

**NOMINATION OF HON. NIMRATA “NIKKI”
HALEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE U.S.
AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JANUARY 18, 2017

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web:
<http://govinfo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

31-612 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2018

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

BOB CORKER, Tennessee, *Chairman*

JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho	BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
MARCO RUBIO, Florida	ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
RON JOHNSON, Wisconsin	JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona	CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware
CORY GARDNER, Colorado	TOM UDALL, New Mexico
TODD, YOUNG, Indiana	CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, Connecticut
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming	TIM KAINE, Virginia
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia	EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio	JEFF MERKLEY, Oregon
RAND PAUL, Kentucky	CORY A. BOOKER, New Jersey

TODD WOMACK, *Staff Director*

JESSICA LEWIS, *Democratic Staff Director*

JOHN DUTTON, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Corker, Hon. Bob, U.S. Senator from Tennessee	1
Graham, Hon. Lindsey, U.S. Senator from South Carolina	1
Scott, Hon. Tim, U.S. Senator from South Carolina	3
Menendez, Hon. Robert, U.S. Senator from New Jersey	4
Haley, Hon. Nimata “Nikki” Haley, of South Carolina, nominated to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations	9
Prepared statement	13

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Responses to Additional Questions for the Record Submitted to Hon. Nikki Haley by Members of the Committee	
Questions submitted by Senator Robert Menendez	73
Questions submitted by Senator Marco Rubio	91
Questions submitted by Senator Benjamin L. Cardin	95
Questions submitted by Senator Todd Young	110
Questions submitted by Senator Jeanne Shaheen	111
Questions submitted by Senator Johnny Isakson	113
Questions submitted by Senator Christopher A. Coons	114
Questions submitted by Senator Tom Udall	115
Questions submitted by Senator Tim Kaine	119
Questions submitted by Senator Edward J. Markey	121
Questions submitted by Senator Jeff Merkley	125
United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 2334 (2016)	129
Explanation of the U.S. vote on UNSCR 2334	133
“Russia: The Threat, the International Order, and the Way Forward,” by <i>Ambassador Samantha Power</i>	137
The Screening Process for Refugee Entry into the United States	145

**NOMINATION OF HON. NIMRATA “NIKKI”
HALEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE U.S.
AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2017

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in Room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Bob Corker, chairman of the committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Corker [presiding], Risch, Rubio, Johnson, Flake, Gardner, Young, Barrasso, Portman, Paul, Cardin, Menendez, Shaheen, Coons, Udall, Murphy, Kaine, Markey, Merkley, and Booker.

Also Present: Senators Graham and Scott.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BOB CORKER,
U.S. SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE**

The CHAIRMAN. The Foreign Relations Committee will come to order.

We had a few conflicting things happening at 10:00 a.m. and so we started at 10:10 a.m. to make sure our ranking member could be with us.

We have two very distinguished guests with us today from the State of South Carolina—Senator Lindsey Graham, Senator Tim Scott. The way the order is going to work today, they will be introducing our outstanding nominee. They are going to say some brief comments. We are going to make some opening comments.

As is the norm, I will not question at first. I will save my time for interjections, and we will move directly to Senator Cardin. But we welcome our nominee, we welcome our distinguished friends, and with that, Lindsey, if you want to lead off, we would love to hear from you.

**STATEMENT OF HON. LINDSEY GRAHAM,
U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA**

Senator GRAHAM. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a great honor to have you here in our committee.

Senator GRAHAM. Well, thank you. You are probably the only one who would say that. So I am—[Laughter.]

Senator MENENDEZ. I will second it.

Senator GRAHAM. I am having a hard enough time staying on the committees that I am actually assigned to. So I may drop by more often. John McCain would be real pleased to see me drop by here more often.

You are going to hear a personal story that I think is uniquely American. So as Nikki begins to explain who she is, where she comes from, and how she got the job she has got, I think you are going to be really proud of our country. And I will not get in the way of that story other than to say it is one of the most compelling stories in American politics, and all of us in South Carolina are proud.

As to the U.N., I consider myself an internationalist. The chairman has been working on trying to deal with modern slavery. I think the U.N. is a body that can do a lot of good but needs to be reformed. Most Americans are losing trust in the body.

Twenty resolutions against Israel and six against the world at large is probably a body that needs to refocus on the world as it really is. I think Governor Haley will talk about her desire to stand up more forcefully for Israel, and I think it is time for America to stand up more forcefully for Israel in the U.N.

She will talk about reform. I am the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations with Senator Leahy. We are in charge of the U.N.'s budget, the State Department's budget. And let me tell you a little bit about the body.

PEPFAR and other programs that the U.N. administers have saved millions of lives. The new Secretary-General, I had a long talk with him a couple of days ago, really encouraged by his vision for the United Nations. He was in charge of refugee programs throughout the world. So he understands the body. He has been out in the field.

And I think Nikki Haley and the new Secretary-General will form a partnership that will reform a body that is long overdue, and the first thing out of the new Secretary-General's mouth was, "I intend to reform this body to make you more proud of the way it functions." In that regard, he will have a good partner in Governor Haley.

She has been the Governor of our State in some of the most difficult times you could imagine—a thousand-year flood, the massacre of nine people in a church in Charleston. She has handled some of the most difficult experiences in modern South Carolina with grace, poise, determination, and dignity.

Trust me, it has been a tough year or so for South Carolina, and Governor Haley has brought us together and gotten us to places we should have been a long time ago. I think that skill set is exactly what the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations needs.

You can learn the details of foreign policy, but you either have the ability to persuade people, you have the ability to transform organizations, or you do not. Now I have seen her persuade people who have dug in for literally centuries about now is the time to move the Confederate flag. I have seen her bring international business concerns to our State by engaging in a fashion to convince them that of all the places you could do business in the world, South Carolina is where you need to be.

Bottom line, America's voice in the United Nations needs to be strong. It needs to be somebody that can bring people together. It needs to be a voice that understands what America is all about.

I think Nikki Haley, our Governor in South Carolina, is the right person at the right time. She represents a combination of intellect, determination, grace, and the understanding of America that the world needs to hear. I know that if she is the Ambassador for our country to the United Nations, the United Nations will be better off, and our country will be in good hands.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much.

Now I will turn to Senator Scott, who in his very brief amount of time here has brought great consciousness, I think, to our body and clarity. We thank him for his service, his unique perspective on so many issues that we deal with, and we look forward to your comments.

**STATEMENT OF HON. TIM SCOTT,
U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA**

Senator SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ranking member, and members of the committee. It certainly is a pleasure for me to be here introducing not only my Governor, but my friend who I have gotten to know over many years.

And her story really is the epitome of the American dream coming to life. Her parents migrated from India to Canada and then to rural South Carolina back in 1969. Her father, brilliant man, college professor. Her mother, an entrepreneur, started a clothing boutique store where Nikki figured out how to work. Thank her mom for that today.

According to my staff, and this is perhaps the most important part of my introduction, she attended a school in upstate South Carolina that in 2015 was the number two football team in the country, Cory Booker. [Laughter.]

Senator SCOTT. This year, they were the number one team. They also are known as the Clemson Tigers, and her daughter is a student at Clemson as well.

She learned how to get along with folks. She learned how to study. She learned how to be a student of the things that mattered in life. And over time, that transcended everything that she did.

I met Nikki back when I started serving in the South Carolina House of Representatives in 2009. She had already been there. She served three terms in the South Carolina House of Representatives. Before she was in the House, she led the local chamber of commerce, becoming the president of the National Association of Women Business Owners and was elected in 2004 to the South Carolina House.

I was able to see firsthand the way she embodied the American values in her leadership, something that we all have grown to love and appreciate about her. In 2010, she became the first female Governor of South Carolina and only the second, second in the Nation Indian-American Governor in our Nation.

Under Governor Haley's leadership, South Carolina's unemployment rate hit a 15-year record low. New jobs in every single county in South Carolina, representing the greatest names in industry. From the Boeings of the world to the expansions of the BMWs, to

the attraction of more investment from Michelin, to Bridgestone, Nikki Haley during her term created over 82,000 jobs in South Carolina.

Nikki is also a champion of transparency and accountability in government, two things that I and many of us hope to see more of at the United Nations. In 2015, as Lindsey has already mentioned, during some of the darkest hours our State has ever known, the Mother Emanuel massacre, Nikki Haley led not only as a Governor, not only as a strong leader, but as a mother, as a human being that was impacted by such an atrocity. She led our State to come together.

With those types of leadership skills, bringing people together under the worst of times, under the most difficult conditions is something that she specializes in. The United Nations will be better because Nikki Haley will be a part of it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you both. I know that you have other business, and you are welcome to go deal with that business, but we thank you for being here.

And Governor Haley, we thank you for putting yourself forward. We look forward to your comments in just a moment.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The United Nations Security Council was created after World War II to create stability and to maintain security in the world, and yet as we look around the world today, it is failing in its cause of peace and security. We can only look to Syria, where over a half a million people have been slaughtered, people have been tortured, chemical weapons have been used against people, and yet the United Nations Security Council has been unable to do anything to counter what has happened there.

Russia has remade the map by invading Georgia in 2008, again in Ukraine, and yet the United Nations has been unable to deal with that issue.

China is violating all kinds of international norms in the South China Sea, and yet the United Nations Security Council is unable to deal with that issue. As a matter of fact, United Nations Security Council has been unable to deal with the issues that it has agreed upon, its own resolutions, whether it is North Korea and the violations that are taking place and the half-hearted efforts that have taken place by members to really push and enforce strong sanctions.

In Iran, we have the same issue where an agreement has been reached, and yet Iran continues to violate especially on ballistic missiles, something that, again, the United Nations Security Council had agreed to.

And what it has done instead is continue to pursue anti-Semitic measures. The Permanent Five have two members that actually are causing the world to be less safe, and that is Russia and China.

So we have a built-in issue here, where any of those permanent five members can veto the actions of the rest and keep the United Nations from rightfully dealing with issues that need to be dealt with. As a matter of fact, the gap between what the United Nations was meant to be and what it has become has never been wider at this moment in time.

The U.S. is the largest contributor, 22 percent of the normal dues. We pay 29 percent of the peacekeeping dues or participation. We also give billions of dollars to other organizations that are affiliated. And yet we see in the peacekeeping mission violations of sexual exploitation and abuse and yet again, it seems, no real action.

And yet I believe the United Nations can and should play an important role. I believe it is and can play an important role in conflict areas in delivering humanitarian aid. But I think we are at a pivotal point, and that is why I am excited that our nominee is here today.

While our former Secretary-General, to me, in many cases for me it was hard to determine if he even had a pulse when big issues were being dealt with by the world, I will say the new U.N. Secretary-General, Guterres, seems to me to be somebody that really wants the United Nations to do what it was intended to do. I had several very strong conversations with him over the last several days as the United Nations was dealing with some current business, and I have a feeling you are going to have a much better partner when confirmed to this position.

I know that Governor Haley is a fierce advocate for U.S. interests. All of us who have met with her in our offices have seen that. I really do believe that she is a person that knows the United Nations needs tremendous reform and change, and I really believe that we have a right to demand that as the largest contributor, as the greatest country on Earth. I think that our nominee will, in fact, demand that, and I think we will, in fact, see very positive changes when she is confirmed.

And with that, I turn it over to our distinguished ranking member and my friend, Ben Cardin.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
U.S. SENATOR FROM MARYLAND**

Senator CARDIN. Well, Chairman Corker, thank you for the manner in which this hearing has been arranged. Thank you very much for all the courtesies that you have shown.

Governor Haley, thank you. Thank you for being here.

Governor HALEY. Oh, it is my pleasure. Thank you.

Senator CARDIN. It is a very difficult time to serve in government, and it is a very difficult time to serve at the United Nations and serve in a critically important position for our national security and our global affairs. So we thank you for being willing to step forward to serve your country.

I want to thank your husband and son, who are here, because this is going to be a family sacrifice. So you are going to have to share your mother and your wife with our country and with the global community, and we thank you for being willing to do that.

Chairman Corker, you are correct. In the meeting I had with Governor Haley, it was most impressive to see Governor Haley's passion for U.S. values, and her statements as to how she sees the role at the United Nations I found to be very encouraging. So I thank you very much for that opportunity.

International institutions like the United Nations are under tremendous stress as is the entire liberal international order of the last seven decades. The United Nations plays a vital role in the

maintenance of the current international order, which has served the United States well since 1945. As Ronald Reagan said, “We must,” in his own words, “determine that the U.N. should succeed and serve the cause of peace for humankind, for the stakes are high.” I could not agree more with our former President.

So we will need a strong, principled voice at the United Nations who is committed to reforming and strengthening it. I firmly believe in a world where America works with our allies and partners, a world that is governed by just laws and institutions, a world where we champion our values, both at home and abroad. And in many ways, the United Nations is the premier international forum to engage in such activities.

Much will be said about your experience today, and I am concerned, I must say, about your lack of foreign policy experience, and we will talk a little bit more about that as we go through this hearing.

One area where I was particularly impressed with your leadership was when you publicly called for the removal of the Confederate flag from South Carolina’s State capitol, an effort that was ultimately successful. Your actions not only demonstrated your willingness to address hate and bigotry, but also your ability to build and work with coalitions, which will be critically important if confirmed to be our United Nations Ambassador.

It is my hope that your shrewd political sensibility, history of coalition and consensus building, and desire to undertake new challenges will help you in the early weeks and months of your tenure, should you be confirmed.

If confirmed, you will lead the fight for American values at the United Nations by standing up against violations of international humanitarian laws, against war crimes, against human rights violations, and against crackdowns on democracy and freedom of speech.

You will face complex challenges like today’s global humanitarian crisis. People are fleeing their homes on a scale not seen since World War II, all at a time when climate change, food insecurity, and water scarcities are increasing tensions and instability across the globe.

These are challenges that cut across borders that the United States alone cannot meet. The United Nations is uniquely placed to address these problems, and we must engage it robustly to advance America’s interests.

The United Nations and the global community need U.S. leadership promoting our core values. The United Nations’ failings are well known. Less known is what it gets right—vaccinating 40 percent of the world’s children; assisting more than 55 million refugees fleeing war, famine, and human rights abuses; providing food to 90 million people in 80 countries and maternal health work that has saved the lives of 30 million women. Many of us have traveled around the world, and we have seen the faces of people who are here today and families that are here today that would not have been but for the work of the United Nations.

The United Nations has also launched the Sustainable Development Goals, which, if fully embraced, could have a powerful impact globally on reducing human rights abuses, poverty, and poor gov-

ernance, in addition to reaching important benchmarks in women and children's health, economic development, and education. I was particularly proud to promote the U.S. leadership on Goal Number 16, which is a special and unprecedented international commitment to improving governance and reducing corruption, which are critically important to U.S. national security interests.

The SDGs, as they are known, are extraordinary and ambitious goals that can be achieved in concert with American diplomatic and development efforts. They represent among the best of what the United Nations can do as a convening power.

Another dimension of that convening power is the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. For 25 years, the nations of the world have come together to try to tackle the most existential threats to humanity, climate change. There has been substantial attention paid to the Paris Accords, and rightly so. But Governor Haley, I want to know your thoughts about America's larger role in climate diplomacy leadership around the world.

The United Nations can and must be more effective in dealing with challenges affecting the world order. U.S. leadership is essential. I do not believe we strengthen the United Nations by enacting across-the-board funding cuts to the United Nations, and yet I do believe we can all agree that the United Nations must do better in many areas. For it to achieve its full potential, it must change.

So let me share with you some areas where I hope we can work to reform and change the way the United Nations does its business. First, the United Nations must be fair. One of the persistent weaknesses across the U.N. system has been its biased and ugly approach to issues related to Israel. This must end.

The responsibility for doing so starts with the member states and our Ambassador, if confirmed, with your voice. The United States must continue to use its voice and its vote to call out and push back against resolutions and other actions that aim to isolate Israel, our unique ally in the Middle East. I remain deeply disappointed by the U.N. Security Council's passage of a blatantly one-sided resolution this December, and it is absolutely unacceptable, though telling, that the attendees at that session applauded after Resolution 2334's passage, underscoring the isolation and bias against Israel.

Second, Russia's cynical obstructionism in the United Nations Security Council must be addressed. I agree completely with Senator Corker. The war in Syria has resulted in more than 400,000 deaths and the displacement of millions. Russia has vetoed six U.N. Security Council resolutions that could have reduced the violence, further exposing the vulnerability of the international system to Russia's aggression.

Atrocities committed in Syria amount to war crimes, and those responsible must be held accountable. That is our role in the international community to make sure that, in fact, takes place.

Third, U.N. peacekeeping must be strengthened. United Nations peacekeepers deploy to conflicts around the world, and as a result, the United States does not have to do it alone. U.N. peacekeepers help end war, protect civilian populations, and secure territory. But troop quality and effectiveness must be increased, and the United Nations must aggressively address sexual exploitation and abuse

by U.N. peacekeepers. No other issue has so profoundly eroded the trust of local populations or the confidence of the international community.

Fourth, the United Nations must reform its internal management through simplification, flexibility, and decentralization. It must focus more on quality and less on process and on people rather than bureaucracy. It must be committed to building a culture of accountability and protection of whistleblowers.

I am confident that the U.S. has a strong partner in reform with the new Secretary-General. I agree again with Chairman Corker. I think that Secretary-General Guterres represents a strong leader who takes this position with a stronger background than any previous Secretary-General of the United Nations. He led the U.N. refugee agency. I urge you to work closely with the new Secretary-General in accomplishing the purposes that we need to accomplish.

Finally, we must shore up the U.N. humanitarian response system, which is under extraordinary stress. Brutal conflicts and violent extremism are devastating the lives of millions of people, but the international assistance being provided is not keeping up with the need and scale of the problem.

South Sudan is a tragic example of the struggles in the U.N., and the international system which is faced with corrupt, entrenched leaders who put their interests and lives ahead of the people with devastating results. Tens of thousands are dead, and millions are being displaced, and are hungry and vulnerable.

The Security Council members must resolve to use the U.N. as a platform and a voice to speak up for the people whose voices often go unheard as well as those working hard on the front lines. We must do so not merely because it is the right thing to do—the United States has a profound moral obligation to lead on these issues—but also because it is squarely in our national interest to do this. The United States is better served when we address these issues through the United Nations than to face it alone.

For all of its shortcomings and, more importantly, for all of the unsung good that it does, it is almost impossible to imagine a world without the U.N. For 70 years, it is where the world has come together to reaffirm norms and values and work through the most pressing shared challenges facing humanity.

Our national security is strengthened when we are at the table at the United Nations, and the United Nations is more effective when American leadership and values are on display. In a time when the world is in turmoil, it is in the interest of the American people for the United States to support and maintain cultural alliances, and institutions that create stability—they are more important today than ever before. We have already seen instability and unrest bring crisis to our own doors.

In addition to the United Nations, there should be little debate about the essential role of the Euro-Atlantic institutions in maintaining peace and security in Europe and elsewhere since the end of World War II. In the 20th century, Europe has been divided by wars and rivalries. Today, Europe faces its challenges, but the progress in creating a stable and free Europe through such institutions as NATO, the EU, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe has contributed immeasurably to European

peace, stability, and prosperity and to the American strength, well-being, and leadership in the world as well. The vitality and endurance of these institutions serve the interests of the United States.

So let me just mention one last point. I was particularly disturbed by President-elect Trump's comments over the weekend about NATO as being obsolete, repeating a statement he had made earlier. Vladimir Putin wishes it were, but it is not.

So I am anxious to hear your views, Governor Haley, on NATO, on the importance of our alliances. We need to be reassuring our allies, not threatening to abandon them. With a strong and sustained U.S. leadership, the United Nations will continue to be the indispensable force for a better world. America's Ambassador to the U.N. is essential to that effort.

Governor Haley, I will look forward to hearing from you today and learning more about your vision as to how the United Nations can better serve the international community.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you, Senator Cardin.

As I listened to your analysis of the United Nations, much of which I agree to, I know that being the United Nations Ambassador is really more about reform and causing something that is dysfunctional to function. And in many ways, having a Governor, a Governor with your energies could well be again a very—a very inspired choice.

I know you have a number of family members here. I have noticed members always treat nominees with much greater kindness when their family members are with them. If you would like to introduce them, you are welcome to do so.

We look forward to your opening comments and questions. Again, thank you for being willing to serve in this capacity.

STATEMENT OF HON. NIMRATA “NIKKI” HALEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, NOMINATED TO BE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Senator Cardin, for your comments. And I certainly look forward to discussing all of those things with you and the rest of the committee.

I do have my family behind me because I have never been able to do anything without the support of my family.

And so, to my left, I have my favorite younger brother, Gogi Randhawa, who owns his own business and is an entrepreneur.

I have my parents, Dr. and Mrs. Randhawa, who reminded my brothers, my sister, and me every day how blessed we were to live in this country.

I have my amazing husband, but also the coolest first man ever, but he is also a combat veteran. Michael is behind me. And next to him is one of my pride and joy kids, and that is Nalin, who is wearing a suit today, which he would prefer not wearing, but he does have his basketball shoes on.

[Laughter.]

Governor HALEY. So I pick and choose my battles as a mom.

I have my in-laws, Bill and Carole Haley, who have been an amazing support to me and a second set of parents to us as we have gone through struggles.

And then I have my favorite older brother, Mitti Randhawa, who is also a combat veteran, and his wife, Sonya.

And then I have lots of friends behind them as well, and so I told them if I started to mess up, one of them needed to act like a protester. So we will see if that—

[Laughter.]

Governor HALEY [continuing]. If that happens.

The CHAIRMAN. I think she is going to do very well at the United Nations.

[Laughter.]

Governor HALEY. So, with that, I would like to say, Chairman Corker, Ranking Member Cardin, distinguished members of the committee, I come before you today both humbled and honored to be considered to represent the United States of America at the United Nations.

Just as other nominees for this position have done, I am here to outline my vision and discuss my qualifications. My story is an American story. I was born in Bamberg, South Carolina, the daughter of immigrant parents from Punjab, India. My parents had comfortable lives in India, but they chose to give up those comforts and move to America with just \$8 in their pockets because of the freedoms and the opportunities this country offers.

Our family's experience is unique, but it is also familiar because it is one that has been repeated many times by many people in American history. Growing up in a small rural community in the South, our family was different. We were not white enough to be white. We were not black enough to be black. My father wore a turban. My mother wore a sari.

Our new neighbors did not quite know what to make of us. So we did face challenges, but those challenges paled next to the abundance of opportunities in front of us.

My dad was a professor at a small historically black college. My mom was a social studies teacher and started a clothing store from scratch. I started doing the books for the family business when I was 13. It was not until I got to college that I realized that was not normal. But it was normal to me. In my family, we worked.

I was also privileged to take advantage of the educational opportunities that America affords, and I am painfully aware that the chance for 13-year-old girls to read and learn and grow is something that does not exist in far too many places around the world today.

I went on to serve in the South Carolina General Assembly and to be elected and re-elected Governor of the Palmetto State. Serving the people of South Carolina has been the greatest honor of my life. During the 6 years of my governorship, our State has faced many challenges. But South Carolina today is stronger economically and more united culturally than it has ever been before, and I could not be more proud.

While South Carolina will always be my home, I am eager to begin this new chapter. International diplomacy is a new area for me. There is much I am learning about the intricacies of the U.N.

and its associated agencies. I do not claim that I know everything or that leadership at the U.N. is the same as leading South Carolina.

But diplomacy itself is not new to me. In fact, I would suggest there is nothing more important to a Governor's success than her ability to unite those with different backgrounds, viewpoints, and objectives behind a common purpose. For 6 years, that has been my work day after day, in times of celebration and in times of great tragedy.

I have negotiated deals with some of the largest corporations in the world and convinced them to make South Carolina their home. I have been the chief executive of a government with more than 67,000 employees and an annual budget of more than \$26 billion. And we have achieved real results. South Carolina is a different, stronger, better place than it was 6 years ago.

Like most government agencies, the United Nations could benefit from a fresh set of eyes. I will take an outsider's look at the institution. As I have in every challenge in my life, I will come to the U.N. to work and to work smart.

I will bring a firm message to the U.N. that U.S. leadership is essential to the world. It is essential for the advancement of humanitarian goals and for the advancement of America's national interests. When America fails to lead, the world becomes a dangerous place. And when the world becomes more dangerous, the American people become more vulnerable.

At the U.N., as elsewhere, the United States is the indispensable voice of freedom. It is time that we once again find that voice.

The job of U.N. Ambassador is different from being Governor, but there is one essential element of leadership that is the same, and that is accountability. A leader must be accountable to the people she serves. Should you confirm me as Ambassador, I will be accountable, first and foremost, to the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, accountability means being honest with ourselves. As I appear before you today, when we look at the United Nations, we see a checkered history. The U.N. and its specialized agencies have had numerous successes. Its health and food programs have saved millions of lives. Its weapons monitoring efforts have provided us with vital security information. Its peacekeeping missions have at times performed valuable services.

However, any honest assessment also finds an institution that is often at odds with the American national interests and American taxpayers. Nowhere has the U.N.'s failure been more consistent and more outrageous than it is—than its bias against our close ally, Israel.

In the General Assembly session just completed, the U.N. adopted 20 resolutions against Israel and only 6 targeting the rest of the world's countries combined. In the past 10 years, the Human Rights Council has passed 62 resolutions condemning the reasonable actions Israel takes to defend its security.

Meanwhile, the world's worst human rights abusers in Syria, Iran, and North Korea received far fewer condemnations. This cannot continue.

It is in this context that the events of December 23rd were so damaging. Last month's passage of U.N. Resolution 2334 was a ter-

rible mistake, making a peace agreement with the Israelis and the Palestinians even harder to achieve. The mistake was compounded by the location in which it took place in light of the U.N.'s long history of anti-Israel bias.

I was the first Governor in America to sign legislation combating the anti-Israel Boycott, Divest, and Sanctions, or the BDS movement. I will not go to New York and abstain when the U.N. seeks to create an international environment that encourages boycotts of Israel.

In fact, I pledge to you this. I will never abstain when the United Nations takes any action that comes in direct conflict with the interests and values of the United States.

In the matter of human rights, Mr. Chairman, whether it is the love of my family's and America's immigrant heritage or the removal of a painful symbol of an oppressive past in South Carolina, I have a clear understanding that it is not acceptable to stay silent when our values are challenged. I will be a strong voice for American principles and American interests, even if that is not what other U.N. representatives want to hear. The time has come for American strength once again.

There are other elements of accountability as well. As Governor, the South Carolina constitution required me to report annually to the people of my State on how their security and prosperity were being advanced by their government. In fact, I gave that State of the State address just one week ago.

I was able to tell the citizens of South Carolina that we now invest more dollars in public education than ever before, that our reserves have doubled while our debt service has been cut in half, and more South Carolinians are working today than ever in the history of our State.

Without fundamental changes at the U.N., I cannot envision making the same kind of report to the American people as their Ambassador. We contribute 22 percent of the U.N.'s budget, far more than any other country. We are a generous nation. But we must ask ourselves what good is being accomplished by this disproportionate contribution? Are we getting what we pay for?

To your credit, the Congress has already begun to explore ways the United States can use its leverage to make the United Nations a better investment for the American people. I applaud your efforts, and I look forward to working with you to bring seriously needed change to the U.N. If I am confirmed, I will need you, and I hope to have your support.

In short, Mr. Chairman, my goal for the United Nations will be to create an international body that better serves the interests of the American people. After the passage of the infamous U.N. resolution equating Zionism with racism in 1975, U.S. Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan came to the unsettling realization that, as he put it, "If there were no General Assembly, this could never have happened."

Today, over 40 years later, more and more Americans are becoming convinced by actions like the passage of Resolution 2334 that the United Nations does more harm than good. The American people see the U.N.'s mistreatment of Israel, its failure to prevent the

North Korean nuclear threat, its waste and corruption, and they are fed up.

My job, our job is to reform the U.N. in ways that will rebuild the confidence of the American people. We must build an international institution that honors America's commitment to freedom, democracy, and human rights. I hope this can be done. I believe it is possible. And I know that if you confirm me, I will do all I can to see that that happens.

Some say we live in cynical and distrustful times, but I believe we all carry in our hearts a bit of idealism that animated the creation of the United Nations. I know I do.

With your blessing, I will represent our great country in this international forum. I will do it in ways that I hope bring honor to our country, our values, and our national interests.

Thank you very much for your time.

[The Governor Haley's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR HALEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Chairman Corker, Ranking Member Cardin, distinguished members of the committee, I come before you today both humbled and honored to be considered to represent the United States of America at the United Nations. Just as other nominees for this position have done, I am here to outline my vision and discuss my qualifications.

My story is an American story. I was born in Bamberg, South Carolina, the daughter of immigrants from Punjab, India. My parents had comfortable lives in India, but they chose to give up those comforts and move to America with just eight dollars because of the freedoms and opportunities this country offers. Our family's experience is unique, but it is also familiar, because it is one that has been repeated many times, by many people, in American history.

Growing up in a small rural community in the South, our family was different. We were not white enough to be white, not black enough to be black. My father wore a turban, my mother a sari. Our new neighbors didn't quite know what to make of us, and so we faced challenges. But those challenges paled next to the abundance of opportunities in front of us.

My Dad was a professor at a small, historically black college. My Mom was a social studies teacher and started a clothing store from scratch. I started doing the books for the family business when I was thirteen. It wasn't until I got to college that I realized that wasn't normal, but it was normal to me—in my family, we worked. I was also privileged to take advantage of the educational opportunities America affords. I am painfully aware that the chance for thirteen-year old girls to read and learn and grow is something that does not exist in far too many places around the world today.

I went on to serve in the South Carolina General Assembly and to be elected and reelected governor of the Palmetto state. Serving the people of South Carolina has been the greatest honor of my life. During the six years of my governorship, our state has faced many challenges, but South Carolina today is stronger economically and more united culturally than it has ever been before. I couldn't be more proud.

While South Carolina will always be my home, I am eager to begin this new chapter.

International diplomacy is a new area for me. There is much I am learning about the intricacies of the U.N. and its associated agencies. I don't claim that I know everything, or that leadership at the U.N. is the same as leading South Carolina.

But diplomacy itself is not new to me. In fact, I would suggest there is nothing more important to a governor's success than her ability to unite those with different backgrounds, viewpoints, and objectives behind a common purpose. For six years that has been my work, day after day, in times of celebration and in times of great tragedy.

I have negotiated deals with some of the largest corporations in the world, and convinced them to make South Carolina their home. I have been the Chief Executive of a government with more than 67,000 employees and an annual budget of more than \$26 billion. And we have achieved real results. South Carolina is a different, stronger, better place than it was six years ago.

Like most government agencies, the United Nations could benefit from a fresh set of eyes. I will take an outsider's look at the institution. As I have in every challenge in my life, I will come to the U.N. to work—and to work smart.

I will bring a firm message to the U.N. that U.S. leadership is essential in the world. It is essential for the advancement of humanitarian goals, and for the advancement of America's national interests. When America fails to lead, the world becomes a more dangerous place. And when the world becomes more dangerous, the American people become more vulnerable. At the U.N., as elsewhere, the United States is the indispensable voice of freedom. It is time that we once again find that voice.

The job of U.N. Ambassador is different from being a governor, but there is one essential element of leadership that is the same, and that is accountability. A leader must be accountable to the people she serves. Should you confirm me as Ambassador, I will be accountable, first and foremost, to the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, accountability means being honest with ourselves. As I appear before you today, when we look at the United Nations, we see a checkered history.

The U.N. and its specialized agencies have had numerous successes. Its health and food programs have saved millions of lives. Its weapons monitoring efforts have provided us with vital security information. Its peacekeeping missions have, at times, performed valuable services.

However, any honest assessment also finds an institution that is often at odds with American national interests and American taxpayers.

Nowhere has the U.N.'s failure been more consistent and more outrageous than in its bias against our close ally Israel. In the General Assembly session just completed, the U.N. adopted twenty resolutions against Israel and only six targeting the rest of the world's countries combined. In the past ten years, the Human Rights Council has passed 62 resolutions condemning the reasonable actions Israel takes to defend its security. Meanwhile the world's worst human rights abusers in Syria, Iran, and North Korea received far fewer condemnations.

This cannot continue.

It is in this context that the events of December 23 were so damaging. Last month's passage of U.N. Resolution 2334 was a terrible mistake, making a peace agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians harder to achieve. The mistake was compounded by the location in which it took place, in light of the U.N.'s long history of anti-Israel bias.

I was the first governor in America to sign legislation combatting the anti-Israel Boycott, Divest, and Sanction, or "BDS" movement. I will not go to New York and abstain when the U.N. seeks to create an international environment that encourages boycotts of Israel. In fact, I pledge to you this: I will never abstain when the United Nations takes any action that comes in direct conflict with the interests and values of the United States.

In the matter of human rights, Mr. Chairman, whether it's the love of my family's and America's immigrant heritage, or the removal of a painful symbol of an oppressive past in South Carolina, I have a clear understanding that it is not acceptable to stay silent when our values are challenged. I will be a strong voice for American principles and American interests, even if that is not what other U.N. representatives want to hear. The time has come for American strength once again.

There are other elements of accountability as well.

As governor, the South Carolina constitution required me to report annually to the people of my state on how their security and prosperity were being advanced by their government. In fact, I gave that State of the State address just one week ago. I was able to tell the citizens of South Carolina that we now invest more dollars in public education than ever before, that our reserves have doubled while our debt service has been cut in half, and that more South Carolinians are working today than at any point in our state's history.

Without fundamental changes at the U.N., I cannot envision making the same kind of report to the American people as their Ambassador. We contribute 22 percent of the U.N.'s budget, far more than any other country. We are a generous nation. But we must ask ourselves what good is being accomplished by this disproportionate contribution. Are we getting what we pay for?

To your credit, the Congress has already begun to explore ways the United States can use its leverage to make the United Nations a better investment for the American people. I applaud your efforts, and I look forward to working with you to bring seriously needed change to the U.N. If I'm confirmed, I will need you, and I hope to have your support.

In short, Mr. Chairman, my goal for the United Nations will be to create an international body that better serves the interests of the American people.

After the passage of the infamous U.N. resolution equating Zionism with racism in 1975, U.S. Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan came to the unsettling realization that, as he put it, "if there were no General Assembly, this could never have happened." Today, over forty years later, more and more Americans are becoming convinced by actions like the passage of Resolution 2334 that the United Nations does more harm than good. The American people see the U.N.'s mistreatment of Israel, its failure to prevent the North Korean nuclear threat, its waste and corruption, and they are fed up.

My job—our job—is to reform the U.N. in ways that rebuild the confidence of the American people. We must build an international institution that honors America's commitment to freedom, democracy, and human rights.

I hope this can be done. I believe it is possible. And I know that if you confirm me, I will do all I can to see that it happens.

Some say we live in cynical and distrustful times. But I believe we all carry in our hearts a bit of the idealism that animated the creation of the United Nations. I know I do.

With your blessing, I will represent our great country in this international forum. I will do it in ways that I hope bring honor to our country, our values, and our national interests.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for those comments.

We will begin a 7-minute round, including answers from the nominee, and we will start with Senator Cardin and go to Senator Johnson.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Haley, first of all, thank you for your presentation. I find it very encouraging, very refreshing. You have hit points that I strongly agree with—about not staying silent when our values are challenged. You indicated that to me when we were together in my office—and made your point about America being the indispensable voice of freedom.

So I am very encouraged by your statement. So let me get specific, if I might, and talk a little bit about Russia. Russia certainly has not been a voice for freedom under President Putin.

A free country has free and fair elections and does not interfere with other countries' free and fair elections. Russia has not only interfered with our elections, they are interfering with other elections, including in Europe.

A country that believes in freedom allows civil societies to function. It allows opposition a fair opportunity. Mr. Putin imprisons his opponents and kills them, if need be.

A free country does not invade another country and take over territory. Russia has invaded not just Ukraine but is in Georgia and Moldova and other countries.

My first question to you, involves speaking up when you say that you will and your statement that staying silent is not an option, so speak to me about Mr. Putin and Russia.

Governor HALEY. Well, thank you, Senator Cardin, for that question, and I think that Russia is going to continue to be at the forefront of a lot of issues that we have to deal with.

What I will tell you is Russia is trying to show their muscle right now. It is what they do. And I think we always have to be cautious. I do not think that we can trust them. I think that we have to make sure that we try and see what we can get from them before we give to them.

They certainly have done some terrible atrocities when you look at things in Syria and how they are working with Iran, and I think that we have to continue to be very strong back and show them

what this new administration is going to be. And it is going to be an America that shows exactly where we stand, what we are for, what we are against, and how we are going to proceed.

And I think that we need to let them know we are not okay with what happened in Ukraine and Crimea and what is happening in Syria, but we are also going to tell them that we do need their help with ISIS and with some other threats that we all share, that we have to move forward.

Senator CARDIN. Does Russia have legitimacy in Crimea?

Governor HALEY. I do not think—I think what we saw with Crimea and Ukraine is a big concern because I think it is Russia trying to make sure that they are inserting themselves in places that they want to continue to insert themselves. The problem is there is no boundaries with Russia. They do not have boundaries. They consider that whatever they want, they will.

It is the same thing with NATO. They do not want to see NATO become stronger or more powerful.

Senator CARDIN. But the EU and the United States have made it clear they will never recognize Russia's incursion into Crimea. Do you agree that Crimea is Ukraine? It is not Russia.

Governor HALEY. I do, and I think that we have to make that very clear to them. And I think that is what we have to show is our disappointment in those things.

Senator CARDIN. And talk to me a little bit about the sanctions we currently have against Russia.

Governor HALEY. We do.

Senator CARDIN. We have been able to get Europe to go along with those sanctions.

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator CARDIN. Do you agree that those sanctions should not be at all reduced or eliminated until Russia complies with the Minsk Agreement?

Governor HALEY. I think that Russia has to have positive actions before we lift any sanctions on Russia.

Senator CARDIN. Some of us have filed legislation to strengthen the sanction regime against Russia—getting additional tools, additional power to impose additional sanctions. Do you support additional sanctions if Russia does not change its behavior?

Governor HALEY. I think that what I do believe is important is that we get together with the National Security Council and the President-elect, and we decide a plan for Russia—what we expect from them, what we plan on looking at as we go forward, what violations will trigger additional sanctions. And when we say it, we should do it and follow through with it.

Senator CARDIN. The Philippines have been an ally of us for a long time. Under their current president, they have sanctioned extrajudicial killings. People have been killed that have not gone through court proceedings because they are suspected of using drugs. Do you agree that that violates basic human rights?

Governor HALEY. I am sorry. I missed the first part of that question.

Senator CARDIN. The President Duterte of Philippines—

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator CARDIN [continuing]. Has sanctioned extrajudicial killings.

Governor HALEY. Right.

Senator CARDIN. Does that violate basic human rights?

Governor HALEY. It does, yes.

Senator CARDIN. And you are prepared to speak up about that in the United Nations?

Governor HALEY. Yes, I am. I am prepared to speak up on anything that goes against American values, and the American values is something that we should talk loudly about all the time to all countries because I think it is the values that we hold dear, and it is at the core of what the United States American heart is all about. We have always been the moral compass of the world, and we need to continue to act out and vocalize that as we go forward.

Senator CARDIN. I mentioned the Sustainable Development Goal 16, good governance. I talked to you about expanding that so that the United States' leadership in good governance, fighting corruption, would use the model that we have used in regards to fighting modern-day slavery and trafficking. Will you work with us and in your role in the United Nations to strengthen the U.S. role in fighting corruption globally?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. I think that is who we are as Americans, and I think that is what we need to do to make sure that we continue to fight corruption. Because if we fight corruption, we will move closer to peace.

Senator CARDIN. There has been some suggestion of a national registry for subgroups of Americans. It has been talked about in regards to Muslim Americans that perhaps there should be a registry. Could you just tell us your view as to whether it is acceptable to have a registry for subgroups of Americans?

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator Cardin, for that question because I think it goes to maybe some discussions that had been had by President-elect Trump early on, and this administration and I do not think there should be any registry based on religion. I think what we do need to do is make sure that we know exactly which countries are a threat, which ones have terrorism, and those are the ones that we need to watch and be careful and vet as we go forward in terms of who comes into the country.

Senator CARDIN. I understand vetting people who come to America. I am talking about American citizens. Is there any justification for any registry of subgroups of Americans?

Governor HALEY. No, there is not.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Johnson.

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor HALEY. Good morning.

Senator JOHNSON. Governor Haley, welcome.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator JOHNSON. I want to thank you for your willingness to serve. The testimony from your State Senators and outlined in your own testimony here, you have been a very effective leader in South Carolina. So you are obviously going to be leaving a State you love,

a job you have performed well in, taking on a pretty significant challenge.

It is striking, quite honestly, to listen to the chairman lay out point by point how ineffective the U.N. has been, how Ranking Member Cardin says that the U.N. must change. It must be fair. People must be held accountable.

In your testimony, you point out going back 40 years, then-Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan said if there were no General Assembly, this could never have happened.

So you are taking on a challenge here to reform a U.N. that has been unreformable. Do you have a game plan for doing so?

Governor HALEY. It is what I have done all my life. I love to fix things, and I see a U.N. that can absolutely be fixed. There are reforms that need to be taken place in a lot of different areas. There are things that the U.N. does well, and we talked about the food and health organizations, what they have done with the AIDS epidemic. All of those things have been very good.

But we have to look at certain issues. If you look at we have 16 peacekeeping operations. Some are very successful. Some are not. And we need to go back and look at when we get into a mission, what is the end goal? Is it happening? Do we need to shift and do things differently, or do we need to pull out?

You look at Sierra Leone, and you see it started off rocky, but it ended up very strong. If we look at South Sudan, it is terrible. But you also have to look that we are not getting cooperation from their own government, and that requires us to go back and look at that and see what can be salvaged from that.

So I see peacekeeping reform from the standpoint of not just those issues, also when it comes to the whistleblower issues. We have seen fraud. We have seen sexual exploitation. We have seen corruption of all kinds. And the whistleblower protections are not strong enough. People are still too afraid to speak up.

We need to make sure that the countries that are contributing troops hold those troops accountable when they go and make these violations. That is not happening, and they need to understand that if we have to pull out their country's troops altogether, we will do that. Because many of those countries actually make money off of the peacekeeping missions.

And so I do see lots of areas of reform that need to happen, but that is where I thrive. That is what I look forward to is making real change at the U.N.

Senator JOHNSON. So to a certain extent, what you are describing is shining light on these situations, sexual exploitation, highlighting that to hopefully effect change and reform. In testimony, you also talked about leverage, and that would be the funding that the U.S. provides.

Would you have a particular game plan in terms of how we would use U.N.—or U.S. funding to the U.N. to gain that leverage to actually enact some reforms that, again, that have been pretty hard to enact over the last 40 years?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. I think that we need to go into every part of the organizations of the U.N., but one in particular is you can look at the Human Rights Council, and you have to really question what is the goal of the Human Rights Council when

they allow Cuba and China to serve on those? They basically are protecting their own interests while they are going after other countries to make sure that they give them a hard time.

And so do we want to be a part of that? Do we want to leverage funding for that and say we do not want to do that? We have done that with UNESCO before, and we have also—you know, we have got decisions to make on those types of organizations.

And so I do think it can be leveraged, and I do think it is something that we should be open about, and it is something I look forward to exploring further.

Senator JOHNSON. So you will not shy away from threatening and actually enacting, withholding U.S. funding to get real reforms out of the U.N.?

Governor HALEY. I will not shy away, and I need your help to do it. Because I need to be able to say that I have Congress backing me up, saying that if this does not change, the funding will stop. And I think that that could be great leverage.

Senator JOHNSON. I agree with your assessment of the real harm, the damage of the most recent anti-Israel resolution. What can we do to repair the damage? Have you given that any thought?

Governor HALEY. I have given it a lot of thought, and I think it is going to take time, and I think it is going to take effort by more than just me.

First, we need to go and make sure that we let Israel know that we are an ally and that we will be an ally, and it is important because what happened with Resolution 2334, it basically said that being an ally to the United States does not mean anything. And if we are a strong ally, if we always stand with them, more countries will want to be our allies, and those that challenge us will think twice before they challenge us.

What we saw with 2334 was it not only sent a bad signal to Israel, it told the entire world that we do not stand with anyone. And I think that that was a terrible mistake, and we have to come out strong. We have to be incredibly vocal. We need to probably fight harder than we have fought before.

And it will not just be me. It needs to be from this Congress. It needs to be from the National Security Council. It needs to be from the President-elect, and we need to speak with one voice.

Senator JOHNSON. I was in Israel the Sunday before that resolution, and I had about an hour-long meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu, and we talked about that. Tried to push back on it, but I do not think there is anything we could have done to deter this administration from basically poking a stick in his eye and Israel's eye.

I certainly saw the consulate there in Jerusalem. Have you taken a position, would you support moving the embassy from Tel Aviv into that consulate? It is really just a matter of changing a sign.

Governor HALEY. Absolutely.

Senator JOHNSON. Is that something you—would that be one of the actions we can take to repair the damage of that resolution?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. Not only is that what Israel wants, but this Congress has also said that that is what they support.

Senator JOHNSON. So we have talked about U.N. reforms. We have talked about repairing the damage of that U.N. What other

priorities, moving into this position, would you really concentrate on?

Governor HALEY. I think the biggest part is how we represent America going forward. We need to represent our country from a point of strength. We need to remind the rest of the world that we are the moral compass of the world, and we need to express our values as we go forward.

We need to let them know that we are not one that is going to be gray anymore. When we say something, that is where we stand. And when we say we are going to do something, we need to follow through and do that.

And I think that we—the strength that we show from the beginning and the way we handle it through our actions and my work with the Security Council and how we move forward dealing with other countries is going to do that.

Senator JOHNSON. Well, again, Governor Haley, thank you for being willing to serve. We look forward to working with you to effect those reforms.

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Menendez.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And Governor Haley, congratulations on your nomination.

Governor HALEY. Thank you. Good morning.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you for stopping by to visit with me. I think everybody here is impressed by your personal and professional story, and certainly, nobody doubts your commitment to public service.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator MENENDEZ. However, the world in which we live in is complex, and the United Nations is an enormous organization with a wide mandate in which we have to carefully navigate our own interests, those of our allies, confront direct and indirect threats, and build consensus around some of the most confounding and complex problems.

So with that in mind, I would like to ask you a broad set of questions. I think some of these can be yes or noes, others may require a little bit more of an answer, and then move to some specific areas.

Do you believe it is in the national interests and security of the United States to continue to preserve and promote the international rules-based order that we created after World War II?

Governor HALEY. In terms of—

Senator MENENDEZ. Of our national interests and security, to continue to promote and preserve the international order and rules-based structure we created after World War II?

Governor HALEY. Yes, sir. I do.

Senator MENENDEZ. Do you believe that as part of that rules-based structure, the inviolability of borders and territorial sovereignty is an essential part of that?

Governor HALEY. I think that—are you referencing Israel and the Palestinian Authority, or are you—

Senator MENENDEZ. No. I am just saying in general, as part of the rules-based order, do we—do you believe that the inviolability

of borders of a nation and its territorial sovereignty is an essential element of that?

Governor HALEY. I do.

Senator MENENDEZ. Okay. And do you believe that there should be serious consequences for violation of the international order?

Governor HALEY. Again, I believe it is up to the circumstance, but yes.

Senator MENENDEZ. Okay. So when you say "up to the circumstance," what circumstances of violations of the international order would you believe there are not serious consequences for, and which ones should there be serious consequences for?

Governor HALEY. So I think with every situation, it is important that we discuss it with the National Security Council, with the President-elect, and we have a plan. What we do not want is knee-jerk reactions. What we do not want is just quick answers to things. We should have a plan on every situation so that we know what our end goal is and what our mission is.

Senator MENENDEZ. I would hope that there are some things that are so overarching that we do not have to convene the National Security Council to say that is a violation of the international order. For example, do you believe that Russia violated the international order when it annexed Crimea and invaded Ukraine?

Governor HALEY. Yes, I do.

Senator MENENDEZ. Do you believe there should be serious consequences for such actions?

Governor HALEY. I think there should be consequences that we say, but if we are going to do that, we need to follow through on them and make sure they happen.

Senator MENENDEZ. I agree with you. We should always follow through. But you do believe there should be serious consequences for violating that.

Governor HALEY. Yes. Yes.

Senator MENENDEZ. So in that regard, we have a series of sanctions that have been levied against Russia. Many members of this committee and others in a bipartisan basis have been promoting a new round of sanctions because of what they have continued to do in that regard, what they have done in Syria, what they have done in trying to interfere in our own domestic elections.

And my question to you is do you believe that those sanctions that are there should be preserved until there is a dramatic change by Russia? Do you believe that they should be enhanced? Knowing what we know today, forgetting about what may happen tomorrow, what is your view on sanctions as it relates to Russia?

Governor HALEY. I certainly think they should be preserved, and I do not think they should be lifted unless we have seen a strong change from the Russian government.

Senator MENENDEZ. Okay. Do you believe that Russia committed war crimes when it ultimately indiscriminately bombed civilians in Aleppo and hospitals in Aleppo?

Governor HALEY. Yes, I do.

Senator MENENDEZ. Let me ask you this. When you sat with the President-elect, I assume that in taking this role that has a global magnitude to it, you had some discussions about what the role would be like and what not. Did you discuss Russia with him?

Governor HALEY. We discussed, basically, the international situation, and I think that the President-elect is coming in, again, with a fresh set of eyes. He wants to look at each and every country. He wants to look at all of the threats that face us, and I think that he wants to work with the national security team to come up with a plan with each and every one.

Senator MENENDEZ. Did you specifically discuss Russia with him, though, as part of that?

Governor HALEY. Russia came up. Yes, it did. Just from the standpoint of that we were going to have issues with Russia.

Senator MENENDEZ. Uh-huh. There were no greater specificity than that?

Governor HALEY. No, sir. There was not.

Senator MENENDEZ. Did you discuss China?

Governor HALEY. Yes, we did.

Senator MENENDEZ. Uh-huh. And in what context was that discussion?

Governor HALEY. The same thing. Just it was more about the issues that we had and the countries we were going to have them with, but it did not go into detail as to what those were going to be.

Senator MENENDEZ. These two countries obviously are Security Council members——

Governor HALEY. Yes, they are.

Senator MENENDEZ [continuing]. And part of your challenge is getting them not to be using their vetoes in ways that actually have undermined, in my view, the international order versus promote it. You know, I totally agree with you when in your opening statement you said U.S. leadership is essential in the world, essential for the advancement of humanitarian goals, advancement of America's national interests, and when we fail to lead, the world becomes a more dangerous place.

But I read some of the President-elect's comments that seem nothing short of denigrating towards our international commitments and international organizations like the U.N. I could read a litany of tweets, but I will just choose two. "When do you see the United Nations solving problems? They do not. They cause problems." Then at the flip side of that, he says "China is filling the vacuum left by Obama at the U.N."

So it is either an entity that is worthy of being used to help promote U.S. national interests and security interests, or it is not. And if you are worried about "China filling the vacuum," it is because there is something worthwhile to pursue because you do not care about losing and having a vacuum filled if the entity is of no value.

So my question is how do you reconcile those comments with concerns that if the United States pulls back at the U.N. that China will fill the void? Have you talked to the President-elect about the value and the effort that you are willing to undertake, leave your governorship and go to undertake in terms of making the U.N. as a strong institution that will promote our national security?

Governor HALEY. I have talked to the President-elect about that, and when this position came up, he said that he wanted me to have a very strong voice in the U.N. And he wanted us to have a higher profile in the U.N. and to really use it to work, and so I do think

that, obviously, you know, any comments that the President-elect has made, those are his comments.

What I will tell you from my standpoint is I think that we need to go back to what the U.N. was intended to be. And we host the U.N., and that should give us great leverage in the way that we handle that. We are going to be dealing with some tough partners on the Security Council, you know, whether it is China, whether it is Russia, those that do veto. But we also have to remember, we have a veto. So we can keep bad things from happening.

The other side of that is we still need both those countries. We are going to need their help. We need China's help when it comes to North Korea. We need Russia's help when it comes to ISIS. We have got to find ways to let them know when we disagree with them, we should not be afraid to say when we disagree with them.

When we need to work with them, we should tell them exactly what the end goal is and how we need to work with them. And the way we will get those vetoes not to happen is to show how it is in their best interests for their country to make sure they do that.

You see China right now pulling away from North Korea a bit because they see the missiles that are being built. They know what is happening, and we just have to encourage them this is not good for China. And then when you do that, that is when we can start seeing more pressure being put on North Korea.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Gardner.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Governor for—

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator GARDNER [continuing]. Your willingness to serve. And thank you to your family for being here today. And thank you for your leadership during a time of shame in this country and tragedy in South Carolina. You made America proud for your action.

Governor HALEY. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Senator GARDNER. Last week we had an opportunity to hear from Rex Tillerson, the nominee for Secretary of State, who talked about the importance of U.S. global leadership.

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator GARDNER. We had a great interaction about the need for the U.S. to share our values around the globe because nobody else will do it. In his testimony, he talked about security. He talked about liberty. He talked about prosperity and the great need to share those values because, in his words, he said, "We are the only country able to protect—to project those values with authority."

In 1950 in the observance of the fifth anniversary of the creation of the United Nations, President Truman stated that, "The United Nations represents the idea of a universal morality, superior to the interest of individual nations. Its foundation does not rest upon power or privilege. It rests upon faith. They rest upon the faith of men and human values, upon the belief that men in every land hold the same high ideals and strive toward the same goals for peace and justice. This faith is deeply held by the people of the United States of America, and, I believe, by the peoples of all other countries."

It seems like we have a United Nations today composed of people that are pretty far from the idea and the vision that President Truman outlined. It is this idea of faith of men and human values. The faith of men and human values apparently in Russia is illegal annexation of Crimea. Human values to North Korea means torturing its own people, 200,000 people in political concentration camps. Values—human values in Iran mean the leading sponsor of terrorism around the globe.

The United Nations recently, as we have talked about here, passage of Resolution 2334, and I encourage everybody here to watch the video of the reaction of the Security Council after the United States abstained from our leadership. Raucous applause broke out in the Security Council. Contrast that with the passage of Resolution 2270 at the Security Council, passage of a sanction against North Korea that has hundreds of thousands of people in political concentration camps killing its own people, torturing its own people, starving its own people, and there was silence. The world apparently applauds when we attack our ally, but sits by silently when we condemn dictators.

So, to you, Governor Haley, how does the United States continue to project our values in the absence that we have shown the last eight years to assure that we are going to be indeed working with the world on those ideas that Rex Tillerson laid out of security, prosperity, and liberty?

Governor HALEY. You know, I think that so much of this goes back to the fact that the world has seen us gray. They have not seen a black and white of where we stand and where we do not stand. We need to stand, and we need to stand strong. The world wants to see a strong America. That is what they were used to. That has faded, and it hit the ultimate low with Resolution 2334, because when it shows that we will not will not even stand with our allies, that is a sad day in America, and it is a sad day for us in the world.

I do think that what we will now start to do is show our strength. We will not be afraid to stand up. When we decide to make an action, we are going to follow through with it, and we are going to make sure that that is known. And I do not think we will be shy about the values of America and about what we are trying to achieve in bringing peace to the world. And we have to be loud and strong about that, and I intend to do that.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you, Governor Haley. And we have talked about the importance of projecting that strength of leadership.

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator GARDNER. And I want to talk a little bit about alliances. Your role is particularly important to be the face and voice of the United States and that commitment to our allies. Organizations, alliances, such as NATO, matter, and matters greatly. And so, is it—is it your commitment to strengthen our global alliance, strengthen alliances like NATO through the work that you carry out at the United Nations?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. We need as many allies and alliances as we can possibly get. At this point, it is not a numbers game. It is about addition because if we go and do sanctions, sanc-

tions just by the U.S. does not work. Sanctions when we combine and work with alliances, that makes progress. And so, so much of what I look forward to doing is not just expressing the ideals of the United States and where we stand and the agreements and disagreements that we have. It is also building coalitions so that we look so strong, everyone wants to be our ally.

Senator GARDNER. And when it comes to calling out in public forums at the United Nations, no matter what country they are in, no matter where they are in the globe, when a dictator is corrupt, when a dictator abuses human rights, we will call it as we see it. You will not be afraid to do that. Is that correct?

Governor HALEY. You should ask the people of my General Assembly in South Carolina. I have no problem calling people out.

Senator GARDNER. Very good. Thank you, Governor Haley. Last Congress, Senator Menendez and I worked together on passage of the North Korea Sanctions Policy Enhancement Act. It is the first standalone, mandatory legislation on North Korea this Congress signed into law. It mandated sanctions on North Korea's ability to proliferate. It sanctions human rights violations and abuses. Just last week additional sanctions were levied by the administration, and it sanctioned for the first time ever mandatory cyber sanctions, requiring them to be put in place. In 2016, the Obama administration led and helped with those two security resolutions through addressing North Korea.

Have we effectively enforced the North Korea Sanctions—enforced sanctions on North Korea? We effectively made sure that they are effective as well as United Nations sanctions, the 2270 Resolution. Have they been effectively enforced.

Governor HALEY. I do not—sanctions are only as good as if you enforce them, and clearly there is more to do in North Korea. And when a line is crossed, to not say anything is going to be a problem. And so, I think North Korea is definitely one to watch. I think we are going to have to work closely with China to show the threat of what is happening.

And we cannot let up on North Korea. What we are seeing right now is production of nuclear weapons, and he does not care. He is going to continue to do it, and we have to continue to make sure that we are making our voices loud, that we are talking about North Korea, and that we continue to put the pressure on China and other countries to make sure that North Korea does start to slow down.

Senator GARDNER. And what should we do with China in order to get them more active in enforcing the sanctions against North Korea and their ability to help de-nuclearize the North Korean regime?

Governor HALEY. I think that North Korea has started to do that themselves because China is now nervous, and China has already started to pull back economically. And China has the greatest threat to North Korea, and they know that.

And so, what we have to do is let China know this affects China. This affects their region of the world. This affects us. Not talk about it within our—from our results and what it will do to the United States. Talk about it in terms of China, and really encour-

age them to say you are the one that can make a difference here. And I think that we just push them in that direction.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Absolutely. Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Governor Haley.

Governor HALEY. Good morning.

Senator SHAHEEN. Congratulations on your nomination.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you for spending some time with me yesterday.

Governor HALEY. I enjoyed it. Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN. Me too. And as I said to you then, I have been impressed by your work as the governor of South Carolina.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN. And I very much appreciate in your statement your commitment to the U.S. leadership in the world, and to your comments about—your conversation with the President-elect about being a strong voice at the U.N. for the United States.

But I have to say that unfortunately, as strong as I believe our ambassador to the U.N. can be, the President's words are often taken with much more weight. And I am disturbed by some of the President-elect's comments that are different than those positions you have enunciated here about the institutions that the United States helped create after World War II, about the U.N. He recently called it in a tweet just a club for people to get together and talk and have a good time.

In interviews this weekend, he criticized NATO. He was amazingly nonchalant about the future of the European Union and the Transatlantic Alliance. And I see the potential for real negative consequences because of that failure to recognize those institutions that have helped promote the security of the United States, and have helped—have helped us as we have tried to lead in the world.

So, I appreciate that you have said that you have the ear of the President and that you will be part of the national security apparatus. I think that is very important. But how will you avoid the conflict between your efforts at the U.N. and the Security Council and the President-elect's tweets, his—the positions that he is taking on many of the issues that will come before the Security—the United Nations?

Governor HALEY. You know, I think that what the President-elect has put out there are his opinions as they stand now. What I do think is going to happen is I look forward to communicating to him how I feel, as I do—I know the rest of the National Security Council does as well. It is important that we have alliances. I know the President-elect realizes that. It is important that we create coalitions, and I know that he realizes that as well.

And so, his comments are really coming from the fact that he does have a fresh set of eyes. He is looking at those things. But my job is not just at the U.N. My job is to come back to the National Security Council and let them know what I know, which is I want to bring back faith to the U.N. I want to show that we could be a strong voice in the U.N. I want to show that we can make

progress and have action in the U.N. That is going to happen from my actions and from the things that I do. And that is how I will show him that the U.N. matters.

NATO obviously has been an alliance that we value, an alliance that we need to keep. And I think that as we continue to talk to him about these alliances and how they can be helpful and strategic in the way that we move forward, I do anticipate that he will listen to all of us, and hopefully that we can get him to see it the way we see it.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, so do you agree with his suggestion that Vladimir Putin has been a stronger, better leader than Angela Merkel?

Governor HALEY. I think that what he is looking at, just like he is looking at associations, he is looking at opportunities, and he is trying to find opportunities where he can relate to different leaders and work with different leaders. That is not a bad thing.

Senator SHAHEEN. It is not a very good way to relate to Angela Merkel.

Governor HALEY. No, it is not, and I agree with you on that. But I do think that is where he is trying to go is see what relationship he can have with a lot of different leaders. And I think our goal is pull out the best we can in who we can deal with without having to talk negatively about someone else.

Senator SHAHEEN. I was—I appreciated your comments about disagreeing with the idea of a registry for any particular group in the United States, for Muslims. In the past you have criticized then candidate Trump for proposing a ban on all Muslims traveling to the United States. Do you continue to believe that that is unconstitutional?

Governor HALEY. Yes, I do, and I made that clear during that time just as I always speak up when I think something is wrong. But I do want to add that the President-elect has corrected his statement and said that he does not believe there should be a full ban on Muslims. He does believe that we should be conscious as we are looking at the refugee crisis and otherwise that we do not take people from many areas of threat.

Senator SHAHEEN. Today about 60 percent of all maternal deaths take place in humanitarian situations like refugee camps or areas that have been affected by conflict, and in these settings, women and girls are often cut off from healthcare. You pointed out in your statement that you appreciate the challenge that so many young women and girls face around the world in terms of access to the advantages we have in the United States.

Many of those lives have been saved and can be saved with access to proper care, including prenatal care, voluntary family planning, and skilled birth attendants. And the United Nations Population Fund is the world's leading provider of lifesaving care for mothers and their babies in humanitarian settings. They with the World Food Program, with UNICEF, with the UNHCR.

So, if confirmed, would you continue to support those efforts by UNFPA?

Governor HALEY. I will support any efforts that help educate, help plan, help let them know what contraceptions are in place so that we can avoid any other further action. I am strongly pro-life,

and so anything that we can do to keep from having abortions or to keep them from not—knowing what is available, I will absolutely support.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, I very much appreciate that because I think sometimes the idea of access to family planning services is conflated with abortion, and it is a very different issue.

Governor HALEY. Right.

Senator SHAHEEN. And this is a way to avoid abortions, unplanned pregnancies.

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. You are quite right.

Senator SHAHEEN. So, thank you very much for that comment.

As governor of South Carolina, you took the position that Syrian refugees were not being properly vetted, and so you questioned whether they should be allowed to settle in South Carolina. As ambassador to the U.N., the U.S. has had a role in galvanizing global support for refugees. Do you see that the position—how will you be able to resolve the position that you have taken in South Carolina with your new role as ambassador when it comes to refugees?

And I am out of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very briefly.

Governor HALEY. It is hard to give a brief answer to that, but I will say that, first of all, our refugee program in this country is one that is valued and has done a lot of good. And when it comes to refugees, we have to remember those that we have always tried to help, those that have been persecuted for any reason.

I will give a personal story in that my husband when he was deployed to Afghanistan, there were two interpreters that kept his unit safe, and they kept them without harm. When it was time for that unit to leave, those two interpreters staying, they would have been killed. And so, what the refugee program rightly does is it allowed them to go through and vet those interpreters. Those interpreters are now in the United States. They are now having jobs and contributing members of society.

The issue with the refugees in terms of the Syrians, as governor of South Carolina, we always welcomed the refugee program. It changed when it came time to the Syrian refugees, and that was at a time where I did have a conversation with Director Comey, and I said tell me if this is any different than the way we have handled it before. And that is when Director Comey said we do not have enough information to vet these refugees. And I said, so you cannot vet them the same way you vet others, and he said we do not have the information. And that is when I said we cannot take refugees from Syria until I know that I can protect the people of South Carolina.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Before moving to Senator Young, Senator Rubio asked me a question a minute ago. I know that this has nothing to do with today's hearing. But a lot of committees swear nominees and witnesses in and have them stand up and do that, and some do not. Whether they do that or not, they are bound by exactly the same obligations to Congress in that you have to tell the truth when you are in front of a committee. I know it came out relative

to the last hearing we had, and I just wanted to make sure everyone understood that.

Senator YOUNG.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Chairman, and thank you, Governor.

Governor HALEY. Good morning.

Senator YOUNG. Good morning, and thank you for your service in the past and your interest in continuing to serve.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution grants to Congress the power to declare war. Going to war, of course, is one of the most serious decisions a nation can make, and the founders explicitly gave that authority to make the decision to the American people through their elected representatives. The U.S. has not declared war since World War II, and instead have periodically relied on authorizations of the use of military force.

Two and a half years after we started bombing ISIS in Iraq, Congress still sits on the sidelines in terms of exercising this most important responsibility. We are instead relying on a 2001 authorization for the use of military force. It strains credibility at best and I think sets a dangerous precedent.

Perhaps some are concerned about going on the record in support or in opposition to the war against ISIS. Our warfighters and their families, like your husband, have demonstrated incredible courage in taking the fight to terrorists. I believe members if members of Congress show just a fraction of their courage, we can fulfill our constitutional duty to vote on an AUMF focused on ISIS. Friends and foes alike should know that our Nation is all in when it comes to taking the fight to ISIS and other groups.

So, I know Senator Kaine has been actively engaged on this issue. Others have been involved in this fight for some time. I understand that details and wording matter of such an authorization or declaration as it were.

I just want to go on the record early and clearly here in the Senate that I am in favor of Congress showing courage in exercising its constitutional responsibility with respect to an AUMF focused on ISIS. Do you believe, with that long lead in, that Congress should pass an AUMF, an authorization for the use of military force, against ISIS?

Governor HALEY. Well, understand that any time—first of all, Congress does have that authority, and that is an authority that should be respected always. I think that when you talk about any sort of war or any sort of military interference, it is important to have a plan, and it is important to have an end goal. I say that as the wife of a military combat veteran. I say that as a sister, because families, once they send their loved ones into harm's way, they want to know that Congress and the President-elect has a plan.

And so, with that, ISIS is an extreme threat to America and the rest of the world. I do think that they have to be dealt with. I just think it needs to be done responsibly, knowing that we have measurables on what we are looking for, where the end goal is, and knowing exactly where the start and stop is.

Senator YOUNG. Okay. I wanted to see how you thought through that issue. I agree with measurables. That takes me to another

topic with the understanding that we cannot defeat or take on the world's ills through hard power alone.

Governor HALEY. Agreed.

Senator YOUNG. It is a mix of hard and soft power in order to counter what has been called violent extremism by the U.N. and by the United States. We are going to have to certainly defeat the perverse—perverted ideology of radical Islam, and do so by engaging in and winning the war of ideas.

So, based on your preparation for this hearing, what is your assessment of the U.S. government and the United Nations' current performance in the war of ideas abroad against Islamic terrorists' ideology, and what do you specifically think needs to be improved? Back to measuring success, how do we measure success in the war of ideas?

Governor HALEY. Well, I think that, first of all, we need to speak with one voice, and that is something that has not happened. I think it needs to be the President-elect, I think it needs to be the National Security Council, and I think it needs to be Congress along with the U.N., that when we say this is a problem, then we follow through with it, and we finish what we start. I think that is incredibly important. And that way when we are all speaking with one voice, the rest of the world knows this is serious to us. We mean business, and we are not going to stop until it is resolved.

Senator YOUNG. How will you divine what that one voice is? Will it be based on legislative, sort of, resolutions coming out of Congress? Will it—and legislation signed into law by the President, directives of the of the executive branch that you will take with you to the United Nations? Is that how you will determine what that—

Governor HALEY. My hope is that the President—

Senator YOUNG [continuing]. Voice is that you would echo?

Governor HALEY [continuing]. My hope is that the President-elect, the National Security Council, and Congress work together to decide what that looks like, because I think that is very important. If in any way any country in the world or ISIS sees a break in any of us, that will show us weak, and I think we need to all stand together and be very strong if we are going to go take this on and finish it.

Senator YOUNG. And then to measure success, how do we measure success in the war of ideas?

Governor HALEY. When they are no longer a threat and when they are no longer causing harm to Americans.

Senator YOUNG. Are there any incremental success measures—public opinion polling, surveys? Those come to mind for me, but I am sure there are probably some other sophisticated tools.

Governor HALEY. It is hard to find anyone in America today that does not understand the threat of ISIS.

Senator YOUNG. Okay. In your prepared statement, you cite some of the failures of the United Nations, and they are multifaceted: mistreatment of Israel, preventing the North Korean nuclear threat. I think the failure to act on Syria also belongs on the long list of U.N. failures. Hundreds of thousands of Syrians have been killed. Half the country's population has been uprooted. Much of the infrastructure lay in ruins. This is a genocide.

Governor HALEY. Absolutely.

Senator YOUNG. I do not think we remind the American people and the international community frequently enough that a genocide has occurred here. Would you agree the U.N. Security Council has failed with respect to the Assad regime and the catastrophe in Syria? Yes or no.

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. In your opinion, why did the U.N. Security Council fail to act more forcefully with respect to the Assad regime and the catastrophe in Syria?

Governor HALEY. I look forward to getting into the U.N. and finding out why they think hitting Israel is so much more important than dealing with Syria.

Senator YOUNG. Well, I think it is because Russia consistently employed a veto. Russia vetoed at least six U.N. Security Council resolutions focusing on the Assad regime. You indicated Russia committed war crimes in Syria I believe in the hearing here today. I am glad you acknowledged that. Do you agree that both at the U.N. in New York and on the streets of Aleppo, Moscow has acted as an active accomplice in Assad's murder of his own people?

Governor HALEY. Yes, I do.

Senator YOUNG. All right. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. If I could, I cannot let this pass. It would be my observation, and everybody has their own, that the AUMF issue has nothing whatsoever to do with courage. Nothing. That if there was an authorization for the use of force that gave the President all means to fight ISIS and that was it, and it was, like, 12 words, you would have, like, 11 votes. And if you add one that said he can use all means, but you cannot do this, you cannot do this, you cannot do this, and you can only go into X countries, it would have 10 votes.

And so, the fact is that there is a divide, and we have an authorization that is legal, that everybody has come before our committee has said is legal. And at a time when we did not want to show division as it related ISIS, it just seemed it was better, instead of getting to a hung place here, it was better to stand behind what most people believe to be a perfectly legal basis upon which to fight ISIS. But I am more than willing to take it up.

There is a divide about whether the Commander-in-Chief should have all means available to him to fight ISIS. It is a philosophical divide. And I would just say one more time—I say it strongly—has nothing whatsoever to do with courage.

Senator CARDIN. Could I—Mr. Chairman, if I could just—I agree with everything the chairman said there. I just want to go on record as saying that, except for one point. And that is there is serious concern as to whether the current authorization used by the Obama administration and potentially to be used by the Trump administration covers the military actions that they have pursued. There is a serious challenge about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah, there is, and, you know, the administration has made their point. I happen to have agreed with that point. I do want to say that Senator Kaine and Senator Flake have brought this issue up several times. I am more than willing to engage in a discussion. I just think that when you are going to au-

thorize the President to do something, it is best for Congress not to micromanage what is being authorized in that regard.

There is disagreement there, and that is something that we might flesh out. But I just want to say one more time, the courage issue hits a nerve. Nothing whatsoever. As a matter of fact, sometimes it takes courage to do the things that make sure that people see our country as being unified and not divided over something that I know we are unified on. Everybody on this panel wants to see us defeat ISIS.

There are some issues we may want to resolve, but we are unified in that regard. And showing division is not something that I feel is particularly good for our country to do at this time, but I am more than willing to debate it. You might want to say one other thing.

Senator YOUNG. Yes. To the extent I offended or impugned the courage of any of my colleagues, I, of course, want to go on record and say that was not the intent. But I do think that we will have to lay into this issue, continue to very publicly exchange views on it. And I do think that that requires courage because it is an uncomfortable topic to broach.

So, thank you. With that, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much. Senator Udall.

Senator UDALL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And Governor Haley, thank you very much for coming to my office and sharing your views. And it is great to have you here today, and great to have your family here. And I want to thank your husband and your older brother for their service in the military. You obviously have an impressive story here to tell, and we appreciate you being here.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. I am a—I am a very strong supporter of the United Nations, and I believe that strong U.S. leadership is needed to ensure that the United Nations remains a viable institution in the future. I have been extremely alarmed by some of the President-elect Trump's derisive comments about the U.N., and I am very concerned that his statements have harmed our efforts in that body. And it is good to see that you are clarifying some of those.

The most discouraging is that he has insinuated or allowed the perception that the United States will no longer take a leadership role, and you are saying today, I think, that you are going to assert that role. That he would have cut off funding and would end our participation and important aspects of the U.N.

This is not a formula for success. U.S. leadership is paramount. If we left a political vacuum, it would likely be filled by countries that might not necessarily share our interests, such as Russia and try and China. I hope that I am mistaken, and I hope you will be an advocate for U.S. participation in the United Nations, and I believe you have stated that here today.

It is very clear that Russia attempted to influence our election. If you are confirmed to serve as ambassador to the U.N., will you stand up to Vladimir Putin and against Russia's attempt to interfere with our electoral system?

Governor HALEY. We should stand up to any country that attempts to interfere with our system.

Senator UDALL. And what will your message to your Russian counterpart on the Security Council be with regard to their attempts to influence the U.S. elections?

Governor HALEY. That we are aware that it has happened, that we do not find it acceptable, and that we are going to fight back every time we see something like that happening. I do not think Russia is going to be the only one. I think we are going to start to see this around the world with other countries. And I think that we need to take a firm stand that when we see that happens, we are not going to take that softly. We are going to be very hard on that.

Senator UDALL. And your—it sounds like you are going to stand strong and tough on this.

Governor HALEY. Without question.

Senator UDALL. Now, last September, the world passed a milestone in carbon emissions reaching 400 parts per million. 2016 I think was also the hottest on record in terms of our climate. We are moving closer to more—a more unstable climate future, a future that could threaten my home State of New Mexico with heat waves and dangerous droughts, and your state with increased coastal flooding and perilous storms. And that threatens stability, I think, across the globe. And a lot of people talk about climate refugees. We have talked about other kinds of refugees here.

Do you agree that the United States is indispensable and must maintain its leadership in the Paris Agreement in order to ensure that countries abide by their climate obligations?

Governor HALEY. I think that the climate change situation should always be on the table. It should always be one of the issues that we look at. But I do think that when we look at the Paris Agreement, we should acknowledge what we do believe it is right, but we do not want to do it at the peril of our industries and our businesses along the way. As governor of South Carolina, what you would see is we would work really hard to recruit a company to—from another country, and then by the time they saw the regulations and the burdens that were put down on them, they started to pull back. We do not ever want to interfere with our economy.

But I absolutely think that climate change should always be on the table as one of the factors that we talk about.

Senator UDALL. But you are not one to say you are going to tear up the Paris Agreement, and the United States, which has helped to bring all these countries together and for the first time in a generation, we have countries together that you are going to walk away from that.

Governor HALEY. I think that we want to work on the things that we believe work, can benefit the world and the United States. But if we do see burdens that are costing our businesses, then I do think that that is something that I would not agree with.

Senator UDALL. Well, are you—are you—are you committed to stay a part of the Paris Agreement and work towards climate change objectives and goals?

Governor HALEY. Climate change will always be on the table for me.

Senator UDALL. Now, we talked earlier about U.N. Resolution 2334. This was a resolution about Israeli settlements. These settle-

ments have been greatly expanded in recent years. The settlement dispute goes way, way back many, many years. In fact, Ronald Reagan said in 1982, and this is his statement: "The United States will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements during the transitional period. Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlement freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed for a wider participation in these talks."

That position on settlements has been a bipartisan policy of the United States going back to President Johnson. Are the settlements that break up the possibility of a future contiguous Palestinian state harmful to achieving a two-state solution in your opinion.

Governor HALEY. I think what was very harmful to achieving a two-state solution was Resolution 2334, because the whole goal has been to have Israel and the Palestinian Authority at the table talking. That should be the role of the United Nations, and as we go forward, is to support that. When we basically abstained from 2334, we made Israel more vulnerable. We made America more vulnerable and that we do not stand by our allies.

We need to let the two bodies resolve this themselves. That is what has always taken place. And I think it is dangerous when the U.N. starts to tell two different bodies what should and should not happen.

Senator UDALL. Well, you—all those things you said were also in Samantha Power's statements. But are you committed on settlements to the bipartisan policy that has stood for over 50 years in this country—

Governor HALEY. I understand.

Senator UDALL [continuing]. The U.N., the bipartisan policy our country has taken on settlements?

Governor HALEY. I do understand the issue on settlements. I will continue to—I do understand how they think that could hinder peace, but at the same time I will always stand with Israel and make sure that they know we are an ally and the rest of the world knows that we are an ally.

Senator UDALL. But the question is, are you committed to the bipartisan policy on settlements—

Governor HALEY. Yes, I am.

Senator UDALL [continuing]. And the expansion of settlements? Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I think, if I understand correctly, what she is saying is she supports a two-state solution, but understands the parties themselves have got to resolve it. And the U.N. Security Council inserting themselves into that process, as it has been, can be very detrimental.

Governor HALEY. Yes, thank you.

Senator UDALL. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, the statement, and I would like to put the full statement of our U.N. ambassador, Samantha Power, in the record at this point.

[The information referred to is located in the Additional Material Submitted for the Record section of this transcript beginning on page 133.]

Senator UDALL. She said specifically what you have said. The United States supports this two-state solution, many of the things that our ambassadorial designate say here. But the issue of the resolution—the issue of the resolution was about an expanded settlement policy. And she has committed to stand with that bipartisan policy, which I believe you answered the question yes when I said—

Governor HALEY. Well, I—

Senator UDALL [continuing]. Are you going to stand with the bipartisan policy that has this—not only this administration, but every administration since President Johnson has supported on the expansion of settlements?

Governor HALEY [continuing]. And I want to clarify because I do not want there to be any gray in this. What I think happened with 2334 was a kick in the gut to everyone. And so, we can think what we want to think on settlements, but you have to go back to the fact that the U.S. abstention, when that has not happened since 2011 at all, against Israel was wrong. And I think the fact that we have not allowed the Palestinian Authority and Israel to resolve this themselves is wrong. And I think for the U.N. to have inserted themselves into that, I believe is wrong.

So, I want to make sure that I am clear on record as to saying what I think about Resolution 2334.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate it. I think there may be some factual dispute about your last statement, and I think we had some discussion about that in committee. I just want to—I do not want to leave that last statement hanging without a retort. And with that, Senator Flake.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor HALEY. Good morning.

Senator FLAKE. Good morning. Thank you for your testimony. Thanks for coming to my office and visits that you have made, and appreciate also your family.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator FLAKE. It is great to have them here, and appreciate the sacrifices they have made in the past for your public service and will make in the future, as well as their military service for our country.

I have seen examples of the U.N. working well, and obviously seen examples of dysfunction. I happened to spend a year of my life and my family, we went to the country of Namibia in 1989 to see U.N. Resolution—Security Council Resolution 435 be implemented, April of 1989 to April of 1990, and watched where the U.N. can work and work well. That was a process by which Namibia achieved its independence from South Africa. That resolution was passed a decade earlier, and it was finally implemented then. And Namibia is a fine democracy today, much owing to the United Nations and the role that the Security Council resolution played there. And so, I have seen it work.

But also, you mentioned in your testimony many examples of the dysfunction, and a lot of that has to do with the General Assembly, or UNESCO, and other organizations, but also plenty of dysfunction with the Security Council. And the failure, as has been men-

tioned, to take a position and take a stand with regard to Syria will, I think, be judged harshly by history.

Governor HALEY. That is right.

Senator FLAKE. But let me talk just a bit about peacekeeping. We have seen examples where peacekeeping has worked as well. U.N. peacekeeping forces on the Golan Heights, for example, for years kept the peace there. A lot of peacekeeping now is done obviously on the continent of Africa. I have a particular interest obviously there.

The U.N.—the U.S. contributes \$2.6 billion peacekeeping—in peacekeeping activities. That is about 28 percent of the entire U.N. budget. It is about 22. But peacekeeping, as you know, it is a more—even more of a disproportionate number. The next highest is China with just 10 percent.

We talked a little bit earlier on about South Sudan and the situation there. That is an area where peacekeeping is not working well. The focus of the mission there has been changed a bit. We are trying to make sure that, I think, the quote is “protection of civilians, human rights monitoring, support of delivery of humanitarian assistance, and implementation of the cessation of hostilities agreement.” That is not going well.

What can we do to make the situation better there? That is a particular focus of our peacekeeping activities.

Governor HALEY. With South Sudan?

Senator FLAKE. Yes.

Governor HALEY. You know, I think that, first of all, we should look at all 16 of them. Secondly, I do want to point out that we are pushing on 29 percent for the peacekeeping budget. And according to the Helms-Biden Act, it really should be at 25 percent, and we need to be conscious of that.

First of all, I think what is very important is we have to start encouraging other countries to have skin in the game. They have to start being a part of the peacekeeping process, because by doing that, they will want to see more transparency. They will want to see more accountability in the way that peacekeeping missions are handled.

When you look at South Sudan, I think there is something to be said that we have to make sure that the security is already in place when we go to do a peacekeeping mission. The peacekeeping officials are not meant to fight. They are not meant to get involved or take sides on anything. They are there to keep the peace. And so, our goal should be go in, keep the peace, get it settled, and get out.

And what we are seeing in South Sudan is the government does not agree with the fact the peacekeepers are there. And so, that is a problem, and we need to know that if we are doing good, we want to stay. If we are not doing good, then we need to get out. And I think it is extremely hard to see that the government is against us because it is kind of going against what we are trying to do with the peacekeeping mission to start with.

Senator FLAKE. You mentioned 16 peacekeeping operations. Nine of those are in Africa.

Governor HALEY. Yes, they are.

Senator FLAKE. The last six that have been approved by the Security Council are in Africa as well. And I am happy to hear that

you are going to delve in and see how we are doing with those. What other metrics can be used—I know Senator Young mentioned that—in terms of whether or not we are getting bang for the buck out of our involvement?

Governor HALEY. You know, it is one of those where you do have to decide before you even take on a peacekeeping mission if it is something that can see success, if we can get to a resolution. And I think that part of that is making sure that there is a secure base to start with, making sure that we are taking care of things.

If you look at the peace missions in Africa, it has been devastating to see this sexual exploitation, the fraud, the abuse that is happening. And we have to acknowledge that some countries are contributing troops because they are making money off of that. And so, if they are not willing to make sure that they are punishing the violators, then we need to actually pull that country's troops out because they are harming the peace process.

The last thing we want is for U.N. peacekeepers to go into a country, and for people to be scared, and for people to be vulnerable, and I think we are seeing that right now, and mostly in Africa. And I think that is a problem because once we have transparency of how this money is being spent, then we can bring accountability to the actions that are being taken, strengthen the whistleblowing process, and make sure that we are actually doing what was intended to do.

And I think this is extremely important because when we start to become more transparent and accountable, we will start to see the waste of the dollars, and you will not see the U.S. putting 29 percent in. You will see them putting in less than 25, and we will see countries starting to really have skin in the game, which I think is hugely important if we are going to continue peacekeeping missions.

Senator FLAKE. Well, thank you. I am glad to hear you knowledge the problems that have—we have had with these peacekeeping missions. To see the sexual abuse and whatnot going on there is just devastating.

Governor HALEY. It is.

Senator FLAKE. And you are right, for those countries in which peacekeepers are there, not to have trust in the U.N. process there is devastating. So, I hope that we are more proactive to make sure the offending countries with troops there are dealt with more quickly. And I appreciate the testimony and look forward to—for the discussion.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Without objection, I am going to ask that we go ahead and enter into the record U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 so everyone can discern for themselves what it actually said.

[The information referred to is located in the Additional Material Submitted for the Record section of this transcript, beginning on page 129.]

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murphy.

Senator MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Governor Haley, for being willing to serve. Thank you for your history

of speaking truth to power. I enjoyed the time we spent together discussing some of the issues you are going to face. Appreciate you being here before the committee.

And so, I say this respectfully. I sort of feel like the hearings we have had, this hearing and hearing on Secretary of State nominee Tillerson, have occurred in an alternate universe. I hear loud and clear what you are saying about needing for the United States to be clear about where we stand and strong in our values, and I think that Mr. Tillerson used the same phrasing over and over again. And I think we would all agree that those should be goals of U.S. foreign policy.

But President-elect Trump has downplayed Russian attempts to influence our election. He has suggested that NATO is obsolete. He has openly rooted for the breakup of the European Union. He has lavished praise on Vladimir Putin and refused to commit to continuing sanctions. He has criticized one of our most important allies in the world, Chancellor Merkel. He has promised to bring back torture, and he has called for Japan and South Korea to take a look at obtaining nuclear weapons because they probably cannot rely on our security guarantee any longer.

And so, I hear what you are saying, but can you understand why right now the world perceives the Trump administration's foreign policy to be the exact opposite of "clear about where we stand and strong in our values?" I hear you are saying, but can you understand why the world perceives the foreign policy to be the exact opposite of what you are articulating it will be?

Governor HALEY. I understand that anytime there is a new administration, there is always nervousness, and there is always concern. It happened with President Obama. It has happened with presidents before that. That is something that is just natural. It is natural to the world to all watch the United States, because we are such a leader, to see who would who's going to follow it.

It is also natural for a candidate or an incoming President to look at everything and to say things. Once you govern, it becomes very different. And I think that what we have seen is that once the President-elect gets to hear from his national security team, I think what he says after that will be most important. And I think those are the focuses that we are going to have with the National Security Council and making sure that we educate, inform him of what we know, inform him of strategies, and then go along with whatever decision he decides to make.

Senator MURPHY. And I heard a version of this in your answer to Senator Shaheen. So, you believe that after two years of suggesting radical changes regarding U.S. policy about conveying really muddled messages about where we stand, that is all going to change after Friday?

Governor HALEY. Not all of that will change after Friday. But what I know is I am going to control the part that I can, and what I can control is the U.N. And so, I am going to use the power of my voice in the U.N. to talk about America's ideals, and our values, and our strength, and our freedoms.

I am going to talk to the President-elect about the U.N. and the opportunities for strategy in dealing with Russia, and China, and North Korea, and Syria as we go forward. And I think that we are

going to have a lot of opportunities to make that better. And I do think that my counterparts as well are going to inform the President-elect's on what they are seeing.

And so, you know, that is how an administration works. You surround yourself with people who do not just say yes to what you think. They actually challenge you and they tell you of other opinions, and what I know about the President-elect is he actually will listen.

Senator MURPHY. Let me—let me ask you about the future of the U.N. You have a lot of Democrats in South Carolina that do not get what they want all the time from the state legislature and from their governor. And so, would you advise Democrats in the state legislature in South Carolina to boycott the state legislature if they do not get what they want, or for registered Democrats in South Carolina to stop paying their taxes if they do not get what they want from the state government?

Governor HALEY. Well, we have laws in place so they cannot just stop paying their taxes, or they will deal with that. Legislators have been known to do whatever they want, and I as governor, I have seen that happen. So, it is two totally different things.

Senator MURPHY. I guess you understand why I am making the point. The reason that we invest in the U.N. is not because we expect to win every fight. It is not because we expect to have our views prevail, but because we think it is important to have a deliberative body in which differences can be expressed out in the open rather than always dealt with behind closed doors.

And the risk of pulling funding because the United States does not get its way is potentially catastrophic. The U.N. provides food for 90 million people in 80 countries around the world. It vaccinates 40 percent of the world's children. It assists 55 million refugees and people fleeing wars, famine, or persecution, and it provides maternal healthcare to 30 million vulnerable women.

And so, I guess my question is, you are suggesting that we should pull funding from the United Nations if we do not win votes in the General Assembly.

Governor HALEY. I have never suggested that, sir, and if that is the way you took it, then that was not what I intended to say. I do not think we need to pull money from the U.N. We do not believe in flash and burn. It did not—was not anything I considered as governor. It is not something I would consider as ambassador, or anything that I would suggest back to you for Congress.

I think that what is important is we look at every organization, see if it is working for us, see if it is something we want to be a part of, and then I will report back to you as well as to the President-elect on whether that is something we need to be a part of. I know that he had made comments about the U.N., but those are not my feelings, and I do not think that is what is going to happen.

Senator MURPHY. I really thank you for that answer. I think it is a really important answer, and so I want to just maybe ask you to make that answer a little bit clearer. So, you do not believe that we should be threatening to pull funds based on outcomes in the General Assembly that we do not agree with. You would pull funds if you do not think that programs are effective, but you would not

threaten to pull funds because we do not get the outcome that we want from the deliberative process.

Governor HALEY. Right. My job is to make sure that we work to figure out how we get the outcomes, and to negotiate, and to make sure that I am working with those leaders and doing that. If, for example, we see in the Human Rights Council that Cuba is there and China is there, and we are not seeing the human rights move in a way that American values are supposed to, yes, I am going to come back to you and I am going to say this is a real problem, just does not follow our mission. I may go there and find out that there is a way to resolve that.

And so, with those, I will come back to you. But, no, I do not think we should have a slash and burn of the U.N.

Senator MURPHY. I appreciate that. I will just note that since rejoining the Human Rights Council—we were out of it from 2007 to 2009—once we rejoined, special sessions on Israel dropped by 50 percent and resolutions on Israel dropped by 30 percent. So, engagement in these forums do matter. And I really appreciate your answer to the questions.

Governor HALEY. And I look forward to looking into that. Thank you.

Senator MURPHY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good. Thank you. Senator Portman.

Senator PORTMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to you and your family.

Governor HALEY. Thank you. Good morning.

Senator PORTMAN. Your family story is the quintessential American story.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator PORTMAN. And in my view, it is a story that the rest the world appreciates and respects when reminded of it. And I think your very presence at the United Nations would be a reminder of that and what makes our country unique. And I also think your management skills that you have shown as governor will be effective in encouraging the U.N. to be more efficient, which is problem in my view.

I was once a member of the U.N. Human Rights Subcommittee after the first Bush administration, and after I left that administration—during that administration I served, and it was a very interesting experience, you know. You had some positives, which is talking about human rights. You also had negatives, which is that human rights abusers used it for their own political purposes.

And so, I do think, in response to your question to Senator Murphy, that the opportunity for reform is obvious. And when all of our taxpayers are paying roughly 22 percent of the budget, I think they do expect to see a more efficient organization that is more objective and more in keeping with our values, and, again, the values that so many other countries seek as well when they look at America's story that you will represent.

We have talked about a lot of issues today. My view is that we are in a more dangerous and volatile world in part because America has not led. And if you look at what is happening on the eastern border of Ukraine, or with Crimea, or in the South China Sea today, or certainly what is happening in Syria, you know, part of

this is a lack of leadership. And I do think that you also see a crumbling of the very foundation of the post-World War II U.S.-led security umbrella that has kept the peace.

And so, I guess my first question to you is just about that, you know. How do you intend to support U.S. national security interests, but also ensure that the U.N. is a more effective body toward promoting a more peaceful and less volatile world?

Governor HALEY. Well, thank you for that question, Senator. I think that, first of all, we need to really have a conversation with other countries on the importance of them having skin in the game, because when they have skin in the game, they will care more about how those dollars are spent. And I think that that is where we can really bring more efficiencies to the U.N., more effectiveness to the U.N. when we get more involved. That is something that I am going to try and work on and see if we can get them to understand that being present is not enough. Being invested is what is going to make the U.N. stronger for everyone. So, that is the first thing.

I think the second thing is we have to have a very strong voice. We have to be very strong on if there are resolutions coming up and we are not seeing resolutions that deal with Syria, and we are not seeing resolutions that deal with North Korea, and we are not calling out the violators that are there, that is up to us to bring up that conversation. It is for us to start it.

Senator PORTMAN. Yeah. Israel has been talked about today, obviously a big issue at the U.N. And I would agree with what was said today about the fact that this relationship is a cornerstone of our strategy in the Middle East. They are our best ally in the region. They are the one democracy in the Middle East.

Let me focus on one specific issue, which is the boycotts, divestments, and sanctions movement, BDS. and this is something that I have worked on over the years actually with Ben Cardin, the ranking member here. In fact, we have proposed a number of legislative solutions, one of which is the law of the land now that was passed as part of the Trade Promotion Authority bill that requires us to look at BDS as a trade negotiating objective in our trade agreements, which is—which is an historic change in the way the U.S. has dealt with this.

Can you talk a little about that? What do you think should be done with regard to countering boycott divestment and sanction efforts against Israel, really the sense of trying to delegitimize Israel, and a little bit about your experience in South Carolina with regard to this issue?

Governor HALEY. Well, first of all, I am very proud to say as governor of South Carolina that we were the first state in the country to pass an anti-BDS law in our state, and so, that was trying to really make the point of how important we think it is. I think as we go to the U.N., that is a point that has to be made.

We have to look at the fact and call out the fact why is it that the Security Council is so concerned with Israel? It is an obsession that they have with Israel where they do not have with North Korea, where they do not have with Syria, where they do not have with other things that are going on. And so, it is up to us to talk

about the fact that you cannot have boycotts against a country that is just trying to protect its people.

And I think that you are finding an authority, not a state, that is actually leading the charge on this. And I think that that is wrong, and I think that we are going to have to continue to really be more aggressive, call them out, let them know what is wrong, and then find out what their answers are, because there is no good, fair honest answer on why they continue to pick on Israel and why they continue to allow these things happen.

Senator PORTMAN. We talked briefly about this broader issue of Russia, China, and other countries using disinformation and propaganda. There has been a lot of discussion about the meddling in our election here, which is a great concern of all of us. Publicly I have heard the UK and Germany both express concerns even recently on this topic.

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator PORTMAN. Certainly when I travel in Eastern Europe, every country in the region is very concerned about this issue of disinformation and, specifically, the effort to meddle in democracies—fledgling democracies.

I wonder in your role as ambassador what you would intend to do about that. There is this new Global Engagement Center that has been set up at the State Department. Senator Murphy and I worked on legislation that was passed as part of the National Defense Authorization bill to establish this.

I think the U.S. is asleep at the switch. I think we have not kept up with the—the counter efforts that have come our way and to our allies, specifically with regard to technology and being online. Can you comment on that and what you are willing to do as ambassador to push back against this campaign of disinformation that is being waged by some countries?

Governor HALEY. Well, first of all, I applaud you for wanting to improve our technologies and the way we handle cybersecurity issues or other types of hackings and countries getting involved in our business, because we are behind the curve on that. And we very much need to get in front of it because the rest of the countries are.

Having said that, we need to make it very clear that we do not accept any country that tries to meddle in any of the business of the United States, and that needs to be made loud and clear. It needs to be made loud of any of the violators. We need to be able to call them out by name, and we need to let them know that this is not something that we are going to allow going forward.

And I think this is going to be more of a conversation not just for the United States, but for our European allies and other allies around the world because they are feeling the same thing. And they are concerned about the same thing, and in some cases have witnessed the same thing.

Senator PORTMAN. Thank you, Governor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Booker.

Senator BOOKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor, it is very good to see you here. And I want to just thank you for bringing your family here. You add a proud level of diversity to the leadership of our country, and I think it is needed.

And I think your record is something in South Carolina that there are many aspects of it that I celebrate, particularly what I think you showed especially in the wake of a horrific shooting. You showed grace and dignity in dealing with the tragedy, and then you showed tremendous courage in removing the Confederate flag from the Statehouse. And I have been in a state of gratitude about that, in particular. So thank you very much for showing a strength of leadership during very, very difficult times.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator BOOKER. You and I have had some time to talk in the past, and we have known each other for some years. And you will have to forgive me. I have three hearings going on at the same time.

Governor HALEY. So you are just here to say nice things about me. [Laughter.]

Senator BOOKER. Touché, Governor.

Forgive me if some of these questions may have been covered before.

Governor HALEY. Understood.

Senator BOOKER. All right, so, Governor Haley, do you support a two-state solution?

Governor HALEY. I do.

Senator BOOKER. Governor Haley, do you believe that it advances U.S. interests to provide food, jobs, homes, and hope to the people of the West Bank and Gaza by decreasing the pool of potential recruits or radicalized individuals to join terrorist organizations like Hamas?

Governor HALEY. Yes, I think that we need to do whatever we can to protect the region, and I think that we need to make sure that we are doing all we can to go against the threats.

Senator BOOKER. Yes, and I am grateful for your very strong, steadfast statements in terms of the support of Israel and pointing out what even a former U.N. Secretary-General has pointed out about the biased nature of the U.N. against Israel.

But security for Israel is something that is of critical import to me, and there are serious issues around the security. But, again, as a security guarantor, does the aid that the U.N. provide save the Government of Israel the expense of providing assistance to the people of the West Bank? In other words, a lot of the work that the U.N. is doing to provide basic humanitarian aid, uplifting the dignity of people, access to clean water, are these things critical as a larger part of Israeli security and that of the beauty and the dignity of the Palestinian people?

Governor HALEY. I think it is. It is something I want to get more information on, but I think that anytime that we can help mankind, regardless of where they are and what country they are in, the United States has always been there. So I do think that anytime we can create peace, then we want to do that. And so certainly, any services that we are giving to the area right now, we will continue to look into and work on.

Senator BOOKER. And I hear, and sometimes I find it problematic, that with the obvious realities of terrorism, sometimes people's response to that is wanting to cut off that vital aid that provides basic human needs. Is that something that, those calls to cut off that kind of aid, does that concern you?

Governor HALEY. You know, I have not had anyone talk to me about cutting off the aid, but I also think that it is like everything else I have said. We need to look at each and every mission, see what we are doing, and see how we can make it more effective for the people in the area.

Senator BOOKER. Okay, I want to switch really quickly to something you and I discussed together, and I think it is important to do it on the record. We talked about the challenges of the LGBT community even here in the United States. We see 40 percent of all homeless youth in this country are LGBT youth. Fifteen percent of LGBT youth miss school because of fear of bullying.

On the international context, you see even more serious challenges to the basic human rights and dignity of LGBT citizens of the world.

Ambassador Power has been a champion of LGBT human rights. She has really put it at the forefront of her work. She put the issue at the heart even of the Security Council, which is a pretty important and bold step.

She said in a speech that LGBT rights are human rights; human rights are LGBT rights; and human rights must be universal.

If confirmed, can you just say a little bit about how you plan to continue the leadership of the United States on this issue, given the fact of really tragic realities going on around the globe of not just abuse, not just harassment, but physical torture and killings, imprisonment and killings of LGBT people? And do you pledge, can you pledge here, that you will maintain our country's positive voting record on critical human rights resolutions and mechanisms for all people, obviously, but including LGBT? And finally, under your leadership, will the United States continue to work behind the scenes to support the principle that LGBT rights are human rights?

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator, for that question. I think it is very important that we talk about America's values. And when it comes to America's values and opportunities, we do not allow for discrimination of any kind to anyone.

And that is something that I will always speak loudly about. It is something that I will always fight for. And I think it is important that we never have to deal with discrimination in this country, and I do not want to see any other country have to deal with discrimination.

Senator BOOKER. And specifically on LGBT rights, will you be looking to be a champion of protecting their dignity, their security, and their safety in the global human rights context?

Governor HALEY. I will make sure that there is no one that is discriminated against for any reason whatsoever, and every person deserves decency and respect.

Senator BOOKER. Thank you very much.

I know Senator Shaheen asked a little bit about contraception. If I may just drill down on that a little bit more, the United Na-

tions announced in 2012 that access to contraception is also a universal human right that can dramatically affect the lives of women and children in some of the world's poorest countries.

As you know, women who use contraception are generally healthier; better educated; more empowered in their households and communities; and, economically, often more productive. And women's increased labor force participation that is a result often of having access to contraception boosts nations' economies. This is giving women the power of contraception. It has a profound impact.

Can you just speak generally, in the remaining seconds I have, on how you will work with other countries to recognize the benefits of access to safe and effective family planning methods and support politics and policies that are supportive of family planning?

Governor HALEY. Well, and as we discussed, I am strongly pro-life and will always be pro-life. And so to me, education and contraception are important to those countries, so that they know that they do not get put into a situation where we have to sacrifice a life in the process.

So, yes, absolutely, when it comes to the education and the contraception, I think those are incredibly important, that we educate and that we make sure that those are provided to other countries.

Senator BOOKER. And I just want to say, in closing before the next round that, as I said to you in private, I am very grateful that you are—that Donald Trump is including you, the President-elect Donald Trump is including you in his Security Council and in a significant role. I hope that you will be one of those independent voices, as you were during the campaign, that will speak truth to power no matter what the consequences.

Governor HALEY. Yes, I will.

Senator BOOKER. Thank you.

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Rubio.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Haley, welcome.

Governor HALEY. Good morning.

Senator RUBIO. Congratulations.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator RUBIO. I, of course, had the opportunity to get to know you and your family quite a bit about this time last year in another endeavor, and came away from it incredibly impressed and excited now about this opportunity you will have to represent our country.

I wanted to summarize some of the testimony, because it is going to lead to the question that I have to ask.

First, in your written statement, you said that in the matter of human rights, I have a clear understanding that it is not acceptable to stay silent when our values are challenged. You also said that in terms of reforming the U.N., we need to build an international institution that honors America's commitment to freedom, democracy, and human rights.

In your testimony, you have said that you do not believe that sanctions should be removed from Russia without positive actions regarding the actions that led to the sanctions in the first place. You testified as well that you believe that war crimes have been

committed in Aleppo by the Russian military. You testified that the Russian Government has helped Assad murder his own people.

In the Philippines, you acknowledged that the current President of the Philippines has conducted—involved in extrajudicial killings, violated human rights.

And, of course, you acknowledged that the Human Rights Council of the United Nations, you called into question their legitimacy because of not just their membership but their pattern of behavior over the last—forever.

And therefore, I imagine by extension you believe that we should consider returning to the Bush policy of not being a part of it.

From your testimony—yet, I know you also understand, as you said in your testimony, you have to be able to work with countries all over the world at the Security Council and the General Assembly on critical issues.

So I take it and gather from both your testimony, from all of the testimony, that, if confirmed as Ambassador to the United Nations, you are going to have to deal with countries whose behavior violates human rights and international law. And yet you believe it is possible to speak truth to those countries and their horrendous human rights records and yet still negotiate with them on issues of importance at the Security Council when necessary.

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. I do not think we should ever apologize for the American values, and I do not think we should ever shy away from talking about them.

At the same time, I think it is very important that when negotiating with other countries and when we are dealing with them, they know exactly where we stand, they know where we support and agree. They know where we disagree. And they also know what our intended goals are in terms of working together.

And that is what I have had to do as Governor. That is what you do when you deal with legislators and international officials. And I think that is what we will be doing there.

But I do not think that we have to compromise one to get the other. I think that we make sure that we always stand firm and strong for what we believe in.

Senator RUBIO. And on an unrelated topic, in March 2015, and many times afterward, our current Secretary of State told this Senate that the Iran nuclear deal would not be legally binding on the United States. Yet, the outgoing administration attempted to use the United Nations, in particular the Security Council through Resolution 2231, to go around Congress on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and attempt, as they claimed, to create a binding, legal obligation under what they claimed to be international law related to a flawed new Iran nuclear deal.

I would first ask, what is your view of this use of the Security Council to go around Congress, and, in particular, to go around the Senate's constitutional role to provide advice and consent on treaties?

Governor HALEY. Well, I think I have been on record that I think that it was a huge disappointment. I think that it created more of a threat. And I think that we are going to have to do a lot of things to fix what has happened.

Senator RUBIO. If confirmed, would you advise the President-elect never to use the United Nations to try to circumvent Congress, especially the Senate, on international agreements?

Governor HALEY. Yes, I would, because I think Congress and the Senate are extremely important that we work together with the U.N. to make sure that anything that is proposed is always supported by Congress, as we go forward.

Senator RUBIO. And this is related to one of your answers, but I think for a point of clarification, because I know you were asked about the recent Security Council resolution with regards to Israel and the Palestinian question, and I think you recognized that, as part of that agreement, it assumed, for example, that portions of Jerusalem are occupied territory, that portions of Jerusalem are, therefore, by definition, settlements.

I believe you would agree when I say that Jerusalem is not a settlement.

Governor HALEY. Right, I agree.

Senator RUBIO. And so you continue to see—it is important to understand, and I think that is what the chairman was getting at when he talked about some dispute over the meaning of that resolution, that it, in fact, assumed and accepted as fact the notion that basically any Israeli presence in Judea and Samaria constitutes a settlement.

So I think that is the key point. I also think it is not true to say that this is the longstanding policy of the U.S., to somehow try to organize and utilize international organizations to force a negotiation. What has been, in fact, a bipartisan commitment, and I think certainly what our partners in Israel would like to see, is a negotiation between the two parties involved with assistance from the international community as a forum potentially, but certainly not by pre-imposing conditions and the like.

And I guess my question, you have already answered this. Had you been the U.N. Ambassador and had been asked to abstain on a vote of this kind, would you have agreed to do so?

Governor HALEY. I would never have abstained. I do not like when legislators abstain. I certainly think that it has to be a huge exception when you do abstain. I think that that was the moment that we should have told the world how we stand with Israel, and it was a kick in the gut that we did not.

Senator RUBIO. Well, I thank you. And I just would close by pointing out that the United Nations actually came about as a result of the work of someone from Tennessee, the former Senator from Tennessee, Cordell Hull. So it is appropriate that you are chairing this meeting here today. It all comes back to Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. It always does. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you for reminding everyone who has tuned in that that is the case. Thank you.

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I would just say I know that you all have a special relationship for lots of reasons that have not been involved here. Senator Cardin and I were talking earlier, and there are some things that you have very good instincts, and you have been a Governor, and I think going into an organization that needs re-

form, having been a Governor, someone who solves problems, is something that is going to be very useful.

I would also say that this committee at large has spent a lot of time in places all around the world and has an understanding of things that, coming into this, may be somewhat new to you. And I think the committee as a whole, if you utilize it, can be very useful to you as you undertake what you are going to be undertaking at the United Nations. And I think everyone here, especially as they have seen you in operation today, would be more than glad to do so.

Governor HALEY. Well, and I plan on using this committee quite a bit, and look forward to having you, if confirmed, to the U.N. so that you can actually speak with the Security Council members, and they can hear from you, because I think that is hugely important, that it is not just me speaking, that they hear from Congress as well and know how important all these issues are to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you again.

Senator Kaine.

Senator KAINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thanks, Governor Haley. It was good visiting the other day.

Governor HALEY. It is always nice to talk to a fellow Governor.

Senator KAINE. Indeed. Once a Governor, always a Governor.

Governor HALEY. That is right. That is right.

Senator KAINE. Authoritarian nations around the world are cracking down on freedom of the press, and that is a freedom that is part of the 1947 U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. And even nations that are allies—for example, Turkey and Egypt where we have significant alliances—have seen real declines in press freedom. I think recently a study came out suggesting Turkey may be the principal violator of press freedoms now in the world.

What can be done through the U.N. to promote a free press around the world?

Governor HALEY. Well, you know, I think the United States has always promoted freedom of press. And while those of us that have been in elected office may not always like it, it is the way it is supposed to be. The press has a job to do, and we should allow them to do it.

And so I think, again, that goes in with American values, that we should talk about that. And that is something that I would be happy to express.

Senator KAINE. So you agree that efforts to restrict the press would be a clear violation of not just the U.N. charter but American values?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely.

Senator KAINE. And that would include blacklisting members of the press corps whose coverage you do not like, ridiculing individual journalists who are doing their job.

Governor HALEY. Are you trying to imply something?

Senator KAINE. Not about you. Or imploring voters not to trust the media. That is sort of a violation of our leadership role in trying to promote a free press, would you not agree?

Governor HALEY. We do always want to encourage free press.

Senator KAINE. Thank you.

With respect to Israel and Palestine, you answered a very direct question from Senator Murphy about whether you believe the long-standing bipartisan U.S. policy with respect to the goal would be a two-state solution between the Jewish state of Israel and an Arab state of Palestine. That was the phraseology of the original 1947 U.N. resolution.

To the best of your knowledge, is the Trump administration committed to maintaining that 70-year bipartisan commitment?

Governor HALEY. I have not heard anything different.

Senator KAINE. Okay. If as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. there are actions taken by Palestine, violence incitement, rocket attacks from Gaza, that threaten the prospects of peace, would you be firm in calling those out?

Governor HALEY. I will be firm in calling out anyone that is trying to disrupt peace around the world.

Senator KAINE. And so if it is Palestinian actions or Israeli actions that you think threaten the bipartisan commitment toward a two-state solution, you would not hesitate to speak out?

Governor HALEY. I think that we will always have those conversations. What forum we have those conversations in may be different, but, yes, I will always have those conversations.

Senator KAINE. Okay. This committee forwarded a resolution to the floor last week stating that the U.S. should not allow Security Council actions that would either dictate peace terms or recognize unilateral Palestinian actions but would instead encourage the parties to find the path forward. I think it was reported out unanimously.

We have all been disappointed by the lack of progress on this issue. How could you use your role as U.S. Ambassador to help find—it may not seem like it is right around the corner, but we always have to be trying—to help find a path toward achieving the goal that we have had for so very long?

Governor HALEY. You know, I think that as important as it is for the United States to see Israel as an ally, it is just as important for us to want peace in that area. And so I think it is important that we support the two coming to the table, that they continue to have those discussions, and that we encourage other Security Council members, rather than putting forth or allowing resolutions like that, to instead show their support for how they want the two to come together and have those discussions.

Senator KAINE. Senator Young asked you a question. You were having a discussion about Syria and about why there had been insufficient actions here. He pointed out that Russia had over and over again vetoed Security Council resolutions about Syria, and it was not really a surprise. It was probably understood that they would veto them. But there is still a value in putting a resolution on the table even if a Security Council member is going to be veto it, just to point out sort of who will stand up for principles and who will not.

We had all of this report about Russian effort to influence the American election, and it is not the first time. They did it with respect to the Brexit election. There is significant discussion about what they may be doing with respect to the French presidential elections, and with elections for the German Chancellor as well.

Would you be willing to speak out for the integrity of nations' electoral processes and work with colleagues to present a Security Council resolution counter Russia for their activity to try to influence the elections of other nations?

Governor HALEY. Yes, Russia or any other country that tried to commit that act.

Senator Kaine. You indicated that you were an opponent of the Iran deal. Would you support the U.S. unilaterally backing out of the Iran deal at this point?

Governor HALEY. I think what would be more beneficial at this point is that we look at all the details of the Iran deal. We see if they are actually in compliance. If we find that there are violations, then we act on those violations.

I think watching that very closely is important. What we did is we gave the state sponsor of terrorism a pass that, even after 10 years, they will not be held to any sort of prohibitions on building nuclear weapons, and we gave them billions of dollars to do it.

So I believe that if that has passed, and if that is where it is, we need to hold them accountable and watch them as we go forward.

Senator Kaine. I would encourage you to read the agreement, because what you just stated about the agreement is quite inaccurate. There are many, many restrictions in the agreement after 10 years, specific restrictions in perpetuity. The first paragraph of the agreement says that Iran, pursuant to the agreement, will never seek to develop, acquire, or otherwise construct a nuclear weapon. So the notion that there is no restriction after 10 years, I do not know where you got that from.

The notion that we gave them money, we did not give them anything. There was money that was Iran's that had been frozen. We released access so they could get money that was theirs in exchange for their agreement to restrict their nuclear weapons program and guarantee in perpetuity not only to not have nuclear weapons but allow inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency that accurately reported to this body that Iraq did not have a nuclear weapons program, and we disbelieved them and started a war and found out that they were right.

So I would encourage you to read the agreement because if you think those things, I can see why you were against it, and I can see why you might want to back out of it. But actually, that is a completely inaccurate reflection of the agreement.

I would also encourage you to speak to intelligence and military officials in Israel, many of whom now say that they think the agreement is working with respect to the nuclear aspect of Iran's activity. There is other activity that is very troubling that we obviously need to be very aggressive in countering.

That is all I have. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator. And I would just say that while, yes, I will look into that, what we all need to remember is a nuclear Iran is very dangerous for the entire world, and it is important that we look at all the details of the agreement, which I will do, and make sure that they are actually following through on the promises that were made.

Senator Kaine. I appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think your emphasis was on radically or strongly enforcing the agreement as it sits——

Governor HALEY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. And beginning in that place.

Senator Paul.

Excuse me. Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. Thank you.

Governor Haley, thank you so much for agreeing to take this on.

My good friend Senator Kaine, I agree with sometimes, and sometimes I do not. His description of the wonderfulness of this Iran agreement, in my judgment, is 180 from what the facts are in real life. One of the primary objections that a lot of us had to the Iran agreement was something that you alluded to, and that is the fact that although a lot of us both publicly and privately urged the administration to take Iran by the throat, and if you are going to make them change their behavior, make them change their behavior.

You cannot take the bad kid in the classroom and say, look, you have been throwing spitballs. You have to stop that. And the kid says, well, okay, I will do it. And they say, and not only that, you are also throwing erasers around and what have you. And they say, well, the kid says, well, I am not going to do that, but I will stop throwing the spitballs. You cannot do that. These people needed to change their behavior. And they have not changed their behavior.

And your characterization of us giving billions of dollars to them that they are going to be able to use to go out and finance terrorism is absolutely accurate. And my friends on the other side had their eyes absolutely closed on that as we went forward.

And they were financing—they were the world's largest sponsor of terrorism when they were broke. What do you think is going to happen after we have given them billions of dollars? This is going to be awful.

So with all due respect to my friends on the other side, and particularly Senator Kaine, who I admire, they are just dead wrong on that issue.

Having said that, as far as the Iran deal is concerned, we have sanctions in place that deal with other things than just the nuclear agreement. And I know a lot of people are just ignoring that, including Iran itself. It is complaining, oh, they are not agreeing, or they are not doing what they are supposed to do on the sanctions.

But they forget they are still sponsoring terrorism. The fact that they launched a missile in absolute contravention of a U.N. resolution that prohibited that within days after it was signed shows you how they feel about all this.

So in any event, do not back down from where you are on that. Keep their feet to the fire.

Governor HALEY. I have no intention. Thank you.

Senator RISCH. Thank you.

Glad to hear your comments about the reputation and confidence of the U.N. in America. You know, people on the East Coast do not have an understanding that there is that lack of confidence. There is a lot of disagreement as far as the U.N. is concerned.

There are places in America where units of government have passed resolutions to declare their area a U.N.-free zone. That is how strongly they feel about the lack of confidence in the U.N.

I want to focus for a minute on something that I think is incredibly important. Senator Rubio talked about it with you, and I want to underscore that. And that is this business of thinking that somehow the second branch of government can bind America.

Probably the poster child for that is the Paris Agreement. You know, my good friends on the other side and the media and everybody keeps saying, well, it is in violation of the Paris Agreement. There is no America—no American bound by one word in the Paris Agreement simply because the President signed it.

And when you talk to—particularly when you talk to the foreign media, they just, their eyes just go round and round. They say, well, the President signed it. They do not understand that we have three branches of government, and the head of the second branch of government is just that. The first branch of government has the power of the purse strings, and the job of the second branch of government is to execute the laws that we pass and to oversee the spending that we authorize.

To somehow think that the second branch can create law and bind Americans to a law that has not been approved by Congress is outrageous.

The provision in the Constitution that says that all treaties, before they can become effective, have got to be approved by this body is incredibly important. And I hope and I know that you will take that with you when you go to the U.N., and underscore that whenever the second branch starts talking about going off on their own. We are much stronger—we are much stronger—if we have all of our branches of government in support of those kinds of things.

So I cannot stress that enough. In the last administration, we have had really nothing but disdain for this provision in the Constitution which says that we have the power to either ratify or not ratify an agreement with a foreign power.

Let me just close here, and I do not mean this to the sound the way it does. You did make the statement that says, well, sanctions by us alone do not work. I want to—our experience on this committee and on the Intelligence Committee I sit on, I can tell you that sanctions by us alone do work.

Now, I will agree with you, they do not work nearly as well as when we have everybody on board, but because of our control over the financial and banking sectors on this Earth, we can really have some substantial effect by ourselves.

When you get right up against it, if we put sanctions on other countries, other banking institutions are going to have to make a choice. Are they going to deal with American institutions, or are they going to deal with Iranian institutions, or whatever country we are talking about? And that always resolves in our favor. It has to resolve in our favor.

So I just ask you to modify that and say that, indeed, they will work better if everybody is on board.

Governor HALEY. And if I can clarify?

Senator RISCH. Sure.

Governor HALEY. Sanctions obviously do work. I just think they work better if we have allies with us to help do that.

Senator RISCH. Absolutely no question about it.

Governor HALEY. And the second thing is that sanctions have to be enforced.

Senator RISCH. Absolutely. They have to be enforced aggressively.

That was one of our objections also to the Iran deal. They kept talking about these snapback provisions. Well, I want to see all these heroes try to put that genie back in the bottle and snap back. That is just flat not going to happen. We are going to have to rely on our own sanctions, if we get to that point. And I, for one, am ready to do that.

Thanks for agreeing to do this. I think you are going to be a great Ambassador to the United Nations. We really appreciate it.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

Senator RISCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Senator Markey.

Senator MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor, our negotiating strength at the U.N. depends on having our allies standing with this. This weekend, President-elect Trump gave an interview to European journalists in which he undermined that unity by yet again disparaging NATO as obsolete and threatening to start a trade war with the European Union.

Last week, General James Mattis, President-elect Trump's nominee for Secretary of Defense, testified that President Putin "is trying to break the North Atlantic alliance," and noted that if we did not have NATO today, we would need to create it.

Do you agree with President-elect Trump that NATO is obsolete? Or do you agree with General Mattis that it is vital?

Governor HALEY. I think NATO is an important alliance for us to have, and now we need more allies than ever, and we need more alliances than we have ever had. And I think it is one that we need to strengthen.

Senator MARKEY. So what would you say to our allies about the need for us to stay together in our resistance to especially the Russian attempts to destroy that alliance?

Governor HALEY. Well, I think that is a great question, because you will see me, if confirmed, all over the U.N., making sure that they understand the importance of alliances and allies, and working together where we can for the greater good.

Senator MARKEY. There are some that wish to have the United States placating Russia, making concessions to Russia that go right at the core of what the key alliance that NATO represents has been providing as security for the world for generations. And from my perspective, but I think from the United States' perspective generally, NATO is not only not obsolete, it is essential. It is the key to making sure that Russia understands that there is no room on a partisan basis that exists in our country in terms of our commitment to resisting Russian incursion.

So from my perspective, I am glad to hear your answer, and I thank you for it.

On the question of global health, in Haiti, I talked to you about this in my office yesterday, the United Nations' peacekeeping force from Nepal actually introduced cholera into a country that had never had cholera before, in the year 2010 after the earthquake in Haiti. Eight hundred thousand people have contracted cholera; 9,000 have died from it. It was created by a Nepal peacekeeping U.N. mission that actually brought that disease to the country by their introduction of it into the water system with their own human waste.

Thus far, there has been no real U.N. financial commitment to cleaning up the sanitation system in that country so that they do not have to worry that every time a hurricane comes through, like it did in October 2016, that it just once again raises up this cholera issue.

Can you talk a little bit about what you feel the United Nations' responsibility is to countries like Haiti where the peacekeeping mission has, in fact, wound up creating more harm than any that was ever reduced by the introduction of that peacekeeping mission?

Governor HALEY. Yes, sir. Senator, thank you for that question.

I will tell you what happened in Haiti is just nothing short of devastating, and it is the reason why I think every peacekeeping mission needs to be looked at thoroughly to make sure that things are moving in the right direction. But it is also why I think it is so important that the contributing countries take responsibility and take actions against those violators that are doing anything to harm the people that they are supposed to be protecting.

And so I think that that was a terrible problem, and so we have to acknowledge the fact that there were peacekeepers involved in that, that there were peacekeepers that contributed to that. And it is really that action that I think we can use to show that these contributing countries have to stand up and take responsibility and be accountable for those causes that they happen to do during peace missions.

Senator MARKEY. And you would argue for increased financial commitment from the countries around the world so that that funding can go into Haiti in order to help with their sanitation system?

Governor HALEY. Those violating countries need to be held accountable.

Senator MARKEY. I agree.

Governor HALEY. And they need to have that responsibility of resolving that problem.

Senator MARKEY. The problem is that Nepal does not have the financial capacity to remediate the problem, but they actually created the problem in the name of all the countries in the world that are part of the United Nations. So it would be necessary to ensure that all the other countries that use the Nepalese military as their agent to then be held accountable as well financially.

Governor HALEY. Right. And there are two things. I do not know if you were in the room when I said it. I think that, one, it is very important that we get other countries to contribute to our peacekeeping missions because they have to have skin in the game because when these things happen, they will help the United States be more accountable, hold these peacekeepers more accountable, hold these contributing countries more accountable, and we should

decide should we use their peacekeepers again, because I think that is another conversation that needs to be had.

We are going to have to make this right with Haiti, without question. And the U.N. is going to have to take responsibility. And I hope that we can have peacekeeping reform in the process while we do that.

Senator MARKEY. Thank you. Eighty-five percent of the Security Council's peacekeeping personnel actually serve in Africa.

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator MARKEY. And the U.N. is deeply involved in ending conflict there. But much of the conflict is caused by poverty. It is caused by disease.

President Bush initiated a program, PEPFAR, to deal with the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. Mr. Tillerson testified last week about his strong support for that program and pointed out that it should be continued and enhanced.

Can you talk a little bit about how you view the PEPFAR program in terms of going forward in the future and the funding levels that would be needed to make it the success it has been thus far?

Governor HALEY. I think PEPFAR, you can look at the results and see the success. You can look at the numbers and the lives that have been affected by that. And I think it is one of the successful programs that happen at the United Nations, and I certainly would continue to support it going forward.

Senator MARKEY. Great. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Senator Paul.

Senator PAUL. Governor Haley, congratulations on your nomination.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator PAUL. James Madison wrote that the executive branch is the branch of government most prone to war. Therefore, the Constitution, with studied care, vested that power in the legislature.

In the days of our Founding Fathers, it was very important who had that power, you know, distributed among the U.S. Government. I do not think they ever conceived of an international body compelling the U.S. to go to war.

I still think it is an incredibly important debate, and we have lost a little bit of this. We let Presidents go to war willy-nilly without much oversight at all. We have still not voted on the current war in the Middle East.

So my question to you is, will you vote for any U.N. resolution that commits U.S. soldiers to war or to a war or to a battle zone that has not been authorized by Congress?

Governor HALEY. Well, and thank you, Senator, for that question, because I think it is an important one.

First of all, I think that as we go forward with all the threats that we have in the world, understand that you are talking to a military wife and a military sister, where both of them have been in combat. And I think that we have to really be careful, if we are going to decide to go to war.

But I also think that, if we decide to go to war, it is important that we have the President-elect, the National Security Council,

Congress, everyone moving in the same direction in order to do that. It will show our strength in the world when we do that. It will also give confidence to those military families that everyone is in agreement that we are doing the right thing.

And so I think it is in the best interests of us regardless of partisanship or anything else to make sure that we all stand in agreement if we decide to show military influence.

Senator PAUL. You know, I agree with the sentiment. I am not sure if we got to the specifics of would you vote for a resolution to send our soldiers, a U.N. resolution, to a war that had not been authorized by the U.S.?

Governor HALEY. And I think that probably the best answer I can give you is that, as a member of the National Security Council, I would encourage them to make sure that they have had these conversations with Congress and that they have Congress' buy-in before we interfere.

Senator PAUL. I would go one step farther in the sense that many say, well, we should have the advice of Congress, and we ought to occasionally go down there and pat them on the back and talk to them. No, no. The rules are pretty specific. We do not go to war really unless Congress votes on war.

And the reason I bring this up is, we may well be in a situation—we are in a war right now, primarily with ISIS in Syria and Iraq. That war has not been authorized. We have had no vote here on whether or not we should be involved in that war.

Some try to stretch a resolution that said we could go after those who attacked us on 9/11. ISIS did not attack us on 9/11. They are not related in any way to anybody who attacked us on 9/11.

Governor HALEY. Right.

Senator PAUL. So we have had no vote. And one generation should not bind another generation to war, but that could well come before you.

Right now, we are at war. You could say, well, we are already at war. We can send people there in the U.N. banner. Well, you should not. I mean, we should say to you, you should not vote for that. You should come back to us and say I will vote for it gladly after Congress does their job and authorizes.

But no U.S. soldiers should ever fight under any international banner without a vote here by Congress. And I cannot state that strong enough because that is a check. That is a check and a balance to try to prevent unnecessary war.

There is a bill floating around to try to withhold U.N. dues until the vote on the Israeli settlements is reversed. Without asking you specifically on that, what do you think of the concept of withholding U.N. dues based on U.N. behavior?

Governor HALEY. Senator, I do not believe in the slash-and-burn approach. As a Governor, you could never do that. That is not effective. I know many legislators will put bills out of frustration, and I absolutely understand the frustration over Resolution 2334. But I think it is important that we are strategic in the way that we hold dues.

So, yes, I do see a place where you can hold dues. I do think it needs to be strategic in nature. I would want to use Congress as

my heavy and leverage in terms of doing that so that I could get members of the council to do the things that we need it to do.

But, yes, I do think that there are times where you can withhold dues. I do not think you should slash and cut across-the-board, because I do not think that will accomplish the goal.

Senator PAUL. And finally, the general concept of U.S. sovereignty is important to many of us. You have heard from some of the other members about whether a U.N. resolution instructs us legally. And, I would say only if approved by Congress, that really there is no supersedence of U.N. resolutions over U.S. law, and I think that is important because we can go to war through the U.N.

But we can do a lot of things through the U.N. that really need to be approved by Congress, not as a consultation, not as a "here is what we are doing, guys." No, it is coming to us and asking permission, because we are directly responsible to the people as well. And it is a check and balance.

And I hope, as you become the U.N. Ambassador, and I will support you, but as you become the U.N. Ambassador, I hope you will consider that and that some of these questions are not simple questions, but they are incredibly profound questions. And whether or not when we go to war and when we do not go to war—as you know, you have family members who will fight in these wars. You know, war is the last resort. We do not want to make it easy. The Founding Fathers did not want to make it easy to go to war. They wanted to make it difficult.

And then we go through consensus. But we do not go through consensus if the U.N. takes us to war.

And I have a great deal of sympathy. There is a young man who is currently suing the U.S. military saying it is an unlawful order for him to take an order from the United Nations because it is a war that has not been authorized here. And I have some sympathy for that.

So I hope you will continue to ponder that and how important it is that we maintain the checks and balances of how we go to war.

Governor HALEY. And I strongly believe of the importance of, should I be confirmed, the U.N. always working with Congress and Congress always having that sort of element to be able to make those decisions as we go forward. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for those sentiments.

Senator Merkley.

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

And thank you, Governor, for appearing today.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator MERKLEY. It is a pleasure to hear you talk about these challenging issues in the world and what is ahead of us.

I wanted to start out with a topic that we conversed about some of my office, and that is the challenge of North Korea, its nuclear weapon development program and its missile program, ballistic missile program.

And specifically, what do you think that we should do more in regard to heading off the continued development of the missiles and the weapons?

Governor HALEY. I actually think we need to have a lot of conversations with a lot of other countries. And that comes from the fact that North Korea is trying to exercise their muscle right now, and they are trying to show their strength.

And I think that while we have seen China start to pull away, we need to talk to China and let them know of the threat. We need to talk to other countries within the area and let them know how strong a threat this is. And we need to try to create a united front in approaching North Korea, because North Korea will feel it if China puts the pressure on them.

And I think that is very, very important because it is getting to a very dangerous situation.

Senator MERKLEY. So, Governor, last year in January, there was a fourth nuclear weapon test by North Korea, and then in February, a major ballistic missile test. And within less than a month of that, the United States was able to get China to agree to increase sanctions on North Korea that included mandatory inspection of all cargo going to and from North Korea, and the requirement to terminate all banking relationships. And it lays out a whole—and that came out exactly the type of pressure you are talking about.

But that Resolution 2270, do you think that was a step forward in terms of that U.S., China, and the world saying to North Korea you have to stop?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. If followed. And that is the thing, that they are not following that, and so actions need to happen from there.

Senator MERKLEY. So and then there was another nuclear test that followed that in September, the fifth nuclear test. And the U.S. again went to work to really try to get the international community and China to push on North Korea. And what they did was put a hard binding cap on North Korea's coal exports. This was considered to be the single most vulnerable point of pressure, because it is their largest source of external revenue.

And China did sign up, and America signed up. And we have this mandatory inspection in place. It is that, too, a step forward in terms of pressuring North Korea?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely.

Senator MERKLEY. But as you pointed out, we have done this, and then North Korea goes ahead anyway. And so in terms of the conversation, China said it is on board. It has agreed to cut all the banking relationships, inspect every piece of cargo, cut their ability to generate revenue.

Should we specifically draw any sort of redline over the missile tests or the nuclear weapon tests? And if so, what would that be?

Governor HALEY. Well, obviously, that is a conversation I need to have with the National Security Council as well as with the President-elect. But I do think this warrants very strong conversations with China to say that this is a slap in the face to China. This is a slap in the face to every country that told North Korea they were not to proceed. And the fact that they are doing it anyway should be offensive to all countries involved in sanctions. So I think that we do need to see where do we go forward.

Senator MERKLEY. I will be very interested in hearing more of your thoughts after you are at the U.N., because we have been using the U.N. really aggressively on this particular topic.

And I went back after our conversation. I was surprised at the amount that had been done that I was not aware of when we talked in my office.

Turning to China, China has dramatically increased its engagement in the U.N. In 2003, they did not really have any U.N. peacekeeping troops, and then they increased it to 2,000, more recently 3,000. Now they have made a pledge to contribute 8,000 troops. It is not clear to me if that is 8,000 on top of the 3,000 or 8,000 total.

But they are now the third overall contributor to the U.N. They are the second overall contributor to fund peacekeepers. And they are the first overall contributor to peacekeepers among the Permanent Five members of the Security Council. So they have vastly—they have really moved in there.

And one of the concerns, and it is related to several questions that were asked about whether the U.S. essentially holds its monetary support of the U.N. hostage. One of the concerns has been that China would love for us to do that because then they go from being almost at the top of the heap to being at the top of the heap in terms of their influence on the organization.

Do you share the concern about China's kind of growing expansion of its power inside the U.N.?

Governor HALEY. I think that you have to look at—and this is a lot of what we discussed yesterday. You have to look at the fact that China is very different from Russia. Russia is trying to show their military strength. China is trying to show their economic strength.

So their strategy is to go and help other countries, to build infrastructure in other countries to buy favor with them and to try to take over that way. So whereas Russia looks at military force, China looks at economic force. And we need to realize that.

And it is a lesson to the United States that we need to strategically understand that the funding needs to be used as a force, the same way China does. And I absolutely agree that we have to keep an eye on China and the funding and the way they are engaging in these other countries, because they are trying to add to their allies list, and we need to be conscious of that.

Senator MERKLEY. Well, this is part of an enduring discussion about tactics in the United States, to the degree we have an outside game and pressure the U.N. by saying you did wrong and we are going to hold you hostage on different programs, or we have an inside game of diplomacy, communication, relationship-building, the type of inside game, actually, that led to those two major resolutions in regard to North Korea.

You will obviously be captain of the inside game, and I look forward to learning more from your viewpoint as that unfolds.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

Senator MERKLEY. In my last few seconds, turning to the global warming, the National Intelligence Council has said that climate change is a wide-ranging national security challenge for the U.S. over the next 20 years.

Do you share the view that global warming is a security threat to the United States?

Governor HALEY. I think it is one of the threats, yes. I do not think it is the most important, but I do think it is on the table.

Senator MERKLEY. One of the widely discussed issues is how it affected the refugees that moved into the Syrian cities, sparking the Syrian civil war. Are you familiar with that chain of events? And do you consider that an example of how climate change can trigger a chain of events that cause a lot of security concerns and impacts in the world?

Governor HALEY. I think there are many countries that look at climate change and what their effects are on all types of elements in the world. So that is why I think it will always be something on the table that would look at and always something that we consider.

Again, as we had the conversations yesterday, I think we have to make sure that we continue to look at it and keep it as a strong element, but not to the burdens of industry and the economy as we go forward.

Senator MERKLEY. My time has expired. Thank you.

Governor HALEY. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

It would be my observation that while the U.N. Security Council may have been active on the North Korean issue, the members themselves, China is not living to the letter of the sanctions that have taken place. Had they been doing so, we might be in a slightly different place.

But I agree that there may be some unilateral actions at some point that need to take place.

Senator BARRASSO.

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

Congratulations. Great to see you again.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much. Absolutely.

Senator BARRASSO. The last questioner just used the phrase, "We are using the U.N. aggressively." And I think this last administration has actually been using the U.N. aggressively to bypass Congress to support Iran, to attack our closest ally Israel, to attack American energy.

So the question to you is, as our Nation's top representative at the United Nations, I think you have to be committed to standing up for American ideals, American values, our standards.

So can you talk a little bit about that, about your commitment to challenging the actions of the United Nations that run counter to our values, our interests, our ideals?

Governor HALEY. You know, and I think that that is a very good question, because the United Nations I think has overstepped. And when you look at Resolution 2334, there is no better example of how they have overstepped.

And I think that there is a role for the United Nations. And I think that is in negotiating deals, in telling what our story is, in talking about America's values and ideals and freedoms and what makes us the best country in the world. And we need to continue to use the U.N. forum to show what we are for, what we are against, and what we will not tolerate.

But having said that, I think that the U.N. is not a place to insert into what other countries do and is not a place to actually take action without Congress having a strong support of it or without the President-elect and the National Security Council.

Senator BARRASSO. We are the largest financial contributor to the United Nations. When you take a look at our Nation, our contribution is more to the U.N. budget than all of the other member permanent members of the U.N. Security Council combined.

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator BARRASSO. We have an incredible debt in this country that I continue to hear about. They say, why are we spending money at the United Nations with this kind of debt?

So can you talk a little bit about your commitment to safeguarding U.S. taxpayer dollars at the U.N. and the kind of transparency that we really need with regard to those funds?

Governor HALEY. Well, thank you, Senator. In South Carolina, that was something that was very important to me, because I think transparency breeds accountability, and that needs to happen.

We do pay 22 percent of the general fund. We are close to 29 percent on the peacekeeping fund, which is actually not what the law requires. We are supposed to be at 25 percent. And I think that when you look at that, every organization and government can always be improved and can always be efficient. And the way you get to that is through transparency. And we need to start showing how the money in peacekeeping is being spent. We need to start showing the programs that are happening in the United Nations and how that is being handled.

I think that there was good progress made in that they had inspector general oversight come in. But I think that is not independent. And as long as it is not independent, we are not getting the true facts there.

So that is something that I will also try to do, is try to make that oversight council more independent so that no countries can weigh in on that, so that we can actually get to the heart of how we can fix the U.N. and make it more effective.

Senator BARRASSO. Can I just stay on the issue of the U.N. peacekeepers for a second, because there have been horrendous reports of sexual exploitation and abuses being committed by the peacekeepers? It is unacceptable. It is outrageous that the United Nations peacekeepers are inflicting terrible atrocities on the people that they are supposed to be protecting.

As the largest contributor of money, all the things, can you talk a little bit about working to ensure that the United Nations holds these peacekeepers accountable in ways from the sort of things that we have been seeing with sexual exploitation and abuse?

Governor HALEY. Yes, Senator. And I spoke about this earlier. I think it is devastating when you have a child or you have a mother who sees peacekeepers and are afraid. And that is something that can never happen.

And I think that we absolutely have to strengthen the whistleblower protections because it is not working. People are too scared to speak up when they see something wrong.

I think that we have to really make sure that we are holding our contributing countries accountable, because when their troops vio-

late, we cannot just let them give them a pass. They have to actually be dealt with accordingly.

And then in some cases, we have to look at whether that country should be providing peacekeepers at all, because a lot of times, they are doing it just to make money and it is not about whether they are protecting people.

And when someone goes in from the U.N. and when they present themselves, people should feel safe, and people should feel protected. They should not be scared, and they should not be leery of what is happening. And we cannot say that right now, and so—especially in the peacekeeping missions in Africa.

So I do think it is very, very important that we start to really hold these countries accountable and let them know. And that is why I think them putting money, more money, toward peacekeeping will have skin in the game. And when they have skin in the game, they will care more about how their money is spent.

And so I think that is true for the general fund as well as the peacekeeping fund.

Senator BARRASSO. And I want to get back to Resolution 2334, and I think that is just part of an ongoing strategy to undermine our friends in Israel.

In 2011, UNESCO voted to admit Palestine as a member state in the organization.

Governor HALEY. Right.

Senator BARRASSO. And it triggered a law that we have in the United States cutting off contributions to UNESCO.

Could you talk a little bit about the United States in terms of opposing Palestinian efforts to obtain full membership at any U.N. agency or organization?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely, because we do not recognize the Palestinian Authority as a state. And I think that we will not, whether it is funding UNESCO—and the fact that we stopped that, I think that was a good move to do that. Or whether it is something where they are trying to insert themselves to be a member, which they tried to do. And I think that now we have to make sure that we continue to hold that ground on that front.

And I think that there are more and more attempts to try to do that. So far, they have failed, but we have to make sure that we do that, because I do think that they are still getting in through resolutions and issues that are happening. And that is all the more reason why we have to stand strong.

Senator BARRASSO. Well, I appreciate your attention. I thank you very much, Governor.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Just to understand the state of play, I had not planned to have a second round, but there was an email exchange with one of our staff members indicating that was a possibility, and I think the minority has understood that to be, that there will be.

Because I do want to conduct always our business with an air of trust, we will have, for some few members who wish to have a second round, a 5-minute round. I do not know of anything that is controversial that has occurred. I would just ask members to re-

spect the fact that it was not something that I intended. But if you really have something that you want to ask, in order to maintain trust, we will have a second round for those few members who may have questions.

I would ask our nominee, who has been here now for 3 hours, would you like to take a 10-minute break?

Governor HALEY. No, sir. I am ready to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

Senator Coons will finish his first round of questioning. And if other members do, in fact, have questions, I would remind folks that we are going to have QFRs, and those will be due as of the close of business tomorrow.

But with that, we will continue on and plow through this.

Senator Coons.

Senator COONS. Thank you, Chairman Corker.

Welcome, Governor Haley. I enjoyed our conversation yesterday, and I was encouraged to hear in your opening statement that you think U.S. leadership is essential in the world and that you look forward to being a strong voice for both American principles and American interests at the U.N. I recognize that, as you said, international diplomacy is a new area for you. We talked about the transition from county executive to senator, from governor to potentially U.N. ambassador.

Let us talk about the U.N. Security Council and some of the challenges we face there and some of the interests that other countries bring into play there. We talked yesterday about the Iran nuclear deal, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and why Russia and China worked with us on imposing and enforcing multilateral sanctions, negotiating to a finished deal, and then to enforcing it. Another member asked you earlier about why the U.N. Security Council has not been able to make progress in challenging or confronting Assad's war crimes against his own people.

Do you have a clear understanding of what might be driving these two issues at this point?

Governor HALEY. Well, first of all, with the Iran deal, the fact that Russia and China were supportive is the red flag that I need to know that there is a problem with the deal, and I think that we have to be very conscious of that.

I also think that as we deal with Syria, we have got to start seeing something that happens. You cannot turn on the TV and see what is happening to children and women and all of those that are just trying to live being dealt with that way. And so I think we are seeing terrible things that happen. And when, again, you see Russia protecting Syria and Russia protecting these issues that are happening, it is dangerous and it is something that we need to be very conscious of, because right now it is not about protecting human life. I think it is very much about making sure they are protecting their own interests, and that is not what America is. We value human life.

Senator COONS. And these were questions I told you yesterday I would follow up on again today. Let me make sure I understand your answer.

Is it clear to you that the reason the Security Council has not acted to confront human rights violations in Syria is because Russia blocks that action?

Governor HALEY. Yes, it is clear.

Senator COONS. Why does it raise a red flag for you that Russia and China supported the JCPOA, the Iran deal, if the United Kingdom and Germany and the EU and other vital American allies, France, did so as well? Are you questioning the value of our international partnerships with them? And let me ask the follow-on question. If we walk away from it without giving it a chance to be fully implemented, will we be safer?

Governor HALEY. Well, first of all, I think that it is in our best interest to be distrustful of all countries as we move forward, as they are distrustful of us. That is just us protecting American interests. So when you look at Russia, you should always know that there is an angle that they are trying to do; the same with China. They are all playing strategy, and that is part of what they continue to do.

With the Iran deal what I said, as I said to you yesterday, I think it is very important that we look at every aspect of the Iran deal and see if it is being followed. And if it is not being followed, and if we do find violations, then I think we should act, and I think we should act strongly.

Senator COONS. And I think you will find strong bipartisan partners here in insisting in its vigorous enforcement. I do encourage you to read the details of the deal, because it does have longer-term and more binding consequences than a previous answer you gave may suggest.

Let me also, if I could, before we turn to U.N. reform, ask you about Russia and your view of Russia. A number of the recent statements by the President-elect have unsettled a number of our allies, and a number of us, and he has in some ways suggested that if we reach a much closer relationship with Russia, it could break the log jam at the Security Council, it could make progress in the fight against terrorism. Many of our allies ask what is on the table.

So in your view, what should be on the table if there were some closer arrangement with Russia? Would you ever accept recognizing their illegal annexation of Crimea?

Governor HALEY. No. I think that we need to make it very clear with Russia on where we stand on Crimea and Ukraine and Syria and be strong on that. Having said that, it is very much like we talk about human rights violations. We may not agree with a country on human rights violations, but we need to work with them on other things.

I think what the President-elect is trying to do is see are there any opportunities to work with Russia, because we can use Russia's help in trying to go against ISIS, and we can use Russia's help on trying to help with other threats throughout the world.

Senator COONS. We have vital allies in NATO such as the Germans, the French, the Brits, who have gone alongside us and fought in Afghanistan, who have invoked Article 5 of the NATO charter and stood alongside us in the fight against terrorism. I have real trouble with his idea that in any way we should trust Vladimir Putin and his Russia at an equal level as Angela Merkel

and Germany, and all of our NATO allies, his ongoing, steady diminution of the value of NATO when NATO has been the strongest, most important, most enduring alliance we have built and been a part of.

Ambassador Power gave a very pointed farewell speech yesterday where she laid out the case that Russia is the single greatest threat to the world order today, to the world order that we have built, the so-called liberal rules-based world order that the U.N. is one of the highest examples of. Did you read or follow that speech?

Governor HALEY. I did not.

Senator COONS. I urge you to do so.

Governor HALEY. I will. I have been working towards this committee assignment, so I have not had the time to do that, but I will make a point to do that.

Senator COONS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that it be admitted to the record, entered into the record, because I think it is a very clear-eyed assessment of just how persistent a threat Russia has been to our core values, which I would argue are our core interests—free press, democracy, human rights, and our vital NATO alliance.

Governor HALEY. And, Senator, just to be clear, we agree on that. We agree on Russia, and I know that your concerns over the comments of the President-elect are probably best suited to ask him as opposed to me.

Senator COONS. But he is not in front of me and you are, so forgive me.

Governor HALEY. And you are not getting any answers from me on that. So I am just telling you, in the importance of time.

Senator COONS. About U.N. reform, if we were to simply, as some have suggested, in order to punish the U.N. for the Security Council taking a vote which I think we have unanimously opposed, if we were to simply cut funding to the U.N., would that strengthen or weaken our hand in defending Israel at the U.N.?

Governor HALEY. Well, as I have said, you can never win with slash and burn techniques. That does not work. What is important is that we do strategic types of cutting if we are going to cut anything at all. So I do not agree with that. I do not think that is the way that we can come out strong and show our strength in terms of what we believe in and what we are against. I think it is better to do that with negotiations than I think with just slash and burn.

Senator COONS. I will close and then come back for another round, briefly, if I could.

Let me commend to you that the new Secretary General, Antonio Guterres, I think will be a strong partner for you in engaging in thoughtful and systemic reform, and our vital ally, the United Kingdom, does have a multilateral aid effectiveness review, a process that they go through to look at the return on investment, as you have put it, or the effectiveness of their contributions, and they have assessed many of the U.S. voluntary funded programs as having a high impact. I would recommend that to you for your reading.

I look forward to asking you some more questions in a few minutes.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The statements by Samantha Power will be, without objection, entered into the record.

[The information referred to is located in the Additional Material Submitted for the Record section of this transcript, beginning on page 137.]

The CHAIRMAN. It would be my observation that sometimes even our closest friends have different interests. If you remember, there were 58 senators I think that opposed the Iran deal. Unfortunately, by virtue of it being done the way that it was that many people have alluded to—it was done by an executive agreement with the U.N. Security Council. But our friends in Germany and Great Britain and France had mercantile interests that caused them to support an agreement that allowed them to do business with Iran, in addition to other issues. Again, I would say that 58 senators here disagreed with them on the efficacy of this agreement. So we sometimes disagree even with our closest friends.

Senator Cardin.

Senator CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the courtesy on the second round.

Governor Haley, thank you for your strength to continue through.

Governor HALEY. Oh, there is a lot more strength than that.

Senator CARDIN. You are going to need it at the United Nations, so the best to you.

I want to take my time to go over a few issues that were covered in the first round. You have mentioned frequently that we want other countries to have skin in the game as it relates to peacekeepers and the importance of the peacekeeping missions. I just really want to point out that in 2016 alone, 79 U.N. peacekeepers lost their life in service to humanity. So countries have skin in the game. We have used mostly resources, money, and there is the ability-to-pay issue among different states. I do not disagree, and I included in my opening comments my concern about the sexual exploitation and abuse that cannot be tolerated, and we do need more countries participating. But I just wanted to point out that countries have given their people, and some have lost their lives in support of our peacekeeping—

Governor HALEY. And I have great respect for that. My ordering was about monetary.

Senator CARDIN. Well, some countries cannot afford the monetary aid, and that is why they use their people. They subsidize that way.

Secondly, I want to just respond to what you did in South Carolina in regards to Syrian refugees. I do not question the way that you responded based upon the information given to you by the FBI. I just really want to set the record straight here about the vetting process used for Syrian refugees. It is the most strict vetting process of any coming into America. I think we have had somewhere around 13,000 settled through the Syrian refugee program; this is far less than our pro rata share by any reasonable allocation, and there have been no problems that I am aware of for any Syrian refugees that have come to this country. Most, of course, are women and children.

In fact, if you look at the refugee program, which you were complimentary of—

Governor HALEY. Yes.

Senator CARDIN [continuing]. Between 1975 and 2015, over 3 million refugees have come to America, and it is my understanding there have been three specific episodes of terrorist involvement that have led to convictions. That is three too many, do not get me wrong. It should be zero, and we have to continue the strict vetting. But it is not the risk pool that maybe is popularly perceived by refugees coming to America, and I just really wanted to correct the record in that regard.

I want to underscore one or two points, one dealing with war crimes. You have acknowledged that what has happened in Syria has elevated to war crimes. Not only has it been what we saw in Aleppo, which was absolutely outrageous, with the use of chemical weapons, which has also been confirmed, which in and of itself would be war crimes. I just want to make sure that you are focused on not only calling them war crimes but using the United Nations forum to say we cannot condone this. You cannot wipe this off. You cannot say, well, we will deal with the other issues of the Syrian civil war, but we will not hold those who are responsible accountable. That cannot be the U.S. position, and I just urge you to make sure that when we say never again, we mean never again.

When we are talking about never again, what is happening in South Sudan? Ethnic cleansing is taking place as we are here. Civilians are losing their lives because of this ethnic conflict. The leadership has been unable or unwilling to deal with this. In the United Nations there are a couple of proposals that are pending, one is an arms embargo that I would urge you to support. There is strong support in Congress for an arms embargo. The other is to get a peace process actually working while protecting human life. We have got to be more aggressive because it is the next ethnic cleansing when we say never again.

And the last thing I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in my 50 seconds that are remaining is that it was refreshing to hear your comments about speaking truth to power. I think it came out in the context of the President-elect and the U.N. National Security Council, which I am convinced that you are going to speak up for what you believe is right. But it is also dealing with Russia and China and the Security Council resolutions. When you are confronted with the situation where they say, well, you want our help here, then get off this kick of human rights; I am convinced that you are not going to get off this kick of human rights, that you will continue to speak out for American values, and that we can do more than one thing at a time and we are not going to be bullied to give up the values that have made this country's leadership so critically important around the globe.

Once again, thank you for your patience, and thank you for being willing to serve.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Menendez.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor, I just want to follow up on Senator Cardin's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into the record a State Department process of how refugees enter into the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

[The information referred to is located in the Additional Material Submitted for the Record section of this transcript, beginning on page 145.]

Senator MENENDEZ. And I would just simply say that even Director Comey, in testimony before the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, when he referenced the Syrian refugees, said "I think we have developed an effective way to touch all of our databases and resources to figure out what we know about these individuals." And also in other testimony by Director Rodriguez of the USUHS, 20 percent of all Syrian refugee applications are not granted entry into the United States. So I hope you will look at that. One thing is what you were given at the time, but I hope you will look at that because, particularly at the U.N., the question of refugees, whether they be Syrian or not, is particularly of global concern.

I would like to talk to you a little bit. You have answered the sanctions question a couple of times here, and I am left concerned because in your answers you said sanctions by the United States do not work if they are alone; they have to be multilateral. Of course we would like to see multilateral sanctions, but I would call to your attention that the sanctions regime that we built on Iran that ultimately led them to come to the negotiating table—I did not care for the ultimate result and voted against it—but that led them to the negotiating table was built largely by members of this committee working with the Congress, and then getting the administration on board, and started off alone, and then worked to build an international coalition.

So I would like to just hear from you that sometimes we have to go it alone before we get others to go with us. You talked about leadership various times. Leadership is not always being able to get a coalition from the start. Leadership sometimes takes action and then getting others to join you in a coalition.

Governor HALEY. Yes. Thank you, Senator, for the opportunity to clarify that. I clarified earlier. Sanctions work when they are enforced. And of course, you know, if the U.S. were to put sanctions against certain countries, that does work. It just works better when we have coalitions. I think for us to do sanctions against—I give that example—against North Korea, that is all well and good. If I can get China to help and really strengthen those sanctions, then we make magic.

So it is always going to be that we lead and we lead strongly. It is my job to make sure that we just are not the only ones doing sanctions, that we have others with us.

Senator MENENDEZ. Okay. I appreciate hearing that clarification, and I look forward to you making a lot of magic at the end of the day. But sometimes we have to lead in order to achieve that, and sanctions do not always start off with a multilateral unity at the beginning.

And because sanctions is a tool of peaceful diplomacy—and I do not think it should be used each and every time, I do not think it

is the only tool of peaceful diplomacy, but it is a major one—if you have neutered yourself of it, then you have left yourself very little in the pursuit of peaceful diplomacy.

I want to go to Iran. U.N. Resolution 2231 specifically calls upon Iran “not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches using such ballistic missile technology.” Since it was adopted at the Security Council, Iran has launched at least 10 ballistic missiles.

Earlier this month a report from the United Nations indicated Iran is likely in violation of these resolutions because of armed shipments to Hezbollah and possibly to rebels in Somalia and Yemen. The U.N. Security Council’s arms embargo and ballistic missile sanctions require not just compliance of Iran but also member states to enforce them.

If Iran violates both the ballistic missile sanctions, as has been universally recognized, and violates the arms embargo, do you plan to use your position at the United Nations to try to create a coalition to hold Iran accountable?

Governor HALEY. Absolutely. And any time that we put sanctions forward, we should follow through on those when there are violations.

Senator MENENDEZ. Now, in doing so, do you also plan to leverage against those—I wanted to underline the emphasis that, yes, Iran is responsible, but so are other member countries not to allow Iran to have the wherewithal to do that in terms of suppliers and other things. We also seek to pursue them as well.

Governor HALEY. I think that we have to call out anyone that is helping Iran do anything. I think that the other side of that is we are seeing more and more where Iran is not allowing us access to see if violations are occurring, and that is also going to be something we will have to be careful of.

Senator MENENDEZ. I have another line of questioning but I will wait, Mr. Chairman.

Governor HALEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. There will not be a third round. If it is a brief question, because of your distinguished service here, then we will let you do that so we can close this out. Would you like Senator Coons to go first so you can collect your thoughts?

Senator MENENDEZ. Yes. In order to make it brief, Mr. Chairman, if I can collect my thoughts.

The CHAIRMAN. Before I go to Senator Coons, I would make this observation. I am all for the pursuit of Russia potentially being involved in war crimes in Syria, all for it. There is nobody on this committee that would be more for that. I will say that it has been interesting with our witnesses coming in for a new administration, that has been a line of push, but there has not been much towards the sitting administration and the sitting U.N. ambassador relative to calling those out.

So it would be more fulsome to me if we were talking about that over the last month also.

Senator CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I would take personal exception to that. I will give you the volume of letters and phone calls and public questioning that I have done to not only the Obama admin-

istration but the Bush administration. As I said previously, we generally have disagreements with all administrations as to how helpful Congress can be, but I can assure you that I am an equal opportunity human rights advocate.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you probably are. I just would, again, stick to my observation.

Senator Coons.

Senator COONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor, a number of us have real concerns about fragile states and about the arc from troubled states, states with internal conflict, to really fragile states, to failed states and what the consequences are. Typically, a fragile state is one that really has a legitimacy problem. The central government really does not control the whole country. It has some insurgencies. It has real disconnections between its average citizen and very weak state capacity, but it is not yet a completely failed state.

Tell me, why should the average American care about fragile states, and how do they affect our national security? Just name a couple of states you consider fragile, if you would. Then I want to talk about U.N. platforms to address and deal with fragile states.

Governor HALEY. Well, Americans should always be concerned about fragile states, and it is because usually when states are fragile they start to erupt in things that can cause threats down the road. I think if you look at South Sudan, that is a perfect example, that while we have tried to bring peace to that area, you now have a government that is not wanting that. We are starting to see other issues that are starting to happen in that area.

So it is important for us to work towards peace everywhere, and I think it is important for us to get in front of the situation. We can see it before it gets fragile. We can see conflict before it happens. It is important that I think the U.N. not acknowledge it once it is too late, that we start to acknowledge it as we see it happening because I think we can get more effectiveness done that way than otherwise.

Senator COONS. The archetypal fragile state in this area has been Afghanistan, which was a refuge for the terrorist organization, Al Qaeda, that attacked us largely because it really was not a coherent or effective state.

I would argue that the U.N. offers some of the strongest tools we have to address fragile states without deploying American troops, whether it is UNICEF, which does great work in terms of dealing with human suffering, or whether it is UNHCR, which deals with refugees, or it is U.N. peacekeeping.

Talk to me about how you would imagine advocating for the U.N. being a more effective platform for addressing fragile states in the interest of our security and values.

Governor HALEY. I think it is important that we look for results. It should not just be that we have a conversation about how a state is becoming more fragile. It is actually looking at results. Any time we are dealing with any situation that could start to pose a threat, we need to decide what we want to do as a plan and where we want to go and what we will consider success. I think there need to be measurables along the way to make sure that we are complying with that. I think those conversations need to be more de-

tailed in nature, as opposed to more high-reaching, saying that it is fragile or it may cause problems or it may be an issue. I think we need to get more involved.

Senator COONS. Let me ask you a closing question, if I might, that Mr. Tillerson and I went back and forth on, and several others did as well. Some view our values—and I will just give three examples, things that we fight for in the world that, frankly, the Chinese and the Russians do not: press freedom and transparency; human rights and democracy. I see those as essential to our interests, not distinct from our interests. In one exchange Mr. Tillerson suggested that at times, at times, our national security interests have to take a front seat and we maybe have to, with some of our allies and partners, have our advocacy for our values take a back seat. I would argue there are other settings where it is our failure to consistently advocate for democracy and human rights and good governance that leads to failed states, in some cases.

What is your view about the value of continuously advocating for democracy and human rights and a free press? Is it in conflict with our interests, or does it complement our interests?

Governor HALEY. I think we always talk about the values of America. I think we always talk about why we are the greatest country in the world. I think that we always express why we want to share those values with the rest of the world.

When it comes to other issues, I understand that we can have more pressing issues that we want to negotiate. I do not think we have to compromise our values to do that. I think these are conversations that can take place at the same time. I think it is very important that countries around the world know what we value, but they also know where we stand. I think we can have negotiations, conversations on issues that are at hand without ever compromising us talking about our values. I think both can be done at the same time.

Senator COONS. I think we will have a productive conversation about how we keep those in the right balance going forward and how we invest appropriately in advancing democracy and governance and human rights and a free press at the same time that we advance our commercial or security or other interests as well.

Thank you, Governor.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Menendez for a succinct question.

Senator MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, it is because the questions are too important, I am not going to synthesize them. I will submit them for the record. They involve our participation with the U.N. Commission on Refugees in Central America. They involve where we are headed and what role the Governor thinks we can pursue in Venezuela, which is a crisis right here in our own hemisphere. And also I would like to hear from the Governor something that you are very passionate about that we worked together on, which is a greater role at the United Nations on human trafficking. And because I cannot synthesize those and do them honor and worth, I will submit them for the record and look forward to what I hope will be a very explicit response to them.

I just want to take one more moment to say I appreciate the Chairman's comments earlier, but speaking only for myself, there has been no one who has more consistently challenged this administration as part of his own party on various issues, including the question of actions in Syria and war crimes. So, it is not new to some of us.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think that is, especially coming from you, I will say, a very accurate statement, and I appreciate the way we have been able to work on the Syrian issue. I know that we all have been very disappointed with the actions that have not been taken, and certainly working together on the Iran resolution, trying to oppose it. So I thank you for that.

This is an observation. There is a new zeal relative to it for lots of reasons, but I think that all of us certainly need to be pushing back against Russia and the violations of international norms that they have put forth. Certainly what has happened in Aleppo is something that somebody needs to pay a price for. It upsets all of our sensibilities, and I appreciate everyone here on the committee expressing that.

Senator CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I may be a little sensitive on this, but as one of those individuals who has been on a list for a long time not able to go to Russia because of my leadership on the Magnitsky law, this is not just recent. Our concern about Russia has been building for a long time, and many of us have been very open about the danger Russia poses to the world order. So I do not think this is something that is new.

The CHAIRMAN. With that, do you have any other statements relative to our nominee?

Senator CARDIN. No. But just again, it has been a pleasure hearing your responses and, as I said the first time we met, thank you for being willing to serve your country.

Governor HALEY. And thank you for the opportunity. I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. So, for the state of play, we are going to leave the record open until the close of business tomorrow. I have just talked to the ranking member, and we plan on having the markup on Mr. Tillerson on Monday, Monday afternoon, assuming his questions come in this week and are answered thoroughly.

In the event you are able, and it would be quite a feat I think, I hope that people will keep the questions to questions that really need to be answered. But to the extent you are able to answer the questions by the end of the week also, we would attempt to have your markup at the same time we have Mr. Tillerson.

Just an observation again. I think that people have very much respected your instincts here today, and I think the nuance of some of the foreign policy, having been the governor of South Carolina and all of a sudden coming to New York to the U.N. Security Council, there is going to be a lot of nuance that you are going to pick up over time, and certainly knowledge relative to foreign relations issues that you just have not been dealing with.

But I think I can tell you as Chairman, I feel very good about you going there with the instincts that drive the desire for reform that you have expressed here. I think you have impressed everybody in the individual meetings that you have had. I am certain

that you are going to be confirmed overwhelmingly, and I thank you for your desire to serve our country at this time in this important capacity.

Senator CARDIN. What is the date for the questions for the record? When is it open until?

The CHAIRMAN. Close of business tomorrow.

Governor HALEY. And I would respectfully ask that I do not need 1,023 of them. I am hoping that we do not have quite that many.

Senator CARDIN. We will try to keep it under 1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You remember how the General Assembly or legislature was in South Carolina?

Governor HALEY. I do remember.

The CHAIRMAN. They generally did not listen to you, and I doubt that will be heeded.

Governor HALEY. I do not expect you to listen now, but I thought at least I could try.

The CHAIRMAN. But I do hope that people ask questions that truly need to be answered, and I appreciate your sentiment there.

Governor HALEY. And I look forward to answering them.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting is adjourned.

Governor HALEY. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 1:38 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR ROBERT MENEDEZ

U.S.–U.N. Ambassador

Question. António Guterres of Portugal was appointed by the General Assembly to succeed Ban Ki-Moon as the U.N. Secretary-General on January 1, 2017. Guterres stated that his priorities will include working for peace, supporting sustainable development, and reforming internal management. He is seen as having priorities much better aligned to that of the U.S. than many of his predecessors.

- What tact will you take to cultivate a direct, personal relationship and to forge a partnership with him to advance U.S. policy interests?
- Broadly, what will you tell the Secretary-General when you meet him as to what the U.S. thinks his priorities should be?

Answer. I believe the new Secretary-General's long experience as U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees will be a unique asset as we work together not just on refugee issues, but also on peacekeeping and other security and reform issues. I look forward to working with him as we will both be newcomers and will have fresh eyes on the many challenges ahead for the U.N. If confirmed, I expect to pursue an open and continuous dialogue with him. The issues of U.N. reform, including peacekeeping, management and transparency reforms, will be some of the early topics I will address with him as priorities.

Question. President-elect Trump has made a number of perplexing and even disturbing statements regarding foreign policy issues and the role of the U.S. in the world. Importantly, as our ambassador to the United Nations, you be the chief spokesperson in New York as to our values and priorities. An anxious world wants to know what an "America First" approach means in international affairs.

- How will you address these legitimate concerns?

- Will you work within the administration, as a member of the National Security Council, to advance traditional understandings of foreign policy and U.S. values? What particular values will you highlight/champion?

Answer. As I mentioned in my testimony, I will always stand for American values and ideals at the United Nations. I believe the President's "America First" approach in practice means that he will identify America's fundamental national interests and vigorously defend them using all of the diplomatic, economic and military tools at his disposal. If confirmed, I look forward to vigorously promoting our nation's objectives through diplomacy at the U.N.

United Nations

Question. The U.N. Human Rights Council (UNHRC) has not lived up to its mandate and some have called for the U.S. to withdraw. But the council has had a number of important successes over the years (highlighting abuses in the DPRK and Iran, among others), and others therefore argue that the U.S. must remain committed and engaged in the council to help it be more effective and to drive the agenda.

- In your opinion, are U.S. policy goals better achieved by remaining in the UNHRC by limiting our involvement?
- How would you advance a positive human rights agenda reflective of our values at the U.N.?

Answer. As I mentioned during my hearing, I think that the Human Rights Council is a flawed body, particularly in its bias against Israel and the ability of human rights violators to be elected and shield each other from criticism. I do not know if or how the Trump administration plans to engage with the Human Rights Council, but will work to implement the policies of the administration in this area.

Question. While there is a commonly-held perception that the U.N. is generally anti-American and not a partner with us on many of the seminal issues of the day, a recent poll indicated that 61 percent of Americans have a positive opinion of the organization. Certain programmatic areas such as peacekeeping, enjoy even more support. Nevertheless, the U.N. has not lived up to its mandate and often engages in actions and rhetoric that is either hostile to the U.S. or to our allies.

- What is the role of the United States U.N. Ambassador in explaining U.S. foreign policy to a global audience?
- To what extent do you plan to educate, inform, and reach out to broad sectors of the American public? How will you accomplish this?
- How do you plan to refresh and sustain public support for the institution during your tenure?

Answer. As I said in my testimony, I believe part of my role as U.N. Ambassador is to be accountable, first and foremost, to the people of the United States. I believe that, if confirmed, an important part of my job will be to explain to the American people what is happening at the U.N. and to give an honest assessment of the successes and challenges I find there. I am committed to making domestic public outreach a priority, as well as speaking to the international audience that cares about the work of the U.N. My firm message will be that U.S. leadership is essential in the world, and certainly at the U.N. In every case, I will call it as I see it.

The United Nations Security Council

Question. The U.S. has a history of opposing one-sided U.N. Security Council (UNSC) Resolutions where Israel is concerned. These initiatives, where the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is concerned, are not helpful and actually are counterproductive to producing positive outcomes. This past September, I and some Senate colleagues sent a letter to President Obama expressing our concerns about such votes.

- Will you continue the longstanding U.S. policy to veto any one-sided UNSC resolutions that may arise during your tenure?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What steps will you take to encourage other member states to engage in productive efforts and to resist joining such anti-Israel resolutions?

Answer. Israel is a vital ally of the United States, and we must meet our obligations to Israel as our most important strategic ally in the region. Should I be confirmed, I would recommend to the President that the U.S. will any U.N. Security Council resolution that unfairly condemns Israel, undermines progress toward a mutually agreed peace agreement, or is in conflict with U.S. interests.

Question. A number of our Western Hemisphere neighbors and other countries who often otherwise share similar worldviews, continue to vote for these one-sided resolutions (e.g., resolutions on the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Division for Palestinian Rights, and the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People)

- Will you urge your colleagues at the U.N. to withdrawal their support of these annually recurring resolutions by the U.N. General Assembly? What arguments will you make to get them to change their positions?
- How will you counter such future initiatives that do little than stoke unproductive efforts to inappropriately use international funding and the mantle of the United Nations to pursue a unilateral approach in the region?

Answer. Yes. If confirmed, I will work with Congress and other Cabinet officials to use U.S. diplomatic and economic pressure to encourage such outcomes and assess if U.S. funding for these initiatives can be eliminated or conditioned.

Question. I am an original cosponsor of S. Res. 6 which expresses grave objection to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334. If further calls for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that it is no longer one-sided and rejects efforts by outside bodies, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose solutions from the outside that set back the cause of peace.

- What are your views about this resolution?

Answer. Israel is a vital ally of the United States, and we must meet our obligations to Israel as our most important strategic ally in the region. Should I be confirmed, I would recommend to the President that the U.S. announce it no longer supports that resolution and would veto any U.N. Security Council efforts to implement it or enforce it, and block any future U.N. sanctions based on it.

Question. Some have argued for the need for reform of the Security Council (UNSC) to including broadening permanent membership to include additional countries such as India. Others have called for changes as to the use of the veto power.

- What, if any, reforms of the UNSC would you support?
- Would expanding membership on the UNSC help or harm the legitimacy and effectiveness of the body? How about increasing the permanent membership?
- Does the P5 structure impede getting more support (e.g., financial, peace-keeping) from other developed and advanced nations? What arguments would you make to those countries who only occasionally have a seat on the council to get them to share in shouldering the burdens of global engagement?

Answer. As I understand it, there is not a broad consensus among U.N. member states on Security Council reform. If confirmed, my advice would be based on the particulars of such a proposal. I would not support any reform proposal that weakens U.S. influence in the Security Council or undermines U.S. interests in that body. Although this can be immensely frustrating—for example, Chinese and Russian opposition to taking stronger action with respect to North Korea—I would not support any change to the veto power because such a change would undermine the ability of our nation's representatives to protect U.S. interests in that body.

U.N. Reform

Question. While the U.N. has taken steps to improve its efficiency, operational effectiveness, and accountability, the continuing need for reform is obvious to most observers, even to strong supporters of the institution. The incoming Secretary-General has committed to an agenda of reform. The U.S. push for reform is one of the main drivers behind the progress to date. Sustained engagement by successive administrations have improved the environment and the U.N.'s receptivity to change.

- In your opinion, what are the top three reforms that the U.N. could undertake in the coming two years that will have the greatest impact?
- How will you explain to the Secretary-General and the member states that continued reform is a precondition for full U.S. support of the U.N.?
- What tactics would you use if reform efforts falter or lack urgency?
- Are you satisfied with the pace of reform? Why or why not?

Answer. As I mentioned during my hearing, I agree that the U.N. is in serious need of reform. I also believe that Congress can be a vital partner in pressing the U.N. to adopt specified reforms through application of financial leverage. If confirmed, I will consult with Congress on reform priorities and how to best achieve them.¹²⁾

Question. There has been considerable talk of late about the U.S. withholding financial support of the U.N. in response to various votes and resolutions. Critics have countered that a distinction should be made between the institution of the U.N. and the actions and votes of its individual members. In some ways, votes contrary to U.S. policy positions and national interests can be seen as a partial result of U.S. ineffectiveness in working with fellow member states at the U.N. in addition to institutional bias.

- In general, do you think the threat of financial withholding is an effective tool in advancing a U.S. policy of U.N. reform?
- Does threatening to limit our engagement and financial support enhance U.S. leverage?
- Would you agree with the statement that our significant financial contributions garners increased influence at the U.N. and that reductions in such support will actually create opportunities for our adversaries?

Answer. As I stated during my confirmation hearing, I do not support slash and burn cuts to U.S. funding, but targeted and selective withholding tied to specific reforms has proven in the past to be an effective means for pressing the organization to implement reforms.

U.N. Peacekeeping Operations

Question. Former Chairman of the joint Chiefs Admiral Mike Mullen stated that “[United Nations] peacekeepers help promote stability and help reduce the risks that major U.S. military interventions may be required to restore stability in a country or region.” Also, studies indicate that U.N. peacekeepers are significantly less expensive than the U.S. equivalent. Reform efforts to date have reduced the cost of U.N. peacekeepers by about 18%.

- Do you view U.N. peacekeeping operations as complimentary to U.S. military efforts elsewhere?
- Is peacekeeping participation a genuine expression of a burden-sharing?
- How could U.N. peacekeeping operations be made more effective, more accountable?

Answer. As I stated during my hearing, I believe that U.N. peacekeeping operations have been useful and effective in some circumstances. U.S. support should be decided on a case-by-case basis.

Question. U.N. peacekeepers often enjoy a degree of credibility that forces from sovereign nations do not. U.N. peacekeepers operate in a number of challenging areas where there would be minimal public or Congressional support for U.S. forces to do so. The conflict in Korea provides a historical example of how U.N. peacekeeping operations can directly benefit U.S. policies, there are more contemporary examples as well.

- Would you be prepared to engage in active U.S. leadership with regards to U.N. peacekeeping operations to ensure improved accountability, operational effectiveness, and further efficiencies?
- What particular initiatives would you engage in this area within the first six months?

Answer. If confirmed, yes. As I mentioned in my hearing, I am particularly troubled by sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers and will focus on bolstering current policies and efforts to address this serious problem.

Question. Recently a Department of State authorization was passed by Congress for the first time in more than a decade. In the authorization, there was specific language that called for the Secretary of State to submit a (1) a United States strategy for combating sexual exploitation and abuse in United Nations peacekeeping operations; and (2) an implementation plan for achieving the objectives set forth in the strategy.

- What will be your role and the role of the Mission you lead over the next six months to ensure that the submitted report is comprehensive, actionable, and in keeping with the intent of the legislation?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with the Department of State to ensure that this report complies fully with the law.

Question. There are 16 U.N. peacekeeping missions worldwide—the U.S. is the largest financial contributor in the world to these operations. However, there are longstanding differences between the U.N. and the U.S. regarding our financial contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations (28.47 percent vs. 27.14 percent) The new authorization calls on the United States U.N. Ambassador to have peace-

keeping credits for discontinued operations returned to the U.S. (and thus not available to be used towards the resolution of the assessment gap) The continuation of this disagreement undermines our standing at the U.N. and contribute to financial irregularities.

- What steps can be done to regularize our peacekeeping funding assessment and to eliminate the so-called gap?
- What strategies will you use to ensure the U.S. receives any unspent credits from discontinued peacekeeping operations?
- Do you think it is appropriate that the P5 are assessed more for peacekeeping operations as opposed to the general assessment?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work to establish a maximum peacekeeping assessment of 25 percent to comply with U.S. law enacted in 1994. I will also seek to spread the scale of assessments more equitably among the member states so that even small contributors have a financial interest in making sure that there is efficient use of their contributions.

FUNCTIONAL

Climate and Environment

Question. The Paris climate agreement sets a baseline goal of limiting warming to 2 degrees Celsius over pre-industrial temperatures, with an ultimate goal of limiting it to 1.5 degrees Celsius. It was an agreement adopted with near global consensus. Many foreign countries do not see the U.S. as a leader on climate change and are concerned about the incoming Trump administration's commitment to climate change mitigation.

- Do you believe the United States should meet its commitments under the Paris agreement?

Answer. See answer below.

Question. How would you assert American leadership in this area at the U.N. and demonstrate resolve in confront the issue of climate change with determination and clearheaded global effort?

Answer. If confirmed, I expect that the State Department and other departments of the government will conduct a review of the Nationally Determined Contribution submitted by the Obama administration as part of our review of the Paris Agreement and the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change to determine whether the NDC and/or the international agreements advance U.S. national interests. Both the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement were negotiated by different presidential administrations and it is the obligation of the incoming administration to make its own determination regarding the ongoing viability of those agreements to determine whether they advance U.S. national interests.

Question. Marine mammals play a vital role in marine ecosystems and are critical to the health of our oceans. Unfortunately, human activities, have devastated many populations of marine mammals. On an international level, the United States is a signatory of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling and a member of the International Whaling Commission, which regulates whaling practices and the conservation of whales. The International Whaling Commission has implemented a moratorium on commercial whaling since 1986 with exceptions for certain subsistence whaling by indigenous populations.

- What steps will you take at USUN to help sustain support for the international moratorium on whaling?
- Where do you see maintaining marine ecosystems in the ranking of environmental priorities at the U.N.?

Answer. This is an area on which I look forward to be briefed as soon as feasible, should I be confirmed.

Development

Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)

Question. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is an example of broad, U.N.-led policies to guide international efforts to address global economic, social and environmental development issues. The SDGs logically build on the accomplishments of the Millennium Development Goals. The U.S. was deeply engaged in this effort and pushed hard for a number of specific goals.

- Do you believe that the SDGs are in accordance with our foreign assistance goals? Are they a useful framework for addressing complex, global problems and development challenges?
- How do you plan to leverage your position to help advance SDGs of particular goals at the U.N.?
- Which are most important to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy? Are there particular goals/targets that you will individually champion?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on the Sustainable Development Goals. My experience as a governor has convinced me that market oriented policies, reduced regulatory barriers to business and entrepreneurship, and a strong, fair and transparent rule of law are essential to higher economic growth and development. To the extent that the Sustainable Development Goals promote and encourage sound policy in developing countries, I believe they can be a useful tool in promoting global development. If confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

Question. One of the SDGs has a specific target of taking “immediate and effective measures” to eradicate forced labor and human trafficking and to “secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour.” The recent report on the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 lists the total number of goods produced by child or forced labor at 139, involving 75 countries.

- How can the U.S. and the U.N. be more effective in shining a spotlight on countries that have not made a genuine commitment to abolishing child or forced labor?
- Is “conscious capitalism” a U.S. value? What does the term mean to you in the context of the SDGs.
- Are we doing enough to share with the international community how the SDGs align with our values?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I commit to working tirelessly with the President, senior policymakers, and other federal agencies to assist in the fight against human trafficking through my voice, vote and influence in the United Nations.

Women and Girls

Question. U.N. agencies such as UNICEF, U.N. Women and UNFPA, and associated programs such as Girl Up, work to help realize the Sustainable Development Goals by promote gender equality and equal rights for men and women around the world.

- How can you and our mission to the U.N. help these efforts and to build sustaining global support for these issues?
- In what way, if any, do women and girls’ policy issues stand apart from wider human rights and development goals? Are women and girls issues best treated within a broader policy framework or do they need particular focus, support to be successfully implemented?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about the Sustainable Development Goals in this area and what appropriate role the U.S. should play.

Question. The U.N. carries out vital work supporting women and girls access to education and employment and by advising governments on how to combat violence against women and girls. But needed programming demands far exceed the U.N.’s ability to deliver, due to funding gaps and inconsistent political will amongst U.N. member states.

- Given the enormous, proven returns on investment this work generates, and its importance to U.S. foreign policy, how do you plan to further the U.N.’s efforts in this regard?

Answer. I agree that violence against women and children is a serious problem and, if confirmed, I will use my voice, vote, and influence to bring attention to this matter.

Question. There is a growing body of evidence showing that the empowerment of women and girls, through investments in their health, education, livelihoods, and the prevention of violence, not only benefits them as individuals, but leads to healthier, more prosperous, and more stable societies.

- Under your leadership, how will you continue to prioritize the empowerment of women and girls in US development and humanitarian assistance and diplomatic engagement?

Answer. The issue of empowering women is personally important to me and, if confirmed, I will support efforts to advance women’s participation in peace, security, and the political process.

Question. Violence against Women and girls continues to plague our world. It is reported that one billion children a year are victims of violence, and the global economic impact of physical, psychological, and sexual violence against children is as high as \$7 trillion—or 8 percent of the world's GDP.

- Will you use your position to encourage your colleagues, publicly and privately, to garner support for continuing efforts aimed at ending violence against children?
- What specific steps might you take to accomplish this?

Answer. I enthusiastically support programs to empower women and girls and to help them gain access to education and employment. Such efforts are proven to increase economic growth and stability. Violence against women and girls is abhorrent and I will look for opportunities to advance efforts to prevent this violence and to mitigate the impact of it where it has occurred around the world.

Trafficking In Persons

Question. I co-sponsored with Senator Rubio, The Trafficking in Persons Report Integrity Act (TIPRIA) legislation designed to comprehensively reform the State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report. Our TIP process came under widespread international scrutiny after the 2015 report rankings were flagged as having been blatantly and intentionally watered-down due to political pressures: certain countries received favorable adjudications despite failure to meet minimum legal standards prescribed by Congress. This harms our witness to the international community and collective efforts to address TIP.

- What steps will you take to restore the credibility of the TIP report amongst member states?

Answer. I will ensure that data is better integrated into the Trafficking in Persons report by consulting with academics and specialists in the field to create a more objective system for tier ranking evaluation.

Question. Will you be a determined advocate in working with Tier 3 countries to make the necessary reforms or risk restrictions on certain U.S. assistance if they fail to combat human trafficking?

Answer. Yes, if confirmed I will do so to the best of my ability.

Question. The crime of human trafficking is a \$150 billion worldwide enterprise that enslaves tens of millions of people in commercial sex and forced labor. According to estimates by the International Labor Organization, nearly 21 million people around the world are victims of human trafficking. Despite international and U.S. efforts to curtail human trafficking, reports indicate TIP stubbornly remains pervasive global blight.

- What, in your view, could international organizations, especially those associated with the U.N., to improve efforts to combat trafficking?

Answer. International organizations should require employees working in the field to receive training on how to recognize signs of human trafficking. International organizations should do a better job of integrating anti-trafficking efforts into broader global initiatives.

Question. How could the U.S. and especially you at the U.N., work to provide additional leadership on this issue and to help make progress?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I commit to working with the State Department in the fight against human trafficking. I believe the United States should continue to lead international efforts to combat trafficking in persons and believe the Trafficking in Persons report is a valuable diplomatic tool.

Question. UNICEF estimates approximately 21 million people around the world are victims of human trafficking each year, and the International Labor Organization estimates that 5.5 million of those are children. Research has found that because one of the primary drivers of trafficking is poverty and the inability of parents to care for their children, making them susceptible to traffickers. Family planning plays a critical role in the ability of parents and families to care for their children. Education about and access to contraception allows women to choose the timing and number of children they have, thereby enhancing their ability to provide for those children, and may ultimately be a step toward reducing one of the causes of trafficking. As the largest multilateral provider of voluntary family planning services, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) is working to address this root cause and eliminate a key driver of trafficking.

Family planning and reproductive health also play an important role in the package of services needed for victims of trafficking. Girls and women who have been

trafficked are often victims of sexual exploitation and violence and need targeted health services. The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) is on the front lines in places ranging from Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos, to Syria and Iraq, providing vital services to trafficking victims including psychosocial support; voluntary family planning services, including emergency contraception; prevention and treatment of sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS; treat of injuries such as fistula arising from sexual violence; and other critical health services. The U.S. is the third largest contributor to UNFPA, and without U.S. funding UNFPA's ability to do its critical work combatting human trafficking would be severely diminished.

- Given your dedication to fighting against human trafficking, will you commit to continuing U.S. funds to UNFPA to ensure this scourge of human abuse does not continue and that victims of trafficking receive the care they need to recover and thrive?

Answer. I anticipate that the Trump administration will be taking a look at our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)

Question. Countries and economies that deny adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights (IPR) and/or who deny fair and equitable market access to U.S. persons (entities) who rely on such protection are a serious problem that plagues U.S. businesses and creative citizens. The 2016 Special 301 Report identified many countries, some of whom are allies and recipients of U.S. foreign assistance that have serious gaps in IPR.

- What strategies will you use to continue to highlight this problem at the United Nations?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on this issue, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning what additional measures might be taken and giving them my full support. Intellectual property theft worldwide is one of the most pressing trade issues facing our country. I will work with the White House National Trade Council and the U.S. Trade Representative, and other agencies, to ensure we have a coordinated and effective response against IP theft.

Question. Will you work with the U.S. Trade Representative to encourage those cited in the 2017 report to make positive changes, such as the necessary legislation, enforcement, and policies, to be removed from the 2018 list?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The United Nations can take a more active role relating to intellectual property protections that drive America's innovation and creativity-led economy that supports more than 45 million jobs across the country.

- If confirmed, what will you do to ensure the U.N. makes an improved effort to protect intellectual property and to safe guard the creative and innovative work of American citizens and businesses?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on the United Nations and IPR. If confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

International Child Abduction

Question. Beginning this year, the 2007 Hague Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance entered into force for the United States. We now have treaty relationship with 32 countries under this multilateral convention. However, many countries, including some of our closest allies, have failed to ratify the treaty or to address this tragic problem in a forthright manner. There are dozens of children from New Jersey that have been taken overseas without authorization.

- What specific steps can you undertake at the U.N. and with the international diplomatic community to encourage additional progress in this arena?
- Will you actively enforce U.S. public policy in this area as part of your foreign affairs agenda?
- Will you pledge to undertake determined diplomatic efforts to discourage international child abduction and to seek the return of children illegally removed from this country?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on the Hague Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance. If confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

Security

Question. Harnessing the legitimacy and outreach of the U.N. to support shared U.S. security and counterterrorism objectives has been shown to be an important component to effective strategy since the attacks of 9/11. The U.N. and its agencies have been partners in preventing and countering violent extremists (CVE). Studies indicate that failing and failed states are breeding grounds for such groups and the utility of promoting stability, human development, good governance, and poverty alleviation as important tools in the collective CVE effort.

- How can we work better with the U.N. and its member states to combat violent extremism and terrorist activity?

Answer. Should I be confirmed I would work with the rest of the cabinet to determine what additional measures would be appropriate and give my full support to working for their implementation.

Question. Would you agree with the notion that in some perhaps many, cases a dollar spent on U.N. peace, security, and CVE efforts could actually be more productive in advancing our interests than spending it on U.S.-only led programs?

Answer. I believe there is a place for both. Should I be confirmed I pledge to work with the rest of the cabinet to determine the effective and efficient balance that best support U.S. goals and objectives and work tirelessly to ensure the U.N. does its part.

Human Rights

Question. Throughout the world, political dissidents, activists, journalists, and human rights advocates have been victims of repression, and have been imprisoned solely for peacefully exercising their right to freedom of expression.

- What would you do to reiterate the U.S. government's commitment to protect and advocate for those on the frontlines, including civil society organizations, who are exercising basic freedoms?
- Are there ways the U.N. could strengthen the protections governing freedom of expression?

Answer. If confirmed, I will use the microphone of the U.N. ambassador to state publicly and often that the United States supports and is committed to free speech and expression all over the world, and that we will call out those who are victimized because they are peacefully advocating their beliefs.

Question. Similarly, securing the southern U.S. border must be done in conjunction with addressing root causes driving people to flee Central America. The problems in the region are numerous, ranging from poverty to the pernicious activities of violent criminal/terrorist organizations, and defy unilateral or simple solutions.

- How can the U.N. a partner with the U.S. and Central American governments to address the underlying causes resulting in these migrant flows?
- How does the Refugee Convention and its Protocol, which the U.S. codified in the Refugee Act of 1980, contribute to this effort?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I will work with Congress and the President to ensure that our foreign policy priorities align with our domestic needs and fulfil our legal obligations. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of the U.S. refugee policies, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this matter.

Question. The recently passed Department of State authorization stated that the U.S. should ensure that “the United Nations Human Rights Council takes steps to remove permanent items on the United Nations Human Rights Council’s agenda or program of work that target or single out a specific country or a specific territory or territories.”

- What is your strategy to mitigate the noxious impact of item number 7 on the UNHRC agenda?

Answer. I oppose Agenda Item 7 and, if confirmed, I would strive to eliminate it. I do not know if or how the Trump administration plans to engage with the Human Rights Council, but, if confirmed, I would advise the President that elimination of Agenda Item 7 should be a primary goal of our participation or a condition for U.S. participation.

Humanitarian Assistance

Question. The U.N. is often the “first responder” in global crises. The number, scope, and duration of the humanitarian needs of today dwarf those of even twenty years ago. The persistence of failing and failed states is very concerning. Climate change, conflict, enduring poverty, and other challenges bedevil mitigation efforts.

In 2017, the global appeal for the U.N. office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) was \$22.2 billion, its highest ever. The U.S. is the single largest donor of international humanitarian assistance, providing approximately one third of the total contributed.

- Are other member state contributions to UNOCHA adequate?

Answer. I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer that question at this time. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

Question. Despite valid “burden sharing” considerations, is there an opportunity for the U.S. to demonstrate further leadership in this area? How so?

Answer. I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer that question at this time. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

Question. What would you do to build consensus for increased international awareness of and financial support to the UNOCHA?

Answer. I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer that question at this time. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue, determining what measures would be most effective and working tirelessly to build consensus for equitable burden sharing.

Question. How can the U.S. hold the 173 signatories to Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon’s World Humanitarian Summit accountable to make aid more efficient and effective?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, the best I can contribute to this effort is press the case that the U.S. government takes this issue seriously.

Question. The U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reported that at the end of 2015, there were more than 130 million people worldwide requiring humanitarian assistance. The problem is worsening: the global population of forcibly displaced persons has increased 75 percent in the last two decades. Many national governments are unwilling (or unable) to fulfill their obligations under international law to assist migrants and internally displaced persons.

- How can the U.S. help realize the aspirations behind the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants passed this past September?
- What can the United States U.N. Ambassador do to ensure that member states honor commitments made to protect refugees and migrants?
- Do you believe signing the global compact on refugees and the global compact for safe, orderly, and regular migration are in the U.S. national interest?

Answer. The U.S. is by far the largest contributor to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and provides billions more in direct and indirect assistance, bilaterally or through multilateral organizations like UNOCHA, to assist refugees and address humanitarian crises. U.S. contributions to these efforts are immensely important and, if confirmed, I will support U.S. leadership in this area and focus on making sure U.S. contributions are used to maximum effect. I will also highlight the security implications of fragile and unstable nations and the critical problems to which these situations contribute, including refugees, in the U.N. Security Council.

GEOGRAPHIC

Western Hemisphere

Central America

Question. In recent years, Democrats and Republicans have forged a bipartisan consensus—including appropriating \$750 million last year—to respond to Central America’s refugee and migration challenges. This assistance recognizes that countries like El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala have consistently ranked in the top five countries in world for high murder rates—murder rates generally seen only in war zones. Consequently, there is growing recognition that many Central American migrants should be viewed as refugees and thus eligible for international protections.

- As tens of thousands of vulnerable people arrive at our southwestern border, how will you ensure that our legal and moral international obligations are fulfilled in protecting their well-being and rights?
- Will you maintain the United States partnership with the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees to ensure that Central American migrants fleeing violence receive sufficient protections and that they can be screened for relocation in third-countries?

Answer. I anticipate that the Trump administration will be taking a look at our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Mexico

Question. In its 2016 National Drug Threat Assessment, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) identified Mexican transnational criminal organizations (TCO) as the “greatest criminal drug threat” to the United States. TCOs also pose a serious threat to Mexico’s Central American neighbors as well. Some of these ultra-violent groups employ terrorist-like tactics and have begun to operate in non-traditional areas.

- How can the U.N. better contribute to the fight against such groups? Is the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime an effective leader on this problem? What could the office do in the coming year to better coordinate international efforts to frustrate Mexican TCOs?

Answer. The U.S.’s strategy should be based in continuing efforts to weaken these TCOs by building capacity and strengthening the rule of law in Mexico. Despite the successful bilateral security cooperation between the U.S. and Mexico, insecurity exists in many parts of the country. As a result of high levels of trade, demographics, energy and geography, their security and stability is in our national interest.

Question. The State Department plays a central role in coordinating U.S. counter narcotics assistance. Additionally, Mexican criminal organizations continue to illegally traffic South American cocaine and a growing volume of Mexican-produced heroin and Mexican- and Chinese-produced fentanyl into the U.S.—which is fueling opioid addiction and an alarming number of overdoses across the U.S.

- As we cannot resolve this challenge alone, if confirmed, what strategies will you employ to work with the Government of Mexico and U.N. member states to combat these criminal organizations and the illegal drug trade?

Answer. Drug trafficking has destabilized Latin America and the expansion of fentanyl trafficking and precursor chemicals used in its production have become lucrative sources of revenue for Chinese criminals. The expansion of Mexican origin heroin has devastated communities throughout the U.S., with an immeasurable human toll. Unfortunately these drugs have a higher profit rate and are cost effective to smuggle into the U.S. than marijuana and cocaine. We must work to identify and shut down the illicit trafficking infrastructure from physical to financial and continue working to weaken the influence of drug trafficking organizations.

Venezuela

Question. The situation in Venezuela has deteriorated since the introduction of S. Res. 537, something for which I was an original co-sponsor. Accordingly, I’m working with colleagues to reintroduce this resolution in the new Congress. I am profoundly concerned about the ongoing political, economic, social and humanitarian crisis in Venezuela.

- What will you do in New York to call for respect of constitutional and democratic processes by President Maduro and this regime?
- Will you work to build consensus and support among fellow Ambassadors, especially from OAS states, to hold the Maduro regime accountable?

Answer. The series of crises in Venezuela have become particularly acute in recent months. The Venezuelan government’s criminality and corruption has wreaked havoc on its country and we must work to stop them from co-opting legitimate institutions like the U.N. Human Rights Council. We must also work to ensure regional stakeholders like leaders and the OAS hold the regime accountable.

Question. I’d like to gauge your thoughts on the potential role of the U.N. in addressing Venezuela’s crisis. As the world watched, the Venezuelan economy has collapsed; shortages of food and medicine are prompting a humanitarian crisis; and the country’s authoritarian president has jailed political opponents and preceded over the demise of country blessed with natural and other resource.

- If confirmed, will you commit to meeting with Venezuelan human rights activists and the families of political prisoners, including Lilian Tintori, the wife of jailed opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez?

Answer. Currently Venezuela has more political prisoners than Cuba, a country governed by the Western Hemisphere’s longest running military dictatorship. As the U.N. Ambassador, if confirmed I would be proud to meet with the relatives of political prisoners and advocate for their release. It appears the failure of UNASUR to negotiate a responsible outcome to the crisis was due to the lack of political support

for publicly condemning Maduro. In order to avoid the U.N. falling into the same trap, I will work with other countries to raise awareness and build consensus on what the U.N.'s proper role in addressing Venezuela should be.

- Given that diplomacy by the Vatican and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) have not produced results, is it time for the United Nations to take an increased role in resolving Venezuela's political, economic, and humanitarian crisis?

Answer. Seeking a resolution to Venezuela's multitude of crises requires the support of regional and international stakeholders. Last year, the Secretary General of the Organization of American States applied the InterAmerican Democratic charter against the government of Venezuela. I believe future diplomatic efforts should be based on its principles of good governance and respect for human rights. For too long, the Venezuelan government has used organizations like the United Nations to legitimize their erosion of Venezuela's democracy. I will use every opportunity to exposing the destabilizing impact of this behavior.

Haiti

Question. This past autumn, I and some of my concerned Senate colleagues, sent letters to United States U.N. Ambassador Powers and to Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon regarding the cholera epidemic that has swept through the country since the 2010 earthquake. There is general consensus that the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti introduced the disease in the country. This epidemic has infected more than 779,000 people and caused at least 9,000 deaths so far. I was pleased that Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon finally took some ownership of this dire problem and laid out a new policy to address, albeit belatedly, this preventable situation. I'm troubled by the time it took for the U.N. to accept responsibility and to take meaningful steps to stop and reverse the disease. I'm equally disappointed by this country's lassitude with regards to holding the U.N. accountable and seeming passivity as to forceful actions to stop the epidemic.

- If confirmed, will you pledge to ensure that the U.N. fully follows through on its "New Approach" to the cholera epidemic and that it make its implementation a top priority?
- Will you work with the new Secretary-General and your colleagues in New York to ensure that other member states commit to providing the necessary mandate and funds to support alleviating the suffering caused by the epidemic?

Answer. If confirmed, I would try to mobilize international support for Haiti.

Question. Years after the earthquake that devastated Haiti, meaningful rebuilding and redevelopment continues, but it is far from complete and Hurricane Matthew only complicated an already desperate situation for Haitian nationals. The U.S. Congress played an instrumental role in the recovery effort by approving \$3.6 billion in assistance for the Haitian government and its people, but more work is needed.

- If confirmed, what measures will you take to build international consensus for sustained support to Haiti? And that such support be provided from a broad range of donors in accordance with our collective responsibilities?

Answer. If confirmed, I would try to mobilize international support for Haiti but I would need to better understand the legal and financial implications of U.N. compensation and restitution before endorsing such a policy.

Cuba

Question. Despite the Obama administration's controversial and misguided decision to normalize relations with Cuba and its' hope that this could lead to improved governance and human rights, Cuban officials continue to arrest dissidents and violate the rights of citizens, and increased tourism revenues benefit only government officials and a small minority of the population.

- How do you plan to approach the United States' relationship with Cuba within the context of your role at the United Nations?
- What strategies will you employ to apply further multilateral pressure to lessen authoritarian rule in Cuba?
- Will you continue to support programs that promote democratic voices and initiatives in Cuba through the aegis of the U.N. and its subsidiary bodies and related organizations?
- Can you list some of those entities and how they might further contribute to advancing this agenda?

- What steps will you take to increase international pressure on the Castro regime to return American political fugitives like New Jersey cop-killer Joanne Chesimard?
- What steps will you take to encourage the government of Cuba to release political prisoners, artists, journalists, and other Cubans being detained for politically-motivated reasons?

Answer. As U.N. ambassador, I plan to make it clear that the U.S. will return to having common cause with Cuba's anti-Castro dissidents. President Obama's policy has led to skyrocketing levels of political repression, human rights abuses and an empowered government in Cuba. We must continue actively supporting the dissidents on the island, through programs aimed at carrying out democratic initiatives throughout the island. Our government will condition our relationship with the Cuban government on improvements on human rights as well as the return of wanted U.S. fugitives. The past administration did not understand that it is in America's interest to have a prosperous and free Cuba 90 miles from our coast and never tried to build coalitions of the like-minded in the matter.

Colombia

Question. The long running conflict in Colombia appears to be finally coming to an end with the signing of an agreement between the government and the FARC rebels. The U.N. has a small political mission there to assist in securing the peace.

- Can the U.N. contribute further to realizing peace and stability in Colombia?
- What can you and USUN Mission do to ensure that the international community remains committed to helping Colombia in this difficult but long overdue process of normalization and reconciliation?

Answer. If properly implemented, this peace deal could potentially bring an end to the over fifty year-long conflict. From demobilizing combatants to removing mines, the U.N. and other international stakeholders stand to play an important role. To the extent possible, we must make sure that FARC combatants are held accountable for their crimes, and the gains from Plan Colombia are not forsaken in the process of implementing the peace deal.

Near Eastern and South and Central Asia Affairs

Iran

Question. Iran continues to be the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world and a nuclear-armed Iran poses a grave threat to the United States and our allies.

- What concrete steps will you take to build and sustain efforts to stop malign Iranian influence in Syria and Iraq?
- Likewise, what can the international community do, and especially the U.N., to support the Iraqi government and the Iraqi people to stop the influence of Iran and violent extremist groups within the country?

Answer. If confirmed I will work with my Cabinet colleagues to do my part at the U.N. to implement the administration's strategy to deter and stop Iran's malign influence in the region.

Question. Iranian and Russian cooperation in the Syrian conflict is one facet of a web networks Iran is cultivating to advance its agenda in the Middle East.

- Do you believe that joint Russian-Iranian operations in Syria are in the interest of the United States? If no, please describe what steps specifically you plan to take to weaken the network of Russian-Iranian military actions in Syria and across the region.

Answer. I do not believe Russian-Iranian operations in Syria are in the interest of the U.S. If confirmed I will work with my Cabinet colleagues to do my part at the U.N. to implement the administration's strategy in Syria

Question. Iran is engaged in a concerted effort to undermine traditional U.S. allies in the region and to hold themselves out as a model for principled resistance to what they perceive as U.S./Western hegemony in the Middle East. Their use of proxies, such as Hezbollah, their fomenting conflict in Yemen and Syria, and their provocation in the Straits of Hormuz indicts that despite JCPOA, their involvement in international affairs is almost entirely malign.

- How do you plan to cultivate international support to aggressively stop Iranian proxy networks like Hezbollah from attacking Americans and other nationals?
- How will you work with other countries to ensure they comply with primary and secondary sanctions we have in place to stop Iran's proxy terrorist networks from destabilizing the region?

- Will you work to build support for additional sanctions against Iranian individuals and actors who are known to fund terrorism as required?

Answer. If confirmed I will work with my Cabinet colleagues to do my part at the U.N. to implement the administration's strategy to deter and stop Iran's malign influence in the region.

Syria

Question. There are more refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP) in the world now than any other time since World War II. Many, but not all, of these refugees and IDPs stem from years of conflict in Iraq and Syria. 20 percent to 25 percent of the population of Lebanon is made up of such individuals.

- Are you satisfied with the leadership of U.S., from policy and financial angles, within the international community to address the crisis? If not, what do you plan to do to ameliorate the situation?
- Should you be confirmed, what concrete steps will you take to address the dire humanitarian crisis in Syria and to help prevent the further destabilization of neighboring countries?
- What do you think the role of both the U.N. Security Council and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees should play?

Answer. I look forward to being briefed fully on these issues in the event I am confirmed. I understand that dealing with the refugee situation in the region is a priority for the U.S. goal of bringing peace and stability to the region. Should I be confirmed, I commit to assessing U.S. leadership with the context of my duties as U.N. ambassador and tirelessly working to make every effort to ensure U.S. leadership is as effective as possible.

Afghanistan

Question. I co-sponsored with Senator Corker The Afghanistan Accountability Act, which lays out a framework for the United States to take meaningful steps, working with our Afghan interlocutors to tackle the roots of corruption including: developing clear accountability benchmarks; supporting the Afghan legal system to better oversee property rights and asset management; and, in certain cases, imposing specific penalties on persons who are knowingly involved in direct acts of mismanaging or misappropriating U.S. assistance.

- What steps can be taken internationally to encourage Afghanistan to combat rampant corruption, extensive patronage networks, and mismanagement of assistance dollars that is contributing to instability and poor governance?
- How can the U.N. and our international partners contribute towards institutionalizing reform and progress?

Answer. I believe the efforts to reduce corruption and improve governance in Afghanistan are vital to advancing U.S. interests in bringing peace and stability to the region and the goal eliminating Radical Islamic Terrorism. I do not have sufficient knowledge to determine what specific additional measures to take. Should I be confirmed I look forward to gaining a greater understanding of this issue and in particular working with the Congress to determine how U.S. leadership can best contribute to this effort.

Question. This is longest running armed conflict in U.S. history. Success seems elusive despite an unprecedented commitment by the U.S. and our allies.

- What specific policy steps would you take to further isolate the Taliban and its supporters?
- What could the U.N. do further to undergird our efforts to achieve improved security and good governance in the country?
- Some Americans feel the U.N. is not doing enough in Afghanistan. Do you agree? What will you tell the Secretary-General when you meet him in this regards?

Answer. I believe U.S. leadership in helping Afghanistan achieve peace and stability is vital. That starts with ensuring the military defeat of the Taliban and mitigating their capacity to affect the lives of the people. I do not know what additional measures might be prudent for the U.N. to take. Should I be confirmed, I commit to fully assessing U.N. support and working tirelessly to make it both appropriate and effective.

*Asia Pacific**China*

Question. It is a longstanding US policy to not recognize Chinese claims of sovereignty over the South or East China Sea and or any islands therein. Yet we see the country taking aggressive steps to expand its influence and control, even to the point of militarizing the islands and outrageously seizing a U.S. Navy vessel in international waters.

- Would you work to build international support for a targeted sanctions regime against firms and individuals that facilitate certain investments in the South China Sea or East China Sea, including land reclamation, island-making, construction, supply facilities or civil infrastructure projects in any land that is currently disputed territory between any other nations?

Answer. I am open to considering any new approach to this problem.

Question. Likewise, would you work to build international support to prohibit official recognition of the South China Sea or East China Sea as part of China, and to limit certain kinds of assistance to countries that recognize Chinese sovereignty over either Sea?

Answer. Of course, we have complex relationships with many countries around the world. However, I am open to considering new approaches that raise the profile of this particular issue in our interactions with them.

Question. How will you counter China's role in the U.N. Security Council to achieve these goals?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I will forcefully represent the views of the U.S. government at every opportunity.

North Korea

Question. One major concern at a global level is North Korea's sharing and transferring of nuclear technology. North Korea has successfully subverted sanctions and export and import controls, often through flagging cargo ships with non-North Korean flags.

- What steps has the international community taken since March to more rigorously monitor and control North Korean shipping vessels?
- What steps can be taken to ensure that all countries are complying with stricter controls the U.N. Security Council passed last March? Where are the weakest links in the system?

Answer. I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer these questions. I do believe that the fullest and most comprehensive implementation of sanctions is vital to the U.S. goal of eliminating the threat of a nuclear North Korea. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue and working tirelessly in the effort to tighten and expand the sanctions regime.

Question. I recognize that some analysts are skeptical about the effect of sanctions on a corrupt country like North Korea. However, as the leading sponsor of legislation that was overwhelmingly passed to impose and tighten sanctions on North Korea, I believe they can have a meaningful impact if rigorously enforced.

- How are we in monitoring member compliance of agreements to enforce multilateral sanctions? What are not doing enough of in this area?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on this issue, but should I be confirmed I commit to learning more about this issue.

Question. How do multilateral sanctions fit into the fabric of prevention and deterring North Korea's nuclear ambitions?

Answer. I believe in concert with U.S. unilateral measures they are vital.

Question. Do you believe China is in fact in compliance with UNSC resolutions? What measures can we take to more tightly enforce our unilateral sanctions?

Answer. No. I believe assessing China's effort and pressing them to be in full compliance is vital.

Question. Will you work at the UNSC to impose additional sanctions on DPRK if needed?

Answer. Yes.

Taiwan

Question. President-elect Trump suggested that the United States would no longer be bound by the One China policy—a policy that is in our national security interests. Moreover, Taiwan's successful democratic experiment is a significant accom-

plishment for American foreign policy; the country remains a strategic partner of the U.S.

- Are you committed to maintaining the One China policy?

Answer. If I am confirmed, I will work with the President and the National Security Council on all aspects of our policy toward China.

Question. Where does Taiwan stand in President-elect Trump's calculus? Is he committed to an alliance and partnership we maintained with Taiwan since 1949 or is it a negotiating "bargaining chip"?

Answer. I believe the six assurances and the Taiwan Relations Act are the bedrock of U.S. commitments to Taiwan. I believe the president does as well.

Question. What impact would this have on our relationship with China at the Security Council or other U.N. bodies?

Answer. Regardless of the impact, the Taiwan Relations Act is law and six assurances a long-honored policy precedent that should continue to be followed.

Question. I was extremely disappointed by the decision of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) not to issue an invitation to Taiwan to attend the 2016 ICAO Assembly that was held in Montreal, Canada. ICAO's unfortunate lack of resolve in the apparent face of Chinese coercion is deeply regrettable and reflects poorly on an agency created by the United Nations to support a safe, efficient, secure, economically sustainable and environmentally responsible international civil aviation sector. A similar situation continues with regards to sensible Taiwanese participation in INTERPOL. The vagaries of cross-strait relations should not be allowed to prevent the prudent participation of Taiwan in international bodies, assemblies, and agencies, even if only as an observer.

- What will you do to actively resist imprudent Chinese efforts to isolate Taiwan even when common sense, international security and safety imperatives argues for Taiwanese engagement?
- What can you do to put pressure on ICAO to reconsider this decision for future gatherings and to demonstrate leadership, fairness, and courage by allowing the needful participation of Taiwan?

Answer. Should I be confirmed I pledge to resist efforts to isolate Taiwan and assist it in achieving meaningful participation in international organizations.

Question. I'm the co-chair of the Taiwan Caucus. In that capacity, I've years of experience following the cross-strait relations between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan; this past April marked the 37th anniversary of the enactment of Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), a pivotal event in our shared history and emblematic of our strong bilateral relations. Unfortunately, China is increasingly taking an aggressive approach with its neighbors, including Taiwan. Given these geopolitical developments, it would make sense to ensure that Taiwan can adequately defend itself and possess the means to resist new and increased military threats, from where ever source.

- Would you be supportive of being an advocate within the Trump administration to return to a process of regular and normalized arms sales for Taiwan as opposed to the "package" approach that the past couple of administrations have taken?

Answer. If confirmed, yes.

Europe

Cyprus

Question. We have a historic opportunity to achieve a peaceful resolution of the long festering and untenable situation in Cyprus. Positive Turkish engagement and support of this process is vital, as is that of International Organizations and the U.S.

- How do you view the current, ongoing Cyprus settlement talks held under U.N. auspices?
- Do you support a reunified Cyprus with a single sovereignty, single international personality and single citizenship; and with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded as described in the relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions?
- Will you maintain U.S. high-level engagement on this issue and push back on any proposed U.N. solution that is not supported by the concerned parties?

Answer. I am hopeful that this issue can be resolved. If confirmed, I will do what I can to encourage a mutually acceptable agreement.

Armenia

Question. 2015 marked the centenary of the Armenian Genocide. Pope Francis has publicly affirmed the Armenian Genocide. However, Turkey has consistently denied that a genocide took place or that it has any meaningful culpability for this gross crime against humanity.

- Do you support a U.S. declaration calling the Armenian Genocide as such and working with other member states to do so as well?
- Do you think our failure to do so hereto speaks ill of our values and encourages the continuation of such crimes?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on this issue but I understand how emotive the subject is. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue. But, as a general matter, as I stated throughout my hearing, I will never shy away from calling out other countries for actions taken in conflict with U.S. values and in violation of human rights and international norms.

Ukraine

Question. On March 12, 2014, I authored and introduced legislation (S. 2124, the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014), to provide loan guarantees to support Ukraine, and to impose sanctions on Russian and Ukrainian officials responsible for violent human rights abuses against anti-government protesters, as well as against those responsible for undermining the peace, security, stability, sovereignty or territorial integrity of Ukraine. The legislation, which was signed into law on April 3, 2014, also imposes asset freezes and visa revocations on Russian officials and their associates who are complicit in or responsible for significant corruption in Ukraine. Likewise, the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 called for the administration to impose sanctions on other defense industry targets as well as on special Russian crude oil projects. It also was signed by the President.

- How can USUN be used an effective tool to build international consensus that will hold Russian and Ukrainian official accountable for gross human rights abuses and for violating the territorial integrity of Ukraine?
- What points will you make to counter Russian propaganda and disinformation campaign with regards to Crimea?

Answer. The U.S. should use its leadership position at the U.N. to maintain public pressure and awareness of Russia's actions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine. This includes working with like-minded partners in both the U.N. Security Council and the General Assembly. This is particularly important to show international support for Ukraine's territorial integrity and the gross human rights abuses taking place in occupied Crimea.

Russia

Question. The use of the veto power by Russia and other permanent members of the United Nations Security council has contributed to the UNSC's ineffectual responses to some serious humanitarian and security challenges, Syria and South Sudan come to mind. Some have suggested that a Trump administration could forge new understandings and mechanisms to move forward at the UNSC to solve some of the global problems facing us.

- Do you see forging a new relationship with Russia at the UNSC as a realistic prospect?
- What fruitful areas might we be able to work with Putin's Russia at the U.N.?

Answer. I do not see, at present, the conditions which would allow the U.S. to forge a new relationship with Russia at the UNSC. However, each opportunity for cooperation would have to be considered on a case by case basis taking into consideration all the circumstances at the time.

Question. Russia is running an influence campaign against the West to delegitimize governing institutions and weaken democratic states from within. Besides their interference in our own elections they have do so elsewhere, such as in Germany, and seem committed to undermining liberal, Western-style democracy across the globe.

- Do you believe that Russia is actively engaged in disrupting elections in other western democracies? What can be done at the United Nations to confront this threat?

Answer. I do believe that Russia is actively engaging in trying to disrupt the democratic process in the West. The U.S. should use its leadership position at the U.N. to maintain public pressure and awareness of Russia's actions. This includes

working with like-minded partners in both the U.N. Security Council and the General Assembly.

Question. Do we need to embark on a Marshall-like plan for global democracy promotion?

Answer. No. The Marshall plan was appropriate for the situation in post-World War II Europe. Should I be confirmed, I will advocate for plans that most effectively and efficiently foster U.S. interests.

Question. Can you outline specific steps you would stake to encourage the U.N. to further embrace good governance initiatives? Can you point to specific programs or agencies who might be able to assist in this effort?

Answer. I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer this question. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this and issue and in particular in consulting with the Congress.

Question. What role could the U.N. play in terms of countering illiberal forces that it presently is not?

Answer. Through strong, clear and consistent leadership against illiberal forces that beset the globe.

Question. Because of Russia's vetoes at the Security Council, the Syrian conflict has been prolonged and Assad consolidated power. Russia has deepened its involvement in the region and crippled meaningful action at the U.N.

- What will you do in your capacity as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. to work humanitarian concerns aren't ignored?
- What will be your specific strategy at the U.N. Security Council to hold Russia accountable for its aggressive activities in Ukraine and Syria?

Answer. The U.S. should use its leadership position at the U.N. to maintain public pressure and awareness of Russia's actions in Syria. This includes working with like-minded partners in both the U.N. Security Council and the General Assembly.

Africa

Ethiopia

Question. Ethiopia, an important security partner for the United States, is suffering its worst unrest in years, in response to the government's intensifying human rights abuses and restrictions on freedoms. The government's harsh response to the unrest—which has involved the killing of hundreds of protesters, mass arrests, the imposition of a state of emergency that includes curfews and travel restrictions for foreign diplomats—has created an unsustainable situation.

- In a world filled with serious problems, how can the U.N. and the USUN Mission draw attention to the problems in Ethiopia and effect positive changes?
- Can Ethiopia be an effective partner on terrorism without addressing this illiberal turn?

Answer. The human rights situation in Ethiopia is troubling. If confirmed, I will work to strengthen our partnership with Ethiopia on counterterrorism and other issues important to American interests. I will also use the tools available to me as Ambassador to the U.N. to encourage Ethiopia to grant its citizens the protections and rights critical to the flourishing of a just, free, and safe society.

South Sudan

Question. The humanitarian suffering, endemic corruption, and conflict South Sudan has the hallmarks of a failing state. The Transitional Government of National Unity, as established by the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan, has been unable to make progress. In November, 2016 I was part of a bipartisan letter, from both houses of Congress, to outgoing United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon urging him to lead efforts to revitalize the stalled political settlement in South Sudan and to work to bring peace and stability to the nation.

- What specific steps would you take to put South Sudan back on the track towards peace?
- Can you outline how you might use your office to help bring attention, support, and leadership to ensure we avoid another tragedy?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I recognize that this is an issue in which the U.S. must show leadership in the international community. Ethnic violence has continued over the last several years. I would commit to continuing to highlight the situa-

tion and pressing the U.N. to play a more effective role. I look forward to consulting Congress on this issue.

Question. Relatedly, the conflict in South Sudan is becoming one with an increasingly ethnic aspect, one that some believe could bring about “ethnic cleansing” and even genocide. The U.N. peacekeeping mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) is providing protection to hundreds of thousands of civilians impacted by the fighting yet there have been inexcusable lapses by UNMISS.

- How can the U.S. and the U.N. help prevent a worsening of the conflict and the specter of ethnic cleansing?
- What steps can the administration take to encourage better operational effectiveness by UNMISS? Are the problems structural or financial?
- What can be done to impede the flow of arms into the country?

Answer. The situation in South Sudan is one of the most pressing humanitarian situations in the world. It is critical to help build some political space for reconciliation between the government and rebel factions. The United States should continue to engage in international forums like the U.N. and bilaterally with key partners in the area to address this issue, and decide upon a combined policy to address this violence. This would include deploying robust diplomacy, possible sanctions, and other measures.

Central African Republic (CAR)

Question. Recently Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) reported that it had to engage in food distribution in Central African Republic (CAR) to address the worsening humanitarian situation there. They further pointed out that World Food Program efforts in the country are inadequate to meet the need.

- What can we do to assist the WFP in meeting this need? Will you make it a priority to work with Ambassadors of other states to increase emergency financial contributions?

Answer. One of our steps to support WSF would be to work with Ambassadors of other states, which the United States could do.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR MARCO RUBIO

On the Western Hemisphere

Question. In October 2015 at the United Nations General Assembly, the United States abstained from condemning the U.S. embargo against Cuba. President Kennedy proclaimed a U.S. embargo on Cuba as a result of actions taken by the Cuban government against American companies, including the confiscation and nationalization of property.

- Do you think the United States should vote against Cuba’s yearly resolution condemning the embargo against Cuba, or abstain on the yearly resolution, as President Obama’s administration did in October of 2016?

Answer. Yes, I think the United States should vote against Cuba’s yearly resolution condemning the embargo against Cuba.

Question. The Cuban government has been caught on several occasions smuggling weapons internationally. As you are aware, Cuba was found in breach of international sanctions for attempting to smuggle weapons to North Korea. These actions, with false manifests, also threaten the safety and integrity of the Panama Canal.

- What would you do to prevent Cuba’s international weapons smuggling in the future?

Answer. I believe this effort is vital. Should I be confirmed I would work tirelessly with the rest of the cabinet to see what additional steps could be taken. I look forward to consulting with the Congress on this issue.

Question. Venezuela is no longer a democracy. There are approximately 100 political prisoners. Political opponents and ordinary critics are routinely subject to arbitrary arrests and prosecution. Electoral authorities, which respond to President Maduro, have failed to carry out a recall referendum on his presidency and governor elections that should have occurred in 2016. The Maduro administration continues to exercise unchecked power, and has used the Supreme Court to undermine the powers of the National Assembly, the only independent branch of government left in the country. Meanwhile, the government has contributed to the dramatic humani-

tarian crisis that leads to the enormous suffering of many Venezuelans—among other things, by failing to ensure that international aid, which is readily available, reaches the Venezuelan people.

- What concrete measures would you take to address the grave human rights situation and humanitarian crisis that Venezuela is facing under the Maduro regime?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I would tirelessly work to make every effort within my duties as U.N. ambassador to highlight the human rights abuses and humanitarian crisis in the country and condemn the regime.

Question. The cholera bacteria was introduced by the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) and has caused the death of thousands of Haitians. The disease is now putting the lives of many at risk, and the lack of clean water and sanitation infrastructure caused by Hurricane Matthew is only exacerbating the spread of the disease. U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon had announced his plan to give cholera victims in Haiti or their communities cash payments from a proposed \$400 million cholera response package.

- Will you commit to work to ensure these victims receive proper compensation from the United Nations?

Answer. If confirmed, I would try to mobilize international support for Haiti but I would need to better understand the legal and financial implications of U.N. compensation and restitution before endorsing such a policy.

On the U.N. Human Rights Council

Question. Last year, the Obama administration rejoined the U.N. Human Rights Council, the membership of which is mostly made up with countries who hold some of the worst human rights records. The fact that countries such as Saudi Arabia, Cuba, China, and Egypt have a seat on the U.N. Human Rights Council proves that it is a broken and ineffective institution with very little credibility. Many of these countries use the Council to cover up their own abysmal human rights records.

- Do you believe the United States should even be a member the Council while countries with abysmal human rights records sit on it?
- If so, then what is best way for the United States to promote human rights and basic freedoms on the Council when human rights abusers like Cuba, China, Ethiopia, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia also sit on the Council? And how do you plan to clean up the U.N. Human Rights Council's membership and protect fundamental human rights?

Answer. the ability of human rights violators to be elected and shield each other from criticism. If confirmed, I will work with the President and the cabinet to determine the appropriate level of engagement with the HRC that best advances U.S. interests.

Question. In March 2016, the U.N. Human Rights Council adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a database of Israeli companies operating in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. Last month, the U.N. General Assembly approved a budget that included \$138,000 to support this effort. I view this blacklist as a dangerous step that can lead to a boycott of our ally Israel.

- How can the United States derail this blacklist effort?
- What more can we do to make sure that we find ways to push back against efforts to isolate the Jewish state and instead fully include Israel as a state receiving equal treatment at the United Nations?

Answer. I agree. Israel is a vital ally of the United States, and we must meet our obligations to Israel as our most important strategic ally in the region. Should I be confirmed, I would recommend to the President that the U.S. announce it no longer supports UNSCR 2334 and would veto any U.N. Security Council efforts to implement it or enforce it, and block any future U.N. sanctions based on it. Although the U.S. may not be able to stop the implementation of the BDS list in the General Assembly, if confirmed, I commit to use my position to do what is possible to impede it.

On the U.N. Peacekeeping

Question. Allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers and personnel continue to surface.

- How will you push the United Nations to hold peacekeepers accountable for abuses committed while on mission wearing the U.N. blue helmet?

- How will you push the governments of troop-contributing countries to hold peacekeepers accountable for abuses committed while on mission wearing the U.N. blue helmet?
- Will you name and shame countries whose troops are involved in sexual abuse allegations and publicly identify those countries which have not taken steps to advance prosecution of soldiers for alleged misconduct committed while part of U.N. missions abroad?
- What specific reforms do you recommend to prevent future failures?

Answer. See below.

Question. The new U.N. Secretary General, António Guterres, has pledged to make eradicating sexual exploitation and abuse from peacekeeping operations one of his priorities.

- How will you support him in these efforts?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with Congress and the United Nations to strengthen the U.N.'s zero tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse. Effective steps must include naming and shaming, repatriation of units, and holding troop contributing countries to account and require transparent reporting on investigations, prosecutions, and punishment for offenders. This must include withholding payment and, as a last resort, barring countries from participating if they fail to comply.

On Global Women's Issues

Question. Conflict and crisis have significant implications for women and girls. In contemporary conflicts, as much as 90 percent of casualties are among civilians, most of whom are women and children. Women are the first to be affected by infrastructure breakdown, as they struggle to keep families together and care for the wounded.

- How do you believe the United States and the United Nations should approach and prioritize the protection of women and girls in conflict settings?

Answer. I agree that women and girls are most at risk in conflict situations, and that we should prioritize their protection in our own foreign policy programs and those at the U.N. I look forward to finding additional opportunities and initiatives to advance existing efforts, if confirmed. I also support efforts to advance women's participation in peace and security, including preventing conflict and building peace in countries threatened and affected by war, violence and insecurity.

Question. One of the U.N.'s core missions is to promote equal rights for men and women around the world, including the right of all women and girls to decide if, when and whom they marry.

- What is your vision for how the United States and the United Nations can continue to promote the rights of girls worldwide, including the U.N. goal that commits to ending child marriage by 2030?

Answer. I strongly support the goal to end the human rights abuse of child marriage and will look for opportunities to advance this goal in the U.N. should I be confirmed.

On Israel and the Security Situation in the Middle East

Question. U.N. Security Council Resolution 2231, which endorsed the JCPOA, calls upon Iran not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles and restricts Iranian arms transfers. Iran has violated these restrictions with virtual impunity. Iran continues to test ballistic missiles, ship arms to Assad, Hezbollah and the Houthis, and import arms from Russia.

- Will you insist upon robust enforcement of the ballistic missile and arms transfer restrictions on Iran?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What steps can we take to overcome the reticence by other nations to enforce the U.N. Security Council's own edicts?

Answer. The incoming administration intends to conduct a deliberate review of the JCPOA in order to determine its approach. At a minimum, it will be critical to ensure that all provisions of the deal are very strictly enforced to hold Iran accountable and deter any cheating.

Question. In 2011, UNESCO voted to admit Palestine as a member state in the organization. That action triggered U.S. laws and a cut-off in our financial contributions to UNESCO. The cutoff of U.S. funding had a dramatic effect. Since the

UNESCO action, no similar agency has acted to grant membership to the Palestinians.

- Do you agree that the United States should oppose Palestinian efforts to obtain full membership at any U.N. agency?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Will you continue to enforce U.S. laws requiring that the United States not fund international organizations that grant Palestine full member privileges?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The United Nations maintains several peculiar bodies and departments that focus on the Palestinians. These including the Division on Palestinian Rights (DPR), the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP), and United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL). The plethora of Palestinian-specific agencies in the U.N. does nothing to promote peace while reinforcing the U.N.'s systematic anti-Israel bias.

- Will you work to challenge the existence and funding of these departments?

Answer. I anticipate that the Trump administration will be examining our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Question. Rather than working to solve the problem of Palestinian refugees, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) seeks to perpetuate refugee status for Palestinians. The U.N. treats Palestinian refugees in a manner different than all others—it grants refugee status to all descendants of refugees, even if they are citizens of our own nation. By this treatment, UNRWA has swelled the population of Palestinian refugees seven-fold in the last 60 years' to over 5 million people. Congress has sought to bring reality back to this issue, and to focus our efforts only on those individuals who can truly be considered refugees.

- How would you approach this issue? How can we get UNRWA to try to solve the problem of Palestinian refugees rather than to perpetuate the problem?

Answer. I anticipate that the Trump administration will be examining our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Question. Since its inception, the United Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) has done nothing to prevent Hezbollah from rearming in Lebanon. Ten years after the Second War in Lebanon, Hezbollah has ten times the number of rockets and missiles it had at that time. UNIFIL does not even patrol certain urban areas out of a fear of Hezbollah. I am afraid that another war could breakout between Israel and Lebanon with devastating consequences.

- What more can and should we be doing to ensure compliance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1701, which ended the 2006 war in Lebanon and required Hezbollah to disarm?
- Will you work to highlight Hezbollah's violations of Resolution 1701 and its illegal placement of arms among Lebanon's civilian population?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of UNSCR 1701, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

On Human Rights, Democracy and Religious Freedom

Question. Throughout the world, political dissidents, activists, journalists, and human rights defenders have been victims of repression and imprisoned—or worse, tortured and killed—solely for peacefully exercising their right to freedom of expression.

- What would you do to reiterate the U.S. government's commitment to protect and advocate for those on the frontlines, including civil society organizations, who are exercising basic freedoms?

Answer. If confirmed, I will use the microphone of the U.N. ambassador to state publicly and often that the United States supports and is committed to free speech and expression all over the world, and that we will call out those who are victimized because they are peacefully advocating their beliefs.

Question. What will you do to initiate a U.N. inquiry on war crimes in Syria, including those committed by Russian and Iranian forces as well as Syrian forces?

Answer. I have not been briefed on how such an inquiry could proceed, but, if confirmed, I commit to exploring this matter.

Question. Saudi Arabia has one of the worst human rights records, with Freedom House giving them a score of “Not Free” on their annual Freedom of the World Report.

- How will you address these abuses at the United Nations and encourage Saudi Arabia to improve its human rights record?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, through clear, strong and consistent leadership on this issue.

Question. Iraq and Syria’s Christian community has been deliberately targeted, along with Yazidis and other religious minorities, by ISIS for genocide, as Obama administration stated in its official designation last year. Since 2011, Syrian Christians have been disproportionately underrepresented in refugee resettlement referrals to United States by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees as shown in State Department-published data.

- In light of these realities, how will you work to ensure that those religious and ethnic minorities who are victims of genocide are not neglected or marginalized in the U.N. context?

Answer. By playing a leadership role, ensuring that the U.S. portion on this issue is clear, strong and consistent.

On North Korea

Question. Currently, the human rights situation in North Korea is only discussed once a year at the U.N. Security Council, typically in December.

- Will pledge to place North Korea’s human rights record on the U.N. Security Council General’s agenda every quarter—similar to debates on the country’s proliferation of nuclear weapons technology?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The United Nations Commission of Inquiry Report on human rights in North Korea found that China was in violation of its obligations under international human rights and refugee law. Specifically, China’s forced repatriation of North Korean refugees—many of whom face torture, starvation, imprisonment, sexual violence and even execution—could be considered aiding in crimes against humanity.

- Will you make it a priority to press China to change its policies as it relates to North Korean refugees?
- Will you use the United Nations to elevate this issue and press for international action?

Answer. Yes.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

Value of the U.N. to the U.S.

As tempting as it may be to turn the U.N. into a scapegoat for the world’s problems, the U.N. system performs duties that are of immense value to the United States. U.N. peacekeepers help maintain stability (albeit imperfectly) in countries where the U.S. cannot or will not deploy and the U.N. does so at a fraction of the cost of U.S. unilateral deployment. The U.N.’s humanitarian agencies (UNAIDS, UNHCR, WFP, UNICEF, etc.) have an unmatched capacity to help millions of people survive disasters, both natural and manmade, while sharing the cost for this immense burden across the international community. The U.N. serves as a forum for international cooperation in areas of great value to the U.S. ranging from setting standards for civilian air travel to combatting infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, and the Zika and Ebola viruses. Even staunch critics of the U.N., such as the George W. Bush administration, used these and other U.N. capabilities vigorously.

- What U.N. functions would you describe as being of the greatest value to the United States?
- Would you agree that U.N. peacekeeping serves as a useful tool in furtherance of U.S. interests around the world, and at a fraction of the cost of a direct U.S. military deployment?
- Do you see any viable replacement to the life-saving work done by the U.N.’s humanitarian agencies, which feed, shelter, and protect millions of people around the world who have nowhere else to turn? And isn’t U.S. support for

these U.N. activities leveraged several times over by sharing the burden of the cost for these operations with other U.N. members?

- If confirmed as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., would you see it as one of your responsibilities to serve as a spokesperson to the American people regarding the value of the U.N. system to the U.S., in addition to calling out its shortcomings?

Answer. As I mentioned at my hearing, although it has flaws and failings, I believe that the U.N. does valuable work. Among the most important responsibilities the U.N. has are U.N. peacekeeping operations and the humanitarian work done by U.N. specialized agencies, funds, and programs. If confirmed, I will not shy from acknowledging the good work done by the U.N. and its affiliated organizations.

Question. The New York City Mayor's Office, in its 2016 report, estimated that "the U.N. Community contributed an estimated \$3.69 billion in total output to the New York City economy" and that "approximately 25,040 full- and part-time jobs in New York City are attributable to the presence of the U.N. Community." The United Nations Foundation found that U.S. businesses generated more than \$1 billion in contracts with the United Nations in 2014 and 2015.

- Would you acknowledge that the U.S. reaps an impressive financial benefit for staying engaged with the U.N.?

Answer. U.S. contributions to the U.N. system should be based on the performance of the U.N. and how its activities advance U.S. foreign and security interests, not on whether those funds benefit New York.

U.N. Reform

Question. Conservatives have long espoused the need for the U.N. to reform, but calls for reform are often nebulous including demands for "better oversight" or "eliminating waste and fraud." Alternatively, reform proposals center around issues that more appropriately stem from Member State policies as opposed to those of the U.N. Secretary-General or staff (i.e. Human Rights Council focus on Israel; Human Rights Council membership; Palestinian membership in UNESCO). A mechanism favored by conservatives to try to force the U.N. to accept reforms is to advocate for withholding of U.S. assessed membership dues. However, withholding of U.S. assessed dues has long been opposed by successive administrations, Democrat and Republican alike. In fact, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. during the George W. Bush administration, John Bolton, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee (then named the International Relations Committee) on 9/29/15 that the Bush administration's position was to "oppose mandatory withholding of U.S. dues." Bolton repeated this position the following month before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, though eventually, after leaving government, Bolton personally advocated for withholding.

- If confirmed, would you advise the President that withholding of U.S. assessed dues to the United Nations is a useful way to try to leverage reforms at the U.N., despite successive administrations, including the George W. Bush administration, having opposed legislation that would mandate the non-payment of dues as obligated by U.S. treaty commitments?

Answer. As I stated during my confirmation hearing, I do not support slash and burn cuts to U.S. funding, but I do think that targeted and selective withholding can be effective. As I also stated, I think Congress can be a critical partner in advancing U.N. reform. If confirmed, I will work with Congress on these matters.

Question. The U.S. has sometimes found itself in significant arrears to the U.N.

- Do you think failing to pay our bills in full and on time undermines our ability to work constructively with other members and with the U.N. management to pursue U.S. interests?

Answer. As I stated during my confirmation hearing, I do not support slash and burn cuts to U.S. funding, but targeted and selective withholding tied to specific reforms has proven in the past to be an effective means for pressing the organization to implement reforms.

Question. One of your predecessors for this role as U.S. Ambassador, Richard Holbrooke, once famously observed that blaming the U.N. for many of the failings laid at its doorstep is "like blaming Madison Square Garden for the Knicks" performing poorly. This may be simplistic, but it is true that it is often very difficult to separate out the U.N. shortcomings that result from management by the Secretary-General and his staff, from the policies espoused or established by its Member States with which the U.S. disagrees.

- As Ambassador, how would you work to reform the U.N. itself, without blaming it for the policy positions of its Member States?

Answer. The member states are often responsible for problems besetting the U.N. and for impeding reforms. If confirmed, I will work with the Secretary-General to encourage him to implement reforms within his responsibility and with other member states to implement reforms requiring their support.

Question. On the one hand, the Human Rights Council has been criticized for allowing states that violate human rights to become members of the Council and also for disproportionately focusing on Israel. On the other hand, the Human Rights Council has brought much-needed attention to human rights issues, including in North Korea.

- What is your perspective on the Human Rights Council and, if confirmed, how would you engage with it?

Answer. As I mentioned during my hearing, I think that the Human Rights Council is a flawed body, particularly in its bias against Israel and the ability of human rights violators to be elected and shield each other from criticism. If confirmed, I will work with the President and his foreign policy team to determine the appropriate level of engagement with the HRC that best advances U.S. interests.

Question. One key set of U.N. instruments are the U.N. Human Rights Council Special Procedures or the “Special Rapporteurs” to defend specific rights. These Special Rapporteurs are assigned to work on key human rights issues, such as freedom of expression, freedom of religion, and freedom of association—many of which could be lifted right from our own American bill of rights.

- As U.N. Ambassador, what would you do to strengthen the mandate and influence of these Human Rights Special Rapporteurs?

Answer. My understanding is that the performance of the Special Rapporteurs varies, but I have not been fully briefed on what the U.S. has done and continues to do to address this issue. If confirmed, I commit to gaining a greater understanding of this matter.

U.N. Security Council

Question. The Security Council has become increasingly gridlocked, with disagreements between the U.S. and western Europeans on one side, and Russia and China frequently aligned in opposition. This has crippled the Council’s ability to address the nightmarish situation in Syria, and has led to inaction in numerous other hot spots. Some have advocated for Security Council reform, either in terms of expanding membership to make the Council more representative of the world of today, or diluting the veto power of the permanent five members in situations where there are humanitarian crises.

- If confirmed, would you advocate within the Trump administration for looking at ways to reform the Security Council, either to make its membership more reflective of the world we live in today, or to restructure the ability of members to unilaterally veto humanitarian initiatives?

Answer. As I understand it, there is not a broad consensus among U.N. member states on Security Council reform. If confirmed, my advice would be based on the particulars of such a proposal. I would not support any reform proposal that weakens U.S. influence in the Security Council or undermines U.S. interests in that body. Although this can be immensely frustrating—for example, Chinese and Russian opposition to taking stronger action with respect to North Korea—I would not support any change to the veto power because such a change would undermine the ability of our nation’s representatives to protect U.S. interests in that body.

Question. Resolutions in the Security Council can be vetoed by any of the five permanent member states; thus the requirements to impose economic sanctions can be diluted and rendered ineffective. The earliest actions taken on North Korea and China’s resistance to robust restrictions, for example, or Russia’s resistance to considering a resolution in an attempt to deter the emerging civil crisis in Syria, offer critical examples.

- What alternative strategies would you consider in such circumstances?

Answer. If confirmed, I would consult with the President and the Secretary of State on possibilities to moderate such opposition or, if U.N. Security Council action was not possible, what alternative actions could be taken.

Extremism

Question. On June 17, 2015, Dylann Roof shot and killed nine African Americans, including the senior pastor, State Senator Clementa Pinckney, at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina. You immediately and passionately denounced the massacre as “an absolute hate crime” and you success-

fully advocated for removing the Confederate flag from the grounds of the state Capitol. You know personally how bigotry, hate, and other extremism can cause violence.

- If confirmed, how would you, as Ambassador to the U.N., combat bigotry and the rise of violent extremism?

Answer. As I stated during my hearing, I strongly believe that the U.S. should unabashedly promote American values. If confirmed, I will work to advance human rights for everyone.

Americans at the U.N.

Question. Traditionally, Americans have held the leadership positions in U.N. agencies such as UNICEF and the World Food Program. In addition, the U.S. has held at least one Under-Secretary-General position in the U.N. Secretariat's headquarters in New York. The U.S. has also had a senior American in an Assistant Secretary-General position in the Department of Field Support since the Department's inception in 2007. Having Americans in senior U.N. positions helps keep open vital channels of communication between Washington and the U.N., serves as a two-way street to help the U.N. hear from Americans, as well as have Americans speak credibly to the U.S. about the U.N. There have been proposals for the U.S. to zero out all voluntary contributions to U.N. agencies, endangering the ability of the U.S. to maintain the leadership post at UNICEF. And there is uncertainty as to whether the U.S. will try to maintain its hold on the important position of Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs at U.N. headquarters.

A member of the Trump administration's Transition Team at the State Department, Chris Burnham, has previously served as a United Nations staff member in the role of Under-Secretary-General for Management. An American, Jeff Feltman, currently serves as the head of the Department of Political Affairs, and Americans also run UNICEF and the World Food Program.

- Do you think it is important for Americans to continue to hold senior jobs at the United Nations? If so, will you advise the Trump administration to try to retain the post of Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs for an American, or would you suggest an American return to running the U.N.'s Department of Management?

Answer. I believe it is critically important to retain high level positions for Americans in the U.N. system, including UNICEF and the World Food Program. One of the issues I will pursue as soon as confirmed is determining, in consultation with the White House, candidates for these positions as well as for the Under Secretary General position. Both Under Secretary General positions have important implications for the U.S. which I look forward to discussing with the White House and conveying to the Secretary General.

Question. The House of Representatives has proposed in recent State Department and Foreign Operations Appropriations bills to cut all voluntary U.S. contributions to the U.N., citing them as duplicative of assessed payments. These voluntary contributions are not duplicative, as all U.S. funding for UNICEF, for example, is made on a voluntary basis.

- If confirmed as U.N. Ambassador, would you advocate within the Trump administration for stopping all voluntary contributions to the U.N., including UNICEF, potentially endangering the ability of the U.S. to advocate for an American to lead that organization?

Answer. No. As I stated in my testimony I would support selective withholding of contributions with the purpose of making institutions in the U.N. more effective and efficient working in concert with U.S. interests.

U.N. Secretary-General

Question. Former High Commission for Refugees, and former Prime Minister of Portugal, Antonio Guterres, was recently elected by Member States as the 9th Secretary-General. Guterres received generally high marks for his leadership at UNHCR, and won surprisingly easy consensus for the Secretary-General post. President-elect Trump and Guterres have reportedly spoken by phone. With both a new U.S. administration, and new leadership at the U.N., it is an important opportunity for the U.S. to help empower the new SG in his early days in the job, and in any reform efforts he may undertake.

- If confirmed, how do you anticipate working with Secretary-General Guterres?

Answer. I very much look forward to working with the new Secretary-General, and if confirmed, hope to present my credentials to him as soon as possible. His long experience as U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees will be a great asset to all of

U.S. working on not only refugee issues, but on peacekeeping and other security challenges. His interest in addressing sexual exploitation in peacekeeping will be a critically important issue that we can and will work on as soon as I arrive in New York.

U.N. Treaties

Question. A number of U.N.-negotiated treaties have been languishing in the U.S. Senate for years, despite some of them having strong bipartisan support (the Law of the Sea Treaty, which has the bipartisan support of officials ranging from every Secretary of State from Henry Kissinger to today, a host of current and former military leaders, and the U.S. private sector including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce), or others doing little more than codifying on an international basis legislation that has long been the law of the land in the United States (the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which was voted down despite the presence of former Majority Leader Robert Dole on the Senate floor during the vote). Others include the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, where the U.S. is in the embarrassing company of being one of two countries in the world (along with Somalia) that has yet to ratify. Simply having the apparent stigma of being a U.N. treaty seems to be enough to doom the chances for ratification, no matter how worthwhile the substance.

- If confirmed as Ambassador, will you advise your colleagues in the Trump administration of the value of the U.S. ratifying any of these important treaties?

Answer. The United States should only join treaties that advance U.S. national interests. There are many treaties that the United States has signed but have not received the advice and consent of the Senate. If confirmed, such treaties will be reviewed to determine whether ratification would advance U.S. national interests.

Children and Youth

Question. We know now that one billion children a year are victims of violence, and the global economic impact of physical, psychological, and sexual violence against children is as high as \$7 trillion—or 8 percent of the world's GDP.

- In your dealings and negotiations with U.N. colleagues, how will you not only prioritize it in your day-to-day proceedings but also elevate the issue of ending violence against children on the international stage?

Answer. Violence against children is abhorrent anywhere. As a mother, I am appalled with the prospect of such treatment of any child, anywhere in the world. U.N. agencies like UNICEF as well as non-governmental organizations have done good work in this area and I look forward to learning more about how this issue can be further elevated.

Civil Society Space

Question. Over 50 countries have introduced or enacted laws restricting the operations of NGOs and other civil society organizations. The promotion of vibrant civil societies has been a key element of U.S. foreign policy as a result of bipartisan support for many years. In 2016, the U.N. Human Rights Council passed a resolution committing States to protect civil society space.

- As Ambassador, how will you work with States to ensure the implementation of this crucial U.N. Human Rights Council resolution and otherwise help promote a safe and enabling environment for civil society around the world?

Answer. As I stated in my testimony I believe promoting civil society is a vital component of U.S. foreign policy. I have stated my reservations with regard to the ability of the Human Rights Council to advance the cause of civil society. Should I be confirmed, I will work to make the instruments of the U.N. more efficient, effective and accountable.

Question. If confirmed, what else will you do to ensure that the U.S. continues to be a strong champion for civil society participation, space, and engagement at the U.N.?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I believe my greatest contribution will be working with other members of the cabinet to ensure our efforts at the U.N. work in concert with the other instruments of U.S. influence to advance U.S. efforts in promoting civil society.

Democracy, Rights, and Governance

Question. A Democratically controlled Senate unanimously confirmed Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad—a Republican nominee. Ambassador Khalilzad, in a 2007 speech

on human rights, said “The progress of freedom is a vital interest of the international community” and “we aspire to a world in which all human beings, regardless of their race, culture, or religion, see their fundamental rights respected and enjoy the progress and prosperity that protection of those rights make possible.” Khalilzad’s words represent U.S. values.

- As Ambassador to the U.N., how will you promote human rights and protect fundamentals of freedom—including support for elections, democratic governance, civil society, rule of law, free speech, and human rights protection, especially as people around the world—who share our values—struggle against the dangers presented by repressive and authoritarian regimes and governments?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I commit to working with other members of the cabinet to ensure our efforts at the U.N. work in concert with the other instruments of U.S. influence to advance human freedoms including support for elections, democratic governance, civil society, rule of law, free speech and human rights protection.

Gender

Question. There is a growing body of evidence showing that the empowerment of women and girls, through investments in their health, education, livelihoods, and the prevention of violence, not only benefits them as individuals, but leads to healthier, more prosperous, and more stable societies.

- As Ambassador to the U.N., what concrete steps will you take to prioritize the empowerment of women and girls in U.S. development and humanitarian assistance and diplomatic engagement?

Answer. All around the world, we have seen how even modest investments in the abilities and potential of women and girls can yield transformative results not just for women and girls themselves, but for their families and communities. Investing in women produces a multiplier effect—women reinvest a large portion of their income in their families and communities, which also furthers economic growth and stability. I believe women’s empowerment and advancement is an important part of our foreign policy and I look forward to promoting this further at the United Nations.

Question. What role will the U.S. government play in ensuring grassroots women and girls’ participation in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about the Sustainable Development Goals in this area and what appropriate role the U.S. should play.

Question. The United Nations Population Fund provides services for women and girls globally, such as prenatal care, safe delivery services, and post-partum check-ups—saving the lives of babies and mothers worldwide, including in the midst of grave crises. For example, UNFPA’s clinics in northern Nigeria provide medications, counseling and treatment to women raped by Boko Haram; UNFPA support in Northern Iraq reached victims of ISIL.

- Would you ensure that the U.S. remains an important supporter of these efforts, including as the second-largest donor to the UNFPA’s efforts?

Answer. As I stated at my confirmation hearing, I strongly support efforts to provide maternal care services. I anticipate that the Trump administration will be taking a look at our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Question. The Women Peace and Security (WPS) agenda has been a priority for the U.N. and the UNSC since passing UNSCR 1325 in 2000. On the 15th anniversary of 1325, the High Level Review of Women, Peace and Security was completed, as was the Global Study on Women, Peace and Security. These prompted the unanimous approval of UNSCR 2242, which formally adopts the recommendations of the Review.

- How will you specifically support the WPS agenda on the UNSC and within the U.S. Mission’s broader engagement? What commitments to the WPS are you prepared to make today?

Answer. Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can best be forged and sustained, when women’s lives are protected, their experiences are considered, and their voices are heard in all aspects of peacemaking and peacebuilding in their countries. I support these efforts and will look for opportunities to advance them at the U.N.

Question. Improving maternal health was a U.N. Millennium Development goal. Despite this, access to safe sexual and reproductive care continues to be a major challenge for millions of women around the world.

- Would you make improving maternal health a continued global priority?

Answer. As I stated in my testimony, I am opposed to abortion, but I believe that maternal health is an important priority.

Women's Empowerment

Question. As you know, U.S. foreign policy places a high priority on global women's empowerment, gender equity, and combating violence against women. Gender inequality and gender-based violence are impediments to development, economic advancements, democracy, and security. For example, one of the State Department's core missions is to promote gender equality and equal rights for men and women around the world, including the right of all women and girls to decide if, when and whom they marry. This understanding has transcended party lines. As former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice noted, "In today's modern world, no country can achieve lasting success and stability and security if half of its population is sitting on the sidelines." More recently, Secretary of State Kerry noted: "Our path forward is clear. We must prevent and respond to gender-based violence—We must open the doors for women to fully participate in society—as farmers, entrepreneurs, engineers, executives, and leaders of their countries. And we must invest in the next generation of women by making sure girls can go to school in a safe environment."

- If confirmed as U.N. Ambassador, how will you ensure that empowering women remains a core pillar of U.S. foreign policy?

Answer. Empowering women has always been a priority for me, both through setting a personal example, and through policies. If confirmed, I will work with the President and the National Security Council to develop our foreign policy goals and will use my position as U.S. Ambassador to forcefully and passionately implement them and the U.N.

Question. How do you intend to build on the progress that has been made to ensure that our foreign policy reflects our national values that men and women should enjoy equal rights? Among other things, as U.N. Ambassador, how will you build on the work of former policymakers to elevate and fully integrate gender analysis into U.S. foreign policy? How will you support continued development and implementation of the U.S. Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally and the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security?

Answer. As mentioned above, I believe in supporting women's empowerment around the world and will look for ways to promote and further efforts in this regard in our own foreign policy and at the United Nations.

Question. The U.S. has played an important role in expanding effective programs around the world to address gender-based violence and gender inequality, such as child marriage. According to recent estimates, at least one of every three women globally will be beaten, raped, or otherwise abused during her lifetime. In 2012, the State Department launched a global effort to combat gender-based violence, and this committee led a legislative effort to authorize this 5-year strategy in the State Department Authorization bill that was signed into law late last year. At the core of the strategy is a commitment to increase program resources for combating gender-based violence, improve coordination within the interagency, and increase the quantity and quality of data needed to design and implement effective GBV programs.

- As an issue that has enjoyed bipartisan support, please discuss your vision for how the U.S. Mission to the U.N. can continue to promote the right of all women and girls to live free from gender-based violence and to decide if, when, and whom to marry with free, full, and informed consent?

Answer. The issue of gender-based violence is important to me personally, and I will support efforts at the U.N. toward preventing violence against women and girls and mitigation of the impact of such violence that is occurring around the world. This will include not only prevention of violence but also protection of women, both physical and legal, and prosecution of perpetrators.

Global Health and Nutrition

Question. As you know, the United States has been a leader in global health and has played a catalytic role in increasing countries' own responses to health needs including HIV/AIDS, malaria, and maternal and child health. In fact, the U.S. has contributed to a 50 percent reduction in the deaths of mothers and children globally in the last two decades. We have made particular gains in areas with the world's most vulnerable populations, such as in Afghanistan, where the rate of women dying in child birth has dropped by more than half. I believe it is in America's economic interest to continue to lead the way in addressing global health issues including maintaining a strong focus on addressing the health of mothers and children

around the world. Economists have found that an increase of just \$5 per year in solutions that address children's and mothers' health will produce up to nine times the economic and social benefits over a generation, including increased GDP of a country.

- As U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., what will be your vision for U.S. leadership to help end preventable child and maternal deaths within a generation?
- How will you ensure that the United States continues to provide robust support for the work of U.N. agencies such as UNICEF, WFP, FAO, IFAD, WHO, and UNAIDS that all work to ensure global health, food security and improved nutrition for vulnerable populations?

Answer. As I stated in my testimony, I am opposed to abortion, but I believe that maternal health is an important priority. I anticipate that the Trump administration will be taking a look at our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Humanitarian Response / Refugees

Question. How should the U.S. follow up on the commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit and U.N. Summit for Refugees and Migrants?

Answer. The U.S. provides billions of dollars in direct and indirect assistance, bilaterally or through multilateral organizations, to assist refugees and displaced persons. U.S. contributions to these efforts are immensely important and, if confirmed, I will support U.S. leadership in this area and focus on making sure U.S. contributions are used to maximum effect.

Question. The global system developed to handle refugees is broken, leaving an estimated 21 million refugees in search of safety around the world. In September 2016, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a set of commitments to enhance the protection of refugees and migrants, the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants (NY Declaration). The New York Declaration reaffirms the importance of the international protection regime and represents a commitment by Member States to strengthen and enhance mechanisms to protect people on the move. It paves the way for the adoption of two new global compacts in 2018: the global compact on refugees and the global compact for safe, orderly, and regular migration.

- What do you see as the role of the United States at the United Nations to help address the refugee and migrant crisis? To meaningfully achieve the two new global compacts by 2018, will you commit to working for concrete commitments by Member States to share greater responsibility for refugee hosting and resettlement, offer more safe and legal routes for refugees and asylum seekers to secure protection, and defend the human rights of people on the move?

Answer. The U.S. is by far the largest contributor to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and provides billions more in direct and indirect assistance, bilaterally or through multilateral organizations like the World Food Program, to assist refugees and displaced persons. U.S. contributions to these efforts are immensely important and, if confirmed, I will support U.S. leadership in this area.

Question. While governor of South Carolina, you took the position that Syrian refugees were not being "properly vetted" before resettlement to the United States.

- Why do you believe that current systems are inadequate to properly vet Syrians, and what specific changes to these systems would you propose?

Answer. Determining appropriate vetting processes is the responsibility of other members of the cabinet. Should I be confirmed, I commit supporting their efforts in accordance with my duties at the U.N.

Question. The United States is currently a major supporter of the only prenatal care facility and maternity ward in Zaatari Camp, the world's largest Syrian refugee camp. Support to this maternity ward is given through contributions to UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund, which is the world's leading provider of lifesaving care for mothers and their babies in humanitarian settings. As of today, more than 7,000 babies have been delivered without a single maternal or baby death—an amazing statistic in any setting.

- Cognizant UNFPA does not provide abortions and that U.S. funding to UNFPA is subject to longstanding congressional restrictions, do you know of any reason not to encourage the U.S. government's support for UNFPA and its lifesaving work?

Answer. As I stated in my testimony, I am opposed to abortion, but I believe that maternal health is an important priority. I anticipate that the Trump administra-

tion will be taking a look at our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Question. In recent years, Democrats and Republicans have forged a bipartisan consensus—including appropriating \$750 million last year—to respond to Central America's refugee and migration challenges. This includes the fact that countries like El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala have consistently ranked in the top five countries with the highest murder rates in the world—murder rates generally seen only in war zones. Consequently, there is recognition that many Central American migrants should be viewed as refugees and be eligible for international protections.

- As tens of thousands of vulnerable people arrive at our southwestern border, if confirmed, will you maintain the United States partnership with the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees to ensure that Central American migrants fleeing violence receive sufficient protections and that they can be screened for relocation in third-countries?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I will work with the President and Congress to ensure that our foreign policy priorities align with our domestic needs and fulfil our legal obligations. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, but should I be confirmed, I will faithfully administer my responsibilities consistent with law and the policy preferences of the President.

International Humanitarian Law

Question. The conflict in Syria provides a stark example of how attacks on health facilities are increasingly used as a weapon of war; by August 2016, attacks on health facilities were happening every 17 hours in Aleppo.

- What is the role of the United States in ensuring compliance of U.N. Security Council resolution 2286 to document and conduct investigations of attacks on health workers and facilities? And what more can and should be done to ensure that health workers and the civilians they serve are protected in humanitarian emergencies?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of UNSCR 2286, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue and faithfully administering the policy preferences of the President.

Peacekeeping

Question. How will you press troop contributing countries and the U.N. itself on transparency relating to sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) so as to ensure that information on investigations and prosecutions is made public and also conveyed to the victims and witnesses affected?

Answer. As I mentioned in my hearing, I am appalled that these crimes are being committed by those who should be protecting vulnerable people. I would need to be fully briefed on this issue in order to provide a complete response. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue and implementing the most effective policies to address this serious issue.

Question. Many experts assert that U.N. peacekeepers from Nepal introduced cholera in Haiti in 2010, killing at least 10,000 and causing illness to many others. In December 2016, U.N. Secretary-General Ban stated that the United Nations “simply did not do enough . we are profoundly sorry for our role.” Ban introduced a number of measures to address the issue, which would cost about \$400 million over the next two years.

- Please provide your assessment of current U.N. efforts to address the issue and how a similar incident can be prevented in the future.

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I commit to gaining greater knowledge of this issue. As in all matters in addressing U.N. operations I will press for greater transparency, accountability and clarity of mission, insisting on greater efficiency and effectiveness.

LGBT

Question. If confirmed, how will you represent the government in discussions regarding the rights of LGBT persons? For example, will you continue U.S. participation in the LGBT core group?

Answer. As I stated during my hearing, I strongly believe that the U.S. should unabashedly promote American values. If confirmed, I will work to advance human rights for everyone.

Atrocity Prevention and Accountability

Question. What do you see as the U.S. role and responsibility to prevent atrocities globally? What will you do at the United Nations to advance this agenda? How can the Security Council prevent crises before they become threats to international peace and security?

Answer. As I stated in my hearing, I am appalled that these crimes are being committed. I would need to be fully briefed on this issue in order to provide a complete response. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue and implementing the most effective policies to address this serious issue.

Question. The outgoing U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. has been outspoken about human rights violations in armed conflict, including sexual violence.

- How do you see your role on these issues, as Ambassador, if you are confirmed? What specific steps would you take in advocating for preventing and responding to human rights abuses, including accountability for perpetrators and services for survivors?

Answer. As I stated in my hearing, I am appalled that these crimes are being committed and that countries committing human rights abuses sit on the Human Rights Council. I would need to be fully briefed on this issue in order to provide a complete response. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue and implementing the most effective policies to address this serious issue.

Climate

Question. Do you believe that climate change is merely a “concept” and a “hoax”, created by the Chinese or someone else?

Answer. No, I do not believe climate change is a hoax. If confirmed I commit to working with experts at the State Department and elsewhere in the government on the issue and helping to determine what role the U.S. Mission to the United Nations should play.

Question. Do you accept the scientific consensus that should average global temperatures reach or exceed +2 degrees Celsius that many regions of the world will very likely experience catastrophic changes in the environment that may very likely impact the safety and prosperity of many people? If not, do you place greater credence in the opinions of less than 2 percent of climate scientists whose interpretation of the data on climate change yield less grave concern over the threat of climate change?

Answer. I believe that climate change is real, and should be addressed, in concert with American economic and other interests. If confirmed I commit to working with experts at the State Department and elsewhere in the government on the issue and helping to determine what role the U.S. Mission to the United Nations should play.

Question. Do you trust the analysis, concerns, and recommendations of security experts at the State Department, Department of Defense, Central Intelligence Agency, Navy War College, U.N. Security Council, and the World Bank, who have expressed growing concerns over the threat climate change poses to national and global security?

Answer. If confirmed, I commit to taking a closer look at those specific recommendations.

Question. What do you interpret Secretary of State nominee Rex Tillerson’s comments that the U.S. should maintain “a seat at the table” with respect to U.S. involvement in international cooperation on climate change to mean?

Answer. I agree with Mr. Tillerson that the United States should have a seat at the table when it comes to the discussion on climate change and other global environmental issues. We must participate and engage in those discussions to advance the interests of the United States.

Question. Do you support maintaining U.S. leadership on climate diplomacy?

Answer. I support maintaining U.S. leadership on all matters crucial to our national interests.

Question. What is your understanding of how important global action to address climate change is to the global community and members of the United Nations?

Answer. If confirmed I commit to helping to determine, along with other members of the Government, the proper role that the United States should play in international climate change negotiations and other matters.

Country-Specific Questions

Russia

Question. Russia's Ambassador to the U.N., Vitaly Churkin, has held his post for over a decade and has a deep knowledge on the U.N. politics and systems. If confirmed, you will be serving in your first significant position engaging foreign policy concerns.

- Given Russia's consistent efforts to block American interests in the Security Council, how will you strengthen your expertise in order to effectively counter Ambassador Churkin and his colleagues on the UNSC?

Answer. As I mentioned at my hearing, I am committed to working hard and representing the ideals and values of the United States in all of my work at the United Nations. If confirmed, I will be representing the U.S. in the U.N. Security Council and other U.N. bodies and, just as in my past experience in the South Carolina legislature and as Governor of South Carolina, I will work to overcome differences wherever they exist, including with Russia. I also understand that there is a fine group of foreign service and career staff at the U.S. Mission who are providing continuity and expertise on ongoing negotiations and issues with countries like Russia, and I look forward to working with them as well.

Israel

Question. Since 1967, successive U.S. administrations have promoted a negotiated two-state solution between Israelis and Palestinians with both sides living side-by-side in peace and security.

- Do you believe that supporting the two-state solution should still be U.S. policy?

Answer. Yes. However, the specific outlines of what the two-state solution looks like should be determined in negotiations between the two parties rather than imposed on them by others.

Question. In December, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 2334, which I believe is a biased resolution that unfairly targets Israel and makes restarting direct negotiations for a two-state solution more difficult.

- If confirmed as U.N. Ambassador, what steps do you plan to take to mitigate the negative implications of 2334?

Answer. Israel is a vital ally of the United States, and we must meet our obligations to Israel as our most important strategic ally in the region. Should I be confirmed, I would recommend to the President that the U.S. announce it no longer supports that resolution and would veto any U.N. Security Council efforts to implement it or enforce it, and block any future U.N. sanctions based on it.

Question. In his outgoing remarks to the U.N. Security Council, Secretary General Ban Kim Moon acknowledged the U.N.'s institutional bias against Israel. He said "Over the last decade I have argued that we cannot have a bias against Israel at the U.N. Decades of political maneuvering have created a disproportionate number of resolutions, reports, and committees against Israel. In many cases, instead of helping the Palestinian issue, this reality has foiled the ability of the U.N. to fulfill its role effectively."

- In your view, how best can the U.S. work to rid the U.N. of its institutional anti-Israel bias? What is an effective and appropriate role for the U.N.?

Answer. Israel is a vital ally of the United States, and we must meet our obligations to Israel as our most important strategic ally in the region. Should I be confirmed, I would recommend to the President that the U.S. veto any U.N. Security Council resolutions and oppose other U.N. resolutions that unfairly single out Israel or would undermine prospects for a negotiated peace. If confirmed, I would recommend that the President oppose Palestinian membership in U.N. organizations prior to a mutually acceptable peace agreement with Israel and enforce laws prohibiting funding to international organizations that do so.

Question. In March 2016, the U.N. Human Rights Council adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a database of Israeli companies operating in the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights. Last month, the U.N. General Assembly approved a budget that included \$138,000 to support this effort. I view this blacklist as a dangerous step that will energize BDS activities against Israel.

- What efforts will you undertake if confirmed to challenge this effort? What more can we do to make sure that—rather than being isolated—we find ways to fully include Israel as a state receiving equal treatment at the United Nations?

Answer. Israel is a vital ally of the United States, and we must meet our obligations to Israel as our most important strategic ally in the region. Should I be con-

firmed, I would recommend to the President that the U.S. announce it no longer supports UNSCR 2334 and would veto any U.N. Security Council efforts to implement it or enforce it, and block any future U.N. sanctions based on it. Although the U.S. may not be able to stop the implementation of the BDS list, if confirmed, I commit to use my position to do what is possible to impede it.

Question. Members of the U.N. Human Rights Council includes human rights violators such as China, Saudi Arabia, Cuba and Venezuela. These undemocratic countries outrageously focus on Israel and America while ignoring atrocities committed in states like Syria and Iran. The UNHRC has passed more resolutions condemning Israel than the rest of the countries in the world combined. Additionally, it maintains a permanent agenda item (item 7) that requires that Israel's behavior is raised at every UNHRC meeting.

- Will you commit to working to eliminate Agenda item 7? How will you go about this?

Answer. I oppose Agenda Item 7 and, if confirmed, I would strive to eliminate it. I will work with the President and the National Security Council to determine the appropriate level of engagement with the HRC that best advances U.S. interests, and, if confirmed, I would advise the President that elimination of Agenda Item 7 should be a primary goal of our participation or a condition for U.S. participation.

Lebanon

Question. What more can and should we be doing to ensure compliance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1701, which ended the 2006 war in Lebanon and required Hezbollah to disarm? Will you work to highlight Hezbollah's violations of Resolution 1701?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of UNSCR 1701, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

North Korea

Question. In recent years, with strong U.S. support, the U.N. Security Council has adopted several resolutions sanctioning North Korea for its nuclear and ballistic missile programs. Most recently, in early December, the U.N. Security Council adopted a new sanctions resolution aimed at curbing North Korea's ability to raise hard currency. The U.S.-drafted resolution caps DPRK coal sales—the country's biggest export—by approximately 60 percent and bans the export of copper, nickel, silver, and zinc, as well as the sale of several additional “luxury” items. Of note, under these new unanimously adopted sanctions, China will slash its DPRK coal imports by some \$700 million compared with 2015 sales.

- What is the impact of these types of measures?

Answer. The goal of sanctions is to force North Korea to comply with U.N. resolutions. We will have to see what effect they have.

Question. What is a good example of how multilateral sanctions can have more impact than unilateral ones?

Answer. I believe both types of sanctions can be appropriate, and if I am confirmed, expect both to learn more about the efficacy of each, their impact in combination, and advocate the policy of the President and the United States government in relation to any sanctions regime.

Question. How will the U.S. work through the Security Council to ensure full implementation of these new sanctions? What additional measures through the U.N. do you think will be necessary to enforce the new round of U.N. sanctions?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I look forward to working with the other members of the cabinet to assess the impact of current sanctions and determine the next steps.

Question. How do you intend to approach sanctions enforcement and implementation if you are confirmed as Ambassador?

Answer. I believe rigorous enforcement of sanctions is vital, and if confirmed will advocate the policy of the United States

Question. Do you believe that China has acted to fully implement and enforce UNSCR sanctions on North Korea? Has Russia? If not, what specific sanctions and in what ways has China (Russia) failed to implement and enforce?

Answer. I believe they can do more. Should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about their current compliance with U.N. sanctions and what I appropriate step I should take to ensure the fullest possible implementation.

Question. Are there specific tools that the U.N. needs for the implementation and enforcement of sectoral and financial sanctions on North Korea under the UNSCRs that are currently lacking?

Answer. Should I be confirmed I commit to work with the rest of the cabinet to determine what additional tools might be needed, receive guidance from the President and then advocate the policy of the United States.

- How do you view U.S. unilateral sanctions and UNSCR sanctions working together to create an effective sanctions regime? *Answer.* My goal would be to ensure they are complementary, both supporting the U.S. goal of lessening the threat of a nuclear North Korea.
- What additional steps will you support at the U.N. to highlight North Korea's human rights record?

Answer. Should I be confirmed I would take every opportunity to highlight the human rights record of North Korea in every forum within the institution where it was appropriate.

Question. In addition to the new round of sanctions by the Security Council, are there additional steps that the United States should take through our alliances with Korea and Japan or through unilateral U.S. measures, including secondary sanctions as authorized by Congress, to set up a possible diplomatic pathway to denuclearization?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I would consult with the rest of the cabinet to what additional measures would be appropriate.

Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

Question. The DRC is in the midst of a major political crisis, with presidential elections delayed until April 2018 and President Joseph Kabila attempting to remain in power until then. The political opposition has accused Mr. Kabila of trying to extend his presidency (he is term-limited and was originally supposed to leave office on December 20th) through extra-constitutional means, and there are concerns that his efforts to cling onto power could spark violence. The U.N. peacekeeping mission in the DRC (MONUSCO) has been preparing for the possibility of violence, reinforcing its presence in the Congolese capital, Kinshasa, and deploying mobile teams to several cities where MONUSCO does not have a permanent presence to monitor human rights violations. Nevertheless, the U.N. has warned that these measures are unlikely to be sufficient to fully respond to a major outbreak of political violence, as most of the force is concentrated in the country's east, where it has been working to counter a variety of armed groups that continue to pose a serious threat to stability. As a result, the resources and capabilities available to the mission in Kinshasa and other places are stretched thin.

- What should the U.S. do to help bolster MONUSCO's capacity to address this situation? How can the U.S. use its influence to pressure the Congolese government to prevent a descent into all-out violence?

Answer. The United States must lead with its values; many times, that includes facilitating peace negotiations and settlements. If confirmed, I would work with the Secretary of State to engage the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and other interested parties to encourage a peaceful political solution, with a guarantee of basic human rights and accountability for those who transgress such rights. Targeted sanctions, possibly through the U.N. Security Council, might be part of achieving that solution, but sanctions are a tactic, not a strategy or a solution. Through robust dialogue with relevant actors, the United States could help the DRC achieve a stable political outcome, which would also translate into increased stability regionally and an improvement in human rights.

Syria

Question. U.N. humanitarian agencies are playing a central role in responding to the conflicts in Syria and Iraq. These activities have powerful knock-on effects that reach beyond the immediate beneficiaries as well. For example, electronic food vouchers provided by WFP to Syrian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq, and Egypt have helped inject more than \$1 billion into local economies in recent years, helping to create thousands of jobs in the food retail sector in these countries. Unfortunately, despite the generosity of the American people, ever-growing humanitarian needs in the region have consistently outpaced available financial resources over the past several years. This has negatively impacted U.N. aid operations, with agencies being forced to scale back assistance to vulnerable populations, which in turn has been one of the key drivers of the refugee exodus to Europe.

- How will the U.S. work with its international partners to convince other countries—including oil-rich countries in the Persian Gulf—to contribute more to these relief efforts?

Answer. It is my understanding that there are a number of efforts ongoing. Should I be confirmed, I would want to assess ongoing efforts and consult with the rest of the cabinet and the President to determine what additional measures would be most appropriate.

Question. The U.N. Security Council failed abysmally to stop the horrific carnage and targeted killing of civilians in Aleppo.

- In your new role, how will you push for the full and timely implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 2328, which passed on December 19, 2016, and calls for a U.N. led monitoring mechanism for areas that have been retaken by the Syrian government? This is a measure that would save lives and make sure that agreements made by parties to the conflict to protect civilians are upheld.

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of UNSCR 2328, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

Question. Humanitarian access to people in need in Syria remains constrained by ongoing conflict, shifting front lines, administrative and bureaucratic hurdles, violence along access routes and general safety and security concerns in contravention of international humanitarian law.

- As U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., how would you prioritize negotiating for humanitarian access?

Answer. If confirmed, I will support the Secretary of State in his efforts with key parties to the Syrian conflict to achieve a political solution to the war and limit its humanitarian effect on Syrians. Part of these efforts will be assistance to internally displaced persons, through ongoing USAID programs and others, in coordination with our partners.

Central African Republic (CAR)

Question. In April 2014, the Security Council voted to dispatch a U.N. mission to CAR. The U.N. force is working to carry out a number of essential activities, including protecting civilians from violence, providing assistance to help the country carry out elections, facilitating the delivery of humanitarian aid, monitoring, investigating, and reporting on human rights violations, and helping build the capacity of CAR's police force and court system. Due to the collapse of virtually any semblance of law and order in the country, peacekeepers are also mandated to arrest and detain people in order to crack down on impunity. Over the last year, CAR has seen some promising signs of progress, with peacekeepers playing an important role. As a result of improvements in the overall security situation in the country, CAR organized, with U.N. support, largely peaceful and credible presidential and legislative elections in 2016 that led to a peaceful transition of power.

- Can you talk about the importance of the U.N.'s role in helping to build on these gains moving forward? How should the U.S. work with its international partners to help bolster the new government in Bangui?

Answer. The U.N. peacekeeping operation has helped stabilize the country, but has been plagued by sexual exploitation and abuse. If confirmed, I pledge to focus on this operation to shore up weaknesses and assist the government in reaching the point where the operation is no longer required.

Colombia

Question. The U.S. has invested \$10 billion in support for Colombia—first through Plan Colombia and now Peace Colombia. This support has spanned three U.S. presidencies and has broad bipartisan backing in the U.S. Congress. Sixteen years ago, Colombia teetered on the edge of being a failed state. Today, it has an historic peace agreement and stands on the verge of joining the OECD. In January 2016, the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 2261 to establish a political mission to monitor Colombia's ceasefire and the disarmament of armed combatants.

- If confirmed, will you work to ensure continued U.N. support for the Colombian peace process so that the gains of the past 16 years are fully consolidated?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of UNSCR 2261, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

Question. As a result of the 16-year, bipartisan commitment by the U.S. to Plan Colombia, Colombia not only ratified a historic peace accord but also has become a net "exporter" of security assistance. Colombia's security forces have provided

training to police forces in Central America, have contributed to counternarcotics initiatives in Afghanistan, and have maintained a presence in the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) on the Sinai Peninsula.

- As Colombia's security forces assume a more traditional role in the aftermath of the country's armed conflict, if confirmed, will you support Colombian efforts to increase participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations?

Answer. Yes.

Saudi Arabia/Yemen

Question. U.N. Security Council Resolution 2216 (2015) required Houthi forces to withdraw from all major cities in Yemen, give up all weapons seized from the Yemeni military, and refrain from provocations or threats to neighboring states. Unfortunately, the Houthis have neither withdrawn from Yemen's cities nor given up their weapons. They have also repeatedly launched missiles into Saudi Arabia. The U.N.-led peace process in Yemen has been on hold since late November when Houthi leaders and former Yemeni president Ali Abdullah Saleh announced that they would form a national government. U.N. special envoy Ismail Ould Cheikh Ahmed called this development "a concerning obstacle to the peace process."

- What further steps can be taken to enforce Resolution 2216? Do you believe that supporting the U.N. Special Envoy to Yemen's roadmap remains the best chance of securing a negotiated settlement to end this conflict? What specific steps can the Government of Saudi Arabia take to move political talks forward? If confirmed as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., will you call on the Saudi-led Coalition to refrain from steps that escalate the conflict? What additional sources of leverage does the United States have to press for unhindered humanitarian access to address the suffering of Yemeni civilians?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of UNSCR 2216, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

Libya

Question. Libya's Government of National Accord (GNA) was formed after a political agreement negotiated under United Nations auspices and in accordance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 2259 in December, 2015. The U.S., along with most of the international community, recognizes the GNA as the legitimate government of Libya. Russia is now increasingly supporting General Khalifa Hefatar, a Qaddafi-era general who continues to defy the GNA's authority, hosting him on a visit to Moscow in November and most recently, on its aircraft carrier, the Kuznetsov.

- Do you believe that Russian actions and support for Hefatar outside of the GNA are helpful? What are U.S. national security objectives in Libya and do we need the participation of the U.N. and its agencies to achieve those objectives?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of this matter, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

China

Question. I remain concerned about the continuous repression of basic human rights of Tibetans in China. Despite decades of oppression, the Tibetans continue to resist the injustice without resorting to violence. Since the mass demonstrations of 2008—where around 200 Tibetans were killed and thousands were imprisoned by the Chinese authorities—more than 140 Tibetans have self-immolated to protest against Chinese rule and for the return of the Dalai Lama in Tibet. Over 600 Tibetans continue to be prisoners of conscience according to the U.S. Congressional Executive Commission on China. With respect the United Nations, specifically, the Chinese authorities continue to regularly deny access to U.N. officials in charge of human rights to the Tibetan Autonomous Region and other Tibetan areas. The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights has requested to visit China and Tibetan areas of China since the beginning of his mandate—and other U.N. Special Rapporteurs have done the same—but the Chinese government has prevented them to travel there.

- Will you make it a priority in your engagement with Chinese officials at the U.N. to urge their government's compliance with its international obligations on human rights, at the very minimum, by allowing U.N. officials in charge of human rights to travel to Tibetan areas?

Answer. American values are a critical component of American interests. Standing up for human rights and democracy is not just a moral imperative but is in the best traditions of our country. If confirmed, I will support efforts to advocate for democ-

racy and human rights as an integral element of our diplomatic engagement with China and other countries around the world.

South Sudan

Question. There is strong bipartisan commitment across multiple administrations and Congress' to promote the well-being of the people of South Sudan. The U.N. recently warned that "a steady process of ethnic cleansing is already underway in some parts" of South Sudan, and that the country is on the verge of an "all-out ethnic civil war" that could devolve into genocide. South Sudanese civilians face acute malnutrition, and the African Union and the United Nations have documented that war crimes and crimes against humanity that have occurred during the course of the conflict. Last year despite the administration's best efforts, we were unable to garner support for an arms embargo and additional targeted sanctions on individuals including Riek Machar, South Sudan Army Chief Paul Malong, and Information Minister Michael Makuei.

- Are you prepared to support assertive U.N. action to prevent genocide or mass atrocities in South Sudan, if confirmed?
- If confirmed, will you seek to garner U.N. support for an arms embargo and targeted sanctions?
- If confirmed, will you push the new Secretary General to convene a high-level meeting to bring about a political settlement to the crisis? What specifically will you do towards that end?

Answer. The situation in South Sudan is one of the most pressing humanitarian situations in the world. It is critical to help build some political space for reconciliation between the government and rebel factions. The United States should continue to engage in international forums like the U.N. and bilaterally with key partners in the area to address this issue, and decide upon a combined policy to address this violence. This would include deploying robust diplomacy, possible sanctions, and other measures.

Question. In two separate incidents in South Sudan last year, United Nations peacekeepers failed to adequately carry out their mandate to protect civilians; once during an outbreak of violence in Malakal in February, and again when hostilities broke out in July. In both instances, the Secretary General ordered a review.

- Will you commit to ensuring the United Nations takes steps to improve its ability to protect civilians in South Sudan, if confirmed?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Just last week, the Government of South Sudan rejected the Rapid Protection Force authorized by the United Nations last year.

- What will you do, if confirmed, to ensure the 4000 strong RPF troops are deployed?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of this matter, including what has been done and can be done, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR TODD YOUNG

Question. Do you agree that we need maximum possible transparency and details from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in its reporting on Iran's nuclear program?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If confirmed, do you commit to pushing the IAEA to provide the international community the maximum possible transparency and details regarding Iran's nuclear program?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you believe that all side agreements and understandings related to the implementation of the JCPOA should be made public?

Answer. Yes, with appropriate redactions for classified matters.

Question. Based on your preparation for this hearing, and your review of U.N. Security Council Resolution 2272, what is your understanding with regard to whether or not units that do not hold U.N. peacekeepers accountable for sexual exploitation are in fact being replaced?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on this matter. If confirmed, I commit to looking into this issue and sharing that information with Congress.

Question. In light of the rapidly expanding ballistic missile programs of Iran and North Korea, what is your assessment of their collaboration currently, and what more do you believe the United Nations should do to oppose ballistic missile collaboration between North Korea and Iran?

Answer. I will rely on the assessment of the DNI on the extent of the collaboration between Iran and North Korea. There is currently a strongly-worded UNSCR on North Korea, and I will push for the enforcement of its terms.

Question. How would you characterize Russia's military activities and support for separatists in eastern Ukraine?

Answer. Russia's actions in Eastern Ukraine and its invasion and illegal occupation of Crimea establishes a very dangerous precedent only last seen in Europe during World War II. This could lead to a complete breakdown in the post-war settlement which has largely ensured peace and stability throughout much of Europe since 1945. This would have a profound negative impact on U.S. national interests.

Question. Ukraine has filed a lawsuit at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) demanding that Russia immediately halt its support for separatists fighting in eastern Ukraine.

- What is your view of Ukraine's filing and the ICJ more generally?

Answer. I am not familiar with the Ukraine's case against the Russian Federation at the ICJ, but I look forward to learning more about it if confirmed. The United States does not submit to compulsory jurisdiction at the ICJ.

Question. If confirmed, what would you do at the U.N. to push for better intellectual property rights protections?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on the United Nations and IPR. If confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED
TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR JEANNE SHAHEEN

U.N. and Climate Change

Question. Do you agree with the scientific consensus that global climate change is occurring and that coordinated action is urgently required to address the risks?

Answer. See answer below.

Question. Do you agree with the objective of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, under which the Paris Climate Agreement was negotiated, to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations at a level that would prevent dangerous interference in the climate system?

Answer. See answer below.

Question. Will you advise President-elect Trump not to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris Agreement?

Answer. See answer below.

Question. Are you concerned that efforts to weaken or withdraw from this agreement could isolate the United States and diminish U.S. leadership or diplomatic leverage on issues of national interests?

Answer. I commit to working with experts at the State Department and elsewhere in the government on the issue and helping to determine what role the U.S. Mission to the United Nations should play.

If confirmed, I expect that the State Department and other departments of the government will conduct a review of the Paris Agreement and the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. Whether the temperature goals set forth in those agreements are the correct goals, whether the agreements themselves are adequate to meeting those goals, and whether the agreements advance U.S. national interests will be part of that review.

The United States should join international agreements only if membership would advance U.S. national interests. While having good diplomatic relations is in the U.S. national interest, it is only one factor that should be weighed. The decision to remain outside of the Kyoto Protocol, for example, did not to my knowledge diminish the United States' ability to conduct its foreign policy as it wished, nor did it impact U.S. national security or trade in any manner. I expect that these and many other

factors will be weighed in any decision regarding U.S. membership in the Paris Agreement.

Special Immigrant Visas

Question. As you may be aware, I am a longtime supporter of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program because I believe it would be a moral and strategic failing not to ensure that those Afghans who supported the U.S. mission and face threats to their lives as a result have the opportunity to seek refuge in the United States. Recognizing your family's personal experience with the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program, will you promise to advocate for the program with the President-elect and the next Secretary of State?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I will work to ensure that the Special Immigrant Visa Program aligns with the national interest.

Refugees

Question. The U.S. refugee admissions process takes an average of two years and requires a rigorous vetting process. Before a refugee comes to the attention of the United States, the U.N. Refugee Agency conducts its own thorough refugee status determination, which excludes anyone suspected of serious criminality. The U.S. vetting process involves extensive investigation by the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, the National Counterterrorism Center and other agencies. Applicant refugees also undergo multiple, overlapping interviews and INTERPOL checks.

Currently, the United States resettles more refugees than any country worldwide, and for decades, welcoming refugees from all over the world has been a bipartisan priority for U.S. administrations and Congress.

- How do you plan to maintain U.S. leadership on refugee protection worldwide?

Answer. The U.S. is by far the largest contributor to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and provides billions more in direct and indirect assistance, bilaterally or through multilateral organizations like the World Food Program, to assist refugees and displaced persons. U.S. contributions to these efforts are immensely important and, if confirmed, I will support U.S. leadership in this area and focus on making sure U.S. contributions are used to maximum effect. I will also highlight the security implications of fragile and unstable nations and the critical problems to which these situations contribute, including refugees, in the U.N. Security Council.

Question. The humanitarian needs in the Middle East continue to outpace available financial support, despite the incredible generosity of the American people. How will the Trump administration work with its international partners to convince other countries—including oil-rich countries in the Persian Gulf—to contribute more to these relief efforts? Are you concerned that your efforts will be hampered by the President-elect's rhetoric about Muslims and about immigrants?

Answer. I agree that the humanitarian needs of refugees are dire. However, I have not been fully briefed on the ongoing efforts of the U.S. in this area, so am not in a position to judge where current efforts can be improved. If confirmed, I will work with our global partners with regard to the global refugee crisis.

Conflicts of Interest

Question. If confirmed, how will you ensure employees you lead at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations will not feel pressure or encouragement, explicit or implicit, to benefit the President-elect's financial position or that of his family?

Answer. Such pressure would be completely unacceptable. I will lead my staff faithfully in accordance with my oath of office.

Question. If confirmed, how will you respond if you suspect that a foreign government or entity is attempting to influence the President-elect's decision-making through his financial holdings or other means of leverage? Will you notify this committee?

Answer. I will notify the appropriate law enforcement agencies in the event that I suspect foreign attempts to circumvent U.S. law.

Sustainable Development Goals

Question. Do you think the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development a useful tool in promoting global development? Are the Sustainable Development Goals consistent with U.S. foreign policy priorities, as you see them? If not, where do you see specific inconsistencies?

Answer. I have not been fully briefed on the Sustainable Development Goals. But my experience as a governor has convinced me that market oriented policies, reduced regulatory barriers to business and entrepreneurship, and a strong, fair and

transparent rule of law are essential to higher economic growth and development. To the extent that the Sustainable Development Goals promote and encourage sound policy in developing countries, I believe they can be a useful tool in promoting global development. If confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue.

LGBT issues

Question. For many years, the U.S. mission at the United Nations has been an important member of the U.N. LGBT Core Group, a network of countries and civil society organizations that aims to ensure a place for sexual orientation and gender identity issues on the U.N. agenda. The U.S. mission at the U.N. has also played an important role protecting parts of the U.N. system challenged by governments hostile to the rights of LGBT people, including the newly appointed Independent Expert on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity.

- If confirmed, will you work to further the rights of LGBT individuals around the world? Will you continue U.S. participation in the LGBT core group? What other actions will you take to further this important issue?

Answer. As I stated during my hearing, I strongly believe that the U.S. should unabashedly promote American values. If confirmed, I will work to advance human rights for everyone.

Women Peace and Security

Question. In 2000, the U.N. Security Council formally recognized the role of women in peace and security, unanimously adopting resolution 1325, which specifically addresses the situation of women in armed conflict and calls for their participation at all levels of decision-making on conflict resolution and peacebuilding.

- How do you believe the U.S. should approach and prioritize the role women in peace, security and conflict? How can we work with our U.N. partners to ensure that women are prioritized in the global peace and security agenda?

Answer. As I stated in my testimony, I believe all human rights issues are important. Should I be confirmed, my approach would be to best address these issues with clear, strong and consistent leadership supporting programs that are efficient, effective and consistent with goals that support U.S. interests.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR JOHNNY ISAKSON

Question. One of the key complaints I hear from my constituents about the United Nations is that we, the United States, spend a lot of taxpayer dollars to support the UN, but we don't seem to get a lot of return on that investment. Will you commit to work with me and the committee to get greater transparency on the U.N.'s expenditures?

Answer. If I am confirmed, yes.

Question. There has been a lot of debate and discussion about the appropriate role of the U.N. Security Council in a number of different issues, particularly related to Israel and Iran.

- What are your views on our relationship with Israel?
- How will you work against the anti-Israel bias that we so often see at the U.N.?

Answer. Israel is a vital ally of the United States, and we must meet our obligations to Israel as our most important strategic ally in the region. Should I be confirmed, I would recommend to the President that the U.S. veto any U.N. Security Council resolutions and oppose other U.N. resolutions that unfairly single out Israel or would undermine prospects for a negotiated peace. If confirmed, I would recommend that the President oppose Palestinian membership in U.N. organizations prior to a mutually acceptable peace agreement with Israel and enforce laws prohibiting funding to international organizations that do so.

Question. Regarding Iran, will you insist that Iran be held accountable for violations of UNSCR 2231, which endorses the JCPOA, calling upon Iran not to undertake actions related to ballistic missiles and arms transfers? How will you encourage other nations that it is worthwhile to enforce the U.N.'s own resolutions?

Answer. As I stated at the hearing, if confirmed, I will do so.

Question. I have strong concerns about the U.N. Human Rights Council and its agenda that often targets democratic nations while ignoring the atrocities committed in places like Syria and Iran.

- Do you think it is appropriate for the U.S. to maintain a seat at the table of the Human Rights Council?

Answer. As I mentioned during my hearing, I think that the Human Rights Council is a flawed body, particularly in its bias against Israel and the ability of human rights violators to be elected and shield each other from criticism. If confirmed, I will work with the President and senior policymakers to determine the appropriate level of engagement with the HRC that best advances U.S. interests.

Question. If so, will you commit to working to adjusting the focus of the Human Rights Council so that it actually focuses on the human rights violations we continue to see across the world?

Answer. If it fits within the broader foreign policy design that comes out of the interagency process, I will pursue reforms to address this problem should I be confirmed.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED
TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR CHRISTOPHER COONS

Refugee Protection

Question. I attended the U.N. Summit on Refugees last September at the U.N. General Assembly in New York. Under President Obama's leadership, we secured commitments from 52 countries and international organizations around the world to cumulatively increase their total 2016 financial contributions to U.N. appeals and international humanitarian organizations by approximately \$4.5 billion over 2015 levels; roughly double the number of refugees they resettled or afforded other legal channels of admission in 2016; create improved access to education for one million refugee children globally; and, improve access to lawful work for one million refugees globally. How do you intend to continue to advocate for U.S. leadership on the protection of refugees?

Answer. The US is by far the largest contributor to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and provides billions more in direct and indirect assistance, bilaterally or through multilateral organizations like the World Food Program, to assist refugees and displaced persons. U.S. contributions to these efforts are immensely important and, if confirmed, I will support U.S. leadership in this area and focus on making sure U.S. contributions are used to maximum effect. I will also highlight the security implications of fragile and unstable nations and the critical problems to which these situations contribute, including refugees, in the U.N. Security Council.

North Korea Human Rights Abuses

Question. What are your views of the International Criminal Court?

Answer. I share many of the concerns about the International Criminal Court expressed by Congress in the American Service-Members Protection Act and by previous U.S. administrations that led them not to seek ratification of the Rome Statute and limit U.S. interactions with the International Criminal Court.

Question. Do you believe North Korea should be referred to the International Criminal Court for its human rights abuses?

- Will you make a concerted diplomatic effort to gain the votes needed to overcome Russia and China's veto in the U.N. Security Council?

Answer. I wholeheartedly believe that the North Korean government has committed and continues to commit horrible crimes against its people. If confirmed, I will be forthright in condemning that government. Currently, there is no number of votes that can override a veto by a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. Although this can be immensely frustrating on situations like North Korea where Chinese and Russian opposition prevents stronger action, I would not support any change to the veto power because such a change would undermine the ability of our nation's representatives to protect U.S. interests in that body.

U.N. Treaties

Question. A number of U.N. treaties have been languishing in the U.S. Senate for some time. Among them is the Law of the Sea Treaty, which has the bi-partisan support of officials ranging from every Secretary of State from Henry Kissinger to today, a host of current and former military leaders, and the U.S. private sector including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was voted down despite the presence of former Majority Leader Robert Dole being on the Senate floor during the vote. Only two countries in the

world have failed to ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the United States and Somalia. Many of these treaties seem to be opposed in the Senate simply because of their association with the United Nations. If confirmed as Ambassador, will you advise your colleagues in the Trump administration of the value of the U.S. ratifying any of these important treaties?

Answer. There are many treaties that have been signed by the United States but have not yet received the advice and consent of the Senate—a procedure in which this committee plays a central role. My understanding is that any incoming administration conducts reviews of such agreements to determine whether any of them should be prioritized, and whether the new administration will support U.S. ratification. At this time I don't hold a particular opinion as to the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea or the Convention on the Rights of the Child, but I look forward to reviewing those agreements along with other experts at the State Department if I am confirmed.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED
TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR TOM UDALL

Question. New Mexico's national labs have played a key role in nonproliferation and weapons monitoring since the dawn of the atomic age. And they played a key role in the Iran agreement—which is why I have strong confidence in the agreement. Do you trust the science behind the Iran agreement and that each pathway to create a nuclear weapon has been effectively stopped by the JCPOA?

Answer. I am not confident that the agreement cut off Iran's potential to obtain a nuclear weapon.

Question. Will you be open to briefings from Department of Energy and NNSA officials while you review the JCPOA?

Answer. Yes.

Question. All of the IAEA inspectors who are in the field today receive training from our nuclear experts at the national labs on how to identify violations to the Nonproliferation Treaty. Will you engage with the national labs and the National Nuclear Security Administration to address key issues regarding nonproliferation and take a science based approach to countering would be proliferators in the future?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What are your thoughts about the wisdom of sending arms to so called moderate rebels in Syria? (many of whom are affiliated with terrorist groups) Will you continue to support—in my opinion—this misguided program?

Answer. I have concerns, and if confirmed, look forward to learning more about the facts, and participating in any policy development as appropriate.

Question. Our foreign relations budget is approximately 1 percent of the national budget—United Nations funding is far less than that. Yet, leveraged with other countries, our funding in the U.N. supports humanitarian efforts, peacekeeping, and the protection of national treasures. Do you support continued funding of the U.N., and how will you work to ensure that the U.N. better leverages that funding for the greater good?

Answer. I anticipate that the Trump administration will be examining our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Question. The U.N. Security Council has adopted multiple resolutions to address the threat of North Korean proliferation—but North Korea's development of its nuclear arsenal continues. The last such resolution capped the export of North Korean coal. How will you work to maintain these multilateral sanctions on North Korea—and will you hold China accountable for its promise to slash imports of coal from North Korea? How will you work with the security council to ensure full implementation of its sanctions program?

Answer. Should I be confirmed this would be a top priority. I would consult with the rest of the cabinet on appropriate actions. I look forward to consulting with Congress on this issue, and advocating the policy of the U.S. government

Question. On November 30th, the Colombian parliament ratified a final peace agreement between the government and FARC rebels, ending the longest-running conflict in the Western Hemisphere. Currently, a U.N. political mission, made up of 450 unarmed military observers and additional civilian personnel, is on the

ground in Colombia with a mandate to monitor and verify the cessation of hostilities and ensure that the FARC gives up its weapons. Can you talk about the UN's role here and what the U.S. is doing to support it?

Answer. The U.N. mission is supporting the peace process in numerous ways including demobilizing and reintegrating FARC combatants. It is also supporting various civil society initiatives. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about what the U.S. is currently doing and options for the future.

Question. What is your stance on key multilateral treaties that the United States is signatory to but has not ratified—for example: Would you support the ratification of the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea and do you agree that ratifying it would give the United States a stronger hand to address Chinese violations and illegal annexations of islands in the South China Sea?

Answer. The United States should only join treaties that advance U.S. national interests. The U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) has been debated on several occasions by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and I will, if confirmed, examine UNCLOS to determine whether it is in the best interests of the United States to be a party.

Question. Would you support ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities—in order to ensure that U.S. standards for access by disabled individuals are adopted throughout the world?

Answer. The United States is strongly committed to protecting the rights of disabled Americans through the legal protections afforded by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other applicable laws, and to working cooperatively with like-minded partner countries interested in strengthening their own disability rights laws. In fact, the U.S. already funds and administers a number of programs that provide assistance to strengthen disability rights in foreign countries. My view on whether to support the ratification of the Convention will be based on such factors as whether the Convention benefits Americans who live in the United States and whether the Convention improves disability rights in other countries, thus benefiting Americans living abroad, the Convention's effects on U.S. sovereignty, and the Convention's impact on existing protections in the law and under the Constitution.

Question. During the Presidential campaign, President-elect Trump made several very troubling statements and comments indicating that in the context of counterterrorism he would support waterboarding and other types of torture. Do you think those practices violate international prohibitions on torture and war crimes, and if so, will you urge the administration to avoid such violations?"

Answer. Should I be confirmed I would support the law.

Question. A bipartisan group of Senators, including Republicans and Democrats on this committee, have cosponsored legislation to remove restrictions on U.S. citizens' ability to travel to Cuba and to authorize U.S. companies to facilitate greater internet access inside Cuba. Do you believe that current restrictions on the rights of U.S. citizens to travel to Cuba enhances the cause of freedom for the Cuban people?

Answer. Considering that the Cuban military fully owns the tourism industry under the holding company Gaviota and that Cuban citizens are largely barred from these facilities, I would be hesitant to believe that expanding travel for Americans would support freedom for the Cuban people. Purposeful travel for the intention of expanding people to people interaction should be allowed. The current statute as outlined by the U.S.'s Department of Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) should be governing principle.

Question. Do you support allowing U.S. companies to expand internet access inside Cuba so that the Cuban people can have greater access to information that isn't currently available on the island?

Answer. Expanding the ability of Cubans to communicate should be supported but not if the Cuban government seeks to use this as an additional tool to monitor or censor communications. Additionally, these U.S. companies must not be allowed to use seized property or assets that are part of the Department of Justice's Cuba Claims Program.

Question. Do you agree that the U.S. should help support private entrepreneurs in Cuba with training or other assistance, so they can build businesses, market their products and services, and compete with state-owned enterprises?

Answer. Unfortunately, Cuba does not have private entrepreneurs and working independently is not a right but a privilege granted only to supporters of the regime. Taking power after his brother stepped down, Raul Castro moved the profitable sectors of the Cuban economy under control of the military and divided them up into

holding companies. While the U.S. should seek to empower entrepreneurs on the island, we should avoid doing so if it overwhelmingly benefits the regime.

Question. Will you continue the recent practice of abstaining to the U.N. General Resolution pertaining to the statutory U.S. embargo on Cuba?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you agree that after more than half a century the U.S. embargo against Cuba has failed to achieve any of its principle objectives?

Answer. We should be clear about a few things. The goal of the embargo was never to cause regime change, but rather to raise the costs of the Cuban government's bad behavior. Access to the U.S.'s market is not a right but a privilege and it's a privilege the Cuban government does not yet deserve. They do not meet the basic standards as outlined in the OAS's InterAmerican Democratic Charter, a resolution every single other country in Latin America meets.

Question. Do you support continued diplomatic relations with Cuba?

Answer. At this point, it is clear that President Obama's unilateral normalization process has resulted in a net loss for the U.S. Conditions were never put in place to the Cuban government, such as requesting an improvement on human rights, the return of wanted U.S. fugitives nor the compensation of stolen American property. Normalized relations with other countries depend on a certain level of trust and reciprocity, and that does not exist at the moment. Moving forward, we should ask to see improvements in these areas.

Question. Do you support the New START agreement with Russia and how will you work with Russia to ensure that the agreement is followed?

Answer. I support the implementation of New START, and I will advocate the policy of the United States government if confirmed.

Question. The NNSA has made tremendous progress with the stockpile stewardship program. In short, our science based efforts to confirm that our stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable have worked—and have negated the need for testing of nuclear weapons. During the debates to consider the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, this was a significant barrier because the science had not yet matured. Now that the science has matured, will you advocated to the Trump administration that they support for the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and will you visit with our experts at NNSA to learn more about the stockpile stewardship program?

Answer. There are many treaties that have been signed by the United States but have not yet received the advice and consent of the Senate—a procedure in which this committee plays a central role. My understanding is that an incoming administration conducts reviews of such agreements to determine whether any of them should be prioritized, and whether the new administration will support U.S. ratification. At this time I don't hold a particular opinion as to the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty, but I look forward to reviewing that agreement along with other experts at the State Department if I am confirmed.

Question. In response to signals that the Trump administration may act less aggressively on climate change, leading Chinese officials have stated that they will continue to act aggressively to reduce their emissions and that they will take on more international leadership around climate change—including establishing a national carbon market and investing hundreds of billions in clean energy at home and abroad. Are we putting the nation at a disadvantage internationally by ceding U.S. leadership on climate change to China?

Answer. I believe it is debatable whether any U.S. actions regarding climate change necessarily “cedes” leadership to China or any other nation. Each nation, including the United States, must act in its own national interest, protect its economy, and preserve employment security for its citizens. Such interests must come first before any perception of leadership on any particular issue.

Question. I asked during the hearing if you were inclined to tear up the Paris Agreement. You responded that “We will keep what we see beneficial and revisit the parts that impact our economy.” Specifically, which parts of the Agreement do you believe are beneficial, and which will impact our economy?

Answer. The part of the Paris Agreement that will impact the U.S. economy is the U.S. Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). If confirmed, I expect that the State Department and other departments of the government will conduct a review of the NDC submitted by the Obama administration as part of our review of the Paris Agreement and the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change to determine whether the NDC and/or the international agreements advance U.S. national interests. Both the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement were negotiated by different

presidential administrations and it is the obligation of the incoming administration to make its own determination regarding the ongoing viability of those agreements to determine whether they advance U.S. national interests.

Question. It was reported that during your administration in 2013 the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources kept hidden a report which “outlined serious concerns about the damage South Carolina will suffer from climate change—.” Were you or anyone in your administration involved in the Department’s decision to keep this report secret? Please outline any discussions you may have had with regards to this report.

Answer. I am not aware of any attempt, nor do I recall any attempt, to keep such a report hidden. I will look into this matter.

Question. Your administration in South Carolina called a minimum wage quote “More government mandates on small businesses.” Do you believe that advocating for a livable wage in foreign countries where there is a record of mistreatment of workers and poor wages is an unneeded mandate on businesses in those countries?

Answer. My experience as a governor has convinced me that market oriented policies, reduced regulatory barriers to business and entrepreneurship, and a strong, fair, and transparent rule of law are essential for higher economic growth and development. If confirmed, I will advocate for these principles in other countries as a means to promote prosperity.

Question. Will you advocate for basic workers rights in countries such as China and Bangladesh, where workers are known to be mistreated or underpaid?

Answer. Yes

Question. Do you support global efforts to improve safety for workers in the energy and agricultural sectors?

Answer. Yes

Question. Article 23 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights states that “Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his [or her] interests.” The United States is a signatory to the declaration and has been an advocate for labor rights around the world. You were quoted as saying “We discourage any companies that have unions from wanting to come to South Carolina because we don’t want to taint the water” and have been referred to as a “union buster.” Do you support the Declaration of Human Rights, and, more importantly, will you work to reinforce the United States’ protection of labor rights around the world?

Answer. I will support the human rights obligations of the U.S. for those treaties that have been ratified. I also support the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). However, the UDHR is not legally binding on the United States and does not require domestic implementation, including in regard to its provisions on labor rights.

Question. In order for the United States to honor its commitment under Articles 23 and 24 of the Declaration of Human Rights, will you work with unions and other organizations to protect the right to free choice of employment; the right to just and favorable conditions of work; the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours; and the right to worker safety and to equal pay for equal work?

Answer. I will support the human rights obligations of the U.S. for those treaties that have been ratified. I also support the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). However, the UDHR is not legally binding on the United States and does not require domestic implementation, including in regard to its provisions on labor rights.

Question. Your administration supported and signed into law a harsh “Arizona style” immigration law. Using state police officers to attempt to enforce immigration laws, and opening the door to unneeded racial profiling and exacerbating diplomatic relations with our neighbors in the western hemisphere. How will you work to mend diplomatic relations with our southern neighbors given your support for this harsh policy and the President elect’s comments calling Mexicans rapists, and murderers among other things?

Answer. I will work closely with my U.N. counterparts and our U.S. ambassadors to ensure our relationship with all law-abiding nations are mutually beneficial to the maximum extent consistent with our national security. This includes our neighbors to the south.

Question. Expanding democratic ideals and governance is an important policy of the United States government. A cornerstone of this effort is the observation of elec-

tions by multiple organizations including the United Nations. These efforts give the public, in new democracies, the confidence that their elections are free and fair. While you served as governor, however, you work to impede access to the ballot box by supporting voter id legislation, impairing the ability of low income and minority voters to cast their ballot. Will you work to support increased access to the ballot box overseas or do you plan to advocate for restrictions similar to those you supported in South Carolina?

Answer. I will work toward ensuring the integrity of free and fair elections, including supporting methods that lead to honest and accurate results.

Question. Will you oppose efforts to strip U.S. funding to the United Nations?

Answer. As I stated during my confirmation hearing, I do not support slash and burn cuts to U.S. funding, but targeted and selective withholding tied to specific reforms has proven in the past to be an effective means for pressing the organization to implement reforms. I anticipate that the Trump administration will examine our relationship with and funding for all U.N. and affiliated agencies to make sure our contributions are appropriate.

Question. Are settlements that break up the possibility of a future contiguous Palestinian state harmful to achieving a two state solution in your opinion?

Answer. I do not believe that settlements are the principal obstacle to peace. Suicide bombers and rockets launched into Israel are much larger obstacles to peace. The issue of settlements should be resolved as part of a comprehensive peace agreement negotiated between the two parties, rather than imposed upon them by others.

Question. Do you support Israel's legalization of previously illegal (under Israel law) Israeli settler outposts in the west bank and do you think this is harmful towards ultimately achieving a two state solution?

Answer. I believe this is a matter of Israeli law.

Question. How will you work to urge other countries to press the Palestinians to put an end to incitement and violence against Israelis?

Answer. By clear, strong and consistent leadership on behalf of ending incitement and violence against Israelis, I believe I can work with other countries if confirmed.

Question. What is your plan to address and oppose the boycott, divestment, and Sanctions movement and will you make it a priority to urge other countries and organizations not to join this movement?

Answer. I oppose the movement. Should I be confirmed I would make every effort to press others not to participate.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
SUBMITTED TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR TIM KAINE

Anti-Semitism and Israel at the U.N.

Question. During a meeting of the U.N. General Assembly last January, former Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon stated, "a U.N. that wants to be true to its founding aims and ideals has a duty to speak out against anti-Semitism." The gathering was the first of its kind, attended by prominent ministers, U.S. Members of Congress and diplomats, brought together to discuss the U.N.'s role in beating back the rising tide of global anti-Semitism.

- Can you elaborate on the significance of this meeting?

Answer. I have not been briefed on the details of this event, but, as I mentioned at my hearing, I am alarmed by the bias against Israel that pervades many U.N. organizations and, if confirmed, am determined to use the influence of the U.S. to reduce it.

Question. Does this signal a commitment to elevating the fight against global anti-Semitism within the U.N.?

Answer. One meeting does not make a pattern or overcome decades of anti-Semitism. If confirmed, I will use the influence of the U.S. to address this problem.

Question. Do you think continued strong U.S. engagement is important to the success of these initiatives?

Answer. If confirmed, I will use the influence of the U.S. to combat anti-Semitism in the U.N.

Question. While you were clear in the confirmation hearing regarding your firm opposition to UNSCR 2334, your position regarding continued Israeli settlement activity in the West Bank was vague.

- Do you believe that the Israeli government's policy of continued settlement activity in the West Bank has an effect on efforts to achieve a negotiated two-state solution?

Answer. I support the long-standing U.S. policy that a negotiated two-state solution must be based on direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, including negotiations on the future borders.

Question. In 2011, members of UNESCO decided to admit the Palestinians as a member state. As a result, since FY2012, the U.S. has withheld approximately \$80 million a year in funding to UNESCO under laws that prohibit funding to U.N. entities that admit the Palestinians as a state.

- Do you believe that the U.S. ability to stand up for Israel at UNESCO and push back against biased resolutions is undermined by the fact that the United States is currently prohibited from paying dues to this organization?

Answer. As stated at my confirmation hearing, I do not support renewed funding for UNESCO because it would encourage other U.N. specialized agencies to similarly grant membership to the Palestinians, undermining the prospects for a negotiated peace. Unlike the U.N. Security Council, the U.S. cannot block anti-Israel actions in UNESCO and the organization continues to take such actions despite the continued presence of the U.S. since 2011.

Colombia

Question. The U.N. is playing an important role in the historic peace treaty between government and FARC by helping to demobilize FARC members and monitoring the peace process.

- Will you pledge your support for the U.N.'s efforts in Colombia?
- Will you encourage increased Colombian participation in U.N. peacekeeping missions?

Answer. Yes.

Human Rights

Question. Secretary Kerry and Ambassador Power often used their channels, discreetly at times, to press for the release of unjustly detained American citizens. These efforts include Ms. Aya Hijazi, a Virginian, who has been imprisoned by Egyptian authorities due to her advocacy on behalf of the poor and children, and Mr. Otto Warmbier, an American college student who has been held by North Korea for more than a year on trumped-up charges.

- Will you commit to using your role as U.N. Ambassador to prioritize and press for the release of detained Americans overseas, like Ms. Aya Hijazi and Mr. Otto Warmbier?

Answer. I have not been briefed on these specific cases, but I commit to working with the Secretary of State to protect Americans overseas and prevent their mistreatment.

International Commitments

Question. Given comments by President-elect Trump, many in the international community are concerned that the United States cannot be counted on to uphold the commitments we have made on critical issues such as being a dependable ally for our NATO partners, combatting climate change, and preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. In your confirmation hearing, you spoke about the importance of the United States building coalitions and maintaining strong alliances to advance our core U.S. national security interests.¹⁰ you think your ability to engage effectively with your counterparts at the United Nations will be undermined if the United States is seen as backing away from our commitments on key policy issues?

- How will you be able to gain the trust of other key members in the international community if other governments do not believe we can be expected to uphold our commitments?

Answer. I do think that building strong coalitions is important and I look forward to building support in the U.N. for U.S. priorities. A new administration reviewing policies of a previous administration is not a new phenomenon and I believe I will be able to effectively engage with U.N. counterparts if I am confirmed.

ISIS

Question. ISIS has undermined security and stability in the Middle East and poses a clear threat to international peace and security, including a threat to the United States and our partners.

- Do you believe the United Nations should play a more robust role in the global effort to combat the threat posed by ISIS?

Answer. Yes, but the U.N. is only one of many tools that the U.S. should use to use to combat the threats posed by ISIS.

Syria

Question. In 2014, the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 2139, demanding that all parties allow delivery of humanitarian assistance, cease depriving civilians of food and medicine indispensable to their survival, and enable the rapid, safe and unhindered evacuation of all civilians who wished to leave. It demanded that all parties respect the principle of medical neutrality and facilitate free passage to all areas for medical personnel, equipment and transport. It also called upon all parties, especially the Assad regime, to allow unhindered humanitarian access for U.N. agencies and its partners, including across conflict lines. However, as events over the last two months have shown, eastern Aleppo's residents were unable to flee aerial bombings and extrajudicial killings at the hands of the Assad regime, with the clear support of Russia.

- In your assessment, what prevented the implementation of resolution 2139?
- How would you deal with the issue of civilian protection, particularly IDPs and refugees?
- How can the U.N. work with member countries to more strongly enforce UNSCRs focused on humanitarian protection and aid delivery?
- How would you respond to the massive violation of international humanitarian laws and principles by Syria, Russia and other parties to this conflict?
- After Russia's invitation to join the Astana peace talks, what will you do in your first weeks in office to negotiate an end to sieges of civilian populations and bombing of civilian infrastructure?

Answer. I have not yet been briefed on all aspects of UNSCR 2139, but should I be confirmed, I commit to learning more about this issue. If confirmed, I will support the Secretary of State in his efforts with key parties to the Syrian conflict to achieve a political solution to the war and limit its humanitarian effect on Syrians.

Treaties

Question. The treaty ratification process has slowed down in the Senate. For example, UNCLOS was passed in 1982 and 167 nations have ratified it, including Russia and China. The U.S. is the only major power to have not ratified it, despite a bipartisan consensus among our military and diplomatic leadership that ratification would be in the U.S. interest in matters as diverse as China's island-building in the South China Sea or arctic drilling rights.

- Does our refusal to join the overwhelming majority of nations at the table in a treaty such as this hurt U.S. interests and our leverage at the U.N.?

Answer. The United States should only join treaties that advance U.S. national interests. The U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) has been debated on several occasions by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and I will, if confirmed, examine UNCLOS to determine whether it is in the best interests of the United States to be a party.

Question. Does our refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) hurt U.S. interests and our leverage at the U.N.? Would CTBT's ratification help efforts being pursued in the United Nations Security Council to reinforce the global norm against nuclear weapons testing and improve the verification architecture to detect such testing?

Answer. At this time I don't hold a particular opinion as to the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty, but I look forward to reviewing that agreement along with other experts at the State Department.

Question. Senate ratification of Montenegro's accession to NATO would reassure our European partners and reaffirm our support for our alliances. Would this message be helpful for your role at the U.N.?

Answer. I support Montenegro's accession to NATO.

Question. Does our refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) hurt U.S. interests and our leverage at the U.N.? Would CTBT's ratification help

efforts being pursued in the United Nations Security Council to reinforce the global norm against nuclear weapons testing and improve the verification architecture to detect such testing?

Answer. At this time I don't hold a particular opinion as to the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty, but I look forward to reviewing that agreement along with other experts at the State Department.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED
TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR EDWARD J. MARKEY

Proliferation

Question . Governor Haley, for more than seven decades, U.S. leadership has been vital for slowing the spread of nuclear weapons. President-elect Trump has threatened to upend this policy by saying it would not be so bad if South Korea, Japan, or Saudi Arabia acquired nuclear weapons.

- Do you disagree with President-elect Trump? If not, why not?

Answer. I believe in the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

Arms Control

Question . The United Nations is a vital forum for international discussions of arms control issues. Arms control is a vital component of U.S. national security, as it can reduce the risk of nuclear war by accident or miscalculation, while simultaneously reducing the risk of destructive and costly arms races.

- Do you support proposals to negotiate verifiable arms control treaties between the world's nuclear powers? If not, why not?

Answer. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about the various arms control negotiations taking place in the U.N. and how U.S. national security interests can be best served by them.

China

Question . As one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, China has the power to veto any resolution. As such, China's cooperation is vitally important on a range of issues, particularly those affecting security in the East Asian region. President-elect Trump has chosen to aggravate China by threatening to recognize Taiwan's independence, which Beijing fiercely opposes, and by threatening a trade war.

- How do you intend to work with China's permanent representative to the United Nations, when the President-elect is deliberating picking fights with Beijing over issues that are of core concern to China's leaders?

Answer. The U.S. relationship with China has elements of cooperation and competition. The President, as President-elect, reaffirmed that the U.S. will continue to follow the Taiwan Relations Act. If confirmed, I am committed to working in a straightforward manner with my Chinese counterpart on all matters, including the critically important issue of North Korea.

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Question . The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) is home to one of the U.N.'s largest and most complex peacekeeping missions—the 22,500-person strong U.N. Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO). This peacekeeping force is charged with protecting civilians, humanitarian personnel, and human rights defenders under threat of physical violence, and to support the government of the DRC in its stabilization and peace consolidation efforts. Yet the government of the DRC has triggered a political crisis because of President Kabila's refusal to step down and hold elections, as the constitution requires. International pressure (including US sanctions freezing the U.S.-held assets of top government officials) as well as internal pressure from opposition groups and citizen-led protests (in which more than 50 Congolese were killed) led to an agreement between the government and the opposition brokered by the country's Catholic bishops. The deal calls for establishment of an interim governing arrangement and elections by the end of 2017. While the deal offers a way out of the crisis, significant implementation challenges lie ahead.

- How will you use U.S. leadership in the U.N. to help ensure that the DRC remains on course to elections in 2017 and an eventual peaceful transfer of power to a new democratically elected leader?

- How can the United Nations help the DRC strengthen its institutions and eventually end its dependence on the organization's largest and most costly peacekeeping mission?

Answer. The United States must lead with its values; many times, that includes facilitating peace negotiations and settlements. If confirmed, I would work with the Secretary of State to engage the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and other interested parties to encourage a peaceful political solution, with a guarantee of basic human rights and accountability for those who transgress such rights. Targeted sanctions, possibly through the U.N. Security Council, might be part of achieving that solution, but sanctions are a tactic, not a strategy or a solution. Through robust dialogue with relevant actors, the United States could help the DRC achieve a stable political outcome, which would also translate into increased stability regionally and an improvement in human rights.

Nigeria

Question . Boko Haram continues its campaign of violence and terror across much of northern Nigeria. In November, Save the Children found that around 200 children die each day from malnutrition and disease in areas ravaged by Boko Haram. The group has destroyed houses and schools and forced two million people to flee their homes, according to the U.N. Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs. U.N. officials estimate that fourteen million people need humanitarian assistance and that the specter of widespread famine remains, with 75,000 children in immediate danger.

- How can the United Nations help Nigeria reverse the humanitarian disaster that is already occurring in areas affected by Boko Haram?
- How can the United States and our allies help countries like Nigeria better combat terrorist groups like Boko Haram while minimizing the harm done to civilians?

Answer. The challenge of radical Islamic terrorism in Africa is a serious and growing problem. Through its diplomatic engagement, assistance programs, and public diplomacy efforts, the State Department clearly has a leading role in helping shape long-term U.S. efforts to counter and defeat the ideology of radical Islamic terrorism—in Africa and around the world. The United States should also continue to engage in international forums like the U.N. to address this issue and decide upon a combined policy to address this violence. This would include deploying robust diplomacy, possible sanctions, peacekeeping efforts, and other measures. If confirmed, I will work with and support the efforts of the President, the Secretary of State and other cabinet officials to address this issue.

South Sudan

Question . The political and humanitarian crisis in South Sudan continues to worsen, and there are now warnings of mass atrocities or genocide. USAID estimates that “food security will deteriorate in northern South Sudan from February–May 2017 due to poor harvest yields, disruption of livelihood activities, and high staple food prices.” In addition to the food insecurity, there is a cholera outbreak in southern South Sudan. The United States has delivered more humanitarian aid than all other donors combined, and now there are new warnings of mass atrocities or genocide. The government of South Sudan has continued to restrict the activities of the U.N. Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS). In December, the Security Council failed to adopt a U.S.-sponsored resolution that would have imposed an arms embargo on South Sudan and placed sanctions on officials responsible for human rights violations there.

- What specific measures will you pursue in the Security Council and through the U.N.'s humanitarian agencies to address both the conflict and the humanitarian situation in South Sudan?

Answer. The situation in South Sudan is one of the most pressing humanitarian situations in the world. It is critical to help build some political space for reconciliation between the government and rebel factions. The United States should continue to engage in international forums like the U.N. and bilaterally with key partners in the area to address this issue, and decide upon a combined policy to address this violence. This would include deploying robust diplomacy, possible sanctions, and other measures.

Women's Rights and Education

Question . Your opening statement said that you are “painfully aware that the chance for 13-year-old girls to read and learn and grow is something that does not

exist in far too many places around the world today.” Unfortunately, this is the case. According to the U.N.’s most recent data from 2013, male literacy in sub-Saharan Africa was 72 percent, but female literacy was only 57 percent, a gap of 15 percentage points. In India, that gender gap in literacy was 18 percentage points, while in Pakistan, the gap was 27 points. These stark gender disparities in education and literacy represent a tragic and unjust waste of human potential. They are also a major hindrance to economic development and health. According to a 2014 report from UNESCO, if all women in low-income countries had a secondary education, child mortality rates would fall by 49 percent, resulting in 2.8 million lives saved every year.

- If confirmed, how will you work to improve the rates of female education around the world, and to improve women’s rights more generally?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work to promote the advancement of women and girls around the world and will look for opportunities to do so both in our own foreign policy and at the U.N.

U.N. Peacekeeping

Question . U.N. peacekeeping operations can provide a vital contribution to international peace and security by helping to prevent conflicts, stabilize fragile states, protect civilians from human rights violations and other atrocities, and support the delivery of needed humanitarian relief. Some peacekeeping missions have not, however, always lived up to these goals. During your testimony you repeatedly stressed the need for reform of U.N. operations and pledged to closely examine all 16 U.N. peacekeeping missions in order to evaluate their effectiveness.

- Please describe the kinds of specific criteria that you will use in evaluating peacekeeping missions and discuss how you plan to consult on the results of that evaluation with Congress.
- Please also describe how you will work to ensure that peacekeeping missions work to build the capacity of the states where they operate, thereby reducing the need for prolonged dependence on U.N. peacekeepers.

Answer. If confirmed, I will consult with the President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, and experts in the U.S. government and the United Nations to develop these criteria and assessments so that current and future peacekeeping missions are more effective.

Climate Change and International Security

Question . In his first speech to the U.N. Security Council on January 10, Secretary-General Antonio Guterres warned that global conflicts are “exacerbated by climate change.” The Pentagon has taken a similar view, noting in 2015, “Global climate change will have wide-ranging implications for U.S. national security interests over the foreseeable future because it will aggravate existing problems that threaten domestic stability in a number of countries.” Climate change can cause water and food shortages, refugee flows and other developments that can drive conflict and instability, as has been seen in as North Korea, Chad, Bolivia, and Yemen, which are experiencing widespread food insecurity and undernourishment. U.N. agencies are often on the front line of responding to such crises.

- What do you see as the role for U.S. leadership at the U.N. to address climate changes as a threat to global peace and stability?

Answer. If confirmed I commit to working with experts at the State Department and elsewhere in the government on the issue and helping to determine what role the U.S. Mission to the United Nations should play.

Human Trafficking

Question . As many as 17,500 persons are trafficked into the United States every year, and more than 100,000 are trafficked within our borders. In addition, legalized indentured servitude exists in several countries around the world, notably in Qatar and Bahrain (where the United States maintains a naval base). Both human trafficking and indentured servitude are clearly antithetical to American values and human rights.

- How would you uphold human rights and continue to advance efforts to address trafficking in persons and protection of workers in the global supply chain?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, I commit to working tirelessly with the President-elect, representatives of the National Security Council, and other federal agencies to assist in the fight against human trafficking through my voice, vote and influence in the United Nations.

Children's Rights

Question . While 196 states are parties to the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, the United States is not, despite having helped to draft portions of it and signing it in 1995. The convention includes protections such as a ban on the use of child soldiers, the rights of children to stay in contact with their families across international borders, special rights as refugees, and the rights of parents to have a say in determining what is best for their child and protecting their child's rights.

- Do you support this convention, and what are your plans to support efforts to defend the rights of children around the world, if you are confirmed as U.N. Ambassador?

Answer. There are many treaties that have been signed by the United States but have not yet received the advice and consent of the Senate—a procedure in which this committee plays a central role. My understanding is that an incoming administration conducts reviews of such agreements to determine whether any of them should be prioritized, and whether the new administration will support U.S. ratification. At this time I don't hold a particular opinion as to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, but I look forward to reviewing the agreements along with other experts at the State Department if I am confirmed. My understanding is that the Convention has never been transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Humanitarian Intervention

Question . One of the most divisive debates in the U.N. Security Council in recent years has been over when the international community should act to prevent a government from using violence and committing gross human rights violations against its own people. Russia and its allies have blocked United Nations Security Council resolutions on Syria, and impeded international action in places like Sudan and South Sudan. In the absence of effective external action, we have seen widespread human rights violations and mass atrocity crimes in these places.

- What do you see as the proper role for multilateral action to halt a government from committing mass atrocities against its own people?
- How will you exert U.S. leadership at the U.N. to help prevent genocide and other crimes when committed by a state against people within its borders?

Answer. As I stated at my hearing, I believe that such serious decisions should have broad support among the American people and the Congress. If I am confirmed, I will work with the President and the National Security Council to develop the appropriate response to these issues and will use my position as U.S. Ambassador to forcefully and passionately implement them and the U.N.

Global Health

Question . Antimicrobial resistance is a global problem with far-reaching implications for global health. Currently, antimicrobial resistance is present in every country and resistant strains are present in almost every disease of note in the world. Approximately 10 percent of the 2 billion cases of tuberculosis worldwide are extensively drug resistant, meaning they are resistant to at least four of the core treatment drugs. There are significant incidences of resistance in malaria, HIV, and influenza all around the world. Problems surrounding antimicrobial resistance include misuse or over prescription of antimicrobials, lack of effective prescription laws, and lack of research and development into new antimicrobial therapies.

- How would you work within the United Nations system in order to mitigate or solve the problem of antimicrobial resistance?

Answer. I agree that is a serious concern. However, I have not been fully briefed on the ongoing efforts of the U.S. in this area, so am not in a position to judge where current efforts can be improved. If confirmed, I will work with our global partners with regard to this issue.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED
TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY BY SENATOR JEFF MERKLEY

Question. The threat of global climate change is an important priority for the United Nations with climate change now affecting every country. Every country in the world has signed on to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and Paris agreement and most are already taking action. Mr. Tillerson last week said that “we need a seat at the table.” The majority of Americans believe that the U.S. should stay in the Paris Agreement and honor its commitment to lead on

climate. Do you think it is important for the United States not just to have a seat at the table but to have an active leadership role in addressing climate globally? Do you believe it is important to honor our commitments under the Paris Agreement and that reversing course would negatively affect U.S. credibility and influence in other diplomatic pursuits? What role do you think the United States should play in addressing this crisis?

Answer. If confirmed, I expect that the State Department and other departments of the government will conduct a review of the Nationally Determined Contribution submitted by the Obama administration as part of our review of the Paris Agreement and the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change to determine whether the NDC and/or the international agreements advance U.S. national interests. Both the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement were negotiated by different presidential administrations and it is the obligation of the incoming administration to make its own determination regarding the ongoing viability of those agreements to determine whether they advance U.S. national interests.

Question. An important element of the Paris Climate Agreement is that countries made commitments to help the most vulnerable countries in the world adapt to the worst impacts of climate change - such as food scarcity, drought, and sea level rise - and help leapfrog to cleaner energy technologies. This has been a longstanding bipartisan policy of this country, and a universal desire across the world. Do think it is advisable to walk away from this policy? Part of the Paris Agreement is that much of the funding for this work would be provided by the Green Climate Fund. The Green Climate Fund has received bipartisan support in Congress, and the Republican Congress even gave the State Department explicit authority to contribute to the Green Climate Fund, yet President-elect Trump has said he would stop funding all United Nations climate funds. A large number of countries have contributed to the Green Climate Fund, intend to fulfill their pledges to the Green Climate Fund, and expect the United States to not walk away from its own pledge. What, in your view, is the advantage of the United States fulfilling its pledge to the Green Climate Fund? What are the advantages of withdrawing the United States support for the Green Climate Fund? Are you concerned about the diplomatic challenges that would be created if the United States did not fulfill its pledge to the Green Climate Fund? How would you suggest the United States lead in combatting climate change and help developing countries avoid the worst outcomes?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to participate in a review of the U.S. role in international climate change matters, including the funding of mitigation and adaptation measures through the Green Climate Fund and other financial mechanisms.

Question. Secretary General Guterres just last week told the U.N. Security Council that many of today's conflicts are "exacerbated by climate change," and that the U.N. spends "far more time and resources responding to crises rather than preventing them." The State Department's latest Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review concluded that "we are already seeing the negative consequences of climate change, which is a national and global security threat." Recent National Intelligence Council (NIC) reports say that climate change "will have direct and indirect social, economic, political, and security effects." Another NIC report says climate change is likely to pose "wide-ranging national security challenges for the United States and other countries over the next 20 years." Do you agree that acting now on climate to avoid some of its impacts will improve security and reduce global conflicts? How will you support the U.N. and Secretary General Guterres's attempts to be more proactive in avoiding climate driven conflicts?

Answer. If confirmed I commit to working with experts at the State Department and elsewhere in the government on the issue and helping to determine what role the U.S. Mission to the United Nations should play.

Question. We are already seeing the impacts of climate change on the ground around the world. 2016 was the hottest year on record (and 15 of the 16 warmest years have been since 2000). Some countries have already relocated citizens due to climate change, creating the world's first climate refugees. Extreme drought in the Middle East and even small amounts of sea level rise in parts of Asia are likely to displace tens of millions of people, and Western nations have been asked to accept some of the displaced people. Do you agree that the rise in refugees presents a unique national security threat that requires international solutions? What do you view as the role of the U.N. and the United States in aiding with climate refugees around the world?

Answer. If confirmed I commit to engaging experts at the State Department and the U.N. on the issues of climate change and refugee resettlement. The U.N. plays a significant role in the management of refugees on a global basis. If confirmed, the

role that climate change plays in refugee flows is an issue I look forward to assessing, and assisting refugees is a U.S. policy in which I look forward to engaging.

Question. You have spoken passionately about American values and the need to uphold those values at the U.N. Can you explain what you mean by “American Values” and how you see those values playing out in the international arena at the U.N.?

Answer. The American values that I spoke of at the hearing are those embodied in the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights, including but not limited to the freedom of speech and the press, the right to worship, and other fundamental civil and political rights. Such rights are sometimes placed at risk within the U.N. system in General Assembly resolutions, resolutions of the Human Rights Council, and in other parts of the system. If confirmed I commit to adhering to and speaking out for American values at all times.

Question. Do you believe it is consistent with those values for an American company to skirt US sanctions by creating and using a European subsidiary to do business with State Sponsors of Terrorism--Iran, Syria, and Sudan?

Answer. I believe U.S. companies should follow U.S. law. Observance of the rule of law is crucial protection for individual liberty.

Question. President Obama was derided for his desire to “reset” relations with Russia when he came into office. In truth, much progress was made by our nations while Dmitry Medvedev was President. However, President Putin has waged a relentless battle against international norms since retaking power in 2012. How do you plan to use your post to counter Russia’s delegitimizing of the democratic process throughout the West by helping fund illiberal parties like France’s National Front, hacking our allies like Germany to interfere with their elections, and hacking our election to help discredit Hillary Clinton?

Answer. The lessons to learn from the failed Russian “reset” is that as long as Vladimir Putin is in charge Russia will never be a credible partner for the United States. If confirmed I will use my position to raise awareness of and increase international pressure on Russia’s malign influence increasingly prevalent in Western democracies.

Question. Do you agree that rewarding Russia for their actions by rolling back sanctions would not only embolden them, but other nations to defy international norms?

Answer. I agree with the President’s policies that at present sanctions against Russia should remain in place.

Question. Would you support and work with our allies to place further sanctions on Russia?

Answer. I believe that sanctions can be effective as a part of an overall strategy to advance U.S. interests and achieve foreign policy goals. Should I be confirmed, any recommendations for sanctions would be based on observing that principle.

Question. What do you believe are the appropriate levels of US funding for the U.N., for the assessed regular budget, voluntary contributions, and assessed peacekeeping budget?

Answer. Under the current system, fewer than 20 U.N. member states pay roughly 80 percent of the U.N. regular and peacekeeping budgets. The U.S. by far pays the most. In my opinion, this impedes efforts to adopt reforms to use U.N. funds more effectively. If confirmed, I will work to spread the scale of assessments more equitably among the member states so that even small contributors have a financial interest in making sure they oversee efficient use of their contributions, too. I will consult within the administration and in Congress as to how to achieve this goal and determining what appropriate funding levels should be.

Question. Do you agree with the concerns of many experts that if the US were to withhold funding that China would then fill that void? Do you have concerns about China’s increasingly aggressive influence in the U.N. and how the US withholding funding would contribute to that?

Answer. I am concerned about China’s increasingly aggressive influence. However, I do not believe that Chinese motivations are determined by U.S. contributions to the U.N. They will continue to pursue their interests as they see them regardless of U.S. funding. If confirmed, I will work to defend and advance U.S. interests in the U.N.

Question. In many places around the world, including Africa, the Middle East and the Former Soviet Union, among others, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer people are criminalized, arrested, tortured and even killed simply because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. The U.N. has held hearings, passed resolutions and even created a position to help protect the lives of people based on their sexual orientation and gender identity. The Obama administration has made protecting LGBTQ rights around the world a cornerstone of its international policy. This has included working through the U.N. and at the U.N. to support LGBTQ individuals. Will you continue the Obama administration's legacy on LGBTQ rights?

Answer. As I stated during my hearing, I strongly believe that the U.S. should unabashedly promote American values. If confirmed, I will work to advance human rights for everyone.

Question. Do you agree that the Olympics should only be awarded to any country that protects its LGBTQ citizens?

Answer. Although the International Olympic Committee was granted permanent observer status by the U.N. General Assembly, it is not a U.N. organization and this question is outside of the responsibilities I would have if confirmed.

United Nations

S/RES/2334 (2016)



Security Council

Distr.: General
23 December 2016**Resolution 2334 (2016)****Adopted by the Security Council at its 7853rd meeting, on
23 December 2016***The Security Council,**Reaffirming* its relevant resolutions, including resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973), 446 (1979), 452 (1979), 465 (1980), 476 (1980), 478 (1980), 1397 (2002), 1515 (2003), and 1850 (2008),*Guided* by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and reaffirming, inter alia, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force,*Reaffirming* the obligation of Israel, the occupying Power, to abide scrupulously by its legal obligations and responsibilities under the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and *recalling* the advisory opinion rendered on 9 July 2004 by the International Court of Justice,*Condemning* all measures aimed at altering the demographic composition, character and status of the Palestinian Territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, including, inter alia, the construction and expansion of settlements, transfer of Israeli settlers, confiscation of land, demolition of homes and displacement of Palestinian civilians, in violation of international humanitarian law and relevant resolutions,*Expressing* grave concern that continuing Israeli settlement activities are dangerously imperilling the viability of the two-State solution based on the 1967 lines,*Recalling* the obligation under the Quartet Roadmap, endorsed by its resolution 1515 (2003), for a freeze by Israel of all settlement activity, including "natural growth", and the dismantlement of all settlement outposts erected since March 2001,*Recalling* also the obligation under the Quartet roadmap for the Palestinian Authority Security Forces to maintain effective operations aimed at confronting all those engaged in terror and dismantling terrorist capabilities, including the confiscation of illegal weapons,

16-22920 (E)

Please recycle 

Condemning all acts of violence against civilians, including acts of terror, as well as all acts of provocation, incitement and destruction,

Reiterating its vision of a region where two democratic States, Israel and Palestine, live side by side in peace within secure and recognized borders,

Stressing that the status quo is not sustainable and that significant steps, consistent with the transition contemplated by prior agreements, are urgently needed in order to (i) stabilize the situation and to reverse negative trends on the ground, which are steadily eroding the two-State solution and entrenching a one-State reality, and (ii) to create the conditions for successful final status negotiations and for advancing the two-State solution through those negotiations and on the ground,

1. *Reaffirms* that the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace;

2. *Reiterates* its demand that Israel immediately and completely cease all settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and that it fully respect all of its legal obligations in this regard;

3. *Underlines* that it will not recognize any changes to the 4 June 1967 lines, including with regard to Jerusalem, other than those agreed by the parties through negotiations;

4. *Stresses* that the cessation of all Israeli settlement activities is essential for salvaging the two-State solution, and calls for affirmative steps to be taken immediately to reverse the negative trends on the ground that are imperilling the two-State solution;

5. *Calls* upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967;

6. *Calls* for immediate steps to prevent all acts of violence against civilians, including acts of terror, as well as all acts of provocation and destruction, calls for accountability in this regard, and calls for compliance with obligations under international law for the strengthening of ongoing efforts to combat terrorism, including through existing security coordination, and to clearly condemn all acts of terrorism;

7. *Calls upon* both parties to act on the basis of international law, including international humanitarian law, and their previous agreements and obligations, to observe calm and restraint, and to refrain from provocative actions, incitement and inflammatory rhetoric, with the aim, inter alia, of de-escalating the situation on the ground, rebuilding trust and confidence, demonstrating through policies and actions a genuine commitment to the two-State solution, and creating the conditions necessary for promoting peace;

8. *Calls upon* all parties to continue, in the interest of the promotion of peace and security, to exert collective efforts to launch credible negotiations on all

final status issues in the Middle East peace process and within the time frame specified by the Quartet in its statement of 21 September 2010;

9. *Urges in this regard* the intensification and acceleration of international and regional diplomatic efforts and support aimed at achieving, without delay a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions, the Madrid terms of reference, including the principle of land for peace, the Arab Peace Initiative and the Quartet Roadmap and an end to the Israeli occupation that began in 1967; and *underscores* in this regard the importance of the ongoing efforts to advance the Arab Peace Initiative, the initiative of France for the convening of an international peace conference, the recent efforts of the Quartet, as well as the efforts of Egypt and the Russian Federation;

10. *Confirms its determination* to support the parties throughout the negotiations and in the implementation of an agreement;

11. *Reaffirms* its determination to examine practical ways and means to secure the full implementation of its relevant resolutions;

12. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Council every three months on the implementation of the provisions of the present resolution;

13. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE AT THE ADOPTION OF U.N. SECURITY
COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334 ON THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

AMBASSADOR SAMANTHA POWER,
U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, NY.

December 23, 2016

Thank you, Mr. President, let me begin with a quote:

The United States will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements during the transitional period. Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlement freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed for wider participation in these talks. Further settlement activity is in no way necessary for the security of Israel and only diminishes the confidence of the Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated.

This was said in 1982 by President Ronald Reagan. He was speaking about a new proposal that he was launching to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. While ultimately, of course, President Reagan's proposal was not realized, his words are still illuminating in at least two respects.

First, because they underscore the United States' deep and long-standing commitment to achieving a comprehensive and lasting peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. That has been the policy of every administration, Republican and Democrat, since before President Reagan and all the way through to the present day.

Second, because President Reagan's words highlight the United States' long-standing position that Israeli settlement activity in territories occupied in 1967 undermines Israel's security, harms the viability of a negotiated two-state outcome, and erodes prospects for peace and stability in the region. Today, the Security Council reaffirmed its established consensus that settlements have no legal validity. The United States has been sending the message that the settlements must stop—privately and publicly—for nearly five decades, through the administrations of Presidents Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and now Barack Obama. Indeed, since 1967, the only president who had not had at least one Israeli-Palestinian-related Security Council resolution pass during his tenure is Barack Obama. So our vote today is fully in line with the bipartisan history of how American Presidents have approached both the issue—and the role of this body.

Given the consistency of this position across U.S. administrations, one would think that it would be a routine vote for the U.S. to allow the passage of a resolution with the elements in this one, reaffirming the long-standing U.S. position on settlements, condemning violence and incitement, and calling for the parties to start taking constructive steps to reverse current trends on the ground. These are familiar, well-articulated components of U.S. policy.

But in reality this vote for us was not straightforward, because of where it is taking place—at the United Nations. For the simple truth is that for as long as Israel has been a member of this institution, Israel has been treated differently from other nations at the United Nations. And not only in decades past—such as in the infamous resolution that the General Assembly adopted in 1975, with the support of the majority of Member States, officially determining that, “Zionism is a form of racism”—but also in 2016, this year. One need only look at the 18 resolutions against Israel adopted during the U.N. General Assembly in September; or the five Israel-specific resolutions adopted this year in the Human Rights Council—more than those focused on any other specific country, such as Syria, North Korea, Iran, or South Sudan—to see that in 2016 Israel continues to be treated differently from other member states.

Like U.S. administrations before it, the Obama administration has worked tirelessly to fight for Israel's right simply to be treated just like any other country—from advocating for Israel to finally be granted membership to a U.N. regional body, something no other U.N. Member State had been denied; to fighting to ensure that Israeli NGOs are not denied U.N. accreditation, simply because they are Israeli, to getting Yom Kippur finally recognized as a U.N. holiday; to pressing this Council to break its indefensible silence in response to terrorist attacks on Israelis. As the United States has said repeatedly, such unequal treatment not only hurts Israel, it undermines the legitimacy of the United Nations itself.

The practice of treating Israel differently at the U.N. matters for votes like this one. For even if one believes that the resolution proposed today is justified—or, even more, necessitated—by events on the ground, one cannot completely separate the vote from the venue.

And Member States that say they are for the two-state solution must ask themselves some difficult questions. For those states that are quick to promote resolutions condemning Israel, but refuse to recognize when innocent Israelis are the victims of terrorism—what steps will you take to stop treating Israel differently? For those states that passionately denounce the closures of crossings in Gaza as exacerbating the humanitarian situation, but saying nothing of the resources diverted from helping Gaza's residents to dig tunnels into Israeli territory so that terrorists can attack Israelis in their homes—what will you do to end the double-standard that undermines the legitimacy of this institution?

Member States should also ask themselves about the double standards when it comes to this Council taking action. Just this morning we came together, as a Council, and we were unable to muster the will to act to stop the flow of weapons going to killers in South Sudan, who are perpetrating mass atrocities that the U.N. has said could lead to genocide. We couldn't come together just to stem the flow of arms. Earlier this month, this Council could not muster the will to adopt the simplest of resolutions calling for a seven-day pause in the savage bombardment of innocent civilians, hospitals, and schools in Aleppo. Yet when a resolution on Israel comes before this Council, members suddenly summon the will to act.

It is because this forum too often continues to be biased against Israel; because there are important issues that are not sufficiently addressed in this resolution; and because the United States does not agree with every word in this text, that the United States did not vote in favor of the resolution. But it is because this resolution reflects the facts on the ground—and is consistent with U.S. policy across Republican and Democratic administration throughout the history of the State of Israel—that the United States did not veto it.

The United States has consistently said we would block any resolution that we thought would undermine Israel's security or seek to impose a resolution to the conflict. We would not have let this resolution pass had it not also addressed counter-productive actions by the Palestinians such as terrorism and incitement to violence, which we've repeatedly condemned and repeatedly raised with the Palestinian leadership, and which, of course, must be stopped.

Unlike some on the U.N. Security Council, we do not believe that outside parties can impose a solution that has not been negotiated by the two parties. Nor can we unilaterally recognize a future Palestinian state. But it is precisely our commitment to Israel's security that makes the United States believe that we cannot stand in the way of this resolution as we seek to preserve a chance of attaining our long-standing objective: two states living side-by-side in peace and security. Let me briefly explain why.

The settlement problem has gotten so much worse that it is now putting at risk the very viability of that two-state solution. The number of settlers in the roughly 150 authorized Israeli settlements east of the 1967 lines has increased dramatically. Since the 1993 signing of the Oslo Accords—which launched efforts that made a comprehensive and lasting peace possible—the number of settlers has increased by 355,000. The total settler population in the West Bank and East Jerusalem now exceeds 590,000. Nearly 90,000 settlers are living east of the separation barrier that was created by Israel itself. And just since July 2016—when the Middle East Quartet issued a report highlighting international concern about a systematic process of land seizures, settlement expansions, and legalizations—Israel has advanced plans for more than 2,600 new settlement units. Yet rather than dismantling these and other settler outposts, which are illegal even under Israeli law, now there is new legislation advancing in the Israeli Knesset that would legalize most of the outposts—a factor that propelled the decision by this resolution's sponsors to bring it before the Council.

The Israeli Prime Minister recently described his government as “more committed to settlements than any in Israel's history,” and one of his leading coalition partners

recently declared that “the era of the two-state solution is over.” At the same time, the Prime Minister has said that he is still committed to pursuing a two-state solution. But these statements are irreconcilable. One cannot simultaneously champion expanding Israeli settlements and champion a viable two-state solution that would end the conflict. One has to make a choice between settlements and separation.

In 2011, the United States vetoed a resolution that focused exclusively on settlements, as if settlements were the only factor harming the prospects of a two-state solution. The circumstances have changed dramatically. Since 2011, settlement growth has only accelerated. Since 2011, multiple efforts to pursue peace through negotiations have failed. And since 2011, President Obama and Secretary Kerry have repeatedly warned—publically and privately—that the absence of progress toward peace and continued settlement expansion was going to put the two-state solution at risk, and threaten Israel’s stated objective to remain both a Jewish State and a democracy. Moreover, unlike in 2011, this resolution condemns violence, terrorism and incitement, which also poses an extremely grave risk to the two-state solution. This resolution reflects trends that will permanently destroy the hope of a two-state solution if they continue on their current course.

The United States has not taken the step of voting in support of this resolution because the resolution is too narrowly focused on settlements, when we all know—or we all should know—that many other factors contribute significantly to the tensions that perpetuate this conflict. Let us be clear: even if every single settlement were to be dismantled tomorrow, peace still would not be attainable without both sides acknowledging uncomfortable truths and making difficult choices. That is an indisputable fact. Yet it is one that is too often overlooked by members of the United Nations and by members of this Council.

For Palestinian leaders, that means recognizing the obvious: that in addition to taking innocent lives—the incitement to violence, the glorification of terrorists, and the growth of violent extremism erodes prospects for peace, as this resolution makes crystal clear. The most recent wave of Palestinian violence has seen terrorists commit hundreds of attacks—including driving cars into crowds of innocent civilians and stabbing mothers in front of their children. Yet rather than condemn these attacks, Hamas, other radical factions, and even certain members of Fatah have held up the terrorists as heroes, and used social media to incite others to follow in their murderous footsteps. And while President Abbas and his party’s leaders have made clear their opposition to violence, terrorism, and extremism, they have too often failed to condemn specific attacks or condemn the praised heaped upon the perpetrators.

Our vote today does not in any way diminish the United States’ steadfast and unparalleled commitment to the security of Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East. We would not have let this resolution pass had it not also addressed counterproductive actions by Palestinians. We have to recognize that Israel faces very serious threats in a very tough neighborhood. Israelis are rightfully concerned about making sure there is not a new terrorist haven next door. President Obama and this administration have shown an unprecedented commitment to Israel’s security because that is what we believe in.

Our commitment to that security has never wavered, and it never will. Even with a financial crisis and budget deficits, we’ve repeatedly increased funding to support Israel’s military. And in September, the Obama administration signed a Memorandum of Understanding to provide \$38 billion in security assistance to Israel over the next 10 years—the largest single pledge of military assistance in U.S. history to any country. And as the Israeli Prime Minister himself has noted, our military and intelligence cooperation is unprecedented. We believe, though, that continued settlement building seriously undermines Israel’s security.

Some may cast the U.S. vote as a sign that we have finally given up on a two-state solution. Nothing could be further from the truth. None of us can give up on a two-state solution. We continue to believe that that solution is the only viable path to provide peace and security for the state of Israel, and freedom and dignity for the Palestinian people. And we continue to believe that the parties can still pursue this path, if both sides are honest about the choices, and have the courage to take steps that will be politically difficult. While we can encourage them, it is ultimately up to the parties to choose this path, as it always has been. We sincerely hope that they will begin making these choices before it is too late.

I thank you.

U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS SUSAN
POWERS, SPEAKING BEFORE THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL, JANUARY 17,
2017

RUSSIA: THE THREAT, THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER, AND THE WAY FORWARD

Thank you so much. Thank you. I have had the privilege of serving in the Obama administration for eight years: first in the White House and for the last three and a half years as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. I have never had a more meaningful job. And now I have just three days left.

This is my last major speech as a member of this administration. And much as I would have liked to use it to urge young people to go into public service or to make the pragmatic case for strengthening the United Nations, I feel that the circumstances require me to focus on a much more immediate subject, a major threat facing our great nation: Russia.

Before getting to the core threat posed by Russia, I want to stress from the bottom of my heart that some of the most rewarding and impactful work I have done at the United Nations has come in the times when my Russian counterpart and I have been able to cooperate. Back in 2013, together we negotiated a resolution to get the most dangerous chemical weapons out of Syria. Russia, as you all recall, was a key pillar in imposing sanctions on Iran for its illicit nuclear program—sanctions that were essential in bringing Iran to the table, so that we could forge an agreement that cut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear bomb. And Russia worked really constructively with the rest of the Security Council to select the best candidate for a new U.N. Secretary-General, a leader with tremendous experience and vision.

While people tend to look to the Cold War as the paradigm for understanding the nature of U.S.—Russia relations, the reality is that for pivotal parts of our shared history, U.S. and Russian interests have frequently aligned. We fought together in both of the 20th century's world wars. Indeed, had it not been for the colossal sacrifices made by the Soviet Union in World War II, in which they lost more than 20 million people—many times more than any other nation, friend or foe—the war would have dragged on for much longer, millions more Americans and people of other allied countries would have lost their lives, and fascism might well have prevailed in large parts of the world, not to mention that the post-World War II order may never have been built. Russia's immense contribution in that war is part of their proud history of standing up to imperialist powers, from the Mongols in the 16th century to Napoleon in the 19th century. In addition, many of the challenges that Russia faces today, from violent extremism and China's territorial expansionist aims, to national industries and jobs that have been rendered obsolete by globalization, are ones we also face here in the United States. So—let me say from the outset—it is very much in our interest to try to solve problems with Russia. Dialogue between us is absolutely imperative.

Having said that, anyone who has seen my debates in the U.N. Security Council with Russia knows that I and my government have long had serious concerns about the Russian government's aggressive and destabilizing actions. The argument I want to make today goes beyond any particular action Russia has taken to its broader strategy and what that means for the security of the United States and the American people.

Today, I will set out how the Russian government under President Putin is taking steps that are weakening the rules-based order that we have benefitted from for seven decades. Our values, our security, our prosperity, and our very way of life are tied to this order. And we—and by "we," I mean the United States and our closest partners—must come together to prevent Russia from succeeding in weakening that order. This means better understanding and educating our public about how Russia is challenging this order. This means reaffirming our commitment to the rules and institutions that have long undergirded this order, as well as developing new tools to counter the tactics that Russia is using to undermine it. And this means addressing the vulnerabilities within our democracy that Russia's attacks have exposed and have exacerbated. To do this, we cannot let Russia divide us. If we confront this

threat together, we will adapt and strengthen the order on which our interests depend.

Now, terms like “international order” can seem quite abstract. So let me be very concrete about what is threatened by Russia’s actions. The order enshrined in the U.N. Charter and other key international agreements in the aftermath of the Second World War was built on the understanding that all of our nations would be more secure if we bound ourselves to a set of rules. These included the rules that the borders between sovereign states should be respected; that, even in times of war, some weapons and some tactics should never be used; that while forms of government might vary from one nation to another, certain human rights were inalienable and necessary to check state power; and that the nations that break these rules should be held accountable.

Now, as we all know, a lot has changed in the seven decades since that order was created. When the United Nations was founded, there were just 51 Member States, a fraction of today’s 193; some great contemporary powers were not yet independent nations; and many countries that did exist did not have a say, much less an equal voice, in developing its rules. In addition, some of the threats that we face today, such as violent terrorist groups and cyber-attacks, would have been unimaginable to the architects of that system. So there are many reasons why the rules—based order conceived in 1945 is not perfectly tailored to the challenges that we as an international community face in 2017. And it is reasonable to think that we need to update those rules with more voices at the table, some of which we will not agree with. Yet, evolve as the system may, the vast majority of countries today recognize that we all benefit from having rules of the road that constrain certain kinds of behavior to enhance our shared security, rules that must not be rewritten by force.

Now, I also acknowledge that there are times when actions the United States takes in the interest of defending our security and that of our allies can be seen by other nations as offensive moves that threaten their security, and we need to be alert to this, which is why dialogue is so very important. And some may argue—not unreasonably—that our government has not always lived up to the rules that we invoke. As President Obama made clear when he entered office, while the United States strives to lead by example, there are still times when we have fallen short. Yet, under President Obama’s leadership, we have shown our commitment to investing in and abiding by the rules-based international order. The same cannot be said for the Russian government today.

For years, we have seen Russia take one aggressive and destabilizing action after another. We saw it in March 2014, not long after mass peaceful protests in Ukraine brought to power a government that favored closer ties with Europe, when Russia dispatched its soldiers to the Ukrainian peninsula of Crimea. The “little green men,” as they came to be called, for Russia denied any ties to any of them, rammed through a referendum at the barrel of a gun, which Mr. Putin then used to justify his sham attempted annexation of Crimea.

We saw it months later in eastern Ukraine, where Russia armed, trained, and fought alongside separatists. Again Russia denied any role in the conflict it manufactured, again flouting the international obligation to respect the territorial integrity of its neighbor.

We saw it also in Russia’s support for Bashar al-Assad’s brutal war in Syria—support it maintained even as the Assad regime blocked food and medicine from reaching civilians in opposition-held areas, civilians who were so desperate that they had resorted to eating leaves, even as photographs emerged of countless prisoners who had been tortured to death in Assad’s prisons, their bodies tagged with serial numbers, even as the Assad regime repeatedly used chemical weapons to kill its own people.

We saw it in 2015, when Russia went further by joining the assault on the Syrian people, deploying its own troops and planes in a campaign that hit hospitals, schools, and the brave Syrian first responders who were trying to dig innocent civilians out of the rubble. And with each transgression, not only were more innocent civilians killed, maimed, starved, and uprooted, but the rules that make all of our nations more secure—including Russia—those rules were eroded.

We saw it in Russia’s effort to undercut the credibility of international institutions like the United Nations. For example, in an emergency U.N. Security Council meeting last month, then—Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon told the Member States that the Assad regime forces and Iranian militia were reportedly disappearing men as those forces took parts of eastern Aleppo. In response, the representative of Russia, which was providing air cover for the offensive, not only claimed that Russian investigations had uncovered “not a single report of ill treatment or violation of international humanitarian law against civilians of eastern Aleppo,” but also accused the Secretary-General of basing his information on fake news. Minutes later, Syria’s

representative to the U.N. echoed Russia's line, holding up as proof what he claimed was a photograph of a Syrian government soldier helping an elderly woman. The only problem was that the photo was taken six months earlier, in June 2016, in Fallujah, Iraq.

In this same period, we also saw Russia's systematic efforts to sow doubt and division in democracies and to drive a wedge between the United States and our closest allies. Russia has done this by supporting illiberal parties, like France's National Front, which has a xenophobic, anti-Muslim platform. When the National Front was having trouble raising funds for its 2014 campaign, a Russian bank with ties to the Kremlin stepped in to loan the party more than \$11 million. While that may not seem like a very large amount compared to the budgets of U.S. national campaigns, it was roughly a third of what the party was aiming to raise, and the National Front made significant gains in that election. With national elections coming up in France this year, the National Front has said that it is looking again to Russian financing for help. Little surprise that the party's leader has repeatedly attempted to legitimize Russia's attempted land—grab of Crimea.

Russia has also used hacking to sow distrust in the democratic processes of some of our closest allies and undermine the policies of their governments. Consider the case of Germany. According to German intelligence agencies, groups linked to the Russian government carried out a massive May 2015 attack targeting the German parliament, energy companies, telecoms, and even universities. And just last month, Germany's domestic intelligence agency reported an alarming spike in what it called "aggressive and increased cyber spying and cyber operations that could potentially endanger German government officials, members of Parliament, and employees of democratic parties." The agency attributed this to Russian hackers. The head of Germany's foreign intelligence service said the perpetrators' aim is "delegitimizing the democratic process."

In other instances, Russia's interference in democratically elected governments has been far more direct. Late last year, officials in Montenegro said that they uncovered a plot to violently disrupt the country's elections, topple the government, install a new administration loyal to Moscow, and perhaps even assassinate the prime minister. Montenegro's prime minister had been pushing for the country to join NATO, a move that Russia openly opposed. The plotters reportedly told investigators that they had been funded and equipped by Russian officials, who had also helped plan the attack.

It is in this context that one must view the Russian government's latest efforts to interfere in America's democracy. As our intelligence community found and as you are now familiar, we know that the Russian government sought to interfere in our presidential election with the goals of undermining public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrating one candidate, and helping the other candidate. Our intelligence agencies assess that the campaign was ordered by President Putin and implemented by a combination of Russian government agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries, and government-paid trolls. We know that, in addition to hacking the Democratic National Committee and senior Democratic Party officials, Russia also hacked U.S. think tanks and lobbying groups. And we know that Russia hacked elements of multiple state and local electoral boards, although our intelligence community's assessment is that Russia did not compromise vote tallies. But think for just a moment about what that means: Russia not only tried to influence our election but to access the very systems by which we vote.

At first glance, these interventions by Russia in different parts of the world can appear unrelated. That is because the common thread running through each of them cannot be found in anything that Russia is for. The common thread can be found only in what Russia is against—not in the rules that it follows but in the rules that it breaks. Russia's actions are not standing up a new world order. They are tearing down the one that exists. And this is what we are fighting against. Having defeated the forces of fascism and communism, we now confront the forces of authoritarianism and nihilism.

There are multiple theories as to why the Russian government would undermine a system that it played a crucial role in helping build and that has fostered unparalleled advances in human liberty and development. Perhaps, as some speculate, it is to distract the Russian people from the rampant corruption that has consumed so much of the wealth produced by the nation's oil and gas, preventing it from benefiting average citizens. Perhaps it is because our rules-based order rests on principles, such as accountability and the rule of law, that are at odds with Russia's style of governing. Perhaps it is to regain a sense of its past glory or to get back at the countries that it blames for the breakup of the Soviet Union, which President Putin has called the "greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the 20th century."

It is not my aim here to theorize about which, if any, of these motives lie behind the Russian government's actions, which not only threaten our democracy but the entire order upon which our security and our prosperity depends. It is instead to ask: what are we going to do to address this threat?

First, we must continue to work in a bipartisan fashion to determine the full extent of Russia's interference in our recent elections, identify the vulnerabilities of our democratic system, and come up with targeted recommendations for preventing future attacks. The congressional hearings initiated last week, the bipartisan inquiry announced on January 13th by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the Joint Analysis Report on Russian Malicious Cyber Activity and Harassment, and the Joint Intelligence Report prepared at the request of President Obama are all important steps toward achieving these crucial objectives.

The purpose of such efforts is not to challenge the outcome of any races in our recent election. The purpose is to identify the gaps in our defenses that Russia exploited, as well as other gaps that may not have been seized upon in this attack but that Russia or others could take advantage of in the future. And the purpose is to determine the steps needed to close such gaps and strengthen the resilience of our system because it would be deeply naïve and deeply negligent to think that those who have discovered vulnerabilities in our system would not try to exploit them again and again—and not just Russia but all of the governments and non-state actors who see undermining our democracy as a way of advancing their interests. Indeed, it already has happened repeatedly. As we know, there were also hacks in our presidential elections in 2008 and in 2012.

That these efforts be bipartisan is absolutely essential. Allowing politics to get in the way of determining the full extent of Russia's meddling and how best to protect our democracy would undermine our core national security interests. It is healthy for our parties in our political system to debate issues such as how to expand our middle class or what role our nation should play in the wider world. What is not healthy is for a party or its leaders to cast doubt on a unanimous, well-documented assessment of our intelligence community that a foreign government is seeking to harm our country.

Second, we have to do a better job of informing our citizens about the seriousness of the threat the Russian government poses. Here too, our unity is crucial. When we send conflicting messages about a threat Russia poses, it sends a mixed message to the American people. A recent poll found that 37 percent of Republicans hold a favorable view of President Putin, up from just 10 percent in July 2014. That is an alarmingly high proportion for a leader that has had journalists, human rights activists, and opposition politicians murdered, for one who has ridiculed our constitutional safeguards, and tried to tip the scales in our elections. I know that some have said that this focus on Russia that we are bringing is simply the party that lost the recent presidential election being "sore losers," but it should worry every American that a foreign government interfered in our democratic process. It's not about the leader we choose—it's about who gets to choose—who gets to choose our leader. That privilege should belong only to Americans.

We must also forcefully reject the false equivalency between the work that the U.S. government and the Russian government are doing in other countries. There is a world of difference between supporting free and fair elections, and investing in independent institutions that advance human rights, accountability, and transparency, as we do; and, on the other hand, trying to sow distrust in democratic processes, misinform citizens, and swing elections toward illiberal parties, as

Russia is doing.

Third, we must reassure our allies that we have their backs, and we must ensure that Russia pays a price for breaking the rules.

That means maintaining our robust support for NATO and making clear our nation's steadfast commitment to treat an attack on any NATO member as an attack on us all. We expect all of our NATO allies to do their part in keeping the Alliance strong, which includes meeting the pledge made in 2014 to spend at least two percent of their GDP on defense—a commitment that we in the Obama administration have pushed relentlessly for them to fulfill. We also need to increase cooperation and intelligence sharing to deter, detect, and defend against the next generation of hacks and cyber threats, particularly as France, Germany, and the Netherlands look forward to national elections this year.

That also means maintaining the sanctions placed on Russia, including those imposed by President Obama in response to Russia's meddling in our election. Now, some have argued that the most effective way to get Russia to start playing by the rules that undergird the international order is actually by easing sanctions. If only we reduce the pressure, they claim, Russia will stop lashing out against the international order. But they have it backwards: easing punitive measures on the Rus-

sian government when they haven't changed their behavior will only embolden Russia, sending the message that the best way to gain international acceptance of its destabilizing actions is simply to wait us out. And that will not only encourage more dangerous actions by Russia, but also by other rule-breakers like Iran and North Korea, which are constantly testing how far they can move the line without triggering a response.

Similarly flawed is the argument that the United States should put recent transgressions aside and announce another reset with Russia. Yes, the Obama administration tried this approach in our first term. But 2017 is not 2009. In 2009, Dimitri Medvedev was president of Russia, and we were able to find common ground on issues such as counterterrorism, arms control, and the war in Afghanistan. More important, in 2009, Russia was not occupying Crimea, fueling an ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine, and bombing hospitals and first responders in Syria. Nor, most importantly, had Russia interfered directly in the U.S. election.

Yet it would be a mistake to think that all we need to do to defend ourselves and our allies against the threat Russia poses is to rely on the same tools we have been using; that if we just close the gaps in our defenses, inform our public, maintain or even ratchet up sanctions, shore up NATO, we do all that, it would be a mistake to believe that we will be able to protect the rules-based order. We have to do more, because Russia has an edge in one respect. It turns out is easier to break institutions down than to build them up. It is easier to sow skepticism than to earn 8 people's trust. Making up fake news—ask the reporters here today—is a lot easier than reporting the facts required for real news. Put simply, in international affairs in 2017, it is often easier to be bad than good.

Let me give just one example. On September 16th, 2016, as you might remember, a humanitarian convoy of the Arab Red Crescent was bombed in the Syrian city of Urem al-Kubra, killing at least 10 civilians, and destroying 18 trucks filled with food and medicine intended for desperate Syrian civilians. Because the strikes were carried out in a region where only the Assad regime and its Russian allies were flying, the attack was widely reported as likely being carried out by the regime or Russian forces. Yet rather than accept any responsibility, rather than even try to get to the bottom of what had happened, the Russian government did what it always does in the face of atrocities with which it is associated: deny and lie.

Russia's Ministry of Defense initially said no airstrikes had been carried out in the area by Russian or Syrian planes, and that its expert analysis of video footage of the strike showed that the aid convoy had been destroyed by a fire. Then President Putin's press secretary said that terrorists had been firing rockets nearby, suggesting they were the ones who had struck the convoy. Then Russia claimed that a U.S. drone had been detected above the convoy just minutes before it was struck, contradicting its initial assessment that the convoy had not been hit from the air. Two days. Three stories. All false.

Yet Russia's willingness to lie turned reporting on the attack into an "on the one hand, on the other hand" story, even in respected outlets like the New York Times, the BBC, and CNN. And Russian government-controlled networks like RT played a critical role in this effort, rapidly disseminating those lies while questioning the accounts of witnesses. As RT's own editor once said, "Not having our own foreign broadcasting is the same as not having a Ministry of Defense. When there is no war, it looks like we don't need it. However, when there is a war, it is critical." In other words, lying is a strategic asset. It didn't matter whether Russia's accounts were accurate or even consistent; all that matters was that Russia injected enough counterclaims into the news cycle to call into question who was responsible. By the time the U.N. issued a report on the incident more than three months later, concluding that the convoy had been struck by an airstrike that could only have been carried out by the Assad regime or Russia, the finding and Russia's cover-up received almost no attention. Deny and lie.

At times, it can start to feel that the only way to outmaneuver an adversary unbound by the truth is to beat them at their own game. But that would be deeply misguided. If we try to meet the Russian government in its upside-down land—where right is left and black is white—we will have helped them achieve their goal, which is creating a world where all truth is relative, and where trust in the integrity of our democratic system is lost.

We don't need to gin up our own propaganda networks, bankroll our own army of trolls, and inundate social media platforms with even more fake news targeting our adversaries. We have to fight misinformation with information. Fiction with facts. But documenting and spreading facts, just like manufacturing fake news, takes resources. A report by the UK parliament found that the Russian government spent between \$600 million and \$1 billion a year on propaganda arms like RT. So we need to be spending at least as much—and arguably much more—on training

and equipping independent reporters, protecting journalists who are under attack, and finding ways to get around the censors and firewalls that repressive governments use to block their citizens from getting access to critical voices.

This brings me to the fourth and final way to address the threat Russia poses to the rules-based international order: we must continue to seek ways to engage directly with the Russian people and, coming back to where I started, with the Russian government.

It can be easy to forget that virtually all the tactics the Russian government is using to undermine democracy abroad are ones that they fine-tuned at home, on the Russian people, to devastating effect. After all, when Russian soldiers are killed fighting in a conflict in eastern Ukraine that their government denies it has any role in, it is Russian mothers, widows, and orphans who are denied the benefits and recognition they deserve as the family members of slain soldiers. The mafias that the Russian government uses to sow corruption abroad profit most off the backs of the Russian people. And it is Russian journalists and human rights defenders who have been harassed, beaten, and even killed for uncovering their government's abuses.

So we must be careful to distinguish between the Russian government and the Russian people. We cannot let America's relationship with a nation of more than 140 million people—people who have made remarkable contributions to the world, who have a proud, rich history and culture, and whom we fervently wish to see prosper—be defined solely by the nefarious actions of a tiny subset in their government. And yet we have less contact with ordinary Russians today than at any time in decades. This is no accident; in the past few years, the Russian government has closed 28 U.S. government-funded “American Corners,” which offered free libraries, language training, and events about American culture to Russian citizens, and has shuttered the American Center in Moscow, which hosted more than 50,000 Russian visitors per year. It has also expelled U.S. government-supported and independent non-profits, such as the National Endowment for Democracy and the Open Society Foundation, which had spent decades fostering civil society and the rule of law in Russia. As the Kremlin closes off these outlets for reaching the Russian people, we must find others to take their place.

We also cannot give up engaging with the Russian government. We should do this in part because collaborating on issues of shared interest will allow us to show, not just tell, what we know to be true—that our nations have a lot more to gain by working to build up a system of shared rules and principles than tear it down; and, in part, because by working together, we may be able to rebuild the respect and the trust needed to tackle unprecedented global threats that we face today—many of which cannot be solved without one another's help.

Let me conclude. In 1796, our nation's first President, George Washington, used his farewell address to issue a stark warning to the American people about the danger of foreign governments trying to interfere in our democracy. He told his audience: “Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.”

More than 220 years later, Washington's warning feels strikingly relevant. For if anything, the vulnerabilities that Washington saw, in his words, “to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils”—those are his words—those have only multiplied with modern technology. And unlike in 1796, it is no longer enough for us simply to protect our own democracy against foreign interference; we also have to protect the integrity of the entire rules-based international order, on whose foundations our security and our prosperity rest.

Yet while so much has changed since Washington issued his warning, the essence of the threat has not. It goes to the creation of America itself—a nation born out of a simple, yet revolutionary idea: that it was the American people, ordinary citizens—and not a government, domestic or foreign—who should enjoy the rights to shape our nation's path. That is a right that we have had to fight to defend throughout our history. And while in recent decades we may have felt confident that no power would dare try to take that right away from us, we have again been reminded that they will try.

Just as the threat is fundamentally unchanged since Washington's time, so is our most effective way to confront it. And that is by renewing the faith of the American people in our democracy. Our democracy's vitality has long depended on sustaining the belief among our citizens that a government by and for the people is the best way to keep ourselves and our loved ones safe, to preserve the freedoms we value most, and to expand our opportunities. It is not that we have a perfect system, but

a perfectible system—one that the American people always have the power to improve, to renew, to make our own. That faith is the engine that has powered our republic since its creation, and it is the reason other nations still look to America as a model.

And it is precisely that faith that the Russian government's interference is intended to shake. The Kremlin's aim is to convince our people that the system is rigged; that all facts are relative; that ordinary people who try to improve their communities and their country are wasting their time. In the place of faith, they offer cynicism. In the place of engagement, indifference.

But the truth is that the Russian government's efforts to cast doubt on the integrity of our democracy would not have been so effective if some of those doubts had not already been felt by many Americans, by citizens who are asking whether our system still offers a way to fix the everyday problems they face, and whether our society still gives them reason to hope that they can improve their lives for the better. In this way—and we need to reckon with this—the attack has cast a light on a growing sense of divisiveness, distrust, and disillusionment. But we know here in America not only what we are against, we know what we are for. So just as we are clear-eyed about the threat that Russia poses from the outside, and unified in confronting it, we must also dedicate ourselves to restoring citizens' faith in our democracy on the inside, which always has been the source of America's strength, and always will be our best defense against any foreign power that tries to do us harm.

I thank you.

The Screening Process for Refugee Entry Into the United States¹

MANY REFUGEE APPLICANTS IDENTIFY THEMSELVES TO THE U.N. REFUGEE AGENCY, UNHCR. UNHCR, THEN:

- ◆ Collects identifying documents
- ◆ Performs initial assessment
 - Collects biodata: name, address, birthday, place of birth, etc.
 - Collects biometrics: iris scans (for Syrians, and other refugee populations in the Middle East)
- ◆ Interviews applicants to confirm refugee status and the need for resettlement
 - Initial information checked again

Only applicants who are strong candidates for resettlement move forward (less than 1% of global refugee population).

APPLICANTS ARE RECEIVED BY A FEDERALLY-FUNDED RESETTLEMENT SUPPORT CENTER (RSC):

- ◆ Collects identifying documents
- ◆ Creates an applicant file
- ◆ Compiles information to conduct biographic security checks

Refugees are subject to the highest level of security checks of any category of traveler to the United States.

BIOGRAPHIC SECURITY CHECKS START WITH ENHANCED INTERAGENCY SECURITY CHECKS:

- ◆ U.S. security agencies screen the candidate, including:
 - National Counterterrorism Center/Intelligence Community
 - FBI
 - Department of Homeland Security
 - State Department
- ◆ The screening looks for indicators, like:

¹ <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2015/11/20/infographic-screening-process-refugee-entry-united-states>. [Editor's note: In its original form the "infographic" version of this information was not compatible with the GPO's hearing format; the information was converted into a text document.]

- Information that the individual is a security risk
- Connections to known bad actors
- Outstanding warrants/immigration or criminal violations
- ◆ DHS conducts an enhanced review of Syrian cases, which may be referred to USCIS Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate for review. Research that is used by the interviewing officer informs lines of question related to the applicant's eligibility and credibility.

This process is repeated any time new information is provided, such as a previously used name or different phone number. Otherwise the process continues.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (DHS)/USCIS INTERVIEW:

- ◆ Interviews are conducted by USCIS Officers specially trained for interviews
- Fingerprints are collected and submitted (biometric check)

Re-interviews can be conducted if fingerprint results or new information raises questions. If new biographic information is identified by USCIS at an interview, additional security checks on the information are conducted. USCIS may place a case on hold to do additional research or investigation. Otherwise, the process continues.

BIOMETRIC SECURITY CHECKS:

- ◆ Applicant's fingerprints are taken by U.S. government employees
- Fingerprints are screened against the FBI's biometric database.
- Fingerprints are screened against the DHS biometric database, containing watch-list information and previous immigration encounters in the U.S. and overseas.
- Fingerprints are screened against the U.S. Department of Defense biometric database, which includes fingerprint records captured in Iraq and other locations.

If not already halted, this is the end point for cases with security concerns. Otherwise, the process continues.

MEDICAL CHECK:

- ◆ The need for medical screening is determined.

This is the end point for cases denied due to medical reasons. Refugees may be provided medical treatment for communicable diseases such as tuberculosis.

CULTURAL ORIENTATION AND ASSIGNMENT TO DOMESTIC
RESETTLEMENT LOCATIONS:

- ◆ Applicants complete cultural orientation classes.
An assessment is made by a U.S.-based non-governmental organization to determine the best resettlement location for the candidate(s). Considerations include:
Family; candidates with family in a certain area may be placed in that area.
Health; a candidate with asthma may be matched to certain regions.
A location is chosen.

Recurrent vetting: Throughout this process, pending applications continue to be checked against terrorist databases, to ensure new, relevant terrorism information has not come to light. If a match is found, that case is paused for further review. Applicants who continue to have no flags continue the process. If there is doubt about whether an applicant poses a security risk, they will not be admitted.

TRAVEL:

- ◆ International Organization for Migration books travel
- ◆ Prior to entry in the United States, applicants are subject to:
Screening from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's National Targeting Center-Passenger
The Transportation Security Administration's Secure Flight Program

This is the end point for some applicants. Applicants who have no flags continue the process.

U.S. ARRIVAL:

- ◆ All refugees are required to apply for a green card within a year of their arrival to the United States, which triggers:
Another set of security procedures with the U.S. government.

Refugees are woven into the rich fabric of American society!
