

**A REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AT THE
END OF THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION**

**HEARING AND PUBLIC
MEETING**

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 26, 2000

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

69-749 CC

WASHINGTON : 2001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana

CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska

GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon

ROD GRAMS, Minnesota

SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas

CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming

JOHN ASHCROFT, Missouri

BILL FRIST, Tennessee

LINCOLN D. CHAFEE, Rhode Island

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware

PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin

PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota

BARBARA BOXER, California

ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey

STEPHEN E. BIEGUN, *Staff Director*

EDWIN K. HALL, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Albright, Hon. Madeleine K., Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC	4
Prepared statement	6
Responses to additional questions submitted by Senator Jess Helms	36
Responses to additional questions submitted by Senator Gordon Smith	44

A REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AT THE END OF THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2000

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Jesse Helms (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Helms, Lugar, Hagel, Grams, Brownback, Biden, Sarbanes, Dodd, and Wellstone.

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. At last we are able to begin this meeting, and I understand that an objection has been filed by someone, frivolously, on the Senate floor to object to our meeting past 11:30, but we will see.

Once again, ladies and gentlemen, it is our pleasure to welcome a great lady who is special to all of us, the distinguished Secretary of State, Hon. Madeleine Albright, and that is the good news. The bad news is this, Madam Secretary. This is your final official appearance as Secretary of State, unless we can get you reappointed.

I counted up over the weekend, Madam Secretary, and if I did not miscount somewhere along the line this is your eighteenth appearance before this committee. It has always been a pleasure to have you here. You have always been straight with us, and you have always prompted the committee to participate in wide-ranging discussions on crucial issues of U.S. foreign policy, and you have never ducked a question.

Now, we have not always agreed, but when we have not, we have agreed to disagree agreeably. In any event, I am going to repeat, you are a great lady, and I believe the record will show that all together we have accomplished a very great deal.

We worked together for the expansion of NATO, to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, and in doing so the scars of Yalta were erased, and that was followed by an assurance of democratic futures for host nations. We reached agreement on landmark legislation to reorganize and revitalize the State Department, abolishing two of those temporary Federal agencies that were created back in the 1950's and integrating any of their essential functions into the State Department, where they belong.

So Madam Secretary, together we have abolished two and we may have something to propose about a third next year, and I am going to ask that the balance of my statement be printed in the record, and I call on the distinguished Ranking Member of the committee, Mr. Biden.

[The prepared statement of Senator Helms follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JESSE HELMS

Once again, it's a pleasure to welcome a great lady who is special to all of us, the distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Madeleine Albright. That's the good news.

The bad news is that this, Madam Secretary, will be your final official appearance as Secretary of State. I counted up over the weekend, Madam Secretary, and if I did not miscount somewhere along the way, this is your 18th appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It has always been a pleasure to have you with us. You have always been straight with us, and you have always prompted the Committee to participate in wide-ranging discussions on crucial issues of U.S. foreign policy.

We have not always agreed, but when we have not, we have agreed to disagree agreeably. In any event, you are a great lady and I believe the record will show that together we have accomplished a great deal.

- We worked together for the expansion of NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. In doing so, the scars of Yalta were erased and that was followed by an assurance of democratic futures for those nations.
- We reached agreement on landmark legislation to reorganize and revitalize the State Department, abolishing two of these "temporary" federal agencies that were created in the 1950's, and integrating any of their essential functions into the State Department. So, Madam Secretary, together we abolished two, and I may have something to propose about a third, AID, next year.
- We secured passage of landmark U.N. reform legislation so that a reasonable part of our so-called UN "arrears" can be paid—in exchange for sweeping reforms at the U.N. I think it is fair to say that we have agreed at the outset of Secretary General Kofi Annan's tenure on conditions that—if the U.N. does its part—will result in a renewed U.S. relationship with a reformed United Nations. But that's up to the U.N. to achieve those reforms.

In short Madam Secretary, perhaps that's not a bad few years' work for a lady who escaped from communism in Czechoslovakia who worked always agreeably with a couple of Monroe boys, Bud Nance, and me. Admiral Nance thought highly of you, and so do I and I believe both you and I miss our friend, the Admiral.

So, Madam Secretary, we welcome your testimony here today. And I am confident that I speak the sentiments of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in assuring you that it has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with you. Wherever your career takes you in the coming months and years, you will always be remembered with affection and admiration by all Senators of this Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me begin, Madam Secretary, by saying as well as the chairman and I get along, and we do, I am going to miss you, because I tell you what, when you are around you make my life a lot easier with him. I am going to miss you personally. I will not, I hope, miss your advice, which I was always able to receive before you were in this position, and I hope I will be able to receive it after you leave this position.

I would like to welcome you back for what probably is going to be your last appearance before this committee as Secretary, but I suspect that, as I said, I will not be the only one calling on your wisdom many times in the future. I am not being presumptuous about my tenure, but God willing and the crick not rising I have 2 more years.

Let me be straightforward in the very beginning. I think despite the inevitable ups and downs of an incredibly complex international relations, the administration's foreign policy, led by you, has been highly successful. You would expect me to say this, I guess, as a friend and as a Democrat, but I think you deserve a great deal of credit.

Policy begins with policymakers, and the 1997 and 1998, on a bipartisan basis, and in close cooperation with you, Madam Sec-

retary, this committee developed, and Congress approved, what your predecessors were afraid to touch, and that is landmark legislation to reorganize and streamline the foreign policy agencies of the U.S. Government, led by our chairman. He had been moving and trying to get attention on that issue for, what, 6, 8, 10 years before, but in earnest probably the previous 2 or 3 years.

By integrating the arms control and public diplomacy functions into the State Department, and by giving the Secretary of State increased authority over foreign assistance, I think we have established a sound organizational framework for the challenges of the new century, and your efforts Madam Secretary, and those of Ambassador Holbrooke, again with the great help of the chairman of the committee, have led the committee and the Congress on a much-needed change of attitude toward the United Nations.

If it was a perfect world, you and I would have written Helms-Biden slightly differently, but the fact of the matter is there is progress, significant progress, and we are I think—as I said, the attitude—the attitude has changed.

Our relationship with Russia remains strategically, in my view, our most important one. To whatever degree Russia's current weakness exists, it is still the only country with weaponry potentially available to annihilate the United States and imposes a mortal threat to us.

All of us continue to worry about the stability of that country, as well as other countries in the region, and under your leadership, Madam Secretary, the United States has worked to keep Russia's weapons technology—and the know-how of its scientists—from being transferred to rogue states.

We have had some successes, particularly regarding Russia's scientists, but preventing the transfer of technology of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems presents a persistent challenge of the highest priority there.

Perhaps no region in the world has been more senseless tragedy and upheaval and ethnic hatred in the past decade than in the Balkans, and you have been, more than anyone else in the administration, instrumental and a persuasive voice within the administration in trying to resolve the region's century-old and seemingly intractable problems, in the eyes of many Americans and Europeans.

Under your leadership, we have helped implement the Dayton Accords, returning some measure of peace and stability to that war-torn country of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and we have also moved to stop the brutal murder and forced expulsion of millions of Kosovar Albanians. Perhaps better than anyone else, you understood Europe's security and stability is vital to our own, and you realized the Balkans, and convinced others in the administration and out, that they were part of that security.

And I think you understood the moral imperative for the United States and its NATO allies to reverse Slobodan Milosevic's murderous ethnic cleansing in Kosovo and hopefully, Madam Secretary, as we discussed privately earlier with the chairman, we may be seeing the beginning of the end of Milosovic.

Much, of course, remains to be done, and I am eager to hear your views, Madam Secretary, regarding Balkan policy and the direction you think we need to take.

The Senate's passage last week of legislation granting China permanent normal trade relations, even though the chairman and I disagreed on that issue, I think has to be viewed as a significant accomplishment.

As important as trade is, though, to our overall relationship with China and to our aspirations for China, however, we must continue to press China's leaders for strict adherence to their commitments regarding nonproliferation and to international human rights and labor norms. Because we now have a trade agreement does not mean that we should cease and desist from our criticism and our attempts to change their policy.

The administration's patient diplomacy in North Korea I think is also beginning to bear some fruit. I do not want to overstate what may be the outcome, but I think any reasonable observer, objective observer would say things today are better than they were yesterday, a year ago, and 5 years ago, and I give you a good deal of credit for that.

But we are relying not only on deterrence, as we continue to do in South Korea, but also on a careful reciprocal process of engagement between the United States and South Korea. We have reduced the chances of war and I think begun to lure North Korea out of its shell into a more rational position.

Madam Secretary, the world remains endlessly complex, and our country, for better or worse, is constructively engaged in nearly every part and every facet of it, and in such a kaleidoscope no one directing U.S. foreign policy can come close to batting one thousand, but I believe you have done a remarkably good job, and again I thank the chairman for having called this hearing, for the way you and he have gotten along, because it is one of the—I should not say rare, but one of the welcome areas of bipartisan cooperation that this country needs more of, and as I said, the past 4 years has brought high hopes all round the world.

One place I did not mention was Israel and the agreement, potential agreement between Israel and the Palestinians. You and your team have worked tirelessly on this matter and I am going to ask you at an appropriate time, although I am supposed to be at the funeral of Mrs. Mansfield, which I think I am now missing, at this critical juncture I am going to ask you at some point whether or not Ambassador Indyk's loss of his security clearance will have a negative impact on that process.

But you will have time to answer that when it gets around to my questioning, but again I thank you. You have added not only a sense of dignity to the office, which has existed with other Secretaries of State, but you have made—by visiting most of our states and the way in which you have taken foreign policy to the American people you have added a sense of reality. You have helped the American people understand better what we are doing, and for that we owe you a debt of gratitude.

The CHAIRMAN. Madam Secretary, you may begin at long last.

STATEMENT OF HON. MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, SECRETARY OF STATE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman and Senators, good morning, and I am delighted to have this opportunity to appear before you

this one last time before you head home and I apply for membership in what has heretofore been known as the fraternity of former Secretaries of State.

You have my written presentation, which I know you will read carefully and make part of the record, and I will keep my remarks brief because time is short, and I want to be sure that every Senator has a chance to say how much he or she will miss me.

Mr. Chairman, over the past decade we have had to reevaluate our entire approach to international affairs in light of the geopolitical and technological changes transforming our world, and together we have had to adapt our institutions, adjust our thinking, and steer a course between isolation, which is not possible, and overreaching, which is not sustainable. Our goal has been to keep America secure and prosperous and free, and our means have included everything from military force to quiet diplomacy, with strong statements from Chairman Helms and Senator Biden somewhere in between. Our strategy has been to build from the center outward, strengthening core alliances, engaging Russia and China, building peace, repelling threats, and supporting democratic transitions in key regions.

This committee has contributed mightily through its support for NATO enlargement, the Nunn-Lugar program, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Freedom Support Act, the SEED program, the Helms-Biden bill, Plan Colombia, China PNTR, and many other initiatives. And, through your support for reorganization, I truly do believe that you have helped shape the architecture of the State Department for the 21st century. This committee also includes Senators who were right from the very beginning about the need to stand up to ethnic cleansing and intolerance in the Balkans, and on this point I would just like to comment briefly about Sunday's elections in Yugoslavia.

They provided a critical test of whether that country will remain isolated and a prisoner of its own leadership or become a part of Europe's democratic mainstream. Despite threats from Milosevic's thugs, the opposition waged a courageous campaign for change, and now they have won a sweeping endorsement at all levels from the Serb people. The authorities in Belgrade used every trick in the book to prevent a fair campaign, rig the election, and distort the results. In so doing, they have fooled no one.

Milosevic has been repudiated, and claims by his regime to the contrary are laughable. Clearly now Milosevic is a figure of the past. For too long his lawlessness has weakened Yugoslavia, his cronies have robbed Yugoslavia, and his mismanagement has all but bankrupted Yugoslavia. Given this record of failure, it is no wonder that the democratic forces have grown in unity and strength. They have earned the encouragement of the international community.

The road ahead will not be easy, and so our message now and in the future must be unified and clear. Yugoslavia belongs in Europe as a free and independent state with a normal economy, democratic institutions, and a government that neither fears nor is feared by its people. Under Milosevic, there is nowhere Yugoslavia can go. Under democratic leaders, there is no limit to what the Yugoslav people may accomplish.

Mr. Chairman, whether one serves as a Cabinet Secretary or as a Senator, we are all acutely aware that we only occupy temporarily the chairs of responsibility in American Government, but we know as well that America's responsibilities are permanent. Upon taking office, we inherit from our predecessors a mixed bag of opportunities and dangers, unfinished business, and commitments that must be kept. During our time, we devote all of our energies to clearing the in-box and fixing the hardest problems, but we labor every day knowing that when the time comes to leave, our successors will have plenty to do. The basic continuum does not change, but most everything else does.

Twenty years ago, when American diplomats sat down with their counterparts overseas, the agenda was dominated by cold war concerns, and America's interests were measured primarily by the single yardstick of superpower rivalry. Today, our agendas are far broader, and so are the demands we place on our diplomats and on others. The United States is the most powerful nation in the world, and yet when I sit down with the Foreign Ministers of even very small countries, I often have more to ask than to give. Will they change their behavior, will they support us in a number of policies?

This reflects the reality that American diplomacy in the 21st century ranges across almost the full spectrum of human activity. In the past 4 years, I spent most of my time on big-ticket issues of security, war, and peace, but I spent some of my time on everything, from the war against AIDS, to explaining our position on biotechnology, to trying to crack down on the trafficking of human beings. Our Nation's interests and responsibilities and reach are truly global, and that problems abroad, if left unaddressed, will all too often come home to America.

This past week we named the State Department after President Truman, one of our greatest international leaders, but we cannot forget that half a century ago we backed our leadership with resources. Today, even if you exclude the Marshall Plan's peak year, we only invest about one-seventh as much of our budget on foreign affairs as we did when Mr. Truman was President.

This fall, some in Congress want to cut our budget even further, and I hope that you will stop them, because the 21st century is no time for America to retreat. Congress should approve the President's full request for international affairs. The entire amount is equal to only about 1 penny of every dollar the Federal Government spends, but it will make an enormous difference to the ability of the next President and Secretary of State to ensure the security of our communities, the prosperity of our families, and the freedom of the world.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, and Senators, I want to reiterate the depth of my pride and the sense of honor I have had in representing the United States of America, first at the United Nations, and now to the world. Our country, like any other, is composed of humans and is, therefore, flawed. We are not always correct in our actions or judgments, but I know from the experience of my own life the importance and rightness of our country's ideals. I have seen first-hand the difference that our actions have made and continue to make in the lives of men, women, and children on every continent, and I believe profoundly in the goodness of the American

people and in the goodness of American power, and my faith in the future is grounded like a rock in my belief in America. This land has given me so much, and I cannot hope to repay it, but I will always be grateful to President Clinton and to this committee for allowing me the opportunity these past 7 3/4 years to give it a try.

Senators, your friendship and support has been immeasurable, and I salute you. For your hospitality today I truly thank you, and for the opportunity to continue to work with you until the very last minute I want to express in advance my heartfelt appreciation.

I will be happy to answer questions.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Albright follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT

Mr. Chairman, Senators, good morning. I am pleased to have the opportunity to see you all again.

This late in the session, I see little value in duplicating the rather encyclopedic statement I presented earlier in the year. Instead, I would like to restrict myself to three main points.

First, although there are only a few days left in this Congress, and only a few months in this Administration, there remains considerable work to be done. The world does not stand still, even for American elections. Between now and January, we can expect significant developments in key regions, and we prepare constantly to deal with the unforeseen.

During this time of transition, I ask your help in providing the kind of bipartisan support for U.S. leadership that has characterized our nation at its best, and that American interests constantly demand.

Second, I would like to highlight once more the importance of obtaining adequate resources for our international operations and programs. The next President, of whichever party, will be expected to provide strong leadership. But it takes money to forge peace, prevent proliferation, dismantle nuclear weapons, defeat drug cartels, counter terrorists, promote U.S. exports, spur development, strengthen democracy, enhance the rule of law, fight pollution, combat AIDS and otherwise defend America's interests and values around the world.

America's capacity to lead is not a partisan issue; it's a patriotic issue. At the moment, Congress is proposing to slash roughly \$2 billion from the President's budget requests for international operations and programs. If these plans prevail, the next President will take office with his foreign policy bank account depleted and his ability to respond to changing world events gravely impaired.

The 21st Century is no time for America to retreat. The cuts proposed in such key areas as security for our diplomatic personnel, nonproliferation, counter-terrorism, peacekeeping, family planning and foreign military financing are not simply disappointing; they are dangerous. Congress should approve the President's full requests for international affairs. The entire amount is equal to only about one penny for every dollar the Federal Government spends. But it makes an enormous difference to the security of our communities, the prosperity of our families and the freedom of our world.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to review briefly some of the major foreign policy accomplishments that resulted from this Administration, this Committee and this Congress working together the past few years on behalf of America, and also to take a look at where we are headed as the new century begins.

When President Clinton took office, our nation was beginning an historic re-evaluation of its entire approach to international affairs in light of the geopolitical and technological changes that were transforming our world.

Our goal was to make the most of the opportunities opened up by the prospects for East-West cooperation, while coping with the accompanying disruptions and preparing to meet emerging threats.

To succeed, we had to resist both the temptation to retreat from international affairs, and the compulsion to become involved in every crisis and conflict. We needed to steer a steady course between isolation, which is not possible in our era, and overreaching, which is not sustainable.

We had to replace the Cold War foreign policy framework with a new framework, able to meet the demands of the new century, including effective public diplomacy, and make full use of every available foreign policy tool.

Together, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I believe we have made great progress.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP

Consider, for example, that eight years ago, America was viewed widely as a drag on global economic growth, because our budget deficits were huge and our economy sluggish. Today, those deficits are gone; our people are prosperous; our economy is the world's most competitive; and our international economic leadership has been fully restored.

America's strong economy and the Administration's support for reform helped the world navigate successfully through the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. We have worked to make the international financial system more effective by placing greater emphasis on fighting corruption, creating transparency, and encouraging investments in people. We have tried to make the global economy more inclusive through targeted debt relief, helping developing countries build the capacity to meet WTO commitments, and working with Congress to enhance trade opportunities for Africa, Central America and the Caribbean.

We have worked with American business, farming and labor representatives to make world markets more equitable by negotiating beneficial trade and investment agreements, supporting core worker standards, and striving to outlaw commercial bribery and ensure the protection of intellectual property and other legal rights.

We have negotiated dozens of Open Skies and other civil aviation agreements that have benefited American communities, businesses and travelers.

The result is a world economy that is strong and growing, with the United States as its dynamic center; and an international economic agenda aimed at broadening the benefits of growth both within and among societies.

LEADING FOR A SAFER WORLD

In 1993, our most urgent security objective was to ensure the control and safe handling of weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet Union.

Since that time, with strong support from this Committee, the Administration has gained the removal of nuclear arms from three former Soviet Republics; helped deactivate thousands of nuclear warheads; strengthened the security of nuclear weapons and materials at more than 100 sites; and purchased more than 60 tons of highly-enriched uranium that could have been used by terrorists or outlaw states to build nuclear weapons.

We have also provided opportunities for tens of thousands of former Soviet weapons scientists—including chemical and biological weapons experts—to participate in peaceful commercial and research ventures at home rather than take their expertise to potentially hostile states.

Despite these steps, the job of preventing "loose nukes" and other proliferation dangers is far from complete. Russia's record on nuclear and missile exports remains mixed, whether for lack of capability or lack of will. That's why nonproliferation remains among our highest priorities in dealing with Russia at every level from the Presidential to the technical.

And it is why so much of our assistance to Russia is used for programs that reduce the chance that weapons of mass destruction or sensitive missile technology will fall into the wrong hands.

For example, funds from our Science Center program helped develop a kidney dialysis capability that is being further developed and commercialized through an Energy Department program. By providing hundreds of jobs for former weapons scientists, this program is helping to downsize Russia's closed nuclear cities and make Americans safer. It is both disturbing and puzzling, therefore, that Congress is proposing to reduce funding for the Science Centers by fifty percent.

I urge Congress to support the President's request for nonproliferation programs in their entirety, including the Science Centers and the nuclear safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

TOWARDS A EUROPE "WHOLE AND FREE"

In 1993, skeptics were saying that the Trans-Atlantic link would surely weaken in the post-Cold War world, and that NATO would lose relevance in the absence of its traditional unifying rationale.

Here again, with your help, we have proven those skeptics wrong. We have worked steadily with the European Union to broaden our partnership, develop joint responses to global challenges and fast-breaking crises, and support its plans for enlargement.

We have joined in strengthening the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, agreeing last November on a new Charter for European Security.

We have encouraged integration and cooperation through such measures as our Northern Europe Initiative and our Southeast European Cooperative Initiative.

And we have joined other Alliance leaders in strengthening NATO through the admission of three new members, and the adoption of a plan to help other aspiring Allies prepare for possible entry, and have provided military assistance to aid these countries in reaching their accession goals.

During the 1999 Washington Summit, President Clinton and his counterparts adopted a revised Strategic Concept, vowed to develop the capabilities required to respond to the full spectrum of threats NATO may face, deepened NATO's partnerships with Europe's other democracies, and agreed to strengthen the European pillar of the Alliance in a way that bolsters both Alliance effectiveness and Trans-Atlantic ties. Now NATO and the EU are in the process of forging an historic partnership to just that end.

But NATO did more during the 1990's than prepare. It also acted.

When President Clinton took office, war was raging in the Balkans, where a UN peace operation was failing, and atrocities were being committed on a daily basis. Many argued that America should look the other way and hope the fighting would simply burn itself out.

But history warns us that in this region there is no natural firebreak to conflict. So when diplomatic options were exhausted, the Administration and many Members of this Committee called for NATO airstrikes to help end the war in Bosnia. And when Slobodan Milosevic launched a campaign of terror in Kosovo, NATO launched a campaign to stop him.

This was not simply a humanitarian intervention. President Clinton was making good on a solemn pledge given by President Bush in 1992 that America would respond if Milosevic used force to repress the people of Kosovo.

NATO was proving it could act with unity and resolve to defend European stability.

And together, we were reinforcing the principle that massive violations of human rights cannot be ignored; they must be opposed.

During the past fourteen months in Kosovo, a million refugees have returned, schools and health services have reopened, a market economy has begun to function, civilian police are being trained and the KLA has been demilitarized and disarmed. The process of strengthening local autonomy will continue with the municipal elections scheduled for next month.

We did the right thing in Kosovo, but the job is far from finished. To talk about leaving prematurely, as some now do, is to suggest weakness in a region where weakness still attracts vultures. Our purpose in Kosovo is not simply to punch a time clock and move on; it is to replace the rule of force with the rule of law. So that when we do leave, order will be self-sustaining, democracy will have taken hold, and our troops can not only come home, but stay home.

Kosovo is important, but it is only one piece of a much larger puzzle.

After World War II, the Marshall Plan helped establish strong democracies in Europe's west. After the Cold War, the SEED program helped democracy take hold in Europe's center. Now, after years of conflict in the Balkans, we have forged a Stability Pact with our EU and regional partners to encourage democracy in Europe's southeast.

And we are making progress throughout the area, including the former Yugoslavia.

In recent years, Bosnia has held fair, competitive elections at every level. Croatia has made a national U-turn away from extremism and towards integration with the West. Slovenia, Macedonia and Montenegro have elected democratic leaders.

Even in Yugoslavia, democratic forces are becoming stronger. Despite threats from Milosevic's thugs, they have waged a courageous campaign for change, kindled hope among the Serb people, and brought closer the day we can welcome all of Yugoslavia into the democratic community. As this is written, we await the final results of the September 24 elections.

SECURITY AND DEMOCRACY IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Mr. Chairman, eight years ago, there were many doubts in Asia and the Pacific about America's willingness to continue playing a strong regional role in the aftermath of the Cold War. These doubts have been put to rest.

There can no longer be any question about the level of American commitment to, or interest in, Asia. President Clinton has visited there more often than any other President. I have visited more frequently than any previous Secretary of State.

With our allies and partners, we have weathered the financial crisis while encouraging financial reform. We have upgraded and modernized our security ties with our ally Japan and developed a robust Common Agenda for action on global issues.

We have welcomed South Korean President Kim Dae-jung's engagement policy with North Korea, and will resume tomorrow our own discussions with Pyongyang on issues of concern to the international community, including nuclear programs and missiles.

Our relationship with China remains both important and complex. I want to congratulate Members of both Houses of Congress for supporting legislation to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to that country. This was the right vote economically because it will enable American farmers, ranchers and businesspeople to gain greater access to China's market, and to do so under international rules about what is fair. It was the right vote from a security perspective because it encourages China's integration into the international system. And it was the right vote for the future because it will help to open China up to new influences and ideas.

Although the PNTR issue has garnered much attention, the other aspects of our relationship with China have not been neglected. We have continued to press Beijing to bring its policies and practices into line with international nonproliferation norms. We have encouraged the resumption of its dialogue with Taipei. We consult regularly regarding developments on the Korean Peninsula. And we have been firm and persistent in raising our concerns about human rights, including religious and press freedom, and respect for the unique religious, cultural and linguistic heritage of Tibet.

In Southeast Asia, we have developed a bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam, pressed hard for a democratic dialogue and respect for human rights in Burma, and assisted the UN mission in East Timor. We have also been the largest bilateral donor to the forces of civil society in Indonesia as that key nation struggles to build stability and prosperity through its promising but extremely fragile democracy.

In South Asia, President Clinton's historic trip last spring, and Prime Minister Vajpayee's recent return visit here, have helped open a promising new chapter in our relations with India, the globe's largest democracy. India can be an important partner on issues ranging from world peace to global climate change, and from cooperation in exploring the new frontiers of science to combating humanity's oldest plagues, such as poverty and disease.

At the same time, we have not forgotten our other friends in South Asia, including Pakistan. We are keeping open channels of communication to Islamabad, most recently in my meeting at UN General Assembly with Pakistan's Foreign Minister Sattar. We continue to urge Pakistan and India to observe the "four R's" articulated by President Clinton in both countries in March: restraint, respect for the Line of Control in Kashmir, rejection of violence, and renewal of dialogue. We will keep working, publicly and in private, to ease tensions and reduce the nuclear threat in this vital part of the world.

THE COMMUNITY OF THE AMERICAS

In our own hemisphere, the Summit of the Americas process has generated unprecedented level of cooperation in support of democracy, development and law. From Argentina to Alaska, we are now pursuing a common agenda towards more open economies, fighting poverty, improving education, respecting human rights, and strengthening the rule of law.

We have also given close attention to our key bilateral relationships.

For example, I was pleased last month to have the opportunity, along with President Clinton, to meet with Mexico's President-elect Vincente Fox. The growth of democratic pluralism in our southern neighbor is welcome, as is the President-elect's desire to explore fresh opportunities for cross-border cooperation.

Also in August, I had a chance to visit six countries in South America. I conveyed a strong message of support for strengthening democratic institutions, broadening economic opportunity, and enhancing regional cooperation in the fight against illegal drug trafficking.

In this connection, I want to thank Members of this Committee for supporting our supplemental request to assist President Pastrana's Plan Colombia. Every country, not only in our hemisphere, has a stake in this Plan's success. Obviously there are no easy answers in Colombia.

Illegal armed groups from the left and right feed off the narcotics trade and run roughshod over the rights of civilians. It will take more than talk to defeat the drug thugs. But at the same time, there must be an economic plan, a peace program, a commitment to human rights and an effort to prevent conflict from spreading across national borders. President Clinton, Speaker Hastert, Senator Biden and I ex-

pressed strong support for such a comprehensive approach during our visit to Colombia last month. I hope this kind of approach will continue to find bipartisan support in our country for years to come.

In Peru, President Fujimori's announcement that he will call new elections and deactivate the National Intelligence Service is welcome and provides an opportunity to strengthen Peruvian democracy. The ways and means of achieving these goals, including the appropriate date for elections, are for Peruvians to decide. The appropriate role for the international community is to urge parties to return to the OAS-sponsored dialogue on democratic reform and to cooperate in devising electoral procedures that are open, orderly, free and fair. It is vital that President Fujimori meet the commitments he has made to his people. It is also important that other participants in the political process come together in support of democratic norms, and on behalf of policies that will unite, rather than divide, the Peruvian people.

A NEW APPROACH TO AFRICA

The Clinton-Gore Administration has devoted more time and attention to Africa than any of its predecessors.

Our approach has been based on two overriding goals. The first is to integrate Africa more fully into the global economy, through the promotion of democratic reforms and the resolution of destabilizing conflicts.

The second is to work with African leaders to combat transnational security threats including terrorism, illegal drugs, crime and disease.

On the economic side, we have supported debt relief for the most heavily-indebted reforming countries, requested and obtained higher levels of development assistance, crafted an Africa Food Security Initiative, responded rapidly to humanitarian disasters such as the recent floods in Mozambique, and worked with Congress in win approval of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Diplomatically, we have lent support to regional and United Nations efforts to conclude a comprehensive peace between Ethiopia and Eritrea; end fighting in the Democratic Republic of Congo; achieve a viable internal settlement in Burundi, halt the bloodshed and violations of basic human rights in Sudan, and restore stability to Sierra Leone.

Through the Africa Crisis Response Initiative, we have sought to enhance the region's indigenous peacekeeping capabilities. We have been the largest donor to both ECOMOG and the OAU Conflict Management Center.

With strong support from Members of this Committee, and personal leadership from the President and Vice-President, we have substantially increased our investment in what must be a multi-year, around-the-clock campaign not only in Africa, but around the world to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS.

We have developed innovative counter-terrorism, counter-crime and counter-narcotics strategies for Africa, and signed an agreement this past summer to establish a regional law enforcement academy in Botswana.

And as President Clinton's recent trip indicates, we have placed special emphasis on support for the fragile democratic transition in Nigeria, Africa's most populous country. Through our Joint Economic Partnership Committee, we are helping Nigeria deliver a "democracy dividend" to its people.

LEADING FOR PEACE

Mr. Chairman, I think Americans may be especially proud in recent years of our role in trying to ease historic enmities and help one-time adversaries to settle differences peacefully.

Even when these initiatives do not succeed, they put pressure on recalcitrant parties to justify their actions, and give encouragement to those seeking a basis for agreements in the future. Congress is a full partner in these efforts, both through the counsel you give and the resources you provide.

President Clinton and former Senator George Mitchell deserve special credit for the role they played in making possible the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland, where centuries of bitterness have been supplanted by cooperation and hope.

And the President deserves praise, as well, for his indefatigable efforts on behalf of a Middle East Peace.

As Members of this Committee are well aware, the prospects for achieving an agreement between Israelis and Palestinians this year on permanent status issues diminish with each passing day. But at Camp David, Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat made unprecedented progress on matters they had not before seriously discussed. Since then, Israeli and Palestinian negotiators have explored ways to build on these gains.

Like the last miles in a marathon, the final steps towards peace in the Middle East are the hardest. But if we were to look back to the beginning of the last decade, we would realize how far the parties have come toward resolving some of the most intractable, emotional and complex issues negotiators have ever had to untangle.

Together, Israelis and Palestinians have moved far down the road to a settlement that would meet each other's core needs, and open the door to a period of greater security, prosperity and cooperation than the region has ever known. The stakes are too high for them to turn back now, or for the United States to reduce in any way its commitment to help the parties move further along that road.

PROMOTING DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Under President Clinton, the United States has led for prosperity, security and peace. We have also led for democracy.

Today, the world is more free than at any prior period. For the first time in history, more than half its people live under elected governments. But many democratic regimes are fragile, and require both internal reinforcement and outside help.

That is why, this past summer in Poland, more than 100 nations came together for the first time to reaffirm democratic principles and ensure that the democratic tide remains a rising tide around the world.

Our purpose was to initiate a global dialogue on how democratic nations can best help each other to strengthen their institutions, cooperate within international organizations and combat threats to democratic development.

We are now following up this Community of Democracies initiative through discussions with our co-convening partners, deliberations at the UN General Assembly, conversations with nongovernmental groups, bilateral dialogues with Warsaw participants, and planning for a second conference in Seoul in 2002.

DIPLOMACY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. Chairman, we have been privileged during the past decade to witness and help engineer a dramatic restructuring in our national security institutions to reflect dramatic changes in the world.

This Committee has contributed mightily through the FREEDOM Support Act, the Nunn-Lugar program, the SEED Act, consent to NATO enlargement, the reorganization legislation, the Helms-Biden bill and many other initiatives.

You have also been participants in a process of shifting and expanding the focus of American foreign policy.

Twenty years ago, when American diplomats sat down with our counterparts overseas, the agenda was dominated by Cold War concerns. And America's interests were measured primarily by the single yardstick of the superpower rivalry.

Today, our agendas are far broader and so are the demands we place on our diplomats and on others. The United States is the most powerful nation in the world. And yet, when I sit down with the Foreign Ministers of even very small countries, I often have far more to ask than to give.

My interlocutor may seek a larger USAID program, debt relief or technical assistance to help respond to one problem or another. But I may ask for cooperation and help on a long list of issues, from countering terror and interdicting drugs to economic reform and human rights.

This reflects the reality that, in our era, foreign policy is no longer comparable to a game of chess. Now, it's more like a game of pool, with each action setting off a chain reaction that rearranges every ball on the table. We are more mobile, but so are weapons, criminals, viruses and pollutants. In the West, populations are older, but almost everywhere else they are younger, and pressures for migration will accumulate if those in less-advantaged countries cannot build decent futures at home. Today, everything is connected. A society weakened by disease will find it harder to resist the predations of international criminals or to cope with environmental stress.

Because of our global interests, responsibilities and reach, no country has a greater stake than America in an international system of institutions and laws that works to improve the lives of people everywhere.

That is why we have been right to devote so much energy to reforming and improving international organizations, including the United Nations. And why we should come together now and in the future to support their vital work by meeting our obligations and striving with others to strengthen their capabilities.

In this way, we can help to blaze new trails of cooperation on what are commonly referred to as global issues. And thereby respond to opportunities and threats in a manner essential to America's long-term security and prosperity.

These challenges include protecting our planet by limiting greenhouse gas emissions; securing safe water supplies; halting desertification; promoting biodiversity; and negotiating a ban on the world's most persistent and toxic pollutants.

Equally vital is the challenge of protecting people by caring for refugees, advancing the status of women and girls, preventing the exploitation of children, saving lives through family planning and reproductive health care services, and helping law-abiding people everywhere to be more secure.

A good example of this last imperative is our strong backing for the International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, and our support for special judicial mechanisms to achieve accountability for atrocities in places such as Cambodia and Sierra Leone. We have also been working with others to collect all the evidence we can to support a possible future prosecution of Saddam Hussein. The world will be a better, safer and more just place if those who violate international humanitarian law are required to answer for their crimes.

The world will also benefit if nations close ranks against the threat posed by international criminal organizations. To this end, the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime was finalized last July with strong U.S. support. The Convention would require participating countries to criminalize such activities as money laundering, corruption of public officials and obstruction of justice.

Next month in Vienna, negotiators will meet to complete three protocols related to this Convention, on migrant smuggling, trafficking in persons, and the illicit manufacturing and sale of firearms. If adopted, these instruments can provide powerful new tools in the fight against organized crime.

We can also help by approving strong and smart domestic legislation, such as that developed by Senators Brownback and Wellstone, against trafficking in human beings.

On the surface, the many issues and accomplishments discussed above may appear to comprise a very disparate list. But in our era, democracy, prosperity and security are intimately related. The connecting thread is our goal of encouraging nations everywhere to come together around basic principles of political freedom, economic opportunity and the rule of law.

In this process, there are no final victories. Most of our efforts remain works in progress. Protecting America's interests is a 24 hour/7 day a week/365 day a year mission that has no completion date.

But our interests are served with every successful democratic transition, every conflict resolved without violence, every advance toward a more open and transparent world economy, every example of justice served, and every increase in respect for basic human rights.

I cannot conclude without repeating a request I have made every time I have appeared before this Committee. Please approve the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. If you're thinking about a goodbye present, Mr. Chairman, this would do fine.

The Senate also has before it two protocols negotiated earlier this year in Geneva, one on child soldiers and the other on the sexual exploitation of children. I urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to these treaties before going home for the year.

I also want to make a plea for passage of legislation to re-authorize the Visa Waiver program, which has been approved by the House and is now held up in the Senate. This program is essential to literally millions of American and foreign travelers, to our transportation and tourist industries, and to our relations with key allies and friends.

PARTING THOUGHTS

Mr. Chairman, and Senators, it has been a great privilege and—more often than not—a real pleasure to have worked with you these past seven and a half years. I cannot tell what the future may hold. But I leave you with these thoughts.

First, I believe very genuinely in the importance of bipartisanship in foreign policy. This is not simply because, as I have said, that upon joining the State Department I had my own partisan instincts surgically removed. It is because our role in the world is just too vital—to us, to our many allies and friends, and to our children—to be compromised for short-term political gain.

Second, there must be a true spirit of partnership between the Executive Branch and Capitol Hill. It is a tribute to Members of this Committee that on most issues, most of the time, we have had that. When we have disagreed, we have done so agreeably. And when we have acted together, we have usually prevailed. The beneficial results of our partnership provide much of the substance of my testimony today.

Third, I hope this Committee shares my pride in the people—Foreign Service Officers, Civil Service and Foreign Service Nationals—who work every day, often under very difficult and dangerous conditions, to protect our interests and tell America's story around the world. I have never been associated with a more talented, professional or dedicated group of people. We need a first-class military, and we have one. We also need first-class diplomacy, and we should give those who represent our nation abroad all the support and respect they deserve.

This means that we simply must make a far greater commitment of resources to our international operations and programs. At this point in the Administration, I hope you recognize that this is not special pleading. There are only a few days left in this Congress, and I recognize there are limits to what even the Members of this prestigious Committee can accomplish.

But I urge you to use your influence and eloquence to help give this Administration and the next the kind of support they will need to exercise strong American leadership around the globe.

Finally, I want to reiterate to you the depth of my pride and the sense of honor I have had in representing America first to the United Nations and now to the world.

Our country, like any other, is composed of humans and therefore flawed. We are not always correct in our actions or judgments. But I know from the experience of my own life the importance and rightness of our nation's ideals. I have seen firsthand the difference that our actions have made and continue to make in the lives of men, women and children on every continent. I believe profoundly in the goodness of the American people. And my faith in the future is grounded like a rock in my belief in America.

This country has given me so much; I cannot hope to repay it. But I will always be grateful to President Clinton and to this Committee for allowing me the opportunity these past seven and a half years to try.

Senators, for your friendship and support, I salute you. For your hospitality today, I thank you. And for the opportunity to continue working with you in the weeks immediately to come, I want to express in advance my heartfelt appreciation.

And now, I would be pleased to respond to any questions you might have.

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes. We are going to do the best we can. Five minutes per Senator, and I think we will just continue to ask questions after 11:30, if it meets the approval of all the Senators. I do not like playing games with whether committees can meet and how long they can meet.

Madam Secretary, since the Russian President Putin assumed the top post in Russia, basic human rights and democracy have suffered there, the Kremlin's indiscriminate and brutal war against the Chechnyan people continues today, press freedoms have been curtailed. Compounding matters, this month the *Moscow Times* documented extensive fraud in the new President's electoral victory, including the sudden and unexplained growth of 1.3 million registered Russian voters in the 3 months prior to the March Presidential election.

In your view and that of your administration, did he win that election fairly, or did he steal it?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I believe that he won it fairly, because nearly 70 percent of eligible voters participated. The election showed that basic democratic processes and institutions are taking hold in Russia, and that the Russian citizens are comfortable making their voices heard at the ballot box. The OSCE, which does a lot of monitoring, called the election—and I quote—“a massive expression of the will of the Russian people.” It did cite some concerns, as we have also, about unbalanced media coverage and pressure on the independent media. I do think that there is question about the fact that President Putin talks about the importance of an independent media but in fact is putting a great deal of pressure on the media.

Putin was the most popular candidate, and the reason for that, and I think I have spoken about this here before, is that the Russian people had a sense that there was chaos, and they wanted order. The Russian word, *poriadok*, was kind of the buzz word in Moscow. I think that the "order" he offered was something appealing to the Russian people. As we observe what is going on in Russia, I think we have to watch carefully that it is order with a small "o," and not order with a capital "O," but I do believe that he was elected fairly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chechnyan Resistance wrote you a letter sometime back asking you to endorse their five-point peace proposal for resolution of the conflict there. Should the United States endorse this proposal?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I think that what we have done, in fact, is raised very many of the same points that they have. I have said in any number of places that there has to be a political solution to the situation in Chechnya, that it cannot be solved militarily, that there needs to be access for the international agencies, and I have spoken about this to my counterpart, Foreign Minister Ivanov many times, and the President has spoken to President Putin.

We have to make very clear that we think the kind of wanton acts against the civilian population are unacceptable, and that basically they need to find an interlocutor with whom they can deal on the Chechan issue. It is coming back in a way that I think President Putin is going to have to deal with it politically, as the military solution does not work.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the most courageous democratic activists in the world today suffers under house arrest in Burma. Now, I know that the United Nations and our allies and you have eloquently raised concerns regarding the fate of that wonderful lady. On July 19, the Senate passed a resolution, and so forth.

It calls for the United States to seek multilateral support. Could you please inform the committee of efforts made by the administration to gain concrete measures of support from our allies in Asia and Europe, and what has been the response?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the saddest cases, where 10 years after she and her party were elected they are not allowed to take their rightful position, and there is no dialog between her and the Burmese Government.

We have raised this issue consistently and systematically. President Clinton raised it in his opening address to the Millennium Summit at the United Nations. I have made it a point in every single meeting that I attended to try to get a joint statement out of people in terms of support of Aung San Suu Kyi.

What happened was that they did release her temporarily after they had her under virtual house arrest. They have gone back again to denying her free movement. I can assure you that I will not let this issue drop. We are trying to make the others move. It is not easy.

The CHAIRMAN. Good. Senator Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, welcome. I am pleased to see you before the committee.

As you know, I strongly share your view that we are devoting inadequate resources to meeting our international responsibilities, and I think it has severely handicapped the ability to carry out a constructive American foreign policy in the international arena.

You obviously have spoken about that a number of times, and in fact your statement here today again emphasizes it. I think it might be helpful if you would give us some specific examples of where a shortage of commitment of resources has handicapped our ability to carry through a policy that would serve our national interests.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes. Thank you very much. Let me just make clear that the budget we submitted in the first place is bare bones in my view. We operate within an overall system, and when we asked for \$23 billion plus, it was a very careful assessment. I personally have gone through the budget review in the State Department for each of the sections. We were then cut by over \$2 billion, which is a reduction of nearly 11 percent of what we asked for.

Now, since we are operating at something that already I think is low, I have said, and you will appreciate this, that we are not only robbing Peter to pay Paul, but we are robbing Paul also. I think the problem here is that we have to keep shifting in order to be able to achieve what we want. Let me just say that if the current cuts stand, it would, for example, mean reducing U.N. peacekeeping by more than a third and thus threaten the success of our operations in Kosovo, East Timor, and Africa.

Now, I hope we have more chance to talk about peacekeeping, but I happen to think that peacekeeping, well done, is a burden-sharing operation and allows the United States, which is not involved in most peacekeeping operations, to deal with serious issues. We cannot just be stuck with doing it ourselves or doing nothing at all. Congress' proposed budget would mean a one-third cut.

The cut would also jeopardizes essential security improvements in U.S. diplomatic facilities. We have all been talking about the horrors of the bombings a couple of years ago in Kenya and Tanzania. We have been systematically trying to upgrade our diplomatic facilities. It would also limit support for what is happening in the Balkans, the Newly Independent States, and the key democracies. We can talk further about Nigeria and Indonesia, how much we have had to cut. Congress' budget would slash our funds for nonproliferation and antiterrorism programs, cripple our debt relief programs, reduce funding for international banks, and weaken our programs to boost U.S. trade.

I could go on, but those are the major problems. You cannot cut this much out of our budget, when you are already operating with less—with only a penny out of every Federal dollar—I think it is very bad. I happen to believe we need a strong defense budget. I have never argued against that. But our diplomacy and our diplomats are the first line of defense, and I think we underfund at our own jeopardy.

Senator SARBANES. Well now, a lot of people emphasize burden-sharing, and they press the point that our allies ought to be making contributions in these various endeavors, but it is my understanding that the inability of the United States, as it were, to meet

its share in various international institutions or in various joint efforts is in effect resulting in other countries not coming forward with their share, so to speak.

So, as a consequence, the international community ends up committing less resources than it might otherwise do, so that if the United States were better able to act as a catalyst in those situations, we would be able to attract contributions from other countries as well and have an international effort that was much more substantial in addressing some of these problems. Do you perceive that problem?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Absolutely, Senator, because I have seen this in various pledging conferences. We are like a magnet, and I think they want to know how much we have given. I think there is also a misapprehension here. We all know how important it is to the American people and to you that we are not the sole bearer of financial responsibility, and we are not. As far as Kosovo is concerned, for instance, or the Balkans, the Europeans are truly paying the lion's share of it. We can give you some facts and figures on it. I think they do not see that we are participating but we are, in fact, providing the seed money for force multiplying in terms of cash.

Let us take Plan Colombia as another example. We put money up, but the Europeans are now pledging in donors conferences. Spain itself has put up \$100 million. We have international responsibilities, and I think our being a part of something creates a larger fund of money, so I believe it is essential that we do our share in order to get more from the others.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Albright, I join Chairman Helms and Senator Biden in the comments they have made about your remarkable service and the period of cooperation with the committee, and I appreciate that.

I have appreciated serving with you on the National Endowment for Democracy board, and likewise applauding your work at the United Nations.

I am struck by the questions that Senator Sarbanes has asked and your responses. Let me just say that for a variety of reasons the amounts of money that have been required for American diplomacy for the State Department, for international relations simply have not been available.

I remember, as perhaps you do, after the re-election of President Clinton there had been a proposal by the State Department for its budget, obvious cuts that were publicly made by OMB. I visited with the President and asked him personally to reverse OMB, to go to bat for the State Department. Obviously you endorsed that idea, and he did, and to some extent what had been almost a straight-line secular decline of resources, when inflation was factored in, was reversed, at least in that year.

Now, then it resumed, and you are describing today a situation which is a dismal one. Perhaps at this point in your service, or in the President's service, you are really not prepared to answer this question fully, but I would like for you at least to begin today.

Why was the President, or his group, including yourself, less effective than you needed to have been in alerting the American peo-

ple to what our responsibilities are, to what we should be doing, or co-opting the Congress, persuading us?

Or, correspondingly, what failures have there been on the part of the Congress in failing to understand America's role in the world, as you say, our defense budget combined with strong diplomacy, with embassies that really do have up to speed telecommunications and are equipped really to do the job of a competitive America for trade, quite apart from diplomacy.

This just clearly does not seem to me to be the picture, and it is one in which there is a lot of responsibility to be shared, but for the moment I perceive that the American public as a whole is not alarmed about this debate over the State Department or international affairs budget, does not really share our particular grief about these situations, although people around this table care and so do you.

You know, what should we do about it, and maybe in your memoirs of the experience you will have more to say, but it just seems to me that instructing for the next administration, whether it be the Vice President of the United States or Governor Bush, that they really start off on a different track if they are to make headway in what I think is essential.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think, Senator, you have asked a key question about how we operate, and I will give you some thoughts, but I will actually do more thinking about it and do something about it after this.

First of all, I would like to say that the President is my best friend on this. I have now made a Christmas Eve call a number of times and it has brought forth more funds. I think his support of the State Department budget has been really unbelievable, and I am very grateful to him. The problem I think is that the American people got accustomed to a State Department budget when we were fighting communism and its goal was very clear. Our assistance programs were designed to get countries to be our friends versus our being their friends, so that when the world was divided into red, and red, white, and blue it was easier.

I think the issues—and I know people get sick of hearing this—are complicated and do not seem as threatening to people at this time, and we are dealing with a whole host of new issues. You, sir, have understood the fact that threat reduction in the former Soviet Union is essential to our security. That takes money, and the bulk of the money that goes to Russia and Ukraine and Kazakhstan has been for that.

I think our real problem is we have got to stop calling it foreign aid. Those are two words that do not go together, and the American people do not like them. This is not assistance to other countries. This is the way that the United States maintains its prosperity. Our prosperity today is dependent on other countries also rising and having functional economic systems and functional governments. This is not foreign assistance. It is assistance to America, and I think we need to see it that way, and not see what we do as a give-away program or supporting people that we are not interested in. We have managed to keep America at peace and prosperous and it takes assistance to America to make that happen.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I have just been advised by the majority leader that the opposition to all committees continuing their hearings this morning stands, so without objection, as chairman I am going to suggest that we are now meeting as a public meeting, instead of a hearing. I do not know what the distinction is, but one is legal and one is not.

Senator WELLSTONE. Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator WELLSTONE. I understand what you are doing, but could I make it clear to the Secretary that I am in—just to support—this is Senator Levin's request, I think, because he has not been able to get judges through for years, and I am going to have to excuse myself from the hearing out of respect for him, even though I understand what you are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you. I apologize.

The CHAIRMAN. We will miss you.

Senator DODD. I gather there is no official record of this. Is that what we are doing, that is the distinction?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, no. I intend that—and I think we would be remiss if we do not have a record for everything that the Secretary says. Now, if there is objection to that, we could just have a friendly get-together.

Senator DODD. No, I do not want to object to that. I am very interested in having the Secretary here, but there is a process and procedure which we respect here, and I have been victimized by it in the past, and I know that we respect each other's right to do so, and I do not want to undercut a process here that has been—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I am not going to debate the Senator about it. I think he knows and I know what is going on on the floor. There is a concerted effort to confuse and delay and all the rest of it.

What is the will of the remaining Senators? Shall we proceed on a hearing?

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Chairman, I think we should proceed, but I think Senator Dodd makes the point. We attempted this the other day in the Agriculture Committee. We had the Secretary present, and we continued to have a very interesting dialog but without a court reporter, so that there really was no inference that it was an official thing, but we did have, as you say, a meeting and a continuing dialog.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, all right. The chair will make another suggestion, then. Provided that C-SPAN continues its coverage of what was a hearing, we could transcribe from a tape from C-SPAN the remainder of what is said and done here. So do you wish to ask a question?

Senator DODD. Well, under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, obviously we do not have any control over C-SPAN. They can cover any meeting they want to, but I just in terms of maintaining a purity of process that we have had for years and years here—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, C-SPAN has been very cooperative with us, and I trust if they decide not to be I will have a secretary sitting by the TV set taking down every word that the Senator—

Senator DODD. I am sure she will be delighted, or he will be delighted to hear that.

The CHAIRMAN. Seriously, you may proceed, Senator.

Senator DODD. Fine, and you are——

The CHAIRMAN. Wait.

Senator DODD. Yes, but the court reporter would no longer transcribe it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll have a statement for C-SPAN. I will deliver it to them and they can include it, but let me just briefly say to you, Madam Secretary, that in so many areas, but going back to the NAFTA issue I guess in 1993, it was President Bush that negotiated the agreement, but it would not have been passed had it not been for the effectiveness of this administration.

That was before your tenure, but nonetheless an example, I guess, of some wise policy decisions, but certainly under your tenure the Middle East, the Balkans, Northern Ireland, Korea, the demonstration the other day in Sidney of the two Koreas marching in together, while we certainly have not resolved the issue here, it is certainly an indication of the direction that some of our very creative foreign policy has brought us to. It certainly did not go unnoticed by the world, so I think there is much to commend you and the Clinton administration for during your tenure as Secretary of State.

I do not know whether in 5 minutes I will have time to really discuss all of these issues, but let me just raise a few of them if I can with you. First of all, Colombia. You have raised it already by inference to Plan Colombia. I was supportive of the plan. I have great respect for what the Colombian people have been through now for years and years, but I am worried a bit about this.

The reports are not good on the human rights front. There are now a couple of battalions that have received some warning here, two vetted units, 24th Brigade and the 12th, that have been suspended from receiving training and aid as a result apparently of some human rights violations, the issue of how effective these dollars are in terms of dealing with the coca production.

If the Plan Colombia is going to work it has got to be a sustained plan, in my view. It has got to be one that we are willing to stick to for maybe as long as a decade or beyond if it is going to work. At least it seems to me the narcotraffickers and others have to have a clear understanding that we are committed to this over the long haul. I am worried that some of the reports we are getting out of this early on are going to undermine this effort, and the September vote in Latin America.

Now, some of that has been changed, I gather, but there is a lot of hesitancy among our Latin American allies. I know there is some hesitancy in Europe about this.

But I would like you to give me some idea of where you think we ought to be going with Plan Colombia as a new administration comes in next year. I would like to review to what extent we can build stronger regional support for this than presently exists, particularly among the Andean nations, so that it is not just a U.S.-Colombian effort here, but one that really does involve and enjoys

the support of our allies and friends throughout the hemisphere. Short of that, I am very concerned that this plan will not be sustainable.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I do think the following. I think we have done the right thing in having a Plan Colombia that is based on what the Colombians came up with. It is a plan by President Pastrana which we are supporting.

I believe it has the right components, and your concerns about human rights are our concerns and President Pastrana's as well. We have just been down there. President Clinton paid a visit and I have gone a number of times. Under Secretary Pickering has made it very clear that human rights are an essential aspect of the plan, and the Colombians know it, and they will pursue this.

But to answer your larger question, I do believe that this has to be sustained, because it is a complex issue, and let me focus on the region a little bit, as you have. I took a regional trip. I know how nervous they are about the fact that there will be spillover from it and that those countries need to also have a plan for trying to deal with the problem, and part of Plan Colombia does, in fact, give money to some of the countries in the region. Ecuador, for instance, is very concerned about its northern border and spillover there, so I think we have to see this as not only a way of working with Colombia but its neighboring countries.

I think there is some misunderstanding about how the region feels about it. I think they are not eager to give money to Plan Colombia themselves, but are supportive of it. At the summit in Brasilia they actually came out in support of Plan Colombia, and I think they need to see the value of it not only for Colombia but for themselves.

The plan needs its component parts. It has to continue to have a central anti-narcotrafficking aspect to it, a human rights aspect, a peace process, and an alternative economic development plan to it. I think it is a carefully constructed plan, but it cannot bring results immediately. If we give up on it and do not see it as a longer term program, I think it will undermine the region. We have to continue to see it as a regional issue.

Senator DODD. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hagel.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Madam Secretary, welcome. I did not anticipate having coffee and Danish with you this morning in our discussion format, but it is OK.

First, let me echo those who have gone before me in expressing my thanks to you and your team, under the able leadership of Assistant Secretary Larkin, for their courtesies and good work over the last few years. We are grateful. You have been an engaged, competent, honest, and faithful public servant, and to me that is the highest compliment, so thank you.

I know you would not want to be put in the position to give advice to your successor or to the next administration.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. It depends.

Senator HAGEL. Well then, that gives me considerable license and flexibility with the question.

The world, as you know as well as anyone, is interconnected, and you have expressed that thought succinctly this morning in your

statement regarding America's role in the 21st century. We should not abandon our leadership history, and future generations will judge us harshly if we should do such a thing. You have talked a little bit about budget inadequacies and a couple of other specific areas.

But I would be very interested in your thoughts, understanding that there is not one issue, I suspect, that is all overriding or all-consuming, but a number, if you could frame for this committee what the next administration in your opinion should be focusing on in this large, interconnected, overhanging big-picture world, that would give this committee, or at least this Senator, some direction as to where the next administration is going to have to focus some resources, some leadership, and some attention.

Thank you.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, let me say I think we always have to remember what foreign policy is about, and why we have a foreign policy. It is to protect our territory, our people, and our way of life. The reason that it is complex is that our territory is still between two oceans, but we have porous borders to the north and south, and must deal with issues that range from top and bottom, so to speak. Therefore we have to be concerned about such matters as terrorism, nuclear proliferation and the environment.

Americans travel everywhere now and they need to be protected everywhere. We need to work on the rule of law in countries so that they can invest properly and on a whole host of economic issues that promote prosperity. The American people will benefit from this as they travel abroad. Protecting our way of life is everything that our foreign policy is all about. So, we have to worry about narco-trafficking, and HIV/AIDS and various things that know no borders. Those are the larger issues that are the new global transnational issues that affect foreign policy as never before.

At the same time, the United States will never be able to not focus on our relationships with Russia and China. We also have to continue to keep our alliances strong. We have to deal with all parts of the world. I think that is where the situation is different today. There can be no forgotten continents.

The hardest part about being Secretary of State is to prioritize, and I have tried to do that, not always successfully, because problems come in from various places. I do think that the next Secretary of State has to understand that the future is integration of the global system. Our prosperity depends on that kind of integration, and our resources need to go to make sure that we can follow through on programs, that we have the right people in the right places, and that our diplomats are at secure facilities.

It is a very large agenda, but we are a very large and powerful country, and the world depends on us. I know that. Every day that I sit somewhere behind a sign that says, The United States, I do it not only with pride, but with the realization that unless the United States is involved there will not be a difference. We can make that difference, and asking for funds for that is not too much. A penny in every Federal dollar is not too much for the most powerful country in the world.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Grams.

Senator GRAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, always a pleasure to see you. Thank you very much for being here today.

A couple of questions. I will start out with one that has direct ties to Minnesota, an incident in Kenya recently. Also I have some questions on policy and then some housekeeping questions.

But first of all, dealing with Kenya, back on August 23 Father John Kaiser was murdered in Kenya. He was a native of Minnesota but he had spent 36 years serving a mission in Kenya, strongly advocating the human rights of Kenyans, and he was against government corruption.

Now, documents were found on Father Kaiser's body that he had intended to hand over to a commission investigating the 1992 through 1997 tribal clashes of the Great Rift Valley. Given the dismal record of the Kenyan security forces outlined in the State Department's human rights record and report, I am concerned about the integrity of the investigation by the Government of Kenya.

Do you believe that it is probable that a timely and thorough investigation of Father Kaiser's murder will be completed by the Government of Kenya, or should an independent investigation be started as well?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. First, let me say that we were shocked and saddened by this violent death. Father Kaiser, a courageous and tireless advocate of human rights in Kenya, will be greatly missed. Massive attendance at Father Kaiser's memorial services and an outpouring of public eulogies and letters demonstrate the high regard in which he was held.

Immediately after learning of Father Kaiser's death, U.S. Ambassador to Kenya, Johnnie Carson, met with high-level representatives of the government of Kenya, to demonstrate our concern and to urge the government to conduct a complete, transparent and credible investigation.

Days later, three FBI agents arrived in Kenya, at the Kenyan Government's invitation, to assist the Kenyan authorities with the investigation. The FBI continues to work on the investigation today.

We are monitoring the case of Father Kaiser closely. To date, the FBI reports that cooperation between the FBI and Kenyan officials has been excellent, and the investigation is being conducted in a professional manner. We will keep you apprised of the investigation's outcome.

Senator GRAMS. OK. I appreciate that very much. Thank you.

Dealing with a question on the Middle East and the peace process, there was a report in the September 22 Jerusalem Post that the United States is going to propose ending Israel's sovereignty of the whole of Jerusalem by handing the Temple Mount over to the U.N.

Now, the question I would have, Madam Secretary, is this true, because as the Jerusalem Post article notes, this is a serious break from the past U.S. position that the city's status was to be determined through negotiations by the two sides, and not something, I believe, that was to be imposed or suggested by the United States, so do you have a comment?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all there is nothing that can be imposed by the United States. We have spent years, months, weeks, and hours trying to get the parties to deal with each other. We assist in that way and do what we can to help move the process forward.

The reason, we have been saying that there are gaps between the positions and that the hard decisions have to be made by the leaders themselves, is because the United States cannot make existential decisions for either of these parties. So whatever is agreed to will be agreed to by the parties. There cannot be an American imposition of an agreement. There can be American assistance, American suggestions, but I can assure you that the only way there will be a comprehensive agreement is if both the parties agree to it.

Senator GRAMS. So, but are we talking formally or informally? Could this be a U.S. idea that is informally put on the table, or are we not involving ourselves in at least leading the debate?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. We are very much involved in helping. I can tell you, from having spent more time on this than practically any other issue, is that ideas come from a variety of places. They are suggested by one of the parties or the other of the parties, or outsiders, or other countries. I have just spent a lot of time in New York. There are lots of ideas out there.

We are, I have to say, the country that can make a difference on this. We have been told that even by countries that would like to have a leading role. We are the ones that have the ability, to bring the parties together when they make the tough decisions.

Senator GRAMS. So is President Clinton prepared to do this informally, to make this suggestion specifically, of turning over the Temple Mount? Is he prepared to make that proposal informally?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. The President is looking, with the parties, for a variety of ways to resolve all the issues, and I think it is only fair to say there are many ideas out there. At this stage there is no American proposal on the table. We are looking at ways that we can be of assistance.

Senator GRAMS. All right. I have another line of questioning but my time is nearly up. I will wait for another round. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Brownback.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to the committee. We are delighted to have you here again, and do a superb job, as usual. It has been a pleasure to be here on the committee and working with you, Madam Secretary.

I want to turn your attention to Iraq, if I could, and some serious violations of the sanctions regime that has taken place just in the last 2 weeks. Russia has permitted three direct commercial flights to Baghdad, and France has permitted one and is about to permit a second. Jordan is reportedly contemplating a sanctions-busting flight as well.

Although the United Nations was informed of the flights, only one of the Russian flights had explicit permission to travel to Iraq. The others had none. I would like to know a couple of things. First, do you view these flights as sanction violations and then, under the terms of the Foreign Operations Appropriation Act 2000, no assist-

ance can be provided to countries not in compliance with the U.N. sanctions on Iraq.

Obviously, France does not receive too much foreign aid from the United States, but Russia and Jordan are another matter, and in light of this section in the Foreign Operations Act, section 534, does the Clinton administration intend to proceed, given these sanctions violations?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. First of all, I do believe that we need to remember that the sanctions regime has been in effect longer than any other. Having worked on it for a long time myself, I can assure you that we will remain firm. But it is complicated because as you have pointed out, there are a number of countries that disagree with us on various parts of the sanctions regime. But interestingly enough, all of them have said that they will abide by Resolution 1284, the most recent resolution on Iraq.

We are concerned about these flights that have taken place. I did mention while I was in New York both to the French and the Russians that we did not think these flights should take place. There is a dispute about whether flights that do not carry cargo are sanctions-busting or not. The U.N. has not ruled on this. But we have made our point that these flights need approval, and we will continue to press the Russians and French on it. I think that absent any new kind of consensus, the Sanction Committee will continue to operate under the practices of the last 10 years that these flights require approval, not just notification.

Now, to answer your larger question, we give assistance to Russia because it is in our national interest. That assistance is for threat reduction—the Nunn-Lugar program—and various local government and nongovernmental organizations because we want to promote democracy. So I think we always have to remember with our assistance programs why we are doing them. In suggesting that we remove assistance from *x* country or *y* country, we must remember why we are providing it in the first place and that it is in our national interest, otherwise we would not be doing it.

Senator BROWNBACK. Have you had discussions with Jordan on their proposed flights to Baghdad?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. We have, yes.

Senator BROWNBACK. And what has been the outcome of those discussions?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, those are ongoing. We are very concerned about them. We are concerned about the fact that people cannot seem to get the facts straight on Iraq. I know that there is a great deal of compassion for the Iraqi people. The administration has compassion. Saddam Hussein does not have compassion for his people, and there is a way that he can get out from under the sanctions—by following through on what the U.N. requirements are.

He is now selling more oil for food and medicine than ever before, and we allowed that because we wanted the Iraqi people to have what they needed. But I find the misrepresentation of facts about the sanctions regime—not by you, but generally—misplaced in terms of saying that we are the ones keeping the Iraqi people from having food and medicine. There never has been an embargo on food and medicine. The only thing that has been lacking was the

money for Saddam Hussein to allow that, and the pumping of oil has now allowed that.

Senator BROWNBACK. Madam Secretary, my time is almost up. I would note to you that we are conferencing hopefully as Members this afternoon on the sex trafficking bill that we have worked on, and I talked to Under Secretary Loy about this, and I would be happy to have the State Department's support.

We really need to get at that dark side of the new globalization of the trafficking in human beings, and I am very hopeful, with strong administration support I hope we will have, we will be able to get this though and to the President shortly.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think it is a very important issue. I raise it whenever I can in bilateral meetings, and I am very proud of the lead that we have all taken on this. It is a horrible crime, and we need to deal with it.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I suggest that we have a quick 3-minute round, and then I am going to throw it open to you at the end, and things that you wanted to say that were not asked, I want you to have this wind-up time.

I want to ask about NATO. In the couple of years, a little more than, we added Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, we have not only improved the security of those countries, we have revitalized NATO, I think, and we worked together on that very well.

Is there any reason why, in 2002, the next administration should not extend invitations to other Central European democracies if they are qualified?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, as I said in my remarks, I think one of the best things we did together was NATO enlargement. I think that it revitalized the alliance, as you have said, and showed its relevance for the 21st century. I know the benefits of it already, because those countries are side-by-side with us in the Balkans and have contributed in a variety of ways and have improved their own defense capabilities, and understand the responsibilities that come with membership.

I believe that enlargement should be an open, ongoing process if the countries are ready. It is not a gift. NATO membership is not a gift. It is a responsibility. We now have the membership action plan which enables countries to get ready.

The CHAIRMAN. Last week, we had before this committee two young Cuban doctors, one of them a lady, one of them a gentleman, who defected in Zimbabwe back in May, and who had been kidnaped by Cuban officials who tried unsuccessfully to force them back to Havana.

I was stunned to discover that before they were kidnaped they had visited the U.S. Embassy in Zimbabwe on two separate occasions pleading for asylum, even telling the U.S. consular office that they were being harassed by Cuban authorities. Both times, they were turned away because the embassy refused to help them until they were interviewed by the United Nations refugee office. Now, these were not just another couple of refugees. They were defectors from one of the world's last Stalinist regimes.

Now, what I want to know, Madam Secretary, is, can the State Department do anything to ensure that such people get the urgent

sanctuary they need and, when such defectors finally reach the United States, what can the State Department do to help get visas to their families so that they can join them in this country?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think you know that my record on Cuba is clear, and I have utilized every option we have to get the Government of Cuba to reunite families and to allow the people to emigrate freely. The issue here, however, is that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in the host country has the responsibility to protect the people seeking protected status around the world. We cannot provide protective status to anyone outside our borders.

In the case of these Cuban doctors, after they had approached both the Canadian and U.S. Embassies, according to standard procedure, they were, as you said, referred to the U.N. High Commissioner. Once it was determined that they were in need of third country resettlement, officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Services traveled to Zimbabwe and interviewed these two people. They were, however, placed in detention by the Government of Zimbabwe, and we pressed the Government of Zimbabwe for their release, both publicly and privately.

Now, the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner continued to work with the Government of Zimbabwe to authorize their release from detention and departure from Zimbabwe. The Government of Zimbabwe, insisted as a condition of their departure that they not be resettled directly in the United States. The Government of Sweden agreed to receive the two of them and, once in Sweden, the two approached the U.S. Embassy and their processing for resettlement in the United States was completed.

Now, a complicating factor is that, as it turns out, publicity on these two cases proved to be counterproductive, and so we generally are declining comment in the interest of those who are seeking asylum. These situations end up being highly complicated, and I think that the problem here is that it ultimately got resolved. I think, nonetheless, that we need to be very careful in how we discuss this.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the embassy personnel in Zimbabwe handled it right?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Excuse me?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the embassy personnel handled it properly?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I do believe so, because it was their responsibility to turn it over to the U.N. High Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, fine.

Senator.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and 3 minutes is not a lot of time, so I am going to run down a couple of quick issues, and if you do not get a chance to respond to them in the time left, maybe at the end of the—

[Due to technical difficulties, a portion of the taped record was lost at this point. The Committee regrets the omission.]

The report is a compromise report, and it is working its way through parliament. On this issue, obviously, we have great respect

for our ally, Great Britain, and what they are trying to do here, but it is very, very important, it seems, to many people who are closely watching the events in Northern Ireland that there be full implementation if we are going to be successful in attracting both communities to the policing forces in Northern Ireland, and the present arrangement, the reason for the Patton report, was to try and figure out ways to break down those barriers, and so I would be very interested in whether or not there is something more the administration can be doing, or what it is doing with regard to that.

On Peru, Madam Secretary, back in 1996 Senator Leahy and I wrote a letter to the Central Intelligence Agency about our concerns over Mr. Montessino, and what our relationship was with him 5 years ago. We obviously supported, along with the Organization of American States, putting some pressure on Panama to accept him, and I wonder if you might, if time permits here, to go into that a little bit, and then whether or not you think there is going to be successful negotiations between Mr. Fujimori and the opposition parties about a new round of elections.

Last, with regard to Mexico, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison and I have introduced legislation to postpone for 1 year the certification process on the drug issue to allow for President-elect Vincente Fox and our government to try and work on a better relationship here in terms of dealing with the drug issue.

As you know, I have for years thought we ought to come up with a new process here. The certification process has been counter-productive, in my view, on the drug issue, but I would be interested to know, No. 1, whether or not the administration would support the legislation Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison and I have introduced, and some broader thoughts possibly on the certification process for the incoming administration.

I apologize for racing here, but we are only going to have a few minutes left, so it is sort of a shopping center. You have got a little bit of time if you want to respond to a couple of these, and I will wait around for your response to the others.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes. Definitely a warning to Colombia, and we made that very clear.

On the Northern Ireland issue, I think we continue to think that the Good Friday agreement really offers the best chance for some solution to this. We also believe that there are realistic prospects for putting all the paramilitary weapons beyond use within the context of that, and the Patton Commission offers the possibilities. We have been talking about this, and we urge the parties to engage with the de Chastelain Commission and agree with each other on a variety of these important goals. I can tell you that when we were in New York we did talk to the parties involved, and I can assure you that we continue to work on that.

On Peru, I think the Montessino case is one in which it was very important from talking to our Latin American friends that he not be involved in the Peruvian situation at the moment. It is very fragile and there were genuine risks that greater instability might be created. We supported his going to Panama, but we are not supporting impunity, so that he is not free of the charges against him.

I do believe that it is important to support the next round of elections. We will do everything we can through the OAS mechanism,

which I think, in fact, had a role in moving Fujimori forward to take this decision. I think our best hope here is to work with our OAS friends—and the Canadians have taken a role in this. They have a representative now in Lima, and we should continue to work through them.

I hope very much that we can ultimately move to some kind of an international mechanism on certification. I think that is the way to go, and I hope that this is not overreaching, but I think that such a mechanism should be named after Senator Coverdell.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, ma'am.

Senator Biden has returned. He went to express the sympathy of all of us to former Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, who lost his wife. We thank you for doing that, and we are in the midst of a second round, but we had one round of 5 minutes, and this one is—

Senator BIDEN. I will not take 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, this is a second round of 3 minutes. You go ahead.

Senator BIDEN. I will just ask one question, if I may. With regard to the Middle East, can you please let me know, let us know, Madam Secretary, the status of where we are right now, and the consequence, if any, of Ambassador Indyk no longer being a part of that process.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. First of all, let me indicate where we are—we are clearly in the end stretch here. I do believe, and this goes back to a question that Senator Grams asked, that President Clinton has a unique role in terms of having the confidence of the Israelis and the Palestinians, and the ability to bring the parties together as best we can through a variety of methods. These include getting them to understand where the gaps are and where and how they can come together. As was evident from the papers, Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Barak had dinner together last night. Negotiators are coming here in order for us to continue our work. We are giving it the full court press, and I hope very much that we succeed. But as I said before, unless the leaders themselves make the hard decisions, we cannot do that for them.

You asked previously about Ambassador Indyk, and let me say that I have found this a very difficult situation. The professionals within the Department of State made a recommendation that Ambassador Indyk's security clearance be suspended pending the outcome of an investigation of suspected violations of the Department of State's security procedures.

I would just like to say for the record that there has been no indication that any intelligence information was compromised at this time. This is a question of security procedures that have not been followed. Ambassador Indyk is cooperating fully with the diplomatic security and FBI investigators, and has stated that he will continue to do so. I have asked the Diplomatic Security Bureau to conduct this investigation in an expedited manner.

Now, I did have the opportunity to overturn this and it was very difficult. Ambassador Indyk is a good friend, and I respect his work very highly. I also believe, however, that it is essential that government-wide security procedures, which we are following in the State

Department, need to be abided by. I also believe that it is important to get this investigation concluded quickly.

Obviously, he will be missed within the peace process. He was a very important player, but there are others involved as well. Ambassador Ross I think is well-known to you and has everybody's respect, and has been the lead in this and will continue to be. Nonetheless, I hope very much that this is resolved quickly, and let me just say that, contrary to some newspaper headlines, the Ambassador's security clearance has been suspended, but his title and position have not. However, as this deals with the Privacy Act I think that that is as far as I should go.

Senator BIDEN. Well, at 4:30 today, as I understand, Mr. Chairman, we are—if my schedule is correct. I was not sure if it was today or tomorrow, but 4:30 today I think we are receiving a briefing on this matter—

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Correct, yes.

Senator BIDEN [continuing]. In a secure setting.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Correct.

Senator BIDEN. So I look forward to hearing that at the time. I appreciate your response, Madam Secretary, and I thank the chairman for his time.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Put very simply, Senator, I think that you know what is already a difficult task has not been made any easier as a result of this.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Albright, as you touched upon this in your statement, just scarcely over a year ago American Armed Forces and NATO allies were involved in substantial military action in Yugoslavia.

Now, just a year later, what seems to have been totally unexpected then has happened. Namely, an election has occurred in the country, although the official returns, unless something has occurred while we have been here, have not been made known.

It is reported that President Milosevic's wife, his supporters have been in conference for a long time, that the count has been suspended, or at least announcements of it, and it has all the elements that would seem obvious of a regime trying to decide what to do, given an election that had an unexpected turnout, perhaps an unexpected result.

Now, while they are conferring, what I would hope you might describe to us, if it is not confidential, is what we are doing in terms of conference. Are we in touch with our major NATO allies, and in addition, neighboring states, Hungary, for example, the Bulgarians, the Romanians, who will have a fall-out from a situation that can become volatile.

You and others have described this as a fateful moment, when you finally come to the end of a regime which may not want to go, and the violence that could occur could affect other states, including our Armed Forces who are in Kosovo, so I believe this is a very, very tense moment.

It is on the front pages of the paper, but I do not think the American people have the sense of urgency about this that they may need to have, given steps that you may need to take. Can you give us any indication of what you are doing?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, I do think that there have been a lot of nay-sayers about the importance of the Balkans to the United States, about what we have been doing, was this worth it, et cetera, et cetera.

Now, the story is not over, as I said in my remarks, but I have believed that the Balkans and their integration into a free Europe is essential for American peace and prosperity. It is the missing piece of a Europe that is whole and free. Therefore, while it may have taken a little longer than some people would have liked, I think we have done the right thing. Of the various things I am very proud of—having taken a little bit of flack on this subject—I do think that our role in the Balkans is a very important step forward.

Believe me, we have been in very close consultation. All along—and at some stage I will write about this—the consultations with our major allies, within the stability pact, and with the neighboring states on the Balkans have been the closest that I think have ever existed on a real-time basis.

We have and are continuing to be concerned about Montenegro and have made quite clear that that is of concern to us. I cannot go into detail, but I can honestly tell you that we have looked at this very, very carefully and in very close consultation. We are just hoping very much that the will of the Serbian people, who have come out in record numbers, is respected by Milosevic, and that we will be in a position to welcome a free Serbia, Yugoslavia, into the community of nations, and be able to render them assistance once Milosevic is gone, and sanctions are lifted.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Amen.

All right, Mr. Hagel.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Madam Secretary, I know national missile defense is not in your portfolio exactly, but I would be very interested in getting your perspective on national missile defense, from the perspective of viewing it through your lens on our geopolitical strategic relationships in the world. What yet needs to be done in order to implement a national missile defense system? What worked with our allies?

Within your portfolio, your general assignment responsibilities, and your grasp of the world, we would be interested in hearing your thoughts.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. When President Clinton made his decision, he did say that it was a system that needed to continue to be looked at, and that it was something that was worth having for American defense but that it was not technically ready, and I think that is the basis.

From the work that the State Department did, I think we have to look at our defense. We obviously have to do everything we can to protect the United States within an overall framework of what does not undermine what we already have. I believe that the ABM treaty is important, that there is a way that it can be adjusted that would allow for a national missile defense program to go forward.

Our allies were not persuaded, and the Russians were not persuaded, and I think that what needs to happen is that the next administration should work very closely with our allies, based on the

work that we have already done. They should explain our position to the Russians and the Chinese and the others. I think that the groundwork laid by this administration has been very important and very useful. I hope that the next administration looks into all of this in an appropriate way. We cannot do this completely alone.

Senator HAGEL. You mentioned you believe that the ABM treaty could be adjusted in order to implement a national missile defense treaty. Could you explain that?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think in the past there have been amendments to the ABM treaty. It can be done, so that the ABM treaty is vibrant and useful, and the Russians and the United States have to work on that.

Senator HAGEL. Any specific thought you have on that adjustment?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I would prefer not to go into that.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Grams.

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

Madam Secretary, to followup on Senator Biden's concerns about Ambassador Indyk, during my ongoing dialog with the State Department officials over the Department's security procedures over the last several months, the Ambassador's situation was never brought to the committee's attention. It required an anonymous caller to a committee staffer to alert us to this case.

Now, understanding all the confidentiality surrounding this, I believe it would be better for the Department to alert the committee to such sensitive ongoing investigations so that we are not caught by surprise, as I was over the weekend, so should we not reach some kind of an agreement by which you would provide periodic updates to the committee on these types of sensitive but important matters?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, let me first of all say that I believe we have been handling this in a most responsible way. We have obligations to the Intelligence Committee. They were briefed, I believe, at the appropriate time. Your staffers were there. I think that we also have to consider the Privacy Act and due process aspect of this. I feel comfortable that we handled this in an appropriate way that protects the security of the United States as well as the rights of the individual involved.

Senator GRAMS. So your feeling is you will not share this information, then, in the future under certain—

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I think that we have to do this on a case-by-case basis and understand when something is ready to be briefed. We have to think in this atmosphere a little bit about how to protect due process.

I stand down to no one in my determination to get things right at the State Department on security issues, and I have worked very hard on this. The Department over many, many, many years had a different approach to this. I have zero tolerance for security breaches, and I have made that very clear. As I said, this was a very hard decision, but I think that we have to be careful as we look at this not to begin to impinge on people's privacy and rights. We will share information as quickly as we possibly can, and I

frankly do not believe that it took an anonymous caller. We were making decisions to do this.

Senator GRAMS. Well, there appears to have been a 9-day period between the time when the diplomatic security recommendation that the Ambassador's security clearance would be suspended, and when that suspension occurred, and the briefing to the Intelligence Committee and my staff did not occur until after the anonymous call, so would there have been a briefing if that call had not been made?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. There would have been a briefing when we believed that we had all the facts in place. I believe that the Secretary of State has the right to look at issues carefully and be able to make sure that things are done right. Let me just say, in terms of the way this was done, once the recommendation to suspend his clearance was made, it was expeditiously reviewed within the Department because we wanted to do the right thing once this was completed, we took the appropriate action to suspend and to brief.

I honestly think that we have done the right thing in this, in terms of protecting security, recognizing the appropriate role that Congress needs to play in this and protecting the privacy and the rights of the individual involved in this.

Senator GRAMS. I take you at your word, but the timing does—it leaves some questions. So thank you very much, Madam Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Now then, I said before your return that I made a hundred speeches, good speeches, after the speech was delivered and I was driving home.

Senator BIDEN. As a matter of fact, I have withdrawn a number of my comments I made on my way home.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I suggested to the distinguished Secretary of State that at the conclusion of questioning she must have a dozen things on her mind that maybe she would like to discuss, and we would be glad to hear from you.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and it is characteristic of your kindness that you would allow this.

I believe that we have accomplished a lot in these years, and at a time that is so transitional and changing that it has given us huge opportunities and challenges. I believe that together we have gotten the world ready for 21st century foreign policy, but it is not there yet. The issues are quite different than they ever have been, and obviously take a much greater breadth of knowledge than either people on our side of the table or yours have had to confront previously.

I did not ever think that I would be in a position of discussing genetically modified corn with the Foreign Minister of France or Italy, for instance, or that I would have to know as much as I do about the spread of HIV/AIDS and what kinds of medicines it takes, or about every detail of what happens in a country in Africa that did not exist when I graduated from college. So I think we need to widen our scope about what we know and what we care about.

While you and I, I think, have had a remarkable relationship and I hope that it is noted, I honestly wish we had more biparti-

sanship, or nonpartisanship. I think that it would make a big difference, and I truly do believe that when somebody represents America, as we do, that we should try to be as unified as we can, and that we represent the greatest country in the world, so I would really like to see more bipartisanship.

I agree with what Senator Lugar was saying about the necessity to explain our foreign policy better to the American public. It is a little hard to do, given the way the media operates these days, and how one must get complicated issues out very quickly. When I leave, because I am a teacher, I am going to try very hard to make American foreign policy even more understandable to the American people, because a democracy cannot operate without the American people understanding. I fully believe that the American people are the most generous people in the world, and they do the right thing when they understand it. We just dedicated our building to Harry Truman, and he had ultimate faith in the American people, and I know you do, too.

I also have the greatest faith in the people who help us represent America. They are fine people who work very hard within a very, very difficult context. They do not have the money that we need to carry out our programs. Our buildings are not as secure as they should be. As I have said, there is a great deal of compassion for the American military, and I have it for them also. I have the highest respect for the American military, but I want our diplomats to be seen in the same way. They serve America in very dangerous places, and they sacrifice their lives and they are very, very good people. I need your help in getting our nominees out to their posts so we are properly represented around the world.

And to say finally, I am very grateful to you and Senator Biden for all the time we have spent on the phone and here in various meetings. You have been great partners, and I hope it is not all over yet. We have a lot more to do, and I am not going too far away. I will be always very pleased to appear before this committee in whatever role I am in.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask Senator Biden, is it in order if all of us give her a hand?

[Applause.]

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thanks a lot. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not believe that has ever been done before.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I believe not.

Senator BIDEN. Surely no Secretary of State has ever curtsied before.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it has been our pleasure, and we have got some weeks ahead, and we will be on the telephone and so forth. But thank you for being a great friend, and a great servant of the American people.

If there be no further business to come before the committee, we stand in recess.

[Whereupon, the committee recessed.]

STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

I want to thank the Chairman for holding this hearing, and to thank Secretary Albright for being here today.

I regret that I am unable to stay at the hearing in order to ask questions today. An objection has been made to committee meetings past 11:30 a.m., and I respect the right of my colleagues to use all procedural tools at their disposal. I respect the rules of the Senate, but I also respect the motive for this particular objection—the need to respond to the refusal of the majority to allow action on the nominations of several excellent judicial nominees who have been denied a vote and an opportunity to be confirmed.

Secretary Albright, your tenure as Ambassador to the United Nations, and then as Secretary of State, has coincided exactly with my tenure as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Both of your confirmation hearings, your subsequent excellent performance, and the strong relationship that you have forged with the committee are among my fondest and most satisfying memories of this committee's work.

This hearing is an ambitious one. The committee intends to examine an eight-year record of policy toward the entire world. No doubt members' questions will take us into the weeds of specific decisions relating to individual countries. But I would like to take this opportunity to make a few general remarks about the big picture—the course of American foreign policy since I joined the Senate in 1993.

America has borne, and will continue to bear, great responsibility as the world's sole superpower. This country, more than any other, can affect the course of this new century, and already has affected the shape the "post-Cold War era" that we examine today.

History teaches us that great powers often become the enemies of progress, because they perceive their interests to lie in maintaining the status quo. Great powers tend to enforce and maintain the international order from which they profit and draw strength. I believe that the challenge before this Administration, and before American foreign policy in general, is one of balancing this imperative for order and stability with another imperative, drawn from our national character and national values, to seek justice and respect for the basic rights of men and women around the world. History has also taught us that order without justice will eventually rot from within. In our own lifetimes, we have seen empires and orders crumble—from the independence movements of the 1960s to the collapse of the Soviet Union—because they could not contain the pressure within for greater justice, for human rights, and for liberty. When this country has supported corrupt orders and turned a blind eye to injustice, we have only undermined our own interests, and betrayed our own values, in the end.

The pursuit of a balance between justice and order, then, has been the fundamental task before this Administration. I fear that the Administration has sometimes been distracted from this pursuit. For example, I have been distressed by a tendency to segregate human rights issues from other items on the foreign policy agenda. I believe that we must not "de-link" human rights from trade or security issues. We must raise human rights consistently at the highest levels, in bilateral talks and in multilateral fora. I believe that that the Administration's critics are right when they insist that labor rights should be raised in the context of global trade negotiations. I fear that our China policy will suffer from the recent push to end the annual Congressional review of China's human rights record. And I believe that the influence of money in politics goes a long way toward explaining some of this deviation from our core foreign policy goal.

That said, this Administration has shown remarkable vigor in embracing new democracies around the globe. State accountability to citizens and the rule of law are two of the strongest bulwarks against oppression, and this Administration has admirably worked to increase the number of genuine democracies in the international community. The Administration has made progress in the Middle East, forged important new relationships in Europe, and has engaged the countries of Africa at higher levels than ever before. Most recently, the Administration has devoted significant resources and high-level attention to the terrible the HIV/AIDS epidemic and the crippling debt crisis, recognizing the impossibility of maintaining order or justice in a world in which poverty is a death sentence.

There is much to applaud, and much more to be done. If I had been able to stay and ask questions, I would have touched on a number of these unresolved and critically important issues. For example, this past weekend, the Indonesian army has begun to confiscate weapons from militia groups in West Timor. How credible that

effort is remains to be seen. I would have liked an opportunity to explore what the Administration plans to do if the latest Indonesian effort does not prove to be significant, and particularly to learn whether the Administration willing to delay the October's international donors' meeting for Indonesia if there is no progress on this issue.

Turning to Africa, where so many urgent needs go unmet and so many critically important issues remain unresolved, I would have explored the Administration's plans for monitoring the West African troops that the U.S. is currently training for participation in UNAMSIL. Certainly some these troops are likely to see very ugly combat; the RUF has proven its willingness to test international forces time and again. However, there are lines that should not be crossed, even in serious combat situations. I hope that the Administration plans to monitor the human rights performance of the troops we train, and to monitor the involvement of U.S.-trained troops in illicit diamond smuggling, an accusation recently leveled at Nigerian troops in Sierra Leone.

In addition, the war in DRC continues to exact a terrible human cost, and the status of the Lusaka agreement remains uncertain. The DRC conflict is very much the outcome of central Africa's recent history, and is inextricably linked to the crises in Rwanda and Burundi, crises which this Administration has seen unfold over its tenure. Many observers believe that the conflict cannot be resolved as long as there is no accountability for crimes against humanity in the region—and therefore no imperative to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate activities. I hope that the Administration is working to address the need for accountability in Congo and Burundi.

Finally, turning to a major, unresolved issue to which this Administration admirably devoted a great deal of time and energy, I am interested in the status of the Middle East peace process, and in the status of Syria's position towards Israel.

My own questions and interests bear out the Secretary's opening remarks. There is much yet to be done, and the world does not stand still for American elections. I hope that the Administration will continue to work toward peace and justice in the months ahead, and I trust that Secretary Albright will continue to insist that U.S. foreign policy reflects U.S. values throughout the remaining days of the Administration.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS TO SECRETARY ALBRIGHT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF HON. MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JESSE HELMS

EMBASSY TEMPORARY SANCTUARY

Question. In your remarks before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concerning the two Cuban defectors in Zimbabwe, you indicated that American Embassies cannot provide emergency protection for citizens of allied or enslaved states who, like the two Cuban doctors, come to our embassies in hostile third states to seek temporary sanctuary owing to an imminent danger of some kind.

There are well known instances in the recent past of Western embassies providing sanctuary or other assistance to American officials or travelers during emergencies in third countries. One such instance reportedly occurred in 1978 when Iranian revolutionaries attacked and seized the American Embassy in Tehran, and the Canadian Embassy assisted a number of our citizens in their efforts to escape from Iran.

Your answer to the Committee sent a clear message to friendly nations and peoples around the world, namely, that they may no longer count on the American embassy for such extraordinary temporary assistance when their officials or citizens are in distress. Logically, American officials and travelers could pay a corresponding price.

Is this the message which you intended to convey?

Answer. That is not the message I intended to convey. Our diplomatic and consular posts throughout the world have been instructed that, subject to the paramount importance of the safety and security of the mission and its personnel, temporary refuge may be provided to individuals of any nationality in extraordinary circumstances of imminent physical danger or imminent danger of involuntary repatriation to a country where they have a well-founded fear of persecution. As discussed in response to the second part of your question, it was the correct judgment of our embassy in Zimbabwe (as well as the Canadian Embassy), based on the evidence and information available at the time, that such extraordinary circumstances were

not present when the two Cuban doctors initially approached the embassy and were properly referred to the local Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). In any case where asylum seekers or those claiming refugee status walk into a U.S. diplomatic or consular post, the assistance that can be provided is constrained by many practical realities, including the general need to respect host country law and the ultimate dependence of the mission and its personnel on host government authorities for safety and security. In the Department's experience, such cases are normally best handled by local authorities and/or UNHCR. Moreover, publicity can be counterproductive, as was the case in Zimbabwe. With regard to the assertion that friendly nations and Peoples around the world might no longer be able to "count on" the local American embassy, I would note that the record shows just the opposite has been true for many years. In case after case where noncombatant evacuations have been necessary, it has been the American embassy that has organized the friendly diplomatic and civilian communities so that the evacuation can be carried out (normally by the U.S. military).

Question. It is our understanding that two Cuban doctors were turned away from our embassy in Harare recently because the State Department did not consider them to be in imminent danger which turned out to be a gravely mistaken judgement. In light of the extraordinary efforts of the Castro regime to recapture these doctors, as well as Castro's predictable response to the spate of defections by Cubans on other humanitarian missions, what steps will you take to alert American embassies to take special care in ensuring the security of Cubans seeking asylum?

Finally, please provide the Legal Adviser's explanation of the premise that the United States embassy in Harare was completely powerless to provide any assistance whatsoever to these defectors, and had no alternative to approaching the UNHCR.

Answer. As indicated in response to the first question, the guidance received by our diplomatic and consular posts concerning the handling of such cases is not based on nationality but is the same for all individuals without regard to nationality. And the test for temporary refuge is the same for all: are they in imminent physical danger or in imminent danger of involuntary repatriation to a country where they have a well-founded fear of persecution? Whether or not temporary refuge is given, an eventual status determination by the host government (if appropriate or in imminent danger of involuntary repatriation to a country where they have a well-founded fear of persecution? Whether or not temporary refuge is given, an eventual status determination by the host government (if appropriate refugee screening procedures are in place), or otherwise by UNHCR, is the way to determine if the individuals concerned are in fact refugees.

My statement was not intended to leave the impression that our embassy in Harare was "completely powerless" to provide assistance to the two Cubans or that there was "no alternative" to approaching UNHCR. There are substantial practical limitations on the nature and extent of the assistance we can give, particularly in a difficult environment such as Zimbabwe in this case. Moreover, in the absence of imminent danger to the two Cubans, there was no good alternative to approaching UNHCR (or referring the Cubans to UNHCR) and that doing so was fully consistent with the standing instructions given Embassy Harare and all other U.S. diplomatic and consular Posts. We are pleased that UNHCR's intervention with the Government of Zimbabwe was ultimately successful and that the two Cuban doctors were allowed to depart safely for Sweden. As you know, they were subsequently approved by INS for admission to the United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT RETIREES

Question. Why has the State Department decided to bar Foreign Service and Civil Service retirees from Main State and the Annexes unless they obtain escorts? Please list all security incidents involving retirees. Does the State Department issue renewable identification cards to its Foreign Service and Civil Service retirees? How does the State Department's new policy on escorts for retirees compare with Department of Defense and Central Intelligence Agency policies for their retirees? May former Presidents or Secretaries of State enter Main State or the Annexes at will, and without an escort?

Answer. In response to several well-publicized and unacceptable security incidents at the Department including the bugging of a seventh floor conference room and a missing lap-top possessing highly classified material, a top down review of security procedures in place at the Main State Department building was conducted. Following this review, a stricter visitor policy to the building was put in place wherein all visitors must be escorted while in the building. On September 1, 2000, this policy was extended to include State Department retirees.

The purpose of this policy was never to prohibit retirees from entering the building but was instituted in an effort to only allow unescorted access inside the building to individuals who have active employment status or activities within the Department. Retirees are welcome to visit the State Department albeit with an escort from the office they are visiting.

The Department's records of security incidents involving the possible compromise of classified information do not reflect the employment status of the violator. Therefore we cannot conduct such a search of our records. However, by definition retirees are no longer employees of the U.S. Government and the Department would not issue a security incident to retirees as it would to active employees. Retirees fall into the same category as uncleared Americans visiting our facilities. Although retirees may have held security clearances in the past upon separation with the U.S. Government any security clearances they may have once held are withdrawn. Allow me to reiterate that the recent tightening of our visitor policy was not focused on any incidents involving retirees but rather it was an attempt to adopt a stricter, more uniform access control policy.

The Department continues to issue renewable photo retirement cards, which identify the holder as a former Foreign Service Officer or Civil Service employee. Before September 1, 2000, this card allowed the bearer unescorted access inside the building. Although this identification card continues to be issued by the Bureau of Human Resources Office of Retirement, the card may no longer be utilized for unescorted access within the Department's facilities.

All intelligence community agencies have retiree escort requirements. The Department of Defense's policy for the Pentagon is similar to the Department's policy as it requires retirees to be escorted. Limiting unescorted access to individuals who have an active employment status or activities with the Department is a reasonable measure in line with access control policies in most similar institutions.

Former Presidents or Secretaries of State would not be allowed access to Department facilities without an escort, but the issue is a moot one as these individuals would receive an escort as a matter of protocol.

CHINA HUMAN RIGHTS

Question. Now that both houses of Congress have voted for PNTR for China, how will the Administration exert effective pressure for human rights improvements?

Answer. We believe principled, purposeful engagement with China on human rights is the most effective way to influence China's human rights practices over the long term.

Our long-standing policy combines vigorous external focus on the human rights situation in China with support for internal reform trends and continued economic development. Our strategy will not change post-PNTR. We will continue to tell it as it is.

Our annual Human Rights Report in February documented the marked deterioration of the human rights situation in China throughout 1999, highlighting the sharp limits the government sets on how much freedom it will tolerate and its failure to protect freedom of association, assembly, expression, religion and conscience.

Our second annual Report on International Religious Freedom this September spotlighted persecution of persons in China for peacefully practicing religious or spiritual beliefs. The report was the basis for the decision to continue the designation of China as a country of particular concern for violations of religious freedom.

We also press this issue multilaterally. Last spring, we sponsored a UN Commission on Human Rights resolution on human rights abuses in China. Although China's "no-action" motion blocked passage of our resolution, we focused international attention on this important issue.

In our bilateral contacts with Chinese leaders, we have urged repeatedly, led by the President's personal initiatives, that China live up to its international commitments to respect fundamental freedoms.

We are committed to continuing to press the Chinese government to meet its international obligations to respect fundamental human rights.

CHINA EXECUTIVE-CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION

Question. Would you favor beefing up the role of the new Executive-Congressional Commission on China by posting staff for commission in Beijing and Lhasa, and seeing a debate each year in Congress on the commission's report and recommendations?

Answer. The Executive-Congressional Commission on China provides a valuable forum for research, discussion, and analysis of the human rights situation in China. We look forward to cooperating with the Commission.

We do not believe it is appropriate for the Commission to post its personnel in China.

As the Commission conducts its review function, it will have access to the reporting from our Embassy and Consulates in China. We look forward to working with the Commission to ensure we provide the information the Commission needs.

Of course, we always welcome a constructive debate in Congress, but believe that pursuing such a debate is a question for the Congress to decide.

CHINA: U.S.-CHINA LABOR DIALOGUE

Question. Will Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman go to China this fall to press for respect for workers' rights? She was invited by the Chinese to visit last year, and though USTR and Commerce have sent high level delegations on trade issues, Labor has yet to engage Beijing on serious violations of worker rights.

Answer. The Administration remains deeply concerned about violations of worker rights in China. Pursuant to a 1998 agreement that established a bilateral labor dialogue with China, Secretary Herman hosted Zhang Zuoji, China's Minister of Labor and Social Security, for meetings in Washington in March 1999. As part of those meetings, the issues of worker rights and compliance with fundamental principles of the International Labor Organization were discussed at length. Secretary Herman asked that Minister Zhang take steps to comply with findings of the ILO's Committee on Freedom of Association, including the release of prisoners that the ILO has determined appear to be incarcerated in China for legitimate trade union activities.

In addition, the Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, the head of the U.S. delegation to the ILO Governing Body meetings, has repeatedly spoken in support of the adoption of the findings and recommendations in ILO cases that relate to incarcerations of labor leaders and the inconsistency in the law and practice in China with regard to ILO norms on basic labor rights. The Deputy Under Secretary also visited China last year to continue discussions on the labor dialogue on issues related to core labor standards.

The originally scheduled dates for Secretary Herman's visit to China were postponed by the Chinese. Secretary Herman continues to have under consideration the current invitation from the Chinese for such a visit, and she continues to give high priority to such a visit, particularly in light of the new labor elements contained in the PNTR legislation approved by the Congress.

BURMA

Question. On July 19 the U.S. Senate passed a resolution, which calls for sustaining current economic and political sanctions against Burma. It also calls for the U.S. to seek multilateral support of the U.S. sanctions policy. Please inform the committee of efforts made by the State Department to garner concrete measures from our allies in Asia and Europe to help the Burmese people.

Answer. We have worked hard to garner strong multilateral support for our sanctions policy. The European Union has joined us in implementing a variety of sanctions on the Burmese military government including suspending the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), instituting an arms embargo, limiting official government-to-government assistance to humanitarian aid only, and banning the issuance of visas to high-level military officers and government officials. Switzerland recently moved to freeze the assets of Burmese military officers. Japan has suspended the bulk of its Official Development Assistance (ODA) program. We are also working with key allies and like-minded countries in the ILO to secure the unprecedented application of Article 33 sanctions against the Burmese regime in response to its forced labor practices. Application of Article 33 entails an ILO recommendation that all ILO members review their political and economic relationship with Burma and pursue relevant sanctions as appropriate.

WEST TIMOR AND INDONESIA

Question 1. This past weekend, the Indonesian army has begun to confiscate weapons from militia groups on the West Timor/East Timor border, but has the effort been significant or mainly for public relations effect?

Answer. We have made clear to the Indonesian government that failure to take decisive action to disarm the militias could harm Jakarta's relations with the U.S. and the rest of the International Community. The militias remain a threat to peace and security in the East Timor/West Timor border region and they must be disarmed to eliminate the threat to public order and safety.

Indonesia has invited the UN Security Council to send a delegation to Indonesia to review progress in the implementation of UNSCR 1272 (1999) and 1319 (2000).

Indonesia's plan for dealing with the militias called for a period of voluntary arms surrender to be followed by weapons seizures. We note that after the short period of voluntary surrender of arms, the government has moved to an interim phase it calls "persuasion," and it is conducting sweeps to look for weapons. The Indonesian government has indicated that 81 standard automatic weapons, 1,140 homemade weapons, 69 grenades and 8,111 rounds of ammunition have been surrendered. Estimates of the number of weapons still in militia possession vary, but it is clear the process of confiscating weapons is far from complete. We have repeatedly urged the government to continue and intensify their activity until the militias are effectively disarmed and arrest militia leaders suspected of crimes and human rights abuses. We also expect the government will take steps to disband the militias, as called for by the Security Council. To date, the government has taken few steps to meet this requirement.

Question 2. Has there been any serious effort made by the Indonesian authorities to arrest Eurico Guterres and other militia leaders, either for their role in East Timor last year or on illegal weapons charges?

Answer. The Indonesian police arrested Eurico Guterres on October 4 on charges of illegal weapons possession and for inciting his followers to reclaim weapons handed over to the Indonesian authorities in West Timor on September 24. We welcome his arrest as a first step in ending militia violence in East and West Timor and hope the Indonesian authorities will conduct a thorough investigation into his activities. This investigation must include his possible involvement in the Atambua attack on September 6 in which three UNHCR workers—including a U.S. citizen—were brutally murdered. This investigation must also include his alleged involvement in atrocities committed in East Timor following the independence referendum in August 1999, for which the Indonesian Attorney General's office has named him as a suspect. We will closely follow the Indonesian investigation of Eurico Guterres, and we look for additional investigations of militia leaders.

Question 3. What arrangement, if any, has been made for the repatriation of refugees wishing to return to East Timor? What needs to be done to create the necessary safe conditions for the return of UNHCR and other relief workers?

Answer. Spontaneous, small-scale repatriation to East Timor of refugees continues despite the evacuation of almost all expatriate relief workers. Returnees make their own way to the border where they are received and assisted by the UN. More organized, larger-scale repatriation will require security in West Timor so that refugees are free to choose to go to East Timor and so that relief agencies can be present to assist with the movements.

The Government of Indonesia has initiated an effort to confiscate weapons belonging to militias operating in West Timor but to date the effort has been insufficient to ensure security and the GOI has not established a deadline for this task to be completed. It is crucial that disarmament and disbanding of militia succeed in order to allow refugees in West Timor the opportunity to decide in peace where they wish to settle, and to bring peace to the citizens of West Timor. In addition, UNHCR workers will not be able to return to assist until their security is assured.

The United States government has contributed over \$75 million in humanitarian assistance for victims of the conflict, including refugees in West Timor, since the crisis in the territory began in September 1999. An additional \$25 million has been provided by the United States government for employment generation and economic support efforts in East Timor over the last fiscal year.

Question 4. Does the U.S. support the formation of an independent fact finding team to investigate who was responsible for the murder of UN workers, local villagers and a militia leader on September 5th and 6th as the Indonesian Human Rights Commission has recommended?

Answer. We place great importance on a thorough investigation of the circumstances surrounding the terrible murders of UNHCR workers and Timorese residents in Atambua on September 5th and 6th. We strongly support UN Security Council Resolution 1319, which calls for the Indonesian government to bring the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. The Indonesian government has pledged to comply with the terms of Resolution 1319. We have repeatedly urged Indonesia's leaders to fulfill this commitment and pursue their investigation in a vigorous, expeditious, and credible fashion—emphasizing the need for concrete results rather than rhetoric. We welcome the planned Security Council mission to Indonesian—including West Timor—scheduled for November, which will review Indonesian progress in complying with Resolution 1319. We will continue to follow closely the progress of

the Indonesian investigation, which has led to the arrest of seven suspects to date. While we support a credible Indonesian investigation as the best way of proceeding, we will have to consider an international mechanism if the Indonesian-led process does not prove to be credible.

Question 5. Is the Administration engaged in discussions with other donors and the World Bank on how best to use the international donor meeting for Indonesia in Tokyo, Oct. 18-19, to press for concrete progress to end human rights abuses in West Timor, Aceh, the Moluccas, and elsewhere? Will the U.S., along with the EU, and others, try to delay the meeting if the crisis on the West Timor border is not satisfactorily resolved?

Answer. The USG has led efforts among major donors to discuss ways in which the Consultative Group for Indonesia (CGI) can be used as a forum to express the grave concerns of the international community regarding the need for Indonesia to make real progress in implementing USCR 1319 and resolving the problems in West Timor. We have been successful in coordinating our CGI statements with those of most other major donors to emphasize that continued economic support for Indonesia will depend in part on progress in resolving the country's problems in its provinces. The USG determined that this coordinated action at the CGI was more practicable and acceptable to other donors than attempting to delay the CGI.

CAMBODIA: KHMER ROUGE TRIBUNAL

Question. The negotiations between the UN and Cambodia over creating a tribunal to bring Khmer Rouge leaders to justice appear to be at a standstill. What can the U.S. do to help jumpstart the process, while not compromising on the highest possible international standards for conducting such trials? Do you expect the UN and the Cambodian government to sign an MOU this year?

Answer. In April of this year, the UN and the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) agreed in principle on the conditions necessary to create Extraordinary Chambers of the Cambodian Court to try former senior Khmer Rouge leaders for crimes committed during their regime (1975–1979). In July, both sides reaffirmed their intention to create and conduct such Extraordinary Chambers.

The next step will be for the Cambodian National Assembly to debate and pass a law implementing the Extraordinary Chambers and permitting international participation in the Cambodian Court for the purpose of bringing former senior Khmer Rouge leaders to justice. We understand that the legislative committee of the National Assembly has begun the necessary first step of reviewing the articles of the draft law with representatives of the Royal Government of Cambodia. The committee must finish reviewing the legislation, then present it to the National Assembly at large. Once the legislation has been passed, the UN and the RGC will be able to sign a formal MOU.

Our Ambassador in Phnom Penh has been discussing the timetable for possible presentation of the legislation to the National Assembly with the highest levels of the Cambodian government. The RGC has assured us that consideration of the draft legislation will resume as soon as possible, given delays caused by recent massive flooding in Cambodia. We have consistently urged the RGC to move forward as quickly as possible on this matter, and will continue to do so at every opportunity.

CAMBODIA: DEMOBILIZATION OF MILITARY

Question. Reintegration of factional armies into the Royal Cambodian Armed forces, and demobilization of Cambodia's bloated military, is now a priority. The U.S. is one of the funders of Cambodia's demobilization program. What steps can be taken to insure that military enrollment does not increase with either real or phantom troops as the demobilization program is implemented, that weapons are actually confiscated, and that elite forces in Phnom Penh—as well as provincial forces and commune-level militia—are included in the demobilization program?

Answer. The U.S. provides no assistance to Cambodia for the demobilization effort, although the World Bank, to which the U.S. contributes, will provide funding. The demobilization process for the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces (RCAF) serves a twofold purpose: demilitarization of armed forces which have swelled from thirty years of war and civil strife, and reshaping the national budget to allocate more resources to social needs. Demobilization remains a crucial condition for broader and continued international financial aid and loans.

A pilot program conducted earlier this year by the RGC demobilized 1,500 soldiers, and was undertaken to help assess the costs of conducting larger-scale demobilization and to determine an equitable level of compensation to be allotted to each demobilized soldier. The pilot program has two components, (1) immediate demobili-

zation of soldiers with one year's compensation, and confiscation of arms, and (2) provision of training and development of infrastructure to provide sustainable income to the demobilized. The crucial second phase has not yet occurred due to delayed funding from donors. The RGC has said it will not proceed with the full demobilization until the pilot program is complete.

The RCAF has completed a computerized registration of all soldiers and has produced numerical targets for demobilization based on this accounting. Currently there is no recruitment into the RCAF and donors will closely monitor the demobilization effort and military budget. Elite forces (e.g., body guard and special forces units) are not targeted for demobilization under the demobilization program, nor are provincial militias, which fall under the authority of the Ministry of Interior, rather than the RCAF. We will continue to press the RGC to proceed with a separate demobilization of militia and police.

VIETNAM—RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Question. The Communist Government in Vietnam continues to ban independent religious activities and repress religious practitioners who want to exercise their freedom of religion. Mr. Truong Van Thuc, a Hoa Hao Buddhist, will be tried today along with: Nguyen Chau Lang, Tran Van Be Cao, and Tran Nguyen Huon for crimes described as defaming the government and abusing democracy.

Madam Secretary, how will you and others in the Administration initiate strong and immediate intervention with the Government of Vietnam on behalf of the above Hoa Hao Buddhists and urge their early release from prison?

Answer. The State Department deplores all restrictions on religious freedom. Department officials, along with our Embassy in Hanoi and our Consulate in Ho Chi Minh City, frankly and frequently express to the Vietnamese Government our concerns about religious freedom. During my September 21 meeting with Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nien, I pressed the issue of Vietnamese Government harassment of religious adherents who do not belong to officially-recognized religious organizations. Former Ambassador for International Religious Freedom Seiple discussed this issue at length with the Vietnamese during the last meeting of our Human Rights Dialogue. Ambassador Peterson regularly raises these issues at the highest levels of the government in Hanoi. While immediate results may not be apparent, our engagement with the Vietnamese Government on this issue has contributed to the release of some persons who have been detained for religious practices. We will continue to monitor religious freedom in Vietnam, and to urge that the Vietnamese Government respect the basic right to freedom of religion.

VIETNAM—HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

Question. How will President Clinton's upcoming visit to Vietnam be used to promote significant improvements in human rights and ensure that Vietnam's progress in political reform keeps pace with economic change?

Answer. President Clinton's upcoming visit to Vietnam will promote U.S. policy goals as part of a strategy of engagement with Vietnam. The President will use his meetings with Vietnam's leaders to press for the fullest possible accounting for American POW/MIAs, freedom of emigration, and respect for human rights and religious freedom. He will also encourage them to continue with economic reform, to provide increased opportunities to U.S. business, and to contribute constructively to Asian regional stability.

VIETNAM—PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Question. What will President Clinton do both prior to and during his visit to press for significant, realistic and tangible progress in human rights, specifically in terms of addressing the harassment and silencing of government critics and restrictions on basic rights of free expression, freedom of association, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press?

Answer. As the State Department's annual human rights reports make clear, this Administration is well aware that Vietnam has a long way to go to meet international standards of respect for human rights. While the White House is the most appropriate source for information about the President's specific actions and activities, I fully expect that the President will use his meetings with Vietnam's leaders to underscore our concerns about Vietnam's performance in the realm of human rights.

U.S.-VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS DIALOGUE

Question. How can the U.S. beef up its bilateral human rights “dialogue” meetings with Vietnam, which since 1994 have led to little or no substantial progress beyond providing a forum for exchange and discussion?

Answer. The annual Human Rights Dialogue with Vietnam, which began in 1992, has become increasingly frank and substantive. These exchanges have served as a vehicle for demonstrating to Vietnam that the recognition of international human rights principles is a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. While progress may be slow in coming, we are convinced that, over time, Vietnam will see that its interests will be best served by adhering to international standards of respect for human rights.

VIETNAM—PRESIDENTIAL TRIP THEMES

Question. Does the President intend to apologize to Vietnam for our involvement in the Vietnam War?

Answer. While the White House is the most appropriate source for information about the President’s specific actions and activities, we do not expect the President to apologize to Vietnam for the United States role in Vietnam.

MALAYSIA: IMPRISONMENT OF ANWAR IBRAHIM

Question. Does the State Department still oppose the imprisonment of Dato Seri Anwar? Are efforts being made to bring up the treatment of Dato Seri Anwar and other Malaysian political prisoners in bilateral discussion? Will you instruct our Ambassador to Malaysia to do everything possible to pressure the Malaysian government to release Dato Seri Anwar?

Answer. We have repeatedly stated our concerns about Anwar Ibrahim’s situation, and have joined others in openly questioning, on many occasions, the fairness of his treatment. We have made our concerns about Anwar and other Malaysian human rights issues known to the government of Malaysia, and will continue to do so. The strong views we conveyed to the Malaysian government have been reflected as well in many public statements about this matter.

Our statements have cited concerns about his detention under Malaysia’s Internal Security Act and his treatment in prison. We have publicly criticized questionable aspects of his initial trial. On the conclusion of his most recent trial in early August on a second set of charges, our spokesman issued statement expressing our further outrage over this new conviction and the heavy sentences meted out to Anwar and his adopted brother Sukma. The statement also highlighted our concerns over the many questionable legal procedures that arose during Anwar’s trial.

The U.S. Government considers Anwar to be a political prisoner and has identified him as such in the Department’s Human Rights Report.

MALAYSIA: DOING BUSINESS IN MALAYSIA

Question. What is the State Department doing to ensure the safety of U.S. citizens doing business in Malaysia; and is the State Department currently warning Americans who wish to do business in Malaysia about the arbitrary nature of that country’s judicial system?

Answer. The Department of State’s annual human rights report notes that “Since 1988, Government action, constitutional amendments, legislation restricting judicial review, and other factors have eroded judicial independence and have strengthened executive influence over the judiciary.” The American business community in Malaysia, of course, is well aware of the situation with regard to the Malaysian judiciary.

However, we have had no report of improper judicial actions against American investors. The American Embassy works closely with the American Chamber of Commerce in Malaysia and its members and regularly briefs visiting American business executives. In discussions with American firms and individuals considering investments in Malaysia and other foreign countries, as a matter of course we urge them to review carefully all available and pertinent information on their possible investment destinations. We will continue to do so.

CHINA PROLIFERATION SANCTIONS, JAPAN WHALING SANCTIONS

Question. On September 13, the Clinton-Gore Administration helped defeat a Senate amendment that would have provided for sanctions against China for its proliferation activities around the world. On that very day, the Administration announced that it was initiating sanctions against Japan because Japan had resumed whaling.

So here we have the Clinton-Gore Administration refusing to sanction an adversarial nation, China, over a critical national security threat—nuclear proliferation, while simultaneously sanctioning a treaty ally, Japan, over a manifestly trivial issue—whaling.

Why should this not be viewed as an example of misplaced foreign policy priorities?

Answer. Nonproliferation is one of the most important issues for this Administration and is a key component in our relationship with China. As has been pointed out many times, we have serious concerns about the missile- and weapons of mass destruction-related export activities of Chinese entities. We have sanctioned Chinese entities before (1991, 1993, and 1997) for proliferation-related activities, and we will do so again if warranted.

The question is not one of commitment, therefore, but of results. We continue to believe that our current approach is the most effective way to make progress with China in the nonproliferation area. Our 1997 agreement on Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy and the accompanying strengthening of China's nuclear related export control regime is a case in point. We will not relent in our efforts to bring China's policies and practices in line with international norms.

As for the response to the expanded Japanese whaling program, the Administration does not consider this a trivial matter. Despite international protection, Japan expanded its North Pacific lethal "scientific" whaling program to include two endangered or threatened species, the sperm and Brydes whales. Commerce Secretary Mineta certified Japan under the Pelly Amendment to the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967, a law that requires the Secretary to notify the President whenever the Secretary determines that a country is taking actions that undermine the effectiveness of an international fishery conservation program—in this case, that of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). The certification triggers a process for the President to consider trade measures against Japan and requires him to report to Congress within sixty days on any action taken by him pursuant to the certification. Our goal is an outcome that protects this threatened resource and strengthens the effectiveness of the IWC.

HONG KONG

Question. Why did the Clinton-Gore Administration deem the recent Hong Kong elections as "free and fair," when more than 50 percent of the seats in Hong Kong's legislature were not democratically chosen and in fact were packed with people who are loyal to the Communist Chinese government?

Answer. The Administration's assessment that Hong Kong's elections were "free and fair" referred to the conduct of the electoral process. Most observers, including democratic parties and civic organizations, agree that the elections were widely contested and free of fraud or malfeasance. Restrictions on campaign spending and regulations requiring equal airtime were rigorously and fairly enforced. The Administration recognizes that only 24 of the 60 Legislative Council seats are fully democratic, i.e., directly elected by Hong Kong's people. We have never endorsed the British instituted system of "functional constituencies" or the "Election Committee" by which the other 36 seats were elected by significantly smaller numbers of voters. However, there have been no reports that any of those "closed circle" elections were characterized by fraud.

In addition to commenting on constitutional limitations on the power of the legislature, the State Department's press statement on the elections also noted that Hong Kong's mini-constitution, the Basic Law, states the election of all members of the legislative council by universal suffrage is the "ultimate aim." The United States continues to push for increased democratization in Hong Kong at a pace the people of Hong Kong want.

RESPONSES OF HON. MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR GORDON SMITH

NATO ENLARGEMENT

Question 1. Are there any Central European states that are prepared today to join the Alliance?

Answer. NATO has not made any decisions on extending invitations to any of the nine self-designated aspirant countries—Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia. At the April 1999 Washington

Summit, NATO agreed to review this process at its next summit, which will be held no later than 2002.

The Administration, however, strongly supports an Open Door policy on NATO enlargement. President Clinton has stated: "NATO's door is and will remain open to every Partner nation, and America is determined to create the conditions under which [aspirant countries] can one day walk through that door." Under the Membership Action Plan, NATO with full U.S. participation is working with the aspirants to help them become as strong candidates as they possibly can.

The aspirant countries are fully engaged in the MAP process in order to enhance their candidacies for eventual membership in the Alliance.

Question 2. As you know, Madam Secretary, at the Washington Summit, the Alliance committed to address the issue of NATO enlargement in 2002. What, specifically, is the Clinton Administration doing to encourage our current Allies to be more supportive of NATO enlargement in 2002?

Answer. We remain committed to establishing a Europe that is whole and free, and—pursuant to that policy—NATO enlargement remains a high priority. As NATO moves toward its next summit in 2002, the U.S. and its Allies focus on the issue in both bilateral and multilateral contexts. For example, via NATO's Membership Action Plan, Allies regularly meet in a structured program and review the efforts of the nine aspirant countries to improve their candidacies for membership.

Most recently, during their meeting in Florence in May, NATO's foreign ministers reaffirmed the Alliance commitment to remain open to new members. Also in May, all nine foreign ministers of aspirant countries, meeting in Vilnius, Lithuania, underscored their commitment to taking the steps needed to fully implement their MAP programs.

NATO will remain seized with this issue. Throughout the next year and into 2002 (the next summit is not yet scheduled but should take place the first half of that year), Allies will continue to work with aspirants via MAP. The U.S. will also continue to offer aspirants advice in bilateral and regional contexts.

NATO

Question. How do you assess the performance of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as new Allies?

Answer. NATO's three newest members—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—are effectively integrating into the Alliance. All three are fully engaged in NATO's Defense Planning Process and are committed to providing the forces and resources that NATO is asking of them. The three newest members can provide military forces to NATO's Reaction Forces and are supporting operations in the Balkans.

The defense budgets for the three countries have increased for the last three years and, despite domestic economic challenges, each has committed to increase or maintain at year 2000 levels its defense expenditures for 2001. The greatest challenge the three newest members face is the same faced by all NATO members: a lack of sufficient financial resources to implement all of their modernization programs and NATO Force Goals.

They continue to reform, restructure and modernize their military structures to make them more mobile and more interoperable with other Allies' militaries. Particular emphasis is being placed on personnel reform issues and on the replacement or modernization of obsolete equipment.

The three new members engaged in Operation ALLIED FORCE and supported NATO objectives. All three nations supported the air campaign by offering or providing the use of their airfields for the basing of NATO aircraft and troops and by allowing the transit of NATO forces through their territory.

Further, all three nations provided financial assistance to Albanian refugees, accepted or agreed to take Albanian refugees from Kosovo, and deployed military forces and aircraft to Albania in support of humanitarian operations. Currently, each nation has military forces deployed in support of KFOR and SFOR.

The three new members, particularly the Czech Republic, gave support to the democratic opposition in Serbia. Additionally, the three new members are sharing their experiences in preparing for NATO membership and providing invaluable assistance to those nations aspiring to join the Alliance.

Overall—in a process that will take time to fully complete—I believe we must be pleased with the record to date on the performance of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as our newest NATO Allies.

EUROPE

Question 1. What impact do you expect the European Union's new defense identity to have on the process of NATO enlargement? Is the EU focussing more on this effort, than on the further inclusion of Central European countries in the Alliance?

Answer. ESDI/P and NATO enlargement both figure prominently on the transatlantic security agenda. Getting ESDI right means that the Alliance will also be stronger. NATO has not made any decisions on extending invitations to any of the nine self-designated aspirant countries. At the April 1999 Washington Summit, NATO agreed that the door remains open to new members and they committed to review the enlargement process at the next Alliance summit, to be held no later than 2002. The May 2000 Florence Ministerial reaffirmed this commitment as NATO Allies continue to work with aspirants via the Alliance's Membership Action Plan.

The EU has made a commitment to the further inclusion of new EU members in order to establish a Europe that is whole and free. The U.S. supports development of ESDI/P. The Open Door Policy on NATO enlargement, a successful ESDI/P as part of an Alliance framework, and integration of transitory democracies in Central Europe are mutually reinforcing developments.

Question 2. Would the EU headline goal, if fulfilled, substantially increase the ability of our European NATO members to better contribute to a high-intensity NATO military operation, such as the NATO bombing campaign in Serbia?

Answer. The EU Headline Goal aims to establish a rapid reaction EU force, consisting of 50,000-60,000 soldiers, capable of undertaking a range of crisis intervention missions—the so-called Petersburg tasks. If successfully implemented, the resulting enhanced European capabilities will benefit NATO as well as the EU. At the Feira Summit in June, EU member states again reaffirmed that the Headline Goal and NATO's Defense Capabilities Initiative will be mutually reinforcing.

Successful implementation of ESDI/P and DCI would give the EU member states in the Alliance the capabilities to carry a greater share of the burden in possible peacekeeping operations. This is why we support ESDI/P—it will address the transatlantic gap in capabilities while ensuring that NATO as a whole will act when its interests are at stake.

NATO/ICTY

Question. Did NATO's review of its conduct during Operation Allied Force in response to the investigation by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia set a legal precedent that gives the Tribunal or any other international organization the right to investigate NATO activities, including those involving U.S. personnel?

Answer. The jurisdiction of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia's (ICTY) is set out in UN Security Council Resolution 827 (1993). NATO responded voluntarily to questions from the Prosecutor of ICTY, which were part of an informal internal inquiry by ICTY and not a formal "investigation." Voluntary cooperation, by its nature, does not create a legal precedent. The United States policy is to cooperate fully with the ICTY Office of the Prosecutor, whether legally required to do so or not. We and ICTY consider this matter now closed.

RUSSIAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

Question 1. What steps has the Administration taken during the past year to indicate U.S. concerns about Russian Government interference in the internal affairs of the Russian Jewish Community?

Answer. The Administration continues to make religious freedom in Russia a priority. Freedom of religion and the rights of religious communities to conduct their internal affairs is an essential part of Russia's democratic transition.

We have conveyed to the Russian Government in our bilateral meetings our concern that religious communities, including the Jewish community, be free to conduct their internal affairs without government interference. The President, Secretary and other USG officials have discussed religious freedom during their meetings with senior Russian officials. Our views have also been put forward in public statements and reports which, we know, are followed closely by the Russian Government.

Our Embassy maintains close contacts with all segments of the Jewish community in Russia and meets regularly with Jewish leaders to discuss this and other issues of importance to the community.

Question 2. How confident are you of the Russian Government's commitment and ability to safeguard the rights of Russia's Jewish community, as well as other religious and ethnic minorities?

Answer. President Putin recently made a strong statement in support of the Russian Jewish community, noting the importance of religious pluralism and respect for Russia's traditional religions.

There have been statements and other actions by the Russian Government in recent weeks, however, that raise questions about the Russian Government's attitudes toward the Jewish Community. For example, on October 19, the police raided the Choral Synagogue 19. Earlier this fall, an anti-Semitic article in the press was attributed to a member of the Presidential Administration.

We have called on the Russian Government to disavow these acts. In response, the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has stated that the Russian Government is committed to protecting religious freedom.

The registration of religious groups and organizations required by Russia's Law on Religion is proceeding at a faster pace but there is some concern that all groups will not be registered by the December 31 deadline. Many of the earlier registration problems can be traced to confusing registration procedures or to local officials who do not understand the process. In some instances, however, local officials have used the process to discriminate against minority religions. In cases where the religious denomination has filed suit, the courts have generally ruled in their favor.

We have urged Russian Government to do more to bring local officials and regulations in line with federal law and to give religious organizations every opportunity to register. Russian Government officials have offered assurances that most all registrations will be approved by the deadline. Potentially hundreds of groups may not be, but it is our understanding based on conversations with Russian Government officials that those groups not registered will not automatically lose their juridical status. Authorities must seek a court order before that status is withdrawn. This is a different interpretation than what religious organizations were led to believe earlier this year, and we hope that this is evidence that the government wishes to be responsive to religious freedom concerns.

The Department and our embassy and consulates in Russia have actively supported religious freedom, regularly meeting with government and religious officials and investigating reports of violations of religious freedom.

