

**STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED
PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL
YEAR 2009**

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 3288

AN ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR END-
ING SEPTEMBER 30, 2009, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Department of State
United States Agency for International Development

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

41-269 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2009

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia, *Chairman*

DANIEL K. INOUE, Hawaii	THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont	TED STEVENS, Alaska
TOM HARKIN, Iowa	ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland	PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
HERB KOHL, Wisconsin	CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
PATTY MURRAY, Washington	MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota	RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama
DIANNE FEINSTEIN, California	JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois	ROBERT F. BENNETT, Utah
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota	LARRY CRAIG, Idaho
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
JACK REED, Rhode Island	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, New Jersey	WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado
BEN NELSON, Nebraska	LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee

CHARLES KIEFFER, *Staff Director*
BRUCE EVANS, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont, *Chairman*

DANIEL K. INOUE, Hawaii	JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
TOM HARKIN, Iowa	MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland	ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois	ROBERT F. BENNETT, Utah
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota	CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
JACK REED, Rhode Island	LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee

Professional Staff

TIM RIESER
KATE ELTRICH
NIKOLE MANATT
PAUL GROVE (*Minority*)
MICHELE WYMER (*Minority*)
LASHAWNDA SMITH (*Minority*)

Administrative Support

RENAN SNOWDEN

CONTENTS

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2008

	Page
United States Agency for International Development	1

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2008

Department of State: Office of the Secretary	31
--	----

**STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED
PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL
YEAR 2009**

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2008

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 2:36 p.m., in room SD-138, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Patrick J. Leahy (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Leahy, Gregg, and Bennett.

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

STATEMENT OF HENRIETTA H. FORE, ADMINISTRATOR AND DIRECTOR OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

Senator LEAHY. They've doctored up this hearing room a little bit. I have to get used to where all the buttons are for the sound, as this is the first hearing of the subcommittee this year.

Senator Gregg and I have a strong interest in ensuring that our foreign aid dollars are used wisely. There have been a lot of examples, of course, where they have not been, and there have been a number of great examples where they have.

Iraq comes to mind as one example of how not to do it. If USAID had been listened to earlier, I think there would have been a lot less money wasted. We'll hold a hearing in the full committee on the Iraq reconstruction fiasco a week from today.

We also have some concerns with the effectiveness of our programs in Afghanistan and Pakistan, countries that do not get enough attention, and where we should be doing more. I'm speaking now of USAID's role.

I'm delighted that Henrietta Fore is here. She is the Director of United States Foreign Assistance. She is Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development. It's quite a mouthful of a title. Ms. Fore, we appreciate you being here.

Some say there's not enough time in an election year to accomplish anything significant. I disagree with that. We have a lot to do. We should make the most of the time we have. We want to focus on the President's fiscal year 2009 budget request for USAID, and there's a great deal in the President's request that I support.

He proposes higher levels of funding for development assistance than he has before. These funds support USAID's core programs.

They have strong bipartisan congressional support. For international health, the President proposes higher amounts for HIV/AIDS, malaria, and neglected tropical diseases.

I met with him last week, with some other leaders from the House and Senate, to talk about his Africa trip. I did point out to him, that once again, he has cut funding for child survival and maternal health, and family planning and reproductive health.

You can't take away with one hand what you gave with the other. We've got to get that in balance. One of the President's proposals is to recruit and train 300 new Foreign Service Officers to begin to rebuild USAID's professional workforce. It's long overdue.

I will support the President on that. It's something I called for years ago. I think we would be a lot further along if people had listened back then, but I'm willing to welcome converts whenever they show up.

But, in the meantime, USAID's professional staff has become a shadow of what it was. We routinely hear that USAID has become a check-writing agency for a handful of big Washington contractors and NGOs because you don't have the staff to manage a large number of smaller contracts and grants, even though oftentimes those smaller contracts and grants are the ones that will have the most effect.

Sometimes the large contractors do a good job. They do charge an arm and a leg to do it, but other times there are piles of money that are wasted. We get glowing reports, but it doesn't always reflect what you see on the ground.

The small, not-for-profit organizations are shut out of the process. I don't think that helps these countries. It certainly doesn't help U.S. taxpayers.

When your predecessor passed by here last year, he had big plans for reforming foreign aid, but he did not appear to have much of a grasp of USAID's budget and programs.

You, however, come with considerable USAID experience, and I appreciate that. The best advice I could give is to focus on two or three key areas where you can make a real difference, where USAID can become more accessible and more responsive.

I know that Senator Gregg is going to a budget meeting, but Senator Bennett—who is a very knowledgeable Senator, and one who has worked very hard in these areas—I yield to you, Senator Bennett, if you'd like to make any comments?

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

Good afternoon. This is the first hearing of this subcommittee this year. Senator Gregg and I share a strong interest in ensuring that our foreign aid dollars are used wisely. There have been many examples of when they have been, and many examples of when they have not been.

Iraq comes to mind as one example of how not to do it. If USAID had been listened to earlier I think there would have been a lot less money wasted. The Appropriations Committee will hold a hearing on the Iraq reconstruction fiasco a week from today.

We also have concerns with the effectiveness of our programs in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and countries that do not get much attention where we should be doing more.

Today we welcome Henrietta Fore who is the Director of United States Foreign Assistance and Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development. That is a mouthful of a title. Ms. Fore, we appreciate you being here.

Some say there is not enough time in an election year to accomplish anything significant. I disagree. We have a lot to do and we should make the most of the time we have.

Today we want to focus on the President's fiscal year 2009 budget request for the U.S. Agency for International Development.

There is much in the President's request that I support. He proposes higher levels of funding for Development Assistance than he has before. These funds support USAID's core programs that also have strong, bipartisan congressional support.

For international health, the President proposes higher amounts for HIV/AIDS, malaria and neglected tropical diseases. But, yet again, he cuts funding for child survival and maternal health and for family planning and reproductive health.

One of the President's proposals is to recruit and train 300 new Foreign Service Officers to begin to rebuild USAID's professional workforce. This is long overdue and I strongly support it. I and others called for this years ago. Imagine how much farther along we would be today if OMB had listened to us.

USAID's professional staff is a shadow of what it once was. We routinely hear that the reason USAID has become a check writing agency for a handful of big Washington contractors and NGOs is because you don't have the staff to manage a larger number of smaller contracts and grants.

Sometimes these big contractors do a good job, although they charge an arm and a leg to do it. Other times they waste piles of money and accomplish next to nothing, although they are masters at writing glowing reports about what a good job they did.

Meanwhile, the small not-for-profit organizations are shut out of the process. This is bad not only for U.S. taxpayers but also for the countries that need our help.

When your predecessor testified here last year he had big plans for reforming foreign aid, but he did not appear to have much of a grasp of USAID's budget and programs.

You come with considerable USAID experience. The best advice I can give you is to focus on two or three key areas where you can make a real difference to help make USAID a more accessible, responsive agency that is not beholden to a select few.

I will stop there so Senator Gregg can make any opening comments.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. BENNETT

Senator BENNETT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity. Madam Administrator, I've been on your side of the table, and I know that what you are allowed to say here is dictated by the elves in OMB, and that many times you would like more to agree with the people here than you agree with the people who control what you have to say.

But I notice that microenterprise programs have been cut back very dramatically in this budget. In fiscal 2008, there's going to be \$245 million to go to microenterprise programs. Of all of the things I've done since I've been in the Senate, none has been more satisfying than the work I've done to try to increase the amount of money going for microenterprise.

The request for fiscal year 2009 is \$104.5 million, so it's cut more than in half. I don't know who did that, and I really don't want to know who did that, but I want you to know that I will do what I can to try to change that around here, and get back up towards the previous number. I don't see anything but enormous value that comes out of this.

We talk about the standard reasons why it's good for the people—overwhelmingly they are women—who get these microloans. We get the anecdotal evidence of this woman, and this family, and this business, and so on. Ideologically, we make capitalists out of these people, and I think that's a very good idea. The father of microenterprise has been given the Nobel Prize, Muhammad Yunus. He's in town, he's been written up recently, and I don't know if we

get to the appropriate question point period, but I'd like to discuss that with you a little bit further.

Then having said that, I make my standard annual plea, that I'm sure you're familiar with and sympathetic with. That is the fight against corruption, and the use of these funds in governments that are corrupt, and we end up seeing bank accounts in Switzerland, or other projects that get handed out to sons-in-law, and nephews, and those sorts of things.

It goes through a laundering process of two or three ways, but somehow it ends up more in the pockets of the government officials than it ends up making sense for the people involved. I've never heard any hint of any kind of corruptions with microenterprise, which is another reason why I like it.

So those are my two hobbyhorses. This is your first time here, and I couldn't let you come without just repeating what I've repeated to all of your predecessors in these two areas.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator LEAHY. To make it easy for you, we have two tall, bald-headed men in gray pin-striped suits, with glasses on. So just take either one. It doesn't make any difference, especially on this issue that we agree so much on—microenterprise. It goes to my point that it's easy to give a contract to a very large corporation, with a large bureaucracy, and oftentimes large cost overruns. It's kind of hard to steal the money when you're talking about a \$200 or \$300 microloan, but it may bit-by-bit change society, certainly in a number of areas that empower women who would not have been otherwise.

Go ahead and give your opening statement, please.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF HENRIETTA H. FORE

Ms. FORE. All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am so intrigued with these subjects. I love the issues of women and business enterprise, as you know, Senator Bennett, so I would love to talk about this more deeply. Senator Leahy and Senator Bennett, thank you both for your support for the U.S. Agency for International Development over the years, but also now. It is very important for the development efforts of our country.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will give a shorter oral statement. I've placed my longer statement in the record.

Senator LEAHY. Your full statement will be part of the record.

Ms. FORE. Good. Thank you very much.

The degree of turmoil and poverty in the world right now poses both challenges and opportunities for our assistance programs, and underscores the vital role of development in achieving our objectives. The dramatic election in Pakistan, Kosovo's declaration of independence, the humanitarian crises all over the world—never has foreign assistance been more critical to our national security and to the citizens of the developing world.

The path from poverty to prosperity is a long one, but already we have made progress this century. In 1981, 40 percent of the population of developing countries was in poverty. In 2004, that percentage had decreased to 18 percent, and is projected to decline further to 10 percent in 2015.

As we discuss the budget request, which can often seem dry and abstract, it is important, as I know you are very aware, to remember what this funding will mean to our partners and recipients all around the world.

For example, Senator Leahy, because of your vision, we have had great success in the services and emerging technologies to allow war victims, as well as other people with mobility-related disabilities, to become productive participants in their social, political, and economic communities.

The Prosthetic Rehabilitation and Barrier-Free Accessibility Project in Vietnam paved the way in providing mobility and barrier-free access to tens of thousands of individuals in Vietnam, as well as in other countries where its approaches and lessons have been learned and replicated.

The Marla Ruzicka War Victims Assistance Program has provided assistance to individuals, families, and entire communities harmed as a result of coalition military operations. To date, 1,311 projects have been implemented directly, assisting nearly 2 million war victims and their family members.

Both Senator Leahy and Senator Gregg, your continued attention in health and education, and the needs of Iraqi refugees, has helped ensure that they receive resources so desperately needed. Senator Bennett, thank you for being a leader in advocating for economic growth programs for the many people that we serve, as a means for people to find sustainable solutions and livelihoods.

These are small examples of the many people that we serve. Those who have the least means and opportunity, yet still yearn to build their lives, their nations, and their futures. With that backdrop, I would like to describe the highlights of the fiscal year 2009 request.

President Bush's fiscal year 2009 foreign operations budget for the State Department and the United States Agency for International Development requests \$22.7 billion—a 2.7 percent increase for the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. Our request is an increase of over \$2.1 billion, compared to the fiscal year 2008 President's budget request for State Department and USAID foreign operations accounts.

The key new component to this year's request is the \$92 million to launch the Development Leadership Initiative for USAID, which aims to strengthen and invest in USAID's critically important Foreign Service Officer core. Not only do we need to ensure the size of USAID's workforce keeps pace with the significant increases in USAID program management responsibilities, but we also need to make sure the workforce has the necessary expertise and skill sets.

The fiscal year 2009 request demonstrates our strong commitment to fighting poverty, with a focus on promoting economic growth and strengthening democratic governance, specifically in Africa and the Western Hemisphere.

This is reflected in our request for the Development Assistance Account, which is more than a 40 percent true program increase from the fiscal year 2008 request.

While we continue our strong commitment to key intervention, such as health, education, and environment, the fiscal year 2009 request renews our focus on creating comprehensive programs that

address development gaps in other sectors. We aim to leverage the large investments that we are making through PEPFAR and the MCC with balanced development programs to ensure that all of the investments that the United States makes on the ground are lasting and secure.

While I know the Public Law 480 title II appropriation is handled by a separate subcommittee, over the past 6 months commodity costs have risen 41 percent, eroding the buying power of the funds appropriated in this account, and making it ever harder for us to meet the humanitarian needs around the world.

We hope that our supplemental budget request will be enacted as soon as possible, and that any restrictions on our ability to meet lifesaving emergency food aid needs will be considered within the context of rising prices. There is a direct link to our development goals and other humanitarian assistance programs funded by this subcommittee.

I look forward to engaging with this subcommittee to ensure that America retains its humanitarian leadership. In support of the war on terror, this request will provide strong support for our critical efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the continued focus on security assistance to our key allies, such as Israel and Egypt.

In both Iraq and Afghanistan, we are creating strong foundations for the governments to build upon. Our Iraq programs continue to focus on economic and governance reform, and in Afghanistan we are bringing the government closer to the people through improvements in health and education services, justice administration, and local governments. We will continue to work with the Government of Pakistan to end extremism and violence, particularly on the frontier region.

This is a robust request, one that is fully justified and critical to the interests of the United States, and I would be glad to take your questions. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HENRIETTA H. FORE

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before the committee today in support of the President's fiscal year 2009 Foreign Operations budget request and to discuss our Nation's foreign assistance priorities. The degree of turmoil and poverty in the world right now poses both challenges and opportunities for our assistance programs and underscores the vital role of development in achieving our objectives. The dramatic election in Pakistan. The transfer of power in Cuba. Kosovo's declaration of independence. The safety concerns that so many of our staff and the staff of our partners face on a daily basis. The humanitarian crises in Darfur, Chad, West Bank Gaza, Iraq, Burma and Democratic Republic of Congo . . . to name a few. Never has foreign assistance been more critical to our national security, and to the citizens of the developing world.

The path from poverty to prosperity is a long one. Success can't be realized in a matter of months, by a single Administration, or by any one generation of development leadership. But already we have made progress this century. In 1981, 40 percent of the population of developing countries was in poverty. In 2004, that percentage had decreased to 18 percent and is projected to decline further, to 10 percent in 2015. According to Freedom House, by the end of 2007, the number of not free countries dropped from 59 in 1980 to 43, the number of partly free countries increased from 52 to 60, and the number of free countries increased from 51 to 90.

We are here today to talk about the fiscal year 2009 Budget for Foreign Operations. As we discuss these numbers—which can often seem dry and abstract—it is important, as I know you are very aware, to remember what this funding will mean to our partners and recipients all around the world. The surest, truest compass point I know to remember the why of what we do is to see first hand the people

we serve. The Peruvian farmer in the highlands, the Malian girl who just attended her first day at school, the Sudanese family who found safety in a refugee camp, a youth activist in Ukraine, a young trafficking victim from Vietnam, a landmine victim in Lebanon, a Kyrgyz business woman looking to expand her business. These are the people we serve—those who have the least means and opportunity yet still yearn to build their lives, their nations and their futures. With that backdrop, I would like to describe some highlights of the President's fiscal year 2009 Foreign Operations request.

President Bush's fiscal year 2009 Foreign Operations Budget for the State Department and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) requests \$22.7 billion, a 2.7 percent increase above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. Our request is an increase of over \$2.1 billion compared to the fiscal year 2008 President's Budget for State Department and USAID Foreign Operations accounts. This robust request was built with an improved model that reflects an integrated approach between State and USAID and Washington and our missions in the field, and a collaborative effort with other U.S. Government agencies involved in foreign assistance.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS REQUEST

The fiscal year 2009 budget request will strengthen and expand U.S. capacity for global engagement by enhancing our ability to pursue diplomatic and development solutions to vital national security issues. It reflects the critical role of the Department of State and USAID in implementing the National Security Strategy and addressing the conditions that facilitate terrorism by promoting freedom, democracy, and development around the world. The budget request supports five key goals: supporting our war on terror efforts, strengthening USAID's operational capacity, expanding our poverty reduction investments, maintaining a strong focus on health, and continuing our focus on security assistance. I would like briefly to address for the committee each of these goals.

GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Terrorism is the greatest challenge to our national security, and the war on terror will continue to be the focus of both diplomatic and reconstruction efforts as long as violent extremist ideologies and their proponents find safety and support in unstable and failing states. As the President said in his September speech to the U.N. General Assembly, the best way to defeat the extremists is to defeat their dark ideology with a more hopeful vision of liberty. We have made important strides in diplomatic and foreign assistance efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, even as we recognize the daunting work that remains. The fiscal year 2009 request includes \$2.3 billion to continue providing strong support for our critical efforts in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Our engagement with Iraq remains the centerpiece of the United States' effort in the War on Terror. The administration's fiscal year 2009 request of \$404 million is critical to achieving our long-term goals in Iraq, the Middle East and the War on Terror. While the strategy to achieve success in Iraq has evolved, the overarching goal remains unchanged: a unified, democratic, federal Iraq that can govern, defend, and sustain itself, and is an ally in the War on Terror.

This request includes economic, democratic and governance reform programs that take advantage of the recent security gains to help the Iraqis create a strong political and economic foundation. I also would urge Congress to act quickly on the President's remaining \$986 million requested in the fiscal year 2008 Global War on Terror Supplemental. These funds are urgently needed to help the Iraqis become more self-reliant and undermine Iraq's insurgency through job creation programs for young men, capacity building, governance and reconciliation programs at both the community and national level. We would like to thank this Committee for its leadership and continued support for the Marla Ruzika War Victim's Assistance program. This program has provided assistance to individuals, families, and entire communities harmed as a result of coalition military operations. To date 1,311 projects have been implemented directly assisting nearly 2 million war victims and their family members. Your support has been essential in achieving these excellent results.

The President's request of \$1.05 billion in foreign assistance for Afghanistan will assist to fight the insurgency and establish long-term stability in the country. The United States is pursuing a multi-year program of economic development, security sector assistance, and political engagement buttressed by efforts to establish democratic institutions and improvements in governance, rule of law, and service delivery by the Government of Afghanistan. I would urge Congress to also act quickly on the

fiscal year 2008 supplemental for additional, and critical, assistance programs to help Afghanistan push-back on recent gains by the Taliban. The fiscal year 2009 request sustains activities that are supported by the fiscal year 2008 Supplemental request, which is aimed at making government more accountable and closer to the people through improvements in health and education services, justice administration, opportunities for political participation, and local governance. Efforts to improve Afghan governance, establish and strengthen democratic institutions and achieve prosperity for the Afghan people are just as crucial to winning the War on Terror as security assistance to fight insurgent groups, prevent narcotics trafficking, and train the Afghan Security Forces.

With the increasing influence of extremists in the Pakistan border region with Afghanistan, Pakistan has become an even more critical front to winning the War on Terrorism, particularly in Afghanistan. The \$826 million requested supports the Government of Pakistan in fulfilling its vision of a moderate, democratic, and prosperous country at peace with its neighbors and contributing to regional stability. It will be important to align these resources with the newly elected democratic government of Pakistan, and we are prepared to engage fully with that government on its development priorities, including in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas.

A Fiscal Year 2009 Global War on Terrorism Supplemental request is not included in this budget request. As needs are better known, the administration will request additional funds for Foreign Operations.

STRENGTHENING USAID'S OPERATIONAL CAPACITY

Under President Bush and with the full support of Congress, the United States has launched the largest international development effort since the Marshall Plan. USAID's workforce and infrastructure must keep pace. This request includes \$92 million to launch the Development Leadership Initiative (DLI), which aims to strengthen and invest in USAID's critically important Foreign Service Officer Corps. Not only do we need to ensure the size of USAID's workforce keeps pace with the significant increases in USAID program management responsibilities, but we also need to make sure the workforce has the necessary expertise and skill sets.

The request for the Development Leadership Initiative will allow USAID to hire an additional 300 Foreign Service Officers, a 30 percent increase in the career Foreign Service workforce. DLI will address critical staffing challenges in stewardship and technical areas, which will help provide increased accountability in U.S. foreign aid programs. We need more talent on the ground, in more countries, with the resources and skills to help build the capacity of people and institutions.

The overall request for USAID administrative accounts represents a significant increase in the resources for training and information technology from the fiscal year 2008 enacted levels. Increased training will enable the Agency to ensure that staff have essential job skills and leadership training to carry out the development mission. We need to modernize antiquated business systems to improve the integrated procurement and financial management processes, continue e-government initiatives, and improve the agency's ability to report results.

RENEWING THE FOCUS ON POVERTY REDUCTION

The fiscal year 2009 request demonstrates our strong commitment to fighting poverty, with a focus on promoting economic growth and strengthening democratic institutions and governance. This is reflected in our request for the Development Assistance (DA) account, which represents a 40 percent true programmatic increase from the fiscal year 2008 request.

A key priority in building this year's budget is strengthening our commitment to Africa. Funding is targeted to address development gaps and to support economic opportunity and governance programs critical to the success of the massive investments we have made through the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. The budget provides significant increases for democracy funding in African countries.

Another key priority is reinvigorating investment in the Western Hemisphere. Programs to advance democracy and free trade in the region are prioritized, with significant investments for Peru and Central America. Our goal is to encourage transparent and competitive political processes, promote the rule of law and respect for human rights.

PROMOTING FREEDOM

The United States supports freedom through promoting institutions that foster just and democratic governance for three reasons: as a matter of principle, as a central pillar of our national security strategy, and to advance our broader development

agenda. For this reason, our request for governing justly and democratically (GJD) programs has increased 27 percent from fiscal year 2008 enacted levels.

U.S. foreign assistance will support the President's Freedom Agenda to end tyranny and the Secretary's vision of Transformational Diplomacy by promoting and strengthening effective democracies in recipient states and moving them along a continuum toward consolidation and sustainable partnership. Our objective is to reduce the number of authoritarian states that do not allow meaningful political competition and do not respect human rights, and to increase the number of democracies and improve the quality of their governance.

Over 75 percent of the money is targeted to fragile democracies and authoritarian states. With this Committee's continued strong support for democracy programs, we will support elections in Afghanistan, build government capacity in Iraq, and support a genuine transition to democratic, civilian rule in Pakistan while building up the capacity to govern in the volatile frontier region. We will also continue to support democracy activists in some of the world's most repressive regimes in countries like Belarus, Burma, Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Syria, and Zimbabwe.

To assist us in the work that we do, American private capital flows to the developing world have tripled over the last three years—and now represent over 80 percent of financial flows to developing countries. This is a profound—indeed, radical change in the relationship between institutional and private foreign assistance flows. Across the broader development landscape, I envision USAID making an invaluable contribution, by using its convening influence to better coordinate public and private sector resources and programs that support human progress in the developing world. We will devote more of our management, technical expertise and financing resources to coordinating international development—and to building partnerships that will accelerate the pace of progress.

MAINTAIN A STRONG FOCUS ON HEALTH

This request continues our commitment to improving interventions that address critical worldwide needs for HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, neglected tropical diseases, other infectious diseases, maternal and child health, and family planning. A total of \$1.58 billion is requested for the Child Survival and Health Programs Fund (CSH). This includes \$385 million to support the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI) to provide prevention and treatment in 15 countries severely burdened by malaria; \$370 million for life saving interventions for children and mothers, including immunizations, newborn and post-partum care; and \$301 million for high-quality, voluntary family planning.

The Global HIV/AIDS initiative continues to be the centerpiece of our health programs and is the largest source of funding for the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). The request of \$4.779 billion is a substantial increase over the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. Funding will support country-based activities, international partners, technical support, and oversight and management. The fiscal year 2009 request is the first of a new, 5-year, \$30 billion commitment that builds upon and expands our initial 5-year, \$15 billion commitment.

CONTINUED FOCUS ON SECURITY ASSISTANCE

Building well-governed, democratic states and reducing poverty is an anti-dote to extremism and requires a foundation in security. The United States must remain a leader in combating transnational security threats, including terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, transnational crime and illicit narcotics. We also must continue to support bilateral and multilateral stabilization efforts in countries that are in or rebuilding from conflict. The United States cannot do this alone. Therefore, our security assistance request will help ensure that our coalition partners and friendly foreign governments are equipped and trained to work toward common security goals and share burdens in joint missions. This request includes more than \$5.1 billion for security assistance, a five percent increase over fiscal year 2008 levels.

The largest component of our security assistance request is \$4.8 billion in Foreign Military Financing (FMF). This includes \$2.6 billion for Israel, a \$150 million increase from fiscal year 2008, to support the first year of a 10-year, \$30 billion strategy to help Israel maintain its qualitative military advantage.

The President also is requesting an additional \$550 million to improve security in our hemisphere through the new Merida security initiative. This initiative will combat drug trafficking, transnational crime, and related threats in Mexico and Central America, while consolidating democratic gains. Also in the Western Hemisphere, we are requesting \$406 million for the Andean Counter-drug Program to continue reducing the flow of drugs into the United States.

In Africa, we are committed to supporting peace keeping and counterterrorism efforts. The fiscal year 2009 request includes \$50 million in Peacekeeping Operations to complete the effort to transform the Liberian military, invest in building and transforming Southern Sudanese guerilla forces into a conventional army, support peace in the Horn of Africa, and provide technical assistance and training to the Democratic Republic of the Congo to stabilize this volatile region. The \$61 million total request in several accounts for the Trans Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership will facilitate coordination in countering terrorism between countries in West and North Africa.

The President's request also includes the Civilian Stabilization Initiative (CSI), designed to strengthen the U.S. Government's response to stabilization and reconstruction crises. While it is funded from the Department of State Operations budget, I would note that CSI provides for the creation of a 250-member interagency Active and 2,000-member Standby Response Corps, of which almost half will be based at USAID. Likewise, the U.S. Civilian Reserve Corps will allow the Secretary of State, and USAID as the development agency, to draw on expertise from citizens across the United States in municipal and local government, the private sector and non-governmental partners. Working closely with our Active and Standby Response Corps, these city managers, community police advisors, municipal utility engineers and other experts will allow us to put the right people in the right place at the right time when we need them most.

Finally, I would like to note that there have been concerns expressed among our partners in the NGO community that humanitarian funding has been reduced in the fiscal year 2009 request. I want to assure the committee that this administration supports America's proud tradition of helping those most in need when natural or man-made disaster strikes. As always with regard to humanitarian assistance accounts, additional requests for resources will be made during the course of the year, as the level of requirements becomes clearer. While I know that the Public Law 480 Title II appropriation is handled by a separate subcommittee, the funds requested for emergency food aid have a direct link to our overall development goals and other humanitarian assistance programs funded by this subcommittee. I look forward to engaging with this committee to ensure that America continues its humanitarian leadership.

As Secretary Rice recently said, it is American Realism that informs our pursuit of a just economic model of development. Despite the wealth of many, the amount of deprivation we see still remains unacceptable. Half of our fellow human beings live on less than \$2 a day. But we know what works: We know that when nations embrace free markets and free trade, govern justly and invest in their people, they create a prosperity of their own that fosters opportunities for all their citizens to participate fully in their political and economic system.

We have met, or are on course to meet, our international commitments to increase official development assistance: Since 2001, we have quadrupled our bilateral assistance to Africa and we've nearly tripled our development assistance worldwide. This unprecedented investment calls on us to focus—more than we ever have before—on setting clear goals. Managing performance. Demanding accountability. And generating results. To that end, we have submitted a robust budget while we work to both modernize and revitalize the delivery of foreign assistance.

I know that many of our colleagues in the development community and in Congress have important questions about how the management of foreign assistance is proceeding since the creation of the position of Director of Foreign Assistance. Since I carry this portfolio, as well as that of Administrator of USAID, I have devoted much time to improving this process, as I pledged to the Congress I would. Over the past 9 months, I've made significant changes in the foreign assistance budget processes based on specific suggestions from colleagues in USAID and State—particularly those in the field—and from our partner organizations and from you in Congress. This includes shifting the emphasis to the field by providing more opportunities for field proposals into the budget formulation and distribution processes. Additionally, we have started implementing a number of changes to streamline the fiscal year 2008 Operational Plan preparation and approval processes, increasing transparency and improving communication to the field. We are pleased that these changes will reduce the amount of field time required to prepare the Plan and reduce the volume of materials submitted to Washington by between 20 and 80 percent. We are also starting a new competitive procurement for the Operational Plan database—placing a premium on user-friendliness, performance and flexibility in the system.

Mr. Chairman, the robust fiscal year 2009 Foreign Operations request is fully justified and critical to the national security interests of the United States. We understand that these funds are the result of the efforts of hard working American tax-

payers. By strengthening the capacity of USAID, strengthening our collaboration with other U.S. Government agencies and our coordination with the private sector, we will manage these funds efficiently as stewards of the American people.

Thank you very much. I would be pleased to respond to questions.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. I know, last year, the State Department created the Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance, the F-Bureau.

It's created a lot of confusion, anxiety, and opposition. Designating every country to one of five categories, and focusing assistance in what they considered to be the highest priority for that category, often didn't take adequate consideration of the mission's priorities, or what experts on the ground said was needed.

The one good thing I've heard about is Rich Green who was given the unenviable job of picking up the pieces after Ambassador Tobias. Everybody gives him high marks for the work he does.

What's the status of the F-Bureau today? Is it full steam ahead, or are you changing the procedures? What's going to happen?

Ms. FORE. Thank you, Senator Leahy. It is full steam ahead. In the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, I know that Rich Green is glad to hear that he's picked up the pieces. We have been working very hard to try to simplify, to streamline—

Senator LEAHY. I've probably ruined his career by praising him. Go ahead.

Ms. FORE. But we're trying very hard to simplify, to streamline, and to communicate.

Senator LEAHY. But those are words that we say about everything. You know, we're robust, we're streamlined, we're effective, but it's what actually happens that counts.

I mean, we heard it about another Department right after Katrina—we're streamlining, we're robust, we're this, we're that, and, of course, nothing happened. We've got to be able to point to things and say, "Look, this is why it's better now than it was before."

Anyway, go ahead.

Ms. FORE. All right. We've listened very hard, so those words actually mean something for us. We've moved to country-based programming, so that we are now putting more emphasis on the field. This must be field-centered. It must be that the country team in the field gathers and really talks about the development needs in the country. That they, as a team, begin each budget request.

It is also important that it's integrated with the country's plans for development. If the country doesn't have ownership in the sectors and the areas of the programs that we're working in, it will not result in sustained development. You have worked in this field long enough to know that we must facilitate long-term development. So the country team has that mandate.

Then, the budget moves to Washington, and we have Assistance Working Groups. Assistance Working Groups take the work coming out of their mother bureaus—so out of USAID, and out of State Department—and they try to gather around the table all the U.S. Government agencies that are interested in that country or sector.

It's very complex, it's difficult, but they try to make trade offs based on the opportunities that they see—for example because of democratic elections, or because of economic openings, or because

of stability after conflict—to try to focus our assistance in a way that’s better coordinated than it has been in the past.

Senator LEAHY. But you have to oversee this. You also have to oversee PEPFAR, military assistance, the MCC, and so on. Are we really talking about two jobs?

Because what I’ve worried about in the past, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, has been a lack of emphasis on putting strong administrators at the top. I mean, have we given you jobs that really should be handled by more than one person?

Ms. FORE. Well, there’s lots to do, but I think the jobs are strengthened by being together. Why I say that is something as simple—

Senator LEAHY. Both Director of Foreign Assistance and Director and Administrator of USAID?

Ms. FORE. Yes. Something that you had been speaking about, the invigoration and the growth of USAID personnel, it is difficult if you are a USAID Administrator to move that through the many avenues to get it approved.

I think this year, because it was my number one priority, and because I am doing better, it was successful.

I also think that this year we have focused on trying to simplify, and we have reduced the required paperwork from between 20 and 80 percent for the field and for the people involved in the budget process. We know we’re at the beginning of this process. It’s not in the middle, nor have we reached the end of how to realign foreign assistance, and how to organize it.

But with the new organization of the Office of the Director for Foreign Assistance and the common definitions, I think we have a good start.

Senator LEAHY. You’d mentioned Afghanistan, one of the most important programs we have in the world. I don’t know if you saw the December 2007 issue of Atlantic Monthly. It said it was so hard to work with USAID, it wasn’t worth it.

Another NGO supporting women in Afghanistan, describing work with USAID, said, “I’ve seen a whole lot of folks come and go. Most of them are great. Some are just putting in their time. They come and go quickly, and there’s often not an effective handoff. Every time you try to do something, is the dawn of creation all over again.” It went on to say how hard it is to find funding for \$10,000, \$15,000 projects, applying for millions to build a road, even though the area might not be secure that the road goes through, you could sure build that road, and it photographs well.

But how about these other things?

Ms. FORE. Your opening comments, Senator Leahy, about the need to be sure that we have a number of smaller implementors, is something that we are very much aware of at USAID, and we want to reach out to them.

This request for additional personnel, United States direct hires in USAID, will help, because there must be good accountability and oversight, and the ability to have many smaller partners requires additional staff.

We have many programs around the world, as you know, that are focused on smaller enterprises and encouraging women to participate. It is something of, obviously, great importance to me per-

sonally, but we are making sure that we are improving how we reach out around the world, in both our contracting mechanisms, as well as the effectiveness, what results we're achieving with the funds that we have.

Senator LEAHY. Well, speaking of the funds we have, the dollar is dropping precipitously. I think it takes about \$1.50, \$1.60 to buy a Euro. I remember when 70 cents would buy a Euro.

The Canadian dollar used to cost us 70 cents, and now it actually costs more than \$1. Canada's economy is strengthened, but it's partly because ours has weakened so, and our dollar has gone way, way down.

Thus, the price of fuel goes way, way up. You're talking about these things you're doing, but with the plans we've made for the budget 6 months ago or 1 year ago, the value of the dollar, the cost of fuel the situation today is different.

Is there going to be a supplemental request to make up the difference?

Ms. FORE. Well, at the moment we are struggling with the challenge of the lower buying power of the dollar in almost every aspect. It affects our operations, it affects our ability to buy food, it affects most of our partners around the world. It certainly affects partners that have offices in Europe.

We are constantly analyzing the budgets, and discussing what can be done, trying to utilize all of our funds, as effectively as possible.

Senator LEAHY. But you don't know whether there's going to be a supplemental request for that.

Ms. FORE. I do not know.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can we talk about the microenterprise number? Give me some insight as to why it was cut in half?

Ms. FORE. Yes. The amount that we currently have, the \$104 million, is just a beginning since it represents programs whose primary focus is microenterprise. As you know, funds for microenterprise programs come from a number of other crosscutting programs, from missions and from programs around the world. I would anticipate that for fiscal year 2009, that number will end up much higher than where it is now.

Microenterprise has been a real strength for USAID for many years. As you correctly mentioned, microenterprise has set a number of best practices for the industry. What we also have is a whole new burgeoning industry. I was just at a web-based outreach fair that was a part of what we're calling the Global Development Commons, in which the microenterprise industry has web-based leaders, community leaders, so that communities build up around microenterprise best practices. Lots of private companies are now strongly in the microenterprise sector.

When, Senator Leahy, you and I, were together at the World Economic Forum, one of the things that we heard from a number of banks around the world is microenterprise and how important it is. But what they were also saying is that, for them, microenterprise is a for-profit activity. They would like us to think about what they call "the missing middle." So there's microenterprise and then

there's entrepreneurs that are the next stage up, and then, of course, the big multinationals.

But they are finding that they would like us to blend into that middle category to try to encourage entrepreneurship, whether it's in Liberia or anywhere around the world. So we will try to view this holistically as economic growth to encourage entrepreneurship. It does encourage the empowerment of women and small enterprises, whether in the agricultural sector, or any other sector, because it is how people build their own family wealth and stability, but it also sets a stable, middle class in countries.

Senator BENNETT. Okay. I'm with you and I support that but let's not begin to cannibalize some of the people at the bottom.

The other thing that I have found over the years—and clearly, you don't fall into this category—but there has been resistance on the part of some in the State Department, simply because they don't get to control the money. That's one of the reasons why it works, because it goes into the hands of people who will use it creatively.

It is a for-profit operation, even at the very lowest level, because the repayment level is so high. I'm not telling you anything you don't know. The repayment level is so high, the default percentage is so small, and lots of people get in it for a variety of humanitarian reasons, but it's also very good business all the way around. So just to reinforce that.

Can we talk about corruption? Do you deal with that? We've seen all of the fuss that's gone on in the World Bank, with the retirement by Mr. Wolfowitz, and his replacement by Mr. Zoellick, a lot of conversation down there. I'm not close enough to be able to say absolutely no action, but at least that's been part of the press's report that the World Bank has spent a lot of time talking about corruption in these countries, and then business as usual. It has overwhelmed Bob Zoellick as he's trying to carry on in that effort.

What role does USAID play in this fight? I believe that corrupt governments constitute the number one obstacle to getting people out of poverty and making foreign aid—whether it's ours or any other country's—work intelligently for the people. That as long as you have a corrupt government, no amount of money you can put in can change the conditions in the country.

What leverage do you have? What information do you have? What background can you share with us?

Ms. FORE. Thank you, Senator Bennett. It's a very difficult area, and it is one that is on everyone's mind as they are in the field. But also, in Washington, as we are trying to look for best practices and what levers we can use through the political, economic, and societal means.

Most of our activities for anti-corruption fall within our governing justly and democratically, categories in the budget. In all the programs they try to target areas that are most important. So whether it is at the local government level, or whether it is at a customs office, or whether it is at a business licensing facility, or whether it is in the national government—we try to help civil society organizations that can act as watchdogs. We strengthen journalists and the media, so that there is transparency and an ability to view the financial operations of a government.

We also try to encourage and help with good financial systems. For many countries, a government's capacity, the ability to have a clear financial system, or a clear budgeting system, is very weak. If we can strengthen that, it encourages transparency, and through our training programs, bringing visitors both here, as well as training in the country, they learn how to look for and how to put in internal controls and external controls, so that money is indeed watched.

Senator BENNETT. Let me share with you an experience I had with a Finance Minister.

I said to him, "All right, what do you need?" He said, "I need competent people." He said, "I preside over a Finance Ministry with tens of thousands of employees. I could fire every one of them, if I had 15 people I could trust." This was a man who was trained in the United States, got a Ph.D. in economics from one of our finest universities.

He said, "I can't get USAID to give me any scholarship money. They tell me, 'Well, if we gave you scholarship money, you'd just pick your nephew and your son-in-law, and all of the rest of them, and send them to the United States on a free educational junket that the U.S. taxpayer would pay for.'"

In other words, it would all be kept in the family. We saw a lot of that in the Olympics Movement. We, in Salt Lake City, got blamed for the corruption that was in the International Olympic Movement. We didn't start it, but we ended it.

So this Finance Minister said, "All right. You pick them. The USAID officials go out in my country and pick the brightest, most ambitious, most attractive people, train them in the United States in basic economics and business procedures, and then send them back to me. They won't do it. They'll put money into a bridge. They'll put money into a warehouse. They'll build some kind of monument."

He said, "I could fire all of these people in my ministry." He couldn't, because that's part of the employment of that particular country. They keep their employment up by keeping huge amounts of people working on the government payroll. But he said, "If I had 15 people that I could trust, who were properly trained, I could make a true difference in the way things work here. I can't train them in this country. They've got to come to the United States. USAID would get far greater return on its investment if they were to—they pick the very best and brightest among our young people, and take them to the United States, with the full understanding that by virtue of their having their education paid for by the U.S. Government, they're going to come back, they're going to be employees of the Finance Ministry of this country, and we can start to get something done."

Have you ever had any conversations like that?

Ms. FORE. Well, I haven't had the conversation where USAID hasn't said, "Yes, we'll do it."

So we can talk about this particular Finance Minister and country, but USAID does exactly these kinds of programs all over the world. I think they are enormously important. We try to use it, because building human capacity and human capital is one of the most important things that we can do.

One of the areas that we've been talking about in the Global Development Commons is how to exchange best practices around the world. So that if you are Finance Minister, or someone working within the Ministry, you pick up good ideas about the work that you have before you, at the time you need it, rather than waiting for training.

So I think that part of this education must be on the web. Part of it should be in person, where they come to America, or to another country, where we can teach a variety of skills. But it is very important, Senator Bennett.

Senator BENNETT. I'll share the name with you privately then.

Ms. FORE. Yes. Good, thank you.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to talk to you about India.

Senator LEAHY. Go ahead.

Senator BENNETT. We assume that since India is prospering, India doesn't need any foreign aid anymore. There are some programs that, frankly, the Indian Government isn't qualified to handle, and USAID is.

I have heard, from people who are in the Embassy over there, that we've made a really dumb mistake in our long-term relations with India to say, "Okay. You're now financially capable of doing this yourselves, and so we're going to withdraw any aid from India."

India is going to be an extremely important country in our future, and maybe it's not spot-on for what USAID's mission is, but in terms of our geopolitical relationship with India, a few dollars spent now to keep some of those programs alive would pay huge geopolitical dividends later on.

You don't have to comment, but I want to put that bug in your ear, as they say.

Ms. FORE. Yes. Very good, Senator Bennett. We are transitioning in India, to more public/private partnerships, because we think there is an enormous capacity, in both the United States, as well as in Indian business, that could pair up with us in a number of sectors.

Senator LEAHY. One program that has worked, according to your folks and the Iraqis that have participated in it, is the Community Action Program. I don't want to get too bogged down on Iraq, no pun intended, because we've wasted more money there than your entire fiscal year 2009 budget. But the Community Action Program that supports local initiatives to rebuild has been very successful.

You don't have anything in the fiscal year 2008 supplemental or the fiscal year 2009 request for this program. If it's that successful—I mean, is it so successful that we don't need it?

Ms. FORE. We have a number of programs for which we are requesting funds, and we have a number that we are sharing with other agencies. So some of these programs, we are funding from different streams. So perhaps, Senator Leahy, I could come back to you with the funding—

Senator LEAHY. Would you, please?

Ms. FORE [continuing]. Sources for it. Yes.

[The information follows:]

USAID BUDGET

The Community Action Program (CAP) is a well established Iraq-wide program that has been successful in mobilizing citizens at the local level through the civil society process to make a difference in Iraqi communities. CAP II will end in September 2008 and USAID is reviewing options for a follow on program. It is currently funded from IRRF II with \$22.4 million obligated and ESF with \$145 million. A congressional notification has been submitted for a reobligation of IRRF II funds in the amount of \$20 million.

Senator LEAHY. I would like to know if there are other donors picking that up and who that would be.

Last year, we appropriated \$446 million for child survival and maternal health programs, about \$90 million above the President's request, because every expert we heard from told us how important that is. You measure how well a health system is doing in a country by how many children die before the age of five, how many women died needlessly of pregnancy-related causes.

The administration has done a lot to increase funding for AIDS and TB and so on, but you propose to cut funding for child survival and maternal health in fiscal year 2009. Has the need gone away?

Ms. FORE. The need is still there, and the United States is still the largest bilateral donor in these areas. Our fiscal year 2009 request is about at the same level as our fiscal year 2008 request.

It shows a strong priority, but it also shows that, with reduced resources and stretched resources, that we need to be more broad-based in our health programs. We continue to do very fine work in all of these areas. They have probably been the single most important long-term effort for the United States Government.

Senator LEAHY. But it will be a cut below what we had last year?

Ms. FORE. If we—

Senator LEAHY. No, actually—

Ms. FORE. Yes, from the enacted level. But from the requested level, it's about even.

Senator LEAHY. We appropriated \$456 million for family planning and reproductive health, which we were told is very helpful. Actually, it's about the same that we appropriated in 1995. You propose to cut it by \$156 million, down to \$300. That makes sense?

Ms. FORE. Well, we continue to have a very strong priority in this. It is still very important to us that there is United States leadership. We remain the largest donor. In all of these areas, maternal and child—

Senator LEAHY. The largest donor in dollar amounts, but there are many countries that give more as a percentage of their GDP. Do we not?

Ms. FORE. Correct.

Senator LEAHY. But you feel the cut is justified?

Ms. FORE. We would wish to have money for everything, but in a time of constrained resources, we wanted to be sure that there was broad-based approach to health. So we have a number of excellent health programs, whether they're PEPFAR, the neglected tropical diseases, and others, across the health sector.

So areas where we have great successes and we have done well, we tried to stretch the dollars as far as we can.

Senator LEAHY. This is one that has been successful?

Ms. FORE. Sometimes it's especially because they've been successful. If they've been very successful, then it is time that public/

private partnerships can help pick it up, and local governments can help pick it up, and other donors can help pick it up. So we try—

Senator LEAHY. Well, let's—

Ms. FORE [continuing]. To share those best practices with others.

Senator LEAHY. Well, let's talk about some of these places. You've—between the Child Survival and Health program and the Economic Support Fund, you're requesting \$470 million for Pakistan.

Now, we've given them billions of dollars over the past 2 years. Has that money been spent wisely? Or is it—in a country where corruption is so endemic and accountability seems almost non-existent—are we spending money just to buttress political statements we've made?

Ms. FORE. Well, in Pakistan, in the health sector, the TB case detection rate has improved significantly, from 25 percent in 2004 to 50 percent in 2006. Treatment success rates for these patients is 83 percent, very close to the 85 percent target.

Senator LEAHY. Not my question. Are you convinced that none of that money has or—

Ms. FORE. We have in place a number of programs to try to be sure that we are monitoring every single dollar, so that we are sure that the American dollars are going for areas that are most productive, that are well spent, that are getting the results that we expect.

Senator LEAHY. So is that money—

Ms. FORE. We've had several audits.

Senator LEAHY. Yes. Has that money been well spent and productive in Pakistan?

Ms. FORE. The audits show it's been carefully spent, and the results show that we have some very good, strong results in democracy, in health, in education, and in economic growth.

Senator LEAHY. If this were your money, personally, would you feel confident in that it's going to Pakistan?

Ms. FORE. I think of all of it as being my money, personally.

Senator LEAHY. Well, that's not my question.

Ms. FORE. Well, I think that Pakistan is such a strong and important ally for us, an ally in many areas—the global war on terror—but also, it's an ally in many areas in which we have shared interests.

Foreign assistance works in many ways, both short term and long term, and sometimes our investments are rewarded by immediate results, and sometimes they take a long time.

So I think we are doing a good job in investing the money, and for some of the results, we will not see them immediately. But when you see some of what we've accomplished in education, or in economic growth, or in governance, it's remarkable. Americans should feel very proud of their assistance.

Senator LEAHY. Indonesia—the largest Muslim country in the world—faces huge challenges. I've heard from so many administration officials and the President speak of the importance of Indonesia. You're suggesting cutting our assistance to them. Does that make sense?

Ms. FORE. Well, Indo—

Senator LEAHY. Or has the assistance that we've given them been so successful we don't need it?

Ms. FORE. Indonesia is what we consider a key country. It is important for us in regional security. It's important to us in democracy and economic growth. You know that we've been helping on the reconstruction in Aceh. It is an MCC threshold country.

Fiscal year 2009 budget is \$186 million. There are long-term programs. Indonesia is just a very, very key country for us.

Senator LEAHY. We have spent \$74 million to support programs related to Cuba since 1996. For fiscal year 2008, the President requested, and we appropriated \$45 million—that's a 500 percent increase over the previous year.

In November 2006, a GAO study concluded that poor oversight of the Cuba Program did not provide adequate assurance that funds were properly used. They said administrative costs on the part of grantees were high. Shipping costs to get goods into Cuba were very high.

According to the GAO study, there are instances in which cashmere sweaters, Godiva chocolates, Nintendo Game Boys, and Sony PlayStations were among the items purchased with U.S. Government funds to be shipped to dissidents in Cuba.

How much of this money has been spent on programs in Cuba for dissidents and others? How much has been given to people here, right here in the United States?

Ms. FORE. I do not have an answer for that one. In our fiscal year 2009 budget, we have requested \$20 million. It's the number suggested by CAF/CII, and it encourages democratic freedom and our support for the people of Cuba.

Senator LEAHY. Well, yes. That's easy to say, but you've got this GAO study. Have you responded to it?

Ms. FORE. We believe that we've taken care of all of the outstanding issues and remedied them.

Senator LEAHY. Could we have a copy of that response?

Ms. FORE. Yes, of course.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. Senator Bennett. I have other questions that will be for the record.

The President took a great deal of credit for a number of the programs that we've supported in Africa and elsewhere on his latest trip. But the money you talked about was not the money he'd requested. We actually put more money in for a number of these programs.

When I asked the President about how it's great to take credit for it, but he's put in less money than what he needs, and then we have to find the money by robbing Peter to pay Paul to do it—he said, "Well, I know how appropriations work. You always find the money." I said, "No. I disagree with you."

If you're repairing roads and bridges in this country, sure. Everybody's going to say, "Wait a minute, my State needs to replace that bridge or that road. It's dangerous. Besides which, it's going to look good back home if we can." You're going to want to increase it.

I said to the President, "How many of us do you think are—at a time we are going into a recession—how many of us do you think

have constituents pounding on our doors saying, ‘Please give more money for foreign aid?’”

I don’t have too many people back home saying, “Please give more money for foreign aid.”

I think it’s worthwhile if it’s well spent. But I also worry when I see something like this Cuba GAO report that it’s not being. I think, years ago, of a country where we spent hundreds of millions of dollars to build housing. They showed me one half-finished, one-room apartment. The Administrator of the program did come up in a very expensive car, certainly a lot more expensive than I own.

We provide \$10 million to U.S. nongovernmental organizations for environment and rule of law programs in China. Additional funds are provided for democracy programs under the Democracy Fund account.

When you watch what’s happening in China, I would like a significant portion of that \$10 million used for environmental programs, and in a manner that encourages matching private funds and U.S./Chinese partnerships.

Can you work with us to do that?

Ms. FORE. Yes. Well, Senator Leahy, I know how important foreign assistance is around the world. I know how much good it does. I know that it is a good investment for all of us, and I thank you for your leadership and support of it.

As an American, I am really honored and proud when I see our programs around the world. So we will endeavor to do our best to work with all of you to create the finest programs on behalf of the American people.

Senator LEAHY. Well, look at this China one, too. It’s just one of many. But as Senator Bennett pointed out, it’s often not the big—the grandiose Aswan Dam projects, but it might be a lot of micro-enterprise loans and maybe a whole lot of smaller educational or health programs.

I was glad to hear you mention the Marla Ruzicka Fund. That’s one I wrote. I’m glad to hear it is working. I know a few of you knew Marla Ruzicka. An impressive young woman who died much too soon. Thank you very much.

Ms. FORE. Thank you, Senator Leahy.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY SENATOR CHRISTOPHER S. BOND

Senator LEAHY. We have received the prepared statement of Senator Christopher S. Bond that will be made part of the record at this time.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR CHRISTOPHER S. BOND

REBUILDING THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

As I have said many times, 80 percent of the current war on radical Islam and terrorism must employ our Nation’s smart power, or non-kinetic forces. By putting more sandals and sneakers on the ground, we lessen the likelihood of having to put boots on the ground. The pointy end of this smart power spear, in the past, has been USAID’s Foreign Service. They have been deployed abroad, overwhelmingly in the world’s poorer countries, and increasingly, in some of the same places our folks in uniform find themselves, working closely together. Today, USAID’s Foreign Service amounts to about 1,100 Officers, mostly deployed—spread very thin—among the more than 80 Missions USAID staffs. At the same time, USAID’s program manage-

ment responsibilities have grown, particularly since 9/11, having reached a low point in the mid to late 1990s.

USAID and its mission are about 60 years old, and over that period they have been an important instrument of U.S. foreign policy and national interest, and the principal means by which the U.S. Government extends America's humanitarian assistance to the world. This small agency and its mission may well be even more important in today's world than they have been in the past. Yet their capacity to deliver has shrunk dramatically from times past and now must rely largely on contractors that lack the necessary expertise and experience to conduct sustainable development. Perhaps we started to take a holiday from history after the end of the cold war, or perhaps it started even earlier, in the wake of our withdrawal from Vietnam. Whenever it began, however, the result is today a serious problem for U.S. Foreign policy.

In short, the size of the Foreign Service Officer workforce has not kept pace with the significant increase in USAID program management responsibilities. Between 1995 and 2007, funding for USAID-managed programs increased by 40 percent while FSO staffing decreased by 24 percent, for example. This combination of increased program funding and decreased staff levels has eroded the agency's core leadership and technical capabilities.

Today, I am told, some 45 percent of all of USAID's Foreign Service Officers are eligible to retire as is some 71 percent of the Senior Foreign Service. To make the problem worse, as we have fewer and fewer Foreign Service Officers to administer USAID's programs, they turn of necessity to more and more contracts and grants, so that the face of USAID abroad is increasingly their contractors and grantees. Many do good work, but there are some important things that private citizens can't do that direct hires of Uncle Sam can, like dealing officially and directly with the host governments, for example. It also leads to a vicious circle—as USAID has turned increasingly to contracts and grants to implement its mission, it's hiring priorities have increasingly focused on more contract and grant management officers, at the expense of specialties and professions that once typified USAID's field presence.

The administration is proposing to begin the rebuilding of USAID, focusing first on its Foreign Service, by beginning to hire above attrition for the first time in many years—300 Foreign Service Officers above attrition in fiscal year 2009—toward a goal of roughly doubling USAID's Foreign Service over the next several years. I know that this is beyond the horizon of the current administration, but I am very impressed by the broad consensus that seems to be emerging in the Congress, in both Houses and across Party lines on the importance of this initiative, and I urge my colleagues on the Committee to give it their full support.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator LEAHY. There will be some additional questions which will be submitted for your response in the record.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the agency for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

ADMINISTRATOR FORE'S PRIORITIES

Question. We are all mindful that this is an election year and time is short. What do you see as the two or three most pressing challenges facing USAID—in the way USAID is structured, managed or the programs it administers, what do you plan to do about them, and do you have the necessary legal authorities and the resources to do it?

Answer. Revitalizing and reinvesting in critically-important USAID capacity to carry out our core development and humanitarian assistance mission is my top priority. We need more USAID talent in the field, in more countries, to help build the capacity of people and institutions—and engage more broadly with development partners. In addition, to anticipate the societal losses and setbacks that occur when conflict disrupts our partner nations, USAID, and the State Department, must have similar capacity to “surge” as other parts of the U.S. Government, so that together, we can place enough of our conflict prevention and reconstruction assets in the right places at the right times.

The President's fiscal year 2009 budget request includes Operating Expense funds to enable USAID to hire 300 Foreign Service Officers (FSOs) in addition to those hired to replace FSOs lost through attrition—the Development Leadership Initia-

tive—and \$36 million for information technology systems development in the Capital Investment Fund. If appropriated, these resources will strengthen our good stewardship of taxpayer dollars, begin to restore the technical expertise USAID has been famous for, and provide 21st century tools to enable our people to work more efficiently. The fiscal year 2009 budget also requests funds for significant investments in post-conflict capacity.

I feel deeply that USAID must re-establish intellectual leadership in the development community and am moving rapidly to strengthen the agency's capacity in this regard. We have reinstated an agency policy coordination process and are hiring well-qualified staff to work with me and the senior leadership team to lead policy development. One of the first fruits of this new process is a new Economic Growth strategy that I expect to make public shortly.

USAID has long emphasized evaluation for accountability and, more important, as a source of development learning. The recent lack of a coordinated evaluation plan hampers our ability to identify common issues and best practices across the portfolio. Therefore, I am reinstating a central evaluation function that will be an independent voice to assess the effectiveness of USAID's programs. The new Evaluation Unit will focus on: (1) establishing a core Agency evaluation expertise; (2) developing and implementing an annual evaluation agenda; (3) managing evaluation support services used by Missions; and (4) strengthening evaluation policy and training agency-wide.

Last but not least, USAID needs to extend our reach to private sector partners and NGOs who are eager to combine their own expertise and resources with ours to overcome development challenges, and to the American people, so that they understand the vital role of development in national security and the impact their tax dollars are having on the lives of people around the globe.

DEVELOPMENT LEADERSHIP INITIATIVE

Question. You have talked about your Development Leadership Initiative to begin rebuilding USAID's professional staff. Assuming we give you the funds you have asked for, what tangible differences will this make in the way USAID does business—if I were an NGO or contractor, or a beneficiary of USAID assistance in a foreign country, how will it change things for me?

Answer. The Development Leadership Initiative will enable USAID to engage more directly with more partners on the ground and devote more attention to strengthening institutional capacity in the countries in which we work. Currently, the severe shortage of qualified procurement, financial management and technical personnel, in the field and in Washington, restricts USAID's ability to build productive relationships with a wider range of host country counterparts, significantly expand the innovative Global Development Alliances model and other types of public-private partnerships and manage a substantially larger number of contracts and grants, particularly with local non-governmental organizations NGOs.

With a significant new cadre of procurement, financial management, program and technical officers, USAID staff will be able to spend more time working directly with beneficiary organizations such as local NGOs to strengthen their governance structures and financial management systems, better preparing them to continue their work once USAID's assistance ends.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Question. In fiscal year 2008, including the supplemental, we appropriated \$429 million for International Disaster Assistance. That was more than the President asked for but 25 percent less than the fiscal year 2007 budget. This leaves a shortfall of about \$175 million from the level that the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance expects to need in 2008, yet the President has not asked for any additional funding. OFDA says it is already preparing to cut back programs by 25 percent.

This means the United States will provide less emergency shelters for disaster victims during the rest of this year, impacting hundreds of thousands of people. It means less potable water to reduce the risk of disease in IDP camps. It is estimated that over 600,000 vulnerable people in Darfur will be cut off from basic health immunizations and education. In Kenya, half a million people who would have received seeds and tools to restart their agricultural livelihoods in areas affected by the recent conflict will have no support.

Are you aware of this? Does the administration plan to request any additional funding for these crucial programs in fiscal year 2008? What do you suggest we do about it?

Answer. Yes, we are very much aware of the dynamic, changing, and critical humanitarian situations. We maintain close contact with our staff and partners on the

ground and their constant feedback helps us to make the necessary budgetary adjustments to ensure that the most critical humanitarian programs remain operational and the needs are met. We understand the humanitarian assistance budget situation for fiscal year 2008. Additional resources for our fiscal year 2008 humanitarian programs were not requested; we will do what we can with our existing resources.

CHILD SURVIVAL AND MATERNAL HEALTH

Question. Last year, we appropriated \$446 million for child survival and maternal health programs. This was about a \$90 million increase above the President's request because every global health expert has advised us that effective public health systems begins with children and pregnant women. You can measure the effectiveness of a country's health system by whether children do not die needlessly before the age of 5, and women do not die needlessly of pregnancy related causes.

While this administration has done a lot to increase funding for AIDS, TB, and malaria, you propose to cut funding for child survival and maternal health in fiscal year 2009 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. Why does this make sense?

Last year, we appropriated \$456 million for family planning and reproductive health which, again, public health experts tell us is one of the essential building blocks of a functioning health system. That is about the same amount we appropriated in 1995, yet you propose to cut it to \$301 million.

Why does this make sense, when we know that there are women in many poor countries that need contraceptives and cannot get them, and we know that unplanned births only compound the difficulties of families that are already barely able to earn enough income to survive?

Answer. The fiscal year 2009 request for Maternal and Child Health activities reflects the constrained budget environment and competing priorities for HIV/AIDS and Malaria. The United States Government (USG) programs in HIV/AIDS and Malaria also benefit maternal and child health. The USG is a major donor in the field and will continue its technical leadership. The fiscal year 2009 aggregate request for Maternal and Child Health is the highest funded element in the USAID health portfolio.

Our activities in child survival and maternal health are increasingly focused on the countries with the greatest need and with the greatest opportunity to improve outcomes for mothers and children. Africa continues to receive more maternal and child health funding than other regions, with 33 percent of CSH maternal and child health funds in the fiscal year 2009 request.

The fiscal year 2009 aggregate request of \$327 million for family planning and reproductive health includes \$301 million in Child Survival and Health Programs Funds (CSH). The request is less than the appropriated levels in recent years due to the constrained budget environment and competing priorities. The USG remains the largest bilateral donor for family planning and reproductive health, even at the fiscal year 2009 request level.

TRANSITION INITIATIVES

Question. The Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) provides quick recovery and reconstruction assistance for countries emerging from conflict. By all accounts it has done a good job with a small budget, often under very difficult conditions. Yet you propose to cut its budget from the \$44 million we appropriated in fiscal year 2008 to \$40 million in fiscal year 2009. How do you explain this when the President is asking for \$248 million for the new Civilian Stabilization Initiative, which has the same mission of helping countries stabilize and transition from war to peace?

What role do you see USAID playing in the Civilian Stabilization Initiative?

How do you see OTI and the Civilian Stabilization Initiative coordinating their activities and cooperating on the ground?

Answer. USAID will play a key role in the Civilian Stabilization Initiative (CSI) by providing a significant portion of stand-by personnel to respond to major reconstruction and stabilization needs. USAID experts in areas ranging from Rule of Law to Micro-enterprise to Parliamentary Process to Human Rights Protection will be made available to participate in a CSI action in order to help bring stabilization and recovery to a nation that has undergone a recent major upheaval.

The Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) has consistently engaged with U.S. Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) since its creation and will continue to with new proposed formats such as the Civilian Stabilization Initiative. It is envisioned that OTI and other related actors will participate as part of the Civilian Stabilization Initiative response teams. In countries where OTI is already deployed, OTI field teams will coordinate with and

be a part of advance civilian teams in the same manner that OTI has provided assistance to other urgent priorities. CSI activities are expected to engage OTI staff in front-lines programmatic responses, just as OTI staff have joined larger U.S. Government efforts in recent priority responses, including the Tsunami Relief in Sri Lanka and India, the earthquake response in Pakistan, and flood relief activities in Bolivia.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

Question. This year, like last year, and the year before that, the President is requesting billions of dollars for the Millennium Challenge Corporation at the same time that he wants to cut other programs—for basic education, the environment, child survival and maternal health, to name a few. Isn't this the classic case of robbing Peter to pay Paul, after we were assured that the MCC would be additional money, and that USAID is paying the price?

Answer. The steady increase in the President's requested levels for the traditional assistance accounts since 2002 demonstrates conclusively that Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) has been additive.

The President's request in fiscal year 2009 for the three largest "traditional" assistance accounts—Child Survival and Health, Development Assistance and Economic Support Fund—has risen from approximately \$4.6 billion in fiscal year 2002—before Millennium Challenge Corporation's (MCC) establishment—to \$6.4 billion in fiscal year 2009, an increase of nearly 40 percent. Adding the fiscal year 2009 request for \$2.2 billion for the MCC represents an increase of 87 percent in fiscal year 2009 over fiscal year 2002, a strong indicator of the President's commitment to foreign assistance.

In a world of limited resources, individual country programs increased and decreased before MCA existed, and will continue to increase and decrease with MCA on the scene. What the existence of MCC requires of us is better integration, and that takes place on a country by country basis with considerations of needs, sectors, and timing.

MCC's mission is poverty reduction through economic growth and is one of many important tools the U.S. Government has to accomplish its foreign assistance goals. MCC Compacts are targeted to countries that perform better than their peers on independent policy criteria and are designed by partner countries to address their constraints to economic growth—often infrastructure and rural development. MCC cannot do this alone. Before Compacts begin, and while they are being developed and implemented, USAID will need to continue to use its resources to improve the overall political, economic and social environment necessary for the success of MCC's larger investments. The synergies between MCC and USAID programs to achieve maximum development impact are recognized by both agencies.

This means that USAID must continue to address critical reforms in the broader "enabling environment" needed to expand political and economic freedom, and foster local private sector growth. These elements are essential for the large MCC investment to have maximum impact and for the U.S. Government to achieve its broader transformational goals. A vibrant local private sector is key to reducing countries' reliance on foreign assistance and is the ultimate exit strategy; MCC and USAID working in tandem can accelerate that timeframe. In many MCC countries, particularly the poorest, USAID may need to continue its work after the completion of an MCC Compact whether the country remains eligible for additional MCC compacts or not.

These realities are reflected in the process of determining country assistance programming. The goal of U.S. Government assistance efforts is to have the most effective possible mix of programs given each country's unique circumstances. Annual changes in requested assistance flows from the Economic Support Fund, Development Assistance and Child Survival and Health accounts to individual countries reflect a range of complex country specific factors, only one of which is projected MCC disbursements.

CHINA

Question. The fiscal year 2008 State and Foreign Operations Act provides \$10 million through U.S. educational and nongovernmental organizations for environment, democracy and rule of law programs in China. Additional funds are provided for democracy programs under the Democracy Fund account. We want a significant portion of the \$10 million to be used for environment programs, and I would hope it will be done in a manner that encourages matching private funds and U.S.-Chinese partnerships.

As you determine how to use these funds, I would appreciate it if you would consult with us first.

Answer. Thank you for providing the opportunity to consult with the Appropriations Committee about USAID's programming of congressionally-provided funds in China. USAID's ongoing environment programs in China link counterpart United States and Chinese universities to collaborate on environmental activities while encouraging matching funding from the private sector. Of the \$10 million Development Assistance (DA) earmark, USAID plans to allocate approximately \$5 million to environment activities in China in fiscal year 2008 that address clean energy and climate change, natural resources and biodiversity, and environmental governance.

In the area of clean energy and climate change, USAID will support continued work to promote good governance practices in connection with strengthening regulatory standards for cleaner coal and energy efficient lighting (China is the world's largest consumer and manufacturer of each, respectively), and improving access to financing for clean technologies. We will establish public-private alliances and stronger U.S.-China partnerships in these areas.

USAID will increase activities in China with two critical regional biodiversity programs addressing trade—illegal trade in wildlife and endangered species and trade in illegal forest products. As China is among the world's largest consumers in the illegal trade of wildlife and forest products, new USAID activities will strengthen China's ability to improve inspection, certification, and enforcement practices that help stem the flow of these illegal products into China from its Asian neighbors.

In addition, USAID plans to allocate another \$700,000 in Economic Support Funds (ESF) from the \$5 million Tibet earmark to improve environmental conservation and natural resource management through increased adoption of practices that support sustainable rangeland management, livestock development techniques, and wildlife conservation in Tibetan areas.

USAID also funds the China Environmental Health Project, which supports partnerships between Western Kentucky University, Southwest University of China and Anhui University of Science and Technology. The project will develop new practices for addressing water quality protection and mitigating pollution from coal combustion in southwest China, and it will analyze the relationship between pollution and public health.

Similarly, the University Partnership for Environmental Law in China pairs Vermont Law School with Sun Yat-sen University in Guangdong Province in a 3-year training and technical assistance program to promote the establishment of environmental law clinics. Its public outreach heightens public awareness of environmental issues and increases accessibility to information regarding the environment in China. These partnerships bring to bear on these pressing issues, the capacities, institutional strengths and financial investments of all the partner universities. Further, as the USAID Administrator, I have directed the agency to seek means to triple USAID's public-private sector investments, and USAID has a person dedicated to do just that in the southeast Asia region, including China.

MÉRIDA INITIATIVE

Question. The President wants to spend \$1.4 billion in Mexico and Central America over 3 years to combat drug trafficking. Most of the funds are for the army and law enforcement programs. We all want to help Mexico and other countries facing enormous challenges from drugs and organized crime, but I believe this Initiative all but ignores important aspects of the problem, particularly poverty and a dysfunctional judicial system. Was USAID consulted in advance about this Initiative, and if so, what did you recommend?

Answer. USAID participated in the entire planning process of the Mérida Initiative and is fully supportive of the resulting proposal. USAID will continue to be actively involved at each step of implementation should Congress fund this Initiative.

Interagency cooperation within each country and a high level of cooperation between the Governments of the United States and Mexico have been essential to developing the Mérida Initiative. During this process, representatives of USAID, the Departments of State, Justice, Homeland Security, Defense, and Treasury have participated in crafting the proposed partnership with the Governments of Mexico and Central America. We anticipate maintaining the same type of close cooperation within and between governments during the implementation phase of the Mérida Initiative.

Background

The administration has proposed the Mérida Initiative as a 3-year program and has sought funds in the fiscal year 2008 supplemental bill, and the fiscal year 2009

budget. The proposed \$1.4 billion was for Mexico, with a total amount for Central America still to be determined.

While combating drug trafficking is a critical element of the package, the Mérida Initiative is much more broadly focused. Through the Mérida Initiative, the United States seeks to assist in strengthening our partners' capacities in the three broad areas of (1) counter-narcotics, counterterrorism, and border security; (2) public security and law enforcement; and (3) institution-building and rule of law.

For Mexico, in the proposed fiscal year 2008 supplemental bill, the funds destined for the military are less than 40 percent of our total fiscal year 2008 supplemental request, with the remainder going to help civilian institutions. That percentage drops in the fiscal year 2009 proposal, with only 22 percent allotted for the military and the remainder for civilian institutions. Over \$130 million for these 2 years would go to programs specifically focused on judicial institution-building and the rule of law in Mexico.

With regard to the judicial system, it is important to note that the Mexican legislature has just passed comprehensive judicial reform in an effort to modernize and improve the Mexican justice system. While the proposal to amend the Mexican constitution must still be adopted by a majority of Mexican states, the legislation does establish a presumption of innocence for defendants, facilitates transition to an accusatorial system, and includes several reforms aimed at improving policing and investigative authority.

The elements of the Mérida Initiative directed to support Mexican judicial reform will help Mexico improve its economic climate. The establishment and implementation of a fair, predictable and flexible set of legal rules is vital to the processes of business formation, the establishment of capital markets, the ownership and transfer of real and intellectual property rights, the protection of contract rights, and other key elements that underpin economic development.

As a member of NAFTA and our third largest trading partner, Mexico is the world's 14th largest economy. Yet, at the same time, 40 million Mexicans live at or below the poverty level. At \$7,870, Mexico ranks 73d in the world in terms of Gross National Income per capita, compared to the United States' \$44,970.

The greatest impact of the United States on the Mexican economy is our expanding trade relationship. Mexico is the United States' third largest trading partner; we traded over \$1 billion per day in goods and services with Mexico in 2007. Mexican exporters pay their workers 37 percent more than companies that do not export.

BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION

Question. For fiscal year 2008, we appropriated \$195 million for biodiversity programs. This includes funding to protect forests, watersheds and endangered species in the Amazon, central Africa, Indonesia, and elsewhere. Unfortunately, this falls far short of what we should be doing to protect these threatened areas. How much are you proposing for these activities in fiscal year 2009?

Answer. Preserving biological diversity is critical to sustainable, long-term social and economic development, and is an important issue in its own right. There is a serious problem in countries around the world where habitat and species are disappearing at an alarming rate, and this is especially problematic in developing countries where many of the poorest people's livelihoods are often directly dependent on forests, fisheries and wildlife.

The United States and our developing country partners address this issue in a holistic manner. Conflict, poverty, and the lack of better and more sustainable employment opportunities drive desperate people to put tremendous pressure on the ecosystems on which endangered animal and plant species rely. Weak political legitimacy, accountability, and governance constrains efforts to enforce conservation measures and suppress criminal activity.

Recognizing the depth and complexity of the problem, the United States integrates its biodiversity conservation programs into a broad range of long-term development efforts designed to help countries achieve peace and security, govern justly and democratically, realize economic and social growth, invest in their people, maintain public health, and provide humanitarian assistance.

Our request level for fiscal year 2009 is \$115 million from the Development Assistance (DA) account plus \$10 million from other accounts—totaling \$125 million directed to 32 regional and country programs. These requests are based on specific needs and priorities identified by our embassies and field missions, taking into account competing priorities and the availability of funds.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN

NATIONAL SOLIDARITY PROGRAM

Question. One of the more successful development efforts in Afghanistan, the National Solidarity Program, appears significantly underfunded. The program uses a participatory process to allow citizens to work with their local governments to prioritize and apply for funding for decided upon projects—building critical local ownership and oversight. At a time when development needs are critical to the long-term success in Afghanistan, please explain USAID efforts to support this program.

Answer. USAID views the National Solidarity Program (NSP) as an important tool to build support for the Afghan Government in rural areas of the country. Created by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in 2003, the NSP helps Afghan communities to identify, plan, manage and monitor their own development projects. The program lays the foundation for a sustainable form of inclusive local governance, rural reconstruction, and poverty alleviation.

Since its inception in 2003, USAID has contributed \$50 million to the NSP, including \$15 million in fiscal year 2007 base and supplemental funding. In fiscal year 2008, USAID plans to contribute an additional \$50 million, doubling our total support for the program in a single year.

Fiscal year 2007–2008 USG contributions break out as follows:

(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Amount
2007 Base	6
2007 Supplemental	9
2008 Base Request ¹	10
2008 Supplemental Request ¹	40

¹ Subject to approval and appropriation by the U.S. Congress.

Funds provided by USAID for the NSP are under the daily direction and control of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and are used to meet local development priorities identified by Afghans. USAID funding contributes to the Afghan Government’s objective of extending the NSP to all eligible villages.

By promoting understanding of good governance at the local level, the NSP works to empower rural communities to make decisions affecting their own lives and livelihoods.

DEMOCRACY PROGRAM IN PAKISTAN

Question. Please elaborate on plans to provide long-term democracy programs, including political party, election, civic strengthening, and rule of law efforts, to Pakistan?

Answer. Background.—USAID will conduct two assessments that will guide its future democracy and governance activities: (1) a broad, Democracy/Governance Assessment; and, (2) a specific assessment on the state of the Rule of Law that will recommend specific programmatic initiatives. Following is a general description of the program based on the currently allocated budget.

Probable Areas of Activity.—USAID will work with Pakistan’s governing institutions, political parties, and the public to develop: (1) an issues-based political dialogue, (2) democracy within mainstream political parties, and (3) a transparent electoral process. A key focus will be on increasing transparency and accountability in support of anti-corruption reforms.

The strategy adopts a two-pronged approach:

—First, targeting improvements in local governance through community projects that are designed and implemented by local citizens. This approach helps to change citizen perceptions of how their government works and its role in improving their lives. Projects may include water systems, repair of public buildings such as schools or health clinics, or other collaborative activities.

A large component of the Federally Administered Tribal Area (FATA) program is geared to increasing the capacity of the local government in FATA. A key objective is to help extend the writ of government throughout FATA, in part by demonstrating to the people that the FATA government can provide them with services that respond to their needs.

—Second, focusing on national level political and governance challenges by working with the institutions that shape the entire system, such as the legislature and key ministries. USAID has launched a training program for newly elected parliamentarians to orient them to rules and procedures, and legislative proc-

esses. This and other projects are timely given the window of opportunity presented by the recent elections, the gradual liberalization of the media and the return of an independent judiciary. Other activities will encourage civil society groups to hold accountable newly elected leaders while providing the groups greater access to their provincial and national assemblies.

Question. The administration has noted in presentations regarding the budget that the fiscal year 2009 request marks the first time the President is submitting to Congress a jointly planned State Department-USAID budget. The purpose of the merging of the foreign assistance budgets and policies of the State Department with USAID is to maximize the impact of our foreign assistance dollars to reduce widespread poverty, among other objectives. We know that women are the majority of the world's poor and research has shown that investing in women increases economic productivity, child education, family nutrition and stems the spread of HIV/AIDS. However, the budget does not reflect a clear strategy for addressing gender in our foreign assistance programs. Please explain plans to integrate women's programs into foreign assistance programs.

Answer. I firmly believe in and support consideration of gender in the planning, development and implementation of USAID programs and strategies. USAID has always held a leadership role on gender and I intend that that leadership should continue.

Women benefit significantly from USAID programs. For example, in fiscal year 2006 women represented 58 percent of all clients of USAID microfinance and enterprise development programs. The agency also trains women entrepreneurs in marketing and business planning. In Bangladesh, a training program for entrepreneurs created 5,000 jobs, 80 percent of the positions going to women. USAID is aggressively pursuing reforms to improve the business environment in more than 50 developing countries, making a major impact advancing economic opportunities available to women.

USAID has requirements related to gender in the Automated Directives System (ADS). Under these regulations gender is to be included up front in the planning process and in the procurement process as part of all solicitations issued by the Agency. The entire ADS is now being reviewed and up-dated to ensure that it reflects USAID priorities which include the integration of gender into the programs of the Agency. Two years ago the Office of Women in Development gathered quantitative data on the extent to which gender was included in country strategies and in procurement solicitations. The revision of the ADS in 2003 to make requirements concerning gender explicit had an impact on the integration of gender throughout the planning process. The study results showed a clear improvement in the thoroughness of the discussion of gender in documents from 2003 and beyond over the pre-2003 period. The Office continues to work with Operating Units in Washington and in the field to promote and facilitate the integration of gender into all USAID programs.

With regard to monitoring and evaluation overall, in those programs for which USAID measures benefits to individuals, to the extent possible, results are disaggregated by sex to best track the inclusion of women and girls in our programs.

WATER

Question. How are assistance programs that focus on issues of water, including clean water, sanitation, water management, and conservation, developed, implemented, and overseen within USAID?

Answer. USAID and State consult with Congress on water language in the appropriations act and the Simon Water for the Poor Act. A joint USAID-State team then decides priorities for water assistance in the context of the Foreign Assistance Framework. Two of the Framework's Objectives include water—Investing in People and Economic Growth. The former incorporates USAID's health programs which include the clean water supply and sanitation components. The latter incorporates USAID's environment programs and agriculture programs which include the water management and water conservation components. Coordination across these objectives is achieved through USAID's cross-cutting Water Team.

Programs are then designed and implemented in close partnership between USAID and a broad array of non-governmental organizations, universities, companies, and government agencies in the assisted countries and the United States.

BURMA

Question. What plans does USAID have for both immediate and long-term democracy assistance for both Cuba and Burma, should circumstances in either country suddenly allow for a more open political process or transition?

Answer. In Burma, the United States' top priority is the establishment of a democratic state that observes the rule of law and fully respects human rights. Since the U.S. Government does not have a bilateral assistance agreement with the Government of Burma, the Department of State and USAID provide assistance to achieve this priority synergistically through international and local non-governmental organizations.

The goal of U.S. democracy assistance is to build the capacity of the Burmese people to participate in a democratic society by providing them with the information and skills necessary to participate effectively in a dialogue that leads to a transition to democracy. This includes providing educational opportunities to prepare the future leaders that a democratic Burma will require. These programs complement our diplomatic efforts urging the Burmese regime to begin a credible, inclusive dialogue with pro-democracy activists and ethnic minorities to pave the way for a transition to a free, open, broadly representative government that respects the human rights of all of its people. U.S. assistance programs maintain flexibility in order to pursue emerging opportunities. The co-chairs of the interagency Burma Assistance Working Group would be happy to provide an oral briefing as the situation in Burma develops.

CUBA

Question. What plans does USAID have for both immediate and long-term democracy assistance for both Cuba (and Burma), should circumstances in either country suddenly allow for a more open political process or transition?

Answer. In addition to USAID's ongoing Cuba program, the agency has, for the past 18 months, been engaged in intensive inter-agency planning for democracy and transition assistance to Cuba, upon United States recognition of a transition¹ government in Cuba. This planning effort is being coordinated by the Cuba Transition Coordinator, working with the Department of State's Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs (WHA), the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS), and USAID. Democracy and governance assistance to Cuba is planned in three phases—Hastening, Transition, and Long-Term Democracy and Governance Phases—which correspond to benchmarks identified under U.S. law on assistance to Cuba.

Key tasks in the current, ongoing Hastening Phase include: providing humanitarian assistance to families of political prisoners and others; supporting the release of political prisoners and improving human rights conditions; strengthening civil society and the pro-democracy movement; supporting freedom of information through the dissemination of materials and equipment; and increasing international encouragement of democracy. The USAID program, through its support to non-governmental organizations and U.S. universities, currently provides: Leadership training to Cuba's proponents of human rights; global publication of reports by Cuba's independent journalists worldwide via the Internet and distributed in hard copy inside Cuba; and direct outreach to the Cuban people through distribution of books, newsletters, videos and radios.

The Transition Phase is focused on the goal of free and fair elections, as well as other key objectives identified by the Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba (CAFCEI). Programming during this phase will commence when requested by a United States-recognized transition government in Cuba. Key tasks during this Phase include: Assisting a transitional government to establish the legal framework for elections and civil liberties; strengthening political parties and independent groups through trainings; supporting creation of independent media via journalist trainings; supporting the transitional government's institutions to administer and secure free and fair elections, through the establishment of independent electoral bodies, voter registries and voter education; and supporting the transitional government's measure to establish rule of law, and provide training for security and justice personnel in human rights. During this Phase, there will also be a focus on activities to increase private sector business and economic activity, such as start-up grants for microfinance institutions.

The Long-Term Democracy and Governance Phase plans for assistance to a democratically-elected Cuba along the lines of an assistance portfolio implemented by the USG in other post-transition settings, with the goal of assisting the Cuban people in establishing democracy and good governance of key institutions. Key tasks during

¹ "Transition" refers to a particular "trigger" or key development when the USG and U.S. Congress agree that the situation on the island is such that requirements of Helms Burton and/or other legislative restrictions are met and the United States can provide broader assistance than legislation currently permits.

this Phase include: Supporting a democratic Cuban government in establishing good governance of key executive institutions, through technical support to key ministries; building and consolidating rule of law institutions; reforming legislative functions, via adoption of rules of procedure and establishing leadership and committee structures; supporting transparency and accountability reforms; the institutionalization and strengthening of political parties; strengthening of civil society; and establishing human rights institutions.

Additionally, fostering economic growth and opportunity under a transitional Cuban government will be critical to reinforcing and solidifying a democratic transition on the island. As part of the Inter-Agency Economic Working Group (EWG) for Cuba, USAID has been heavily involved in scoping out key areas of economic assistance that will be crucial in the event of a transition. These areas include macro-economic stabilization and reform, private sector strengthening, trade and investment, business sector development, agriculture, and infrastructure.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. The subcommittee will stand in recess.

[Whereupon, at 3:30 p.m., March 4, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

**STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED
PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL
YEAR 2009**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2008

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 10:05 a.m., in room SD-138, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Patrick J. Leahy (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Leahy, Cochran, Specter, Bond, Gregg, Bennett, Brownback, and Alexander.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

STATEMENT OF HON. CONDOLEEZZA RICE, SECRETARY

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

Senator LEAHY. Madam Secretary, we appreciate you being here. This is the last time you're going to be appearing before us. I think I heard the sigh of relief all the way up here. But I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your service to our Nation.

While we've had some strong disagreements with this administration's handling of foreign policy, you've always been willing to discuss those differences with the members of this committee, and you and your staff have been helpful on issues when there is a problem, and you've also brought the added weight of your office when it's been helpful to get some of these things resolved.

I want to take this opportunity—it would probably embarrass her to be singled out in public—but to express on behalf of myself, my staff, and this committee, our gratitude to Cindy Chang in your Office of Legislative Affairs. In my 34 years here I've seen many dedicated, very capable people in this position, but Ms. Chang has set a new standard. She's absolutely tireless, extraordinarily efficient, totally devoted, day and night 7 days a week.

She has served the State Department, the Congress, the American people and people around the world. We've relied on her every single day, and I saw her in action when she accompanied one of our CODELs to the Middle East. She did an outstanding job making sure that we knew what the position of the Department was at all points.

Senator GREGG. That's because she went to the same high school with me. We graduated from the same high school.

Senator LEAHY. Senator Gregg says they graduated from the same high school. By the time Ms. Chang studied there they had electric lights which, of course, I can say this because he's younger than I am.

Senator GREGG. Actually, they had women when I went, actually women.

Senator LEAHY. Now, one concern I do have is our international reputation. Every time we raise issues of democracy or human rights with Iran, or Sudan, or Russia, or China, they want to talk about what's occurred and continues at prisons such as Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib in Iraq. Each time we vote for another U.N. peacekeeping mission, which this administration has done many times—I applaud you for it—but then when the President's budget comes there's not enough money in the budget to pay for it.

Each time we challenge nations to protect the environment or reduce global warming, they ask who are we to lecture them when the United States wastes more energy than many countries even use.

The next President is going to inherit two of the most vexing foreign policy challenges in half a century in Iraq and Afghanistan. Everything—almost everything—predicted in Iraq has proven false, and what a terrible price we're paying for it.

In Afghanistan we see the resurgence of the Taliban and Al-Qaida, and a reconstruction program that suffers from too many problems to count. The President, when he came in, said he didn't believe in nation-building, which, of course, has always been the State Department's job. And when he came in and began nation-building, the Department of Defense has taken over more and more of the job. I believe it should be the Department of State doing that, not the Department of Defense.

I know the administration sees things differently: that progress is being made. Of course, there are examples of progress, but I worry that the credibility of enduring principles of this country have been and need again to be sources of great strength and leadership for the United States. I'm deeply concerned that in a few short years we've lost much of what our predecessors fought and died for.

If we were safer as a result, that might be tolerable. I don't think we are, and the budget we're here to discuss today is a statement of our priorities, and the decisions we make can show the world another face of America.

I note that your fiscal year 2009 budget request has much in it that I support and much in it that you and I have worked together on for years. There also contains some disturbing shortcomings which we need to discuss. I'd like nothing more than to pass this bill on schedule. I think you agree with that. You're working hard 7 days a week, long hours. I don't think you expect to take a break because of an election year, nor do we.

PREPARED STATEMENT

I will yield back the rest of my time. Senator Gregg.
[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

Madam Secretary, we appreciate you being here. This is the last time you will appear before us and I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your service. While we have had some strong disagreements with this administration's handling of foreign policy, you have always been willing to discuss those differences with us. You and your staff have also been helpful on issues when there was a problem and we needed the added weight your office brings.

I also want to take this opportunity—on behalf of myself, my staff, and this committee—to express our gratitude to Cindy Chang in your office of Legislative Affairs.

Many dedicated, very capable people have preceded Cindy in this position, but Cindy set a new standard. She has been absolutely tireless, extraordinarily efficient, and totally devoted, day and night, 7 days a week, to her work and to the people she has served—at the State Department, in the Congress, the American people, and people around the world. My staff has relied on Cindy every day. I saw her in action when she accompanied me to the Middle East. She has done an outstanding job.

Madam Secretary, when I think about what the world looked like at the beginning of this administration—and our image in the world—and compare that to what it looks like today, it does not give me a good feeling.

Our international reputation is a shadow of what it was 7 years ago. Each time we raise issues of democracy or human rights—with Iran, Sudan, Russia, or China—they want to talk about what has occurred, and continues at the United States prison in Guantanamo Bay and the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq.

Each time we vote for another United Nations peacekeeping mission, which this administration has done many times and I applaud you for it, we then don't see enough money in the budget to pay for it.

Each time we challenge nations to protect the environment and reduce global warming, they ask who are we to lecture them when the United States wastes more energy than entire other countries use.

The next President will inherit two of the most vexing foreign policy challenges in half a century, in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Virtually everything this administration predicted in Iraq has proven false. And what a terrible price the American people are paying for it.

In Afghanistan, we have seen the resurgence of the Taliban and Al Qaeda, and a reconstruction program that suffers from too many problems to count.

Throughout this period, the Department of Defense has steadily taken over more and more of the job of nation building, which had been the State Department's job before the President said he didn't believe in it.

I know the administration sees things differently, that progress is being made. There are examples of progress.

But the credibility, enduring principles, and image of this country have been and need again to be sources of great strength and leadership for the United States, and I am deeply concerned that in a few short years we have lost much of what our predecessors fought and died for.

That might be tolerable if we were safer for it, but we are not.

This budget, which we are here to discuss today, is a statement of our priorities, and the decisions we make offer tangible opportunities to help show the world another face of America.

Your fiscal year 2009 budget request has much in it that I support. It also contains some disturbing shortcomings, which we need to discuss. I would like nothing more than to pass our bill on schedule. Simply writing this year off because there is an election in November would be a mistake, in my view, and I am sure you agree.

So let us work together these next few months and get as much done as we can.

Senator GREGG. Is this for an opening statement?

Senator LEAHY. Yes.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JUDD GREGG

Senator GREGG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to have Secretary Rice here today and to thank her for her extraordinary service to this country which goes over a number of administrations, but, obviously, in this administration has been at the center of a lot of major and important decisions. Her leadership and professionalism cannot be questioned and has to be admired by

all of us—so much so that even the National Football League will probably want to take advantage of your expertise when you finish.

It's just been a pleasure to have you as a friend, and Kathy sends you her best, also.

There are a lot of issues, and, obviously, the issue of Iraq and Afghanistan are critical in how we proceed, and I'll be interested in the Secretary's thoughts on that. But I also think the issue of Colombia is important, as is how we deal with our Latin American neighbors.

This administration has made a major effort to try to open the door to the Latin American community to participate in the American economy and, with the Andes Agreement and now with the Free Trade agreements, we have made huge strides. It would be a major step backwards, in my humble opinion, in our relationships with these Hispanic nations, which are basically nations which speak Spanish, to fail to confirm the Free Trade Agreement with Colombia.

Colombia is a democracy. It's lead by an individual who has sought to move that country further down the road of democracy, who is confronting antagonistic neighbors who are not democratic in their views, and we should be standing by him and his government and that democracy. So I congratulate this administration for sending up the Free Trade Agreement.

In addition, I know that the leadership of the State Department is concerned, as we are or at least I am, and I know Senator Leahy is, with some issues such as how we deal with our neighbors in Africa. Specifically, the fact that we have this bureaucratic snafu, which means that members of the ANC who want to come here are confronted with limitations and even Nelson Mandela has to go through a clearing process before he can come to the United States. I know we need to work on this, and I hope that you will give us some directions to how we can straighten that out.

Further, we have the whole issue of PEPFAR, which is an excellent program that's done extraordinary things and helped millions of people, especially in Africa, the AIDS initiative. But the question is, how much of it can we afford to bear and how much should nations which we are assisting bear of those costs, and should this new authorization which is working its way through at a very high level? Should it go through, it may crowd out other initiatives that we are concerned about.

We also have the issue of Tibet and how we deal with Tibet. I will be interested to hear the Secretary's thoughts on that.

Last, our friends and allies in the neighborhood of Iraq have been impacted dramatically by the Iraqi situation, and we have created problems for them, and our support for countries like Jordan is something I hope we can discuss.

But we can get into all those items in the question and answer period. Right now I just simply want to acknowledge your extraordinary service to this country and thank you for it.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. Secretary Rice, the floor is yours. We'll put your full statement, of course, in the record. Please go ahead so that we could have time to ask questions.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF HON. CONDOLEEZZA RICE

Secretary RICE. Thank you very much, Senator, and Senators, members of the committee. I do have a full statement, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask that it be put in the record, but I will not read it so that we have plenty of time for discussion.

Senator LEAHY. Before you begin——

Secretary RICE. Yes?

Senator LEAHY. I want to say this only once: We have people here that have a right to hear what you're going to say. You have a right to say it whether we agree or disagree, and every Senator has a right to say what they want and ask questions.

If anybody is going to block the view or hinder people who are here watching they will be removed. Whether they are agreeing with me or disagreeing with me is not the point; whether they are agreeing or disagreeing with you, Madam Secretary, is not the point. We want to hear what you have to say. The Senators will be free to agree or disagree, but we will have an orderly hearing.

Please go ahead.

Secretary RICE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me thank the members of this committee for the work that we have done together over the last several years. I think that despite sometimes differences on policy or on tactics, we have always tried to work in the interest of the United States of America, and I think that we have agreed that that has meant that America needed to represent not just power but also principle.

We've worked together to put together an agenda, compassionate agenda, that we see in evidence in places like Africa with the President's Program for AIDS Relief, for the Malaria Program that we have. We have been able to quadruple development assistance to Africa, to triple it worldwide, and to double it for Latin America.

Without this committee, we would not have been able to meet the challenges that we have had in having our diplomats and our civilians in some of the most dangerous places in the world, and I don't mean Iraq and Afghanistan, although those are clearly very dangerous; but also, in many unaccompanied posts around the world where our people go without family and work in harm's way and work in difficult conditions in some of the most remote parts of the world to try and help people build a better life, and without your help we would not have been able to engage in what we call "transformational diplomacy," trying to increase the number of well-governed democratic states that can provide for their people and act as responsible citizens in the international community.

With your forbearance, members of the committee, I would just like to say one word about our people in Iraq in particular right now. It's a difficult time for our Embassy. We have had a number of incidents. It's been more difficult recently, and I just want to say that we keep them in our thoughts, and we appreciate their service. I know that you do, too.

Very often we talk about the honorable service of our men and women in uniform, and it is to be honored. We also have a lot of civilians on the front lines who take risks daily, and so I just like to acknowledge their service.

I believe that the President's budget request this year for State operations and for foreign operations will permit us to continue to pursue our efforts at securing our people, building reasonable facilities for them. Increasing our efforts at public diplomacy and exchanges—something that we all agreed we should do at the beginning of my tenure, and I think we have done precisely that.

There is really no better commercial, if you will, for American democracy and the strength of America than having our people travel abroad and having people travel here. We've tried, through public/private partnership more exchanges, more visitors, to give people access to the United States.

We are also requesting in this budget 1,100 new positions for the State Department and 300 new ones for USAID. This represents a rebuilding, if you will, of our civilian capacity to manage programs, to engage in diplomacy.

I felt that it was important that we first do some important reallocation and redeployment of our people to demonstrate that we were prepared to make tough choices and by moving close to 300 people out of Europe and into places like India and the further far reaches of China, I think we've demonstrated that we are prepared to do what we can with resources that we have.

But the truth is that the Diplomatic Corps is stretched, and the USAID is even more stretched. We went through a period in the 1990s of almost 6 years where we didn't hire or didn't bring in a single Foreign Service officer. So we do need to rebuild.

It speaks, Senator Leahy, to the point that you've made about the role of the State Department and what I'll call reconstruction and development, or, if you wish nation-building, which the Department does want to be at the forefront of those efforts. We need an institutional base from which to do that, and that is why we've requested funding for what the President announced in his State of the Union address last year, which is the civilian reserve, or Civilian Response Corps which we believe would be a very important way for civilians to lead the efforts of stabilization and reconstruction.

Finally, let me say that we have, I think, used our foreign assistance well to support efforts at Middle East peace, at consolidation of democratic forces in Latin America. In places like Pakistan where it is very difficult, we have nonetheless seen Pakistan now move from military rule to civilian rule, to have democratic elections for the first time in more than a decade. These are processes that I think we've been able to support with the assistance and with the efforts of our diplomats.

If I may, just on two other points that were raised on, particularly in Latin America, just to underscore what Senator Gregg has said about the importance of the Free Trade Agreement for Colombia, this is a country that was very near being a failed state at the beginning of this decade.

It was the country where bombings in the capital were routine, where the government was unable to control almost 30 percent of its territory, either because of the FARC or because of paramilitaries. It is a country that now has the foreign minister who was held 6 years in captivity by the FARC, and so it is a coun-

try that has come a long way back under President Uribe and his Program for Democratic Security.

He is, as a result, a very popular leader in Colombia, but I think that is because he has brought his people security, and he is devoted to human rights and to furthering the democratic enterprise. I know there are a lot of concerns, but I will just say I was in Medellín very recently with a congressional delegation, and Medellín which used to be synonymous with Pablo Escobar and trouble is now a thriving city in which Colombian citizens believe they can be secure.

Finally, let me just in response to something that Senator Gregg said, I really do hope that we can remove these restrictions on the ANC. This is a country with which we now have excellent relations, South Africa, but it's frankly rather embarrassing matters that I still have to waive in my own counterpart, the Foreign Minister of South Africa, not to mention the great leader Nelson Mandela.

So we have a lot of work to do. I continue to hope that during the remainder of our tenure that we will be able to make progress in providing for our people compensation reform, security facilities, and new positions. I hope that we'll be able to make some progress on the great foreign policy issues of our day.

PREPARED STATEMENT

But I have been enormously proud to serve as American Secretary of State because George Shultz once told me that it's the best job in government. I said, "George, why is that?"

He said, "Because there is no greater honor than representing the United States of America as its chief diplomat." I have found that, and I want to thank you for helping me play that role. Thank you very much.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CONDOLEEZZA RICE

Chairman Leahy, Senator Gregg, members of the committee: Thank you for this opportunity to appear before the committee today in support of the President's fiscal year 2009 international affairs budget request, and to discuss our Nation's foreign policy priorities. As you know, this is the last budget I will present to you in my capacity as Secretary of State. I want to take this occasion to thank the committee, and especially the Chairman and Ranking Member, for their support and cooperation on many of the issues we addressed here in the past 3 years, and to let you know that this administration is committed to a vigorous foreign policy during our remaining 9 months. We have many critical issues before us and we intend to press forward our national interests on all fronts. I look forward to working with the Committee to do just that.

I would like to take a moment to ask you to act quickly on the balance of funding requested in the fiscal year 2008 Global War on Terror Supplemental. These additional resources are critical to the Department's continued diplomatic operations in Iraq. The Supplemental also addresses critical security and construction requirements in Afghanistan, support for international organizations functioning in Iraq and Afghanistan, and peacekeeping missions in Darfur as well as other urgent humanitarian and foreign assistance efforts. This funding is necessary to our on-going diplomatic mission and I ask for your support.

FISCAL YEAR 2009 STATE OPERATIONS REQUEST

Let me begin by discussing our request for Department of State operations. This request funds the platform on which we build our foreign policy activities, including diplomacy and foreign assistance, around the world.

The fiscal year 2009 budget for Department of State operations totals \$11.456 billion. These funds will significantly strengthen the core programming, policy, and

management capabilities of the Department which are necessary to carry out vital U.S. diplomatic and consular relations with more than 180 countries. They will also support strategic U.S. engagement abroad through public diplomacy and multilateral diplomacy.

DIPLOMATIC SOLUTIONS TO NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES

The request provides \$3.806 billion to increase the capacity of American diplomacy to meet challenges to U.S. national security and welfare in the international arena where power is defined increasingly in economic and financial terms and where transnational threats like terrorism, disease, and drug trafficking have become urgent. The requested funding will strengthen the global operating platform for the U.S. Government and add 1,095 new positions. These new positions will allow us to expand training in much-needed skills, including in critical foreign languages. The positions will also increase the number of Political Advisors to the military combatant commands, enhance interagency collaboration, and allow Department employees to take advantage of interagency development and training opportunities. Increased interagency cooperation is a valuable means to advance our diplomacy, but we need sufficient numbers of trained personnel to execute complex, coordinated efforts abroad. Building the Department's capacity to fill this role is my highest priority and I ask for your strong support.

The request also includes funding, as in previous years, for Foreign Service Compensation Reform, which would eliminate the pay disincentive caused by the loss of locality pay upon transfer to foreign assignments. When the government instituted locality pay in the 1990s, it did not include Foreign Service employees working abroad. As a result, when officers transfer to overseas assignments, they lose the locality portion of their pay. With the Washington, D.C. rate now equal to approximately over 20 percent of employee compensation, this loss severely undermines the salaries of officers assigned abroad. Moreover, this sizable and growing disincentive undermines our ability to attract talent and reward sacrifice. Diplomacy is a difficult, sometimes dangerous business, and the sacrifices made by Foreign Service officers and their families are real. In implementing Senior Pay Reform, we were able to eliminate this disincentive for our senior members of the Foreign Service, but the problem remains—and is more acute—for our mid-level and junior officers. I am asking that Congress provide the necessary authorization requested by the administration to address this problem by enabling a transition to a performance-based pay system and a global rate of pay.

CIVILIAN STABILIZATION IN POST-CONFLICT STATES

The request provides \$249 million, including funding for 351 positions, in a new appropriation, the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, to build a U.S. Government civilian capacity that can assist in reconstruction and stabilization efforts in post-conflict states. The requested funding will support, train, equip, and deploy an interagency civilian response corps comprised of interagency Active and Standby components and a Civilian Reserve of outside experts. This effort will provide mission-ready experts in fields such as policing and the rule of law, transitional governance, and economic stabilization and development. The request will also fund the personnel and operating expenses of the Office of the Coordinator that provides Washington leadership to whole-of-government strategic planning, analysis, policy direction, and coordination of USG reconstruction and stabilization activities. The CSI complements our request for additional personnel and has the strong support of the Department of Defense. This is a high priority and we need to get this accomplished.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S BORDERS

The fiscal year 2009 budget provides \$2.124 billion for the Border Security Program. This program helps secure American borders against illegal entry by terrorists and others who threaten homeland security. At the same time, it facilitates the entry of legitimate foreign visitors and students. Revenue from Machine Readable Visa (MRV) fees, Enhanced Border Security Program fees, the Western Hemisphere Travel Surcharge, and visa fraud prevention fees will fund continuous improvements in systems, processes, and programs. The fees will also fund 448 additional positions required to address rising passport demand associated with the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative and rising visa demand, including increases related to Border Crossing Card renewals.

PROVIDING SECURE DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES

The request provides \$1.163 billion for Worldwide Security Protection to increase security for diplomatic personnel, property, and information in the face of international terrorism. The funding will extend the program to upgrade security equipment and technical support, information and systems security, perimeter security, and security training. This funding will also support the worldwide local guard force protecting diplomatic missions and residences. Funding increases will help meet new security demands in all regions and implement the Visa and Passport Security Strategic Plan to safeguard the integrity of U.S. travel documents. Because people continue to be the single most important factor in deterrence and response to terrorist acts, the funding will add 200 security professionals.

The request provides \$1.790 billion to continue security-driven construction projects and to address the major physical security and maintenance needs of U.S. Embassies and consulates. This total includes \$844 million for the Capital Security Construction Program to replace diplomatic facilities at the most vulnerable overseas posts. Fiscal year 2009 proposed projects include new Embassy compounds in Santo Domingo, Dakar, Maputo, and Malabo. During the fifth year of Capital Security Cost Sharing (CSCS), U.S. Government agencies with personnel abroad under chief of Mission authority will contribute \$455 million to CSCS construction. The request also includes \$105 million to upgrade compound security at high-risk posts and to increase protection for soft targets such as schools and recreation facilities. In addition, the request includes \$841 million for ongoing operations, including major rehabilitations. These programs are essential to protect the investment in real estate assets which are currently valued at over \$14 billion and to keep more than 15,000 properties in good working order.

INFLUENCING FOREIGN OPINION THROUGH PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

The request provides \$395 million in appropriations for public diplomacy to influence foreign opinion and win support for U.S. foreign policy goals, including through providing 20 new public diplomacy positions. In addition to advocating U.S. policies, public diplomacy communicates the principles that underpin them and fosters a sense of common values and interests. Objectives of the national public diplomacy strategy include promoting democracy and good governance, marginalizing extremist leaders and organizations, and preventing extremist messaging from gaining a foothold with vulnerable populations. Through innovative programs we are providing positive alternatives for Muslim youths, and helping build networks among progressive-minded Muslims, in many cases working in partnership with the private sector, civil society and academia. We also place a high priority on modernizing our communications architecture to strengthen our leadership in the war of ideas and sharpen our messaging to counter terrorist propaganda.

Exchange Programs

The request provides \$522 million and 19 positions for educational and cultural exchanges to increase mutual understanding and to engage the leaders of tomorrow. Aligned with other public diplomacy efforts, these people-to-people programs are uniquely able to address difficult issues. The request includes increased funding for academic and professional programs to reach constituencies vital for America—youth and those who influence youth. The programs include English language, Fulbright, and other academic initiatives, and Citizens Exchanges, within the President's Partnership for Latin American Youth. The funding will also continue to support the President's National Security Language Initiative, promoting teaching and study of critical foreign languages, including the Arabic, Chinese, Korean, and Russian languages, and the Indic, Turkic, and Persian language families.

Information Technology

The request provides \$414 million for State's Central Fund, including revenue from fees, for Central Fund investments in "knowledge management" and information technology (IT). The ability of the Department to support transformational diplomacy, information sharing, rightsizing efforts, and E-Government initiatives depends increasingly on robust, secure IT. Funding increases in fiscal year 2009 will help support the State Messaging and Archive Retrieval Toolset project, diplomacy through collaboration, and IT infrastructure that provides American diplomats with anytime/anywhere computing.

Multilateral Diplomacy

The request provides \$1.529 billion to pay U.S.-assessed contributions to 47 international organizations, including the United Nations. The request includes payments to address outstanding U.S. arrears to international organizations. The re-

quest recognizes U.S. international obligations and reflects a commitment to maintain the financial stability and efficiency of those organizations. Membership in international organizations assists in building coalitions and gaining support for U.S. policies and interests. Further, multilateral diplomacy through such organizations serves key U.S. foreign policy goals, including advancing democratic principles and fundamental human rights, promoting economic growth through free trade and investment, settling disputes peacefully, encouraging non-proliferation and arms control, and strengthening international cooperation in environment, agriculture, technology, science, education, and health.

International Peacekeeping

The request provides \$1.497 billion to pay the United States share of costs for United States peacekeeping missions. This funding will help support peacekeeping efforts worldwide, including the activities of ongoing missions in Lebanon, Haiti, Liberia, and the Congo. Proposed funding increases will also pay United States assessments for new missions in Darfur and Chad. These peacekeeping activities further U.S. goals by maintaining peace and strengthening regional confidence and stability. They also leverage U.S. political, military, and financial assets through the participation of other states that provide funds and peacekeepers for conflicts around the world.

FISCAL YEAR 2009 FOREIGN OPERATIONS REQUEST

Let me turn now to our foreign assistance request. The total State Department and USAID Foreign Operations request for fiscal year 2009 is \$22.7 billion. These funds support the strategic purposes of our diplomacy: securing peace, supporting democracy, advocating our principles and ideals, meeting global challenges, and aiding our friends and allies.

War on Terror

Fighting and winning the war on terror remains the greatest challenge to our national security, and it will continue to be the focus of our military and diplomatic efforts as long as extremist ideologies and their proponents find safety and support in unstable and failing states. We have made enormous strides in diplomatic and foreign assistance efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, which are notable for their successes even as we recognize the daunting work that remains. We credit our progress in these countries to many who have struggled there, to our military and our diplomats, to the international community, to our counterparts in the military and government in these countries, and to the citizens in Iraq and Afghanistan who recognize and are fighting for the full benefits of freedom.

Iraq

Our engagement with Iraq remains a centerpiece of the United States' effort in the war on terror.

The administration's fiscal year 2009 requests of \$404 million in foreign assistance funding and \$65 million in operations funding are critical to meet these goals. Of this total, \$300 million in Economic Support Funds will help consolidate the security gains realized in 2007 and 2008, and will increase the capacity of local and national Iraqi Governments (\$75 million) to provide services for their population, which in turn will reduce support for extremist elements. The administration is also requesting funds to help the non-oil economy grow, including the development of the agricultural sector (\$50 million), support for business formation (\$25 million), and continued support for key Iraqi economic reforms (\$62 million), such as reducing subsidies. These programs will generate jobs and stimulate economic growth. This request also includes funding for the Iraqi-American Enterprise Fund (\$40 million), which will address a critical lack of access to capital and know-how that is preventing Iraqi entrepreneurs from forming companies. This request also includes \$48 million to continue Democracy and Civil Society programs, which will be vital to support Iraq's nascent democracy, particularly in working with new representatives and/or parties elected in anticipated nationwide elections in 2009. Democracy and Civil Society programs also will have a direct impact in fostering political reconciliation.

The administration is also requesting \$75 million in funding under International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) to bolster Iraq's rule of law, including continuing training and security for judges and program support for major crime task forces, which will help Iraq combat terrorism and a growing criminal element, and mentoring to Iraq's corrections service to ensure criminals are effectively and humanely kept off the streets. The administration is also requesting \$20 million in Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, and Demining (NADR) programs, of which \$16

million will support expansion of a successful humanitarian de-mining program that has allowed hundreds of communities to bring agricultural and industrial land back into production, and \$4 million in programs to combat terrorism.

Taken together, these programs are an integrated approach to build on the significant investment we have already made in Iraq's success. The fiscal year 2009 programs complement our previous investments in infrastructure, security, and capacity building and will hasten the ability of the Iraqi people to meet their own needs. Failure to fully fund these programs will endanger the progress we have made over the last 5 years. In order for us to carry out these programs, we need the full \$65 million request for operational funding for core Embassy functions.

As a final point on Iraq, I would like to bring some clarity to discussions about the agreement that we plan to negotiate with Iraq. With the United Nations Security Council mandate due to expire at the end of this year, we need an agreement with Iraq that will ensure that U.S. forces continue to have the authorities and protections they need to operate in Iraq. An agreement with Iraq will not contain a "security commitment;"—that is, there will be no binding U.S. obligation to act in the common defense in the event of an armed attack on Iraq, it will not set troop levels, and it will not provide for permanent bases in Iraq. This arrangement will not "lock in" specific policies, but will leave policy options open for the next President. In addition, much as we did in Afghanistan, we expect to negotiate a strategic framework arrangement building on the Declaration of Principles that will formalize our intentions to cooperate in political, economic, cultural, and security fields. We have provided briefings and will continue to do so as our discussions with Iraq progress.

Afghanistan

For fiscal year 2009, the President has requested \$1.054 billion in foreign assistance to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a sanctuary for terrorists. We have achieved many successes in our fight against the Taliban and Al-Qaida, but we have not won yet. The funds requested are critical to supporting our comprehensive approach to defeat the insurgency and return Afghanistan to long-term stability based on Afghan national sovereignty, democratic principles, and respect for human rights. The Afghan Government enjoys broad support, while the Taliban offers no political vision. We are collaborating bilaterally, with donors, and through NATO and other multilateral organizations to tighten the coherence of security, economic, and governance capacity-building efforts. Development and security efforts on both sides of the Afghan-Pakistan border aim to prevent the deterioration of overall progress.

Recognizing that counterinsurgency requires more than physical security, we have requested \$370 million for counter narcotics efforts, \$248 million for democracy and governance, \$109 million for health and education, \$226 million for economic growth, \$74 million to support the work of our Provincial Reconstruction Teams, and \$12 million in non-emergency food aid. Development efforts to improve Afghan governance at the national and regional and local levels and to achieve prosperity for the Afghan people are as crucial to winning the war as security assistance to fight insurgent groups, to prevent Afghanistan from becoming an illicit narcotics-based economy, and to train the Afghan Security Forces. Simultaneously, the efforts of the United States and the international community to work with the government of Afghanistan to improve security, build government capacity, protect human rights, reconstruct infrastructure, and provide humanitarian assistance generate confidence in the Afghan Government and in turn decrease support for insurgents. As part of these efforts, we look forward to working with Congress on Reconstruction Opportunity Zone (ROZ) legislation that would help create employment and sustainable economic development in Afghanistan and the border regions of Pakistan.

West Bank/Gaza

The United States is firmly committed to supporting Israelis and Palestinians as they work to realize peace. Working with international donors and Quartet Representative Tony Blair, the United States is strengthening our support for the Palestinian Authority (PA) Government to help achieve this end.

Our fiscal year 2009 funding request for the West Bank and Gaza is \$100 million. This includes \$25 million for the Palestinian Authority Security Sector Reform Program, part of a broader United States and international effort to strengthen and transform the Palestinian security sector and assist the PA in its efforts to extend law and order and meet its Roadmap obligations to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure, thereby providing a reliable partner for Israel. Establishing the rule of law and effective security in the West Bank will support President Mahmoud Abbas

and Prime Minister Salam Fayyad by demonstrating to the Palestinian people that the PA can reduce lawlessness and improve their lives, and by building the capacity of the PA to address security threats against Israel. The request includes \$24 million for democracy projects that will assist the PA Government to extend the rule of law and improve governance, including bolstering the justice system through training judges and building judicial independence, and supporting local municipalities. A further \$18 million will assist the PA to achieve economic growth by focusing on activities that increase agricultural productivity, provide support for micro-enterprises, create private sector opportunity and increase trade. Finally, \$33 million will assist the PA Government to provide essential health, education, and humanitarian services to the Palestinian people.

U.S. Government assistance in these areas will help the Palestinian people directly and support moderates such as President Abbas and Prime Minister Fayyad, while also providing tools through security improvements, civil society building, and economic growth to combat Hamas and its terrorist infrastructure.

Pakistan

A broad, long-term, and strategic relationship with Pakistan is now crucial to global security and regional economic interests. We are encouraging formation of a moderate center to complete the transition to democracy and underwrite the fight against violent extremism. Our programs support transparent elections, democratic institutions, and long-term development. We are cooperating closely with the Pakistanis to defeat extremist groups and networks. U.S. assistance programs support all these goals.

For fiscal year 2009, the Department of State is requesting \$826 million for Pakistan, to bolster four areas of cooperation: peace and security, democracy, economic growth, and health and education.

To win the war on terror, this request includes \$150 million specifically to support development in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas. This is the second tranche of a 5-year \$750 million Presidential Commitment initiated in 2007. This will allow the United States to help the government of Pakistan recast its relationship with the country's Federally Administered Tribal Areas.

Of the total \$826 million, we are requesting \$343 million for peace and security assistance, including \$7.7 million for counterterrorism programs and \$32 million for border security, law enforcement capacity building, and counter-narcotics efforts. This will aid the government of Pakistan in countering the terrorist threat, enhancing border security, addressing illicit narcotics activities, and establishing the means to provide for a peaceful and secure environment.

Recognizing that the war on terror can not be won solely by improving security, our request includes \$55 million to strengthen democracy and good governance, \$119 million to expand economic opportunity, and \$260 million for health and education.

Lebanon

Progress in Lebanon remains a critical element of our efforts to foster democracy and security in the Middle East. We have joined hands with Lebanon's elected government to support their struggle for freedom, independence, and security. For fiscal year 2009, the Department of State has requested \$142 million in foreign assistance for Lebanon to support two parallel objectives: countering threats to Lebanon's sovereignty and security from armed groups backed by Syria and Iran, and helping foster good governance and a vibrant economy.

Three years ago this week, former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri was assassinated. One month later, the Lebanese people demanded an end to foreign domination and political violence, taking to the streets to call for Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon. The fiscal year 2009 budget request includes support for the Special Tribunal for Lebanon—a concrete demonstration of our unwavering commitment to justice, an end to political violence, and the protection of Lebanese sovereignty.

Since then, Lebanon has elected a new parliament and deployed its army to the south of the country for the first time in 40 years. However, Lebanon remains under siege by a Syrian and Iranian-backed opposition working to undermine the nation's stability, sovereignty, and state institutions. Meanwhile, political violence continues, including a January 15 bombing of an American Embassy vehicle. Our vision of a safe, secure, and democratic Middle East cannot survive without a sovereign and stable Lebanon.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Economic Support Funds

The fiscal year 2009 request for Economic Support Funds (ESF) is \$3.15 billion, an increase of \$164 million over the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. ESF remains a reliable assistance mechanism by which we advance U.S. interests through programs that help recipient countries address short- and long-term political, economic, and security needs. ESF also supports major foreign policy initiatives such as working to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and regional economic integration in East Asia. ESF funds global and regional programs that support specific U.S. foreign policy goals, including assistance to states critical in the war on terror.

The request includes significant increases in some activities over the administration's request for fiscal year 2008, such as programs in Nepal to address rural poverty and help blunt the appeal of Maoist rebels, Lebanon to bolster that country's democratic traditions and reduce the ability of Hezbollah to divide the populace, and South and Central Asia to improve communications and transportation linkages between Afghanistan and its regional neighbors.

The administration's strategic priorities for fiscal year 2009 ESF include funding for our partners in the war on terror to mitigate the influence of terrorist and insurgent groups and reduce their potential to recruit in regions bereft of political and economic participation; countries and regions at risk of civil unrest, to assist in building democratic institutions, fight poverty, and provide basic services and economic opportunities; states of concern to encourage democratic reform and build civil society; and regional and thematic programs like the Asia-Pacific Partnership, Middle East Partnership Initiative, and promoting implementation of Free Trade Agreements, especially improving labor and environmental conditions, and efforts to combat Trafficking in Persons.

Millennium Challenge Corporation

The request of \$2.225 billion supports the continuing assistance efforts of the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), an important contributor to U.S. foreign assistance through the principles of promoting growth through good governance, investment in health and education, and economic freedom. By early fiscal year 2008, the MCC had approved a total of 16 compacts worth over \$5.5 billion. An additional 14 threshold agreements were in place at the end of fiscal year 2007, and there is a robust pipeline of compacts under development. MCC expects to sign compacts with Tanzania (\$698 million) in February 2008, and with Burkina Faso (\$500–\$550 million) and Namibia (\$300–325 million) this summer. MCC is also engaged with Jordan, Moldova, Malawi and other countries in the compact development process, and foresees sizable compacts with those countries in fiscal year 2009.

Eight compacts are entering their second or third year of implementation, and are achieving tangible results. For example, in Georgia, the first phase of gas pipeline repairs is complete, providing Georgian citizens and businesses with needed electricity and heat. In Honduras and Madagascar, farmers are employing new techniques to improve productivity and links to reliable markets, thereby increasing their incomes.

MCC and USAID programs are complementary and mutually reinforcing. USAID programs help countries improve policies to qualify for compacts, build their capacity to manage funds and administer compact and threshold programs, and support overall U.S. efforts to keep MCC countries on a transformational development track. MCC programs frequently build on existing USAID programs and other USG assistance. They do not overlap with them, and USAID adjusts programs to augment funding for opportunities created by MCC programs, and to enhance and sustain assistance in other areas.

Development Assistance

The Development Assistance request of \$1.639 billion supports programs in countries that range from those with very low incomes whose governments are sufficiently stable and organized, to those with income levels above MCC eligibility that are relatively well-governed. The goal of all Development Assistance is to foster an expanded community of well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people and act responsibly within the international community.

Countries receiving DA face a range of long-term development challenges. Experience shows that the most effective response is to provide a well-balanced package that includes sustained support for transformational democratic and economic reforms and that is closely coordinated with MCC programs and the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). These assistance programs also must complement and reinforce other development-related foreign policy initiatives, including

our diplomatic efforts to advance freedom and democracy, expand international trade opportunities, and address climate change and other critical environmental issues. Our strategic priorities for DA funding in fiscal year 2009 include: long-term democratic governance and economic growth programs in Africa; trade capacity building programs in Africa and the Western Hemisphere; capacity building in support of the Global Climate Change initiative; strengthened democratic governance in the Western Hemisphere; accelerated literacy and numeracy programs under the President's International Education Initiative, and more broadly in Africa, the Western Hemisphere and the Middle East.

We also recognize that any effort to improve development initiatives will require a significantly increased overseas presence of USAID, together with expanded technical and stewardship capabilities. Therefore, we are requesting \$767.2 million in USAID Operating Expenses which will allow USAID to increase its overseas workforce. Under the Development Leadership Initiative, USAID will hire 300 Foreign Service Officers above attrition in fiscal year 2009 to build the capacity to implement the National Security Strategy for foreign assistance.

Trade Agreements

Let me say a word about the trade agreements we have concluded with Colombia, Panama, and Korea. Expanding trade opportunities advances American economic and national security interests. The Department is deeply involved in international trade issues at all levels. I recently traveled to Colombia with nine Members of Congress, who saw first-hand the impressive results of economic and political reform there. Our missions abroad actively support the negotiation and enforcement of our trade agreements.

Through multilateral, regional, and bilateral trade agreements, we lower tariff and non-tariff barriers to U.S. businesses, farmers, ranchers, and entrepreneurs. The American worker can compete successfully with anyone so long as the rules are fair. We help set those rules by promoting open markets, as we have done since the end of World War II. Our efforts at the World Trade Organization (WTO) strengthen these rules and expand opportunities globally. We are at a critical juncture in the Doha Round of WTO negotiations, which the President has described as a "once in a generation opportunity" to create economic opportunity, promote development, and alleviate poverty. As the President noted in his State of the Union address, the United States is committed to the conclusion of a strong Doha Round this year, and will provide the leadership necessary to achieve this objective.

With respect to bilateral trade agreements, our free trade agreement with Colombia is a prime example of how such agreements can strengthen both our economy and national security. The United States currently provides duty-free treatment to virtually all Colombian products entering the United States under the Andean Trade Preference Act. With the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, United States GDP will grow by an estimated \$2.5 billion by expanding opportunities for United States exporters as the significant tariffs that are assessed on United States exports to Colombia are reduced and eliminated. We urge Congress to consider and pass the Colombia FTA to allow our exporters to receive the same treatment as is available to Colombian exports to the United States.

The importance of the agreement, however, extends beyond trade. The current and previous administrations, as well as the Congress, have made a significant commitment to Colombia by providing over \$5 billion in assistance through Plan Colombia. Security in Colombia is vastly improved, the economy has rebounded, and Colombians have real hope for the future. The proposed FTA advances our partnership and cements these gains. The Colombia FTA reflects the open, democratic, economic, and political system which is our vision for Latin America. Colombia is a friend of the United States. Its government has taken great risks to achieve the successes it has achieved. I urge the Congress to pass this agreement for internal security reasons as well.

Two additional key allies of the United States are also awaiting congressional action on free trade agreements: Panama and Korea. The U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement will build on our already vibrant trade relations and support the consolidation of freedom and democracy in this important country. The U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement is the most commercially significant FTA in over 15 years. Korea has been a steadfast partner and ally in promoting peace and security in Northeast Asia and globally. I urge your action on these agreements as well.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE

Foreign Military Financing

The request of \$4.812 billion for Foreign Military Financing (FMF) will advance U.S. interests by ensuring that coalition partners, allies, and friendly foreign governments have the equipment and training necessary for common security goals and burden-sharing in joint missions. This request includes \$2.55 billion for Israel, the first year of a 10-year, \$30 billion commitment. FMF promotes our national security by strengthening the defense of friendly governments and bolstering their abilities to contain transnational threats, terrorism, and trafficking in persons, weapons, and narcotics. This request provides funding for Egypt to foster a modern, well-trained Egyptian military, and support for force modernization, border surveillance and counter-terrorism efforts in Jordan. FMF is helping to build a Lebanese army capable of implementing United Nation Security Council resolutions 1559 and 1701, secure Lebanon's border against weapons smuggling, and begin the process of disarming militias in Lebanon. The request also finances programs with the Gulf States of Bahrain and Oman as part of the Gulf Security Dialogue. FMF will also assist ongoing efforts to incorporate into NATO the most recent members of the Alliance and to support prospective NATO members and coalition partners, as well as partners in Iraq and Afghanistan.

International Military Education and Training

The International Military Education and Training (IMET) program request for fiscal year 2009 is \$90.5 million. Through professional and technical course curricula and specialized instruction, this key component of U.S. security assistance provides valuable education and training on U.S. military practices within a context of respect for democratic values and internationally recognized standards of human rights. IMET programs in Europe advance regional security and force integration among NATO and European armed forces, most notably in Turkey, Poland, Ukraine, and the Czech Republic. In the Near East, IMET provides technical training necessary to maintain United States-origin equipment in Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, and Oman. In Africa, IMET provides training programs for Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, and South Africa, countries central to long-term regional peace and stability. In East Asia, IMET programs with the Philippines and Indonesia, for example, focus on professionalizing defense forces and developing skills in fighting the war on terror. In South Asia, IMET programs improve military interoperability with the United States and educate South Asian armies in respect for human rights and civilian-military cooperation. In the Western Hemisphere, IMET focuses on building capacity to respond to regional security challenges, with major programs in El Salvador, Colombia, and Mexico.

IMET is a critical tool to strengthen important military relationships in the global fight against terrorism and to do so in the context of support for human rights. IMET helps ensure that future leaders of foreign militaries are well trained, exposed to the U.S. system of civilian control of the military, and have lasting ties to the U.S. defense community.

Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs

The request for the Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs Account is \$499 million. With this year's request, three separate sub-accounts, Humanitarian Demining, International Trust Fund, and Small Arms/Light Weapons, are combined into one line item in the budget to address more appropriately our global Conventional Weapons Destruction efforts. We are also establishing a proposed new sub-account for WMD terrorism to undertake projects that improve international capabilities to respond to potential WMD terrorist attacks.

The fiscal year 2009 request includes increases in several important areas. We propose continued funding for humanitarian demining and increased funding for programs to address the threat to civil and military aviation posed by terrorists and insurgents armed with MANPADS. We have also proposed increased funding for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund to address emergent nonproliferation and disarmament requirements including additional support for disablement and dismantlement activities in North Korea, as they are achieved in the ongoing six-party talks. Increases in the Global Threat Reduction program will strengthen biosecurity programs and anti-nuclear smuggling programs.

Under the Anti-Terrorism Assistance (ATA) program, we are expanding the TransSahara Counterterrorism Partnership (TSCTP) in the North Africa region, and strengthening linkages with the existing TSCTP in sub-Saharan Africa to prevent terrorist movement between Mahgreb and Sub-Saharan states and to promote

greater regional cooperation. Increased funding for ATA will also support counterterrorism programs in East Africa.

Peacekeeping Operations

The fiscal year 2009 request for Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) is \$247.2 million, which is necessary to advance international support for voluntary, multi-national stabilization efforts, including support for non-U.N. missions and for U.S. conflict-resolution programs. PKO funding enhances the ability of states to participate in peacekeeping and stability operations and to address counterterrorism threats. In the aftermath of conflict, PKO funds help transform foreign military establishments into professional military forces guided by the rule of law.

An important element of fiscal year 2009 PKO funding is the President's Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI), now in its fifth year. Fiscal year 2009 funding will train over 15,000 peacekeeping troops to reach the initiative's goal of 75,000 peacekeeping troops trained worldwide. GPOI includes the African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) program, as well as train-and-equip programs outside of Africa. GPOI assists in the deployment of peace operations troops, provides logistics and transportation support, and assists regional organizations in planning and managing peacekeeping operations. PKO funding also helps support TSCTP; Security Sector Reform programs in Liberia, Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo; peacekeeping activities in Somalia; and the Multinational Force and Observers peacekeeping mission in the Sinai.

GLOBAL CHALLENGES

Democracy and Human Rights

We will continue to promote democratic development and uphold international standards of human and worker rights globally. We are requesting \$1.745 billion for programs to advance good governance, democracy and human rights in support of the President's Freedom Agenda, including political competition and consensus building, rule of law, and civil society activities in countries around the world. This budget will support centrally managed and multilateral efforts that provide targeted funding for unforeseen needs and opportunities, advance democracy in difficult countries where bilateral programs are not feasible and provide technical support to our overseas missions on democracy issues and programs.

Our request includes \$60 million in ESF for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund to support innovative activities that open political space in struggling and nascent democracies and in authoritarian regimes as the leading element of the U.S. Government's efforts to effect positive and lasting change. HRDF will allow us to support pivotal democracy and human rights programming in critical target countries such as China, Belarus, Russia, Lebanon, North Korea, Thailand, Venezuela, Somalia, Burma, and Pakistan. With HRDF, we will continue to support the Global Human Rights Defenders Fund, a program that enables us to quickly disburse small grants to human rights defenders facing extraordinary needs due to government repression. In addition, we will fund innovative approaches to advance labor rights abroad by strengthening democratic trade unions and will promote corporate social responsibility globally.

International Narcotics and Law Enforcement

The \$1.202 billion request for International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) and \$406 million for the Andean Counter drug Program (ACP) in fiscal year 2009 supports bilateral and global programs to combat transnational crime, illicit narcotics threats, and terrorist networks built upon and funded by the illegal drug trade. These programs aim to strengthen and professionalize law enforcement institutions that are weak or subject to corruption.

INCLE funds are focused mainly on countries in which serious security threats exist, both to host governments and to our national interests as well. This includes countries like Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Indonesia, Liberia, and Sudan.

Of particular note this year is the importance and timeliness of the Merida Initiative, our new program for security and law enforcement cooperation with Mexico and the nations of Central America. The President has requested \$550 million in fiscal year 2008 and in fiscal year 2009, a total of \$1.1 billion. The administration believes that we must act now to assist our southern neighbors in their fight against the criminal organizations that threaten their security and prosperity, as well as our own. These nations have demonstrated the political will to tackle critical problems and have asked us to cooperate with them as partners. I strongly urge Congress to fund this important national security initiative both through the fiscal year 2008 supplemental and the fiscal year 2009 appropriation.

Migration and Refugees Assistance

Our commitment to providing humanitarian assistance and protection for refugees, conflict victims, and vulnerable migrants remains strong. We are requesting \$764 million in fiscal year 2009 to fund contributions to key international humanitarian and non-governmental organizations and for bilateral programs to respond to humanitarian needs abroad and identify durable solutions, including resettlement of refugees in the United States. These funds provide for basic needs to sustain life, protect refugees and conflict victims, assist refugees with voluntary repatriation, local integration, or permanent resettlement in a third country. They are a humane and effective response to pressing needs that reflects the compassion of the American people. Humanitarian needs related to Iraq and Afghanistan will be subject to a separate fiscal year 2009 Supplemental request. The request of \$45 million for the President's Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund is critical to meet urgent and unforeseen humanitarian requirements.

Global HIV/AIDS Initiative

The Global HIV/AIDS Initiative account (GHAI) is the largest source of funding for the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). The request of \$4.779 billion is a substantial increase over the fiscal year 2008 enacted level for the PEPFAR bilateral program, and capitalizes on the demonstrated capacity-building and programmatic successes in prevention, care, and treatment during the first 5 years of the program. Funding will support country-based activities, international partners, technical support, and oversight and management. The fiscal year 2009 request is the first of a new, 5-year, \$30 billion Presidential commitment that builds upon and expands our initial 5-year, \$15 billion commitment.

The request also proposes the development of a "Partnership Compact" model, with the goal of strengthening host government commitment. In selected countries, compacts will outline reciprocal responsibilities, linking our resources to increased host country resources for HIV/AIDS and the establishment of policies that foster an effective HIV/AIDS response.

Environment

As President Bush said in his State of the Union address, the United States is committed to confronting the challenge of climate change. We want an international agreement that will slow, stop, and eventually reverse the growth of greenhouse gasses. Achieving that goal will require commitments by all major economies, a point we have made in the two Major Economies Meetings on Energy Security and Climate Change under the initiative launched by the President in support of U.N. negotiations.

In Indonesia this past December, the United States, joined with the other parties to the U.N. Framework on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to adopt the "Bali Action Plan." This document will guide negotiations of a new post 2012 climate change arrangement by 2009. Our fiscal year 2009 budget request includes \$64 million to support our efforts to address adaptation and reduce deforestation, major elements of the "Bali Roadmap."

Through the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate (APP), the United States works with China, India, Australia, South Korea, Canada, and Japan to accelerate the adoption of clean energy technologies. Over 100 APP projects and activities are reducing emissions in major sectors such as power generation, cement, steel, aluminum, and buildings. Our fiscal year 2009 foreign assistance budget request for APP totals \$26 million.

As part of our long-term commitment to protecting the Earth's ozone layer we are proposing \$19 million for the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund. Last year, the international community agreed to a landmark U.S. proposal to accelerate the phase-out of ozone depleting substances. Over the next two decades, this acceleration will provide climate system benefits that could exceed those contemplated under the Kyoto Protocol.

Finally, a request of \$40 million supports our commitment to labor and trade-related environmental initiatives with our Dominican Republic-Central American Free Trade Agreement partners. These activities will strengthen institutions for more effective implementation and enforcement of environmental laws and promote biodiversity, market-based conservation, and private-sector environmental performance.

CONCLUSION

Chairman Leahy, the fiscal year 2009 International Affairs request proposes an increase of 16 percent over the fiscal year 2008 base appropriation, and more than 9 percent over all fiscal year 2008 appropriations enacted to date. I understand that

this is a significant increase. But the President and I, as well as the officials in all departments and agencies which administer the foreign affairs account, strongly believe this request is fully justified and critical to the national security interests of the United States. We understand that these funds are the result of the efforts of hard working American taxpayers. You have our commitment that we will manage these funds efficiently as stewards of the resources entrusted to us by the American people.

Thank you very much. I would be pleased to respond to questions.

Senator LEAHY. I wonder if George Shultz told you about the jet-lag, too.

We've been joined by the senior Republican on the committee, Senator Cochran of Mississippi, and, Senator Cochran, I heard you want to make a statement. Please go ahead.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, that's very kind of you, and thank you for convening the hearing. I am glad to be here to congratulate the Secretary on her outstanding tenure as Secretary of State. You have reflected great credit on our country, and we appreciate the things that you've done, the insights that you have, the energy you've brought to the task understanding the importance of the role that our country has in the world today. You've made us all very proud. Thank you.

Secretary RICE. Senator Cochran, thank you.

Senator LEAHY. Madam Secretary, there are 6 months before the November election, and I've already discussed the fact that neither you nor I want the world to come to an end while we wait for that. We have your budget request for 2009.

Can you tell me what the most urgent challenges your successor would face on management and programmatic needs? Are those adequately addressed in this budget?

Secretary RICE. Thank you, Senator. If I could use—rather than talking about specific issues, I think we know there are multiple issues in this by the turbulent world—

Senator LEAHY. But there are going to be some issues that will be sitting on his or her desk—

Secretary RICE. Yes.

Senator LEAHY [continuing]. On day one.

Secretary RICE. Yes.

Senator LEAHY. Do we have adequate resources?

Secretary RICE. Yes. I think, obviously, to try and have a sustainable position in Afghanistan, and Iraq is going to be very critical, and we will try to use the next 9 months to do that. But I think it speaks to a larger issue, which is, in fact, covered in our Budget, which is the ability of the State Department to exercise its role in what is a fundamentally different world now.

This is not a world now in which diplomats simply report on what is going on in the capital, it's not a world in which diplomats are mostly engaged in government-to-government relations; it's a world in which diplomats are in provincial reconstruction teams in Afghanistan and Iraq, literally imbedded with our Armed Forces and on the front lines trying to help in governance, trying to help in reconstruction.

It's a world in which our diplomats have to be able to go as they did after the earthquake in Pakistan up into the remote regions of

Pakistan to help with reconstruction and relief. It's a world in which they have to go into the villages of Guatemala to help with the programs that we're running to help farmers with subsistence.

So, Senator, if I could focus on one thing, it would be making sure that we are doing—that we have a large enough diplomatic corps, USAID corps, compensated properly, dealing with the concerns about family, and I think giving them safe and secure facilities in which to engage.

Senator LEAHY. Well, let me talk about that. We have staff in trailers in Baghdad, that's the most expensive Embassy ever at \$1.5 billion just for operating costs. Yet we still have staff sitting in trailers and not in a more secure area.

I do agree with you that we have not kept up the appropriate increase in the number of Foreign Service Officers, and I worry about what happens.

You mention Afghanistan. The Taliban and Al-Qaida have regrouped there. President Karzai's government effectively controls only a small portion of the country. The Marshall Plan for Afghanistan that many of us supported never materialized. Corruption's a huge problem. The vast bulk of our aid goes in the form of huge contracts to U.S. for-profit companies, and I would feel far more comfortable if we had our own professionals in the State Department and USAID handling it.

There has been some progress, of course. There are more boys and girls in school. The army's being rebuilt, access to health care has increased significantly. But when you see the Taliban and Al-Qaida regrouping, I worry should we do more? I mean, is the best way to give contracts to a half a dozen companies worth hundreds of millions of dollars? Or would it be a lot better if we had our own people doing that?

Secretary RICE. Well, I think it's a mix, Senator, as I said at the beginning. I do think that, for instance, in the 1990s when the numbers for USAID have gone over the last couple of decades from 5,000 to 1,000, that we've just cut to the bone.

Senator LEAHY. In fiscal year 2008, including the supplemental funding, we appropriated \$429 million for international disaster assistance, that was more than what the President asked for, but it was still 25 percent less than fiscal year 2007. We're told it leaves a shortfall of about \$200 million. The President's not asking for any additional funding. The Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance said it's preparing to cut back programs by 25 percent: that's 25 percent less for emergency shelter, food, and water, and so on.

This has always struck me as an area where we show the best face of America.

Secretary RICE. Yes, Senator, there are competing budget priorities, but I think that we will—the President will submit, both in budget and, I think, ultimately, probably we're looking at in supplementals what we need to do in terms of the disaster relief and also the food assistance.

Senator LEAHY. But—

Secretary RICE. We're suffering greatly just from the cost of food stock.

Senator LEAHY. But—

Secretary RICE. May I just—

Senator LEAHY. Oh, go ahead.

Secretary RICE [continuing]. On the issue of food, one thing that would help us enormously in what are now very stressed food budgets is if we could purchase locally. This is something the President has proposed, and that would be very, very helpful.

Senator LEAHY. I agree with you on that. I think that we are spending far too much money shipping food. We should be doing far more to help raise the food locally.

You're asking for an additional \$822 million for Iraq reconstruction programs. That doesn't include an additional \$1.5 billion you're requesting to pay for operating our huge new Embassy, which is already too small for the 1,100 people posted there.

Oil is at an all-time high. We're told that Iraq is taking in about \$4 billion a month in oil revenues, about \$50 billion a year, which is more than they have the capacity to spend. Shouldn't we start asking them to start paying a larger share of rebuilding?

I told you about the trip I took to Minnesota this weekend and looked at the bridge that collapsed there. We don't have the money to fix the bridges in America. We don't have money to rebuild our infrastructure in America, but you are asking for billions more to rebuild infrastructure in Iraq, and yet they're getting huge oil profits. Shouldn't they pay more of that themselves, and not the American taxpayers?

Secretary RICE. Senator, the Iraqis do need to spend their own money, and Ryan Crocker, I think, yesterday talked about the fact that we are largely out of the large-scale reconstruction business now. The Iraqis are taking that on.

We are trying to help them improve their budget execution so that in fact the money gets to where it's supposed to be, and much of the money that we're spending now is for that kind of programming. It's to improve their capacity, to improve their ability to execute so that they, in fact, can spend their own funding.

But we are largely getting out of the large-scale reconstruction.

Senator LEAHY. Well, you come back and ask for nearly \$1 billion just in the supplemental above what you'd already asked for, for reconstruction. Now, that's what troubles me.

Secretary RICE. Senator, it's a different kind of effort that we're making now. What we're trying to do, this is a part of a counter-insurgency approach which is that when you go into an area—for instance, a provincial reconstruction team goes into an area—where we're trying to build capacity outside of Baghdad, it's important that they be able to work with the governance structures. It's important that we have some programs and some funding that we can put into helping those people build capacities, helping them do small, smaller quick-acting projects so that people who have thrown, as is the case, for instance, in the Sunni heartland in Al-Anbar, who have thrown Al-Qaida out of their communities, can see quick-acting results.

But we've always told the Iraqis that they also have to spend their money. They've budgeted in their 2008 budget, which they did pass, \$49 billion, a significant portion of which is reconstruction funding. So I think you will see that they will take up reconstruction more and more; they will take up their security costs more and

more; that our programs will be aimed at capacity-building and quick-acting projects that really we're better to do.

Senator LEAHY. Well, we may have some disagreements, and I see the price will go up, I see them earning the revenues. I don't see much being spent.

Senator Gregg.

Senator GREGG. I would yield to Senator Cochran, as the ranking member of the committee.

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Thank you, Senator Gregg.

Madam Secretary, the President's request is designed, I assume, to last for the balance of this fiscal year. Do you anticipate any other supplemental requests?

Secretary RICE. Well, we have to consistently, constantly look, Senator, at the operating costs in the wars. We have, generally, not wanted to mainline, so to speak, operating costs that we hope are going to be coming down. So I can't make that commitment, but this is meant in terms of our base budget to last us for the year.

Senator COCHRAN. Is there any funding being requested for additional work to be done on the Embassy in Iraq?

Secretary RICE. There is a small amount. I believe it's about \$75 million, is that—

Senator COCHRAN. Just for the add-on.

Secretary RICE. Just for the add-on, right. The Embassy building is within the budget that was allocated for it.

We had a couple of additional things come along after the Embassy was designed and almost built: additional temporary housing which, because of the environment, has security costs that are high, and because General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker want to collocate some of their staff, we've had to make some additions in terms of space that can be used by the military.

But the Embassy, itself, remains at roughly \$549 million.

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much you and Senator Gregg conducting the hearing and reviewing the budget request. I think it's important for us to move rapidly to make the funds available so we give a clear signal that the Congress is supporting the administration in helping to stabilize the situation and bring peace to that region of the world. We're serious about it and determined to succeed.

Secretary RICE. Thank you, sir.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you, Senator Cochran. Senator Gregg.

Senator GREGG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've got a series of issues I'd like to raise just for—to quickly clear the table here.

There is language that we should be able to put in this supplemental. You would have no objection to it to try to straighten out this issue with the ANC and, certainly, people like Nelson Mandela coming into our country?

Secretary RICE. I would welcome it, sir.

Senator GREGG. Also, you spoke briefly, about the Colombian situation, but maybe you could give us a little more of your thoughts there, because it just seems to me that we're at risk of stepping backwards four or five steps in an area where we've made fairly significant progress, which is opening the doors of America to our

neighbors in Central and Latin America in the areas of commerce. Were the Free Trade Agreement to fail, it would seem to me to be a devastating effect on our relationship with Latin America and these nations which we're trying to bring into our sphere of understanding of what democracy is about, so to say.

Secretary RICE. Yes, Senator. I think this is just a critically important Free Trade Agreement for several reasons: First of all, it's a good trade agreement, and I think my colleague, Susan Schwab, would make the point that almost all Colombian goods, some 90 percent of them, are into the American market and this, in effect, levels the playing field going the other way with American goods going into the Colombian market.

But quite apart from the economics of it, the fact that free trade brings more prosperity and development to these countries than any assistance we could ever give I think is important to note.

Finally, on the strategic side, I was with my Mexican and Canadian counterparts yesterday to talk about our North American partnership, and they were very anxious about what's going to happen with this Colombia Free Trade Agreement, because they recognize as we do that people talk about the growth and alternative, more populist, more, if you will, anti-American trend in parts of Latin America.

Well, here we have a strong friend of the United States who is trying to do all of the right things for his country: where the wages are going up, where people are feeling safer, where he's democratically elected, where they're fighting terrorists, and where they are fighting outside interference from states that are hostile in the region to the United States. If we don't pass this Free Trade Agreement, then what kind of message are we going to send? That if you're a friend of the United States that tries to do all the right things and is under pressure from bad forces in your region, then we're not prepared to support. That's how it will be seen, and that's why I think it's absolutely critical that this Free Trade Agreement pass.

Senator GREGG. Thank you. I couldn't agree with you more.

Two other questions, if you could answer them in seriatim, although they aren't related. The first is, shouldn't we have a consulate in Lhasa, Tibet? It just seems to me that with all that's going on there, it's reasonable that we should open a consulate office there and maybe limit the ability of the Chinese Government to open further consulate offices in the United States until they gave us the right to put a consulate in that part of their country.

Second, we have really disrupted the economics and the culture of some of the neighbors of Iraq, some of whom are allies, specifically Jordan. Now, we have a 10-year agreement with Israel where we're going to spend over \$30 billion.

We have a 10-year agreement with Egypt where we're going to spend over \$15 billion. We have no agreement with Jordan, even though they're one of our best allies in the region, even though they've been extraordinarily supportive, extremely quiet about their efforts, and been willing to take on thousands and thousands of refugees which have cost them hundreds of millions of dollars.

They have requested that we support them in supporting the refugees and their border issues to the extent of \$500 million this

year, and it seems to be an extremely reasonable request. I'm just wondering why we've seen nothing from the administration that gives this type of support to our allies in Jordan. Second, I would hope that there would be no objection from the administration were we to put, find \$500 million in this supplemental to assist Jordan.

Secretary RICE. Thank you, Senator. On Tibet, we are looking at the possibility of a consulate in Tibet. If I may just use the opportunity, though, to say that the United States has been very active in making the case to the Chinese that they are going to be better off to deal with moderate forces on Tibet like the Dalai Lama, that they should open dialogue with him.

We pressed for access, consular access, for diplomats into Tibet. We got some limited access that, frankly, it wasn't good enough. So we've been very active, but we are looking at the question of a—it's on the internal list to take a look of when we could do it.

On Jordan, you're right. We have no stronger ally in the region in the war on terror and in the Middle East Peace, and in taking much of the load on Iraqi refugees. We are providing direct support to Iraqi refugees. We're providing support through the United Nations to help. I've talked to the Jordanians about some of the bureaucratic issues about being able to classify people so that they can receive some of that help.

But as to Jordan, as a whole they are an MCC threshold country. They have received significant debt relief which the United States advocated for and helped them to get. We always have to balance questions of resources. We believe we've dealt adequately with Jordan in this budget, but, of course, Jordan is a very, very good friend of the United States, and we are always pleased to see them helped out.

Senator GREGG. My time is about up, but I really think we've given them a short shrift. I mean, when you look at what we're doing for Israel and Egypt in comparison to our commitment to Jordan, there's essentially nonexistent commitment to Jordan. They're bearing much more of the burden of Iraq than either Israel or Egypt are bearing.

So it seems to me we ought to, at the minimum, have at least some commitment this year to help them with their refugee and border issues of at least a half a billion dollars, which is the number that they've asked for.

Senator LEAHY. Half a billion.

Senator GREGG. \$500 million. Compared to the Israeli commitment and the Egyptian commitment, that's not dramatic. Then we should have a 10-year agreement with them like we do with Israel and Egypt.

Thank you, my time's up. Thank you.

Senator LEAHY. It's interesting Senator Gregg has raised that. I read in the paper about these tens of billions of dollars that we've agreed to give Egypt and Israel. That's the only place I've heard about it. Nobody from the administration has talked to me, nor whether we're to cut disaster relief or maternal health in the poorest nations in the world, or where we find the money to pay for this agreement.

You've agreed with Senator Gregg on helping Jordan, and I happen to agree with that. There's no money in this budget for that either.

I wish, just once, if you're going to be promising to give all this money to all these countries, especially 10-year agreements, that somebody would take, I don't know, 1 minute, 2 minutes—we're talking about tens and tens of billions to talk to the people that actually have to find the money and appropriate it.

Senator BOND.

Senator BOND. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I want to commend the Secretary. I agree with the many things you outline, and I agree with the comments also made by my colleague from New Hampshire. I have a number of items I want to cover that are supportive of your position and would like to ask you, just briefly, if I'm on the right track.

First, yesterday we heard from General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker about the military successes in Iraq, and the kinetic forces have been successful in moving toward security and stability there. But it seems to me that in order to take full advantage of these kinetic military successes by our brave service men and woman, we need a surge in America's nonkinetic, smart power initiatives.

Now, I believe that Secretary of Defense Gates had said that at the very top, and I can tell you down at the operational level, my son, who is a Marine Intel officer and a Scout Sniper commander in Al-Anbar, said the only way we can build on the military successes is to bring economic progress, economic success building the infrastructure. He saw that at the ground level. Secretary Gates has said it at the top level.

I would assume—well, as I've travel around the world, I have talked to our Embassy personnel, and our Intelligence community, and these people who are on the front lines are telling me that if we're to succeed in the challenges that radical Islam terrorists presented, it's 80 to 90 percent smart power, nonkinetic. Is that a sentiment with which you agree?

Secretary RICE. I do, Senator. I think it has really two dimensions, though. One is that in places where countries are already stabilized and the like, obviously, it's getting out beyond capitals and working with subsistence farmers and working with people in AIDS clinics, that kind of work.

In war areas, the civilians are very well represented, and the State Department is very well represented: the provincial reconstruction teams that are operating in Anbar, imbedded with our military, going out and doing governance, working with provincial councils.

I'll tell you, Senator, I sat with the provincial council of Kirkuk, one of the most troubled areas in Iraq. We had two diplomats there who were helping them to work through governance issues, Arabs and Kurds alike. That's the kind of work that we do, and those people are on the front lines.

Senator BOND. Madam Secretary, I would agree with you. I'm very proud that our Missouri National Guard has taken an agricultural development team to Nangarhar Province in Afghanistan with farm boys as the Guards and with extension agents. But I

really believe it's a wide range of smart power from economic investment, Peace Corps, educational exchanges, USAID. I strongly support your comments about the need for free trade and the Free Trade Agreements.

As I've traveled around the Americas, free trade efforts are a critically important item in our overall foreign policy that people don't represent. Right now, we in Congress are faced with the decision of whether to approve the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. We can approve the Free Trade Agreement and provide support to President Uribe, who, you said, is a popularly elected reformist leader of that country. Or, if we turn it down, we will be handing over that part of Latin America to Hugo Chavez, who is no friend of American, no friend of the people in that area.

But moving on to another area, your request is for a 30 percent increase in USAID officers. Right now, the Foreign Service officers are so limited that USAID has had to rely on the crutch of large bureaucratic NGOs, and they are not doing the job. So I'm strongly supportive of that, and I also believe, from what I have heard from people in other countries, we need a significant increase in Peace Corps volunteers, hands-on assistance spreading compassion, goodwill, and the knowledge of English.

With over 20 percent of the Peace Corps volunteers serving in predominantly Muslim countries, we ought to be building on that. They have to provide an alternative to Wahabist barbaric ideologies that so many young, impressionable Muslims fall back on. I'd ask this committee to increase the Peace Corps budget by \$30 million to add another 500 volunteers to expand in Southeast Asia and those parts of the world.

But I also believe that we have a significant obligation to support the Philippines and Indonesia which need our funds because they are potentially a second front on the war on terror.

One particular program that has been instrumental in Indonesia's continued path towards a pluralistic stable democracy and human rights has been affording international military and education training to leaders. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono graduated from the last class before we cut off that aid.

Admiral Timothy Keating, as PACOM commander in September of last year, said that Indonesia, which plays an influential role in the war on terror, is making great progress in large measure due to congressional support for IMET and other things.

I'd be interested in your view about the importance of IMET in providing assistance to make sure that emerging democracies have militaries that are under civilian control and understand human rights and our modern views of a military.

Secretary RICE. Senator, I think there may be no better program in any ways than for exactly that role than IMET because, if you go around the world and you see the number of officers who have studied in the United States, who have been inculcated, then, with the values of civilian control and of democracy, and democracy needing civilian control, it's really quite impressive. As you mentioned, President Yudoyono, of course, was here. He's very proud of that.

Indonesia, we've been able to reinstitute some of our programs on military education, and I hope we will be able to do more. I fully

understand the need for accountability for the acts that were associated with the Indonesian military over the last decades, and I think they understand that, too. It does help us to be able to have a way of being engaged with them, and we have on some occasions cut out that kind of engagement—for instance, with Pakistan—and I think we pay for it when several years later we return to a place and find that we don't have the connections that we once had.

Senator BOND. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, believe it or not, I did have more to say.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, it's already been said, but I want the record to show that I agree with the comments that have been made by both the chairman and the ranking member, and others as to the quality of your service as Secretary of State. I try to be something of a student of history, and while George Shultz may say it's the best job in Government, historically, it has, perhaps, been one of the most turbulent jobs in Government.

I'm just reading about Thomas Jefferson and some of his frustrations with the Barbary Pirates, and the difficulties with the military and to get things right and all the rest of that. I think you know the world hasn't changed all that much, and the challenges of the job. The particulars have changed, but the frustrations are probably still the same.

I add my congratulations to you for the professional and cheerful way in which you've discharged your duties. It could be easy to get discouraged, I would think, and you always seem to have a smile on your face and willingness to go into the breach one more time, and I congratulate you on that.

Also, to recap, the chairman talked about America's international reputation around the world. I cannot think of any place where our reputation would be more damaged than South America if we were to fail to support the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Your statement is one with which I fully agree, that if we're going to have friends around the world, we need to stand by them; and if we do not stand by President Uribe and what he has done in Colombia, it would be a tremendous blow to our reputation and our credibility.

I remember as a new member of this subcommittee with discussions about Colombia in past years, and how difficult it was to contrast that to the circumstance in Colombia now. This is an enormous turnaround. I have been to Medellin, as well, and walked the streets of Medellin, watched the commerce going on, watched the excitement of bustling activity there in areas that there was no commerce, there was no activity because the militias rule, and a sense of government control was completely foreign.

Now people feel secure in their homes and secure in their businesses, can carry on commerce without worry of extortion or robbery, or any of those other kinds of things, and we have to be as supportive of that as we possibly can.

Let me revisit a subject you and I have mentioned before just to get an update from you. To me, the reverse canary in the mine shaft, if you will, in Iraq is the refugees. If the refugees start coming back, that's an indication that I think speaks more volumes than all of the statistics we can put in briefing books and so on.

I think the last time I asked you about that, you say they have started to come back, but it is a small trickle. It is not yet turned into any kind of sustained return.

Are the refugees still coming back? Is it still a trickle? Has it picked up? Has it dropped off? Where are we with respect to that?

Secretary RICE. I think it would be fair to say that it is more than a trickle but not yet sustained. There are two reasons for that: There are still some places that are pretty violent, but even in places that are not the absence of, for instance, housing stock for people to return to, and so one of the things that we've tried to do with the Iraqi Government is to get them to have a more systematic way of reintegrating refugees.

We learned in Afghanistan, when almost 2 million refugees just returned suddenly in Afghanistan that that can really stress a system that is not very strong to begin with.

So one thing that the Iraqis have talked about is the significant housing-build in places like Ramadi, and they've allocated the money for it. I think if we can do that, because I suspect that one of the places that people would come back to first will be Anbar Province now, given the increasing stability there and also given that many of the people who left, left from there. But they're going to have to have not just infrastructure but actual housing to come back to, and we think that is one that the Iraqis can take on and should take on themselves.

Senator BENNETT. As long as the flow is back in rather than out, that's—

Secretary RICE. A good signal.

Senator BENNETT [continuing]. A very encouraging sign.

Let's talk about the issue that everybody in the Middle East wants to talk about, which is the Palestinian/Israeli situation. One concern that it's impolitic to raise, but I raise it nonetheless, is the overall question of corruption. And as we talk about the Palestinian Authority, and there's \$33 million in this bill for the Palestinian Authority to provide health, education, and humanitarian services, what level of confidence do we have that that \$33 million will, in fact, go to provide health, education, and humanitarian services? How serious a problem is corruption?

I believe, just parenthetically, that corruption is the number one problem in developing countries or Third World countries. I applaud the effort of Bob Zoellick over at the World Bank to try to deal with it, and I get very frustrated with people who say we have to tolerate certain levels of corruption because, as President Uribe has shown in Colombia, you attack the corruption first and a whole bunch of good things begin to happen thereabout.

So to what extent is corruption a problem in the Palestinian/Israeli conflict? As I say, what kind of confidence can we have that our \$33 million will go for what it needs to go for instead of ending up in Swiss bank accounts, which is where it went when Yassir Arafat was in charge?

Secretary RICE. Yes. Well, let me start with the bottom line, Senator, which is within the bounds of what's possible. We have really worked hard to help Salam Fayyad, their Prime Minister—former Finance Minister with whom we'd had a lot of work—to put in place systems of control.

I remember sending in first the American accounting firm out there to work with him several years ago, and I think we have some confidence that his government has tried to put in place the proper controls and that he, himself, by doing things like even posting the budget on the Internet, is very much aware.

I will have to say that you are right that one of the problems that the Palestinian Authority has is that it was structured by Yassir Arafat, and it was extremely corrupt. Many of the security forces were just jobs programs and patronage programs, and it's taking some work to unravel all of that.

But I have no doubt about the commitment of this government of the Palestinians and of Fayyad in particular to trying to do this, and we're working with him. I think the Israelis and the Europeans also believe that he is someone who is trying to do the right thing. So the bottom line is I think we have as many controls in place as we can. But, of course, it's a complicated place.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you very much.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. Senator Alexander.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, I agree with Senator Bennett. I thank you for your service and the way you represent our country in the world.

If my colleagues will forgive me, I said on the Senate floor a moment ago that when Pat Summitt and the university basketball team won a championship game last night up here on television, it makes me prouder of our State by the way they conduct themselves and the way they represent our university. You make me feel the same way, as I see you around the world, and I thank you for that service.

Senator LEAHY. I have never seen such a clever way to get—I compliment you, Governor.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Usually, we Senators like to catch the administration in embarrassing mistakes. I want to ask you if you could help us out of an embarrassing mistake—at least I believe it was—that we made in the complicated congressional appropriations process last year, and that's the United States commitment to deal with the ITER fusion project in France that is the ultimate in solar energy.

Fusion is a way of creating electricity by, basically, replicating on Earth what the sun does. It burns hydrogen and turns it into heat and helium, and the heat creates steam, and steam turns turbines, and then we have electricity. It's in a clean way. Here we are in a situation where the whole world is talking about climate change, where we have clean air problems in the United States, where the Olympics are causing more tension to the clean air problems we have in China where they're building two new coal plants every week so we're told.

India, the same, so we have a problem not just with climate change, but we're suffocating from nitrogen and mercury and sulfur, not just produced by us—we're making progress—but by other countries in the world at a time we have a growing need for energy.

I mean, the Tennessee Valley Authority alone in our region says it'll need the equivalent of a new coal plant every year or more, or a new nuclear plant every year-and-a-half. Along comes this idea

of fusion, which is a longer term idea but nevertheless we, along with the European Union and China and India and Japan and South Korea and Russia, agreed to enter into an international project.

I know you know all this, but I'm saying this so that we can get it out all on the record. We've agreed to pay for 9 percent of the overall cost of the project. Eighty percent of our \$1.1 billion contribution will be hardware built in the United States and shipped over there, so it's friendly to us on jobs. The President requested \$160 million for this last year in his fiscal year 2008 budget which would have kept our commitments.

Well, in the final fiscal year 2008 omnibus appropriations bill, that money got dropped. I'm sure it came up against other worthy projects, but here's where we're left with: We're left with, number one, this embarrassing mistake means, that at a time when we're concerned about climate change, clean air here and in the world, that we're not doing what we agreed to do in order to help the world do this problem.

I think a lot of Senators on my side of the aisle say, well, we shouldn't do more until the rest of the world does more. Well, they've agreed to do more here. They're doing their part, and what do we do? We say we won't do what we've agreed to do, that's the first thing.

The second thing, the deal we made said that if we don't put in our \$160 million, we might get charged \$750 million. In other words, we said as a guarantee that if we back out, if we don't live up to the deal, it's going to cost us three-quarters of a billion dollars.

So my question to you, Madam Secretary, is wouldn't it be wiser for us to live up to our commitment to clean the air, to advance this ultimate solar energy, and to spend \$160 million this year in support of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor, the Fusion Project, rather than back down from something we've agreed to do and cost us, potentially, \$750 million a year?

Secretary RICE. Thank you, Senator. Let me begin by congratulating the Tennessee women, even if it did come at the expense of my good friend Tara VanDerveer and the Stanford women.

Senator ALEXANDER. I completely overlooked that angle.

Secretary RICE. But I think that both teams——

Senator ALEXANDER. You were the provost at Stanford when they had great teams and the same kind of academic accomplishment. As long as you brought it back up, every single one of the lady volunteers who have played for Coach Pat Summitt has graduated in her 34 years of coaching.

Secretary RICE. Well, I'm a big fan of women's athletics, and I think that those young women comported themselves very well last night, so congratulations to Tennessee.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you.

Secretary RICE. Yes, on ITER, Senator, we are very supportive of this project. We believe that it is a great example of high-level international cooperation on some of the more promising scientific potential breakthroughs of our time and will have many of the benefits that you talked about.

The President did request \$160 million in 2008. There's a DOE request in 2009, and we work very closely with DOE on this project, on the diplomacy of this project. But we're very supportive, and I hope it will be fully funded.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, that's all I have. I appreciate the opportunity to bring this to the attention not only of the Secretary but to the Chair and ranking member, who I know care a lot about clean energy, and I hope this can be worked out this year so it doesn't cost us \$750 million and so that we live up to our agreement to be part of an international effort to help create unlimited energy with no environmental consequences.

I ask permission of the Chair to include in the record a letter from Senator Corker and from me to Secretary Rice and her Department's response of March 14.

Senator LEAHY. Without objection, it will be included—

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you.

Senator LEAHY [continuing]. And I'll be happy to work with you on the issue you've raised.

[The information follows:]

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 22, 2008.

Hon. CONDOLEEZZA RICE,
Secretary, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY RICE: We are writing to request your assessment of the impact to our national credibility and diplomatic relationships resulting from Congress' failure to fund the President's budget request for the U.S. contribution to the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) Project in the Fiscal Year 2008 Omnibus appropriations bill. In anticipation of the administration's request for supplemental appropriations funding for fiscal year 2008, it is our hope that the administration will include funding for the ITER program.

The United States formally joined the ITER Project in 2007 after many years of intensive negotiations. At a time when we need to arrive at innovative solutions to increase available sources for abundant, clean energy, it is a serious and embarrassing mistake for Congress to renege on our commitment to the ITER Project. ITER was built as a model of cooperation on large, international science projects—the United States should be a leader in encouraging such endeavors rather than undermining them. We strongly believe that investing in international cooperation in the basic energy sciences will pay important dividends to our economy and the environment.

We have heard reports that Congress' failure to live up to our commitment to the ITER Project is already causing trouble for us in other areas of international cooperation. It would be helpful to know if the State Department is aware of specific difficulties our apparent lack of good faith on the ITER Project has caused in the diplomatic realm, such as efforts to negotiate or implement other international agreements.

We'd be happy to furnish additional information, or your staff may wish to be in touch with Tom Craig with Senator Alexander at (202) 224-8986 or Ashley Palmer with Senator Corker at (202) 224-3344. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

LAMAR ALEXANDER,
United States Senator.

BOB CORKER,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2008.

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ALEXANDER: Thank you for your letter of February 22 concerning the lack of adequate funding in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161) for the ITER project, and the impact to U.S. credibility and diplomatic relations.

The U.S. funding shortfall is serious and will undermine a crucial multilateral scientific project at a time when all research regarding potential alternative sources of energy and ways to mitigate climate change must be explored. The President's request for Department of Energy (DOE) funding in both fiscal year 2008 and fiscal year 2009 reflected the importance of ITER and our support for such large-scale multilateral research projects that cannot be undertaken alone and for which benefits should be shared. The shortfall could indeed call into question our commitment to our international obligations. It would also limit our ability to convince other nations to share the costs of other large-scale scientific research projects in the future. Furthermore, an interruption in U.S. funding will hamper our domestic ITER program, undermine our ability to guide the ITER project to best meet our core objectives, and prevent the ITER Organization from delivering the project on cost and on schedule.

We appreciate your support and are prepared to work with you to restore funding in fiscal year 2008 if possible and to ensure that the fiscal year 2009 funding request in the President's budget is realized. In addition, the Department of State will continue working closely with DOE to reassure our ITER partners and the ITER Organization that the United States will maintain its commitment to the project and work to mitigate any negative impact on it resulting from the budget uncertainties we are addressing.

We hope this information is useful to you. Please do not hesitate to contact us again if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY BERGNER,
Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

Senator LEAHY. Senator Specter.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I join my colleagues in welcoming you here and thank you for your outstanding service.

I want to visit with you a couple of subjects that you and I have talked about, extensively, both on and off the record, and that is the Iranian issue and later the Syrian issue. We have talked about the initiative of 2003, which has been confirmed by a number of people in the administration on Iran's effort to initiate bilateral talks with the United States, and I have discussed this with you, urging you to do so.

We all know that among the many pressing problems the United States faces, none is more important than our relation with Iran and the threat of Iran getting a nuclear weapon. The multilateral talks and the sanctions in the United Nations are very, very important, but I would again take up and urge bilateral talks.

You were successful on the bilateral talks with North Korea in structure and agreement. There had to be multilateral talks with China involved, and Japan and South Korea and other nations. But, Madam Secretary, in the waning days of the administration and in light of the intensity of the problems, why not use the approach taken in North Korea and engage Iran in bilateral talks to try to find some way of coming together with them on the critical issue of their building a nuclear weapon?

Secretary RICE. Senator, I think we've made clear that we don't have a problem with the idea of talking to the Iranians. I said at

one point in a recent speech that we don't have any permanent enemies, so we don't—

Senator SPECTER. Well, but without—without preconditions.

Secretary RICE. But I think the problem of doing this, and we do talk with North Korea, bilaterally, but, of course, in the context of the six-party framework, and we have a six-party framework, really, for Iran were Iran willing to engage.

The reason that the precondition is there—and it's not just an American precondition—it is one that the Europeans set well before we entered this six-party arrangement some 2 years ago. It's not to allow the Iranians to continue to improve their capabilities while using negotiations as a cover.

They have only one thing to do, which is to suspend their enrichment and reprocessing efforts, and then everybody will talk to them. I've been clear that we're prepared to talk to them about anything, not just their nuclear issue.

Senator SPECTER. But, Secretary Rice, they don't need talks to have a cover to proceed with whatever it is they're doing; they're proceeding with that now.

I've had some experience. I haven't been Secretary of State, and I haven't been in the State Department, but I've been on this committee, subcommittee, for 28 years, chaired the Intelligence Committee, talked to many foreign leaders, and, frankly, I think it's insulting to go to another person or another country and say, "We're not going to talk to you unless you agree to something in advance."

What we want them to do is to stop enriching uranium. That's the object of the talks. How could we insist on their agreeing to the object that we want as a precondition to having the talks?

Secretary RICE. Senator, we've not told them that we—the talks would be about, in fact, how to get Iran civil nuclear energy and a whole host of other trade and political benefits by the way, because the package that the six parties have put forward is actually very favorable to Iran.

But they do need to stop, suspend. Until those talks can begin and those talks can have some substance, they need to stop doing what they're doing, because to allow them to just continue to do it, to say, well, we're in negotiations while they continue to do it, I think sends the wrong signal to them and, frankly, would erode our ability to continue the kind of efforts at—

Senator SPECTER. Okay.

Secretary RICE [continuing]. Sanctions that we—

Senator SPECTER. Okay, we'll agree to disagree. Let me move to another subject, and that is President Putin's proposal to have the Russians enrich their uranium.

Secretary RICE. Yes.

Senator SPECTER. That, apparently, would provide an answer.

Secretary RICE. Yes.

Senator SPECTER. To what extent has the Putin proposal impressed, in a sense, if we joined with Putin, and they refuse what is really a good offer to have somebody else enrich their uranium so they have it for peaceful purposes, but there is a check on using it for military purposes? Why hasn't that worked?

Secretary RICE. Well, we are fully supportive of it, and the President just told President Putin that again in Sochi, that he is fully

supportive of the Russian proposal. In fact, not only did President Putin himself put that proposal to the Iranians when he was in Tehran, his foreign minister went back within a few days and put the same proposition to the Iranians, which makes people suspicious, Senator, that this is not about civil nuclear power but rather about the development of the capabilities for a nuclear weapon.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I think—

Secretary RICE. Not only—if I may, just one other point—not only did we support the Russians in making their offer, but when the Russians decided to go ahead and ship the fuel for Bashar, saying to the Iranians: Now that we've shipped the fuel, you certainly have no reason to enrich. We supported that effort, too.

So I think this really speaks to the intentions of the Iranians.

Senator SPECTER. Well, we agree on that. My suggestion would be to try to elevate it. It's been in the media, in the press a little, but not very much. So if we could elevate that, I think it would really put Iran on the spot that they deserve to be on.

Let me move in the—

Secretary RICE. That's a very good idea, Senator, we'll try to do that.

Senator SPECTER [continuing]. Remaining time I have here to Syria. Here again, you and I have talked on and off the record about my press to do more with Syria on a bilateral basis. If we could get them to stop supporting Hezbollah and Hamas and destabilizing Lebanon, it would be an enormous achievement. Only the Israelis can decide what they want to do about the Golan.

But I think that Israel and Syria have been so close in the past there in 1995 and again in the year 2000, the prospects are good.

King Abdullah was in town recently, and I had a chance to ask him about the issues as to what could be done to get Syria to stop supporting Hamas and Hezbollah and destabilizing Lebanon. He said the item which is most on the mind of President Bashar Assad is the action of the International Tribunal which could lead to his indictment and raised the possibility that that might be in the mix.

If that were to be, it would be the most astounding plea bargain of all time. I've had some experience with plea bargains, not nearly on that level. Senator Leahy and I have done some work in that field, but not to plea bargain with a head of state.

But do you think that is a subject worth exploring?

Secretary RICE. Senator, I don't think that it would be appropriate to suggest that we might be willing to limit the scope of the Tribunal on the assassination of Rafiq Hariri, just because it might somehow implicate either the regime or the Assad family. I know that that has been on their minds, but I think that would be a very bad step. I think it would be bad for Lebanon and bad for international justice.

Now, we don't know what the Tribunal will produce, and so our effort has been not to focus the Tribunal toward Syria, or about Syrian, or about the Assad family, but rather to try and ensure the smooth and integrous working of the Tribunal. I think that is the appropriate place for us to be.

After all, the Tribunal was created under a U.N. Security Council resolution, and it needs to take place with integrity.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I'm inclined to agree with you about that. I, on this state of the record, I think the Tribunal has to proceed, that it is an International Tribunal, and whatever would be done would have to be done with the International—with the Security Council.

But the problems we're looking at, I raise it as a theoretical possibility, and I think it's worth thinking about, but not acting on.

Secretary RICE. Um-hum.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you, Senator Specter.

We've been joined by Senator Brownback. You're next.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SAM BROWNBACK

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that. Madam Secretary, welcome. Delighted to have you here I guess in the final presentation of a budget. You've done a fabulous job. I'm sure you cheered for my Jayhawks the other night in the championship game, not to mention something of interest to Kansas, but you did cheer for them, or—

Secretary RICE. Of course, Senator, I was right there.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you. Oh, good, thank you. I just told the President, and he said it was, to quote him, directly, "The game was too late for an old fart like me." So I accused him of being a baseball and football guy, myself. But anyway, on to other things.

A couple of things I want to bring to your attention, and I know you've got a great interest and focus on this. On Africa, you guys have done a great job. The public opinion polling numbers impression of the United States is more favorable there than any continent in the world. I think that's directly related to what you've done on AIDS, malaria, I want to put on your radar screen neglected diseases like river blindness, sleeping sickness, elephantiasis. We've got a couple of ideas, once passed, to get and use this marketplace to develop cures for these.

We've got one of them to pass, and we're working on another one. I think we just really ought to follow that track because you guys have done a great job. Our approval ratings are great, and there's nothing like helping a person live to have them like you.

One I want to put on your radar screen, particularly, is in Congo. In Eastern Congo, you continually, continue to have a huge amount of death and suffering there. Much of the conflict has pulled away for as far as the forces, but the forces driving conflict in the area are economic now.

We had up last week testifying an OB/GYN in this region that's seeing 10 women a day that's subject to gang rapes and sexual violence, and most of it, he says, you can track where the mines are, "and that's where my patients come from." It's gangs that want the Coltan Mines, the cobalt, the tin, the gold from these areas, and then they use the sexual violence as a tool to drive people away, and then they mine the operations.

So we've got a bill we're putting in, in a week or two. It will be a bipartisan bill on conflict commodities, trying to track after what took place on the blood diamonds in West Africa, and doing this in Congo. I just want to put that on your radar screen, because I really think this—we can deal with this, but we're going to have to get

at the root of the economic problem, which is just trying to drive people away from these mining operations.

Congo is such a central entity and has had such a terrible past on this. I want to put that on your screen.

The other one I want to ask you about is on your North Korea talks that you've got going on. I've met with Christopher Hill, I met with your nominee for Ambassador. I really think we need to bounce up the Human Rights Portfolio on these negotiations a lot more. I think it would help us in negotiating with China, and I think we've got to put some "specific ask" on the table.

In meeting with your ambassadorial nominee the other day, she was saying, "Look, we're interested in human rights."

I said, "I know you are, but you've got to put a specific 'ask' or it's—you're not going to sharpen the point of the pencil." Why not ask the North Koreans that as part of this they've got to shut the political gulags down? We've got commercial satellite information that's available; we've got people that have gotten out of those. They exist, they're going on. Why not, as a way of bouncing out the human rights agenda, let's put a "specific ask" in that negotiation on human rights.

It's my belief that if in these negotiations, when we press them about nuclear weapons, you tend to strengthen the host government because they can go back to their people and say the United States is trying to deny us something. When you go at their human rights agenda, whether it's North Korea or Iran, you delegitimize the regime, because this is now what they're doing to their own people.

Now, just, I really think we need to up that one in those six-party talks in North Korea, and I'd appreciate your thought on that.

Secretary RICE. Thank you, Senator. If I may, just first on Eastern Congo, thank you for those comments, and I will ask our people to look into the kind of thing that you're talking about in terms of the mining. We've been very active in trying to help bring some stability there to that area.

I held a summit-level meeting with the Presidents of Rwanda, Burundi, and, in fact, the Congo was represented by their foreign minister—Mr. Kabila was not there. But we're trying to strengthen the DROC's security forces. We're trying to engage, have him engage, in greater peace efforts in that area because it's obviously very unstable, and it's also an area that has the potential to spill over. The Rwandans, for instance, are very concerned about the spillover.

As to North Korea, thank you for those comments. Yes, the human rights situation in North Korea is something that we have spoken to, should try to speak to, and we have noticed that the South Korean Government, the new South Korean Government, is speaking to this issue more now, and so we will look.

No people on Earth that I think live in more difficult circumstances, and so we are trying to see if there is even a way to think about greater openness, the way that they might get some exposure to the rest of the world, because it's a really very desperate situation. While trying to deal with the humanitarian situa-

tion, we shouldn't lose sight of the problems that you have just outlined, and I take the point.

Senator BROWNBACK. I think we can weave it into our ask and pressure on the Chinese on human rights. I mean, obviously, that's taking place in Tibet and has for some period of time, but then you also have how they are treating or not allowing North Korean refugees to flow through China, and this is in direct contradiction to their commitments under the U.N. Human Rights Commission, what they do to groups like Falon Gong or, in some cases, the House Church Movement in China.

This thing, you know, with the Olympics coming up, and obviously everybody's keying off of that, but the Chinese are one of the central enablers to human rights abuses around the world—

Secretary RICE. We—

Senator BROWNBACK [continuing]. Whether it's Sudan, whether it's resourcing of commodities in Africa, whether it's North Korean refugees, whether it's Tibet, this is an enabler country, China is. I just—I think we've got to put a real bead on them, given that there's a big public event they're very interested in, and they're such a key enabler to bad human rights activity in so many places around the world.

Secretary RICE. Senator, I have said and I agree, we have to discuss and press the Chinese on human rights issues before, during, and after these upcoming Olympic Games. So we have just, we're going to reinstitute our human rights dialogue with China. The reason for that is that we'd like to get, in terms of internal Chinese human rights issues, we'd like to get to some of the more structural concerns.

It's important to raise individual cases, which we do, but when you have laws that can have somebody put in jail for the kind of activity that this young blogger was just put inactive in jail for, you have a structural problem, and we raise those issues.

But I would add to your list of places that we need the Chinese to really help on the human rights side is Burma where they probably have more influence than any other country in the world. We talk to the Indians, we talk to the Japanese, we talk to the Southeast Asians, but they all come back and say: You really need to talk to China. So we are pressing those cases.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. I might mention to Senator Brownback, I agree with him on neglected diseases. We increased funding sevenfold a couple years ago in that area. We increased it again for 2008.

We're talking about elephantiasis and river blindness, and those things, and we will keep on putting—

Secretary RICE. Yes.

Senator LEAHY [continuing]. Money in. I think it's extremely important. I know you agree.

Secretary RICE. Yes, Senator, if I may, I should have mentioned, the President, when he was in Africa, did announce an initiative on neglected tropical diseases of about \$100 million, if my memory serves correctly. So it is something that we also are very concerned about.

Senator LEAHY. But like the initiatives we hear announced on Egypt and Israel, and everywhere else, make sure the money goes in the Budget, too, because——

Secretary RICE. I think it's there, Senator, yes.

Senator LEAHY [continuing]. For example, you requested \$275 million in supplemental aid for the estimated 4 million Iraqis who are refugees or internally displaced. We've talked about that a bit.

International relief agencies are also involved in this, and the needs are far greater; they say our share is more like \$450 to \$500 million. I've written to the President along with several others asking them for a budget amendment to address this. I think we have a moral obligation to these people.

Are we going to get a request for the additional money?

Secretary RICE. Senator, we do have, in supplemental funding, requests on Iraqi refugees. We believe that it's appropriate to the tasks that we have. We are trying to do several things: We're trying to help U.N. relief agencies; we're trying to help the countries involved; we even have some direct assistance to refugees, and, of course, with the Iraqi Government has undertaken some obligations as well.

I think our biggest problem right now is to try to increase our ability to process people. We're trying to tell them how to do that.

Senator LEAHY. Do you feel the amount of money requested is adequate?

Secretary RICE. I believe the two, the needs that we see at this time, those resources are adequate, but, of course, it's something we watch and gauge all the time, and we wouldn't be shy to ask for more if we needed it.

Senator LEAHY. It worries me that we process them very, very slowly. I raised issues of everything from scholar rescue to the large numbers of refugees. I've visited the refugee camps in Jordan and elsewhere. I don't know what we're going to do with all these people.

Now, we've spoken about aid to Colombia, and I've met President Uribe many times. I have high regard for the efforts he's made, and I've told him that. We've met both publicly, and we've had private meetings. We have given Colombia over \$5 billion in aid. They are one of our largest aid recipients in the world, so it's not as though they have been neglected.

For the ninth year in a row, the administration's requesting hundreds of millions of dollars in military aid for Colombia. This is the ninth year for a 5-year program, but we have required certifications from you that the Army's respecting human rights and perpetrators are being brought to justice.

There are disturbing reports about continuing abuses by the Army and that the administration is providing assistance to some of units that are involved in abuse. I heard the 4th, 9th, 10th, 12th, 13th, and 22nd Mobile Brigades, 14th, 18th, and 30th Brigade have been linked to human rights abuses. Your Department has vetted them to receive assistance.

Of course, U.S. law, in this case the Leahy law, requires you to stop funding unless they're taking effective measures to bring the individuals responsible to justice.

So can you provide for us a list of all the units that have been vetted since the beginning of Plan Colombia—this is the 5-year plan that's now in its ninth year—a list of all units that have received U.S. assistance since the beginning of Plan Colombia; a list of unvetted units from which individual members have been cleared to receive training or equipment.

Secretary RICE. Senator, I'll provide it to you.

[The information follows:]

The answers to both questions are represented in the following tables, divided into two sections. Section I contains information on vetted units in Colombia during 2004–2007. Section II contains information from 2000–2003. The information in Section I was derived from annual vetted units lists that Embassy Bogotá and the State Department use to facilitate the vetting process. The annual vetted units list is a working document that is revised whenever credible information comes to light that could alter a unit's eligibility for to receive U.S. assistance. Note that due to programmatic and budgetary circumstances, not all units that were vetted actually received training or assistance.

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
2007		
Army:		
Colombian Military Joint Task Force Omega Headquarters	X	X
Colombian Military Joint Command—One (Caribe)		X
Colombian Joint Special Operations Command	X	X
Colombian Army Special Forces Command		X
Colombian Army Lancero Group (also known as Colombian Army Ranger Unit/Battalion)	X	X
Commando Battalion (Formerly 1st Special Forces Battalion)	X	X
Special Forces Anti-Terrorism Urban Group		X
Apiay Military Hospital		X
Mobile Medical Trauma Team		X
1st GATRA		X
2nd GATRA		X
3rd GATRA		X
Joint Intelligence Operations Center		X
Colombian Army Intelligence Center	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #4	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #6	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #7	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #8		X
Colombian Army Military Counter-Intelligence Center		X
Colombian Technical Intelligence Center		X
Colombian Army Logistics Brigade		X
Supply Battalion	X	X
Maintenance Battalion	X	X
Quartermaster Battalion		X
Medical Battalion		X
Transportation Battalion	X	X
Combat Services and Support Battalion		X
Dispensary Detachment		X
Colombia Army Engineer School		X
Colombia Army Engineer Maintenance Battalion		X
Colombian Army Logistics School		X
Colombian Army Equestrian School		X
Colombian Army Civil Military Relations School		X
Colombian Army Aviation School		X
Colombian Army Lancero School		X
Colombian Army Special Forces School		X
Colombian Professional Soldier School		X
Colombian Army Retraining Center		X
First Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 01		X
2nd Engineer Battalion	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
6th High Mountain Battalion	X	X
Second Division Headquarters	X	X
27th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 02		X
5th Mobile Brigade	X	X
43rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
44rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
45th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
47th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
27th Combat Services Support Company		X
22nd Mobile Brigade	X	X
5th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
14th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
25th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
36th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
35th Service and Support Company		X
18th Brigade	X	X
18th Cavalry Battalion		X
1st Engineer Construction Battalion	X	X
18th Engineer Battalion (also known as the 18th Military Engineer)	X	X
24th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
49th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
1st Infrastructure Protection Battalion		X
18th Support and Services Battalion		X
30th Brigade Headquarters	X	X
15th Infantry Battalion	X	X
5th Mechanized Cavalry	X	X
46th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
Third Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 03		X
6th Mobile Brigade	X	X
48th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
50th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
56th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
60th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
28th Combat Service Support Company		X
14th Mobile Brigade Headquarters	X	X
3rd Engineer Battalion	X	X
8th Engineer Battalion	X	X
9th Infantry Battalion	X	X
4th High Mountain Battalion	X	X
Fourth Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 4		X
4th Mobile Brigade	X	X
39th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
40th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
41st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
42nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
26th Service and Support Company		X
7th Mobile Brigade	X	X
61st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
62nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
63rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
64th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
29th Combat Service-Support Battalion		X
7th Engineer Battalion	X	X
16th Brigade		X
44th Infantry Battalion	X	X
16th Cavalry Group	X	X
23rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
29th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
65th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
16th Service Battalion		X
28th Brigade Command Section		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
43rd Infantry Battalion	X	X
45th Infantry Battalion (also known as the 45th Motorized Infantry)	X	X
32nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
38th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
Eastern Specified Command		X
Fifth Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 5		X
8th Mobile Brigade	X	X
66th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
67th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
68th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
69th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Combat Service Support Company		X
10th Mobile Brigade	X	X
75th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
76th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
77th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
78th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
24th Combat Service Support Company		X
1st Brigade—Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
6th Brigade—Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
9th Brigade	X	X
26th Infantry Battalion	X	X
27th Infantry Battalion	X	X
9th Artillery Battalion		X
9th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
9th Service Support Battalion		X
13th Engineer Battalion		X
Sixth Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 6		X
9th Mobile Brigade		X
70th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
71st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
72nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
73rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
31st Combat Service Support Company		X
13th Mobile Brigade	X	X
87th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
88th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
89th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
90th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
36st Combat Service Support Company		X
26th Jungle Brigade		X
50th Infantry/Jungle Battalion	X	X
74th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
26th Service & Support Battalion		X
Coast Guard Detachment		X
49th Infantry Battalion	X	X
59th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
25th Infantry Battalion	X	X
Seventh Division Headquarters	X	X
Regional Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Group 5	X	X
11th Mobile Brigade	X	X
79th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
80th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
81st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
82nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
33rd Combat Service Support Company		X
11th Brigade	X	X
31st Infantry Battalion	X	X
33rd Infantry Battalion		X
10th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
11th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
5th Infrastructure Protection Unit		X
11th Service Support Battalion		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
14th Engineer Battalion	X	X
Rural Special Forces Brigade		X
2nd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
3rd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
4th Special Forces Battalion	X	X
Rapid Deployment Forces	X	X
1st Mobile Brigade	X	X
19th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
20th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
21st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
22nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
22nd Support and Services Company		X
2nd Mobile Brigade	X	X
15th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
16th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
17th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
18th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
23rd Support and Services Company		X
3rd Mobile Brigade	X	X
51st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
52nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
53rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
54th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
25th Support and Services Company		X
25th Army Aviation Brigade/Regiment (also known as the 25th Brigade)	X	X
Army Aviation Support Battalion 1		X
Army Helicopter Battalion (also known as the Army Helicopter Regiment)	X	X
Army Aviation Air Assault Battalion 2		X
Cargo and Transport Battalion		X
Army Aviation Reconnaissance and Escort Battalion 4		X
Army Aviation Air Movement Battalion 5		X
Army Aviation Air Maintenance Battalion 6		X
Army Aviation Air ASPC		X
Instruction Battalion Army Aviation School		X
Counter Narcotics/Drug Brigade	X	X
1st Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
2nd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
3rd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
Counter Narcotics Support and Services Battalion		X
Navy:		
Marine Corps Headquarters		X
Mobile Training Group	X	X
Marine Corps Formation and Training Center	X	X
Marine Corps Anti-Explosives School		X
Riverine Combat School		X
1st Marine Brigade	X	X
Command and Support Battalion 1 (Formerly listed as Combat Service-Support and Security Company)		X
1st Infantry Battalion	X	X
2nd Infantry	X	X
3rd Infantry Battalion	X	X
4th Infantry Battalion	X	X
1st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
2nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
Anti-Kidnapping Unit		
First Marine Riverine Brigade	X	X
Marine Riverine Battalion 20		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 30		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 40		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 50		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 60		X
Second Marine Riverine Brigade	X	X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 1 (Renamed from 6th Infantry Battalion)	X	X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 3 (Renamed from 7th Infantry Battalion)	X	X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 4 (Renamed from 8th Infantry Battalion)	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Marine Riverine Battalion 10 (Formerly part of 1st Riverine Brigade)	X	X
Marine Riverine Battalion 70 (Renamed from 9th Infantry Battalion)	X	X
Marine Riverine Battalion 80 (Renamed from 3rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion)	X	X
Marine Special Forces Battalion No. 1		X
Navy Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Group Unit 1		X
Naval Force South		X
San Andres/Providencia Specific Command		X
Caribbean Submarine Fleet		X
Caribbean Airnaval/Naval Air Group	X	X
Caribbean Surface Fleet		X
Training Ship "Gloria"		X
Caribbean Coast Guard	X	X
Naval Special Dive Unit		X
Naval Force Pacific	X	X
Pacific Naval Regional Intelligence Center		X
Pacific Surface Fleet		X
Pacific Naval Air/Airnaval Group	X	X
Pacific Coast Guard	X	X
Pacific Training Center		X
Air Force:		
2nd Air Combat Command	X	X
3rd Air Combat Command	X	X
4th Air Combat Command	X	X
5th Air Combat Command	X	X
6th Air Combat Command	X	X
Military Air Transport Command	X	X
Air Maintenance Command	X	X
Air Group East	X	X
Air Group Caribbean	X	X
Military Aviation School		X
Cadets Group Department		X
Academic Group Department		X
Aeronautical Education Department		X
Combat Group Department		X
Technical Group Department		X
Support Group Department		X
Air Defense Group Department		X
Colombian National Police		
Carabineros—Group 1	X	X
Anti-Narcotics Police	X	X
Anti-Narcotics Chemical Unit		X
Junglas—Elite Squad		X
Special Operations Command		X
Airport Police Unit		X
Municipal Police Units:		
La Victoria Municipal Police		X
Pauna Municipal Police Unit		X
Maripi Municipal Police Unit		X
Muzo Municipal Police Unit		X
Otanche Municipal Police		X
Quipama Municipal Police		X
San Pablo de Borbur Municipal Police		X
Tunungua Municipal Police		X
Coper Municipal Police		X
La Palma Municipal Police		X
El Penon Municipal Police		X
Pacho Municipal Police		X
Paime Municipal Police		X
Puerto Salgar Municipal Police		X
San Cayetano Municipal Police		X
Topaipi Municipal Police		X
Yocapi Municipal Police		X
Albania Municipal Police		X
Barbosa Municipal Police		X
Bolívar Municipal Police		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Florian Municipal Police		X
Jesus Maria Municipal Police		X
La Belleza Municipal Police		X
Puente Nacional Municipal Police		X
Santa Helena de Opon Municipal Police		X
Sucre Municipal Police		X
2006		
Army:		
Colombian Military Joint Task Force Omega Headquarters	X	X
Colombian Military Joint Command-One (Caribe)		
Colombian Joint Special Operations Command	X	X
Colombian Army Special Forces Command		
Colombian Army Lancero Group (also known as Colombian Army Ranger Unit/Battalion)	X	X
Commando Battalion (Formerly 1st Special Forces Battalion)	X	X
1st Marine Special Forces Battalion		X
Special Forces Anti-Terrorism Urban Group		X
Apiay Military Hospital		X
Mobile Medical Trauma Team		X
1st GATRA		X
2nd GATRA		X
3rd GATRA		X
Joint Intelligence Operations Center		X
Colombian Army Intelligence Center	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #4	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #6	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #7	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #8		X
Colombian Army Military Counter-Intelligence Center		X
Colombian Technical Intelligence Center		X
Colombian Army Logistics Brigade		X
Supply Battalion		X
Maintenance Battalion	X	X
Quartermaster Battalion		X
Transportation Battalion	X	X
Combat Support and Services Battalion		X
Medical Battalion		X
Dispensary Detachment		X
Colombia Army Engineer School		X
Colombian Army Logistics School		X
Colombian Army Civil Military Relations School		X
Colombian Army Aviation School		X
Colombian Army Lancero School		X
Colombian Army Special Forces School		X
Colombian Professional Soldier School		X
Colombian Army Retraining Center		X
Colombian Army Equestrian School		X
First Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordnance Disposal Group 1	X	X
2nd Engineer Battalion	X	X
6th High Mountain Battalion		X
Second Division Headquarters	X	X
27th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
Explosive Ordnance Disposal Group 2		X
5th Mobile Brigade	X	X
43rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
44rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
45th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
47th Counter Guerrilla Battalio		X
27th Combat Services Support Company		X
22nd Mobile Brigade	X	X
5th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
14th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
25th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
36th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
35th Service and Support Company		X
Eighteenth Brigade	X	X
18th Cavalry Battalion		X
1st Engineer Construction Battalion	X	X
18th Engineer Battalion (also known as the 18th Military Engineer)	X	X
24th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
49th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
1st PEEV Battalion		X
18th Support and Services Battalion		X
46th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
Third Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 3		X
6th Mobile Brigade	X	X
48th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
50th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
56th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
60th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
28th Combat Service Support Company		X
3rd Engineer Battalion	X	X
8th Engineer Battalion	X	X
9th Infantry Battalion	X	X
3rd Cavalry Group		X
4th High Mountain Battalion	X	X
Fourth Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 4		X
4th Mobile Brigade	X	X
39th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
40th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
41st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
42nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
26th Service and Support Company		X
7th Mobile Brigade	X	X
61st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
62nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
63rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
64th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
29th Combat Service-Support Battalion		X
7th Engineer Battalion	X	X
16th Brigade		X
44th Infantry Battalion	X	X
16th Cavalry Group	X	X
23rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
29th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
65th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
16th Service Battalion		X
12th Mobile Brigade	X	X
83rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
84th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
85th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
86th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
34th Service Battalion		X
Fifth Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group 5		X
8th Mobile Brigade	X	X
66th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
67th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
68th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
69th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Combat Service Support Company		X
10th Mobile Brigade	X	X
75th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
76th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
77th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
78th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
24th Combat Service Support Company		X
1st Brigade—Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
6th Brigade—Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
9th Brigade	X	X
9th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
26th Infantry Battalion	X	X
27th Infantry Battalion	X	X
9th Artillery Battalion		X
9th Service Battalion		X
13th Engineer Battalion		X
Sixth Division Headquarters	X	X
Explosive Ordnance Disposal Group 6		X
9th Mobile Brigade		X
70th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
71st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
72nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
73rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
31st Combat Service Support Company		X
13th Mobile Brigade	X	X
87th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
88th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
89th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
90th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
36th Combat Service Support Company		X
12th Brigade (BR 12)—Reinstated as of December 19, 2000	X	X
12th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
34th Infantry Battalion	X	X
35th Infantry Battalion	X	X
36th Infantry Battalion		X
12th Engineer Battalion		X
12th Support and Services Battalion		X
26th Jungle Brigade		X
50th Infantry/Jungle Battalion	X	X
74th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
26th Service & Support Battalion		X
Coast Guard Detachment		X
Seventh Division Headquarters	X	X
Regional Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Group 5	X	X
11th Mobile Brigade	X	X
79th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
80th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
81st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
82nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
33rd Combat Service Support Company		X
Eleventh Brigade	X	X
31st Infantry Battalion	X	X
33rd Infantry Battalion		X
10th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
11th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
5th Infrastructure Protection Unit		X
11th Service Support Battalion		X
14th Engineer Battalion	X	X
Rural Special Forces Brigade		X
2nd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
3rd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
4th Special Forces Battalion	X	X
Rapid Deployment Forces	X	X
1st Mobile Brigade	X	X
19th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
20th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
21st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
22nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
22nd Support and Services Company		X
2nd Mobile Brigade	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
15th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
16th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
17th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
18th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
23rd Support and Services Company		X
3rd Mobile Brigade	X	X
51st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
52nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
53rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
54th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
25th Support and Services Company		X
25th Army Aviation Brigade/Regiment (also known as the 25th Brigade)	X	X
Army Helicopter Battalion (also known as the Army Helicopter Regiment)	X	X
Cargo and Transport Battalion		X
Instruction Battalion Army Aviation School		X
Counter Narcotics/Drug Brigade	X	X
1st Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
2nd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
3rd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
The Counter Narcotics Support and Services Battalion		X
Eastern Specified Command		X
45th Infantry Battalion (also known as the 45th Motorized Infantry)	X	X
Navy:		
Marine Corps Headquarters		X
Mobile Training Group		X
Marine Corps Formation and Training Center		X
Marine Corps Anti-Explosives School		X
Riverine Combat School		X
First Marine Brigade		X
Command and Support Battalion 1 (Formerly listed as Combat Service-Support and Security Company)		X
1st Infantry Battalion		X
2nd Infantry Battalion		X
3rd Infantry Battalion		X
4th Infantry Battalion		X
1st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
2nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
Anti-Kidnapping Unit		X
First Marine Riverine Brigade	X	X
Marine Riverine Battalion 20		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 30		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 40		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 50		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 60		X
Second Marine Riverine Brigade	X	X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 1 (Renamed from 6th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 3 (Renamed from 7th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 4 (Renamed from 8th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 10 (Formerly part of 1st Riverine Brigade)		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 70 (Renamed from 9th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 80 (Renamed from 3rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion)		X
Marine Special Forces Battalion No. 1		X
Urban Special Forces Unit 2		X
Anti-Kidnapping Unit		X
Naval Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Group Unit 1		X
Naval Force South		X
Caribbean Naval Force/Naval Forces South	X	X
San Andres/Providencia Specific Command		X
Caribbean Submarine Fleet		X
Caribbean Airnaval/Naval Air Group	X	X
Caribbean Surface Fleet		X
Training Ship "Gloria"		X
Caribbean Coast Guard	X	X
Navy Special Dive Unit		X
Naval Force Pacific	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Pacific Naval Regional Intelligence Center		X
Pacific Surface Fleet		X
Pacific Naval Air/Airnaval Group	X	X
Pacific Coast Guard	X	X
Pacific Training Center		X
Air Force:		
2nd Air Combat Command	X	X
3rd Air Combat Command	X	X
4th Air Combat Command	X	X
5th Air Combat Command	X	X
6th Air Combat Command	X	X
Military Air Transport Command	X	X
Air Maintenance Command	X	X
Air Group East (GAORI)	X	X
Air Group Caribbean	X	X
Military Aviation School		X
Cadets Group Department		X
Academic Group Department		X
Aeronautical Education Department		X
Combat Group Department		X
Technical Group Department		X
Support Group Department		X
Air Defense Group Department		X
Colombian National Police:		
Carabineros—Group 1	X	X
Anti-Narcotics Police	X	X
Anti Narcotics Chemical Unit		X
Junglas—Elite Squad		X
Special Operations Command		X
Airport Police Unit		X
Municipal Police Units		X
La Victoria Municipal Police		X
Pauna Municipal Police		X
Maripi Municipal Police		X
Muzo Municipal Police		X
Otanche Municipal Police		X
Quipama Municipal Police		X
San Pablo de Borbur Municipal Police		X
Tunungua Municipal Police		X
Coper Municipal Police		X
La Palma Municipal Police		X
Paime Municipal Police		X
Puerto Salgar Municipal Police		X
Topaipi Municipal Police		X
Yocapi Municipal Police		X
Albania Municipal Police		X
Barbosa Municipal Police		X
Bolivar Municipal Police		X
Florian Municipal Police		X
Jesus Maria Municipal Police		X
La Belleza Municipal Police		X
Puente Nacional Municipal Police		X
Santa Helena de Opon Municipal Police		X
Sucre Municipal Police		X
2005		
Army:		
Colombian Military Joint Task Force Omega Headquarters	X	X
Eastern Specified Command	X	X
45th Infantry Battalion (also known as the 45th Motorized Infantry)		X
Army Special Forces Command		X
Colombian Joint Special Operations Command	X	X
1st Marine Special Forces Battalion		X
Special Forces Anti-Terrorism Urban Group		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Colombian Army Lancero Group (also known as Colombian Army Ranger Unit/Battalion)	X	X
Commando Battalion (Formerly 1st Special Forces Battalion)	X	X
Army Special Operations Command		X
Logistics Brigade		X
Transportation Battalion	X	X
Supply Battalion		X
Combat Support and Services Battalion		X
Maintenance Battalion		X
Quartermaster Battalion		X
Medical Battalion		X
Dispensary Detachment		X
Rapid Deployment Forces	X	X
1st Mobile Brigade	X	X
19th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
20th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
21st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
22nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
22nd Support and Services Company		X
2nd Mobile Brigade	X	X
15th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
16th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
17th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
18th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
23rd Support and Services Company		X
3rd Mobile Brigade	X	X
51st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
52nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
53rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
54th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
25th Support and Services Company		X
First Division Headquarters	X	X
11th Brigade	X	X
31st Infantry Battalion	X	X
11th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
5th Infrastructure Protection Unit		X
11th Service Battalion		X
33rd Infantry Battalion		X
10th Infantry Battalion		X
4th Mobile Brigade	X	X
40th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
41st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
42nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
58th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
26th Service and Support Company		X
2nd Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
Second Division Headquarters	X	X
18th Brigade	X	X
27th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
46th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
24th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
49th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
1st PEEV Battalion		X
18th Cavalry Battalion		X
18th Engineer Battalion (also known as the 18th Military Engineer)	X	X
18th Support and Services Battalion		X
5th Mobile Brigade	X	X
43rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
44th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
45th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
47th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
27th Combat Services Support Company		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
22nd Mobile Brigade	X	X
5th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
14th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
25th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
36th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
9th Service Battalion		X
25th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
26th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
35th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
35th Service and Support Company		X
14th Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
Third Division	X	X
Divisional Command and Staff Section		X
6th Mobile Brigade	X	X
48th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
50th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
56th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
60th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
28th Combat Service Support Company		X
3rd Cavalry Group		X
9th Infantry Battalion	X	X
3rd Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
8th Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
Fourth Division Headquarters	X	X
16th Brigade		X
44th Infantry Battalion	X	X
16th Cavalry Group	X	X
23rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
29th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
65th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
16th Service Battalion		X
7th Mobile Brigade	X	X
39th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
61st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
62nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
63rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
64th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
29th Combat Service Support Battalion		X
9th Mobile Brigade		X
70th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
71st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
72nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
73rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
31st Combat Service Support Company		X
Fifth Division Headquarters	X	X
1st Brigade—Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
6th Brigade—Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
9th Brigade	X	X
9th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
26th Infantry Battalion	X	X
27th Infantry Battalion	X	X
9th Artillery Battalion		X
9th Service Battalion		X
8th Mobile Brigade	X	X
66th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
67th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
68th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
69th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Combat Service Support Company		X
13th Engineer Battalion		X
Service and Support Company		X
Sixth Division Headquarters	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
12th Brigade—suspended as of September 25, 2000, reinstated December 19, 2000	X	X
12th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
34th Infantry Battalion	X	X
35th Infantry Battalion	X	X
36th Infantry Battalion		X
12th Engineer Battalion		X
12th Support and Services Battalion		X
26th Jungle Brigade		X
50th Infantry/Jungle Battalion	X	X
74th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
26th Service & Support Battalion		X
Coast Guard Detachment		X
10th Mobile Brigade	X	X
75th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
76th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
77th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
78th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
24th Combat Service Support Company		X
11th Mobile Brigade	X	X
79th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
80th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
81st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
82nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
33rd Combat Service Support Company		X
25th Army Aviation Brigade/Regiment (also known as the 25th Brigade)	X	X
Army Helicopter Battalion (also known as the Army Helicopter Regiment)	X	X
Tactical Air Transportation Battalion		X
Instruction Battalion (Army Aviation School)		X
Counter Narcotics/Drug Brigade	X	X
1st Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
2nd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
3rd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
Counter Narcotics Support and Services Battalion		X
Special Forces Brigade		X
2nd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
3rd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
4th Special Forces Battalion	X	X
Colombian Army Explosive Ordnance Disposal Team		X
1st Division Marte—Headquarters		X
2nd Division Marte—Headquarters	X	X
3rd Division Marte—Headquarters		X
4th Division Marte—Headquarters		X
5th Division Marte—Headquarters		X
6th Division Marte—Headquarters		X
Joint Intelligence Operations Center		X
Colombian Military Joint Command Caribe		X
Colombian Army Intelligence Center	X	X
Colombian Technical Intelligence Center		X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #4	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #6	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #7	X	X
Regional Military Intelligence Center #8		X
Mobile Medical Trauma Team		X
1st GATRA		X
2nd GATRA		X
3rd GATRA		X
Apiay Military Hospital		X
Colombian Army Logistics School		X
Directorate		X
Sub-Directorate		X
Human Resources Department		X
Operations—Training Department		X
Public Relations Department		X
Course Development Department		X
Security Company		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Military Intelligence Section		X
Administration and Logistics Department		X
Studies Inspectors Office		X
Administrative Services Unit		X
Training Company		X
Colombia Army Engineer School		X
Command and Staff Section		X
Investigation Department		X
Instruction Department		X
Administrative Department		X
Mobile Training Team		X
Colombian Army Lancero School		X
Ayacucho Company		X
Bolivar Company		X
Calarca Company		X
Santander Company		X
Colombian Army Civil Military Relations School		X
Colombian Professional Soldier School		X
Rural Special Forces School		X
Colombian Army Rapid Deployment Force Re-Training Center		X
Command and Staff Section		X
Technical Area Department		X
Tactical Area Department		X
Physical Area Department		X
Psychological Preparation Department		X
4th High Mountain Battalion		X
Navy:		
Marine Corps Headquarters		X
Mobile Training Group		X
Marine Corps Formation and Training Center		X
Marine Corps Anti-Explosives School		X
Riverine Combat School		X
1st Marine Brigade		X
Command and Support Battalion 1 (Formerly listed as Combat Service-Support and Security Company)		X
1st Infantry Battalion		X
2nd Infantry Battalion		X
3rd Infantry Battalion		X
4th Infantry Battalion		X
1st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
2nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
Anti-Kidnapping Unit		X
First Marine Riverine Brigade	X	X
Marine Riverine Battalion 20		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 30		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 40		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 50		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 60		X
Second Marine Riverine Brigade	X	X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 1 (Renamed from 6th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 3 (Renamed from 7th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Assault Battalion 4 (Renamed from 8th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 10 (Formerly part of 1st Riverine Brigade)		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 70 (Renamed from 9th Infantry Battalion)		X
Marine Riverine Battalion 80 (Renamed from 3rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion)		X
Urban Special Forces Unit 2		X
Anti-Kidnapping Unit		X
Marine Special Forces Battalion No. 1		X
Urban Special Forces Unit 1		X
Naval Force South	X	X
Caribbean Naval Force	X	X
San Andres/Providencia Specific Command		X
Caribbean Submarine Fleet		X
Caribbean Airmaval Group		X
Caribbean Surface Fleet		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Training Ship "Gloria"		X
Caribbean Coast Guard	X	X
Naval Force Pacific	X	X
Pacific Surface Fleet		X
Pacific Airnaval Group	X	X
Pacific Coast Guard	X	X
Navy Special Dive Unit		X
Air Force:		
Military Air Transport Command	X	X
Air Group East	X	X
2nd Air Combat Command	X	X
3rd Air Combat Command	X	X
4th Air Combat Command	X	X
5th Air Combat Command	X	X
6th Air Combat Command	X	X
Air Maintenance Command	X	X
Air Group Caribbean	X	X
Military Aviation School		X
Cadets Group Department
Academic Group Department		X
Aeronautical Education Department		X
Combat Group Department		X
Technical Group Department		X
Support Group Department		X
Air Defense Group Department		X
Colombian National Police:		
Carabineros—Group 1	X	X
Anti-Narcotics Police	X	X
Junglas—Elite Squad		X
Special Operations Command		X
Airport Police Unit		X
Municipal Police Units:		
Pauna Municipal Police		X
Maripi Municipal Police		X
Muzo Municipal Police		X
Otanche Municipal Police		X
San Pablo de Borbur Municipal Police		X
Tunungua Municipal Police		X
Albania Municipal Police		X
Puente Nacional Municipal Police		X
Bolívar Municipal Police		X
Army:		
Eastern Specified Command		X
43rd Infantry Battalion		X
25th Army Aviation Brigade/Regiment (also known as the 25th Brigade)	X	X
Army Helicopter Battalion (also known as the Army Helicopter Regiment)		X
Tactical Air Transportation Battalion		X
Instruction Battalion		X
Special Forces School		X
Special Forces Brigade	X	X
Commando Battalion		X
1st Special Forces Battalion (also known as the Commando Battalion)		X
2nd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
3rd Special Forces Battalion	X	X
4th Special Forces Battalion	X	X
Joint Task Force South Headquarters (re-named Sixth Division Headquarters)		X
12th Brigade—suspended as of September 25, 2000, reinstated December 19, 2000	X	X
12th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
34th Infantry Battalion	X	X
35th Infantry Battalion	X	X
36th Infantry Battalion		X
12th Engineer Battalion		X
12th Support and Services Battalion		X
Joint Intelligence Center		X
Counter Narcotics/Drug Brigade	X	X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
1st Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
2nd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
3rd Counternarcotics Battalion	X	X
Counternarcotics Support and Services Battalion		X
Special Forces Anti-Terrorism Urban Group		X
18th Brigade	X	X
1st PEEV Battalion		X
18th Calvary Battalion		X
18th Engineer Battalion (also known as the 18th Military Engineer)		X
18th Support and Services Battalion		X
27th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
546th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
24th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
49th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
52nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
Rapid Deployment Forces	X	X
1st Mobile Brigade	X	X
19th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
20th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
21st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
22nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
22nd Support and Services Company		X
3rd Mobile Brigade	X	X
51st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
52nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
53rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
54th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
25th Support and Services Company		X
Logistics Brigade		X
Transportation Battalion	X	X
Supply Battalion		X
Combat Support and Services Battalion		X
Maintenance Battalion		X
Quartermaster Battalion		X
Medical Battalion		X
Dispensary Detachment		X
1st Brigade—includes: Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
6th Brigade—includes: Command and Staff Section Only	X	X
Colombian Army Logistics School		X
Directorate		X
Sub-Directorate		X
Human Resources Department		X
Operations—Training Department		X
Public Relations Department		X
Course Development Department		X
Security Company		X
Military Intelligence Section		X
Administration and Logistics Department		X
Studies Inspectors Office		X
Administrative Services Unit		X
Training Company		X
Colombia Army Engineer School—Includes: Command and Staff Section		X
Investigation Department		X
Instruction Department		X
Administrative Department		X
Mobile Training Team		X
Explosive Ordinance Disposal Team		X
First Division Headquarters	X	X
Second Division Headquarters	X	X
Fourth Division Headquarters	X	X
Fifth Division Headquarters	X	X
Colombian Army Rapid Deployment Force Re-Training Center—Includes: Command and Staff Section		X
Technical Area Department		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Tactical Area Department		X
Physical Area Department		X
Psychological Preparation Department		X
Colombian Army Operations Command—Includes: Command and Staff Section		X
Colombian Army Lancero Group (also known as Colombian Army Ranger Unit/Battalion)	X	X
Fire Support Company		X
3rd Armor Battalion—Includes: Command and Staff Section		X
9th Infantry Battalion—Includes: Command and Staff Section	X	X
4th Mobile Brigade	X	X
39th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
40th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
41st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
42nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
5th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section	X	X
44th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
45th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
47th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
27th Combat Services Support Company		X
6th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section	X	X
48th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
50th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
56th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
60th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
Combat Service-Support Company		X
7th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section	X	X
29th Combat Service-Support Battalion		X
61st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
62nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
63rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
64th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
8th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section	X	X
66th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
67th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
68th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
69th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
30th Combat Service Support Company		X
9th Mobile Brigade	X	X
70th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
71st Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
72nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
73rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
31st Combat Service Support Company		X
2nd Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
3rd Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
8th Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
13th Engineer Battalion		X
Service and Support Company		X
14th Engineer Battalion	X	X
Service and Support Company		X
17th Engineer Battalion		X
Service and Support Company		X
Colombian Army Lancero School		X
Ayacucho Company at Tolomaida Department		X
Bolivar Company at Tolomaida Department		X
Calarca Company at Tolomaida Department		X
Santander Company at Tolomaida Department		X
26th Jungle Brigade		X
50th Infantry/Jungle Battalion	X	X
74th Counter Guerrilla Battalion	X	X
26th Service & Support Battalion		X
Coast Guard Detachment		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Colombian Military Joint Task Force Omega Headquarters	X	X
Joint Task Force Headquarters		X
Army Special Forces Command		X
Navy:		
Marine Riverine Brigade	X	X
Marine Riverine Battalion No. 10		X
Marine Riverine Battalion No. 20		X
Marine Riverine Battalion No. 30		X
Marine Riverine Battalion No. 40		X
Marine Riverine Battalion No. 50 (former Marine Riverine Battalion 80 which was re-designated as Marine Riverine Battalion 50 on May 2002)		X
Marine Riverine Battalion No. 60		X
Mobile Training Group		X
Riverine Combat School		X
Marine Special Forces Battalion No. 1		X
Naval Force South	X	X
Navy Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit		X
Navy Special Dive Unit		X
Caribbean Naval Force	X	X
San Andres/Providencia Specified Command		
Caribbean Submarine Fleet		X
Caribbean Airnaval Group		X
Caribbean Surface Fleet		X
Training Ship "Gloria"		X
Caribbean Coast Guard	X	X
Pacific Naval Force	X	X
Pacific Surface Fleet		X
Pacific Airnaval Group	X	X
Pacific Coast Guard	X	X
1st Marine Brigade		X
1st Infantry Battalion		X
2nd Infantry Battalion		X
3rd Infantry Battalion		X
4th Infantry Battalion		X
1st Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
2nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
Anti-Kidnapping Unit		X
Combat Service-support Company		X
Security Company		X
2nd Marine Brigade		X
6th Infantry Battalion		X
7th Infantry Battalion		X
8th Infantry Battalion		X
9th Infantry Battalion		X
3rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
4th Counter Guerrilla Battalion		X
Anti-Kidnapping Unit		X
Combat Service-support Company		X
Security Company		X
Air Force:		
Military Air Transport Command	X	X
Air Group East	X	X
2nd Air Combat Command	X	X
3rd Air Combat Command	X	X
4th Air Combat Command	X	X
5th Air Combat Command	X	X
6th Air Combat Command	X	X
Air Maintenance Command	X	X
Air Group Caribbean	X	X
Military Aviation School		X
Cadets Group Department		X
Academic Group Department		X
Aeronautical Education Department		X
Combat Group Department		X
Technical Group Department		X

Section I	Received assistance	Vetted
Support Group Department	X
Air Defense Group Department	X
Colombian National Police:		
Carabineros—Group 1	X	X
Anti-Narcotics Police	X	X

SECTION II

For 2000–2003, the following information was compiled from End-Use Monitoring Agreements (EUM) records related to security assistance and training request cables available to the State Department. EUMs and training request cables were used during this period to vet specific requests for training or assistance to units (vice the annual lists referred to in Section I). Furthermore, we were not able to sort the information by year, as the procedures during this period did not include the use of annual vetted unit lists. This list, therefore, includes a list of all vetted units during the period, most of which likely received security assistance. Due to record retention procedures, we were not able to confirm independently that every unit on the list actually received assistance, such as, for example, whether the planned training took place.

2000–2003

Army:

- Eastern Specified Command
- Army Aviation Brigade
 - Army Helicopter Battalion
 - Tactical Air Transportation Battalion
 - Instruction Battalion
- Special Forces School
- Special Forces Brigade
 - 1st Special Forces Battalion (re-named to Commando Battalion)
 - 2nd Special Forces Battalion
 - 3rd Special Forces Battalion
 - 4th Special Forces Battalion
- 12th Brigade—suspended as of September 25, 2000, reinstated December 19, 2000
- 24th Brigade—suspended as of November 1999, later disbanded
- Joint Task Force South Headquarters (re-named Sixth Division Headquarters)
 - 1st Counternarcotics Battalion
 - 2nd Counternarcotics Battalion
 - 3rd Counternarcotics Battalion
- 18th Brigade
 - 1st PEEV Battalion
 - 18th Calvary Battalion
 - 16th Engineer Battalion
 - 18th Support and Services Battalion
 - 27th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 - 30th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 - 46th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
- 24th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
- 49th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
- 52nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
- 12th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
- 34th Infantry Battalion
- 35th Infantry Battalion
- 36th Infantry Battalion
- 12th Engineer Battalion
- 12th Support and Services Battalion
- Joint Intelligence Center
- Counter Narcotics/Drug Brigade
 - Counter Narcotics Support and Services Battalion
- Special Forces Anti-Terrorism Urban Group
- Rapid Deployment Forces
- 1st Mobile Brigade
 - 19th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 - 20th Counter Guerrilla Battalion

21st Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 22nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 22nd Support and Services Company
 3rd Mobile Brigade
 51st Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 52nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 53rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 24th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 25th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 Logistics Brigade
 Transportation Battalion
 Supply Battalion
 Combat Support and Services Battalion
 Maintenance Battalion
 Quartermaster Battalion
 Medical Battalion
 Dispensary Detachment
 1st Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section Only
 6th Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section Only
 The Army Logistics School
 Directorate
 Sub-Directorate
 Human Resources Department
 Operations—Training Department
 Public Relations Department
 Course Development Department
 Security Company
 Military Intelligence Section
 Administration and Logistics Department
 Studies Inspectors Office
 Administrative Services Unit
 Training Company
 Colombia Army Engineer School—Includes: Command and Staff Section
 Investigation Department
 Instruction Department
 Administrative Department
 Mobile Training Team
 Explosive Ordinance Disposal Team
 Second Division Headquarters—Includes: Command and Staff Section Only
 Fourth Division Headquarters—Includes: Command and Staff Section Only
 Fifth Division—Includes: Command and Staff Section Only
 Colombian Army Rapid Deployment Force Re-Training Center—Includes: Com-
 mand and Staff Section
 Technical Area Department
 Tactical Area Department
 Physical Area Department
 Psychological Preparation Department
 Colombian Army Operations Command Includes: Command and Staff Section
 Colombian Army Ranger Unit
 Fire Support Company
 Commando Battalion
 3rd Armor Battalion—Includes: Command and Staff Section
 9th Infantry Battalion—Includes: Command and Staff Section
 4th Mobile Brigade
 39th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 40th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 41st Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 42nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 5th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section
 43rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 44th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 45th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 47th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 27th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 6th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section
 48th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 50th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 56th Counter Guerrilla Battalion

60th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 Combat Service-Support Company
 7th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section
 29th Combat Service-Support Battalion
 61st Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 62nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 63rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 64th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 8th Mobile Brigade—Includes: Command and Staff Section
 66th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 67th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 68th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 69th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 30th Combat Service Support Company
 9th Mobile Brigade
 70th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 71st Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 72nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 73rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 31st Combat Service Support Company
 2nd Engineer Battalion
 Instruction Replacement Company
 Service and Support Company
 3rd Engineer Battalion
 Instruction Replacement Company
 Service and Support Company
 8th Engineer Battalion
 Instruction Replacement Company
 Service and Support Company
 13th Engineer Battalion
 Instruction Replacement Company
 Service and Support Company
 14th Engineer Battalion
 Instruction Replacement Company
 Service and Support Company
 17th Engineer Battalion
 Instruction Replacement Company
 Service and Support Company
 Navy:
 17th River Combat Element
 5th River Combat Element
 3rd River Combat Element
 9th River Combat Element
 4th River Combat Element
 12th River Combat Element
 13th River Combat Element
 2nd River Combat Element
 10th River Combat Element
 11th River Combat Element
 14th River Combat Element
 Naval Force South
 Pacific Airnaval Group
 Atlantic Airnaval Group
 Marine Infantry Riverine Brigade (River Battalions 50, 60, 70, 80 and 90)
 Marine Infantry Riverine Brigade (River Battalions 20, 30 and 40)
 Marine Special Forces Battalion No. 1
 Marine Riverine Brigade
 Riverine Combat Element 10-1
 Riverine Combat Element 10-2
 Riverine Combat Element 10-3
 Riverine Combat Element 10-4
 Marine Riverine Battalion No. 30
 Marine Riverine Battalion No. 40
 Marine Riverine Battalion No. 50 (former Marine Riverine Battalion 80 which
 was re-designated as Marine Riverine Battalion 50 on May 2002)
 Marine Riverine Battalion No. 60
 Mobile Training Group
 Submarine Command

Riverine Combat School
 Army Special Forces Command
 Navy Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit
 Navy Special Dive Unit
 Caribbean Naval Force
 San Andres/Providencia Specified Command
 Caribbean Submarine Fleet
 Caribbean Surface Fleet
 Training Ship "Gloria"
 Pacific Naval Force
 Pacific Surface Fleet
 Pacific Training Center
 Pacific Coast Guard
 1st Marine Brigade
 1st Infantry Battalion
 2nd Infantry Battalion
 3rd Infantry Battalion
 4th Infantry Battalion
 1st Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 2nd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 Anti-Kidnapping Unit
 Combat Service-support Company
 Security Company
 2nd Marine Brigade
 6th Infantry Battalion
 7th Infantry Battalion
 8th Infantry Battalion
 9th Infantry Battalion
 3rd Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 4th Counter Guerrilla Battalion
 Anti-Kidnapping Unit
 Combat Service-support Company
 Security Company
 Air Force:
 Military Air Transport Command
 1st Tactical Air Support Command
 2nd Tactical Air Support Command
 Air Group South
 Air Group East
 1st Air Combat Command
 2nd Air Combat Command
 3rd Air Combat Command
 4th Air Combat Command
 5th Air Combat Command
 6th Air Combat Command
 Air Maintenance Command
 Air Group Caribbean
 Coast Guard Cartagena
 Military Aviation School
 Cadets Group Department
 Academic Group Department
 Aeronautical Education Department
 Combat Group Department
 Technical Group Department
 Support Group Department
 Air Defense Group Department
 Colombian National Police:
 Carabineros—Group 1

The list below includes un-vetted units from which individuals received either United States training or assistance during 2000–2007. The individuals from these units who received individual training were vetted and the Department did not have any credible evidence of the individuals being involved in gross human rights violations.

General Command of the Armed Forces:
 Center of Medicine
 General Command of the Military Forces
 Military Club

Cooperative Command of the Caribbean
 Office of Arial Installations
 Office of Logistical Processes
 Management Services
 Office of Information Technology
 Medical Clinic of the General Command of The Military Forces
 School of War
 School of Military Penal Justice
 Anti-Explosives Group
 National Hospital
 National Military Hospital
 Military Industries
 Intelligence
 Logistic Support Headquarters
 Quality Control Headquarters
 Legal Office of the General Command of the Military Forces
 Logistical Information System
 Army Operations Headquarters
 Office of the General Command Operations of the Armed Forces

Army:

National Army of Colombia
 Office of Army Health
 Army Command
 Office of Army Personnel
 Department of Data Communications
 Department of D-3
 Superior War School
 Magistrates Army
 Army Reserves
 Commander of the Assistant General of the Army
 Commander of the Inspector General of The Army
 Command Department of Military Penal Justice
 Center of Military Education
 National Training Center
 Battalion of Support Engineers #21 "General Jose Ramon De Leiva"
 Ranger School
 School of Professional Soldiers
 Office of Intelligence
 Center of Military Counterintelligence
 Regional Counter Military Intelligence Operations #1
 Military Intelligence Center
 Regional Military Intelligence #01
 Regional Military Intelligence #03
 Regional Military Intelligence #05
 Center of Technical Army Intelligence
 School of Intelligence And Counterintelligence
 Head of Coordination
 Department E-4
 Special Head
 Office of Information
 Office of Integral Action
 Education And Doctrine Headquarters
 Army Logistics Headquarters
 Office of Training And Instruction
 Military Education Battalion
 Center For Military Education
 Advanced Marksmanship Company
 General Carlos Julio Gil Colorado School of Artillery
 School of Weapons And Service
 Cavalry School
 Infantry School
 Military Police School
 National Training Support And Services Battalion
 National Training Center
 Military Parachuting School
 Military School of Sub officials
 Combat Support And Services Battalion
 Military Cadet School

“Second Lieutenant Jose Maria Hernandez” Health Battalion
 Transport Battalion Tarapaca
 Commissariat General Jelog
 Office of Artillery
 Office of Armor
 Office of Exterior Commerce
 Office of Communications
 Financial Office
 Office of Transportation
 Second Command
 Army Operations Headquarters
 Military Intelligence Support And Services Regiment
 Army—First Division:
 Task Force Centauro
 Counter Guerilla Battalion
 2nd Brigade
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #2
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #2
 “General Jose Maria Cordova” Mechanical Infantry Battalion
 “General Antonio Narino” Mechanical Infantry Battalion
 “General Francisco Vergara Y Velasco” Military Engineers
 Military Police Battalion #2
 2nd Command Brigade
 Atlantic Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Magdalena Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 10th Brigade
 High Mountain Battalion #7
 Artillery Battalion #2 La Popa
 Combat Support And Service Battalion #10
 Company Artillery Battalion #10 Santa Barbara
 Mechanical Infantry Battalion #6 Cartagena
 Cesar Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Guajira Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Armored Cavalry Group Matamoros D’costa
 Cavalry Group #2 Cr. Juan Jose Rondon
 Special Battalion for Energy And Roads #2
 Special Battalion for Energy And Roads #3
 Army—Second Division:
 Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit #7
 5th Brigade
 Artillery Battalion #5 “Ct. Jose Antonio Galan”
 Combat Support And Service Battalion #5
 Military Engineers Battalion #5 “Cr. Francisco Jose De Caldas”
 Infantry Battalion #40 “Cr. Luciano D’elhuyer”
 Infantry Battalion #41 “Gr Rafael Reyes”
 Infantry Battalion #14 “Ct. Antonio Ricaurte”
 5th Command Brigade
 Santander Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Special Battalion For Energy And Roads #7
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #30
 Center of Training And Instruction 18
 30th Brigade
 Combat Support And Service Battalion #30
 Infantry Battalion #13 “Gr. Custodio Garcia Rovira”
 Infantry Battalion #15 Gr. “Francisco De Paula Santander”
 Mechanical Cavalry Unit #5 “Gr. Hermogenes Maza”
 Special Battalion of Energy And Roads #10
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #44
 15th Mobile Brigade
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #95
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #96
 Mobile Brigade #22
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #36
 Office of Intelligence
 Regional Intelligence #2
 Antiaircraft Artillery Battalion #2 Nueva Granada
 Army—3rd Division:
 Command Division 3

Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit #9
 Task Force "Orion"
 3rd Brigade
 High Mountain Battalion #3 "Rodrigo Lloreda Caicedo"
 Artillery Battalion #3 "Batalla De Palace"
 Combat Support And Service Battalion #03
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #3
 Military Engineers Battalion #3 "Cr. Augustin Codazzi"
 Infantry Battalion #8 "Batalla De Bichincha"
 Infantry Battalion #23 "Vencedores"
 Military Police Battalion #3
 3rd Command Brigade
 Valle Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 8th Brigade
 High Mountain Battalion #5 "Gr. Urbano Castellanos Castillo"
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #8
 Artillery Battalion #8 "San Mateo"
 Infantry Battalion #22 "Ayacucho"
 Military Engineers Battalion #8 "Francisco Javier Cisneros"
 8th Command Brigade
 Risaralda Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 29th Brigade
 29th Command Brigade
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #37
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #57
 Infantry Battalion #9 Boyaca
 Infantry Battalion #7 "Gr. Jose Hilario Lopez"
 Cavalry Unit #3 "Gr. Jose Maria Cabal"
 Mobile Brigade #14
 Mobile Command Brigade #14
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #91
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #92
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #94
 Company For Combat Services And Support #37
 Mobile Brigade #19
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #114
 8th Brigade
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #93
 Army—4th Division:
 Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit #10
 Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit #11
 Infantry Battalion #29 "Tc German Campo Herrera"
 7th Brigade
 Combat Services And Support Battalion #7
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #7
 Military Engineers Battalion #7 "Gr. Carlos Alban"
 Aerial Transport Infantry Battalion #19 "Gr. Joaquin Paris"
 Aerial Transport Infantry Battalion #20 "Gr. Manuel Roergas Serviez"
 Infantry Battalion #21 "Pantano De Vargas"
 7th Command Brigade
 Meta Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Casanare Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cavalry Unit #16 "Guias De Casanare"
 28th Brigade
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #32
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #38
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #58
 Army—5th Division:
 5th Command Division
 Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit #3
 Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit #4
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #28
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #34
 1st Brigade
 High Mountain Battalion #02 "Gr. Santos Gutierrez Prieto"
 Combat Services And Support Battalion #1
 Artillery Battalion #1 Tarqui
 Special Battalion of Energy And Roads #06

Infantry Battalion #1 "Gr. Simon Bolivar"
 Infantry Battalion #2 "Mariscal Antonio Jose De Sucre"
 Training And Instruction Center #01
 Boyaca Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cavalry Unit #1 "Gr. Miguel Silva Plazas"
 6th Brigade
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #6
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #6
 Infantry Battalion #17 "Gr. Domningo Caicedo"
 Infantry Battalion #16 "Patriotas"
 Infantry Battalion #18 "Cr. Jaime Rooke"
 Tolima Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Artillery Battalion #9 Tenerife
 Infantry Battalion #27 Magdalena
 Infantry Battalion #26 Acaique Pigoanza
 Huila Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 13th Brigade
 13th Command Brigade
 Communications Battalion #1
 Artillery Battalion #13 "Gr. Fernando Landazabal Reyes"
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #13
 Counter Guerrilla Battalion #13
 Military Engineers Battalion #13 "Gr. Antonio Baraya"
 Infantry Battalion #37 "Presidential Guard"
 Infantry Battalion #38 "Miguel Antonio Caro"
 Infantry Battalion #39 "Sumapaz"
 Military Police Battalion #13
 Military Police Battalion #15 "Bacata"
 Cundinamarca Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cavalry Unit #13 "Gr. Ramon Arturo Rincon Quinonez"
 Cavalry Unit #10 "Tequendama"
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #1
 13th Brigade
 Action Sumapaz Definitive Action Operational Command
 High Mountain Battalion #1 "Antonio Arredondo"
 Sixth Division
 Urban Anti-Terrorist Special Forces Unit #12
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #12
 Infantry Battalion #36 "Hunters"
 Caqueta Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Combat Support And Services Battalion
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #59
 Special Battalion of Energy And Roads #11
 Special Battalion of Energy And Roads #9
 Infantry Battalion #25 "Gr. Roberto Domingo Rico Diaz"
 Infantry Battalion #49 "Sl Juan Bautista Solarte Obando"
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #99
 Army—7th Division:
 Explosive Ordinance Disposal Group
 Special Psychological Operations Division
 4th Brigade
 Artillery Battalion #4 "Cr. Jorge E. Sanchez Rodriguez"
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #4
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #4
 Special Battalion of Energy And Roads #4
 Infantry Battalion #12 "Bg. Alfonso Monsalva Florez"
 Task Force "Atratos"
 Infantry Battalion #10 "Cr. Atanasio Giradot"
 Infantry Battalion #11 "Caciquw Nutibara"
 Military Engineers Battalion #04 "Gr. Pedro Ne Ospina"
 Infantry Battalion #32 "Gr. Pedro Justo Berrio"
 4th Command Brigade
 Antioquia Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Rio Negro Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cavalry Group #4 "Juan Del Corral"
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #11
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #11
 Special Battalion of Energy And Roads #5

Infantry Battalion #33 "Junin"
 Cordoba Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 14th Brigade
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #14
 Special Battalion of Energy And Roads #08
 Infantry Battalion #03 "Barbula"
 Infantry Battalion #42 "Bombona"
 14th Command Brigade
 15th Brigade
 15th Command Brigade
 17th Brigade
 Combat Support And Services Battalion #17
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #33
 Infantry Battalion #47 "Gr. Francisco De Paula Velez"
 Infantry Battalion #46 "Voltigeros"
 17th Command Brigade
 Special Army Command
 Joint Task Force Omega
 Divisionary Reaction Force
 Army Troops
 Colombia Aerial Transportation Infantry #28
 Joint Task Force Command
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #15
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #62
 16th Mobile Brigade
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #99
 Counter Guerilla Battalion#106
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #112
 19th Mobile Brigade
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #108
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #109
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #103
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #104
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #105
 Special Operations Joint Command
 Army Special Operations Command

Navy:

Coast Guard Pacific Command
 Coast Guard Atlantic Command
 Coast Guard Caribbean Command
 Coast Guard Command
 Coast Guard Station of Cartagena
 Second Naval Command
 Colombian Navy
 Assistant General of The Navy
 Chief of Naval Intelligence Adjutants office
 Naval Base Bolivar
 Naval Base Malaga
 Naval Base Leguizamo
 Naval Base San Andres
 Naval Military Attaché
 Naval Aviation Command
 Naval Command Force of The Caribbean
 Naval Command Force of The Atlantic
 United Command of Submarines
 Marine Infantry Command
 Center of Oceanographic Information
 Colombian Naval Command
 Colnav School
 Corporation of Science And Technology for the Development of Naval, Maritime
 And Riverine Industries
 Office of Integral Action
 Supply Depot
 Office of Naval Weapons And Electronics
 Office of Aerial Armament
 Office of Naval Weapons
 Office of Social Wellbeing
 Office of Material Control

Office of Counterintelligence
 Office of Communications
 Office of Aerial Communications
 Office of Science, Technology and Investigation
 Office of Economics and Finance
 Office of Support
 Office of General Maritime
 Office of Exterior Maritime Intelligence
 Office of Naval Engineering
 Office of Information
 Office of Internal Intelligence
 Office of Chief Naval Operations
 Office of Recruitment And Naval Reserve Control
 Office of Naval Health
 Office of General Services
 Office of Information Systems
 School of Dive And Rescue
 Almirante Padilla School of Naval Cadets
 School of Naval Sub officials In Barranquilla
 School of Naval Intelligence
 School of Surface Warfare
 Naval Force of The Atlantic
 Arc-Fsubca
 Naval Air Force Group of The Atlantic
 Permanent Advisor Group of The Navy
 Naval Air Transport And Riverine Support Group
 Naval Hospital of Cartagena
 Naval General Inspection
 Headquarters of Human Development
 Headquarters of The Naval Chief of Human Development
 Headquarters of The Naval Chief of Human Development
 Headquarters of The Chief of Naval Intelligence
 Headquarters of The Chief of Naval Logistical Operations
 Headquarters of The Chief of Naval Operations
 Classification Committee
 Office of International Affairs
 Office of Institutional Planning And Development
 Office of Logistical Planning
 Office of Material Planning
 Office of Personal Planning
 Intelligence Network for the Caribbean
 Second Naval Command
 Marine Infantry Security Battalion #9
 Marine Infantry Special Forces Battalion #1
 Office of The Preservation of Integrity and Security
 Office of Recruitment and Reserve Control
 Office of Wellbeing and Discipline
 Pacific Naval Aerial Station
 Buenaventura Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Riverine Brigade of Marine Infantry 1
 School of Riverine Combat
 Riverine Battalion of Marine Infantry #10
 Advanced Riverine Post #52
 Riverine Tactical Unit
 Riverine Brigade of Marine Infantry 2
 Marine Infantry Command And Support Battalion #3
 Riverine Assault Battalion #2
 Riverine Assault Battalion #3
 Marine Infantry Brigade #1
 Marine Infantry Counter Guerilla Battalion #2
 Marine Infantry Riflemen Battalion #2
 Marine Infantry Riflemen Battalion #3
 Marine Infantry Riflemen Battalion #4
 Marine Infantry Brigade #2
 Counter Guerilla Battalion #3
 Marine Infantry Riflemen Battalion #6
 Marine Infantry Instruction And Entto Brigade
 Marine Infantry Command And Support Battalion #2

Marine Infantry Riflemen Battalion #5
 Marine Infantry Instruction Battalion #1
 Marine Infantry Instruction Battalion #2
 Marine Infantry Instruction Battalion #3
 Marine Infantry School of Information
 Marine Infantry Logistical Support Command
 Headquarters of Incorporation and Naval Education
 Air Force:
 Colombian Air Force Command
 Office of Health—Colombian Air Force
 Military Aviation School
 Sub-Officials School
 Operational Logistics Headquarters
 National Air Transportation Service
 Planning Section
 Colombian National Police:
 National Police of Colombia (CNP)
 CNP—Administration
 CNP—U.S. Embassy
 CNP—High Councilor
 CNP—Presidency
 CNP—Vice Presidency
 Office of Administration And Finance
 Office of Anti-Kidnapping And Extortion
 National Schools Office
 Office of CNP Security
 Office of CNP Health
 National Planning Office
 Canine Police School
 Gabriel Gonzalez School
 School of Judicial Police
 PNC Central Hospital
 Audiovisual Environment
 Hydrocarbons Elite Squad
 Special Operations Command
 Rural Operations Command
 Rifle Police
 Office of Judicial Police And Investigation
 Anti Explosives
 Office of National Police Intelligence
 Anti Narcotics Office
 Anti Narcotics Office Chemical SIU (Special Investigative Unit)
 Elite Jungle Group
 Police Department of Amazonas
 Police Department of Anioquia
 Police Department of Arauca
 Police Department of Atlantico
 Police Department of Bolivar
 Police Department of Boyaca
 Police Department of Caldes
 Police Department of Caqueta
 Police Department of Casanare
 Police Department of Cauca
 Police Department of Cesar
 Police Department of Choco
 Police Department of Cordoba
 Police Department of Cundinamarca
 Police Department of Guajira
 Police Department of Guainia
 Police Department of Guaviare
 Police Department of Huila
 Police Department of Magdalena
 Police Department of Meta
 Police Department of Narino
 Police Department of Norte De Santander
 Police Department of Putumayo
 Police Department of Quindio
 Police Department of Risaralda

Police Department of Santander
 Police Department of San Andres
 Police Department of San Andres And Providencia
 Police Department of Sucre
 Police Department of Tolima
 Police Department of Valle
 Police Department of Vichada
 "Carabineros" Mobile Squadron
 Atlantic Police Department "Antidisturbios" Mobile Squadron
 Risaralds Police Department "Antidisturbios" Mobile Squadron
 Santander Police Department "Antidisturbios" Mobile Squadron
 Bogotá Metropolitan Police Department "Antidisturbios" Mobile Squadron
 Police Department "Antidisturbios" Mobile Squadron
 Aguachica Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Barranquilla Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Bogotá Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Bucaramanga Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cali Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cartagena Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cucuta Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Cundinamarca Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Fusagasuga Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Ibague Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Neiva Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Pasto Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Manizales Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Medellín Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Pereira Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Sogomoso Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Sucre Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Valledupar Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom
 Unified Action Group for Personal Freedom Police
 Penitentiary Institute
 CNP Metropolitan Bogotá
 CNP Metropolitan Cali
 Armenia Municipal Police
 Barancabermeja Municipal Police
 Barranquilla Municipal Police
 Bolivar (Santander) Municipal Police
 Bucaramanga Municipal Police
 Buenaventura Municipal Police
 Buga Municipal Police
 Cartagena Municipal Police
 Cartago Municipal Police
 Chaparral Municipal Police
 Chitaraque Municipal Police
 Choconta Municipal Police
 Cucuta Municipal Police
 Florencia Municipal Police
 Fusagasuga Municipal Police
 Giradot Municipal Police
 Ibague Municipal Police
 La Victoria Municipal Police
 Manizales Municipal Police
 Mariquita Municipal Police
 Melgar Municipal Police
 Monteria Municipal Police
 Muzo Boyaca Municipal Police
 Neiva Municipal Police
 Palmira Municipal Police
 Pamplona Municipal Police
 Pereira Municipal Police
 Pitalito Municipal Police
 Rio Negro Municipal Police
 Santa Marta Municipal Police
 Tocaima Municipal Police
 Tulua Municipal Police

Tunja Municipal Police
 Turbo Municipal Police
 Ubaté Municipal Police
 Villavicencio Municipal Police
 Valle De Aburra Municipal Police
 Valledupar Municipal Police
 Villeta Municipal Police
 Zipaquirá Municipal Police
 Anti-narcotics Police Aviation unit
 Bogotá Metropolitan Police Department
 Medellín Metropolitan Police Department
 Finance And Customs Police
 Judicial Police and Investigation Section
 Judicial Police and Investigation Anti Explosives Section
 Antioquia Judicial Police and Investigation Section
 Bolívar Judicial Police and Investigation Section
 Córdoba Judicial Police and Investigation Section
 Narino Judicial Police and Investigation Section
 Valle Judicial Police and Investigation Section
 Metropolitan Cali Judicial Police and Investigation Section
 Intelligence Service of the National Police

We do not believe that the Department has provided assistance to units that have committed gross human rights violations. Should we find that a unit has committed such violations, we deny assistance to that unit until effective measures are taken to bring the alleged perpetrators to justice. Since the vetting process began in Colombia, the Department has performed more than 150,000 checks on the human rights performance of units and individuals throughout the Colombian Armed Forces. This is a serious and comprehensive process, and the Department of State values it as a means to protect and promote human rights in Colombia. Through this process, we believe this system is achieving our shared goal of denying U.S. assistance to gross violators of human rights.

When making a determination on vetting, the Department explores all sources of information that are available to it. This includes resources at the U.S. Embassy, bureaus within the Department, and information from NGOs and civil society groups. In evaluating information from these sources, including that provided by NGOs and civil society groups, the Department must make a case-by-case determination regarding the credibility of the information provided and the nature of allegations of wrongdoing, if any. This determination obviously is based in part upon whether information can be corroborated with other available information.

There are cases in which allegations are presented for which there is merely a single source of information. In these cases, we rely on the expertise of the Department's vetting personnel to make the best decision regarding the provision or denial of U.S. assistance to the unit or individual in question, based on the information at hand.

Secretary RICE. If I may just say a word about the commitment of the Colombian Government to justice against those who engage in human rights abuses, I don't think you'll find a stronger one in Latin America.

We have to remember that this is a country that's come out of a civil war. They have demobilized 40,000 terrorists, including 32,000 paramilitaries. They are trying to reintegrate those who can be reintegrated into society. They have increased the budget for the Prosecutor General's Office by \$40 million allowing new investigations.

I was talking with their Attorney General, who told me that they sat with the labor leaders, and they actually went through and they said, "What are the most important cases that we should be talking on first?" They're trying to prioritize those cases.

Yes, this is a very tough place, and it's—

Senator LEAHY. I know it is, and what I'm trying to—

Secretary RICE. But I just think we have to speak to the commitment of this Government to deal with the difficult circumstances, and I think their commitment is extraordinary.

Senator LEAHY. One of the reasons I've supported money way beyond the 5-year plan, is that I believe that the President is trying to make these changes. But your own Bureau of Democracy, and Human Rights, and Labor says impunity is the biggest problem here. There still are people given impunity. They have demobilized a number that then went and got new weapons and went right back.

In some ways this helps the President, if we're doing the good-cop/bad-cop routine. That's why I have not released some of the money under the Leahy law. We should discuss this further.

Now, we've talked about U.N. peacekeeping. I mentioned that the administration votes for these missions, and I agree I'd much rather use U.N. peacekeepers than be sending our troops all over the world.

Your budget, though, assumes that each and every one of the peacekeeping missions is going to shrink in fiscal year 2009. That won't happen. The picture before us in fiscal year 2008 leaves us short by \$266 million, and if projections hold for fiscal year 2009, you're between \$400 and \$600 million short.

Have we got ourselves in a catch 22?

Secretary RICE. Senator, I think the point that I would underscore is that we're able to meet our commitment to these peacekeeping missions. Some of this cash flow, frankly—the funding is not required until a specific time. Sometimes the missions, unfortunately, don't come into full fruition, which has been, for instance, the case in the Somalia mission where we want to be able to fund it, but we don't have troops to fund because they haven't been able to raise the troops.

Sometimes we fund through supplemental appropriations, which has been the case with Sudan and had been the case with Lebanon, and so I believe that we are. Were we not, I would be concerned because I think that peacekeeping is extremely important for us to be able to support these missions. But we have been able to meet our obligations and will continue to meet our obligations.

Senator LEAHY. We have Uighurs—I believe I pronounced that right, in lock-up?

Secretary RICE. Uighurs, yes.

Senator LEAHY. In Guantanamo. They were people who were sold to U.S. forces by Pakistani bounty hunters for \$5,000 each in our war against terror about 5 years ago. Now you have determined they were not enemy combatants.

Some have been released and they're in Albania, but, of course, they don't speak the language, don't know the customs and so forth. The rest are still being imprisoned. Are you just going to keep them locked up. We bought them from the bounty hunters. It turns out that they had not done anything against the United States.

Is this the face we want to show the rest of the world?

Secretary RICE. Well, Senator, I'm not sure of the circumstances of each and every one, but I do know that our concern is to get the Uighurs to places where we didn't feel that there would be subject

to any kind of repression or abuse. And, frankly, that's why they haven't been returned to China.

Senator LEAHY. How about the United States?

Secretary RICE. That's why they have not been returned to East Turkistan.

Senator LEAHY. Sure, but how about bringing them into the United States?

Secretary RICE. Senator, we have some concerns, and you know that I also have a partner in DHS and law enforcement that has concerns about the admittance of certain people with certain kinds of records to the United States, given the circumstances that we face on terrorism.

We've not done this as a group. We've tried to get people to places that we think they might be able to survive, but we do have to be careful in who we release into the United States.

Senator LEAHY. It's okay to send them to Albania, though.

Secretary RICE. Well, we believe that there are reasons that there might be less difficulty in Albania than here. But the main thing is to get them to places where they're not going to be subject to repression, and we think that sending them back to China would not be a good idea.

Senator LEAHY. These people do not pose a threat to anybody.

Secretary RICE. But not every case of the Uighurs is like that.

Senator LEAHY. They're locked up simply because somebody sold them to us.

Senator Gregg.

Senator GREGG [presiding]. Let me just, in two issues, further, the PEPFAR Program. Obviously, at its core it's an excellent program which has really helped a lot of people, millions of people. But it seems to me that now that it's gotten fairly mature, there are some issues that we need to revisit.

The first is it's size, and the fact that once you begin this program in a country you are committed for years, and it's an expanding number. It doesn't ever shrink in the foreseeable future from a budget standpoint because once you start these treatments and you start to address these populations, the numbers go up. It seems to me it's going to end up being the program that eats the rest of the programs around it because the ability to fund this program is going to far exceed our capacity, if we have to absorb all the effort.

Which leads me to the second point, which is we're doing this in a number of countries where they actually have significant reserves. Nigeria has \$54 billion of reserves. South Africa has \$15 billion, I think, of reserves, fairly significant reserves, and yet they're bearing almost no responsibility for these programs.

It seems that as we choose countries and we decide to expand this program, we should be choosing countries by under the nature of the nation's capacity to take on the program. If a country can afford to do it themselves, we should ask them to, and the culture of the government of that country which is whether or not they're willing to pursue it, in which it's an issue in South Africa and to some degree an issue in Nigeria.

So I'm just concerned that we need to revisit this. We've got an authorization coming through. If this HIV/AIDS authorization is

set at \$50 billion, it isn't going to be like typical authorizations. When this is set at \$50 billion, we're probably going to have to appropriate the \$50 billion because that's the nature of the support for this program. That's going to take—that's going to basically eliminate large amounts of efforts that would occur in other functions of the State Department and USAID because the money will have to come from somewhere.

So I do hope that before this administration leaves, because it's your initiative, you've done a great job getting this up and off the ground. I congratulate you for it, I think it's had great progress. I hope you'll sit down and convene a think tank, a symposium, about how this program should be left for the next administration. Give us your thoughts on that.

Secretary RICE. We'll do that.

Senator GREGG. It would be nice if it could be done before we have to do this authorization.

[The information follows:]

I appreciate your suggestion and agree it will be valuable to disseminate the lessons we are learning through PEPFAR. There has been an ongoing effort to capture and disseminate these lessons, not only for the benefit of our HIV/AIDS initiative but for our other international development activities, and indeed for the activities of other international partners in development. Now that we are at the end of the program's initial 5-year authorization and with a new administration coming in, it would be particularly helpful to undertake this in a focused way. We are exploring options for a public forum that would serve this purpose. In my view, some of the things we would hope to cover in this effort are the key development principles that undergird PEPFAR, the reasons for the successes we have been able to achieve, areas that need to be maintained and expanded, and areas that require improvement—both in terms of programs and in terms of management and administration. In addition, we will also undertake efforts to ensure a smooth transition of the new administration, including preparation of transition papers that reflect key lessons learned. We have also begun planning for next year's HIV/AIDS Implementers' Meeting, which has developed into a key forum for dissemination of programmatic best practices to a worldwide audience.

Senator GREGG. Second, I had the good fortune to develop legislation for the State Department to oversee and provide funding for Embassies back when I had Commerce, State, Justice in the Clinton administration. We pursued a very aggressive buildup program for Embassies.

Secretary RICE. I'm sorry, for?

Senator GREGG. For Embassies.

Secretary RICE. Embassies, um-hmm.

Senator GREGG. That's continued. But we really put a huge amount of money in very quickly into that, and it seems to me we made some big mistakes. The biggest mistake is that, as I wander around looking at these Embassies I say to myself, is this America? I mean we've set these fortresses out there, these bunkers.

That has got to be a—obviously, there isn't a middle ground because we have to protect our personnel, but there has to be some way to make these Embassies more consumer-friendly, more country-friendly, more visually-friendly than what we're doing. I would hope that you might convene another symposium of good things down at the State Department and come up with a proposal on that before you folks depart.

[The information follows:]

OBO has had the same concerns and goals with regards to the need for design excellence and acceptability for the local cultural environment. The program has

reached an experience level that now allows us to focus on further design excellence. OBO has already raised this issue with our colleagues at the Industry Advisory Panel, which engendered a lengthy discussion about the use of local architects, incorporation of local materials, having designs/facades that blended more with the locality etc. Also, we have looked at a similar design excellence program administered by the General Services Administration. In another outreach effort, OBO is meeting this month with the American Institute of Architects to advance our goal to have more design excellence incorporated into our program. Historically, OBO has used limited design competitions as a method of achieving design excellence (exempli grati, Berlin and Beijing) and we are re-establishing limited competitions for unique locations requiring especially sensitive architectural solutions. Another on-going design excellence element is our Sustainability Program which also focuses on creating designs responsive to the environment and energy efficiency in local conditions.

Finally, with regards to the “fortress” aspects we are in the process, with Diplomatic Security, of revalidating security requirements in a very substantive and systematic manner, with a working group established in February of this year. The working group is co-chaired by Diplomatic Security and OBO. This working group according to its mission statement will review all fundamental elements of the Standard Embassy Design (SED) including basic space standards; the need for and sizes of each building; the amount of land required and how it is acquired; the acquisition and construction phasing methods; labor constraints; and the “bricks and mortar” requirements; and revalidate them in light of cost-benefit and risk management analysis, evolving physical and technical threats and new countermeasure methods and technologies. As an evolution of the SED, OBO is also developing a Vertical SED requirements concept that might be used for more urban areas that must adapt to smaller sites. These efforts will assist in making our Embassies more consumer and country friendly and more visually inviting while factoring in appropriate security measures.

Senator GREGG. So those are my two concerns. I don’t expect the answers here. I just raise those as very significant—the first one is a very significant red flag for the Department. The second one I think is, regrettably, a red flag for our image as a Nation around the world.

Secretary RICE. I will not try to give you a full answer to either, Senator Gregg, but just to say, on PEPFAR, you know what the President’s request was on this. We believe that it’s the appropriate request, but we are trying to work with countries that they take over more of the cost, for instance, for the health care systems that have to support these programs.

Some of this had to get up and running, but we hope that over time that those are going to affect the infrastructure or—cost, but then the kind of marginal cost of treating a patient will not be the same as the cost of treating the first set of patients.

But in some places the programs are, where there is capacity, the programs are very, very small. I was just visiting in Ukraine with the President. We were with some kids. The amount of American money going into that program is very, very small, but it’s a nice program for us to put a good face of America forward. So there’s a range of what we do to support these programs.

But I don’t disagree with you that we should look at the long-term sustainability, and we’ll try to do that.

On the Embassies, we’ve tried to make them as user-friendly as we can. They are strong security standards. We’ve done things, for instance, in China by separating out the consular function so that it’s more readily accessible to people.

Also, I think we can’t just be confined to the Embassies. We are trying to find ways for people to get out and around. We’re trying to find ways to use virtual diplomacy and to have, even in some places where it’s safe to have American presence posts, which just

might be a single Ambassador, or a single official who travels on behalf of the United States.

But I'm aware of the problem that you raise, and we'll try to get back to you.

Senator GREGG. Well, maybe we need an Inman II, you know. I mean, let's go back. I mean, there's no reason we should be locked down to a securities regime that was put in place 10 years ago. Maybe it's working well in a number of areas, maybe it's not working so well in a number of areas. So why not take another look at this in a very substantive, systematic way as versus just an anecdotal way? That's my suggestion.

Senator LEAHY [presiding]. I have to agree with Senator Gregg on this. It is the face that we give. Sometimes there are things long harmed before you wherein there were—you look at me, you wonder what were they thinking? The Eagle in London, you know, there's beautiful around, and this monstrosity that we place in the middle of—was it Grosvenor Square, or something?

Senator GREGG. It doesn't have anything to do with security.

Senator LEAHY. It doesn't have anything to do with security, but it's ugly as heck when you compare that with the—I mean, it's—it goes——

Senator GREGG. It would be a gift to the English people if we tore that down.

Senator LEAHY. Would it ever. I'd vote for that in a nanosecond, but they—then you look at the beautiful one we built in Ottawa, the U.S. Embassy, the Canadians gave us a perfect spot as we did them on Pennsylvania Avenue here. It's an absolutely beautiful place, and very open. Yet with all the various security things built in.

I remember being in New Zealand once years ago, and they just built a new Embassy there. I don't remember who was president at the time, but just massive fortifications around it as though somehow there's going to be bands of crazed New Zealanders marching on our Embassy in probably the most low-key country you could be in.

I would hope that we would work on it because it's bad enough that foreigners come to this country, and so often at the point of entry they're treated like they're criminals until they prove themselves innocent. I mean I've seen some of the very, very rude way they're treated at the port of entry and going through immigration and so on. It's especially true if a foreign accent is heard.

These are the same people when they get a few hundred yards beyond the airport or wherever it is, they find the American people to be very, very friendly, and they have a very good time here.

Incidentally, I wrote and we passed legislation that bans the export of clustered munitions that are going to be used by any country against civilian targets and those that have a 1 percent or more failure rate, which could pretty well preclude most of the cluster munitions being exported from this country.

We saw Israel use hundreds of thousands of these bomblets in Lebanon, many supplied by the United States. Innocent civilians were killed. There were also indiscriminate attacks against Israel, but then, as this escalated, cluster munitions were used in civilian areas in a manner that violated the export agreement on them.

Am I correct in that? Was the agreement violated?

Secretary RICE. Senator, I should probably get an answer to you. [The information follows:]

The State Department has had an ongoing dialogue with the government of Israel regarding its use of cluster munitions in the Summer of 2006 in response to the unprovoked attack on Israel by Hezbollah. Israel undertook to investigate the entirety of its campaign in the 2006 war, including its use of cluster munitions. The findings of Israel's investigation were released in the Winograd Report in January 2008. Where there have been incidents of concern, Israel has made policy changes. We know from our discussions that the Israeli Government continues to take this issue seriously.

The Arms Export Control Act, as amended (AECA) requires that we notify Congress if there has been a possible unauthorized diversion, misuse, or failure to secure U.S.-provided defense articles or defense services. In a letter dated January 29, 2007, the Department notified Congress pursuant to section 3(c) of AECA of the use of cluster munitions by the government of Israel. The Department has consulted closely with Congress regarding Israel's use of cluster munitions, including most recently with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff in May of this year. If you or your staff would like a more detailed, classified briefing on this subject, we would be happy to arrange one.

Secretary RICE. I remember that we investigated this matter. We talked to the Israelis about it, but I will need to get back to you on the conclusion.

Senator LEAHY. I understand the Department issued a finding. It may have occurred they were looking at it further.

Secretary RICE. That's right, they may have, but I don't know where it is, and I will get to you as to where we are in those discussions.

Senator LEAHY. Is this one of these things that may have a way of falling into the wastebasket and, "I'll get back to you, the check's in the mail?"

Secretary RICE. No, we actually continue to have discussions with the Israelis about this, and I know they've done a number of internal looks and investigations. I just don't know where it is, what the status is, so I'll get back to you about it.

Senator LEAHY. All right. Senator Cochran?

Senator COCHRAN. Yes. I have nothing.

Senator LEAHY. Senator Gregg.

Senator GREGG. We thank the Secretary for her extraordinary service to this country.

Secretary RICE. Thank you very much.

PREPARED STATEMENTS

Senator LEAHY. We have received statements from the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange and the Asia Foundation that will be made part of the hearing record.

[The statements follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE

As Chair of the Board of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, I appreciate the opportunity to submit testimony in strong support of the budget request of \$522.444 million for the educational and cultural exchange programs administered by the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) in fiscal year 2009. If additional funds are available, the Alliance urges an increase to \$600 million in order to deepen the public diplomacy impact of existing activities and to develop new and innovative programs. The Alliance also strongly supports the President's request for consular resources.

The Alliance comprises 77 nongovernmental organizations, with nearly 8,000 staff and 1.25 million volunteers throughout the United States. Through its members, the Alliance supports the international interests of 3,300 American institutions of higher education. The Alliance is the leading policy voice of the U.S. exchange community. We look forward to continuing our productive working relationship with the subcommittee, and appreciate the opportunity to offer this testimony.

U.S. Ambassadors consistently rank exchange programs among the most useful catalysts for long-term political change and mutual understanding, and as our experiences since September 11, 2001, demonstrate clearly, we need public diplomacy and exchanges more now than ever. Poll after poll continues to indicate rising anti-Americanism, even in nations we count among our closest allies. We must work to build trust and understanding for our people and our policy goals not just in the Muslim world—an effort of critical importance—but around the globe. To defeat terrorism and address other priority global issues, we will need the help of our friends and allies in every region of the world.

The Alliance therefore urges the subcommittee to fund the Department of State's exchange budget at \$522.444 million in fiscal year 2009. If additional funds are available, we urge you to increase the allocation to \$600 million in order to deepen the public diplomacy impact of existing programs while continuing to develop new and innovative programs. A \$600 million level of spending will allow robust funding for targeted, meaningful growth in every region of the world for the State Department's existing exchange programs, provide additional resources for Islamic exchange, sustain funding for Eurasia, Central Asia, and Eastern Europe, fund the administration's request for the Partnership for Latin American Youth, and encourage the development of new and innovative programs worldwide.

CORE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

The following data define the context for increased exchange program funding:

—A June 2007 Pew poll shows that since 2002, the image of the United States has declined in most parts of the world. Favorable ratings of America are lower in 26 of the 33 countries for which trends are available. (NOTE.—Pew Global Attitudes survey, “Global Unease with Major World Powers and Leaders”, June 27, 2007)

—A Congressional Research Service review of 29 reports on public diplomacy revealed that the most common recommendation was to increase exchange funding.

—State Department evaluations repeatedly show that foreign exchange participants complete their programs in the United States with enhanced positive impressions of the United States, its people, and its values.

An increase in funding for fiscal year 2009, particularly if the subcommittee is able to increase the budget beyond the President's request, will allow for meaningful growth in the State Department's time-tested exchange programs that remain at the core of our efforts to build mutual understanding and respect between the United States and critical nations around the world. These well-established programs—Fulbright, Muskie, and other academic programs, the International Visitor Leadership Program, and citizen exchanges—continue to demonstrate their relevance and effectiveness in a rapidly evolving world.

The Fulbright Program has unique value in deepening mutual understanding between the United States and 150 countries. Visiting Fulbright students report the program's deep impact: 99 percent say the program increased their knowledge and understanding of the United States and its culture; 96 percent shared their Fulbright experiences in their home country through media or community activities; 89 percent report that their Fulbright experiences allowed them to assume leadership roles after their programs. U.S. Fulbright students strongly agree (97 percent) that the program strengthens bilateral relationships, and deepened their understanding of their host country (100 percent). By several indices, American Fulbright students say the program enhanced their leadership skills. Upon returning, U.S. Fulbright scholars make their campuses and communities more international: 73 percent have incorporated aspects of their Fulbright experience into courses and teaching methods. Visiting Fulbright scholars are also likely to incorporate their experiences in America into their professional lives at home: nearly two-thirds of those surveyed said that they “broadened the international aspects of their teaching and research in general” and “became . . . a resource for their colleagues with regard to knowledge and skills learned.”

Approximately 286,500 United States and foreign nationals have participated in the Fulbright Program since its inception over 50 years ago. The Fulbright Program awards approximately 8,000 new grants annually. In 2007, nearly 7,000 U.S. stu-

dents and young professionals applied for 1,500 available Fulbright grants. One hundred and fifty U.S. students will receive on-the-ground training in critical languages in advance of their research grants. Of over 2,000 incoming foreign students from 135 countries, 400 are teaching their native languages at U.S. colleges and universities. Other recent program changes include: the cutting-edge research conducted by New Century Scholars, which provides deep focus on a single global problem by leading scholars from around the world; global expansion of the Fulbright Language Teaching Assistants for U.S. students; initiatives focusing on science and technology, including awards for foreign students to obtain PhDs in the full range of science fields and a “Lab to Market” seminar in the Silicon Valley for students from developing countries; and enrichment programs exposing students from abroad to local communities throughout the United States.

Other valuable academic exchange programs include the Edmund S. Muskie Graduate Program which confers fellowships across a wide range of sectors to graduate students and professionals in Eurasia; the Humphrey Fellowships Program, which provides powerful academic and professional training experiences for professionals in the developing world; Overseas Educational Advising, through which prospective foreign students receive reliable information about American higher education and professional assistance in the application process; the Gilman International Scholarship Program, which enables American students with financial need to study abroad; and English teaching and U.S. Studies programs, designed to enhance understanding of American society and values.

The International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP) continues to be ranked by many U.S. Ambassadors as their most effective program tool. This results-oriented program allows our Embassies to address directly their highest priority objectives by bringing emerging foreign leaders to the United States for intensive, short-term visits with their professional counterparts. The program also exposes visitors to American society and values in homes and other informal settings.

Fifty-three current heads of government and chiefs of state are alumni of the IVLP, including President Nicolas Sarkozy of France, President Hamid Karzai of Afghanistan, President Felipe de Jesus Calderon Hinojosa of Mexico, Prime Minister Gordon Brown of the United Kingdom, and Prime Minister Ehud Olmert of Israel. Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili is an alumnus of the IVLP and Muskie programs, and many of his cabinet members either attended a university in the United States or participated in exchange programs. Saakashvili and his colleagues were among the leaders of the peaceful “Rose Revolution” in 2003 and Georgia’s subsequent transition to democracy.

According to State Department evaluations, IVLP alumni returned to their home countries with positive feelings about democratic values, overwhelmingly agreeing with the following statements: citizens should have equal rights (99 percent); rule of law is fundamental to democracy (99 percent); free and fair elections are cornerstones of democracy (98 percent); individuals and organizations have the right to free speech (97 percent); and independent media are important (95 percent).

Citizen exchanges continue to engage American citizens across the United States in productive international activities. In addition, these programs leverage their relatively modest Federal dollars into significantly more funding through the participation of local communities, schools, businesses, and nongovernmental organizations. Increased funding for citizen exchanges would permit an expansion of these highly cost-effective activities, particularly in the critical area of capacity building in communities across the United States. Engaging more Americans as “citizen diplomats” can only strengthen public diplomacy.

REGIONAL PROGRAMS

The Alliance strongly supports growth in exchanges world-wide. Both public opinion polling and the global nature of most current issues—*exempli grati*, terrorism, the environment, public health—demand that we strengthen our public diplomacy in all world regions. In this brief testimony, however, we wish to draw attention to three particularly critical areas.

While the need for exchanges is worldwide, increased engagement with the Islamic world is particularly critical as we seek to enhance our national security and build understanding, trust, and a sense of shared interests between the people of the Islamic world and the American people.

The State Department has created a continuum of programs to reach out to Muslim participants, particularly diverse and underrepresented populations. The Department has instituted a very successful program of micro-scholarships to stimulate in-country English study by teenagers. In addition, the Youth Exchange and Study Program (YES), also known as the Cultural Bridges Program, brings high

school students from the Islamic world to live with American families and attend American schools for an academic year. For the 2007–08 academic year, the program includes over 750 students from 30 countries, the West Bank and Gaza. We urge funding of \$25 million for YES, which would allow the program to reach its long-term goal of 1,000 students.

The Department has devised a variety of undergraduate exchanges including summer institutes, community college programs, and semester and year-long programs at 4-year institutions, and expanded the Humphrey fellowships for the Muslim world. Under the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI), the Department has used summer institutes and existing programs such as Fulbright and Gilman to increase U.S. capacity in Arabic, Farsi, and Indic languages. The International Visitor Leadership Program has targeted ‘key influencers’ in predominantly Muslim nations, bringing hundreds of clerics, journalists, and women and student leaders to the United States for programs emphasizing tolerance, interfaith dialogue, and diversity. These programs have had remarkable and consistent impact, and U.S. Embassies would welcome many more if funding were available.

We strongly support the administration’s initiative to focus additional exchanges on Latin America. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) continues to apply its continuum approach to Latin America to reach out effectively to non-elite groups in this very important region. Program elements include micro-scholarships for English language study, summer institutes for student leaders, an expanded Youth Ambassadors program, “supplementary scholarships” covering incidental and travel expenses to allow talented but needy students to accept financial aid offered by U.S. colleges and universities, and scholarships to attend U.S. community colleges.

In addition, the Alliance supports continued funding to sustain engagement with the countries of Eurasia, Central Asia, and Eastern Europe. On-going political transition and challenges to democratic change continue in this region, often grabbing international headlines. Over the past few years as the world’s focus turned to the Middle East, funding too has shifted, resulting in a diminished focus on activities with countries in this important and potentially volatile region.

Exchange programs have provided sustained opportunities to expose future leaders to American civil society and values, and to foster personal and professional relationships between Americans and citizens of the region. As political change continues to occur, the Alliance urges sustained U.S. engagement throughout the region to maintain the ties we have developed and to continue to expose youth and future leaders to U.S. ideals and values.

In addition to increased funding for exchange programs, the Alliance strongly supports the President’s request to increase funding for the Department of State, and particularly for consular operations. The State Department has done an excellent job in its management of the visa function despite a greatly increased workload in recent years. Still, the many new requirements mandated by Congress, especially the mandate that nearly all applicants have a personal interview, have meant that waits for visa interviews can be very long in critical countries, and that visas have become a prominent issue in several key bilateral relationships. Bringing qualified people to the U.S. enhances our national security. We encourage Congress to continue to provide the State Department with additional consular resources.

Thank you again for this opportunity to voice the Alliance’s support for a robust appropriation for the educational and cultural exchange programs administered by the Department of State’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in fiscal year 2009 as well as for increased consular resources. We look forward to working with the subcommittee throughout the year ahead to ensure that the United States continues to vigorously support the traditional exchange programs that have proven their success for the past 50 years, while also developing new and innovative programs.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE ASIA FOUNDATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: The United States and Asia face new challenges and pressing needs, complicated by the war on terrorism, and fragile democracies. To support political stability and economic reform, we must give attention to countries where recent events have exacerbated bilateral relations, specifically in the new democracies of Asia and in countries with predominantly Muslim populations. Potential ties to regional terrorist networks threaten regional stability. Human rights abuses continue with impunity in parts of Asia. Even though women have made gains in many places, they still face economic and political inequities, and in the worst cases, along with children, they are victims of trafficking and

abuse. The costs of poverty and poor governance in Asia are high. Our investments in the region must be deep and multifaceted, taking advantage of both government and non-government resources. As literally the only non-governmental American organization that has addressed Asia's needs effectively on-the-ground and contributed to American interests in Asia for over 50 years, the Asia Foundation, under the Department of State, is again requesting \$18 million for fiscal year 2009, as it did last year.

In November 2007, Secretary of Defense Gates stated that the Department of Defense has "taken on many of the burdens that might have been assumed by civilian agencies in the past, but it is no replacement for the real thing—civilian involvement and expertise." Last week, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Rep. Howard Berman noted "we have to deploy American's finest engineers, development experts and diplomats in the campaign for reconstruction and stabilization in vulnerable countries."

Challenges to governance in Thailand, the Philippines, Mongolia, and Indonesia require different approaches than in countries struggling to achieve democracy, peace and stability, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, and Timor Leste. The Asia Foundation's programs benefit from its long experience and on-the-ground presence through 17 Asian field offices. Its work with and through literally hundreds of established and emerging Asian partner organizations make it highly knowledgeable, effective, and trusted by Asians. This experience base, coupled with a staff of more than 80 percent Asian nationals who have a sensitivity and understanding of the local context, makes the Foundation different from nearly all other nongovernmental development organizations. The Foundation does not bring staff for work on a short-term basis and then leave. Its commitment is long term. The Foundation builds and sustains the kinds of institutions and practices that enable Asians to replicate success and be sustainable in the future. In short, The Asia Foundation is the premier development organization focusing on Asia.

Of perhaps particular interest to the Congress today is the fact we have been working effectively with Muslims and Islamic civil and higher education organizations for more than 35 years. Generations of Asians know us from our education grants and exchange programs and through the more than 40 million English-language books we have provided in more than 20 countries (974,000 last year alone). The result is that Asians respect, trust, and like the Foundation at a time when much of what they hear and think about our country is not very positive. In short, The Asia Foundation has an unmatched credibility. It is an irreplaceable American and international asset.

Although the Foundation has operated continuously since 1954, The Asia Foundation Act of 1983 authorizes an annual appropriation from the Congress. That Act acknowledged the importance of stable funding for the Foundation and endorsed its ongoing value and contributions to U.S. interests in Asia. For most of the decade until 1995, the Foundation's annual appropriation was at least \$15 million. However, in fiscal year 1996, during the Government shutdown year, despite broad bipartisan support commending its work, the Foundation's appropriation was cut by two-thirds, to \$5 million. The Foundation painfully was forced to sharply cut back its programs, but struggled to maintain nearly all of its most important asset, its field operation structure. Since that low point, the committee, in support of the organization's mission, has gradually restored funding for the Foundation to its current level of \$15.3 million.

The past year has been important for the Asia Foundation. For the first time in a decade, the Foundation reached its fiscal year 1995 funding level and was appropriated \$15.3 million, enabling us to take on new challenges and start new programs. We greatly appreciate the committee's trust and faith in the Foundation to achieve results and fulfill its mission to advance U.S. interests. It is clear nevertheless that many of the countries where we work in Asia have been under served, and local capacity and experience in democracy and governance is lacking. The Foundation's approach of working with local partners is therefore greatly needed. Past committee report language has commended our grant-making role in Asia, and the Foundation, at the Committee's encouragement, has expanded its programs in predominantly Muslim countries, including Afghanistan, Indonesia, Pakistan, southern Thailand, and Mindanao in the southern Philippines.

Public funds are critical to our capacity to do more to advance American interests in Asia. The Foundation has expanded its private funding, but potential private donors need to be assured that the U.S. Government supports the Foundation's efforts, and private funds are always tied to specific projects. Only public funding through this appropriation provides the flexibility that allows the Foundation to maintain its field presence and respond quickly to new developments, as we did in supporting

the Emergency Loya Jirga in Afghanistan, where we were the first U.S. non-governmental organization on the ground in spring 2002.

Despite the positive attitude and assessment of the Foundation's programs in the State Department, USAID, and especially among those U.S. Ambassadors with deep Asian experience who often turn to our country representatives for information and advice, past and present administrations consistently have used previous year requests as the baseline for future requests, rather than the congressional appropriations of the previous year. This has resulted in a low appropriation recommendation in the past and once again for fiscal year 2009. The result has been that the Foundation's U.S. funding base has been shrinking in both relative and absolute terms. With unfavorable exchange rates and higher security and operational costs in Asia, and its programs more needed than ever, an increase is critical for us this year. The Foundation has the experience, expertise, and office/staffing base to do so much more of great value to the United States and Asia, if sufficient funds are available. Other multilateral and bilateral development agencies have increasingly seen the value of the Foundation's assets and expanded cooperation on a wide range of critical democracy and development programs. But these funds continue to be tied to specific projects and do not allow the flexibility to enable us to address urgent needs as they arise. Therefore, we urgently but respectfully ask the committee to sustain and increase its support for the vital work the Foundation is engaged in on behalf of the U.S. interests in this complex region. The Asia Foundation is requesting a modest increase to \$18 million.

In making this request, we are very aware of the fiscal year 2009 budgetary pressures on the committee. However, an increase would enable The Asia Foundation to strengthen program investments it has begun in recent years with congressional encouragement. We have proved that modest increases for the Foundation not only enhance America's engagement and image in the region, it also has a great impact on the lives of the people of Asia, notably in the areas of protecting women and children against trafficking; promoting women's rights; building democracy and critical government capacity in Afghanistan and Timor Leste; increasing tolerance in predominantly Muslim nations like Indonesia, Bangladesh and Pakistan; securing human rights in Cambodia, Sri Lanka, and Nepal; and strengthening good governance and civil society throughout Asia.

THE ASIA FOUNDATION'S MISSION, EXPERTISE, AND APPROACH

The Asia Foundation is committed to the development of a peaceful, prosperous, just, and open Asia-Pacific region. Our core capabilities and primary program concentrations are central to U.S. interests in the region:

- Democracy, Human Rights and the Rule of Law.*—Strengthening democratic and civil society institutions; encouraging an active, informed and responsible non-governmental sector; advancing the rule of law; promoting free and fair elections; and building institutions to uphold and protect human rights;
- Economic Reform and Development.*—Reducing barriers at the national and regional level to the formation and productive functioning of small business and entrepreneurship;
- Women's Political and Economic Empowerment.*—Encouraging women's participation in public life; protecting women's rights and supporting advocacy training; and prevention of trafficking and domestic violence, including supportive efforts to protect and provide shelter to victims;
- Peaceful and Stable Regional Relations.*—Promoting U.S.-Asian and intra-Asian dialogue on security, regional economic cooperation, law and human rights.

While the Foundation undertakes some development work directly with its own staff experts, the Foundation remains faithful to its primary focus on its grant-making role, steadily building institutions and strengthening Asian leadership and institutions for democratic societies. Foundation assistance provides training, technical assistance, and seed funding for new, local organizations, all aimed at promoting reform, building Asian capacity and strengthening U.S.-Asia relations. Today, Foundation grantees can be found in every sector in Asia, leaders of government and industry and at the grassroots level, and in an increasingly diverse civil society. The Foundation is distinctive in this role, not only providing the technical assistance necessary, but also in providing grants that cover the often neglected nuts and bolts necessities to support that capacity-building effort.

Urgent political and security needs in Asia have increased the need for experienced and credible American actors in the region. In Asia, the Asia Foundation is a well recognized and respected American organization, but its programs are grounded in Asia, helping to solve national and local problems in cooperation with Asian partners.

PROGRAMS

The Asia Foundation makes nearly 800 grants per year. These include such diverse efforts as support for: institutional reform of the Human Rights Court in Indonesia and judicial branch in Timor Leste; the Office of the President and Council of Ministers Secretariat in Afghanistan; conflict and mediation programs in Nepal, China and Sri Lanka; human rights and conflict management in Cambodia, the Philippines and Thailand; educational reform in Muslim schools in Indonesia and Thailand; counter corruption in the Philippines and Mongolia; strengthening civil society and the protection of migrant labor rights in China; improved support among Southeast Asian Muslim organizations on democracy and tolerance; small and medium enterprise policy reform in Vietnam and Bangladesh; anti-trafficking and women's rights in Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Cambodia and Thailand; and regional dialogues to expand peaceful regional relations. A full listing of programs may be found on our website www.asiafoundation.org.

CONCLUSION

The Asia Foundation, with its experienced, highly qualified and committed staff, is first and foremost a field-based, grant-making organization, committed to maximizing program impact in Asia while keeping costs low, despite the growing challenge of providing security to field offices and protecting staff. If the committee provides additional funding for Foundation programs in this fiscal year, we pledge to use those funds to focus on further expanding our on-the-ground programming to build democratic capacity, strengthen civil society, increase economic opportunity, protect women, and work with moderate Muslim groups as described above. The Foundation budget needs to grow in order to meet the growing challenges to American interests in the Asian region.

The increase in funding to \$18 million that we seek is essential if the Foundation is to build on its increasing level of success in contributing to the development of stable, democratic and peaceful societies in Asia. We respectfully urge that the Committee sustain its support for the Asia Foundation, and thereby demonstrate our strong, shared commitment to addressing the challenges and opportunities in Asia today.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator LEAHY. We will leave the record open for questions from other committee members:

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing.]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

Question. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are creating serious staff and funding shortages for other State Department and USAID missions around the world. The State Department has filled only 79 percent of its positions worldwide—so more than 20 percent are vacant.

How many State Department and USAID staff have been shifted from other posts to Iraq?

Answer. As of January 2008, the Department's overseas vacancy rate was approximately 11 percent and the domestic vacancy rate was approximately 18 percent, for a total vacancy rate of 13 percent overall. The Department's 13 percent vacancy rate reflects the insufficient number of Department personnel to adequately conduct foreign language and other types of training while continuing to staff operational positions.

The rapid growth of staffing needs in Iraq and Afghanistan required the Department to shift resources in a number of ways. The Department utilized approximately 100 Diplomatic Readiness Initiative positions, originally intended to create a training float, as a basis to quickly ramp up operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Each year the Department has also left lower priority domestic and overseas positions vacant in order to concentrate staffing resources on higher policy priorities, including long-term language training in superhard languages such as Arabic and Chinese. Approximately 140 domestic and overseas positions were "frozen" in this manner during the 2007 assignments cycle. We have also filled positions in Iraq with employees on short-term and long-term temporary duty [TDY] assignments. In those cases, the personnel resources were not shifted permanently to Iraq, but there

may have been temporary gaps in coverage because the Department does not have adequate personnel to backfill behind the employees serving on TDY.

If approved and fully funded by Congress, the Department's fiscal year 2009 request for 1,543 new positions (1,095 from State Operations Appropriations and 448 fee-funded positions under the Border Security Program) would significantly reduce the Department's overall vacancy rate. The 300 new positions requested for language training, for example, would cut the Department's overseas vacancy rate by half to approximately 6 percent.

Question. Approximately how much has been spent in Iraq that would otherwise have been available for Embassy operations and security and for assistance programs in other countries?

Answer. The administration has requested funding specifically for Embassy operations as well as assistance programs in Iraq in both annual and supplemental appropriations requests since 2004. With the exception of approximately \$88 million provided for staff salaries in Iraq and the operation of the Office of Iraq Affairs housed at the State Department in Washington, DC out of the Diplomatic and Consular Programs account between fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2008, all other costs related to Iraq have been supported by supplemental funding requested and appropriated specifically for Iraq. In addition, no assistance funding has been diverted from other country programs for use in Iraq.

EMBASSY BAGHDAD

Question. The fiscal year 2008 supplemental requests an additional \$1.5 billion to operate the huge new Embassy in Baghdad, but that hides the total cost of operations planned for 2008. Using carryover funds you plan to spend \$2.5 billion, a 100 percent increase over fiscal year 2007.

You have requested an additional \$310 million for construction projects at the new Embassy compound. The building has only just been certified for occupancy, and you need it to be still larger?

Answer. Within amounts requested for the Department of State in the fiscal year 2008 Supplemental, approximately \$75 million would be used for follow-on construction projects at the New Embassy Compound [NEC]. The completed NEC consists of 27 facilities; the requested funds would not be used to enlarge any building within the NEC but rather would go towards re-configuring spaces within two of the office buildings.

When the NEC was originally designed in 2004/2005, it was not expected that offices working under the American Ambassador and offices associated with the MNF-I Commander would need to be co-located. However, circumstances have changed and it continues to be critical to have diplomatic and military offices operate in the same location. The current amount of classified workspace in two office buildings in the NEC is not adequate to support all Mission and MNF-I staffers who routinely process classified material in their daily work. The Department is addressing these new requirements through follow-on projects, funding for which is in the fiscal year 2007 enacted supplemental (approximately \$75 million), and the fiscal year 2008 supplemental request (approximately \$75 million). The follow-on projects, totaling \$150 million also address requirements for additional secure temporary housing (trailers with overhead cover), other security enhancements to the NEC, and food service in addition to the reconfiguration of space in the two office buildings.

Question. A significant portion of the additional construction would delay when staff can move in until 2010.

In 2005, when Congress approved the largest and most costly Embassy ever built at \$592 million we were told it was urgently needed for our people serving in Iraq. Now this Embassy is finally ready to be occupied and you are asking us to delay further.

Why keep staff in trailers for another 2 years while a much more secure compound sits empty?

Answer. The New Embassy Compound [NEC] in Baghdad does not sit empty. The post has implemented a plan to begin occupancy of the staff apartments as of May 23, 2008. Approximately 50 percent of the 600 staff apartments are being subdivided with drywall in order to accommodate two residents. This project provides additional secure housing. In addition, certain components of the Embassy not requiring classified space will relocate their work operations to unclassified facilities in an annex building within the NEC as of June 2008.

If the follow-on projects for which funding has been requested in the fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008 supplementals receive full congressional approval by the end of May 2008, occupancy and use of 2 office structures among the 27 buildings

within the NEC would occur in June or July 2009 for the New Office Building and August 2009 for the Interim Office Building.

The Department has also requested funding for additional secure temporary housing on the NEC in its budget requests. This housing would consist of trailers protected with overhead cover.

The Department takes very seriously its responsibility for and commitment to the physical security of its employees. Employees are being moved out of unprotected trailers with no overhead cover and into secure permanent housing as rapidly as possible. Any additional housing to be constructed on the NEC would be as secure as possible given the need for speed of construction and prudent use of appropriated funds.

Question. In the 7 years of the Bush administration the Palestinians' per capita income has plummeted by 40 percent. At the same time, Israeli security checkpoints and other impediments to Palestinian commerce have increased.

According to press reports 2 weeks ago, the Israeli Government has said it will remove 50 checkpoints in the West Bank, and recent reports are that it has begun doing so. But that would leave about 550. We all recognize and support Israel's right to security. But I have seen how the West Bank has become a maze of fences, bypass roads, barriers and check points. By making it virtually impossible for Palestinians to get produce to market and to their jobs in Israel, hatred, desperation, and violence only increase. Is removing less than 10 percent of the checkpoints going to make a significant difference?

Answer. Israel has committed to reducing obstacles to Palestinian movement in the West Bank, both under the Roadmap, and in the November 2005 Agreement on Movement and Access that Secretary Rice brokered. There is an urgent need for progress in this area to build confidence between the parties, sustain popular support for negotiations, as well as to facilitate progress on important economic and capacity building projects for the Palestinians.

Secretary Rice has urged the Government of Israel to focus on removing obstacles to movement that will create a qualitative improvement in Palestinians' way of life rather than focusing on sheer numbers which may have limited or no effect. The government of Israel has committed to such a policy, and is focused initially on improving movement in and around Jenin, where the Palestinian Authority is currently conducting a law and order campaign as part of a broader initiative to improve economic and social conditions, as well as removing checkpoints near other big cities. For instance, on May 18 Israel removed a checkpoint south of Hebron that Palestinian business leaders had identified as a significant impediment to doing business.

Much more remains to be done. Improved performance by the Palestinian Authority Security Forces [PASF] to uphold law and order and combat terrorism, along with better Israeli-Palestinian security coordination, will facilitate continued progress. Progress on the ground remains a vital component of overall progress towards peace, and as such will remain a high priority for the Department.

Question. The press reported that a few hours after you left the Middle East a couple of weeks ago, the Israeli Government announced plans to build hundreds more homes in the Palestinian part of Jerusalem. Your response was that "settlement activity should stop", but I have lost count how many times this administration has said that and yet it continues. Apparently settlement construction has been booming since Annapolis. What should we take away from this—that the administration is powerless to convince the Israeli Government to stop it?

Answer. We continue to call on Israel to end settlement expansion and to remove unauthorized outposts, consistent with the Roadmap. Continued settlement construction is a problem. While we have seen far more announcements in recent months than actual construction on the ground, both announcements and actual construction are unhelpful. These activities do not contribute to a positive atmosphere supportive of negotiations, and only feed Palestinian and broader Arab skepticism about Israel's commitment to peace. Settlements are one of the many Roadmap issues that Lt. Gen. William Fraser is addressing as he works to monitor and promote progress on implementation of the Roadmap. At the same time, it is vital that we focus on helping the parties achieve their shared goal of a peace agreement before the end of the year, because then we will know what land belongs in Israel and what belongs in Palestine. But nothing that is undertaken under any guise can prejudice the outcome of negotiations.

Question. Past efforts by the Chinese Government have not succeeded in resolving the conflict over Tibet. Chinese officials now say things are back to "normal," but we know that what they call normal in Tibet is like a pot that is in a constant state of almost boiling over.

We want closer relations with China. We also want to see an end to the repression in Tibet. Six years of low level talks between China and the Dalai Lama's representatives have achieved nothing. You have urged the Chinese authorities to talk directly with the Dalai Lama, but they have consistently refused.

What do we do now?

How can we convince the Chinese that there is a solution to this conflict that serves the interest of both China and the Tibetans?

Answer. We welcome the May 4 meeting between Chinese officials and the Dalai Lama's representatives, Lody Gyari and Kelsang Gyaltzen, in Shenzhen as a constructive first step in resolving the longstanding tensions between Beijing and China's Tibetan people. While we do not know the details of the discussions, Mr. Gyari has stated that concrete proposals were made by both sides. We note that the two sides agreed to meet for a seventh round of formal dialogue, and we hope that this next round will be scheduled soon and lead to concrete results.

We share your concerns that the previous six rounds of dialogue from 2002 to 2007 yielded little substantive progress. As we have noted to the Chinese, dialogue that does not result in tangible improvements in the lives of Tibetans is likely to create cynicism and weaken support for the Dalai Lama's non-violent approach in the Tibetan community. We urge the Chinese Government to engage in substantive dialogue with the Dalai Lama's representatives and with the Dalai Lama himself, noting that the Dalai Lama has publicly and repeatedly said he does not call for independence for Tibet, has renounced all violence, and has expressed his support for the Beijing Olympics.

Tibetans have asked for increased autonomy to govern their own affairs within Tibetan areas, particularly on issues such as education, language, religious practices, and other matters that are important to the protection of Tibet's unique cultural heritage. We have called on China to address policies in Tibetan areas that have created tensions due to their impact on these facets of Tibetan life. We strongly believe this is in China's own interest and will serve not only to improve the lives of the Tibetan people, but also to reduce tensions and increase stability.

Question. As a result of the latest unrest, do we know how many Tibetans were killed, how many are under arrest, who they are and where they are being detained?

Does the International Red Cross have access to them?

Answer. Tibetan exile groups have reported 203 ethnic Tibetans killed in the unrest in March in the Tibetan Autonomous Region [TAR] and other Tibetan areas of China. Chinese officials and state-run media have stated that the figure is much lower. We cannot independently confirm these numbers.

We face similar difficulties in confirming the number of individuals detained during the recent unrest and the number still in custody. In an April 10 report, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China cited official Chinese reports stating that over 4,400 persons had either surrendered voluntarily to authorities for engaging in "beating, smashing, looting, and burning" during riots, or had been detained on suspicion of engaging in such activities. Many of the individuals who surrendered voluntarily were subsequently released by authorities; however Tibetan exile groups estimate that about 3,000 remain in custody. We have repeatedly asked for unfettered access to the Tibet Autonomous Region [TAR] and other Tibetan areas of China so that, among other things, U.S. diplomats could observe judicial proceedings against Tibetans charged in connection with recent events in Tibetan areas. Since the Chinese Government has denied such requests, we have not been able to independently confirm the number of detainees or the precise location and circumstances of these individuals' detention.

As was widely reported in the international press in April, the Lhasa Intermediate People's Court issued sentences ranging from 3 years to life in prison to 30 Tibetans for their alleged participation in violent acts during the protests. We are concerned about reports that these individuals were not afforded basic protections of due process. We were particularly disturbed that criminal defense lawyers who volunteered to represent the detainees were denied permission to do so.

Through our bilateral channels, the United States has raised, repeatedly and at the highest levels, our serious concerns regarding the status and treatment of those detained and arrested for their alleged participation in the protests. President Bush and Secretary Rice have spoken to their Chinese counterparts to urge restraint and the release of protesters who expressed their views peacefully. Ambassador Clark T. Randt at our Embassy in Beijing has raised the issue repeatedly with high-level officials in the Chinese Government. Officers from our Embassy and our Consulate General in Chengdu have repeatedly pressed Chinese officials at all levels for information regarding detainees, for unfettered access to the TAR and other affected

areas, and for information on individual cases. To date, we have not received a positive response to our requests.

We have called on the Chinese Government to ensure that all legal and administrative proceedings against persons alleged to have participated in violent acts during the recent protests throughout Tibetan areas of China are conducted in a manner that is both transparent and consistent with Chinese law and international human rights norms. We will continue to raise these concerns with our Chinese interlocutors, including as part of our upcoming bilateral human rights dialogue with China.

To our knowledge, the International Committee of the Red Cross does not have access to the detainees at this time.

Question. For years, the administration was figuratively joined at the hip with Pakistan's President Musharraf. We poured billions of dollars into that country with no conditions. Musharraf is widely despised by the Pakistani people and they hold us responsible for being his patron.

The recent elections offer a new opportunity to reshape our policy and programs in Pakistan. How do you see our policy changing now that Pakistan has a new Parliament and Prime Minister?

Answer. The United States is robustly engaging with the new government and will continue to strengthen civilian institutions and build a broad-based relationship between our two peoples. Deputy Secretary Negroponte and Assistant Secretary Richard Boucher visited Pakistan in mid-March and held meetings with a wide range of Pakistan's new leadership, including Prime Minister Gilani.

Our priorities in Pakistan will not change—we will continue our focus on democracy, development, economic growth, and security, but will pursue our partnership with Pakistan as a long-term relationship with Pakistan's people and institutions.

As part of this goal, we look forward to working with Congress and the new Pakistani Government on expanding United States assistance for Pakistan's continued democratic, economic, and social development. We believe the restoration of democracy in Pakistan is an important opportunity for us to demonstrate our long-term commitment, expand United States programs to help the Pakistani people and help the new government meet its objective of transforming Pakistan into a prosperous, secure democracy. We hope to establish a new framework for political, economic, and security assistance to Pakistan's democracy—one that represents the type of partnership only possible between two democracies with shared interests in good governance, economic development, and combating violent extremism.

Question. The administration has focused attention on Darfur, but the killing and burning of villages continues. We read that the 9,000 hybrid force of U.N./African Union troops on the ground lack everything from adequate transport to blue helmets.

Why does this new mission seemingly not have the equipment and support it needs to respond to the worst humanitarian crisis in the world?

Have we exhausted our leverage with Sudan's President Omar al-Bashir or do you have something else planned?

Answer. The former African Union Mission in Sudan [AMIS] troops who are now part of UNAMID, have accommodations, vehicles, and communications equipment provided by AMIS partners including the United States, the European Union, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Many of these troops are currently in the process of being upgraded to full United Nations-standards by their home governments, with further bilateral assistance from donor countries, primarily the United States.

Once deployed, UNAMID will be one of the U.N.'s largest peacekeeping operations. The mission is struggling to generate, deploy, and accommodate its authorized 26,000 uniformed personnel. UNAMID draws its resources not just from U.N. peacekeeping assessments, but more fundamentally from U.N. member states, which contribute active-duty troops and formed police units. Many of the key troop contributing countries hesitate to pledge troops to the mission due to the ongoing violence in Darfur, including attacks against UNAMID personnel, and perceived government of Sudan opposition to non-African troop contributors.

UNAMID is confronted by three major equipment and capacity challenges: (1) Lack of pledges of crucial enabling units for UNAMID (exempli grati, helicopters, heavy transport, combat engineers); (2) many of the African units pledged fall short of U.N. self-sufficiency standards; (3) lack of infrastructure in Darfur to absorb rapid troop deployment and robust operations.

The United States is confronting these challenges where it can by lobbying key partners to provide missing UNAMID enabling units, by pressing the government of Sudan to accept non-African units, and by pressing the United Nations to make maximum use of its existing legal authorities to contract for service providers to support peacekeeping troops in the field. As announced by President Bush in Feb-

ruary, we are also providing over \$100 million in United States equipment and training assistance to African troop contributing countries (including Rwanda, Senegal, Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Malawi, Ghana, and Tanzania) deploying as part of UNAMID.

United States discussions with the government of Sudan have focused on tangible improvements in the ground situation. We have been clear that no options are off the table.

Question. In the eastern region of the Democratic Republic of Congo, tens of thousands of women and girls have been raped by rebels and Congolese Army troops. Is the administration putting pressure on President Kabila to send more soldiers to eastern Congo who have the training and professionalism to protect these women, and to punish those who have committed these atrocities?

Answer. We are working with President Kabila and Congolese authorities directly and through the United Nations Mission to the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC) to address the problem of gender-based violence in eastern Congo. President Kabila has appealed to us for help in training and professionalizing the Congolese armed forces. It is important to remember that the Congolese armed forces are comprised of former belligerents who are not fully integrated. Untrained and irregularly paid Congolese are sometimes implicated in violence. We are training military prosecutors to investigate sex crimes, and we are working with international and local civil society organizations to not only provide psycho-social relief services to victims but to also educate them about their judicial rights. We are promoting professionalism through training. President Kabila has asked the United States to train a rapid reaction force for eastern Congo. Human rights will be a significant element in this training. Unfortunately, we do not have the peacekeeping funds necessary to do this training.

While increasing the number of professional soldiers is an attractive option to reduce women's exposure to sexual violence, it is obviously not a long-term solution. The sexual violence against women in eastern Congo will not end until the fighting stops. For this reason, the Department continues to focus on assisting the Congolese Government and other parties to implement the Nairobi communiqué of last fall and the January 2008 Goma cease-fire agreement in order to create the conditions for sustainable peace, which will facilitate greater rebuilding of the country's weak justice system and thus an end to the ongoing culture of impunity, particularly in the east. The United States was intimately involved in the negotiations of both agreements.

Question. What about increasing the number of U.N. troops there?

Answer. Given the size of the Congo—as big as the United States east of the Mississippi—increasing the size of the United Nations looks attractive as an option. However, as the demand for U.N. peacekeeping continues to rise worldwide, the feasibility of increasing the size of MONUC becomes ever more problematic. Troop and financial contributors to MONUC had expected that the mission would begin a drawdown in 2008, following national and local elections. An increase in violence in 2007 has pushed local elections back to 2009 and required a realignment of MONUC forces to eastern Congo. We are not ready to begin a withdrawal, but an enlargement is unlikely.

Question. What is the administration doing to pressure Rwandan President Kagame to take back the Rwandan refugees in Congo, most of whom were not part of the genocide?

Answer. President Kagame has called for all Rwandans in Congo to return to Rwanda, with the condition that they must face justice if they were involved in the genocide. The U.S. facilitates the Tripartite Plus Process, a confidence-building mechanism aimed at ending the threat of armed groups in the Great Lakes region. At the Tripartite Plus Summit in Addis Ababa on December 5, Secretary Rice urged Great Lakes leaders to fulfill their previous commitments, including their commitment to the voluntary return of refugees.

Question. How, specifically, is the Leahy amendment being enforced in Israel?

Answer. The Department has issued Leahy implementation guidance to all posts instructing them on how to report on human rights issues and how to conduct vetting for training programs subject to the Leahy amendment. As is policy worldwide, after receiving a training request for Leahy vetting, Post's Leahy point of contact (often Post's human rights officer) conducts a local records search, including Internet, for any indications that the individual or unit has been implicated in gross human rights violations. In Tel Aviv, the human rights officer then asks the Regional Security Office, Defense Attaché's Office, Legal Attaché, and Consular section to search their records and to respond in writing to the human rights officer with the results of their searches. Once the Embassy checks have been completed, the human rights officer sends a cable to the Department with the results and requests

further vetting by the Washington-based bureaus. The Near Eastern Affairs Israel and Palestinian Affairs Desk [NEA/IPA] receives the cables and conducts an INR data-base search on the requested individual and/or unit. NEA/IPA also requests that the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor [DRL] to conduct a records search. Once these checks are complete, the Department cables the results back to the Embassy. If credible derogatory information is found, assistance is withheld.

Question. Please provide me with a list of incidents that have triggered the Leahy Amendment in Israel, and what was done as a result?

Answer. As a general matter, the Department policy would be to deny training when derogatory information is identified, without making a formal determination that the Leahy amendment applies. We would be happy to discuss this further with you in a classified setting.

Question. What is the status of the flawed investigation of Rachel Corrie's death? What is the administration doing to ensure that a thorough, credible and transparent investigation is done?

Answer: The United States Government takes its responsibilities involving American citizens abroad very seriously and has repeatedly engaged the Government of Israel at the highest levels about this issue. Immediately following Ms. Corrie's tragic death, President Bush telephoned Israeli Prime Minister Sharon to request a thorough and transparent investigation and was given personal assurances by the Prime Minister that there would be one. Additionally, then-Secretary Powell, Ambassador Kurtzer, Deputy Chief of Mission LeBaron, Assistant Secretary William Burns, and Deputy Assistant Secretary David Satterfield, among others, raised this issue with their counterparts and other appropriate authorities in the Israeli Government.

More recently, during a visit to Israel in November 2007, former Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs Maura Harty specifically raised outstanding issues again with her counterpart at the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Yigal Tzarfati. Assistant Secretary Harty also gave Mr. Tzarfati a letter that reiterated the U.S. Government's request for a full and transparent investigation of the incident. Janice Jacobs, Acting Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs, reiterated this request in March 2008.

The government of Israel has not yet fully responded to these requests, and specifically to our request for a full and transparent investigation. We continue to follow up with the Israelis for a response to our inquiries.

Additionally, in late October 2007 representatives from the Department of State met with the Corrie family and with Congressman Baird and his staff at his offices to discuss concerns that the Corrie family still has with respect to the death of Rachel Corrie. We are continuing to raise with the Israeli Government charges of irregularities with its handling of the case and to respond to the family's concerns to the maximum extent possible.

Question. Was U.S. assistance used to purchase the bulldozer that killed Ms. Corrie? Was it a U.S.-manufactured bulldozer?

Answer. The government of Israel purchased bulldozers from Caterpillar, Inc., a United States corporation, using Foreign Military Financing funds provided to the government of Israel. An Israeli-purchased Caterpillar bulldozer was involved in Ms. Corrie's tragic death.

Question. Has United States assistance for Israel been used to purchase United States-manufactured bulldozers used in home demolitions?

Answer. U.S. Foreign Military Financing is used by the government of Israel to purchase Caterpillar bulldozers. Caterpillar bulldozers have been used in home demolitions.

Question. Have changes been made in the manner in which U.S.-manufactured bulldozers used in home demolitions are licensed, sold, transferred, monitored, or equipped?

Answer. Since 2003, the sale of one bulldozer was conducted via the Foreign Military Sales [FMS] process. Caterpillar bulldozers are considered standard commercial construction equipment. It is our understanding that the government of Israel arms their bulldozers, if required, in an industrial facility in Israel. FMS sales are subject to end use monitoring.

Question. Have there been other deaths resulting from the use of bulldozers by the Israeli Defense Force since Ms. Corrie's death? If so, what were the circumstances and what action was taken?

Answer. We are not aware of any such deaths resulting from the use of bulldozers since Ms. Corrie's death.

Question. We continue to receive credible reports of atrocities being committed by Ethiopian Government soldiers in the Ogaden region. The administration requests

an increase in military assistance for Ethiopia from \$850,000 last year to \$4 million in fiscal year 2009.

What will these funds be used for and how will you ensure that the United States is not associated with Ethiopian forces who violate human rights?

Answer. We continue to investigate allegations of human rights abuses allegedly committed by the Ethiopian National Defense Force [ENDF] in the Ogaden region. We are not in a position at this time to assess the credibility of the allegations or confirm their veracity. The U.S. Government takes seriously all allegations of human rights abuse. Ethiopia remains a key ally in protecting United States national security interests in the Horn of Africa and regularly contributes troops to peacekeeping operations. Ensuring that Ethiopian forces are professionally trained and equipped is therefore a high priority for the United States.

The fiscal year 2009 Foreign Military Financing [FMF] request of \$4 million is critical to help professionalize the Ethiopian military. The fiscal year 2009 FMF will focus on two priorities: support for the U.S. Army-modeled Command and General Staff College, and to continue funding spare parts, maintenance support, and other training associated with the Ethiopian Air Force fleet of four C-130/L-100 transport aircraft.

The Ethiopian Command and General Staff College trains senior and mid-grade ENDF officers for more senior command and staff positions within the ENDF. Understanding the role of the military in a multiparty democracy, civil-military relations, civilian control of the military and the respect for human rights are core components of its U.S.-modeled curriculum. Assistance to this institution therefore remains a key component of United States efforts to support the transition to multiparty democracy in Ethiopia. Attendees of FMF-funded training will be vetted in accordance with State Leahy procedures to ensure compliance with the Leahy amendment.

The Ethiopia Air Force uses its one operational C-130 to transport its peacekeepers to peacekeeping missions in Africa. Ethiopia currently has peacekeepers in Liberia and is deploying to Darfur. Enhancing Ethiopian air transport capability reduces requirements on U.S. airlift to move African peacekeeping forces in the region. Lastly, having operational transport aircraft enhances the capability of the Ethiopian Air Force to respond to humanitarian crises (drought and/or flooding) in the Ogaden region and elsewhere in Ethiopia, specifically humanitarian relief supplies and food.

The Department of State ensures that all Ethiopian security force personnel that are trained with foreign assistance funding undergo human rights vetting in accordance with Department of State policies and procedures to ensure compliance with the Leahy Law. In addition, the U.S. Government, through the American Embassy in Addis Ababa, conducts end-use monitoring to ensure that FMF-funded equipment does not benefit Ethiopian forces that violate human rights.

FAMILY PLANNING AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

Question. Last year, we appropriated \$456 million for family planning and reproductive health which public health experts tell us is one of the essential building blocks of a functioning health system. That may sound like a lot, but it is actually about the same amount we appropriated in 1995, when the dollar's purchasing power was a lot higher than it is today.

For 2009, you propose to cut it to \$301 million.

Why does that make sense, when we know that there are women in many poor countries that need contraceptives and cannot get them, and we know that unplanned births only compound the difficulties of families that are already barely able to earn enough to survive?

Answer. The President has requested \$328 million for family planning and reproductive health. Of that amount, \$301.7 million is from USAID's Child Survival and Health account and \$25.8 million is from the Economic Support Funds, Freedom Support Act, and Support for East European Democracy accounts. This is a 29 percent reduction from the fiscal year 2008 653a enacted level of \$464 million.

Even at this funding level, the United States remains the largest bilateral donor for family planning and reproductive health. The funding level reflects the current budget coupled with competing priorities for resources to support initiatives in HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and TB. Family planning and reproductive health remains one of the top four programs in the USAID health portfolio.

Question. The fiscal year 2008 State and Foreign Operations Act requires you to convene an interagency committee to evaluate the specific needs of developing countries in adapting to climate change impacts. It further requires you to submit a report by September 1, 2008, describing such needs, on a country-by-country and re-

gional basis, and the actions planned and being taken by the United States, including amounts of funding provided to developing countries to help them adapt to climate change impacts.

I want to be sure someone in your Department is taking this seriously, and that the report will describe action plans for helping these countries adapt to what could be devastating consequences of global warming.

Has the committee been convened, and have they begun this study? If you don't know, will you be sure this is being done?

Answer. Let me assure you that the Department of State is taking seriously the climate change activities you have raised. Our fiscal year 2009 budget request includes \$64 million to support our efforts to address adaptation and reduce deforestation. These are key elements of the Bali Action Plan adopted at the multilateral climate change negotiations in Indonesia this past December. In the case of the Asia Pacific Partnership [APP] for Clean Development and Climate, we have requested \$26 million in the fiscal year 2009 budget request from the Economic Support Fund account. APP is an innovative effort to accelerate the development and deployment of clean energy technologies. Moreover, President Bush has committed \$2 billion for the Clean Technology Fund, which will help advance cleaner and more efficient technologies in key developing countries.

Last year, even before the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill was passed, a National Security Council Principals Committee tasked the Department of State with leading, at the highest sub-Cabinet level, an interagency effort to address the needs of developing countries in taking action on climate change. This effort was undertaken to support President Bush's announcement on May 31, 2007 to develop a new framework on energy security and climate change by the end of 2008. The Department worked closely with other agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Agency for International Development to develop a range of activities to help developing countries adapt to the impacts of climate change. Building on the work begun last year, we are taking steps to convene an interagency committee, at the highest levels, to further discussions and to comply with the September 1 reporting deadline.

Question. The State Department's fiscal year 2009 budget proposes a new program, the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, to train for quick deployment of U.S. Government personnel from various agencies and civilians with special skills to provide a civilian counter-part to the military in post-conflict environments to help countries rebuild.

The budget requests \$248 million for this initiative to build a long-term capacity. How do you expect to spend these funds in 1 year?

Answer. The Civilian Stabilization Initiative [CSI] will develop an Active Response Corps, a Standby Response Corps, and a Civilian Reserve Corps that will be trained, equipped, and ready to be deployed to assist in the stabilization and reconstruction of countries and regions that are at risk of, in, or transitioning from conflict or civil strife.

The CSI fiscal year 2009 budget request is for establishment of a no-year funding account in recognition that crises, and the need for an adequate U.S. Government's response to them, are inherently unpredictable. Funding needed for force protection or deployment, for example, will fluctuate from year-to-year, and funds not needed in one year can then be made available in the following year.

Question. The State Department's fiscal year 2009 budget proposes a new program, the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, to train for quick deployment of U.S. Government personnel from various agencies and civilians with special skills to provide a civilian counter-part to the military in post-conflict environments to help countries rebuild.

What role do you see USAID playing in this initiative?

Answer. USAID is involved at every level of the policy coordination process for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative [CSI]. USAID officials co-chair the senior policy bodies, including several of the sub-Policy Coordinating Committees on NSPD-44 implementation and the Committee of the Consortium for Complex Operations. They also co-chair the Senior Leaders' Roundtable, and the Interagency Counter-insurgency Initiative.

USAID will play a key role in decision-making in all levels of an actual response. USAID is a member of the Country Reconstruction and Stabilization Group [CRSG] that recommends to the President the U.S. Government response to a given crisis under the procedures set out under the Interagency Management System [IMS], which is the framework for responding to reconstruction and stabilization crises. USAID staffs are also expected to play critical roles on the CRSG Secretariat, in the Integration Planning Cell (IPC), and on the Advance Civilian Team (ACT) in-country. USAID also participates in the Assistance Working Groups, organized by

the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, which are part of the planning and budgeting process for reconstruction and stabilization. Additionally, USAID will carry out all implementation planning and decision-making for programming in its areas of responsibilities.

USAID will also have Active Response Corps (ARC) and Standby Response Corps (SRC) members. Under CSI, they will receive the largest percentage of ARC and SRC positions, or 37 percent, which equates to 93 new positions. The State Department will have 29 percent, with the remaining 34 percent distributed among other U.S. Government agencies.

EMERGING INFECTIOUS DISEASES

Question. Many countries have endorsed and participated in the USAID and CDC funded Global Animal Information Network for Surveillance (Wildlife GAINS), developed to monitor and share avian influenza information and samples from wild birds from around the world. International organizations and public health institutions, such as the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization, agree that monitoring wildlife for a wide range of emerging diseases is critical.

Does the State Department plan to support the public-private sector partnership approach to prevent global spread of diseases?

Answer. The Department of State's Avian Influenza Action Group (AIAG) supports the public-private partnerships in the Wild Bird Global Avian Influenza Network for Surveillance (GAINS) under funding from USAID and CDC. These partnerships effectively met multiple action targets in the National Strategy for Pandemic Influenza and, overall, improved participating countries' capacities to assess influenza risks in wildlife. The AIAG directly supports GAINS by helping to ensure that the network is well coordinated with other U.S. Government efforts to strengthen influenza research, surveillance, and detection in priority countries. For example, the Department of Agriculture's international efforts to protect agricultural animals (id est, poultry, swine) from wildlife disease risks directly complements GAINS, and vice versa. Likewise, the AIAG provides a forum to help technical agencies steer their influenza research and international capacity building activities in a manner that helps to expand partnership in GAINS and helps current participants optimize their use of the network. The AIAG plans to continue this level of support to GAINS in the future.

Question. Please provide the following:

List of all the units of any Thai security forces that have been vetted for U.S. assistance since 2001.

List of all units of any Thai security forces that have received U.S. assistance since 2001.

List of unvetted units of the Thai security forces from which individual members are cleared to receive U.S. training.

Answer. A list of Thai security forces vetted for U.S. assistance since 2002 is attached. The list identifies units vetted for the purpose of unit training. Following the GAO Report "Southeast Asia: Better Human Rights Reviews and Strategic Planning Needed For U.S. Assistance to Foreign Security Forces" which was released in July 2005, Embassy Bangkok improved its record-keeping on the vetting of law enforcement personnel, ensuring that all agencies are aware of the requirement to vet law enforcement individuals covered by the Leahy provisions, and that all training/vetting is properly recorded. Post records of law enforcement training prior to 2005 may have some gaps.

All Thai military units that have received assistance since 2001 in the form of training were vetted and are reflected in the response above. Assistance in the form of equipment and supplies is provided to the procurement agencies of the Royal Thai Armed Forces (RTArF) rather than to individual security force units. The individual services of the Thai Armed Forces then decide how best to employ the equipment and supplies per Thai national security priorities. The entire RTArF or service component would not be vetted when providing equipment and supplies, as in comparable cases of providing assistance a centralized national Defense ministry or combined armed forces. End use commitments are secured on all equipment and technology provided, and end use monitoring on select equipment, technology or systems is conducted periodically. Every individual who receives training is vetted and we maintain a list of those individuals. Units with which vetted individuals are affiliated are to be vetted as well, although there had been some inconsistency in the past practice of some posts in this regard, which is being regularized.

STATE DEPARTMENT—LACK OF RESPONSIVENESS

Question. Following your appearance before the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee in May 2007, it took us almost 9 months to receive all of your responses to questions, edits to your transcript, and items you said you would submit for the hearing record. As you know, the hearing record plays an important role in providing the public the opportunity to review the activities of the Committee and I believe they deserve this information in a timely manner.

The printing staff of the Appropriations Committee has had many difficulties in obtaining the Department's record submissions following hearings. In my role as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee I ask that witnesses respond to questions for the record within 2 weeks following the receipt of written questions.

How much time does the Department of State require to respond to record submissions, including questions submitted by Senators?

Answer. The Department attempts to respond to questions for the record in as prompt a manner as possible. In some instances, responses must be coordinated among various bureaus, with other agencies, or with a U.S. Embassy.

Question. What can be done to expedite this process?

Answer. We take the responsibility of providing information to Congress very seriously, and we believe it is important to review our own procedures, periodically, to seek ways of providing responses on a more timely basis.

CONCLUSION OF HEARINGS

Senator LEAHY. Thank you all very much. That concludes our hearings.

[Whereupon, at 11:49 a.m., Wednesday, April 9, the hearings were concluded, and the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

LIST OF WITNESSES, COMMUNICATIONS, AND PREPARED STATEMENTS

	Page
Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Prepared Statement of the	104
Bennett, Senator Robert F., U.S. Senator From Utah, Statement of	3
Bond, Senator Christopher S., U.S. Senator From Missouri:	
Prepared Statement of	20
Statement Submitted by	20
Brownback, Senator Sam, U.S. Senator From Kansas, Statement of	64
Cochran, Senator Thad, U.S. Senator From Mississippi, Statement of	48
Durbin, Senator Richard J., U.S. Senator From Illinois, Questions Submitted by	27
Fore, Henrietta H., Administrator and Director of Foreign Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development	1
Prepared Statement of	6
Summary Statement of	4
Gregg, Senator Judd, U.S. Senator From New Hampshire, Opening Statement of	33
Leahy, Senator Patrick J., U.S. Senator From Vermont:	
Opening Statements of	1, 31
Prepared Statements of	2, 33
Questions Submitted by	21, 110
Rice, Hon. Condoleezza, Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Department of State	31
Prepared Statement of	37
Summary Statement of	35
The Asia Foundation, Prepared Statement of	107

SUBJECT INDEX

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

	Page
Additional Committee Questions	110
Civilian Stabilization in Post-Conflict States	38
Core Exchange Programs	105
Diplomatic Solutions to National Security Issues	38
Economic Assistance	43
Embassy Baghdad	111
Emerging Infectious Diseases	119
Family Planning and Reproductive Health	117
Fiscal Year 2009:	
Foreign Operations Request	40
State Operations Request	37
Global Challenges	46
Influencing Foreign Opinion Through Public Diplomacy	39
Programs	110
Protecting America's Borders	38
Providing Secure Diplomatic Facilities	39
Regional Programs	106
Section II	86
Security Assistance	45
State Department—Lack of Responsiveness	120
The Asia Foundation's Mission, Expertise, and Approach	109

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Additional Committee Questions	21
Administrator Fore's Priorities	21
Biodiversity Protection	26
Burma	28
Child Survival and Maternal Health	23
China	24
Continued Focus on Security Assistance	9
Cuba	29
Democracy Program in Pakistan	27
Development Leadership Initiative	22
Foreign Operations Request	7
Global War on Terror	7
International Disaster Assistance	22
Maintain a Strong Focus on Health	9
Mérida Initiative	25
Millennium Challenge Corporation	24
National Solidarity Program	27
Promoting Freedom	8
Rebuilding the U.S. Agency for International Development	20
Renewing the Focus on Poverty Reduction	8
Strengthening USAID's Operational Capacity	8
Transition Initiatives	23
USAID Budget	17
Water	28