order to keep open our lines of communication with the Pakistani leadership. The visit allowed us to present our views on key issues like democracy, non-proliferation, terrorism, and regional peace and security. During our visit, the President urged General Musharraf to lay out a comprehensive road map for the return of an elected national government.

We will continue to support democracy in Pakistan by working with Pakistani NGOs. Current U.S. law prohibits direct assistance to the Pakistani Government to carry out democratization efforts.

Question:

Madam Secretary, Iran continues to lend support to Hezbollah and other forces committed to the destruction of the State of Israel. What agenda items are you pursuing to tell Iran to stop encouraging attacks against Israel, America's number one ally in the Middle East and the only democracy in the region?

Answer:

Iranian support for terrorism, particularly terrorism directed against the peace process, remains a major concern. We continue to work closely with allies to press Iran to cease this support. Further, we have sought a direct dialogue with Iran to address this and other issues. Until Iran is able to constructively address this problem, our principal sanctions will remain in place.

Question:

Madame Secretary, I want to praise your role in assisting Poland to host the "Communities of Democracies" meeting that will be held in June of this year in Warsaw. What do you see this summit of democracies accomplishing?

Answer:

The goal of the communities of democracies ministerial is to strengthen the capacity and effectiveness of existing international organizations in their support for democracy. Governments attending the meeting will affirm their commitment to a core set of universal democratic principles. The meeting will provide an opportunity for exchanging experiences, identifying best practices, and formulating an agenda for international cooperation in order to realize democracy's full potential.

CHINA: TIBET

Question:

Madame Secretary, like many Americans who believe that human rights should be at the top of our nation's foreign policy agenda, I continue to be troubled by China's repression of the Tibetan people. Please share with me the options the Department of State has taken to stop the Chinese government's unrelenting campaign to imprison freethinking Tibetans?

Answer:

The Department is deeply concerned about China's failure to bring its human rights practices into compliance with international norms and standards. This is true in Tibet no less than elsewhere in China.

Because of our concerns about Tibet, in October 1997 I designated a Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues, in close consultation with Congress.

We have made clear to the Chinese that no individual should be detained solely for expressing personal views, practicing his or her religion, or engaging in other

peaceful, legitimate activities. The Tibetan people—as do all the people of China—deserve respect and guarantees for their fundamental human freedoms. We stress repeatedly to China's leaders the tremendous importance of respecting and preserving the unique cultural, religious, and linguistic heritage of the people of Tibet.

Key to that goal is direct contact between the Dalai Lama and the Chinese leadership. We have repeatedly urged Chinese authorities, publicly and privately, to enter into dialogue with the Dalai Lama or his representatives. Unfortunately, although the Dalai Lama has expressed willingness to meet Chinese conditions for such a dialogue, Beijing has not responded positively. We will continue to raise this matter with Chinese authorities.

We also regularly and vigorously press Chinese authorities to end human rights violations in Tibet, including: the "patriotic education campaign" targeting supporters of the Dalai Lama; the refusal to let internationally credible observers ascertain first-hand the welfare and whereabouts of Gendhun Choekyi Nyima, the boy recognized by the Dalai Lama as the Panchen Lama; lengthy detentions of Tibetans for practicing their internationally recognized right to freedom of religion; failure to follow China's own legal code in the treatment of prisoners, seen in the degradation and torture of Tibetan prisoners; and the concerted effort of the Chinese to resettle ethnic Han in the Tibetan Autonomous Region.

Such abuses were part of the basis for our sponsorship of a resolution on China at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, and why I went to Geneva to make our case in person.

The Department has drawn international attention to China's record by documenting the poor state of human rights in Tibet in our annual Human Rights Report chapter on China. We have also detailed the Chinese government's religious repression in our 1999 report on religious freedom worldwide. Conditions in Tibet were a part of the basis for my decision last fall to designate China last fall as a "country of particular concern" for religious rights violations.

The U.S. government will continue to follow human rights in Tibet closely and will continue vigorous efforts to encourage China to uphold its international obligations.

Question:

> *Madame Secretary, Latin America is increasingly becoming a force for democratic and economic reforms, a region where the innovation of indigenous people is being let loose, creating a region with economic prospects that may, one day, rival the European Union's. In your opinion what is the status of democratic reforms occurring in Latin America and do you see areas where America should be playing a stronger role in supporting democratic institutions across Latin America?*

Answer:

The climate for democracy in Latin America is better today than ever before. Every nation in the Hemisphere—save one—has a democratically elected government. Yet recent events in places such as Ecuador, Colombia, Peru and Haiti remind us that democratic progress is neither immutable nor uniform. Supported by the necessary resources to carry out our commitments, the USG, working with our hemispheric neighbors and other international partners, can help to preserve freedom and democracy in Latin America. We can help countries as they seek to consolidate democracy by:

- Ensuring that civil political discourse remains the norm. We must assist regional leaders and civil society in their efforts to engage in mature discussions, to examine problems and to seek solutions. We must support the strengthening of political parties as a vital mechanism to promote dialogue and channel public participation.
- Helping to strengthen regional mechanisms like the OAS and the Summit of Americas process to foster democracy.
- Exploring new ways to assist governments to ameliorate poverty and overcome huge income disparities by improving the delivery of basic social services, health care, and education to broaden economic opportunities and thus strengthen democracy.
- Supporting judicial reforms to modernize legal codes and to make judicial systems more responsive.
- Supporting the professionalization of law enforcement to foster the ability to respond to "modern" crimes related to narcotics, cyber crime, and money laundering.

- Continuing to assist electoral bodies and supporting election observation missions to ensure elections that are fair, transparent, and credible.
- Encouraging "people to people" contacts to promote mutual understanding and further integration.

NORTHERN IRELAND

Question:

Madame Secretary, I am deeply concerned about the British Government's recent decision to suspend Northern Ireland's new power-sharing government. The Good Friday Peace Agreement, which was negotiated with the aid of U.S. officials, particularly former Senator George Mitchell and President Bill Clinton, was a remarkable step forward toward a new era of peace in Northern Ireland. I urge you to call on the British Government's Northern Ireland Secretary, Peter Mandelson, to reverse his decision of last week to suspend one of the most progressive achievements of the Good Friday Agreement, the establishment of an all-party government in Northern Ireland.

Answer:

- The Good Friday Agreement was a remarkable step forward toward a new era of peace in Northern Ireland.
- We hope local institutions will be restored as quickly as possible with the involvement of all parties.
- The British and Irish governments have continued to work closely together and with the parties to develop proposals for a way forward. Talks are expected to resume again May 2.
- The President has said he is prepared to help advance the peace process in any way he can.

○